

Paradox of Torah and Jewish presence in Church

Boris Balter, Lisa Loden.

Slide 1: Title page

Introduction.

Assuming that there should be a distinct Jewish presence in Church, what should be its Torah: in the Old (OT) or in the New Testament (NT) sense? “Torah” is used here as a tag for a yet-to-be-defined concept having as its root the OT Law and extending into the eschatological perspective via some analogue of this Law in NT. After having questioned the definition of Torah, the further question remains as to its continuing relevance for Jews in the Body of Messiah. How Torah relates to the continuing expression of Jewishness in the Church is as important as the issue of the permanence of Jewishness in the Church.

In treating the issue, we try to incorporate the problem of Jewishness in the body of Messiah into the eschatological vision of Jewishness: the end of time, the Ω point, provides the frame of reference for assessing Jewishness and Torah. This frame incorporates God’s plan for Jewish people into God’s vaster plan for the entire Universe.

Slide 2. Concept of Jewishness in the Church is paradoxical

Torah in OT was the core of Jewishness and had a dual practical and spiritual, earthly and heavenly nature. Obviously, in moving to NT and towards eschaton, the Torah becomes wider, with the balance shifted towards spiritual; therefore, Jewishness in the Church is expected to be wider and more spiritually oriented than Jewishness in OT times.

The concept of Jewishness in the Church is paradoxical. A part of the paradox is that Jewishness is normally considered a *collective* concept, e.g., referring to people, while Christianity is based on *personal* relations with God. Another part of the paradox is that Jewishness has to coexist with the “neither Greek nor Jew” principle (Col. 3:11). The same type of paradox has to be expected for Torah translated into the NT context. For example, how should it coexist with Gospel, which is the Law of the Church? Is it individually chosen or collectively established? Is it verbalized or ineffable? Does it regulate behavior or does it do something else? The coexistence of such polarities is characteristic for paradox. For Torah, be it understood as law or as teaching, the most fundamental polarity is that of letter and spirit.

Slide 3. Epimenides paradox.

To handle the issue, we try to understand and explain paradox, although this is an ambiguous undertaking. This means approaching it with some “reference frame” of logic, like an observer in laboratory. Observation side-effects, analogous to quantum mechanical (QM), immediately appear: the whole splits into dualities: reality vs. mental image; object of observation vs. subject; God’s eternal outlook vs. human temporal outlook; based on reason vs. based on faith; individual vs. collective; verbalized vs. ineffable; last but not least, particle-like vs. wave-like.

Paradoxes abound in the Bible. Even superficially smooth texts such as psalms, on closer inspection divulge their paradoxical contents. OT Torah starts looking paradoxical when we inspect it at a closer distance, and even more so, when one tries to implement it. This was the experience of ancient Jewish theologians who tried to interpret Torah.

Torah Law is the expression of God's truth in a seemingly rational form. Its dual "natural law" does the same in an irrational form, until rationalized by science. The founders of modern science, of whom Newton was the first, saw science as a quest for understanding God's plan for the Universe. For them, the formal laws discovered were significant only to the extent that they embody and hint at some implicit, ineffable divine law, at something like "l'amor che muove il sole e l'altre stelle", "the love that moves the sun and other stars" (Dante). Science, understood this way, *images* the link between the material and spiritual sides of the Universe. Christ *embodies* such a link. Thus, deeper science could yield a deeper Christology and, consequently, a deeper understanding of Torah.

Slide 4. Natural laws are "Natural Torahs"

Modern science discovered that when an observer is explicitly taken into account, even the "natural law" acquires a paradoxical character. That's why Quantum Mechanics is the most paradoxical branch of science. The main dualities it induces are between observable and unobservable properties of matter, and between particle-like and wave-like behavior. Usually, we are biased toward particle-like models. In this paper, we try to redress the imbalance. The wave-like mode means that even if we can't penetrate the "inner dynamics," a paradox by logic, we can interact with it in more than only the logical mode: poetically, artistically etc.

Slide 5. Quantum Mechanics, most paradoxical of hard sciences.

An eminent example of paradox is Christ as the center of God's design. His being a hypostasis of One God generates the duality part/whole; His merging of two natures induces the duality between heavenly and earthly; His status both outside time, "in the beginning" (John 1:1), and in history induces the duality between the eternal and the temporal outlook, and so on. If we consider His place in God's design, it is the Cross, which is a paradox in itself.

By definition, a paradox doesn't lend itself to logical explanation. So, this paper won't try to give exact definitions for every idea we use. This would only multiply the dualities ad infinitum. We'll try to transmit our message in a more or less wave-like mode. The purpose of discussing paradoxes in a paper like this, even if we don't expect to arrive at any "final solution," is the fact that contact with paradox changes us. Our psyche is a paradox in itself, so everything we discover about paradox rebounds on our self-perception, changing our frames of reference. And, after all, self-perception is a key to self-identification, including that of Jews in the Church.

On self-definition of Jewishness.

The essential question for a definition of Jewishness in the Christian Church is: how, in God's design, Jews and Christians reach the final Omega point.

In its first epoch, B.C., Jewish identity was twofold, ethnic and religious. These two were united. Apparently, this was God's plan. The "ethnic" was a vessel for "the spiritual." Then, the vessel

was broken in order to be opened. Today, Jewish identity is a problem, because these two are no more united. This again seems to be God's plan.

At the end of the first epoch, St. Paul was the first to identify the problem of "What is Jewishness?" The reason being was he felt that at the new stage of God's plan for Jews, the old notion of "Jewishness" was insufficient. The full unfolding of this plan is in the eschatological perspective. So our notion of Jewishness has to be viable in this perspective.

Today, Jewishness has acquired a distributed character, typical for our networked age when everything is distributed. Jewishness is already as much dissolved in humanity as it is concentrated in the Jewish nation: as much wave-like as particle-like. Therefore, we find signs of Jewishness in people from many ethnoses. The Church, too, is permeated by "diffused Jewishness." Can Jews, simultaneously exist in it as a distinct group? Obviously, here we have to deal with the paradoxical relationship between the part and the whole, or, in other words, between the universal and the particular. This induces the paradoxical definition of the Torah of the Church.

The Jewish place in God's plan was formed nationally. However, in a Christian environment, that place transforms into a matter of personal choice. Jewish believers in Jesus are obliged to replace the forced national cross-carrying by the voluntary carrying of one's personal cross. We see this as having repercussions for the self-perception of Jews as a people, and not only for Jewish believers.

Mark Kinzer tagged the future relationship between Jewish people and the Christian Church "the bilateral ecclesia."¹ We use the Mobius strip as the image of how we understand "bilateralism." It has two sides that flow continuously into each other, but are opposite in each specific point. It is a metaphor for the future relationship between Jewishness and Christianity, modeled as the two sides of the strip.

We promote the view that the role of "genetic Jewishness" in the self-identification of Jews will be much less relevant in the future than it is now. We extend the Mobius strip metaphor to understanding Jewishness and Christianity as two voices in a God-created melody: voices in counterpoint, yet combining into a harmonic whole. It is a new relationship between the Jews and the church, where each can see the other as a reference point for self-definition, but, paradoxically, through sameness at the same time as through otherness.

"Old Israel" and "New Israel" will always present a problem for each other, yet they form a whole. This is a paradox which will dynamically unfold in time until the Omega point is reached. Only then/there, this paradox will be resolved: only in the New Jerusalem where Israel = Church = Christ = God.

Slide 6. Dual features of Torah in the biblical context

The dual features of Torah in the biblical context

¹ Mark S. Kinzer, "Postmissionary Messianic Judaism: Redefining Christian Engagement with the Jewish People," (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005)

Since NT Torah grows out of OT Torah, we should first see the roots of NT paradoxes in OT paradoxes. The most important duality of the latter is between letter and spirit of biblical law. Usually, Torah as law is considered as a clearly defined and articulated set of precepts or criteria of behavior. Initially, it was based on the law given to Moses at Sinai. Later, expanding itself in the life of Israel, the idea of Torah broadened and included principles “condensed out” of the entire Bible. It is the letter of the Law. This understanding of Torah views it in a “particle-like” manner as the hard spiritual nucleus of the entire Bible.

The Bible, however, obviously also has less hardly defined, e.g., non-verbal elements. The necessity to include them into the understanding of Torah is hinted at by the mere fact that Torah literally means teaching or instruction rather than law. To capture this duality between “hard” and “soft,” verbal and nonverbal layers of the Bible, we use the wave-particle analogy borrowed from quantum physics. The “wavelike” in the Bible is what can’t be pinned down. The best example is the Psalter: its main message is delivered by “poetic waves,” which lie outside its formal content. As any good poetry, the Psalter uses verbal structures to convey content, emotion and nuance but the full meaning and impact is far more extensive than the frame in which the words, concepts, and images are set. Poetry engages the reader on multiple levels, some of which are indiscernible to him/her on a strictly cognitive level.

We see something rarely understood implied by the wavelike character of Torah: one can’t “capture” the wavelike entities, but one can “tune” to them. Like poetic effect, the effect of a wave is difficult to characterize unambiguously – for various reasons, including the fact that its impact and reactions to it are dependent on the perception context. Nonetheless, such a wave is distinctive and clearly discernible in its effect. We can say that this wave “carries the spirit of the Law,” in contrast to its letter. Could the “distinct expression of Jewishness” in the Church be like this?

There is one more lesson to be learned from the Psalter and applied to Torah. In trying to understand the Psalter, we can project its meaning into three symbolic layers, in addition to the literal one: a personal layer addressing the soul of any human being; a collective, or national, layer addressing God’s hand in the destiny of Israel; a universal layer addressing the general relationships between God and His creation. All three express the same universal Logos, each in its own way.

The duality between Torah and Psalter means they can be similarly structured and suggests an analogous layering of Torah. Then, the kind of Torah naturally corresponding to the entire Church (which is going to embrace the entire Universe, in the end) would be the universal layer of Torah; for Jews in the Church, the collective layer; for both individual Jews and non-Jews alike, the personal layer. Due to the duality between reality and image, these layers can be understood either as ways of *interpreting* the Psalter or Torah or as spheres of real Torah *application*: to personal life; as a collective, e.g. national norm; as taking into account the spiritual reverse side of the natural laws on which we build our practice.

These “partial Torahs” are actually as interpenetrating and interacting as the layers of meaning in Psalms. We can liken them to the sounds of different instruments in a symphony. One can tune one’s ear to hearing one specific instrument and this naturally happens when following the flow

of a symphony. However, to perceive the full meaning of a symphony, one has to take in the voices of all the instruments, not just one.

Although Christianity emphasizes the “personal Torah,” it can learn something from the “collective Torah” of the OT. The latter is a guard against “diffusion” of wavelike Torah and keeps the entire diversity of “personal Torahs” together. The earthly substratum of this guard in the OT is the “national vessel,” but the guard itself is spiritual. In the Christian Church, which is trans-national, this role is played by the common “Torah” of the Church, based on Gospel. It can’t be made specifically Jewish, but the “personal Torahs” can. By feeding back to the collective layer, they will resonate and amplify an already existing Jewish note there as well.

Duality of Torah in the context of the “natural Law”

Psalter and, in a more focused way, St. Paul, mentions a “natural law,” twin to the written law and expressing essentially the same Logos. Paul understands the “natural law” primarily in the moral sense; the Psalter (e.g., Ps. 104) gives a wider perspective where processes in the inanimate, the animate, and the rational/moral world all come into play. Galaxies may carry the “letters” of God’s design as much as Torah or the human soul does. We still know how to read this text no more than we know how to read what God has written on our own hearts. True, this “Torah of the Universe” inhabits the universal semantic level, while the usual Torah addresses the individual and, to a lesser extent, human collectives. However, a mapping between the two can be constructed. A better understanding of what is meant by “law” in nature may help us better understand the role of the written Torah.

In order to tackle the complex logic of the problem, we use the analogies from contemporary hard science and try to find the relevant messages in the natural law as revealed by modern natural science, in particular, by physics and biology.

Slide 7. Paradox of Jewishness in Christian Church

There are three “usual” views of the Jewish presence within the Church to which we add a fourth: a) complete dissolution – “no Jew”; b) the whole Church as a (New) Israel; c) Jews as a distinct *part* of the Church – the 4th view of Jewishness as a wavelike “mode” of the Church – a concept borrowed from QM. The same holds true for the Church’s view of Torah. There are three main views of the relevance of Torah within the Church today: a) no Torah (Jeremiah 31:33, 2 Cor.3:3). i.e. the Torah as obsolete and abrogated by the coming of “New Torah” written on the hearts of the people; b) the Torah is summed up and embodied in Jesus, as indicated especially in Paul’s references to the Torah of the Messiah (Gal.6:2, 1Cor.9:21); c) parts of the OT Torah are still applicable for the Church.

The latter view divides the Torah into ceremonial and moral law and posits that the ceremonial law is abolished while the moral law remains in full effect. A variation of this view, concurring with Mark Kinzer’s position, holds that the expression of Jewishness in the Church can be based on the remaining ceremonial features – but then it risks appearing obsolete. Another variation is the expression of Jewishness as based on the moral component of Torah – but then, would there be any difference from the self-expression by the non-Jewish members of the Church?

The 4th view we are positing is Torah remaining in effect as the means by which Jews express their identity in the Church, but in a hitherto unrecognized way: as wave-like projection of God's Word into the world.

What is this waviness like and how does it come about?

Slide 8. Quantum paradox.

Drawing on more information from QM, we see that the source of wave/particle duality is the process of observation of an individual quantum entity by a classical, collective entity. It is the "observation cycle," in which observation influences not only the observer, but also the observed entity. Whether we observe particle-like properties or wave-like properties depends on our frame of reference, i.e. on how we set up observations. E.g., the same sunlight behaves like waves when dispersing on droplets and forming the rainbow, and like particles when forming an image in your camera. The main feature of waviness is the uncertainty of position in space but the definiteness of spectral properties that are the analog of sound.

Thus, depending on how we approach ("observe") the same Torah, we may perceive a set of fixed precepts or something like music. The precepts are as notes. The music can't stay at any fixed note-precept any more than it can stay in space; it runs across both while preserving its own peculiar self-identity. Whether we get music or musical score depends on how the observations are made, especially on how our reference frame changes in the course of observation.

Quantum observation is a very dramatic but specific instance of observation as a part of the dialogue between the real world and its model representation. The best known part of this dialogue is fitting the model to observations. This dialogue (prediction-correction cycle or cognition cycle) is applicable to Torah while preserving some of the quantum features.

Slide 9. Cognition cycle.

Similarly to the quantum cycle, the cognition cycle runs through a pair of dualities: a) real vs. model; b) individual (specific) vs. collective (general). As a result, it tends to a stable state of harmony between the model and observations. However, as all such cycles, it can move into a self-refuting paradoxical mode. This involves the incessant change of the reference frame within which observations are assessed.

The cognition cycle can be applied to Torah as to a way of knowing God. The key issue is the difference between the real, living God and our God-image (model). Both the human experience and the Bible warn us against assuming that the image we form is an adequate model of God. Then, the cognition cycle can't be expected to converge to a stable state. As a default, we can take the "vacuum" (i.e., the absence of any informative model of God) as a stable state. This corresponds to apophatic theology².

² Apophatic theology is a theological approach that describes God by negation, speaking of God only in terms of what He is not (apophasis) rather than presuming to describe what He is. It is maintained that we can never truly define God in words. Words must be transcended to understand the nature of the Divine. Apophatic theology is not a

However, a third possibility exists: cognition cycle as a paradox. It is particularly expressive for the special test-case of theodicy. Not in vain this problem is a conspicuous paradox generator both in the Psalter and in the Book of Job. Job's problem, for example, is exactly that of cognition: forming an image of God compatible both with Job's observed situation and with the set of admissible God's models so eloquently formulated by Job's friends. Notwithstanding the efforts on all sides, no stable state is reached. The discussion circulates between the alternatives "Job is guilty, so God is not" and "God is guilty, because Job is not" – both unacceptable. The reader knows that the problem is in Job's frame of reference, which ignores the devil and ascribes everything Job observes to God. Job is unaware of this problem.

Slide 10. Cognition cycle: fitting the model to observations

The decisive factor here is God himself entering into Job's world. Job's personal encounter with the divine presence radically changes both Job's response to the manifold calamity he has suffered as well as his relationships with his friends. On appearing, God says nothing that could convince Job logically; He just widens Job's horizons, his frame of reference. Job suddenly "sees" his own situation from the perspective of the "shadow of the almighty." No convincing statements are provided, just "the music of the spheres." This does the trick: Job's enhanced spiritual receptivity turns out to be wide enough to accommodate the paradox in its entirety: perceived God, imperceptible Satan, and all.

This lesson in cognition should be applied to how we approach Torah.

Extending the notion of vacuum mentioned above, we can borrow from physics the "variational" concept of the law (viz. Torah): the law born out of all possible deviations from it (including "vacuum fluctuations") and defined by them. What remains if all deviations were removed would be a "zero background," vacuum, the "nothing." Still, this "nothing" (that is, something that logic does not capture) is the most important issue in Torah, just as in our physical Universe the most important thing, cosmologically, is the vacuum. In fact, perceiving nothing as something most important is quite established both in Christianity (e.g., Meister Eckhart), and outside it (e.g., Taoism).

The problem with this kind of "vacuum" is that it is symmetric and morally neutral: indifferent to whether it begets good or bad (like particles and anti-particles). However, we live in the world with the symmetry broken – "false vacuum." The differential between this and the symmetric vacuum is all-important: it carries huge amounts of energy. Analogously, Torah differs from symmetric, dualistic world views by the fact that in it, the symmetry is broken in favor of the good.

Applied to the Messianic Jewish/Jewish Christian community, this view, among other things, warns us against overemphasizing the visibility of our Jewishness: the true Jewish Torah in the Church should be silent, rather deducible than visible. It is how Jesus describes his "New Torah" in Mt. 6: something that happens in the secret core of ourselves – "ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ."

denial; rather it is an assertion that whatever God may be, when we attempt to capture it in human words, it will be insufficient.

Let us now pass from the inanimate to the living world.

Slide 11. Evolutionary paradox.

From biology, we can borrow the concepts necessary to better understand what we mean by saying that NT “Torah” in some sense *inherits* from OT Torah. In biology, the ideas of development and inheritance are determined by the feedback between the genotype and the phenotype. The genotype of a creature (epitomized by DNA) is invisible from the outside – from the world the creature lives in – and structured according to the laws of the inside “world”: biology of the cell etc., which are essentially other than the laws of the outside world. Phenotype is an expression of genotype in the visible features of an individual creature: its body, behavior etc.

Development and inheritance run in a cycle between two dualities: genotype/phenotype (invisible/visible) and individual/collective. This cycle in time generates *inheritance*; its role is preserving the collective genetic individuality of a species. It has as a complementary opposite, *adaptation*, which allows for natural selection. The combination of inheritance and adaptation serves for optimizing “fitness” and thus secures the evolutionary stability of species and ecosystems with respect to the changes of environment.

The analogy is applicable to Torah: halacha is the equivalent for Torah as it is constantly changing /adapting the written Torah to the dynamic of life in a constantly changing environment. This analogy can be further used to capture what we mean by saying that the Church (as the New Israel) inherits Jewishness (as a feature of the Old Israel), and to describe what can be the “NT Torah” if it should inherit from the “OT Torah.” NT inherits from OT the “spiritual genotype,” since they are the successive stages of the same line of development of God’s plan. The external expression of this “genotype” as a “phenotype” can be quite different in OT and NT.

Slide 12. “NT inherits from OT Torah”: biological analogies

Any expression of Jewish identity within the Church should rely on this inheritance rather than on the literal inheritance of Jewishness in the flesh.

All this may be more than just analogy. If we adopt the Christocentric perspective on Torah, we see Torah as self-incarnating, like DNA. DNA does not define what is good or evil as a way to behave in the outside world. Instead, it incorporates in the dual, genetic form the results of the billion-year experience of what was a successful strategy of behavior. The Torah, understood properly, as in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5:17), also does not determine explicitly what to do or not in each specific situation. It contains God’s criteria for our behavior in a transformed, dual form, which has to be interpreted in a personal, free way as a genotype expressing itself into a phenotype.

Christocentric approach to Torah

Now we try to consider Torah as a projection of God’s Word into the world, in analogy to Christ as the incarnation of the Word. Although Christian in form, this view is rooted in OT theology which considered Torah as world “in miniature” (microcosm), world as word. Word (logos) and

world are poles of the duality between reality and image. However, the relationship within this duality is much more complex than just a projection of reality into image. Word is an essential part of the world – including being an essential instrument in the world’s salvation. In addition, Word creates world – either as in Gen. 1:3, or as in John 1:3, or both. This is the Alpha point, and in the Omega point, Word becomes world as cosmic Christ.

Slide 13. Paradoxical nature(s) of Christos Logos

This approach is borrowed from Maximus the Confessor³ who considers Christ as the “logic” (Logos), to whom the logic of everything else conforms.⁴ This includes the logic of “natural laws.” The universal Christ is the invisible tie that keeps the Universe together; without Him the “natural laws” that science finds scatter without forming a whole. The same can be said of Torah, even OT Torah: take out the invisible Christ, and the Torah crumbles into fragments. Torah is not a set of precepts, but a kind of logic applied to moral/spiritual realm. This logic inherits from Logos Christ.

Even more than a tie of the material Universe, Christ is the keeper together of the “Logical Universe.” If we are able to find multiple analogies between various mental constructions from different branches of science and experience, it is to the extent that they all inherit from Logos. Thus, the logic of several cycles described above inherits the logic of Christ’s way through the world: residence in spiritual – incarnation – sacrifice – resurrection – ascension back to spiritual in a new quality changed by dwelling in the material. However, even this lofty sequence is a hypostasis of an even more grandiose development: from Creation as God’s κένωσις to the final “God all in all” (Col. 3:11, 1Cor 15:28).

Let us try to describe this sequence as “the way of the Word,” in analogy to previously described cycles.

Slide 14. Christos paradoxos.

The starting point is in the spiritual realm: Word “with God” (John 1: 1, 2). → Incarnation brings Word to the material realm – as an individual. → Evangelization makes the Word interact with the material world as a collective entity whereby the Word self-sacrifices on the Cross. → Resurrection shakes the basis of this world, including the Underworld. → The outcome of the Word’s stay in the world is assimilated into the collective layer of the spiritual realm: the change

³ Maximus the Confessor, also known as Maximus the Theologian and Maximus of Constantinople (c. 580 – 13 August 662), was a Christian monk, theologian and scholar. The core of his thought is the principle of simultaneous union and distinction. This pervades every area of his theology and can be summarized as: Things united remain distinct and without confusion in an inseparable union.”

⁴ In pre-Christian Jewish thought, Philo of Alexandria (20 B.C.E. - 50 C.E.) identified Logos, the Word, with Torah. Logos in the first chapter of the gospel of John is Logos incarnating in the person of Messiah. In contemporary literature, W.D. Davies suggests that the first disciples understood that the Messianic Age had arrived in the person of Yeshua who they saw as personifying the New Torah. "Although Paul regards the words of Jesus as the basis of a kind of Christian halakah (the entire collection of Jewish law), it is Christ Himself in His person, not only or chiefly in His words, who constitutes the New Torah; and so too in the Fourth Gospel the New Torah is not only epitomized in the commandment of agape which finds its norm in the love of Christ for His own and in the love of God for Christ, but is realized also in the Person of Jesus, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, i.e. the personalized Torah who is set over against Moses... those in the Early Church...saw their Torah in Jesus Himself, as well as in His words..." W. D. Davies, “Torah in the Messianic Age.” (Philadelphia, Society of Biblical Literature, 1952). p. 93

in God's design for the entire world. This sequence, in contrast to other cycles, doesn't end in \rightarrow , because, being an archetype, it need not repeat, although its realizations have a repeated character. This archetype is a template of duality between the material and spiritual.

Multiple dualities and paradoxes contained in Logos translate into the dualities and paradoxes of Torah. The most important of these for our purpose is the relationship between the "full Torah" – the law by which the entire Church lives – and the "Jewish Torah" we consider here, that is, a set of actions, principles, or some wavelike mode of being explicitly expressing the Jewish presence within the Church.

Christ, as Word, is a paradox. It is natural, then, that when this Word produces the words of discourse; they are again paradoxes – what we call parables. More than anything else, they penetrate into human hearts. That's because our psyche – our self – resonates to them, being itself a paradoxical nature. Still, these words are just *images* of the Word – that's why the core and power of Christ's discourse is Himself.

Thus, the invisible presence of Christ manifests itself in any attempt of self-identification of the "self," be it the Jewish self-identification within the Church or the self-identification of Torah. As Christ is not only Word, but body – extending to the Body of the Church, and, finally, to the body of Universe – so Torah is not monolithic but contains the diversity of its body members (1 Cor. 12:12). Diversity supports unity, like the diversity of phenotypes mentioned above supports the unity of the genotype core.

Understanding the expression of Torah as "norms \rightarrow transgressions \rightarrow punishments" is not true to its Christo-centricity. The true way of the Word/word is "embodiment \rightarrow sacrifice \rightarrow resurrection in a new form." Sacrifice here is that of the "body," i.e. letter, not of the spirit. Paradoxically, the spirit of the law lives by sacrificing its letter for the sake of grace. This is the way OT Torah has to follow, in order to resurrect in a new form within the Church. The Torah-conforming expression of Jewishness in the Church has to pass through a sacrifice of one's own Jewishness. This way unfolds across the individual/collective duality. Each choice of grace is free and personal, but the effects concern the entire Church.

The analogy between Christ and Torah implies that the reasons for speaking about Christ apophatically are also valid for speaking about Torah. This is a paradox, since Torah is emphatically verbal; still, it contains the non-verbalized core, which is for words what the vacuum is for observation. What we speak of is always the "body" of Torah; its soul remains ineffable.

One of the visions of St. Maximus is that of a "cosmic liturgy" which is celebrated within the universal Christ. In the cycle model above, the entire cycle can be viewed "particle-like," as a portrait of Christ, or wave-like, as orchestra performing the cosmic liturgy. This liturgy, inaudible, is also celebrated within the core of Torah. A feeling of it is provided by the complementary, wavelike Psalter with its unceasing mention of praise and glory. The "Jewish Torah" within the Church should be a participant in this liturgy.

Dynamics and eschatology of Torah.

Slide 15. Torah from now till Ω

Transition_from OT to NT Torah is an essential element of the Universe moving from point A (creation) to point Ω (eschaton and final salvation). Salvation, in St. Maximus vision, is a change of the ontology of entire world. It proceeds from the Ω point – the cosmic Christ embracing the entire Universe – backward to the present. The energy of Christ that changed the world He walked in came to Him from Himself in glory in this final point. The Church is the embryo of the future Body of cosmic Christ

Extending St. Paul's idea in Heb. 7: 12, the change of ontology will, probably, induce a change of law. This is obvious for "natural laws," but it should also be true for their spiritual substrate and for the projection of the latter into the realm of human conscious– Torah. Although this transition is barely begun, the feedback of its final point is already felt. The transition happens *in excelsis*, out of time.

The change of Torah includes the change of its application domain. Until now, it is the domain of human affairs. It has to extend until, at its widest, it regulates the spiritual metabolism of the body of the universal Christ.

Some features of the final Torah are perceptible even now. First, NT Torah absorbs the OT wave/particle duality by incorporating the wavelike features. To see this, compare the Ten Commandments with the "Torah" of the Sermon on the Mount. This is a prefiguring of Ω where all tensions between dualities are absorbed into a whole.

Second, the main thrust of Torah is moved from the collective to the individual layer: from collective lifestyle to personal development, supporting what is called individuation in analytical psychology.

Slide 16. Individuation paradox.

This feature is often referred to as the "law of the heart." Jewishness can play an important role in individuation.

Can we imagine what Torah will be at the Ω point? There are two metaphors that could illustrate this: one is the vine and branches of the true universal Vine (John 15: 5), the other is the sap that flows in the Vine. The first may be seen as the form of Torah – an extrapolation of what we now call the letter of law, providing solidity. The second may be seen as the spirit of law: blood, which is love, – an heir to Christ's blood shed on the Cross and an expression of the basic property of love to unite parts into a whole. This final Torah is a seed growing in changing temporary Torahs, and it is the seed of Christ.

The human side of Jesus makes it possible to look at the growth of the Universal Christ as the spiritual growth of a human being. This duality provides an important corollary for the Jewish Torah-in-the-Church: its self-definition should be both theologically *and psychologically* sound. That is, the same features that make this Torah compatible with the $A \rightarrow \Omega$ evolution within God's design should make it compatible with the process of personal individuation that brings a person closer to Christ. This is as tough a requirement as a requirement to an eventual change of

genotype both to generate an effective phenotype and to be compatible with the life cycle of a cell.

Slide 17. Psyche, the paradoxical soul

This duality can create an “optical illusion”: we project the features of our own individuation onto Christ. This is inevitable: we have no other language to speak about God than that which was created for ourselves. Let us consider the formation of Christ’s image in humans as a cognitive cycle. It is an instance of the archetypal dynamics of Logos, so it contains in itself a seed of the true representation of the evolution of Logos. Thus, when applied to the universal evolution of Logos, the cognitive cycle (a part of human individuation) becomes self-referent and, so to say, finds itself in what it observes. This same type of paradox is already known to astrophysics: we find in the universe exactly those values of crucial parameters that are necessary for our existence, as if we imposed them on the universe, without knowing it, and long before we began to exist. This paradox is called the anthropic principle. Using this name, we may call the relationship between Christ’s image in humans and Christ “as He is,” the *cognitive anthropic principle*.

Torah as a component of self-definition of Jewishness in the Church

Slide 18. Jew in Church paradox: coexistence of self-identities

Using the eschatological perspective as a reference frame, we return to the problem of self-definition of Jewishness in the Church and the role the Torah takes in it.

A natural way to approach the problem would be to extend it to the “cycle representation,” like those for particle/wave duality in QM, for adapting model to observation, for physical vacuum as a stable state with fluctuations, for interaction of genotype and phenotype in biological evolution, for personal individuation, and for the Christocentric unfolding of God’s design. Compared to this, the problem of Jewish expression in Church may seem small, but in it, the grand patterns are reflected, as the ocean in a drop.

Of all the cycles described above, we chose the biological evolution as a template, starting with the “personal Torah,” analogous to individual genotype. It lives in the invisible, in one’s soul. It is what keeps the soul together, as OT Torah did for the people. → It is expressed in visible behavior (analogue of phenotype), and the free individual choice enters as an inherent component into this expression. Subjectively, this behavior is what expresses the perception of one’s own Jewishness. → This behavior enters Church at the collective level as one of many modes of dynamics of the Body of Christ. This, however, is not a “national” mode of behavior, but something unique – national behaviors simply won’t survive up to the Ω point. This behavior may or may not be perceived by the Church as specifically Jewish, but through it the invisible personal Jewish Torah interacts with analogous Jewish and non-Jewish Torahs of other Church members. As a result of interaction, this behavior may be propagated or damped. → The change of “Church ecology,” that is, of the ensemble of behaviors, is assimilated back into the invisible as a change in the collective Torah of the entire Church. Importantly, this assimilation is not something automatic: each member of the Church, both Jewish and non-Jewish, assimilates what

he sees in the Church into his share of the collective (inevitably, partly unconscious) Torah. The mechanism of assimilation is that of individuation, described above. → One's personal Torah takes on the effects both of its own expression in the Church and of the changes in collective Torah. As a result, those "genetic" traits of one's personal Torah that support one's self-perception as Jewish may be enhanced or reduced → One's self-expression changes ...

All cycles revolve around some central idea or entity ⁵ that they support, stabilize, and even define. In this case, the central idea is that of *Jewish identity in the Church*. As all other central concepts, this one expresses itself, but, on the whole, it is ineffable. The Christocentric descent of all cycles means that this central concept is an image of Christ. It is one of many images of Him present within the Church, but it is unique and irreplaceable. It is the projection of an ineradicable Jewish component in Christ's way from A to Ω.⁶ Obviously, as the Word moves toward its final universal form, so the expression of Jewishness should be mutable, movable. The mutability of Jewishness is facilitated by its losing its exclusively objective, collective character, and acquiring the subjective, individual, wavelike character. In the final form, where all dualities are effaced, two pictures will be paradoxically equivalent: "No Jew or Greek⁷" and "Entire Body of Christ Jewish." This type of paradox is like seeing God as both the center and the circumference, both everywhere and nowhere.

The cycle supporting Jewish self-identity in the Church, like all other cycles, could be in a stable mode, or in a "vacuum" mode where Jewishness is self-evident, or in a paradoxical mode. One suspects that the latter is the case. In the perspective of this paper, Jewishness inherits its paradoxical character from the paradox inherent in Torah, and the latter, in turn, is a projection of the paradox called Christ. The Christocentric paradoxical logic discovered for Torah is mapped and mated to the logic of self-definition mentioned above.

As a component of this paradox, the subject of this paper - questioning the definition of Torah - enters this definition, just as questioning the self-definition of Jewishness in the Church enters the definition of both. It is like fluctuations, which at the same time contribute to the stability, test it, and challenge it. This archetype is vividly expressed in Job. And the answer to Job is Christ.

Slide 19. Christ the archetypal Law

Conclusion.

The articulation of the ongoing relevance for Jewish expression in the Church is bound up with the Jewish Torah as discussed in this paper. From the creation narratives of Genesis One we see the primal act of God being differentiation. Part of the differentiation relates to Israel. According to Hebrews 8:1-7, in an undefined way, some kind of Israel had been worshiping according to some kind of Torah - since creation and continuing to the eschaton. In this view, some

⁵ The center can be quite palpable, e.g. for the genotype/phenotype cycle it is organism, even the entire planetary ecosystem.

⁶ His choice was to incarnate in Jewish flesh, hence the significance of "Jewishness." Rev. 5:5, 22:16 show His Jewishness continuing beyond the resurrection.

⁷ Gal. 3:27-28

expression of Jewishness in the body of Messiah is an inherent and an essential element for the full Torah to be realized in the eschaton.⁸

Throughout the remainder of the creation narratives, continuing in the early chapters of Genesis, we see increasing differentiation, often occurring in pairs – light and darkness, water and water (above and below), evening and morning, male and female, Sabbath and days of work, and finally- Israel and the nations. This generation of dualities suggests that unfolding of a paradoxical ontological structure had been taking place.

The binary separation between Israel and the nations was a component in the complex relationship between Israel and her God, characterized by a double separation: separation *to* God and separation *from* the nations. Torah was the logical matrix encompassing both relationships and the observance of Torah was a way these tense relationships were lived.

With the institution of the New Covenant given to Israel (Jer.31:31. 35-38) and sealed with Messiah's blood, the paradox hidden behind the seemingly obvious polarity "Jews-nations" became evident. From this time the one who comes into relationship with God through faith rather than Torah observance, whether Jew or Gentile, is under obligation to invite all of humanity to come into that same relationship and become part of the one new man (Eph.2:15) joined together in the love of God (Romans 1:14,16). Here we see differentiation as promoting, paradoxically, the dynamic of inclusion rather than that of radical separation that was the primary characteristic of Jewish/Gentile relationships prior to the cross.

Only in this paradoxical form the distinction between Jew and Gentile in the Body of Messiah can survive to the Ω point. Torah in this perspective loses its univocal character and becomes the wave-like way the Jew in the Church/Body of Messiah embodies this essential paradoxical duality.

⁸ This also casts the continuing Jewishness of Yeshua after the resurrection in a new light as He embodies Torah in the expression of both his humanity and his deity.