Response by Rabbi Daniel F. Polish

Allow me, please, first a personal word. It is a great honor to be sharing this moment of remarkable accomplishment with my friend, Father Pat Ryan. It does carry me back to the days when both of us had the honor of sitting at the feet of Wilfred Cantwell Smith. To be here with him as ascends this distinguished Chair in Religion and Society is an honor I doubt either of us could have envisioned that lifetime ago. I thank Pat for including me in this inaugural exercise and I thank Fordham University for its hospitality.

I have been asked to make a commentary on what is a remarkable and significant paper. To rush to the bottom line, I cannot help but feel, as you must, that we were privileged, indeed, to be present at the first articulation of such a profound and important contribution to the understanding of religion, a subject to the implications of which I shall return. It is no small thing that this conviction is being given tangible demonstration by the fact that the inaugural lecture of this chair at this great Catholic institution includes responses from representatives of the Jewish and Muslim traditions. One cannot imagine such a thing happening even the last time this chair was filled.

As it happens the role of commentator is an ancient and honorable one. Indeed the way Jews read our sacred scripture is not actually direct and unmediated, as is sometimes intimated, but rather, refracted through the lens of commentary. Nothing could be further from sola scriptura. Jews read our foundational text as explicated through the interpretations of our classical commentators, halacha (‘law’), and aggada (‘narrative’) elaboration. Indeed it has been suggested that significant portions of the New Testament
itself are essentially commentaries on Hebrew Scriptures very much in a Jewish mode. So I present myself as a commentator to Pat’s dispensation with a significant pedigree.

To turn to the essential matter, what have we learned from Father Ryan this evening? It seems to me he has presented nothing less than a phenomenology of faith much as Rudolf Otto presented a phenomenology of the concept ‘Holy.’ In pursuing the meaning of this fundamental concept, he has reflected on the ways it is articulated in the three Abrahamic traditions. But he has done a brave and essential thing in identifying it as meaning, at its root, the same thing within each of them, namely the awareness of living in reciprocal relationship with G-d. This perspective has profound implications to which I shall return at the conclusion of these remarks.

Given the theme, my task becomes to reflect on the particular way the phenomenon of faith is expressed, and lived, in the Jewish tradition. As you might expect, Jewish tradition has a lot to say about faith expressed in its own idiom. I quite agree with Pat that Jewish faith must not be understood in terms of creedal affirmations or linear systematic formulations of belief. As an aside, I would go so far as to venture the opinion that that mode of expression of faith does not characterize Islam either, or the various expressions of the Hindu or Buddhist traditions. This suggests that faith understood in creedal terms is, among what we call the ‘world religions,’ a modality that is uniquely characteristic of the Christian tradition. While a Christian assessment of Jewish faith might involve the assertion that Judaism is ‘creedally weak,’ the reciprocal evaluation of the Christian tradition could be that it is ‘creedally intense.’ This is a subject which has been discussed exhaustively in Buber’s Two Types of Faith. ¹ Jewish religious understanding seems, as a
result, to be much more comfortable with ambiguities, and even internal inconsistencies, than the more creedally rigorous Christian tradition.

This lack of creedal focus in the Jewish tradition has its roots, I believe, in the Bible itself. Granting the importance of the ‘thirteen attributes of mercy’ which Pat discussed, what is striking about Hebrew Scriptures is how radically little they have to say about G-d in G-d’s own self. It is of no small significance that the earliest chapters of Genesis, for example, tell us nothing about G-d prior to the act of creation. If, as many translations of the first chapter of Genesis currently render the opening words of the Bible, the text begins with that moment “when G-d began to create the heavens and the earth”, it is not insignificant that it tells us nothing of what or where G-d was occupied prior to the moment that creation was initiated. Which is to say we are told nothing of G-d independent of G-d’s interaction with creation. As the Biblical account progresses, it is of profound import that scripture tells us nothing about G-d except when G-d is interacting with human beings. This is in radical contradistinction from the religious texts of the various cultures among which the first hearers of scripture lived and by whom they were so clearly influenced.

To put the matter in its most simplistic terms, one could ask, ‘what was G-d doing when G-d was not interacting with us?’ Scripture offers no answer. Indeed the question virtually leaps out at us as we consider the words of Exodus 3:9, “now behold the cries of the children of Israel have come unto me; moreover I have seen the oppression with which the Egyptians oppress them.” Which forces on any sensitive reader of the text the question, ‘where, then, was G-d during the four hundred years this calamity was inflicted on the children of G-d’s covenant?’ Later commentators seek to explore this issue and offer a
wide variety of interpretations and explanations. But they differ markedly among themselves precisely because, on this subject, scripture is absolutely silent. This silence, I submit, is not an anomaly in scripture, but profoundly characteristic of its refusal to assert anything about G-d outside of G-d’s interactions with G-d’s creatures.

This resolute resistance to creedal formulation is reinforced in scripture by the fact that the G-d of the Hebrews was, in terms that we would employ today—but they did not—invisible. It is not accidental that the Temple in Jerusalem was completely devoid of any physical representation of the G-d who was worshipped there. Or that the very attempt to make any kind of physical representation of the deity was proscribed in the Ten Commandments and then decried when it was prospectively violated in the episode of the golden calf—which is echoed later in the rebellion of Rehoboam as recounted in I Kings 12:25ff.

I would suggest that the non-discursive nature of the G-d of the Bible is epitomized in the elusiveness of the very name of that G-d. When Moses summons the courage in Exodus 3:13 to inquire, “what is Your name,” G-d responds with a phrase that eludes coherent translation, “ehyeh asher ehyeh” -- “I am who I am” or “I am what I will be” or “I am where I will be”. It is simply untranslatable. And in what I believe is another refraction of this incident, G-d responds to Moses’ question with a name which is itself unpronounceable. Even later generations were forbidden to pronounce the name even if they could, with the exception of the High Priest when the Temple was standing who alone could pronounce it only once a year in one single place, the Holy of Holies, well out of hearing of the rest of the people. And then, after Moses is finally given access to that unpronounceable name, G-d goes on to assert that that, of course, was not the name by
which G-d had been known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and then further instructs Moses to tell the Israelite people whom he was to lead that he had been sent by G-d as “the G-d of your fathers”; and still further when he spoke to the Pharaoh to refer to G-d as “the G-d of the Hebrews.” Just what, then, is the name of G-d? All of which seems to point us toward the fundamental human incapacity to name/know the G-d who is at the center of the Biblical tradition.

That same resistance to rendering explicit the nature and character of G-d continued to characterize Jewish religious life. The one central tenet of Jewish faith came to be the words of Deuteronomy 6:4 which have come to be called the Shma: “Hear O Israel the Lord our G-d, the Lord is one.” Jews assert G-d’s oneness, but creedally remain essentially reticent about saying much more. Jews came to see themselves as literally willing to die for this affirmation, a subject to which we will return shortly, but would not append further affirmations to it.

To return to the commentative tradition which I mentioned earlier. In Genesis 12 we read of what is essentially the beginning of the covenantal relationship between G-d and Abraham. In Genesis it appears that this relationship begins with G-d’s initiative: “Go forth, from your land, from your ancestral place and your father’s house to the land that I will show you.” The rabbis wonder what made Abraham so responsive to G-d’s summons. They conjecture about what happened between chapters 11 and 12. And they offer a Midrash, a narrative elaboration. In this telling Abraham began, like all of his neighbors, as an animist. He worshipped the sun, then the moon, then the planets, mighty trees, etc. Then suddenly it struck him that none of these could be the creator of heaven and earth. Rather, there was One who created them all. And it was in this fashion that Abraham became aware
of G-d’s presence in the universe and was thus prepared when that one G-d summoned him to go forth. Does this story have official, ‘creedal,’ standing? Clearly not. And yet, significantly, the vast majority of Jews are familiar with it. So much so that many of them assume it is included in the Torah itself, thus conferring upon it what we can call semi-official standing. In the mind of any Jew familiar with the texts of tradition, and within the canon of sacred literature, these two stories are allowed to stand side by side. This is not only representative of ‘creedal’ inconsistency; it highlights two very different models of faith within the Jewish tradition. For what is significant about this rabbinic rendition of the moment of the inception of Jewish faith is that it does not begin, as the Genesis account does, with G-d’s initiative; but rather with the seeker reaching out for the divine. It is that very same polarity that I hear represented in the title of two books by the 20th century American Jewish thinker Abraham Joshua Heschel: *G-d in Search of Man* and *Man’s Quest for G-d*. This openness to very different approaches to faith is not without relevance for our appreciation of the meaning of that phenomenon in the Jewish tradition.

This is not to suggest that attempts to articulate a formal creed have been wholly absent within the Jewish tradition. At various times learned men would compose statements of Jewish belief. But the salient fact is that none of these statements of faith achieved official status or even widespread acceptance. Indeed, it seems not unfair to conjecture that these attempts were, themselves, made under the influence of the Christian environment in which they were created. Foremost among these efforts are the ‘thirteen articles of faith’ composed by Moses Maimonides (1135-1204). Maimonides’ articles of faith come closest to representing a refutation of all I have said in the foregoing about the non-creedal nature of Jewish tradition. In these 13 articles Maimonides affirms belief in such principles as the
existence, eternity, incorporeality, and eternity of G-d. This formulation may currently be
found in most Orthodox prayer books. In the fifteenth century it was recast in poetic form,
and this poem, called the Yigdal, is similarly included in the prayer book. So on the basis of
this one might assume that there is such a thing as an official formulation of Jewish faith.
Yet it is significant that for most of the centuries after their formulation, Maimonides’
thirteen articles were vigorously repudiated by other leading thinkers and effectively
ignored by the Jewish community at large. Perhaps the most striking repudiation of the
project represented by the thirteen articles comes, paradoxically enough, from Maimonides
himself. In his more philosophical text, the Guide to the Perplexed, Maimonides assumes a
stance that we would call apophatic, insisting that no positive statement can be made about
G-d. In a perspective that would be influential on Aquinas, Maimonides instructs that the
only way we can speak of G-d is through the via negativa. Indeed he goes so far as to argue
that we cannot even say ‘G-d is one’ but must content ourselves with the assertion that G-d
is not many.

If the creedal minimalism of Bible is externalized in the emptiness of its sacred
space and in the ambiguity about the very name of G-d, that same tendency has continued
on into post-Biblical Judaism. There Jewish houses of worship continue to be devoid of any
representation of the deity (as is also the case in Islam). Like their Biblical forebears, Jews
display great delicacy in verbal references to the deity, avoiding even pronouncing the
euphemism for the euphemism for the name that G-d revealed to Moses in Exodus 6. The
rabbis preferred to refer to G-d as HaMakom (‘the Place’) and said that this particular
euphemism implied that G-d is the world’s place, but the world is not G-d’s place.
Strikingly, I would suggest that we see evidence of this same non-creedal posture reflected in the prayer with which the traditional liturgy has Jews conclude every worship service. Called the *Kaddish*, this prayer is a doxology, consisting of elaborate expressions of praise and exaltation. Yet in the very midst of all the glorification of G-d, we find the assertion that G-d is “beyond all the prayers, songs and adorations that we can offer in this world”. It is as if the liturgy itself wants to send us home from the service with the admonition that we should not imagine that in all the hours of prayer we have spent, we have exhausted all that could be said about G-d, let alone approximated any full understanding of G-d.

The non-creedal nature of Jewish religion finds expression in the words of two more contemporary theologians. In a semi-fictional vignette, Martin Buber has a representative figure state:

What you mean by the name of God is something above all human grasp and comprehension….\(^2\)

Abraham Joshua Heschel, regarded as a traditionalist, writes:

God cannot be distilled to a well-defined idea. All concepts fade when applied to His essence. To the pious man knowledge of G-d is not a thought within His grasp, but a form of thinking in which he tries to comprehend all reality.\(^3\)

And yet, if Jewish religion is, in the main, non-creedal, it should not be imagined that Jewish faith is some kind of sterile deism. On the contrary, Jewish religious life is, as Father Ryan asserted, based on a sense of reciprocal relationship. This relationship is traditionally expressed in terms of Covenant with its mutual responsibilities on both sides. This is not the occasion to wrestle with the complicated issue of chosenness and G-d’s implied obligation to protect the people and seat it in its land, a concept which is stated
explicitly in the Bible and remains an integral part of subsequent Jewish understanding. It is the human side of this relationship which is properly discussed under the rubric ‘faith’.

In the first place, as Father Ryan has already stated, this finds expression in the collectivity. It is the people as a whole which is the second party in the covenant. This is reflected in the fact that the vast majority of Jewish prayers are written in the plural, such as the opening of the first of the central prayers of any service, “Blessed are You O Lord, our G-d and G-d of our fathers”. In affirming the covenant, the Jew attests both to his or her faith in G-d and to his or her awareness of belonging to the covenant people. In the liturgy for Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement), even the confession of sins is done communally and in the plural: “for the sin which we have sinned against You by…..” This communal vision is expressed very powerfully even in the formula with which Jews are instructed to offer condolences to the recently bereaved, which asserts, “may HaMakom comfort you along with all the mourners of Zion and Jerusalem.”

But it would be a mistake to assume that because of this sense of shared participation in the Covenant there is no intensely personal component in the Jewish idea of faith. In addition to seeing the Biblical narrative as the account of the collective historical experience of the people, Jews also find in it the intensely personal engagement with G-d of all the Biblical personages: our fathers and mothers, Moses, the prophets and others. The Biblical text is also read to imply that such a powerful personal relationship can be ours.

Indeed, the Book of Psalms is redolent with the personal dimension of faith and this is what makes that text so beloved. Some of the Psalms are devoted to the experience of the collective history or collective calamity or threat; the real power of the majority of the Psalms is the manner in which they give voice to individual persons expressing their
engagement with G-d. The Psalms are written in the singula: “My G-d, My G-d, why have you forsaken me?” They express the individual’s plea to G-d for protection, or they express gratitude for G-d’s beneficence or bounty.

The Psalms also express one of the most significant components of faith both for Biblical understanding and subsequent Jewish faith. One of the most commonly used words in the Book of Psalms is the word betach (trust). Seventy-nine times in 150 Psalms the psalmist gives voice to trust in G-d. Almost always it is voiced in terms of the individual experience:

In G-d do I trust, I will not be afraid;
What can flesh do unto me?  

For Thou art my hope;
O Lord G-d, my trust from my youth.
Upon Thee have I stayed from birth;
Thou art He that took me out of my mother’s womb;
My praise is continually of Thee.  

When Pope John Paul II visited Israel, he invoked Psalm 31, whose verses include the affirmation,

But as for me, I have trusted in Thee,
O Lord; I have said, “Thou art my G-d”  

The sense of personal confidence finds expression throughout the Psalms. We find an abundance of images such as, “My flesh and my heart fail; But G-d is the rock of my heart and my protection forever.” (Psalm 73:26), or “Thou hast enlarged my steps under me, and my feet have not slipped” (Psalm 18:37). Their number could be multiplied vastly.

This same intensely personal quality has carried over to the fabric of Jewish spiritual life. It is reflected in so much of the Jewish liturgical tradition; two examples which will be cited here. Echoing the personalism of Psalms are the words of the prayer
whose recitation is mandated as the very first prayer the Jew recites in the morning—indeed, which is the very first action Jews perform in the day:

```
I acknowledge before You, O King who lives and endures forever
That You have restored my souls within me out of mercy
Great is your emuna/faithfulness to me
My G-d the soul which You have implanted within me
Is a pure one
You have created it. You have fashioned it
You have breathed it into me
You preserve it within me,….
The whole time that the soul is within me
I will praise You
O Lord my G-d and G-d of my fathers….
```

Similarly reflecting an intimate personal connection are the words from Psalms that are included in the liturgy of every worship service:

```
May the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart
Be acceptable in Your sight, O Lord,
My rock and my redeemer.
```

Perhaps the most intense expression of the personal component of Jewish faith was the Chasidic movement which emerged among Eastern European Jews and quickly became the dominant mode of Jewish religious life of that community. Indeed, it has been suggested that it was the very personalism of Chasidism which caused it to triumph over the more arid intellectualism of the theretofore dominant religious modes. Chasidim were given to referring to G-d lovingly in such terms as Tatte (‘Father’) or Tattele, an endearing form of that word. It is that intimate relation of the Chasidim with their G-d which is caricatured in the Broadway play, Fiddler on the Roof. It may be showbiz, but it is a close representation of that form of faith. Two representative selections from the writings of Chassidic masters will stand for many. An account is given of Shneur Zalman of Ladi (d. 1813), the founder of the Lubavitch movement:
Shneur Zalman interrupted his prayers and said: “I do not want Your paradise. I do not want Your coming world. I want You, and You only”7

Another of the great Chasidic teachers, his contemporary, Levi Yitzchak of Berditchev (d. 1809), wrote a remarkable song which goes, in part:

Where I wander – You!
Where I ponder – You!
Only You, You again, always You!
You! You! You!
When I am gladdened – You!
When I am saddened – You!
Only You, You again, always You!
You! You! You!
Sky is You! Earth is You!
You above! You below!
In every trend, at every end,
Only You, You again, always You!
You! You! You!8

This personalist dimension of Jewish piety exists side by side with the sense of faith deriving from the collective participation in the Covenant. Both are authentic strands of the Jewish fabric of faith. This personal relationship is more than an intellectual stance; it has an emotional component. For Jews, no less than for Christians, the relationship with G-d is fairly characterized as love, love which expresses itself in ways which may seem unrecognizable to Christians. As Father Ryan has noted, what Christians call ‘law’ has a very different valence for Jews. No doubt, for Christians, Paul’s depiction of halacha makes it appear a burden and an impediment to any real relationship with G-d. For Jews, those very actions represent an expression of devotion and love. In the Jewish tradition, fulfillment of the mitzvot (Commandments) does not replace a relationship. Rather it testifies to one’s awareness of living in that relationship.
A few representative selections from the liturgy attest to the fact that Jewish tradition does not see a disjunction between ‘law’ and ‘love.’ Rather it sees these elements as two sides of the same coin. Every worship service includes the recitation of words from Deuteronomy 6, words affirming G-d’s unity, which Jews know by the name the Shma. Immediately following the Shma the liturgy includes the words that follow it in Deuteronomy. In the liturgy it has come to be called the V’ahavt’ (“you shall love”). This selection begins with the injunction, “you shall love the Lord your G-d with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might”. The prayer proceeds to delineate a series of actions which the rabbis translate into specific halachic actions such as the wearing of t’fillin, or affixing a mezuzah to one’s doorpost. It concludes with the assertion, “that you may remember, and do all My commandments and be holy unto your G-d”.

Love and law are similarly conjoined in the prayer that immediately precedes the Shma. In this case there are different prayers for morning and evening services. Both bear names that testify to the love component of our relationship with G-d. The morning version is called Ahava Rabba (“with abundant love”). It states, “With abundant love have You loved us, O Lord our G-d…. Put it into our hearts to understand, and discern, to attend to, to learn and to teach, to observe and to do, all the words taught in Your Torah in love. Enlighten our eyes in Your Torah and let our hearts cleave to Your commandments…..”

The evening version is even more explicit. It is called Ahavat Olam (“with everlasting love”). It deserves to be cited in full as attestation to the synonymity of law and love in Jewish tradition:

With everlasting love have You loved the house of Israel, Your people. Torah and commandments, statutes and ordinances have You taught us. Therefore, O Lord our G-d when we lie down and when we rise up, we will meditate on Your statutes. We will rejoice in the words of Your Torah and Your commandments for ever. For they
are our life and the length of our days, and we will reflect on them day and night. O may You never take Your love from us. Blessed are You, O Lord, who loves Your people Israel.

In this way, in every service, the great affirmation of G-d’s oneness is bracketed with prayers that conjoin the idea of love with the fulfillment of G-d’s commandments. Jewish faith is clearly not constituted of law, as opposed to love. Rather law is the emblem of the love that is at the heart of Jewish faith.

At the core of Father Ryan’s phenomenology of faith is the idea of reciprocity. And that quality is abundantly present in the manifestation of faith within the Jewish tradition. What is most striking in this regard is the notion that the attributes that are ascribed to G-d are also regarded as appropriate aspirations for those who would be faithful to G-d. This reciprocity is attested to both in the Bible and in post-Biblical Judaism. In the Bible it is stated most explicitly in Leviticus 19: “You shall be holy, for I the Lord your G-d am holy.” By the same token, all the qualities of G-d articulated in Psalms are similarly mandated for the worshippers of G-d. G-d is, and human beings are summoned to be: chasid (faithful), tzadik (just), rachum (merciful). The highest qualities of G-d are to be reciprocated in human behavior. Quoting Heschel once again:

Now, G-d is invisible. But you can’t live without G-d. So G-d created a reminder, an image. What is the meaning of man? To be a reminder of G-d…. You look at man and you are reminded of G-d….As G-d is compassionate, let man be compassionate. As G-d strives for meaning and justice, let man strive for meaning and justice.9

Perhaps the most remarkable expression of this reciprocity involves even the very oneness of G-d that is the very ground affirmation of Jewish faith. Yet even in regard to that quality, human beings are involved in a reciprocal relationship. Jews are called on l’yached et Shmo (to unify G-d’s name.) By their very faithfulness to G-d, Jews make G-d
one. In the late Middle Ages this phrase took on the specific meaning of offering one’s life in what in other traditions is called martyrdom. When people sacrifice their life for G-d, their act serves to bring unity to G-d’s very name. Kabbalah, the mystical strand of the Jewish tradition, offers an even more radical image of this reciprocity. In the Kabbalistic cosmogony, the creation of the universe was brought about by the shattering of G-d’s essential unity. Sparks of the divine became embedded in the material husks of all that exists. The challenge for the pious is to release those sparks from the matter that imprisons them. Tikkun Olam (the perfection of the world) involves the action of humans literally resulting in the reunification of G-d. It is human effort, in this construct, that makes G-d one.

Perhaps the most audacious aspect of the Jewish model of faith is the notion, present in the Jewish rendition of reciprocity, that G-d and human beings are literally partners. Such an assertion is not found in the Bible itself. It enters the Jewish thought universe with the rabbis and has colored the way in which the rabbis, and those who follow them, read the Bible. It has become a constitutive part of Jewish faith. Paradoxically, it was a Catholic president of the United States who most perfectly captured this fundamental Jewish value when John F. Kennedy stated that, “here on earth, G-d’s work must truly be our own.” The idea has its roots firmly planted in ancient Jewish soil.

A consistent thread runs through rabbinic thought that affirms that G-d created the world but left it incomplete. G-d’s purposes for the world need to be fulfilled by the actions of G-d’s human creatures. Before a meal, Jews recite the prayer that states, “Blessed art Thou, O Lord our G-d who brings forth bread from the earth”. The rabbis point out that
G-d created wheat. But it is dependent on human beings to harvest it, grind it into wheat, and bake it before G-d can be praised for “bringing forth bread from the earth”. G-d created flax and wool. But it is dependent on human beings to harvest it, prepare it, turn it into fabric and weave clothes. (numerous sources). Similarly:

The tree does not produce fruit if it is not fertilized, weeded and plowed [by the farmer] …the tree that produces fruit cannot live but dies if it is not given water…

Indeed, one line of rabbinic teaching goes even further: G-d intentionally left imperfections in G-d’s creation. For what purpose? In order that humans might be able to do their part to make the world whole. Following this thread of Jewish thought, faith extends to the perception of ourselves as partners with G-d in the fulfillment of G-d’s design for creation.

And so, faith in the Jewish tradition does not express itself in creedal formulation. But it is hardly a matter of insignificance to the Jewish soul. Rather it entails a sense of intense relatedness to G-d, both in terms of membership in a covenant people and in the most personal and intimate manner. That faith becomes the template of the Jew’s entire life, shaping every aspect of his or her life. It is the faith of Jews that directs their way in the world and challenges them to the partnership through which the wounded world can be made whole.

In closing, let me circle back to where we began. I must share my own sense of the great significance of Father Ryan’s remarks. In the dialogue or trialogue we have tended to speak about history or about traditions in the sense that Smith uses the term. We seem to scrupulously avoid what is at the core of our respective religious lives: faith. Pat suggests that when we meet, in the fullest sense of the word, as people of faith, we meet in a commonality that transcends the confines of the historic realities that have so often divided
us in the most painful way, these traditions which enrich us and provide the vehicles by which we express our faith; but, at the same time, they also set us apart from one another. In recognizing the commonality of our experience of faith, we may come to recognize how we are joined in the most profound way. And so I echo Father Ryan in the hope that we come to see that most fundamental commonality highlighted among us as we come together.

Amen and Amen.
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