Ha´am- Israel as our People – The Ethnic, Ecclesial, Evangelical and Eschatological Significance of Jewish Believers in Yeshua – Richard Harvey

1. Introduction

My aim in this paper is to set a context for the discussion before us by considering the nature of *Am Israel* in the Body of Christ. I follow the lines drawn in the statement from our previous consultation, which included the following statement:

> There are many Jewish people in the body of Christ. We believe that this reality reflects God's intention that Israel and the Nations live as mutual blessings to one another. In fact, the Church in its essence is the communion of Jews and those from the Nations called to faith in Christ.
>
> In light of this truth, we think that the life of Jews in the body of Christ has theological significance for that body as a whole. Their presence serves as a constant reminder to the body that its existence is rooted in the ongoing story of the people of Israel. This story resounds throughout the celebration of the liturgical life of the community. We believe that this story finds its center in Israel's Messiah. We believe that Jews within the body are a living bond between the Church and the people of Israel. Accordingly, we would like to explore concrete ways in which Jewish people may live out their distinctive calling in the body of Christ.[1]

I also draw support from the paper presented by Mark Kinzer which helpfully proposes a model for understanding the relationship between the two. My approach will be to consider the relationship between *Am Israel* and the Body of Christ, using three angles of entry into the topic, mapping the *ethnic*, *ecclesial, evangelical* and *eschatological* aspects of Jewish believers in Yeshua as members of both communities.

My rationale for a variety of angles through which to approach the phenomenon of *Am Israel* in relation to the Body of Christ is justified by the complex nature of the Jewish people, which is further complicate when in association with the Church. This complex nature is well expressed in the words of Uzi Rebhun:

> Jews are variously defined as a community, a religious or ethnic group, a nation, or a people. Each of these definitions reflects an important but incomplete, aspect of historical Jewish existence. A more comprehensive

[1] Conference Statement Press Release, Helsinki Consultation on Jewish Continuity in the Body of Messiah (June 14-15, 2010), at istina.eu/uploads/**MJTI**-Press%20Release%20Stadium%20Catholicum.pdf (accessed June 2011).

> approach might see the most appropriate way of understanding the maintenance of Jewish continuity, despite periods of devastation, exile and return, and in the light of fundamental changes in lifestyles and religious orientations, in terms of 'civilization'.[2]

Rebhun examines the different conceptions of Jewish identity, the 'objective identity' of those outside the group, and the 'subjective identity' resulting from the consciousness of those within the group. Jewish populations, he argues, 'consist of people who can be identified by detailed criteria of inclusion or exclusion, reflecting various perceptions of group boundaries and identities and a recognizable social composition'.[3]

Because of the complexity we face in understanding and articulating the nature of our Jewish identity in the light of our belief in Yeshua and membership of his Body, the Church, and our continuing identification as part of Israel (the Jewish people) with an enhanced mandate to both live out, serve and witness to our people, I will propose an appropriately four-fold set of criteria with which to evaluate the role that, as our conference pre-publicity affirms, *"Jewish identity should and could play in the daily existence of the Jewish disciples of Jesus."*

The four aspects I wish to examine are:

1. Ethnic – how are we to understand the nature of the Jewish people, and the nature of our continuity with our people as Jewish believers in Yeshua? What are the types of Messianic Jewish identity?
2. Ecclesial and Ecumenical – How are we to understand the role of Jewish believers within the Church – what form and function does Messianic Judaism play within the Church? What does it bring to the table of the communal life of the Body of Christ, in its catholicity?
3. Evangelical and Ethical – what is the Good News that Jewish Christianities and Messianic Judaisms bring to the Church and to Israel? How are they to live this out in their corporate identities – how is the Torah renewed in Yeshua to be lived out as demonstration of God's character of holiness, justice and love?
4. Eschatological – what is the role of Jewish Christianity as an eschatological sign of God's faithfulness to His people Israel and of his purposes for all nations and all Creation?

2. Ethnic Israel

[2] Uzi Rebhun, "Demographic Issues" in *Modern Judaism,* ed. Nicholas de Lange and Miri Freud-Kandel (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 15-26, 15.
[3] Ibid.

a) Ethnicity and Jewish Identity

Irving Horowitz's keynote address at a recent conference on "Jewish survival and the identity problem at the close of the twentieth century" claims that the inability of Christians to "convert Jews" is due to a lack of understanding of the complexity of the issue. He writes:

> Jewish identity…can not easily be destroyed or eliminated: but neither can it be easily synthesised into a single supreme frame of reference. The universalism, or if one prefers, the very porosity of Judaism, even if it causes moments of grief to Israel's particular concerns, provides residual strength to Jewish survivalist impulses. One indicator of this strength is the multiple problems encountered in conversion efforts. The source of so many failures in evangelical efforts to "convert" Jews is the narrow fundamentalist definition of what constitutes Jewishness. Christian fundamentalism tends to limit its interests in Judaism to one of theology…Consequently their efforts to eliminate Judaism via theological conversion have had limited success. Jewish strength resides in its plurality, clerical and secular alike. The gigantic historical ambiguity involving God, ethnicity and nation is a positive factor in Judaism's survival. But it also makes it exceedingly difficult to reach a definitive answer to the question [of how central Israel is to Jewish life].[4]

Horowitz himself is guilty of oversimplification in asserting that we have a "narrow fundamentalist definition of what constitutes Jewishness" and is plainly wrong to suggest that we are attempting to "eliminate Judaism". Yet despite his polemical agenda, he correctly points to the multifaceted nature of Jewish identity, the "gigantic historical ambiguity involving God, ethnicity and nation". Our response would be that we are not only well aware of the difficulty of the subject, but that we are also in a position to make a unique and significant contribution to its understanding, through our appreciation of the gigantic historical event of the coming of Israel's Messiah, Jesus, and of the inclusion of the nations in a renewed Israel.

b) Defining personal identity

So what do we mean by identity? In psychological terms personal identity may be defined as the pattern of observable or inferable attributes which identify an individual to oneself and others (Herman 1997:28). Personal identity develops as the individual passes through different growth stages, from childhood to maturity. At each stage of life, identity formation arises from the selective laying aside and taking up of elements of previous identities. These are then absorbed into a new configuration. Personal identity is something that is both particular to each individual, in that it defines the characteristics that set one apart from others as a unique being. It is also universal, in that membership of a group can only be acquired when it is recognised that certain identifiable features belonging to the individual are shared with others. Personal identity is not so much the question of "who am I?" but rather

---

[4] Irving Horowitz, "Keynote Address: Minimalism or Maximalism: Jewish Survival at the Millennium" in *Jewish Survival: The Identity Problem at the Close of the Twentieth Century* (Ernest Krausz and Gitta Tulea, eds., New Jersey, Transaction Publishers, 1998), 12.

"what do I want to make of myself – and - what do I have to work with?" (Herman 1977:33) Each individual has the capacity to construct a variety of identities, depending on role and social context. It is possible for me to be simultaneously husband, father, friend, Englishman, Jew and believer in Yeshua without too much role-confusion. Different aspects of one's identity often remain implicit until called upon.

c) What is ethnic identity?

Ethnic identity, or ethnicity, relates to that which the individual shares in common with others that permits membership of a particular social group defined according to certain cultural norms, differentiating the group from others. Like the earlier and less acceptable terms "race" and "nation" ethnicity is used to describe socio-political groups. Ethnic identity, or ethnicity, may be defined as a "social way of organising cultural difference." Ethnic identity enables individuals to see themselves and to be seen by others as part of a group on the basis of real or presumed common features such as ancestry, territory, language, religion and culture. Two elements are essential for ethnic identity, a social group, and a cultural unit. There is a dynamic and changing relationship between the two, as those belonging to the social group respond to internal and external factors in their environment with an appropriate change in their culture.

What is important for our study is to note the importance of, and problematic nature of what the Norwegian anthropologist Frederick Barth calls "boundary markers" to define the group and its identity in contrast to its neighbours. The classic Jewish "boundary markers" are Sabbath, circumcision and the food laws, yet what appears a mark of ethnic identity in one context may not apply in another. Whilst these may appear fixed they are often flexible and permeable, and up for negotiation according to changing circumstances.

d) What is Jewish identity?

There is much debate as to whether Jewish identity should be understood primarily as an ethnic or religious identity. Orthodox Jewish thinkers such as Elliot Dorff situate Jewish identity as primarily a religious identity. Because "the languages Jews have spoken, the foods they have eaten and the clothes they have worn have been determined….. by the particular places in which they found themselves….All of the usual factors in defining a people…are skewed when it comes to the Jewish people." (Dorff 1999:263) Dorff argues that

"Even if many contemporary Jews identify themselves as such primarily through other elements of the Jewish civilization, it is to the Jewish religion that we must turn to understand the identity of the Jewish people."(1999:263).

This view is supported on the methodological grounds that contemporary thinking on Jewish identity in a post-enlightenment tradition is inadequate in its use of concepts such as the "individual" and the "nation-state". The particularity of the Jewish people can only be understood correctly through the theological matrix of God's dealings with the people of Israel. Other building blocks of ethnic identity such as land, language and individual self-identity are secondary.

However, such an approach to Jewish identity based ultimately on religious thought brings a distorted perspective to the issue, seeing the problematic nature of Jewish identity as a result of the encounter between religion and modernity. It also leads to Dorff to make rash statements such as:

> "Even though the contemporary Jewish community is much exercised over the question of who is a Jew, it has uniformly and authoritatively determined that groups like Jews for Jesus are decidedly not Jews." (1999:271)

Such statements reveal the agenda of those who would take a religious basis for their discussion of Jewish identity, and who seek to solve the problem of identity by a return to an assumed religious orthodoxy. If we wish to use a religious definition, our framework should be set using the whole compass of biblical revelation of both the Hebrew Bible and the Apostolic writings, and in the light of later Christian and Jewish tradition.

Rather than limit the discussion of the subject to this narrow perspective, it is better to try to understand. Jewish identity from an inter-disciplinary perspective.

> "What makes the study of Jewish identity complex is that we are not dealing with a unilinear phenomenon, but one more akin to a multi-plexed phenomenon moving in a variety of historical as well as structural directions. To discuss the Jewish condition is to examine religiosity, nationality and culture all at once as well as one at a time. Indeed, to separate these elements of Judaism results in distortions and reductions that can, and sadly often does, lead to little light and much heat." (Horowitz 1998:3)

For the purposes of this paper I am using Fredrik Barth's model of ethnic identity based on the two aspects of social group and cultural unit.[5] Jewish identity may be

---

[5] From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fredrik_Barth "Barth was the editor of Ethnic Groups and Boundaries (1969) in which he outlines an approach to the study of ethnicity which focuses on the on-going negotiations of boundaries between groups of people. Barth's view is that such groups are not discontinuous cultural isolates, or logical a prioris to which people naturally belong.

Barth wants to part with anthropological notions of cultures as bounded entities, and ethnicity as primordialist bonds, replacing it with a focus on the interface between groups.

Ethnic Groups and Boundaries, therefore, is a focus on the interconnectedness of ethnic identities. Barth writes (p. 9): "[...] categorical ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact and information, but do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation whereby discrete categories are maintained despite changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories." Furthermore, Barth accentuates that group categories - i.e. ethnic labels - will most often endure even when individual members move across boundaries or share an identity with people in more than one group.

The interdependency of ethnic groups is a pivotal argument throughout both the introduction and the following chapters in Barth's edited book. As interdependent, ethnic identities are the product of continuous so-called ascriptions and self-ascriptions, whereby Barth stresses the interactional perspective of social anthropology on the level of the persons involved instead of

defined as the pattern of attributes characterising the Jewish people at the level of group, sub-group and individual. These attributes arise from the historical, religious and social experiences of the Jewish people. More recent work on ethnicity and social identity distinguishes between 'groups' and 'categories'.[6] Richard Jenkins explains that within social theory on ethnicity there is a 'major faultine':

> ...between an approach which prioritises people's own understandings of their inter-personal relationships and another which looks for an classifies behavioural patterns from a perspective which is outside the context in question.[7]

Jenkins and others propose a distinction between the organising concepts of 'group', which is defined by the members in their inter-relationship with one another, and the 'category', a class whose 'nature and composition is decided by the person who defines the category'.[8] Groups are thus defined by mutual recognition on the part of its members, whereas categories may be defined more arbitrarily, according to any criteria.

This definition gives considerable variety and flexibility to what it means to have a "Jewish identity". Is it necessary to believe in God, live in Israel, keep Jewish customs? Not necessarily? Is there one defining requirement such as matrilineal descent to determine Jewishness? No! Can there be many different and possibly contradictory Jewish identities? Naturally. What did you expect? As Menachem Kellner, professor of Jewish thought at Haifa University has recently argued in his book "Must a Jew Believe Anything?"

> The crucial question for today's Jewish world, is not whether Jews will have Jewish grandchildren, but how many different sorts of mutually exclusive Judaisms will those grandchildren face?[9]

How do these considerations affect our discussion of the subject of this conference, and our own assertion that we are both Jewish and believers in Yeshua? It is clear that our own presence within the Body of Christ and our visible self-identification as Jews within the Church challenges the established boundary markers which have been used in the past, and continue to be used today, that state 'You cannot be considered as Jewish if you have 'converted' to another religion'. But even here the demographic understanding of what constitutes ethnic identity is at variance with, for example, halachic definitions.

---

on a socio-structural level. Ethnic identity becomes and is maintained through relational processes of inclusion and exclusion."

[6] Richard Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations* (London: Sage Publications, 2008, 2nd ed.), 55 and Richard Jenkins, *Social Identity* (London: Routledge, 2008, 3rd ed.), 102.

[7] Jenkins, *Social Identity,* 104.

[8] Mann 1983:41 in Jenkins, ibid.

[9] Kellner, M, *Must a Jew Believe Anything?* (USA: ISBS, Portland, 1999), product description.

Sergio DellaPergola suggests a broader framework for discussing ethnic identity. He proposes that:

> Much of the current debate about Jewish identification deals with the ideological differences that exist between different denominations. While ideational gaps between Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or Liberal Jews are significant and sometimes entail serious conflicts, the substance of Jewish identification is better described in broader and less politically laden terms. (DellaPergola 1999: 54)

Della Pergola proposes a different model, based on the discipline of demography. This approach has the advantage of including those Jews in Diaspora who define themselves as "just Jewish", and those Israelis whose identity is defined in a- or anti-religious terms, and claim an ethnic "Israeliness" rather than "Jewishness." It is worth observing that terms such as Jew, Jewish, Israel, Hebrew etc. bear a range of meanings which change over time. The nuances in Paul's use of the terms "Jew" and "Israel" are now almost reversed in contemporary understanding. (3)

e) Four types of Jewish identity

DellaPergola estimates that of the present 13 million Jewish population, 2 million have a "normative/traditional" identity who "nearly exclusively adhere to a self-contained complex of Jewish beliefs, norms and values, and who consistently perform Jewish traditional ritual practices.

A further 6 million have an "ethnic-communal" type identity, which includes those whose main attachment to Judaism is through membership in a religious congregation. Here, as in the case of some contemporary non-Orthodox congregations, the sense of community is preserved, while the unique element of Jewish traditional or cultural exclusiveness is not. About half this group lives in the Diaspora, particularly in Latin America, Britain and the USA. The other half lives in Israel and blends a national Israeli identity with some elements of traditionalism.

The third type of Jewish identity, the "cultural residue" type, includes those for whom some attachment to Judaism may persist independently of clearly recognisable personal religious behaviour or involvement in a Jewish community. About 4 million are estimated to hold this private and non-involved Jewish identity, particularly in East and Western Europe and the USA.

The fourth type of Jewish identity is that of the "zero Jewish" or "dual Jewish/non-Jewish" Jew, which is applied to people of Jewish origin whose cultural outlook and frame of reference are in DellaPergola's words "basically non-Jewish", but who nevertheless belong within the definitional framework adopted to quantify the Jewish population. It is in this fourth type that Messianic Jews would normally be included, and points to the value of the core/periphery distinction that is being made.[10]

[10] DellaPergola uses the categories of "core" and "enlarged" Jewish identity in order to impose an operational framework on Jewish population estimates rather than allow a "normative definition" to the question "who is a Jew?" based on religious or cultural

DellaPergola estimates the breakdown of the four types as follows (1999:55):

Summary of Main Modes of Jewish Identification: Israel and Diaspora, Rough Estimates, Early 1990's

Type of Identification	World (thousands)	Diaspora (thousands)	Israel (thousands)	% in Israel
Total	13,000	8,600	4,400	33.8
Normative/Traditional	2,000	1,000	1,000	50.0
Ethnicity/Community	6,000	3,200	2,800	46.6
Cultural residue	4,000	3,500	500	12.5
Dual Jewish/Non-Jewish	1,000	900	100	10.0

f) What does Mark Kinzer mean by 'sanctified ethnicity'?

He defines the Jewish people as both a *goy* and an *'am* – "a peculiar ethnic unit joined by kinship, culture and political life, and demonstrating continuity through time".[11] Following Rosenzweig, he contrasts this with the Church, which is an 'eschatological community of witness'" which 'faith gives birth to.'[12]

---

considerations. "More than ever, researchers are having difficulties in defining the target population", he writes (1999:9). His definitions are worthy of consideration. "Core Jewish identity" he defines as those who identify themselves as Jews or are so identified by others in their household. This approach includes both subjective feelings of individuals who identify as Jews, and community norm and bonds. It reflects attitudes that are looser in the Diaspora than in Israel, where personal status is subject to the ruling of the Ministry of the Interior. In the Diaspora the core definition is wider than the halakhic/rabbinic or legally binding definition, and does not depend on a person's Jewish commitment or behaviour, defined in terms of religiosity, beliefs, knowledge, communal affiliation, etc. It includes all those who converted to Judaism or decided to join the Jewish group informally and declare themselves Jewish, but excludes those of Jewish descent who have adopted another religion (whom he labels "former Jews"?!), as well as those who did not convert out but currently refuse to recognise their Jewishness. Before we react too quickly to DellaPergola's arbitrary distinctions, let us note his definition of "peripheral Jews". His understanding of the "enlarged Jewish population" includes the core Jewish population, plus Jews by birth or parentage who do not currently identify as Jews, and thirdly, non-Jewish household members (spouses, children, etc.) who do not declare themselves Jewish. This significantly expands the "potentially Jewish population", as studies have shown, is with growing inter-marriage, the gap between the core and enlarged Jewish population tends to increase. It is here that the battle fought on the nature of Jewish identity is most keenly felt.

[11] Kinzer, 2011:10
[12] Ibid., 4.

Kinzer acknowledges that Jewish thinkers accept 'the particularity of Jewish peoplehood and its inherently biological character, but reject any notion that the Jewish people are dependent on the Christian Church for the realisation of Israel's universal mission' (5) In fact, they not only reject this, but strongly oppose the idea that Jewish people can continue to exist in any meaningful way within the Church (except perhaps Wyschogrod) or that they may continue to live out their calling, mission and identity as Jews whilst they have faith in Yeshua.

So the real question Mark poses is not only how the Messianic Jewish community is to live out its calling, but how the significance of this calling, as identified within the framework of Kinzer's 'bilateral ecclesiology' may be properly affirmed within the Church and Israel. For the purposes of this conference, and with this audience in mind made up of those of us who are Jewish and members of different historic Christian denominations, the question can be put in a more focused way – assuming we see ourselves individually and corporately as members of 'am Israel and as members of the universal body of Christ, what theological understanding and practical outworking shall we give to this bilateral understanding of the calling, identity and mission of Israel within the church, so that one does not overpower or wipe out the other, and our integrity in the pursuit of our unique vocation may be affirmed by ourselves and others?

3. Ecclesial Israel

Ecclesial and Ecumenical – How are we to understand the role of Jewish believers within the Church – what form and function does Messianic Judaism play within the Church? What does it bring to the table of the communal life of the Body of Christ, in its catholicity?

In the light of Mark Kinzer's proposal to conceive of the relationship between the Church and the Jewish people as one of 'bi-laterial ecclesiology', how are we to understand the significance of those of us who represent, both individually and collectively, across all denominations of the Church, and from within a broad variety of Jewish identities and expressions, that Israel within the Church, and the Church within Israel, that calls itself Jewish Christianity, Judeo-Christianity. Hebrew Christianity or Messianic Judaism.

Within the Messianic movement itself several different streams can be identified.[13]

Type 1 - Jewish Christianity, Christocentric and Reformed (Maoz)

[13] For what follows here see Richard Harvey, *Mapping Messianic Jewish Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2009), ch.

This type of MJT may be characterised as Christian proclamation, with limited cultural and linguistic translation into a Jewish frame of reference. Baruch Maoz identifies himself as an ethno-cultural 'Jewish' Christian in dialogue with those in the Messianic movement who advocate a return to a religious 'Judaism'.[14] Maoz works with the presuppositions of Reformed Protestantism and is highly critical of Rabbinic Judaism. His theology is shaped to correct what he sees as the error of Messianic Judaism of compromise on Christian essentials by acceptance of Rabbinic Judaism.

Maoz's doctrine of God reflects Christian orthodoxy with little engagement with Jewish theological concerns. His Christology is expressed in the Creeds, and expounded as Reformed Dogmatics. The Law is fulfilled in Christ, with Jewish observance permitted only when in conformity with New Testament practice. The key theological concern is the elevation of Jesus as Messiah, the uniqueness of his saving work, and the challenge to Rabbinic Judaism that this poses. Judaism and Jewish identity cannot be allowed to diminish the authority of Christ as revealed in Scripture. The hermeneutical system is that of the Protestant Reformation and Conservative Evangelicalism.

Maoz has a strong political loyalty to the State of Israel, but justifies this on the grounds of national and cultural identity. He is critical of Premillennialism and studiedly agnostic on eschatology. Maoz's thought, with its Christian Reformed theological emphasis, its non-charismatic and anti-rabbinic attitude, appeals to those with a focus on Scripture as interpreted through the Reformation tradition. Within the land of Israel such views are popular with those disaffected with the more superficial elements of the Messianic movement and unimpressed with more engaged forms of Torah-observance. The challenge for Maoz's approach will be to develop an appropriate, coherent doctrine of Israel, and a theology of culture that does not artificially separate an ethno-cultural 'Jewishness' from religious 'Judaism'. Maoz's arbitrary distinction between the two is problematic, and has not met with general acceptance.[15]

Type 2 - Dispensationalist Hebrew Christianity (Fruchtenbaum)

Arnold Fruchtenbaum is the leading theologian in this group, whose expression of Jewishness and Jewish identity are defined within the parameters of Dispensationalism.[16] The shape of Fruchtenbaum's theology is determined by a systematic and programmatic application of Dispensationalist teaching and method to existential questions of Jewish identity and faith in Jesus.

---

[14] Baruch Maoz, *Judaism is not Jewish: A Friendly Critique of the Messianic Movement* (Fearn, UK: Mentor/Christian Focus Publications, 2003). Others include Stan Telchin, *Messianic Judaism is not Christianity: A Loving Call to Unity* (Grand Rapids: Baker/Chosen Books, 2004).

[15] Richard Harvey, 'Judaism is Not Jewish [by Baruch Maoz]: A Review,' CWI Herald (Summer 2003), http://www.banneroftruth.org/pages/articles/article_detail.php?490 (accessed October 6, 2007).

[16] Others include Barry Leventhal, Louis Goldberg and Louis Lapides.

Fruchtenbaum's God is the God of Protestant Evangelicalism, articulated in the mode of Revised Dispensationalism, with little room for speculative thought or contextualisation.[17] There is no use for rabbinic or Jewish tradition unless it confirms and illustrates biblical revelation as reflected through a dispensationalist hermeneutic. Orthodox Christology is viewed through a conservative evangelical lens. There are some attempts at translation into Jewish cultural contexts, but a literal rather than dynamic equivalence is sought. The Abrahamic covenant is fulfilled in the Messiah, and the Torah seen as the Dispensation of the Mosaic Law has come to an end. Practice of those national and cultural Jewish elements that do not go against the NT is permitted, but the rabbinic re-interpretation of the Torah and its claims to authority are false.

Fruchtenbaum's concern is an effective rooting of Gospel proclamation within a Jewish context, and with a strong eschatological agenda of Dispensationalism, which looks forward with certainty to the imminent return of Christ, the Rapture, Tribulation and Millennial kingdom. This is the focus and centre of his system.

With this clearly defined theological base, hermeneutical method and eschatological scheme, Fruchtenbaum's articulate exposition appeals to those looking for a clear theological system. The combination of political support for Israel and a strong eschatological emphasis will continue to influence the Messianic movement. However, it also contains the weaknesses of Dispensationalism: its hermeneutical methods; its 19th century amalgam of rationalism, romanticism and historical consciousness; and the problem of Israel and the Church as two peoples of God. These will not gain acceptance with the majority of Messianic Jews, and they will look for alternatives.

Type 3 – Israeli National and Restorationist (Nerel)
Gershon Nerel's theology is observable in his historical studies of Jewish believers in the early church, and in the 19th and early 20th centuries. His theological system is implicit rather than explicit in his narrative of the histories of Jewish believers in Yeshua (JBYs). He has yet to produce a systematic exposition of his theology. Nevertheless he is representative of many Israeli Messianic Jews, who express their proximity to Christianity in solid creedal affirmations, and practice a form of Messianic Judaism which is Hebrew-speaking, rooted in modern Israeli society and culture, but with little regard for Rabbinic orthodoxy as a religious system. Culturally, ethnically and nationally, like the majority of secular Israelis, they identify with Israel and its aspirations as a State, serving in the army, living in kibbutz and moshav, and putting their children through the Israeli school system.

The heart of Nerel's theology is the eschatological significance not just of the modern Zionist movement and the return to the Land, but also the re-

[17] For distinctions between Classical, Revised and Progressive Dispensational see Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock, *Progressive Dispensationalism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, 2000).

establishment of Jewish believers in Jesus in Israel to renew the original apostolic church of Peter and James. For Nerel this has significant implications for the shape and unity of the church, challenging it to repent of supersessionism and anti-Judaism. JBYs bear a special 'eschatological spiritual authority'. This challenges Israel to recognise the imminent return of her Messiah, and calls Jewish people world-wide to make *Aliyah*, in preparation for the end times. In the light of anti-Semitism and supersessionism, Nerel's Messianic Judaism is a powerful prophetic call to Israel and the nations to see what God is doing today. His theological system is not concerned with *minutiae* of doctrinal formulas, but with a clear pragmatic involvement in a Restorationist programme. The fact that Messianic Judaism does not have twenty centuries of tradition to look to is a distinct advantage as it develops its theology.

> The very fact that *congregations of JBY lack a two-millennia tradition* [italics his] helps them to easily find the bridge between themselves and the first-century model of JBY as portrayed in the New Testament.[18]

There exists a clear resemblance between the messianic movement of Jewish believers in Jesus and the modern Zionist movement. Basically, both movements highlight the idea of bridging a historical gap between modern times and biblical times. Namely, they consciously reject allegations that they maintain anachronistic approaches. On the contrary, contemporary Jewish Jesus-believers and mainstream Zionists raise the opposite argument that they still possess a natural right to bypass the last two millennia and directly relate to the pre-exilic period in Israel's history.[19]

Nerel's theological method and shape blends the independent evangelical stream of the previous generation of Messianic Jews who made *Aliyah* in the 1950s with the establishment of the State of Israel and the Zionist movement, combining Jewish political action and Christian eschatology. His eschatology is premillennial, but he avoids the systematisation of Dispensationalism. His realised eschatology stresses the significance of the re-emergence of Messianic Jews in the Land. This could become an important factor in the future, as the Messianic movement grows in Israel, and takes on greater political and prophetic relevance.

Type 4 – New Testament Halacha, Charismatic and Evangelical (Juster, Stern)
The most popular type of MJT found within the Messianic Movement is that of David Stern and Daniel Juster, who advocate 'New Testament *halacha*' within a

---

[18] Gershon Nerel, 'Modern Assemblies of Jewish Yeshua-Believers between Church and Synagogue,' in *How Jewish is Christianity? Two Views on the Messianic Movement*, edited by Stanley N. Gundry and Louis Goldberg (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 106.
[19] Gershon Nerel, 'Primitive Jewish Christians in the Modern thought of Messianic Jews.' In *Le Judéo-Christianisme Dans Tous Ses États: Actes Du Colloque De Jérusalem 6-10 Juillet 1998*, edited by Simon C. Mimouni and F. Stanley Jones (Paris: Cerf, 2001), 399-425.

Jewish expression of faith that is evangelical and charismatic.[20] It is the dominant influence within the UMJC and integrates belief in Jesus as Messiah with Jewish tradition. It expresses Christian orthodoxy within a Jewish cultural and religious matrix, seeing a prophetic and restorative role for Messianic Judaism in the renewal of both Judaism and Christianity. Its theological system is an eclectic combination of evangelical innovation and traditional Jewish observance.

Belief in God and the Trinity follows Christian orthodoxy, but this is translated into Jewish forms of thought and expression. Nicene Christology is recontextualised and expressed in Jewish terms. The doctrine of the Incarnation is expressed apologetically and in dynamically equivalent Jewish terms. The Torah is re-defined in the light of Yeshua, and the Oral Torah is critically evaluated in the light of the New Testament. The Messianic Movement belongs to the movement of restoration of the whole Church, and is part of Israel. Historic Premillennialist eschatology brings urgent expectation of what God is doing in the Land and among the people of Israel.

Salvation is only by faith in Yeshua. Yet Israel is still the people of God, and her future salvation is assured. Until this happens evangelistic witness is imperative, but must be done in ways that are culturally sensitive, showing how the Messianic movement is part of the Jewish community, not separate from it or outside it. Scripture is the supreme authority, but must be interpreted and applied contextually, following the 'Fuller School of World Mission' approach developed by Glasser, Goble and Hutchens. The Oral Torah can help understand and interpret NT *halacha*. The Torah to be observed is that of Yeshua and his followers, with some appropriate adjustments for today.

The future of this stream within the movement is bright, as it occupies the middle ground between Jewish and Christian spheres of influence. It has found popular expression in many Messianic congregations, especially in the USA, combining a vibrant charismatic expression of faith with a 'Torah positive' attitude to Jewish tradition. However, its theological integrity and authenticity has yet to be made explicit, and the tension between tradition and innovation reconciled. The pioneering statements made by Juster and Stern in the formative period of the 1970s and 1980s have yet to be consolidated. It remains to be seen how the combination of charismatic evangelicalism and 'New Covenant Torah observance' will be accepted by the next generation in Israel and the USA.

Type 5 – Traditional Judaism and the Messiah (Schiffman, Fischer, Berkowitz)

Several independent thinkers can be situated between Stern and Juster on one side and Kinzer and Hashivenu on the other. They cannot be easily aligned, as their thinking has not fully emerged and it is difficult to locate their contribution precisely. Nevertheless in the USA John Fischer and Michael Schiffman and in Israel Ariel Berkowitz, David Freedman and Arieh Powlinson bring perspectives which are both 'Torah positive' and appreciative of Rabbinic tradition without

[20] Other key practitioners are Burt Yellin, Barney Kasdan and the majority of UMJC and MJAA leaders.

the full affirmation given them by Kinzer and the Hashivenu group. The systematisation of their views is incomplete, and their theological reflection has yet to be abstracted. They practice a halachic orthopraxy informed by faith in Jesus. It is possible that new streams of MJT may emerge more fully from this as yet disparate group. Whilst they remain close to Jewish orthodoxy their doctrine of Revelation does not see rabbinic tradition as the inspired, God-given means for the preservation of the Jewish people (as does Kinzer), but their observance of rabbinic *halacha* is stronger than that of Juster and Stern.

Powlinson brings a new spirituality to his thinking, and Freedman and Berkowitz bring a new orientation to the Torah making it available, in principle if not in practice, to the Nations. Fischer approaches Torah from his own orthodox Jewish background, but with the eyes of a New Testament follower of Yeshua. This group have maintained orthodox Christian beliefs, whilst interacting with Jewish traditional views and objections, on the nature of God, the Messiah, and the Torah. Their eschatology is premillennial. Their observance of Torah follows orthodoxy, whilst allowing for re-statement where appropriate. Scripture is read in the light of rabbinic tradition, but is still supreme as authoritative revelation. The emerging shape of this theology is not clear, but could result in 'Messianic Hasidism' with a possibly more orthodox Jewish expression.

Type 6 - 'Postmissionary Messianic Judaism' (Kinzer, Nichol, Sadan)

Mark Kinzer's 'Postmissionary Messianic Judaism' presents the potential for a programmatic theological system. Combating supersessionist readings of scripture to argue for the ongoing election of Israel and the legitimacy of a Torah-observant Messianic Judaism, Kinzer employs postliberal[21] and postcritical Jewish and Christian theological resources. His understanding of the revelation of God through the Scriptures and Jewish tradition acknowledges the significance of the Jewish and Christian faith communities through which such revelation is mediated. Ecclesiology and soteriology cohere around his bi-lateral understanding (reflecting Karl Barth) of the community of God made up of both 'unbelieving' Israel, and the Church, with Jesus present in both, visible to the *ekklesia* but only partially recognised by Israel. This 'mature Messianic Judaism' is summarised by the Hashivenu statement of purpose:

[21] Postliberalism began as a reaction to theological liberalism. Karl Barth's reaction against Protestant liberal theology of the 19th and early 20th centuries was taken up by some of his followers in the USA to produce a new engagement with the Bible, Church tradition and contemporary culture. This sat in between the 'liberal' and 'conservative' labels. Key postliberal theologians include George Lindbeck, Hans Frei and Stanley Hauerwas, and the academic journals First Things and Pro Ecclesia are representative of postliberal thought. Postliberalism reacts against the relativism and rationalism of theological liberalism, with a more sympathetic reading of the Bible and Church tradition, but with an openness to theological ecumenism, the existence and impact of other faiths, and engagement with contemporary culture. Cf. Richard Harvey, 'Shaping the Aims and Aspirations of Jewish Believers (Review of Mark Kinzer's *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*)' *Mishkan* 48 (2006): 18-21.

> Our goal is a mature Messianic Judaism. We seek an authentic expression of Jewish life maintaining substantial continuity with Jewish tradition. However, Messianic Judaism is energized by the belief that Yeshua of Nazareth is the promised Messiah, the fullness of Torah. Mature Messianic Judaism is not simply Judaism plus Yeshua, but is instead an integrated following of Yeshua through traditional Jewish forms and the modern day practice of Judaism in and through Yeshua.[22]

It is clear that Kinzer's influences and assumptions place him outside the mainstream of Protestant Evangelicalism, especially the conservative variety often found within previous forms of Messianic Judaism. His view of the authority and inspiration of Scripture is tempered by respect for Jewish traditions of interpretation, and the influence of critical and postcritical biblical scholarship, and postliberal theology.

Kinzer advocates solidarity with the Jewish community.[23] He encourages sympathetic identification with the religious and cultural concerns of Judaism, as found in the North American context. The primary location of identity is 'within the Jewish community' in order that Messianic Jews will 'have Jewish grandchildren'. One purpose is to refute the accusation of assimilation that is levelled at Jewish believers in Jesus by the Jewish community.

'Postmissionary Messianic Judaism' arises as one way of negotiating the tension between proclamation of Jesus as Messiah, and the preservation of Jewish belief, practice and identity. Such concerns reflect the challenges facing the Messianic movement worldwide as it grows in theological, spiritual, communal and personal maturity. Kinzer's response is a Messianic Judaism that echoes Conservative Judaism in its liturgy and practice, and integrates belief in Yeshua in the context of loyalties and identity to 'Jewish space.'

Kinzer sees Jesus as divine, but within a Judaism not inhospitable to the possibility of the divinity and incarnation of the Son of God. The historic Christian formulations of the Trinity are inadequate in Jewish contexts because they are steeped in Hellenism. New postcritical formulations are required that emerge from Jewish tradition and are recognised as possible understandings of the nature of God. The Scriptures of Judaism and Christianity are both inspired, and to be interpreted within a non-supersessionist appreciation of the canonical and communal contexts in which they arose.

Torah is observed in the light of Orthodox and Conservative *halacha*, with some modifications. Jewish believers thus integrate Messianic beliefs within traditional synagogal life, and witness to the Messiah through the presence of a community within the Jewish community rather than through overt appeal to individuals from without.

---

[22] http://www.hashivenu.org/what_is.htm (accessed 17 March 2006).
[23] Others in this group include Stuart Dauermann, Paul Saal, Rich Nichol, Jason Sobel, and the New England Halachic Council.

Kinzer's approach is the most theologically creative proposal to have emerged within Messianic Judaism in recent years, but it remains to be seen how much communal acceptance it will receive. It builds on North American Conservative Judaism in its method and expression, and departs significantly from the evangelical foundations to which much of Messianic Judaism still adheres. Its theological articulation, whilst profound, may not find popular appeal.[24]

Type 7 - Rabbinic Halacha in the Light of the NT (Shulam)

Joseph Shulam expresses an Israeli form of Messianic Judaism using the resources of Orthodox Judaism. Shulam makes the call to 'do Messianic Jewish *halacha*' and to cut the 'umbilical cord' that connects Messianic Judaism to Christian denominations. He reads the Scriptures within the controlling hermeneutical framework of the Jewish tradition. His aim is to teach the church the Jewish roots of its faith by a series of commentaries on the Jewish sources of the New Testament writings.[25]

The project is incomplete, and it is not clear how such a theology will be formulated. Shulam's main concern is to clear away the preliminary barriers of twenty centuries of non-Jewish reading of the scriptures. His call for Messianic *halacha* is in reaction to the 'Gentilisation' of Messianic Judaism. Whilst he advocates a return to *halacha*, it is not clear in what form this will emerge. However, his is a genuine and Israeli-based expression of a Jewish orthodoxy linked to orthodox Christian beliefs about Jesus. His perspective is one that should be recognised within the spectrum of MJT, and it is possible that others will follow in his emphases.[26]

Shulam disassociates himself from mainstream (and 'Gentilised') Christianity, situating himself within Jewish social and religious space. He combines Messianic Judaism with mystical traditions in Judaism that lead to affirmations of his faith. Rabbinic, and even mystical traditions are part of the revelatory process, and to be held in balance with scripture. Shulam's theological system is based on a midrashic approach to scripture, a reading of the New Testament influenced by David Flusser, and some expression of the Jewish mystical tradition (Kabbalah) factored in to his overall approach.

---

[24] Kinzer's work *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic/Brazos, 2005) has been the subject of major discussions and reviews in *Mishkan* 48 (2006) 'Reactions to Postmissionary Messianic Judaism' and *Kesher* 20 (Winter/Spring 2006).

[25] Joseph Shulam, with Hilary Le Cornu, *A Commentary of the Jewish Roots of Romans* (Baltimore: Lederer Books, 1997).

[26] Shulam's position is further complicated by repeated concerns that his Christology is not fully orthodox. Reference has been made to his written work, and not uncorroborated verbal remarks attributed to him.

Type 8 - Messianic Rabbinic Orthodoxy (Brandt, Marcus)

Elazar Brandt advocates a form of Messianic Judaism that is close to Rabbinic orthodoxy, but is a minority position within the Messianic movement. He is convinced that Messianic Jews must:

> make every effort to remain committed to the 4 pillars of Jewish existence that have always held us together -- G-d[27], land, people and Torah. History repeatedly shows that groups who have abandoned any of these commitments have quickly disappeared from the scene.[28]

His advocacy of Torah observance is so strong that:

> I dare say that it is less dangerous to follow the wrong messiah than to follow the wrong Torah.[29]

The authority of Torah, which for him is interpreted through rabbinic tradition, influences his Christology:

> The rightful Messiah will come to Jerusalem where his throne will be established and where he will rule Israel and the nations with justice according to the Torah. There is no such thing as a Messiah who does not keep Torah and teach his people to do so. If Yeshua does not do and teach Torah, then he is not the Messiah -- not for Israel, and not for anybody else.[30]

This leads him to oppose all forms of supersessionism.

> There is no such thing as a Messiah who is not the Messiah of Israel. A Messiah who rejects Israel and chooses another people group is not the Messiah promised in the Bible.[31]

Messianic Jews have no special status among their people as the 'faithful remnant' of Romans 9-11, but rather take their stand within the faithful found within all Israel. They cannot claim special status as the 'remnant' because of their belief in Yeshua, as this would disenfranchise others who do not believe in him.

> Jews who claim to follow Yeshua and to know and do his Torah more perfectly than other Jews, and on such a basis claim to be the 'true Israel', or the 'true remnant of Israel', or other such language, are no less in the

---

[27] Brandt follows an orthodox Jewish custom of not writing the word 'God' in full.
[28] Elazar Brandt, e-mail message to author, February 26, 2007. This has been referred to at length to ensure accurate representation of Brandt's views, and because he has published few statements of his position on these questions.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid.

> replacement camp than Christians who believe G-d has rejected Israel and chosen them instead.[32]

Brandt's soteriology includes all Israel.

> The 'Israel' who today walks the streets of Jerusalem and the cities throughout the land, and the Jews who are identifiable outside of the land, are the Israel that G-d is going to see through to redemption. He staked his name on this by an oath. This includes Haredis and secular, Conservative and Reform as well as Zionist and uncommitted. 'All Israel shall be saved,' said Paul. If G-d does not keep this promise, then he is not G-d. He said so Himself.[33]

Brandt's hermeneutics call for a return to halachic orthodoxy. To Brandt this means abandoning a 'spiritualising and fantasising' approach to the Bible, and returning to 'literal interpretation and obedience'. Jews who believe in Yeshua remain Jews. They are called to repent, not by being 'sorry for personal sins', but by returning to the covenant, and remaining 'faithful to our G-d, land, people and Torah'. As regards the witness of Messianic Jews to their people:
Our best testimony to our own people will be if we can show that we are doing this because we met Yeshua. Instead, we have been doing our best to show that we have broken our covenant with the four pillars [God, Land, People and Torah] since we have met Yeshua. What reason is there today or in the past for our people to see us otherwise?[34]

This type is at the far end of the continuum, and expresses a tendency to move back into Judaism at the expense of Christian affirmations and distinctives. Uri Marcus puts forward a revised adoptionist Christology, Elazar Brandt is more comfortable within Jewish Orthodoxy, and ultra-orthodox Hasidim who come to believe in Jesus remain in their communities, practicing as 'secret believers', invisible to outsiders, as part of an 'insider movement.'

Like Brandt, Marcus distances himself from 'Hellenistic' and 'Gentile' Christianity. Marcus subscribes to Orthodox Jewish views on the indivisibility and singularity of the Divine nature which rules out the possibility of the Trinity. However, his dispensational premillennial eschatology and its charismatic expression relate closely to Christian Zionism, and his denial of the Trinity and Incarnation has caused controversy in Christian Zionist and Messianic Jewish circles.

For Marcus, Jesus is the human Messiah, who did not claim deity and is not divine. Scripture is read in context of rabbinic tradition, which informs and controls the results of such reading. Rabbinic *halacha* is accepted, and there is little overt proclamation. Whilst the theology of this stream has yet to be comprehensively or systematically articulated, it is an influential if heterodox

---

[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.

group within the Messianic movement. Without clearer definition of the significance of Yeshua, it is likely that for some it will be a means back into Jewish orthodoxy, and that an increasing number of Messianic Jews will take up the label of 'Orthodox' or 'Just Jewish'.

4. Evangelical Israel – what is the missiology of the remnant?

Thomas Torrance's theology of Israel as the instrument through which Christ is mediated in revelation and reconciliation raises the question as to what extent the remnant of Israel still continue to play a role. Eschewing the supersessionism which says, in the words of Cardinal Faulhaber "After the death of Christ, Israel was dismissed from the service of Revelation",[35] Torrance asserts that Israel was the environment in which "a two-way movement was involved: an adaptation of divine revelation to the human mind and an adaptation of articulate forms of human understanding and language to fit divine revelation."[36]

---

[35] Lev Gillet, *Communion in the Messiah* (London: Lutterworth, 1942), 191. "Louis 'Lev' Gillett was born in 1893 in Saint-Marcellin (Isère, France). After studies of philosophy in Paris, he was mobilised during the First World War, taken prisoner in 1914 and spent three years in captivity, where he was attracted by the spirit and the spirituality of the Russian prisoners. He studied mathematics and psychology in Geneva and joined the Benedictines of Clairvaux in 1919. Attracted by Eastern Christianity, he became acquainted with Metropolitan Andriy Sheptytsky of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in Galicia and pronounced his final vows in 1925 at the Studite monastery of Univ Lavra in Galicia. Disappointed by the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church towards Orthodoxy, Gillet was received in the Orthodox Church in Paris in May 1928 and, in November 1928, he became rector of the parish of Sainte-Geneviève-de-Paris, the first French-speaking Orthodox parish. In 1938 he left Paris to settle in London, within the framework of the Fellowship of Saint Alban and Saint Sergius, an ecumenical organization dedicated to the bringing together of the Anglican and Orthodox churches. He remained in England until his death in 1980, going on many journeys abroad, in particular to France, Switzerland and Lebanon, where he took part in the spiritual revival of Antiochian Orthodoxy." (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lev_Gillet)

Principal publications in French (under the pseudonym "A Monk of the Eastern Church") include *The Jesus Prayer, Introduction to Orthodox Spirituality, The year of grace of the Lord: A commentary on the Byzantine liturgical year* and *Jesus, simple gazes at the Saviour*. His collaboration with Paul Levertoff led to his work on Jewish-Christian Relations, *Communion in the Messiah.*

[36] Torrance, *Mediation of Christ,* (Edinburgh: T and T Clar,1992) 7, in Colyer, *How to Read T.F. Torrance, IVP 2001.*

Torrance maintains that 'Israel's vicarious mission in the mediation of reconciliation does not cease with Christ's death and resurrection, but has significance through all of history."…He adds that 'the deep schism between Christianity and Judaism that developed in the early centuries of the church, and perpetuated in history since, has impaired Christianity's attempt to understand the gospel, especially the atonement (pp. 37-46).[37]

5. Ecumenical Israel

What form should the Messianic Jewish community take within the body of Christ. Lev Gillet, a contemporary of Paul Levertoff, wrote more than 110 years ago:

> A Jewish Christianity implies, as we have seen, something quite different from the individual adhesion to any present Christian mission or Church. It implies a Christian faith and a Jewish religious environment. Such a combination could be achieved along two lines. We shall call the first way 'un-synagogued Jewish Christianity' and the second 'synagogued Jewish Christianity.'[38]

'Unsynagogued Christianity' is a Jewish Christianity that has 'broken its ties with the Synagogue', and might exist in two forms, which are of interest to us in our discussion. Gillet explains:

> It could be a special and autonomous branch of one of the present Christian Churches, e.g., of the Eastern Orthodox Church, or of the Roman Catholic Church, or of the Episcopal Churches in Communion with Canterbury. The condition of this branch, having its own ritual, discipline, and theological tradition, would offer some analogies with the position of the Eastern Uniat Churches in the Church of Rome.[39]

The alternative 'unsynagogued Jewish Christianity, according to Gillet, would be an 'independent Christian Church, like the Moravian and Waldensian Churches."

However, Gillet devotes more space and interest to what he calls "Synagogued" Jewish Christianity, a Jewish Christianity which "keeps, as far as possible, its ties with the Synagogue." Gillet recognises this way as being more "complex and difficult", but appears to favour it nevertheless. Citing the examples of Rabbi Lichtenstein of Hungary, the German Jewish writer De Jonge, and other Jewish believers in Jesus who maintained Synagogue membership whilst affirming faith in the Messiah, Gillet sees the problems and possibilities of such a movement, both of whole communities becoming 'Jewish Christian Synagogues', a phenomenon he sees as 'purely hypothetical', and the more likely scenario of an

[37] Colyer, 69, fn. 50.
[38] Lev Gillet, *Communion in the Messiah,* 206.
[39] Ibid.

'individual Jew or of a small group of Jews who would believe in Christ and at the same time keep their membership in a synagogue community."[40]

Gillet claims that he is not 'pleading here for any particular form of Jewish Christianity' but is 'merely considering the possibilities'. However, he is convinced that a 'Jewish Christianity under some form is desirable for the whole Christian Church.'[41] He quotes Conrad Hoffman, who argued:

> We should endeavour to help such a movement to remain Jewish and Hebrew rather than endeavour to divorce it from Jewry….The possibility of a new Church evolving out of such a movement [of Jewish people towards Christ] must be anticipated. We must be prepared to accept such into the Christian Church family and even perhaps be ready to profit in a spirit of humble gratitude by the new light which may come to our Jewish neighbours as they discover their long expected Messiah.[42]

Gillet is aware of the important ecumenical significance of a "Synagogued Jewish Christianity":

> Secondly, we believe that the development of a Jewish Christianity is inseparably linked with the development, among Christians, of a new œcumenical consciousness. Therefore it is useless and even dangerous to think of a future Jewish Christianity in too precise categories. Jewish Christianity, if it grows, will grow and evolve with the re-united Church which the present œcumenical movement is trying to restore. Without the Jewish seed, the œcumenical organism will not grow, and isolated from an œcumenical Christianity, Jewish Christianity will remain in a sect – unless it develops entirely within the Synagogue, fecundates it and brings it into real spiritual contact with the Church.[43]

6. Ethical Israel

Evangelical and Ethical – what is the Good News that Jewish Christianities and Messianic Judaisms bring to the Church and to Israel? How are they to live this out in their corporate identities – how is the Torah renewed in Yeshua to be lived out as demonstration of God's character of holiness, justice and love?

7. Eschatological Israel

8. Conclusion

---

[40] Ibid., 207
[41] Ibid. 209.
[42] Conrad Hoffmann, *Christians and Jews,* 60, cited in Gillet, 209.
[43] Gillet, *Communion,* 209-210.