From The Editor

MIT Book Chapter
This spring our primary focus was writing Linguistic Cosmology: The Language of Creation, the chapter on Meru research to be included in The Complementarity of Mind and Body: Realizing the Dream of Descartes, Einstein, and Eccles, a book for MIT Press edited by neurophysiologist Karl Pribram and physicist Richard Amoroso. The entire manuscript is now in the hands of MIT Press, and will be released in June 2008. Because of the MIT Press venue, we were free to include some of our more recent (and previously unreleased) findings in this presentation. The result is a professional introduction to Meru research that is accurate, readable, and current — and we look forward to its release.

The Alphabet in Genesis Book Series
We have reissued The Alphabet in Genesis, our bound and updated Meru research sampler, in three volumes (rather than seven). We’re now offering the three-volume version of The Alphabet in Genesis on our secure-server website www.meetingtent.com for $72 (plus shipping); see this page on The Alphabet in Genesis for details.

The three volumes of The Alphabet in Genesis are also available through Amazon.com (at list price). Placement on Amazon gives Meru additional exposure, allowing new readers to discover our work. If you’ve enjoyed our books, feel comfortable writing about our research, and would like to recommend it to others, I invite you to write a review for posting on the Alphabet in Genesis pages at Amazon.com. Our hope is to create a “buzz” around these volumes, and Meru research in general, that reaches beyond our current eTORUS readership and draws new people to our websites. If you’re interested in writing a review, please contact Levanah at meru1@well.com.

We intend The Alphabet in Genesis to be an ongoing series, and are currently working on additional volumes with new material. See future issues of eTORUS for details and sponsorship opportunities. —Levanah Tenen, ed.

Zohar, B’reshit, and the Meru Hypothesis

Scholars debate the origins of Zohar.

Zohar claims to have been written by Shimon Bar Yochai. Scholars claim it is a “pious forgery” produced by Moses de Leon at the end of the 13th century C.E.

How would it be possible to know which is true?

Because of my lack of education, for most of the Meru Project I have been working from hardly more than the raw letter-text of Genesis. Yes, of course I knew of Zohar, but because of the “difficult” translations and because I didn’t want simply to try to apologize for given teachings, I avoided looking at it until recently. Instead, independently, I found that:

1) The letter-text of the first verse folds up into a smoke-ring, and

2) Reading the letter-text letter-by-letter describes the generation of a smoke-ring by “breathing out and breathing in”.

3) This smoke ring is not arbitrary or amorphous, but rather has an explicit structure. It takes the form of the 3,10 torus knot (either in its usual wreath form, or in its inverted “dimpled-sphere” “idealized fruit” form.)
Either pairing the letters (without regard to their meaning) or reading the words of B'reshit 1:1 letter by letter (acronym-style) leads to an idealized smoke-ring in the form of a torus knot as the “form of first cause.”

Meru findings and information theory

These findings alone are important because they carry the minimum necessary components of a living information system, as set forth by founding information theorist John von Neumann: a working model independent of the letter description, and a letter-description of the working model that is independent of the working model. This lends modern objective meaning to the traditional claim that “Torah is a Tree of Life for those who grasp it.” Here we have a logical tree describing and modeling a living information system. Physicists now understand that physical theories and theories of consciousness derive from information theory. “It from bit” is a short way of saying this. Genesis opens with the first “bit” -- the letter Bet.
Objections and Responses

The most important objection I’ve encountered to my findings is that I am reading them in – I’m making them up. Given that there are only 28 letters in the first verse, and given that there are thousands of ways to cluster the letters so as to read them, it might be possible for people who don’t look closely at the actual audit trail to believe that my finding patterns in the letter-text of Genesis is just the result of looking for them for so long. But even if we initially assume that I read all of this in, made it up, force-fit it, or some such, that still doesn’t address the question of how I could have made all the same “mistakes” about Genesis 1:1 as Moses de Leon, when he wrote down the Zohar 700 years ago.

Currently, the most authoritative scholarly edition of Zohar is Daniel Matt’s new Pritzker-Stanford translation4 (Matt's earlier partial translation for Paulist Press (1983), quoted at right, is essentially the same on the subject at hand.) Matt and literally dozens of other scholars have produced translations of Zohar. Matt is diligent. He has gone through the older translations and variant texts, and thus he has excellent, reliable, and authoritative footnotes.

Here is Matt’s translation of Parashat B’reshit, verse 2 (Zohar 1:15a) (pp. 197-198):5

“At the head of the potency of the King, He engraved engravings in luster on high.
“A spark of impenetrable darkness flashed within the concealed of the concealed, from the head of Infinity – a cluster of vapor, forming in formlessness, thrust in a ring...”

Matt’s footnote to the phrase “a cluster of vapor forming in formlessness, thrust in a ring,” (Aramaic: qutra b’gulma), tells us that qutra means both “knot” and “smoke” in the Zohar. (He goes on to list many references where this occurs. Matt does not indicate he sees the connection between “knot”, “smoke”, and “ring”.)

All translators of Zohar, and indeed all readers of Zohar, have had access to this text and the understanding of these footnotes for hundreds of years.

Yet there appears to be no commentary whatsoever that demonstrates that this is an explicit AND ACCURATE description of B’reshit 1:1. The first verse of B’reshith actually does form a smoke ring -- and also describes the formation of the smoke ring -- from a “cluster of vapor forming in formlessness”, in the form of a (torus) knot.

There are good reasons for this lack of identification. Scholars are not trained to recognize torus knots, or to understand their significance or their relationship to “a cluster of vapor forming in formlessness”. Viewers of the Annenberg educational TV series for High School physics teachers, and teachers and students of physics, are aware of this model of creation. It is a basic demonstration in many modern physics classes.

Matt’s Mistaken Perspective

“To promote this mythical, mystical tradition and establish its authenticity, the Zohar employs a number of devices. It reports teachings from the Academy of Heaven and from the mouth of the prophet Elijah. . . An entire imaginary library provides proof texts whenever necessary. . . [Moses de Leon] was transmitting something beyond himself and felt free to cite the sages who inhabited his imagination. The pseudepigraphic and fictional design proved irresistible to centuries of readers. . . The Zohar is a mystical novel based on the Torah. Its characters include Rabbi Shim’on and his Comrades, biblical figures, and the sefirot, the various aspects of God’s personality.”6

--From Matt’s Introduction to his 1983 translation of Zohar for Paulist Press.
Physics 101

There is a large bellows filled with smoke (so as to be able to see air currents) on the teacher's table. The bellows is activated by pushing a piston or squeezing it. (You can see this for yourself on the “Zero Toys” website; an example of the reciprocal spiral in nature is the diagrammatic hurricane reproduced on page 6 of this eTORUS. For additional examples, see The Arm of God, ©1995, 2006 Stan Tenen, in the New Releases section of the Meru website.)

We also know that the formation of torus knot smoke rings in clusters of vapor that previously carried no form was known in the ancient world. It was necessary to know the physics of the bellows in order to use smoke from a bellows to manage honeybees. The bellows is also required to gain a fire hot enough to smelt bronze or iron. There's no mystery about the appearance of this experimental “creation physics” in Genesis. Bellows physics is not in the experience of today's scholars, but it is what people in the past would have been familiar with, and thus would have been able to understand and appreciate. Since tradition asserts that Torah is intentionally written in the language of [hu]man[s], it is reasonable to find models and methods that people of the time would have understood being used to convey principles in Torah.

Besides being understandable because of “hands on” experience with bees and smelting in the ancient world, this model was, and still is, good physics.

Hidden in Plain Sight: The Legitimacy of Zohar

I have said most of this before. But there has also been a Poe-style “purloined letter” hidden in clear view on this table from the beginning: the legitimacy and authorship of Zohar. If Moses de Leon forged, made up, or fantasized Zohar, as modern scholars claim, then how could he have known what our scholars today don't know -- that Zohar on Parashat B'reshit (the section on Genesis) is explicit, accurate, and on-point? Zohar is aware not only of the letter-level structure of Torah, not only of the descriptions in the letter-text, but Zohar is also aware of the actual physics of creation in Torah and its proper context and application. Today's scholars are not aware of this.

Here is our proof that Zohar cannot be a pious forgery. The authors of Zohar obviously had this tradition, and explicit precise technical understanding of B'reshit at a level beyond what is known in academic or rabbinic scholarship today, otherwise they could not have described what has since been lost -- the same geometry with the same function as I found.

Is there any other possibility? Could I possibly have come up with a smoke-ring by pairing the letters at the beginning of Genesis, and -- merely by reading them letter by letter -- find a description of this smoke-ring that matches the supposedly completely confabulated, fantastical, and made-up claims in a pious forgery called the Zohar? The Zohar claims that it carries genuine tradition. The scholars can’t find the source for this tradition, so they assume there is none and thus Zohar must be fantasy. It should be noted that academic scholarship also insists that Genesis was written during the Babylonian exile. Finding real bronze-age physics refutes this as well.

It is our current ignorance that leads us to be unable to understand what Zohar is referring to, and this leads us to believe it is the sort of fantasized nonsense that Daniel Matt and his colleague Arthur Green7 and the other scholars consistently claim.

Now that we know that at least one part of Zohar knows real physics in Torah, it is certainly worth looking for other parts that might also have objective information that can help to validate Zohar itself, and illuminate B'reshit and the Torah traditions. What else does Zohar tell us about Torah that we don't know?
Ancient Confirmation of Meru Hypothesis

The scholars also claim that letter-shapes are arbitrary and carry no meaning beyond phonetic value. But the evidence is otherwise. In the highlighted quotes on this page, Yehuda HaLevi⁸ and Shabetai Sheftel Horowitz⁸, who lived in the 12th and 16th centuries respectively, each tell us that the letter shapes come from a special “device” which meets the description of the model we found in the first verse of Genesis (by pairing the letters and reading the description given by the letter-text.⁵) Both HaLevi and Horowitz are describing the model hand we call First Hand™, and its use to make letters that have natural meaning, based on hand-gestures.⁹

Once the scholars came to believe that the letters have no individual meaning, they of course could not read the opening verse of Genesis letter-by-letter. The letters have no meaning; ergo, letter-by-letter reading would also have no meaning. Thus, there is no motive for any scholar to look. Thus, they are certain that Zohar is empty fantasy, and that modern scholarship, science, and history are superior to the musings of “God-intoxicated mystics” in past ages.¹⁰

A lot hangs on this. If Zohar can be trusted to tell us how to read Torah at the letter level, and if we do this, and there is meaning at the letter level, we’re going to find it.

Conclusions

1) The “God-intoxicated mystics” dismissed by scholars were, in some cases, “logic-intoxicated mathematicians” who knew what they were talking about.

2) Zohar is genuine. The school of Higher Criticism¹¹, Wellhausen¹², the Documentary Hypothesis¹³ et al., cannot be sustained and must be wrong.

3) The letter-text of B’reshit is not a story. It’s programming -- software for the mind. The letter-text could be read as a story, just as software written in computer code that uses the words of ordinary language could be read as a story. Zohar knows this.

Repeating and protecting the story in effect “refreshes the ROM” of Torah civilization. This is a vital function. But it must not eclipse the purpose of the knowledge on the “Torah ROM” -- our spiritual, emotional, and intellectual evolution, our movement from human animal to full human.

“The shapes of the letters are not the result of accident, but of a device which is in harmony with the character of each letter…”

Yehuda HaLevi’s Al Kuzari (part 4, #25) written in Judeo-Arabic in the 12th century

Example using the letter Mem

The letter Mem means source. The source of speech is at the throat, thus the gesture which displays the letter Mem.
Is there any other possibility? Could I, or anyone else, have found what Zohar describes in Matt's translation (even though Matt himself does not understand the significance of the words he uses), unless Zohar is essentially real as claimed, it is based on the letter-text of Genesis and other genuine tradition as its source, and the models and physics we recovered from B’reshit are essentially valid and consistent with tradition?

**A Revolution in Zohar Scholarship**

It seems to me that if there is no other possibility, and/or if other possibilities can easily be dismissed, then we have here a potential revolution in the history and meaning of Zohar.

---

**References**


2) Image from *Mechanisms of a ring-shaped helicase*, by Ilker Donmez and Smita S. Patel. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 2006, Vol. 34, No. 15, p. 2. This helicase that unzips DNA has six-fold symmetry, with a structure that invites comparison with the 3-torus Shushon Flower model. Note: we are *not* saying that the ancients knew about DNA or ring-shaped helicases. We are saying that basic topology and geometry are universal, and these considerations drive all cosmology, embryology, and conscious awareness.

3) The Jupiter-Saturn cycle was observed and known in the ancient world.

4) For the letter-pairing patterns, see *Symmetry Woven into the First Verse of the Hebrew Text of Genesis* on Meru Foundation’s research website; also printed in Section III--Essential Findings from *The Alphabet in Genesis*, p. 3-14. For an example of reading the first verse acronym-style, see *A More Intelligent Design*, also in Section III of *The Alphabet in Genesis*, on page 3.8. *The Alphabet in Genesis*, ©2007 Stan Tenen, is available at [http://www.meetingtent.com/AlphabetInGenesis.html](http://www.meetingtent.com/AlphabetInGenesis.html).


8) Yehuda HaLevi was a 12-century sage. *Al Kuzari* was written as a defense of Jewish teachings and learning for Jews living in the Islamic world. R. Shabatai Sheftal Horowitz of Prague (c. 1561-1619), known as “the renowned physician of Prague,” was a master of both the Talmudic and mystical traditions of Judaism.

9) For more on the origin of Hebrew letters in hand gestures, see the Meru lecture DVD *The Alphabet in our Hands*, available on www.meetingtent.com.

10) “God-intoxicated mystics” expresses the essence of the scholarly point of view on the content of the Zohar. The quotes on page 3 from Matt’s *Introduction* to his 1983 Paulist Press Zohar translation are examples. Arthur Green’s *Introduction* to Matt’s current Pritzker-Stanford translation is equally condescending.

11) *Higher Criticism*: The school of higher criticism assumes that the Biblical texts are literary documents, and treats them that way, focusing on supposed historical sources.

12) *Julius Wellhausen*: German professor of theology and oriental studies (1844-1918), originator of the Documentary Hypothesis, i.e. that the Hebrew Bible was written in Babylonia.

13) *Documentary Hypothesis*: The documentary hypothesis proposes that the Five Books of Moses represent an amalgam of separate sources edited and spliced together during the Babylonian Exile.
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