



---

(סיכום) בשפה האנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. א (תשי"א), חוברת א-ב (ט"ז), pp. I-V

Published by: [Historical Society of Israel/](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70062307>

Accessed: 15/11/2011 05:14

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Historical Society of Israel/* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zion /*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# SUMMARY

## ZION AND JERUSALEM: THEIR ROLE IN THE HISTORIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF ISRAEL

by B. DINABURG (pp. 1—17)

The people of Israel is a historic nation *par excellence*. This is largely due to Israel's unique position among the nations, as a result of which its historic consciousness revealed in various ways became an integral part of its historic being. The people's awareness of its history was, in fact, not only one of the organic expressions of its being but also one of the chief factors determining the very nature of that being. If, then, we wish correctly to understand the basically important phenomena in the life of the people, we must first know precisely how the people themselves looked upon those phenomena, and precisely what place they occupied or now occupy, in the people's historic consciousness. It is from this point of view, the legitimacy of which the author attempts to establish by reference to the sources, that the author examines the concepts Zion and Jerusalem in the historic consciousness of Israel.

A fundamental aspect of this concept is expressed most significantly in the very usage of the names "Zion" and "Jerusalem". The prophet's promise that the Lord will "... Say unto Zion, thou art my people" (Isaiah 51, 16) has been fulfilled completely, for in the Prophets and the Hagiographa, the Apocrypha and the Aggada, Liturgy and Religious Poetry, the terms "Zion" and "Jerusalem" apply not only to the Temple, the Mount, the City, and the Land, but also frequently to the *People* of Israel, "Zion" and "Jerusalem" are, in fact, used interchangeably with "Israël". At times in one and the same poem the names are used in two different senses. The term "Knesseth Israel" (the Assembly of Israel) is derived from the concept of Zion and Jerusalem as "the mother of Israel", an expression originating in the Prophets and found frequently in the Apocrypha, the Aggada, Religious Poetry, and the translations of Scriptures which often render the word "Zion" as "Knesseth de Zion". After examining these terms and their use in the sources, the author reaches the conclusion that the identification of "Zion" with "Israel" is an integral part of Jewish self-awareness. The author rejects the theory that this identification may originate in the beliefs and conceptions that constitute a sort of "Jerusalem Myth", ascribing the city's sanctity to remote antiquity and giving it a cosmic quality. This, in his opinion, is a much later view, intended as a comment on the facts and not as a foundation for them. Moreover, the "Choice" of Jerusalem as the basis for its sanctity is not explained anywhere and the absence of such explanation simply proves that it was not necessary, since the "choice" of

Jerusalem grew out of the actual relationship between Israel and Jerusalem as it was conceived by those generations.

The central and unique element in this concept is in its emphasis of the fact that both Israel and the land were *chosen* and that there is a close relationship between the choice of Israel for its special function and the fitness of the land for the role the nation must play. Just as Abraham was chosen to receive God's Covenant with the Jewish people so the land was chosen after it was found deserving, after God Himself has "examined" its fitness for His people, shown it to them and chosen it for them. God brought His people into the land then *tested* them. The testing period lasted from the days of the Patriarchs till the prophecy was fulfilled that "Ye shall dwell therein in safety". Even after that, however, it was still recognized that the extent of Israel's control over its land was determined by the degree of its loyalty to the task divinely imposed upon it, "for the land is Mine, for ye are strangers and settlers with me". The promise given to Abraham ended with the words: "And I will make of thee a great nation". Later generations believed that this prophecy was not fulfilled until the conquest of Jerusalem, linked as it is, to the kingship of David. It is the writer's opinion that the term "nation" signifies the organized unity of the group as expressed in a specific religion, a national way of life based on a national code, and a political and military organization that assure the independence of that group. The choice of Jerusalem is closely related to the choice of David, and in these two choices the promise "And I will make of thee a great nation" comes true.

In the last chapter, the author attempts to prove that three factors account for the popular belief that the conquest of Jerusalem signifies the *choice* of Jerusalem. First, the conquest of the city was the direct result of the anointment of David as King of Israel. Secondly, Jerusalem was the first Israelite city with a population drawn from all the tribes and families of the nation, who brought with them all the varied versions of Israelite religious tradition; these, then, merged into a single religious tradition, after the Ark of the Covenant had been brought up and with it the ritual organization specifically related to it. Thirdly, Jerusalem occupied a special place in the life of the people, even in the time of David and Solomon: with the choice of Jerusalem as capital, new ruling circles came to power, new classes in the army, and new methods of government. After its conquest, Jerusalem was a city teeming with life, shaping new ideas and cultural patterns for all Israel. In it the men of that time could not but see the symbol of the future, of the days in which the promise "And I will make of thee a great nation" would be fulfilled. Hence in later periods when the origin of the sanctity of Jerusalem was sought, it was ascribed to the time of Abraham, to whom that promise had been given.

MAIMONIDES' CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE SCHOLARS  
OF PROVENCE

by S. M. STERN (pp. 18-29)

The correspondence is submitted to a new examination, in order to establish the chronological order and the mutual relation of the letters. The following are the results.

Soon after the first exchange of letters about astrology (no. 1-2; 1194 A.D.), the scholars of Lunel, headed by R. Jonathan, submitted a series of queries concerning the legal Codex of Maimonides, and asked for a copy of his philosophical treatise in Arabic, the *Guide of the Perplexed* (no. 3). Receiving no answer (although they received two volumes of the "Guide"), they sent, it seems, two reminders, the text of which has not come down to us (no. 4 and 4a). Later, R. Jonathan sent another reminder (no. 5). The *original* of this letter, that does not occur in the literary tradition of the Epistles of Maimonides, came to light from the Cairo Geniza and is now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. In it R. Jonathan also announces that a suitable translator of the *Guide* has been found in the person of the young Samuel ibn Tibbon; furthermore he asks for a copy of volume III of the book, that has not yet been received. A note on the back of the parchment turns out to be an autograph note by Maimonides, probably intended for the secretary filing his letters. In it Maimonides notes that his illness has prevented him from answering the Lunel scholars; now, however, the answer should be expedited and the *Guide* be .... (Here a word could not be read; we probably have to supply: sent). — The autographed letter of R. Jonathan with the note in the hand of Maimonides, bearing such an immediate witness to the genesis of the Hebrew translation of the *Guide of the Perplexed*, destined to play an overwhelming role in the development of Jewish thought, can be counted amongst the most venerable documents of Jewish literary history. — The letter of R. Jonathan was evidently accompanied by a letter of Samuel ibn Tibbon in which he introduced himself to the master (no. 6; not extant).

At last Maimonides replied (in the autumn of 1199) to his correspondents. He wrote three letters, the text of which has been handed down by the literary tradition. He answered R. Jonathan (no. 7), Samuel ibn Tibbon (no. 8) and the Lunel scholars (no. 9); the last letter was accompanied by the answer to their queries.

Of other letters, subsequently exchanged between Samuel ibn Tibbon and Maimonides, the text of one letter only has come down to us; according to the date in the manuscript it was sent by Ibn Tibbon to Maimonides in Adar II, 1204 three months after the death of the master.

It is submitted that the arrangement as proposed above establishes a satisfactory and coherent sequence and makes superfluous the various critical operations to which the correspondence has, somewhat wantonly, been subjected.

## ON JOY IN HASSIDISM

by A. SHOCHAT (pp. 30—43)

Religious joy which characterizes the Hassidism of the Baal Shem, in contrast to ascetic Hassidism, found earlier expression in the "Musar" literature produced by the Kabbalists and Hassidim of Safad and by those whom they influenced. The insistence on religious joy in this literature is due to various causes: the desire to strengthen religious emotion by the fulfilment of the commands of the Torah and the belief that through religious extasy it is possible to attain the stage of prophecy and inspiration.

The writer points out that in this "Musar" literature there is decided opposition to extreme asceticism on the part of scholars. The attitude to material and carnal life is more positive, on the assumption that spiritual life is impossible without material life. Communal religious singing, so characteristic of the Hassidism of the Baal Shem, was also practiced in Safad. The practice of trying to find new explanations of the Scriptures was likewise already demanded by Isaiah Horowitz. As has been shown, Isaiah Horowitz even considered it permissible to drink more than average since spiritual powers are thus put to work — a means towards encouragement of religious enthusiasm, as was current among the Hassidim of the Baal Shem.

The Will of Israel Baal Shem and the "Toldoth Jacob Joseph" written by his disciple, Jacob Joseph of Pollna, make it evident that both men were greatly influenced by earlier "Musar" literature. The change introduced by the Baal Shem and his disciples was the abolition of the "special privileges" of scholars with regard to the limitation of asceticism. They put scholars and laymen on an equal footing in expecting happiness from both. There was, of course, still a distinction between the new spiritual aristocracy — the *Zaddikim* — and the masses, but the aristocracy for its own spiritual elevation, required the joy of the masses.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN S. R. HIRSCH AND HIS TEACHER,  
ISAAC BERNAYS

by ISAAC HEINEMANN (pp 44—90)

I. Hirsch and Bernays, notwithstanding some slight though rather characteristic differences on matters of details, were of the same opinion on cardinal points:

- 1) Both interpreted Judaism as interwoven with world culture and connected with general philosophy;
- 2) Both were dogmatically opposed to the Reform Movement;
- 3) Both came close to romanticism, especially in accepting its etymological and symbolist methods, though not sharing its high estimation of sentiment.

II. Bernays was the author of "Der Bibelsche Orient", but his attitude to romanticism already began to change when the book was being printed, and seems to have changed even more in his later years.

III. The personalities of the two men were utterly different: Bernays was the scholarly type who found little satisfaction in practical, life and learning. He aimed at a synthesis between theory and practice, life and learning. He appreciated learning only because of its potential contribution to life, and he even went as far as changing certain customs according to the demands of theory.