



(סיכום) באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion* / ציון, Vol. תשי"ח, חוברת ג-ד, (כ"ג), pp. I-V

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70060010>

Accessed: 17/11/2011 09:36

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.



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

<http://www.jstor.org>

SUMMARY

GESHUR AND MA'CAH

by B. Mazar (pp. 115–123)

On the basis of the Biblical sources and external documents, the author deals with the history of the two countries East of the Upper Jordan and North of the Yarmuk. Their destinies in the pre-Israelite period are reflected in the El-Amarna letters. In No. 256 mention is made of the land of Gari. From the towns named in that land it may be concluded that Gari is identical with Geshur (i.e. Ga-šu-ri, the middle syllable being omitted, as often happens with regard to place-names in these letters). The political structure of Gari, according to this source, was a kind of confederation of seven cities similar to that of the four Hivite cities mentioned in the Bible.

It appears that Geshur and Ma'cah became independent kingdoms in the second half of the 11th century B.C., but the accepted view that they were Aramaic is not supported by Biblical sources. The King of Ma'cah is mentioned in the days of David as an ally of the Aramaeans against Israel. Geshur, however, is not mentioned in this connection; moreover David was related by marriage to the King of that state. Hence Geshur's policy was not dependent on that of the Aramaeans.

From the Genealogical Lists (1 Chron. 2:23) follows that Geshur together with Aram (-Damascus) invaded Bashan and cut it off from Israel, presumably after the division of the Kingdom of Israel.

Ultimately Geshur and Ma'cah were merged in Aram-Damascus, Ma'cah was absorbed at the latest in the days of Baasha; Geshur after the military and political reform of Ben-Hadad II, following his defeat at Samaria at the hands of Ahab (1 Kings 20:25).

ASPECTS OF THE HISTORY OF THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD

by J. N. Grintz (pp. 124–140)

The paper includes two notions: (1) High Priests of the First Temple; (2) Origins of the priestly house of Zaddok; and appendix.

I. In the first section, the author differs from accepted opinion (of both the traditional interpretation and the Wellhausen School) in contending that the list of the Priests which appears in Chronicles I 5:29–41 is not to be taken as a list of the High Priests of the First Temple. The number of priests listed there (eight or even ten by some counts) could hardly be a complete list of priests serving in the course of a 400 year period. Furthermore, the High Priests of the historical books (e.g. Uriah, Kings II, 16:10; Isaiah, 8:2) are not mentioned at all in the Chronicles I list. In fact, it appears both from the Talmud (Yoma 9a) and from the writings of Josephus (Antiquities 20, § 231; 10, § 152) that during the period of the Second Temple it was believed that 18 High Priests had served in the First Temple, and the names of these were apparently known. A full list may be reconstructed by comparing those in Josephus (Ibid, 10 § 152) to the corresponding ones which are retained in the later Chronicle "Seder Olam Zuta" V–VI. The names are: Zaddok, Ahimaaz, Azariah, Jehoram, Jehoahas, Jehoiarib, Jehoshafat, Pedaiah, Zedekiah, Jotham, Joel, Uriah, Neriah, Hoshaiiah, Shallum, Hilkiyah, Azariah, Seraiah, Jehozadak.

The author is of the opinion that the latter list is authentic, and that the eleven names following Azariah I (till Shallum) which appear in this list but not in that of the I Chronicles, represent a lineage other than that of the House of Zaddok. This new, otherwise not attested, dynasty (likely of the House of Abiatar) began to serve in the Temple after

the death of King Solomon, but was deposed during the reforms of King Josiah, being, as it seems, suspected of idolatrous inclinations.

The author contends further that the term כהן הראש (Chief Priest in A.V.) which appears in II Chronicles cannot refer to the High Priest, but rather to the Chief Clerk of the Temple. The Writer of Chronicles uses the word הראש as being synonymous with נגיד (cf. II Chron. 11:22; 19:11 and many others).

II. In the second section of the article, the author contends that Zaddok and his family (descendants of Phineas son of Elazar) had been established as priests in Gibeon by Saul prior to being brought to Jerusalem by David.

The author is of the opinion (following the Talmudic tradition — Mishnah Zerahim 14, 4–9) that the highplace in Gibeon was a new construction and was built only after the destruction of the one in Nob (and therefore not mentoined among the places visited by Samuel, I Sam. 7:16).

It is further assumed that towards the close of Samuel's life a היכל (temple) stood in Shiloh instead of the tabernacle or tent-of meeting, whilst the remnants of the latter which had been retained in the new building, at the destruction of Shiloh, were taken to Nob by the descendants of Eli when they fled. After destorying Nob, Saul moved the "tent" to Gibeon (cf. I Chron. 16:39) from whence David took it to Jerusalem (I Kings 8:4).

In the Appendix the author supports the theory recently propounded by M. H. Segal, holding that the Books of Ezra (with Nehemiah) and Chronicles were written by different authors. He points out the existence of differences in approach between these books, a phenomenon which is particularly evident in comparison of Neh. 11 to I Chron. 9, in which the same text is presented by the different authors in accordance with their respective points of view. The present author is of the opinion that the style of the Book of Ezra in which the first and third persons often interchange (a factor also characterizing the Book of Ahikar) and also the use of various key-terms common to Ezra tend to prove that the writer of this Book was a student of Ezra, and like him a Babylonian. On the other hand the author of the Chronicles seems to have been a Palestinian akin the thinking of the Zaddokite Priests.

ON THE PROBLEM OF ESCHATOLOGICAL DOCTRINE DURING THE PERIOD OF THE SECOND TEMPLE

DIALECTICS AND MYSTICISM IN THE FOUNDING OF THE HALACHA

by I. Baer (pp. 141–165)

The author wishes to contribute to the understanding of the Halachic dialectics. To this end he investigates possible influences upon the method of learning of the Khachamim (the Sages) deriving from contact with the Platonic dialectic. In the opinion of the Khachamim, the Torah is the first of the pre-existential beings which God created. It serves as an Organon and also as a Paradigma to which God looks as He creates the world. The Torah as a pre-existential being is similarly a Paradigma of the Torah given to Israel. The Torah She'b'chtav (the Written Law), the earthly image of the transcendental Torah, is to be interpreted by the Khachamim in terms of its own specific principles.

According to the 13th Century Cabbalists, the Torah is a living organism analogous to the body of man, "and he who takes away a single letter or point from the Torah is as one who takes away the entire body"; therefore the Torah is called "perfect" (Psalms, 19:8), "for nothing in the Torah is without purpose... but rather all is given to interpretation", etc. Thus, the Halachic scholars of that generation said, "The entire Torah She'b'al Peh (The Oral Law) is implied by the written Torah". This is basically the approach of the Mishnaic and Talmudic scholars. The Torah is like the work of a weaver,

and suggestive allusions and fine threads connect words which are different and widespread.

Some ten years ago, the scholars Saul Lieberman and David Daube attempted to explain the set of principles by which the Torah is interpreted as having been influenced by the methods of the Hellenistic rhetors and grammarians and of the Roman jurists. The author of the present study goes one step further in the direction of the aforementioned scholars and attempts to explain the basic system of Halachic discussion under the assumption of contact between the first Khachamim and the Platonic dialectic.

In Platonic dialectic the "Logos" is conceived as a living organism and as the work of a weaver. It should be structured and ordered as a living organism to serve as a basis for the dialectic which elevates the scholars in their path towards the transcendental world by means of living and vital discussion. (See the classic example in the dialogue Phaidros).

In the works of Philo there are many indications both of the influence of Platonic dialectic and of the method of Halachic and Agadic discussion accepted among the Khachamim. Philo already had before him a certain combination of the two systems. In explanation, the author of the present study analyzes a number of chapters in Philo's books: De somniis I § 189–248, De sacr. Abelis et Caini § 72–87, Leg. All. III § 162–178.

According to Philo, the Torah is the divine and holy Logos, the word of God. The Torah in its entirety and each word individually is a living force which is revealed by a real vision. It is compared to a weaver's work, woven of divine powers. It is the image of a Paradigma which dwells on high, and this image is incarnated in the Torah given to Israel to be interpreted in the dialectic ways known to the Khachamim. An entire sermon in the book Quis rer. div. heres 129–225 explains the cosmic Dichotomia symbolized by the ritual and indicated in the Torah in an antithetic form ("Gezera Shava" = εἰς ἴδα τομή ἴδη τομή).

The principle of Gezera Shava, one of the rules by which the Torah is interpreted, is not an ordinary human, exegetic, hermeneutic principle, but rather a part of an ancient metaphysical tradition whose original traces have disappeared. This is true for most of the rules by which the Torah is interpreted.

The purpose of the "Study of the Torah" (Talmud Torah) is to ascertain in detail the rules of society and ritual conforming to the divine Paradigma, and simultaneously, to elevate those studying to contemplation of the eternal realities of the world above through dialectic study.

The system of study of the Therapeutae described by Philo in his De vita contemplativa is similar to the ways of Talmudic study. The Torah is considered a living organism by the Therapeutae as well. For those delving into them, the words of the Torah serve as a "mirror" for contemplation of divine forces and beings.

There are Platonic concepts which the Khachamim transformed in interpreting the Torah. Using language of the Platonic philosophy the Khachamim spoke of prophets who had visions through a "lighting mirror" or a "non-lighting mirror". In his epistles, Paul uses the same Platonic term, which he received from the Khachamim (see App. II).

The Talmudic tradition concerning Mishnaic scholars occupied with the study of Ma'aseh Merkava should be interpreted in the light of the foregoing remarks. By virtue of their dialectic method, they combined the "words" of the Torah and of the other Holy Scriptures and thereby reached heights of mystic visions.

APPENDIX I

REMARKS ON THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION

a. The author deals with the development, during the period of the Second Temple, of the dogma subsequently known as "*Creatio ex nihilo*". He quotes the well-known passages in II Macc. 7:28 and Paul, Rom.: 4:17.

The author particularizes and analyzes various words of Philo with reference to that subject, discusses Plato's doctrine of creation, and concludes that a fixed formulation of that dogma was already known in Israel in the period of the Second Temple. This formulation came to us both in Greek, with various alterations, and in a Hebrew formulation known as "He who said — and the world was created".

b. The problem of the existence of evil is discussed by Philo, especially in *de fuga*, § 66 sq., *de confusione linguarum* § 168 cq.

Philo's sermons on that subject are based on a Hebrew tradition, traces of which are preserved in various Midrashim. According to that concept God is not directly responsible for evil nor for the material part of the creation, having left the creation of evil in the hands of mediating forces.

c. There are traces in the Midrash and the Apocryphal tradition of a concept, accepted by the Khachamim, which concerned a notion of "time" in the process of creation.

These three problems, briefly discussed here, may determine the historical place of the Torah of Israel in the development of concepts of creation. On the basis of the Holy Writ and through contact with the Platonic Philosophy, the Khachamim taught certain beliefs which influenced the formation of dogmatic principles later accepted in Christian theology.

APPENDIX II

"LIGHTING" AND "NON-LIGHTING" MIRROR

Philo, in his *de Spec. Leg.* I 36 sq. and *Leg. All.* III. 99 sq. presents various sermons on the verse in Exodus, 33:12–23. In the Midrashim and Talmud there are traces of sermons on the same subjects. In particular: The problem of the pursuit of God *διὰ δυνάως* through *ἔδοπτον*, *אספקלריא* is expressed in the Talmudic Midrash through the *κατοπτρον* ("mirror") (from the root *δωπτειν*?).

These concepts gained acceptance in Israel from the schools of Platonic Philosophy, and on the basis of such connecting links it is possible to understand the well known words of Paul, I Corin. 13:12; Corin. 3:18.

THE SALARS AND NEGIDIM OF KAIRAWAN

by H. Z. Hirschberg (pp. 166–173)

The author deals with the problem of the beginnings of the institution of Negidim in Kairawan. An analysis of the general political situation leads him to the conclusion that there was no room for the appointment of a separate Negid in Kairawan as long as the Zirids remained the faithful vassals of the Fatimites, the rulers of Egypt. This political constellation meant that the Negid at Fustat was at the same time regarded as head of the Jews throughout the Fatimite kingdom.

In the author's opinion, the office of the Negid was established in Kairawan only after the political break had occurred and the Emir Badis became the sovereign ruler of Tunisia and Algeria. The first Negid to be appointed was Abraham ben Natan, ca. 1010–1011. He apparently died around 1018, and was succeeded by Jacob ben Amram, the exact date of whose appointment is not quite clear. The last information available on him dates from the year 1037.

THE VICISSITUDES OF THREE APOLOGETIC PASSAGES

by J. Katz (pp. 174–193)

The article deals with the elaboration and evolution of three passages:

- 1) The righteous amongst the gentiles have a share in the world to come;
- 2) Noahides are not considered as being prohibited from associating (other beings with God).
- 3) In our times Gentiles are not idolaters.

These passages are often quoted to define the relation of Judaism to Christianity and are frequently cited as quotations from the Talmud. In reality — at least in their final form — they were coined at a later period.

i.e. that Christians are not required to accept pure monotheism and that they may combine on the subject were divided.

The second passage was coined by one of the Tossaphists in connection with a halakhic discussion. Only in the 17th century was this passage formulated as a matter of principle: i.e. that Christians are not required to accept pure monotheism and that they may combine the belief in Jesus with the belief in One God.

The third passage is a variation on a saying of Rabbi Yohanan (Hulin 13 B). It was originally formulated in order to cancel certain restrictions which, according to the Mishnah and the Talmud, applied to the idolaters but were not actually observed during the Middle Ages. As in the former case there was originally no desire to formulate a final judgment on Christianity. Since the 17th century this passage has come to mean that Christianity has a positive religious value as a religion desirable for Gentiles. In the 17th and 18th centuries religious tolerance towards Christianity spread. The above quoted passages enabled tolerant thinkers to base their opinions on a quasitalmudic authority. Since the days of the Haskala particularly the first passage has often been quoted, and from it Mendelsohn reached the extreme conclusion that there is no difference in religious status between the Noahides who fulfill the demands of Natural Law and between observant Jews.

Later the last passage was used to cancel many of the restrictions on which the national isolation of Jews from Gentiles had been based. It even served as an argument in favour of intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles. Some cited this passage to indicate that all the commandments relating to the treatment of one's neighbours are obligatory with respect to Christians as well.

THE POGROMS IN POLAND OF 1918–1919, THE MORGENTHAU COMMITTEE AND THE AMERICAN STATE DEPARTMENT

by E. Lifschutz (pp. 194–218)

On its arrival in Poland the Morgenthau Committee met with a hostile reception by the Polish press. The Government tried to influence its report and in many places the Jews were afraid to testify before it. Morgenthau, being unfamiliar with Polish conditions, took certain steps which proved harmful to the Jews, such as his appeal to the Jews of Minsk not to cooperate with the Bolsheviks, which served as "evidence" in the hands of the Polish accusers.

The Morgenthau report was carefully worded, yet, reflected the hatred of the Polish Government and people towards the Jews. No conclusions whatsoever were reached. A separate report was submitted by the other two members of the commission, Johnson and Jadwin, in which they accused the Jews of separatism, sympathy for Germany and connections with Bolshevism. Jewish leaders in the U.S.A. made every effort to correct