



(סיכום באנגלית)

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. (תשכ"ז), pp. I-IX

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70050507>

Accessed: 19/11/2011 11:58

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>

SUMMARIES

THE MESSIANIC IDEA AND MESSIANIC TRENDS IN THE GROWTH OF HASIDISM

by ISAIAH TISHBY (pp. 1-45)

The writer presents the attitude of Hasidism to the messianic idea as one of the leading problems in the controversy in the contemporary study of Hasidism whose principal exponents are G. Scholem on the one hand and B. Dinur on the other. Scholem stated that following the collapse of the Sabbatian messianic movement in its Frankist form, Hasidism, which grew out of the ruins of Sabbatianism, crystallized a neutral attitude towards the messianic idea and reconciliation with life in the Diaspora; and in that historical situation, this was the only possible attitude for the movement, which sought to continue disseminating the Lurianic Kabbalah and fostering it as a factor in public life. On the other hand, Dinur taught that Hasidism had from the very beginning been created as a non-Sabbatian messianic movement and part of a trend to purify the messianic idea of the dross of Sabbatianism which clung to it, and in his opinion it was precisely this development which was inevitable after the collapse of Sabbatianism, for the tense anticipation of redemption and messianic activity could not stop after the people awakened to imminent redemption.

The writer of the article has dealt critically with these views from the following two aspects: from the point of view of their inevitability within the context of their historical background, and from the point of view of their accuracy according to Hasidic sources.

For the purpose of clarifying the historical inevitability, the writer turned to the periphery of Hassidism and conducted a meticulous examination of the works of four kabbalistic preachers at the beginning of the movement: Simha ben Joshua of Zalosce, Perez ben Moshe of Brody, Israel Kharif of Satanov, and Samuel ben Eliezer of Kalvaria. This examination centered chiefly around one question: what do the works of these men reveal of their attitude to the messianic idea — men who were contemporaries of the creators and initiators of Hasidism and belonged to the same class of people, most of them actually coming from the very same environment and living and working and writing their homilies in the period of Jacob Frank and Israel Baal Shem Tov and feeling the results of the struggle against the Frankists and of their conversion.

This examination revealed that despite varying features and contradictions between the four preachers which do not only illuminate the men themselves but also shed light on a considerable number of Kabbalists and expounders of Kabbalistic morality during their lifetime and in areas affected by the Frankist crisis and the growth of Hasidism, they all had the following in common: the maintenance of the combination of fostering and disseminating Lurianic Kabbalah together with acute messianism highly charged with emotional intensity which was unambiguously expressed in all their works by "calculating the end" in the near future and in vigorous propaganda for hastening the advent of the Messiah. This means that the vicissitudes, shocks, and misfortunes involved in the spread and influence of messianic Lurianic Kabbalah in wide circles did not necessarily lead to the fact that whoever persisted in the dissemination and application of Lurianic Kabbalah in public had to keep messianic elements out of it. This contradicts Scholem's assumption that the initiators of Hasidism were compelled to check the messianic impulse in order to be able to maintain and broaden the public influence of Lurianic Kabbalah.

However, the force of this conclusion is limited to the possibility of survival of acute messianism even after the Frankist deterioration and conversion, and it should in no way be regarded as confirmation of Dinur's position that the initiators of Hasidism, too, the contemporaries of the Kabbalist messianic preachers, had to emulate them. On the contrary, on the periphery of Hasidism there are also examples showing exactly the opposite, of the purification of Lurianic Kabbalah from those elements which could be regarded as possessing a positive bond or affinity with the Sabbatian heresy, including messianic elements. To illustrate this aspect the article contains a short discussion of the works of Barukh of Kossow who belongs to the close periphery of Hasidism. Barukh tried to eliminate the opposition to studying Lurianic Kabbalah among the mystics of his generation by violently attacking the Sabbatian and Frankist heresies, and for the purpose of strengthening his design, he obliterated the messianic nature of Lurianic Kabbalah in order to cut it off from any link to the Sabbatian offshoots.

In view of the information concerning the fostering of messianic trends on the one hand and their expulsion and concealment on the other, during the time of the initiators of Hasidism in the area where they lived and among their own kind, the writer summed up that there is no basis for theoretical statements concerning a certain course in connection with the messianic idea which the new movement had to follow by virtue of the historical circumstances obtaining at the time of its formation. A decisive answer to this question depends only on information concerning the actual position of messianic ideas in the Hasidic movement in the early stages of its development, after a study of extant sources with no prior assumptions whatsoever either for or against.

The first outstanding source on the question of messianic ideas in Hasidism is the letter sent by Israel Baal Shem Tov to his brother-in-law Gershon of Kutzy in 1751 or 1752 about his conversation with the Messiah during the "ascent of his soul" in 1747. The writer believes, just as does Dinur, that the letter contains a declaration of the Baal Shem Tov's aspiration to hasten the advent of the Messiah at the beginning of his activity as the leader of the Hasidic sect, and it attests to the fact that at the time of its writing, too, the Baal Shem Tov had not yet relinquished his messianic mission. However, unlike Dinur, the writer holds that the letter only deals with *Yihuddim*, the ascent of the soul, nostrums, and magic formulas similar to the activities of Kabbalists and other Ba'ale Shem (miracle workers) of the period; but regarding the status of messianic ideas in the then new Hasidic doctrine, i.e., opinions and instructions concerning divine worship and a way of life, the question remains open and in order to find a solution to it, it is necessary to turn to the Hasidic literature which thus far has not been properly investigated in this connection.

The writer discusses the attitudes of a considerable number of the teachers of Hasidism to the messianic idea and messianic trends. His principle statement is that matters concerning messianic redemption are few and lightly touched upon in the homilies of the *Maggid* of Mezeritz of which three versions are available; according to these homilies, it may be argued that the *Maggid* adopted the technique of neutralizing messianic trends, which is not the case in the works of Jacob Joseph of Polonnoye and his colleagues on the one hand and in at least part of the homilies of the *Maggid's* disciples, on the other.

In addition to the Baal Shem Tov's messianic letter to his brother-in-law, the publication of which by Jacob Joseph of Polonnoye in 1781 shows that more than 20 years after the death of his teacher the Baal Shem Tov, he held a positive attitude to messianic trends, it is also possible to establish even according to his own works that in the sayings in which he follows in the footsteps of Isaac Luria's writings and Kabbalistic ethical works and homilies with a messianic trend — and such sayings are quite numerous — he speaks of

tikkun (restoration) and similar concepts wholly in accordance with the original eschatological significance. In a large part of the homilies written in the new Hasidic style, a desire for and anticipation of the advent of the Redeemer “quickly in our days” are also felt. Of the disciples of Jacob Joseph, the writer also discusses Ephraim of Sudilkow, a grandson of the Baal Shem Tov. Not only does his book *Degel Mahane Ephraim* contain a number of obvious messianic sayings in connection with the Baal Shem Tov, but in his homilies there are several expressions containing intensive desires for and anticipations of imminent redemption.

Concerning the works of the *Maggid's* disciples, the writer states that although they do not reveal a uniform position, it is difficult to find even one whose wish for redemption is obscure or muted to the same extent that it is in the *Maggid's* homilies. At any rate, all of them are completely remote from a “neutral” attitude to the bringing of redemption, and a few of them even developed messianic trends and enriched them with new ideas based on the Hasidic doctrine of the Baal Shem Tov’s adherents, laying stress on the imminence of redemption as the principal mission of the *Zaddik*.

For the purpose of proving and illustrating this statement, the writer discusses a number of Hasidic personalities and ideas. These are the disciples of the *Maggid* of Mezeritz whose writings and views are dealt with in this study: Menahem Nahum of Czernobyl, Elimelech of Lizensk, Shneur Zalman of Liozno, and finally, Ze’ev Wolf of Zhitomir, whose book *Or Meir* is regarded by the writer as the most conspicuous example of the existence of messianic elements in Hasidism. This is a book permeated with the messianic concept of *tikkun* from beginning to end with no disguise or reservation, and powerful yearnings for immediate redemption with a messianic fervor are contained in nearly every homily in it. The writer of the article finds an entirely new approach to messianic trends in *Or Meir* with other Hasidic works written by his contemporaries: a full synthesis of Hasidism in its ideas and interpretations and a powerful drive to hastening redemption.

The principal conclusions of the author are:

1. From the Baal Shem Tov’s letter to his brother-in-law to the works of most of the disciples of the *Maggid* of Mezeritz it is possible to find indications, to a larger or lesser degree, of the existence and the fostering of yearnings for an imminent redemption and the advent of the Messiah, and a “neutral” attitude to messianic trends may be assumed only with respect to the extant homilies of the *Maggid* himself, which from this point of view seem to be isolated phenomena.
2. After the teachers of Hasidism had abandoned their attempts to bring the Messiah by the use of *Yihuddim* and similar acts and concentrated on the development of a religious and ethical doctrine with varied aspects, they did not dissociate themselves from messianic trends, nor did they arrive at the “neutralization” of messianic ideas, as G. Scholem claims; and at least several of them even set up the messianic idea and the yearnings to hasten the Messiah’s coming in the centre of their spiritual world and integrated them as a dominant element in the religious and ethical doctrines of the new Hasidism.

THE MOVEMENT OF JEWISH AGRICULTURAL SETTLEMENT IN THE ‘KINGDOM OF POLAND’ BEFORE THE PEASANT LIBERATION

by JULIAN BARTIŚ (pp. 46–75)

On the basis of much archival material — both from government sources and from individuals active in this matter — supplemented by material published in the press of the time and place, the writer reconstructs the attempts to settle Jews on the land in the ‘King-

dom of Poland' under Russian sovereignty in approximately 1843 to 1862. He revives the actual achievements and shortcomings of this movement and comes to the conclusion that the achievements were relatively considerable, although the circumstances of the economy and society and prevalent views concerning Polish-Jewish relations of the period stood in the way of greater success. In 1863, there were 30,000 Jewish farmers in the Kingdom of Poland. Ten of their villages were model communities in the Polish agricultural environment. In the course of the survey, the attitude of the Jewish advocates of Enlightenment and the wealthy Jews on the one hand and of most of the Polish landed gentry on the other to this problem becomes clear. Two personalities are particularly conspicuous for their devotion to and preoccupation with this matter — the Pole Władysław Garbiński and the Jew Mattiasz Rosen. Their standing in this matter and views are clarified in the correspondence between them which is given in the Polish original in Appendix A (1-4), p. 63. In Appendix B (p. 70) the constitution of the Society for the Encouragement of the Jews in the Kingdom of Poland is given. Appendix C (p. 74) contains the circular which the Agricultural Society in the Kingdom of Poland sent to its correspondent members in March, 1861, with regard to the question under discussion.

The enthusiastic Polish poem by Alexander Kraushar in praise of Jewish settlement on the land deserves mention; it is published here anew in the original, Note 49, p.

ZIONIST-ARAB-BRITISH RELATIONS AND THE INTER-ALLIED PEACE COMMISSION, 1919

by MAYIR VERETÉ (pp. 76-115)

On the return of Sharif Feisal to Damascus from the Peace Conference in the spring of 1919, both he and the Zionist leaders were desirous of continuing their friendly relations which had begun in the previous June with the meeting, under British auspices, between the Sharif and Dr. Weizmann near 'Aqaba. The fundamental and long-term object of that meeting, and of subsequent talks in London and Paris, was to establish good neighbourly relations between the projected Arab state and the future National Home on a *quid pro quo* basis: Zionist financial, technical, and organizational assistance to the Emir in return for his recognition of the Balfour Declaration policy. The immediate object, however, was to collaborate closely in order to effect the annulment of the provisions of the Sykes-Picot agreement relating to Syria and Palestine. This was exactly what the British had in mind. According to the now available documents, the Cabinet appears to have accepted the resolution of its Eastern Committee (based, in turn, on the strongly held views of the I.G.S. as well as of Allenby and his chief political officer Gilbert Clayton), that it was "desirable to cancel the Sykes-Picot agreement" and that "it was essential that no foreign influence other than that of Great Britain should be predominant in Areas A and B [of the S-P agreement, which include Syria as well as Transjordanian]".

This object was considered attainable provided it had the support of the United States. The Zionist leaders in England appear to have been assigned the role of assisting in winning over, with the help of the American Zionists, President Wilson and other influential members of the American Peace Delegation to the view that an economically viable Palestine should be placed under a British Mandate and an independent Arab state should be established in Syria.

Discussing the many facets of the various British-Zionist-Arab interests involved in this "Triple Entente", the writer shows that in May 1919, each of the three parties concerned still had its former reasons for maintaining its cooperation with each other, since the fate

of Syria and Palestine had not yet been decided by the Peace Conference. Especially so, when a "Peace Commission" sent out by the Conference was about to arrive in those countries to inquire into the political views of the population and to find out which Power the people proposed to have as a Mandatory.

Against this background of seemingly common interests, General Clayton acceded to the wishes of the Zionist Commission in Palestine to send representatives to meet Feisal on his return. The Sharif who, on several occasions in Paris had met quite a few of the Zionist leaders as well as a delegation of Palestinian Jews, seems to have been prepared for a conference with the Zionist Commission, and a business-like and friendly correspondence passed between him, Clayton, and the Commission. But when the Zionist delegates were about to leave for Damascus, Clayton wired them that Allenby thought it inadvisable to hold such a meeting. Both the Foreign Office in London and the British Peace Delegation in Paris were not consulted in advance, nor were they advised subsequently. What then were the reasons for Allenby's and Clayton's sudden decision?

Discussing various possible explanations, the writer, interpreting the sources which have a bearing on the subject, is inclined to suggest the following.

Allenby and Clayton disregarded Lloyd George's promise to Clemenceau (made on March 21; of which they, or at least Allenby, undoubtedly were aware although never officially notified) that England would not accept a mandate over Syria. They went on pursuing the policy of bringing both Syria and Palestine under British control, hoping for the continued cooperation of Feisal and the Zionists to bring this about. Just before leaving Paris, however, the Sharif came to an agreement of a sort with Clemenceau by which he recognized France's presence in Syria. This became known to the British in Cairo within a few days of Feisal's return to Syria. Allenby and Clayton, who went to see him on May 12, must have expected to hear something of this matter directly from the Sharif. He appears, however, not to have broached the subject. The Englishmen must then have become doubtful of this truthfulness and suspicious of his intentions. They were probably afraid that he might ask the "Peace Commission" for a French Mandate after all, or what was only a shade or two worse from their point of view — for an American Mandate. Accordingly, they determined to keep the Zionists away from him (Clayton's cable to this effect was sent on the 14th, on his return to Cairo).

The Zionist leaders were absolutely and exclusively pro-British, and their relations with the French were rather strained. Learning, however, of Feisal's alleged understanding with Clemenceau, they apparently became less reluctant to listen to the possibility of a *rapprochement* with the French. There is so far scant evidence for this, but it is certain that some friendly talks were held at about the end of April of which the authorities in Cairo may have been informed. Allenby may therefore have suspected that the Zionist delegates, on conferring with the Emir, might encourage him to abide by his agreement with Clemenceau.

Alternatively, Allenby and Clayton, perhaps doubting whether Feisal could attempt to implement a pro-French policy in Damascus, but nevertheless being uncertain of his real intentions, may have thought that the Sharif was favourably inclined to the idea of an American Mandate over Syria and Palestine. The writer shows that the desire for such a mandate was quite widespread among the Arab leaders and population and that Feisal, far from being averse to it, had spoken of it on several occasions while in Paris. Zionist leaders, it is true, never wanted an American Mandate over Palestine, but in Paris they were instrumental in helping the cause of the Sharif with the Americans and in influencing Wilson to give him audience. American Zionists were, moreover, in the spring of 1919, quite strongly represented on the Zionist Commission, and their relations with the British

authorities had not been too good for some time. Allenby and Clayton may thus have had some grounds for believing that the Zionist delegates might strengthen any pro-American inclination the Sharif may already have acquired.

In the circumstances, generally rather unfavourable to British aspirations regarding Syria, Allenby and Clayton, having discovered that they were neither sure of Feisal nor quite certain of the views Zionist leaders were then holding with respect to the future of Syria, decided to keep them separate from each other. This decision was, however, a temporary expedient, not, the writer thinks, the result of a preconceived *divide et impera* policy.

THE NATURE OF THE LETTER AGAINST THE BAAL SHEM TOV

by ISAAC BACON (pp. 116–122)

The article deals with a letter ascribed to Rabbi Hayyim Cohen Rappoport, the Rabbi of Lvov, in which the Baal Shem Tov is mentioned as a living person; the Rabbi calls him a witch doctor.

The letter was first published by M. Balaban in his German work on the Frankists (1927). We had received it from Israel Weinlehs who lived in Lvov. Balaban indicates that the letter was taken by Weinlehs from Israel Leibel's *Sefer ha-Vikkuaḥ* (1798).

G. Scholem (*Molad*, vol. 18) rejected the conclusions of Weinlehs and Balaban, for it is now known that the above-mentioned letter is not to be found in *Sefer ha-Vikkuaḥ*. G. Scholem believes that the letter was attached as a separate page to the manuscript of *Sefer ha-Vikkuaḥ*, and that the author also wrote the introduction to the letter and the explanatory remarks which came after it.

The author of this article differs with this view. A number of facts are cited (e.g., Leibel's biography and publications) from which it becomes clear that Leibel never had the letter in his possession nor did he have any knowledge of it. On the other hand, it contains numerous connections with the personality of Joseph Perl:

a) Weinlehs was a librarian at Perl's library in Tarnopol and mentions *Sefer ha-Vikkuaḥ* in his writings as being in this library, the only copy to be found in a library in Poland.

b) Perl was also planning to publish *Sefer ha-Vikkuaḥ*, and under his supervision, the book was copied in 1825 with the addition of an introduction (or introductions) from a description of which (by the Austrian censor) it may be assumed that the letter comprised a part of the foreword.

c) This letter is mentioned by Perl himself in his book *Boḥen Zaddik* which Perl was busy compiling during this period (1825–1826).

d) Among the papers left by Perl there are parts of *Sefer ha-Vikkuaḥ* in manuscript. These also include a single page of the introduction which Perl wrote to the book. This page is identical in style and construction with the quotation in Balaban's work and with the explanatory remarks accompanying the letter. Both of them bear the identical title at the beginning, viz., *haggahah* in the sense of "note".

Accordingly it seems beyond the shadow of a doubt that the letter was inserted into the introduction to *Sefer ha-Vikkuaḥ* by Perl (just as at the same time, he inserted the letter in *Boḥen Tsaddiq*). He was also the author of its explanatory remarks.