



סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion* / ציון, Vol. (מ"ה, חוברת א (תש"ם), pp. I-III

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70048108>

Accessed: 26/11/2011 14:07

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

BEHIND THE STAGE OF HISTORY

On the Dating of the Pentateuchal Priestly Source

by Menahem Haran (pp. 1-12)

The question of determining a date for the Pentateuchal Priestly Source (=P) is well known. The author, after presenting the opposing conclusions of Wellhausen and Kaufmann, takes a stand somewhere midway between these two savants. On the one hand he does not deny the historical connection between Ezra's activity and the appearance of P, but he argues that Ezra's activity coincides with P's *canonization* and *promulgation*, rather than with its *composition*. On the other hand, he concurs (for his own reasons) with Kaumann's conclusion that P's composition preceded the destruction of the First Temple. The author postulates, however, that at that period the source remained within the semi-esoteric circle of Jerusalem priesthood, and was preserved as the exclusive possession of that circle. Consequently, it appears that a degree of truth is to be found in both Wellhausen's and Kaufmann's positions. The author does depart, however, from both of their positions in delimitating the tangible chronological framework for P's emergence. It is his contention that several indications immanent in P point to the time of Ahaz-Hezekiah as the historical background of its appearance.

THE SYSTEM OF LEVITIC CITIES

A Historical-Geographical Study in Biblical Historiography

by Zecharia Kallai (pp. 13-34)

Many territorial designations in Biblical texts are based on fixed patterns and concepts that evolved in certain historical situations. Descriptions employing such terms can be used to study historiographical processes and phenomena of scribal tradition.

The structure of the System of Levitic Cities and Cities of Refuge reveals details regarding the administrative-territorial background of these sources and the manner in which this system was formulated. The period reflected is taken to be the second half of Solomon's reign. The analysis of the list of Levitic Cities is based on the version of Josh. xxi, since the structure shows that I Chron. vi is dependent on it. The cities of Refuge are listed according to all texts available. To illustrate the major points of this study the lists are presented in tables (see pp. 16, 29). The cities of refuge are an integral part of the System of Levitic Cities.

A comparison of the detailed account with the generalized summary, which was placed ahead of it as an introduction, shows the stages in which this system was formulated. The tribal map serves as a primary basis and all other stages are schematic transformations.

These stages are:

1. Realistic tribal map as represented in the boundary system of Joshua;

2. Insertion of Dan and Simeon in accordance with the twelve-tribe pattern of Joshua (town lists);
3. Application of the principle of four Levitic cities per tribe (causing the coupling of West and East Manasseh);
4. The imposition of a division between four sections of Levites, cutting across the structure created by the previous stages.

After the formulation of the system every one of the four sections was presented in the summary according to its internal order, thus diverging from the detailed account which displays the primary form.

The literary reconstruction which imposes the twelve-tribe pattern on the ten-tribe map of the boundary system derives its data from the traditional place of Simeon in Judah and from the second district of Solomon which serves to represent Dan. It must be considered that this framework, which probably served a specific administrative purpose (cf. I Chron. xxvi: 29–32), was based on an archaistic theory that required the twelve-tribe pattern, or that this is a literary presentation of this tradition based on historical features according to such an approach, which may have been a basic tenet in Israelite historiographical tradition.

The schematic manner of the allocation of four cities from each tribe is obvious. It is therefore possible that the roster underwent changes, or that there were more Levitic cities with only four of each tribe represented. This seems to be the reason for the minor differences between versions.

The System of Levitic Cities combines realistic historical elements with a schematic formulation that has its counterpart in the tradition of camping around the Tabernacle in the Wilderness. This is one of the transformations of the Tribal System (of which four basic forms can be identified) designed to highlight the prominent position of Judah, here linked to the Sons of Aaron. It is plausible that this is a formal presentation of a concept that has its roots in the Israelite monarchy.

The geographical designations of the Cities of Refuge and their array seem to indicate that there existed an administrative superstructure of two halves of the Land of Israel, east and west of the Jordan, with each part divided into three sections. The designations seem to be representative names for the sections alluded to. This territorial terminology and the plain division between east and west recurs in other sources pertaining to this period. The whole structure of two halves of Israel as part of an administrative approach seems to be indicated in I Chron. xxvi: 29–32.

NACHMANIDES' TYPOLOGICAL READING OF HISTORY

by Amos Funkenstein (pp. 35–59)

The typological interpretation of history was rich and dominant in Christian tradition, while remaining peripheral and unimaginative in Jewish tradition. It continued weak even when, in medieval Spain, Jews recognized the fertility of typological speculations, and at times borrowed some of its figures from Christian authors. The article tries to adduce some reasons for this phenomenon, through the analysis of an exception which proves the rule: Ramban's typological exegesis. In various instances, particularly in his interpretation of Genesis, Ramban reads "the deeds of the fathers" as "a sign

of posterity" in a sense which exceeds by far the midrashic usage of this figure. He accompanies his search for prefiguration with methodological remarks suggesting that a prefigurative event has a predestining character and is therefore "of the nature of creation". Through their deeds, the patriarchs prefigured and hence "created" Jewish history just as, in the seven days of creation, God prefigured world history (a figure which Abraham bar Hiyya had already borrowed from Augustine). Ramban may have borrowed the emphasis on the predestinative character of prototypes from the doctrine of *"tselem"* found in Ashkenazic Chassidism, but he certainly searches for a Hebrew equivalent to the Christian *"figurae"*. His doctrine, even though he ties it to the notion of "hidden miracles", remained by and large without followers.

The reluctance of Jewish exegesis to employ typologies systematically can be attributed to various circumstances. Figurative reasoning served, from the New Testament onwards, to prove the fulfilment of "the synagogue" in "the church". It was perceived as an eminently Christian form and argument; hence even Ramban's caution. Furthermore, typological reasoning assumes the rigorous separation of scriptural language from the matters it speaks of, a separation enhanced by the distance of the Christian tradition from the original language of the Bible. Jewish speculations, historiosophical and theosophical, were to a much higher degree tied to the language of the scriptures. Finally, the speculative drives in Jewish tradition, at least until the 16th century, were centered much more on theosophical than on historiosophical themes.

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF NUREMBERG IN THE YEAR 1489 — SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE

by Michael Toch (pp. 60–72)

This attempt to recreate the social and demographic structure of the late medieval community of Nuremberg is based on a list of all the male Jews over the age of thirteen, present at the Sabbath prayer in the Nuremberg synagogue on March 13, 1489. This source is complemented by further evidence documenting the economic life of most of the persons mentioned in the list.

The occupational structure is characterized by three major groups: moneylenders, people in private service, and officials and workers in public functions. In addition to these there exists a sizeable portion of local and foreign students. The factors for the development of such an imbalanced occupational structure are attributed to the exigencies of the Jewish minority situation, as well as to religious-cultural reasons, all of which make for the apportioning of a high percentage of the population to economically nonproductive sectors. The breakdown into families and households produces a very high household-ratio of 4.3 male persons over 13 years of age. A pervading cleavage also becomes apparent between three great families who monopolize the moneylending business and the leadership of the community, and a larger number of simple, small households whose members occupy mostly service positions. The question is raised, whether the eviction of the community in 1498 was not facilitated by a breakdown of internal solidarity, occasioned by this profound social polarity.