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**Introduction**

The Israeli educational system has instilled a definitive distinction between the terms ‘longing for Zion’ and ‘Zionism,’ an example of the dichotomous terminology long pursued in the academic world. I began to realize that such distinctions are artificial while researching the Jews of Spain, the Sephardic Diaspora and the Parisian *Hokhmat Israel* School[[1]](#footnote-1) and here seek to lay the foundations for challenging this paradigm. The issue is of considerable significance because it sheds light on the modern era study of Jewish history and on the paths of Zionist historiography and its alternating denigration and exaltation of personalities and processes, especially regarding the messianic idea. The scientific aura in which such historiography is enveloped conceals purely ideological biases.

**The Ottoman conquest of *Eretz Israel* as a point of departure**

Several historical research conferences held in 2017 marked various round-number anniversaries: 500 years since the Protestant Reformation,[[2]](#footnote-2) 120 years since the First Zionist Conference, 100 years since both the Balfour Declaration and the Bolshevik Revolution, 70 years since the UN Partition Plan for Palestine’s publication, and 50 years since the Six-Day War. This study addresses a sixth: 500 years since the conquest of *Eretz Israel* by the Ottoman Empire in 1517, an event that fostered a half-millennium of dissent and decline within Western Christianity as it faced the challenge of Lutherans, Calvinists and Anglicans. It also led to a rise in the British Empire, with its Protestant Hebraism, millenarianism, and avowed close ties to *Eretz Israel*.[[3]](#footnote-3) This year marked the beginnings of the authentic messianic idea and, as a direct consequence, Zionism in its ideology and practice. These processes beginning in the sixteenth century should be the starting point for Zionist historiography.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Originally, the messianic idea was nothing but a call for reinstatement of Jewish reign over *Eretz Israel*, a paradigm Maimonides sets out in *Laws of Kings and Their Wars*,[[5]](#footnote-5) whereby the King Messiah is a political figure who will strive to re-establish the rule of Israel. Maimonides scorns those who perceive the messianic idea as abstract and utopian, entailing miracles and wonders.[[6]](#footnote-6) This idea was key within Jewish history and the foundation of the aspiration for Jewish redemption as a vector for universal redemption, as expressed powerfully since the expulsion from Spain.

Many perceive the expulsion from Spain as the harshest blow to the Jewish people during the Middle Ages: The glorious Jewish community’s downfall was represented as if it were the expulsion of the entire Jewish people, even the expulsion of humanity from the face of the earth.[[7]](#footnote-7) Shortly thereafter, scholars in the Sephardic Diaspora, as well as those of sixteenth-century Safed and other centres of Jewish learning in *Eretz Israel*, accorded a significance to this tragedy, perceiving it as the pangs of redemption, the tribulations that will befall Israel in the redemptive era in Jewish history. The expulsion edict was signed in 5252 (1492), a date echoed numerologically in the following Biblical verse: ‘Hear the word of the LORD, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say: “He that scattered Israel doth gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock”’ (Jeremiah 31:10). Kabbalistic literature associates this verse with the onset of the rising dawn.[[8]](#footnote-8) These interpretations became well-established in the relevant Jewish communities, reinforcing the sense of the era’s redemptive dimensions.

In his *Migdol Yeshuot* trilogy,[[9]](#footnote-9) Don Isaac Abarbanel, the greatest leader among the exiles from Spain, nurtured hope among his fellow Jews and helped them cope with the expulsion crisis. His views were shared by several prominent Kabbalah scholars, including Rabbis Isaac Louria Ashkenazy, Shlomo Alkabetz, Yosef Karo[[10]](#footnote-10) and Manasseh Ben-Israel.[[11]](#footnote-11) The events occurring within *Eretz Israel* during the sixteenth century were considered the renaissance and restoration of the Jewish nation within its own land and fostered attachment to it. This attested to and reinforced the belief that Jewish statehood was being restored. The authentic messianic idea was realized evidently in political and military bids to conquer *Eretz Israel* (David Hareuveni and Solomon Molcho),[[12]](#footnote-12) immigration to and settlementthroughout *Eretz Israel* (*aliyah* pl. *aliyot*; Don Joseph Nasi and Doña Gracia Nasi),[[13]](#footnote-13) the fortification of its cities with perimeter walls, and the undertaking of Jewish political activism (Abraham Castro in Jerusalem and Don Joseph Nasi in Tiberias).[[14]](#footnote-15) It was also realized as evidently in political-economic ways (the Ancona Boycott led by Don Joseph and Doña Gracia Nasi), the development of the textile industry in Safed, silk production in Tiberias and tourist activities in Lower Galilee. It was also achieved through the restoration of the Hebrew language in administration, education and religious literature; in political-legislative ways through restoring the Sanhedrin, renewing ordination, national codification of the *halakhah* in the *Shulhan Arukh* (Rabbis Jacob Berab[[15]](#footnote-16) and Joseph Karo[[16]](#footnote-17)). There was also the establishment of a Hebrew press that disseminated works from Safed and elsewhere in *Eretz Israel* throughout the Jewish Diaspora, including the liturgical poetry of Rabbis Shlomo Alkabetz and Israel Najara.[[17]](#footnote-19) There was also increased significance attached to the Ten Lost Tribes and their inclusion in the vision of redemption and a future Sanhedrin.[[18]](#footnote-20) Finally, an Ingathering of the Exiles in microcosm emerged,[[19]](#footnote-21) owing to *aliyot* from Spain, the Ottoman Empire, North Africa, Italy and even Germany, as well as the liturgical seal on European states from the Low Countries to Poland, resulting from the diaspora’s attraction to the Jewish community in *Eretz Israel*.[[20]](#footnote-22) The messianic ideal underpinning these phenomena was thus not merely some abstract, theoretical or metahistorical concept but rather a series of actual, practical, operative and historical measures.[[21]](#footnote-23)

As indicated, the sixteenth century appears to be an appropriate point of departure for study of the history of Zionism[[22]](#footnote-24) because it was only natural that the Zionist enterprise in the nineteenth century, which sought to restore Jewish sovereignty in *Eretz Israel*, would adopt most of the features already discernible three hundred years earlier, especially the conquest of labour and revival of the Hebrew language. For example, Joseph Marco Baruch[[23]](#footnote-25) and Rabbi Dr Yehuda Bibas,[[24]](#footnote-26) perhaps the fathers of Sephardic Zionism, adopted the sixteenth-century vision of restoring Jewish sovereignty in *Eretz Israel* in a natural and direct manner, believing that it constituted fulfilment of the authentic Messianic ideal. They perceived Zionism as a modern phenomenon deeply linked with ancient intentions.

Gershom Scholem and Ben-Zion Dinur thought differently, ignoring the sixteenth century entirely.[[25]](#footnote-27) In their view, the point of departure of the Zionist enterprise was the Sabbatean crisis and its repercussions, as embodied in the *aliyah* of Rabbi Judah the Pious (Hebrew: *Hasid*).[[26]](#footnote-28) The lively dispute between these two perspectives centred on whether the respective *aliyot* of the Hasidim and the Perushim (the non-Hasidic followers of the Vilna Gaon) were of a messianic nature and whether they foreshadowed the Zionist *aliyah*. Scholem avowed that Zionism is a complete realization rather than a rupture in Jewish history, an original expression of an ancient national awareness and the necessary product of Jewish history. Dinur, by contrast, did not accord the sixteenth century the scholarly attention it deserved. Scholem claimed that the aftermath of the Sabbatean crisis enabled a secularization of traditional Jewish society and its penetration by the modern *haskalah* and reform movements, followed by secular ideologies such as socialism, communism and Zionism that would not have been able to embed themselves in Jewish society were it not for the breaching of the spiritual ghetto walls in the days of Sabbatai Zevi.[[27]](#footnote-29)

Zionist historiography sought to represent Zionism as a manifestation of revolt in the diaspora and a revolution with its foundations in crisis awareness. Consequently, while ‘love of Zion’ represents a traditional and passive world, ‘Zionism’ represents an active revolt against tradition. This pattern was unacceptable to the Sephardic Diaspora but appeared to suit the *Ashkenazim*, who had experienced schisms and social divisions between tradition and crisis, as Katz notes.[[28]](#footnote-30) Zionist historiography is consistent in its emphasis on change, crisis and revolution rather than perseverance, continuity and evolution. Moreover, there is an attempt to differentiate between periods of mass messianic *aliyah* aimed at fulfilment and the realization of redemption and Zionist *aliyah* intended to build a homeland and a nation, as Altshuler and Morgenstern both repeatedly state, though with distinct nuances.

I argue that deep within the messianic idea, at least as perceived by the Sephardic Diaspora, the symbiosis between redemption and construction is natural and organic and the differences between them artificial. I contend that a differentiation between ‘love of Zion’ and ‘Zionism,’ the product of Zionist historiography, is a contrived one as ‘love of Zion’ is nothing other than the culmination of yearnings for the renewal of that very same Israeli statehood. While the Sephardic Diaspora has an organic awareness characterized by perseverance, continuity and evolution, the Ashkenazic Diaspora adopted a crisis-based awareness that would ultimately shape the historiography of Zionism, depicting it as a movement characterized by division and riddled with dichotomous terminology, such as Love of Zion versus Zionism, Old Yishuv versus New Yishuv, the Holy Land versus *Eretz Israel* and so on.[[29]](#footnote-31)

**Continuity and disruption in the Jewish diasporas: the messianic idea and Zionism**

Throughout the period we are examining, the substantive difference between the Sephardic and Ashkenazic diasporas is rooted in the primacy accorded to Bible and Kabbalah studies in the former and Talmud study in the latter. This was reflected in the daily study of *Hok l’Israel* among the *Sephardim* and of the daily Talmud page by the *Ashkenazim*. These practices are rooted in deep historical processes in Spain and Germany during the Middle Ages. The Bible and the Kabbalah demand an overtly spiritual and educational orientation to shaping an identity that strives and yearns for the redemption of Israel and the entire human race.[[30]](#footnote-32) Four roots extend from this historiographic approach that differentiates the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries from one another in the Ashkenazic diaspora and that led directly to the normative messianic idea being severed from its natural reflection, Zionism: The Sabbatean crisis; the shaping of a Jewish identity; attitudes towards the Three Oaths; and attitudes towards the concept of the ‘Messiah son of Joseph.’ Unlike the *Ashkenazim*, the Sephardic Diaspora maintained continuity between the Messianic idea and Zionism throughout this period. Moshe David Gaon, citing Itzhak Bezalel, called it the ‘Zionism of the generations.’

**The Sabbatean crisis**

The Sabbatean crisis, the culmination of which occurred on 6 September 1666 (16 Elul 5426), corrupted the original, normative messianic idea by imbuing it with anarchism, chaotic impulses, megalomaniacal adventurism and apocalyptic dimensions. Sabbatai Zevi’s conversion to Islam shocked the Jewish world and led most of his despairing followers to abandon their faith in him. Jews converted to Christianity or Islam as a result of Zevi’s own apostasy.[[31]](#footnote-33) Once the repercussions of this crisis diffused, however, the respective diasporas began to move in opposite directions on the essence of the messianic idea, a watershed in early and late modern Jewish history. Generally speaking, the Sephardic diaspora saw the normative messianic idea as a key component of national identity and consequently advocated the rehabilitation and explication of the Messianic idea according to its authentic Biblical meaning. Sephardic Jews devoted themselves to messianism as a historical, political and national concept that aspires primarily towards the victory of Jewish nationalism on the soil of *Eretz Israel*.[[32]](#footnote-34)

The Ashkenazic Diaspora concentrated instead on hiding their shame: Community records were destroyed and mention of Sabbatai Zevi’s name was forbidden. To prevent others from declaring themselves the messiah, the Eastern European Council of Four Lands set limits on Kabbalah studies. Only persons expert in the Talmud and *halakhah* were permitted to study the Kabbalah in order to keep others from falling into error.[[33]](#footnote-35) In general, the messianic idea was postponed to the ‘end of days’ and ceased being a live concept because the community feared that further false messianism might emerge.[[34]](#footnote-36) This substantial anxiety gave rise to the ‘division model’ that underlies the schisms in the Ashkenazi Diaspora during the modern era: Secularism versus religiosity; *hasidim* versus *mitnagdim*; orthodoxy, neo-orthodoxy and ultra-orthodoxy versus enlightenment; reformism versus conservatism; tradition versus modernity. This dichotomous world also informed the antagonism between Zionism and anti-Zionism. The anti-Zionist outlook was thus conceived in Ashkenazic religious space. For Zionism to be realized in the Ashkenazic Diaspora it therefore had to rebel against the religious norm. This was not the case, however, in the Sephardic Diaspora.

Some perceive the students of the Baal Shem Tov and especially those of the Vilna Gaon[[35]](#footnote-37) as exceptions to the rule as, for a short time, they diverged from the norms of that diaspora and chose the activist path of ‘natural redemption.’ Nevertheless, when their hopes were dashed, especially in 1840, they renewed their shunning of messianic activism and were destined to be channelled into clearly anti-Zionist directions.[[36]](#footnote-38) Consequently, one should perceive Kook and his school of thought as the exception to the rule as well: He had to swim upstream to restore the normative messianic idea to its ancient glory.[[37]](#footnote-39) By contrast, Rabbi Shlomo Eliezer Alfandari was an outstanding exception in the Sephardic Diaspora because of his opposition to Zionism.[[38]](#footnote-40) Rabbi Yissachar Teichtal (1885-1945), the chief rabbinic justice and head of the Yeshivah in Pishtian, rebelled against the anti-Zionist trends in European Orthodoxy, but met a tragic end. He challenged the entire range of arguments against Zionism that had grown among the *hasidim* of Munkacs.[[39]](#footnote-41)

It thus emerges that the Sabbatean crisis in the Sephardic Diaspora did not sever the continuity between the normative messianic idea of the sixteenth century and the affinity for Zion of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

I refer to Rabbis Abraham Azoulay,[[40]](#footnote-42) Saadia Chouraqui, Yaakov Culi, Shalom Sharabi, Hayim de la Rosa, Haïm Joseph David Azoulay, Raphael Immanuel ben Abraham Hai Ricchi, Haim Ben Attar,[[41]](#footnote-43) Yehouda Ayache and Sephardic Chief Rabbi of *Eretz Israel* Yaakov Moshe Ayash[[42]](#footnote-44) and Zionism and the Zionist idea in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries:[[43]](#footnote-45) Rabbis[[44]](#footnote-46) Judah Bibas, Judah Alkalai,[[45]](#footnote-47) Shmuel Abbo,[[46]](#footnote-48) David Ben-Shimon,[[47]](#footnote-49) Mordekhai Attiya,[[48]](#footnote-50) Moshe Kalfon Hacohen,[[49]](#footnote-51) Chaim Hezekiah Medini,[[50]](#footnote-52) Chaim Shvilly,[[51]](#footnote-53) David Cohen Scali,[[52]](#footnote-54) Chaim Beliah,[[53]](#footnote-55) Ben-Zion Meir Hai Uziel,[[54]](#footnote-56) Yaakov Moshe Toledano,[[55]](#footnote-57) Abraham Taviv,[[56]](#footnote-58) Yosef Renassia,[[57]](#footnote-59) Abraham Almaliah,[[58]](#footnote-60) Amram Aburbeh, Ovadia Hedaya, Yitzhak Nissim, Eliyahu Pardes,[[59]](#footnote-61) Joseph Mashash, Levi Nahmani, Israel Abuhatzeira (the Baba Sali), Yitzhak Abuhatzeira (the Baba Haki),[[60]](#footnote-62) Yeshayahu Meshorer,[[61]](#footnote-63) Hayyim David Halevi,[[62]](#footnote-64) Haïm Houri, Meir Mazuz, Michael Cherbite, Meir Zini[[63]](#footnote-65) and Yehouda Léon Askenazi (Manitou).[[64]](#footnote-66) In this context, we should also mention Professor Abraham Shalom Yehuda, whose life and research express a combination of Jewish Diasporas and a special Zionist approach accordingly.[[65]](#footnote-67) Moreover, the years considered to have ‘messianic potential’ (especially those that fell during the sixth millennium since Creation: 1240; 1540; 1648; 1740-1781; 1840)[[66]](#footnote-68) were viewed differentially by the *Ashkenazim*, who perceived them as a comprehensive objective, and the *Sephardim*, who considered them milestones in a gradual process of redemption. The former reacted to messianic crises with disappointment that even led to apostasy, while the latter viewed them enthusiastically.[[67]](#footnote-69) The ‘Sabbatean syndrome’ permeated academic research, obscuring the difference between the normative messianic idea and the chaotic and apocalyptic variety, indeed emasculating the former and empowering the latter.[[68]](#footnote-70) In this manner, it succeeded in politicizing research, labelling researchers as ‘messianists’[[69]](#footnote-72) and compiling messianism-free historical theses to achieve the ‘normalization of history.’[[70]](#footnote-74)

Israeli academic research is characterized by dialectical and paradoxical trends: On the one hand, it renders the messianic idea mythical, allegorical, abstract and metaphysical[[71]](#footnote-75) while, on the other, it normalizes and secularizes the Zionist idea, removing all of its redemption-oriented thorns. Thus, academic research seeks to obscure the dualism between normative and chaotic messianism, thereby normalizing the history of the Zionist enterprise and according it the character of a national liberation movement, one of many in the modern era.

This perspective was spearheaded by Scholem,[[72]](#footnote-77) whose entire messianic conception was crisis-oriented[[73]](#footnote-78) and whose works have been sharply criticized by many researchers and intellectuals. Ben-Dov’s pointed critique of Scholem’s concept of redemption, attraction to anarchistic mysticism[[74]](#footnote-79) and abhorrence of political messianism[[75]](#footnote-80) in writings is particularly notable. Schweid is equally critical, refuting Scholem’s philosophy and view of the Kabbalah as historically pivotal.[[76]](#footnote-83) Scholem has been strongly supported by Kabbalah and historical scholars, who claim that his study was purely scientific,[[77]](#footnote-84) whereas in actuality the ‘Sabbatean syndrome’ was already evident in their Jewish[[78]](#footnote-85) and political[[79]](#footnote-86) identities.

Kurzweil was the first to take issue with Scholem.[[80]](#footnote-87) By the 1950s, he had already identified weak points in Scholem’s research in the objective *hubris* of researching Jewish studies that conceals a new historiography of Judaism, according to which secularization is immanent in traditional Judaism. Kurzweil argues that Scholem, through rehabilitation of the controversial Sabbatai Zevi, presents him as a legitimate leader and ascribes progressive views to him. On the other hand, Sabbatai Zevi’s most distinctive opponent, Rabbi Jacob Sasportas, is presented as ‘a Jewish Inquisitor.’ It emerges that anyone who attacked the apologetics of the Berlin *Hokhmat Israel* school of thought is tainted with the apologetics of a purely secular identity. One who seeks to accord supreme authority to the research of historical realities ‘is diverting attention from the authentic wellsprings of human spirituality, namely religion on the one hand and poetry and art on the other, drowning his soul in the depths of fine detail in worlds distant from that of his own spirit.’[[81]](#footnote-89)

**Shaping Jewish identity in the diasporas**

While Jewish identity in Christian countries was defensive, as Christianity claimed to embody the *verus Israel* and declared that the Messiah had already arrived, Jewish identity in Islamic countries had no complexes regarding national affiliation, wherein Islam was more of a threat to the status of Jews and less to their identity. Consequently, while the Jews of the Christian world perceived Judaism as a religion[[82]](#footnote-90) and/or an ancient religious community,[[83]](#footnote-91) those in Islamic countries saw themselves as a nation.[[84]](#footnote-92) As such, authentic messianic longing in Islamic countries remained intact. Moreover, the secular appearance of Zionism did not deter Jews in the Sephardic Diaspora,[[85]](#footnote-93) as emphasis was placed on the renewal of a national entity in *Eretz Israel*. Consequently, ‘The “kosher” Messianism was Zionism, because the nation as a whole decided to return to Zion,’ as Rabbi Askenazi (Manitou) declared:

The Zionist enterprise succeeded, unlike all other Messianic initiatives throughout history, because this is the authentic Messianism of which the Torah and Prophets speak—rehabilitation of the nation upon its land, in the political dimension and not the religious-mystical one. Herzl did not perceive himself as the Messiah, yet he was, just as those who lived in the time of Moses did not know that he would save them…When the nation declares that this is the time, it is true. When a mystic declares that he is the Messiah and avows that this is the time, it is false. Two millennia of exile were ordained to eliminate the ‘false Messiah images’ and enable return to the authentic constellation of the Messianic idea.[[86]](#footnote-94)

The basis for conflict that emerges even more powerfully in Judaism experienced as a religious community provides an additional basis for explaining the social polarization of the Ashkenazic Diaspora, including the anti-Zionist element within it.

**The three oaths**

The Talmud indicates that Israel swore three oaths[[87]](#footnote-95) unto God, promising not to undertake mass immigration to *Eretz Israel* (‘scaling the wall’ or ‘as a wall’) and thereby postpone the inevitable. These oaths were never considered part of the *halakhah* by any major rabbinic authority: Rabbi Isaac Alfasi, Maimonides, Rabbenu Asher, Rabbi Jacob ben Asher and Rabbi Joseph Karo did not accord them legal status. They are also absent from the commentaries of the *Rishonim* on Tractate Ketubot (Nahmanides, Rabbi Yom Tov Asevilli, Rabbi Menahem Meiri) and Rashi’s commentary on the Song of Songs.

Rabbi Zeira, to whom the Three Oaths are attributed, retracted them when he came to *Eretz Israel*, as Rabbi Mordechai Attiya explains.[[88]](#footnote-96) Attiya states that the theory propounded by Rabbi Yohanan and the sages of *Eretz Israel* maintains that *aliyah* ‘as a wall’ is mandatory. Yohanan explains that there is an oath obligating the Jewish people to rise ‘as a wall’ and come to *Eretz Israel* as one: ‘Rabbi Yohanan said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, tells us: “I will not come to Celestial Jerusalem until I come to Earthly Jerusalem.”’[[89]](#footnote-97) Yohanan’s disciple Rabbi Elazar consequently stated: ‘The Holy One, Blessed be He, told Israel: “If you uphold the oath, all will be well and if not, I will abandon your flesh like the gazelles and deer of the field.”’[[90]](#footnote-98) Altshuler argues that renowned *halakhah* scholar Rabbi Joseph Karo demonstrated by his *aliyah* that he did not recognize the validity of the Three Oaths.[[91]](#footnote-99) In the Sephardic Diaspora, the Three Oaths do not constitute an impediment at all, in any period. On the contrary, the only valid oath is, as indicated, *aliyah* ‘as a wall.’ By contrast, the Three Oaths continued to deter the leaders of ultra-Orthodox communities in Europe from *aliyah*. Rabbi Meir Simhah Hacohen of Dvinsk, author of *Meshekh Hokhmah*, had this to say after the 1920 San Remo Conference: ‘Fear of the oaths disappeared and by the grace of the monarchs, the commandment calling for settlement of *Eretz Israel*, that is equivalent to fulfilment of all commandments in the Torah, was restored to its place.’ Regrettably, his remained a lone cry in the wilderness.[[92]](#footnote-101)

**The term ‘Messiah son of Joseph’**

The national reawakening of Israel is a gradual, dialectical process in two tiers, one built on the other,[[93]](#footnote-102) each of them essential in historical terms. Indeed, the Messiah son of Joseph (MSJ) precedes the Messiah son of David (MSD), not because one era is inferior to the other, but on account of the development and substance of rebirth: The era of the MSJ is one in which geographic, political, military, economic and institutional reawakening takes place, whereas the MSD heralds a spiritual era in which Hebrew identity becomes complete, applied to all the Jewish people and embodying a universal imprint as well.

In countries under Christian influence, the Jews became accustomed to speaking of one messianic personality only.[[94]](#footnote-103) Actually, the Jewish people await many messiahs, of which the most prominent are the MSJ, to be followed by the MSD. These principles are stipulated in the Midrash, Talmud and of course in Kabbalistic wisdom, but their roots are discernible in the account of Joseph and his brothers in Genesis. For the Jews living in Europe and subject to the religious influence of Christianity, messianism has become part of the occult. This is due to Ashkenazic Jewish sages’ prohibition of study of the topic, which would thereby prevent confusion between the Christian and Jewish interpretations of messianism. As a corollary, the topic of messianism became a kind of legend or dream, until Theodor Herzl rose and declared: ‘If you will it, it is no dream.’

By contrast, messianism for Jews in Islamic countries was an integral part of the conventional curriculum. In my youth, *yeshiva* students were taught the topic from Midrashic and Talmudic sources. Every schoolchild knew simply that the Jewish people anticipate the arrival of the MSJ, inaugurating the messianic era that culminates in the arrival of the MSD and the resurrection of the dead. Whenever Sephardic Jews in Islamic countries studied Judaism in Arabic, messianism was an integral part of conventional studies. But when they began studying in the languages of the Ashkenazic world, messianism began to be classified as an occult topic in Sephardic circles as well. The primary reason for this shift was the danger of confusing Jewish conceptions with those of Christian tradition, leading scholars to prohibit public discussion of such matters. As in many spheres of Torah study, concealment led to oblivion. Consequently, when the incidents hinted at in Jewish source literature began to occur, the Jewish people, except for Kabbalistic circles among them, had no way of identifying their significance, particularly their connection to Zionism. Rabbi A. I. Kook was the first[[95]](#footnote-104) since Rabbi Isaiah Horowitz to explain what the issue was. In his eulogy for Dr Theodor Herzl, visionary of the State of Israel, Kook hinted that Herzl’s endeavours were part of the MSJ conception.[[96]](#footnote-105)

Rabbi Askenazi perceived the MSJ as a component in the restoration of Jewish settlement in *Eretz Israel* in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, basing his conclusion on the Talmudic commentary of Rabbi Chaim Shvilly:

The Talmud explains that there will be mourning for MSJ, ostensibly because he will be killed. Nevertheless, in the Kabbalistic Sephardic prayer book *Tefilat Hahodesh*, published in Livorno, the [*Amida*] blessing ‘who buildeth Jerusalem’ includes a directive instructing worshippers to pray that MSJ not be killed. Even though the Kabbalists accept the Talmudic statement, they believe that the consequences may be avoided through prayer…According to the Midrash, MSJ is destined to be killed by the Roman Army Chief, the wicked Armilus.[[97]](#footnote-106)

Armilus is the Midrashic version of the Latin name Romulus, the founder of Rome. The Midrash thus foresees that, in MSJ’s time, a war may break out between Rome and Israel, during which MSJ will be killed by the Roman military leader. Shvilly, a Jerusalem Kabbalist of Georgian origin whom I knew personally, explains in his book *Calculations of Redemption*[[98]](#footnote-107) that, in our own generation, during World War II, the Jewish community in *Eretz Israel* faced possible destruction by German and Italian forces, led by a field marshal named Rommel. He hinted at the possibility that the MSJ’s death may have been ordained for that time and that we were only saved from tragedy thanks to 2,000 years of prayers, according to the Kabbalistic interpretation. Eulogizing Herzl in the summer of 1904, Kook introduced a ‘major innovation’ for the Ashkenazic Diaspora, an ‘innovation’[[99]](#footnote-109) that was part of the standard prayer ritual for Jews in the Sephardic Diaspora for many years. Kook, in emphasizing the existence of MSJ, hints at the activities of Herzl.[[100]](#footnote-110)

In this respect, Kook examined the exception to the rule, seeking to swim against the current with an outlook that had long been upheld by the Sephardic Diaspora but had worn away among the *Ashkenazim*. Rabbis Judah Loew ben Bezalel (1520-1609) and Isaiah Horowitz (1558-1630), both of whom were active in the Ashkenazic Diaspora during the sixteenth century, were the last supporters of the normative messianic idea to express their views in print until the nineteenth century.[[101]](#footnote-111) Kook would subsequently draw on their philosophy for his own. Rabbi Loew’s outlook was also supported enthusiastically by Rabbis Dr Jacob Gordin and Isaac Hutner, who would impart his philosophy to their students in France and the United States respectively.[[102]](#footnote-112)

**The roots of Zionism: The normative messianic idea or modern European nationalism?** My research, still in its early stages, proposes a basic methodological and historiographic perspective[[103]](#footnote-114) that transcends particularistic analysis. This perspective challenges the crisis orientation that has reigned supreme in Zionist historiography and examines the roots of Zionism that are integral to the Sephardic Diaspora. The purpose, conscious or otherwise, of Zionist historiography that detaches the sixteenth from the nineteenth century is to ensure that the mighty process of return to the Jewish homeland is attributed exclusively to Zionism of the modern era. This ignores all the momentous accomplishments of the sixteenth century that heralded a new age in the settlement of *Eretz Israel*. Most Zionist historiographers attempt to assign all due credit for national activism to the Zionist Movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and to ‘normalize’ history so that anything hinting at redemption is summarily excised.[[104]](#footnote-115) This is the meaning of the historiographic dispute taking place over the past few decades concerning messianism and the history of Jewish settlement of *Eretz Israel* in the modern era.[[105]](#footnote-116)

Nineteenth-century Zionism is only one segment of the process discussed above, only a reflection of the normative messianic idea that has monopolized the entire process of return. The unprecedented success of Zionism diverts attention from the process as a whole, the sum total of all its stages and layers.[[106]](#footnote-117) Historical research ignores far earlier stages that possess all the components of the Zionist enterprise: Formative spiritual foundation, settlement and conquest of *Eretz Israel* and legislation of a national character. The old Sephardic Yishuv was a platform for Eastern European Zionism. Its people were involved in the Yishuv, people of action and vison who drew on the Jewish tradition. The classic Zionist narrative to which we have become accustomed has a direct affiliation to the growth and legitimation of the leadership prevailing in the Yishuv as of the late nineteenth century, a kind of three-way memory–Zion–control relationship. There is an obvious link between research of historical memories and the shaping of Jewish elites.

I emphasize that the treasures of Jewish wisdom have always constituted the source on which Zionism drew.[[107]](#footnote-119) Consequently, it would not be correct to limit oneself to the tripartite paradigm that ostensibly shaped Zionism exclusively: Emancipation/Secularization—Antisemitism—Modern Nationalism. This paradigm is correct regarding the diaspora in Christian countries but less so for those in Islamic lands in the late nineteenth century. It represents the immediate factors that shaped the national ethos of Zionism in the Christian countries of Eastern, Central and Western Europe.[[108]](#footnote-120) But the deepest roots of the birth of Zionism will always be cultural. Zionism’s drawing on the messianic idea embodies a universal aspiration for the land that is its objective. Moreover, the Zionism that was impelled by pogroms and crises, that embodied aspirations for shelter and response to existential distress, drew on cultural roots as well.[[109]](#footnote-121) The substantive difference between these approaches reflects the quality and motives of Zionism in the respective diasporas.

Moreover, it should be emphasized that Jewish nationalism preceded European nationalism in all respects, having faced and challenged the mighty empires of the ancient East. Jewish nationalism thus derives substantially from the Biblical era,[[110]](#footnote-122) in which the Jews were ‘the true proto-nation,’ as Adrian Hastings declared.[[111]](#footnote-123)

Subsequently, Scholem’s dialectic and somewhat paradoxical outlook perceived Zionism and Hasidism as reflections of Sabbateanism, drawing on the wealth of Jewish wisdom without necessarily referring to European nationalism. Scholem considered exile-based mysticism[[112]](#footnote-124) to be the national power of Judaism and Zionism, a factor that accords it a political hue.

However, there has been a certain welcome shift recently from the dominant tones of crisis historiography to the more subdued voice of organic historiography, especially regarding Zionism in the Sephardic Diaspora. Alon Gal describes it as ‘a movement of national continuity that is rooted in Jewish civilization and the tradition of Jewish political culture’ on the one hand and ‘Zionism of tradition, continuity and rebirth with great Zionist potential’ on the other.[[113]](#footnote-125) Furthermore, Dr Itzhak Bezalel wrote an article in whose title he quoted Dr Nahum Sokolov’s address to the Sephardic community in *Eretz Israel*: ‘“We have become Zionists but you were born Zionists.’[[114]](#footnote-127)

Jacob Katz’s[[115]](#footnote-128) most recent book traces the communities of Israel that settled in Christian countries from the dawn of the Middle Ages until the modern era. His methodology, applied in the present article as well, is worthy of attention by those studying the history of the various Jewish diasporas. Like Katz, who observed and focused on the manifestations of tension between Jews and Christian nations and the Jewish aspiration to preserve and maintain a collective identity, I have reviewed the manifestations of the messianic idea over a period of 500 years in the different diasporas. Katz considered the two phenomena he studied to be the historic roots of the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel, while I have sought here to discern what shaped the attitudes of the respective diasporas towards Israel’s rebirth.
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