Some time ago two priests visited the Holy Land, drawn by their theological attachment to its many holy sites. On their pilgrimage, the priests happened by a kibbutz and were invited by its schoolmaster to attend one of the Bible classes in session at the time. Later, when the two pilgrims continued their journey, they exchanged impressions.

"The one thing I did not like about that lecture," said one, "was the political indoctrination the children underwent." "What do you mean?" asked his companion. "Well," he replied, "don't you remember how often they were told that the day will come and 'Israel will be third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth'?"

"My dear friend," exclaimed the other priest, "that was not politics! It happened to be one of the most beautiful prophecies of Isaiah—chapter 19, verse 24."

This little incident underscores one of the essential characteristics of the Jewish state in the land of Israel: the inextricable interrelationship between empirical, or even political, reality and the land's religious significance. The undeniable historical fact that the Jewish state is not and cannot be devoid of theological meaning does not preclude the fact that every state is, after all, only a secular entity—a state is never to be exalted into anything more than that, lest theological messianism be distorted into political messianism.

This very duality—of religion and land, of peoplehood and statehood—is inherent in what I would like to call "biblical realism." It is
a duality rooted in the basic theological self-understanding of Judaism—a self-understanding according to which the Jews have been, still are, and will remain until the "end of days," (the aharit hayamim), God's covenant people. This conception is of course contrary to the theology of the New Testament: since Christ had instituted the New Covenant not in any specific people, nor in any specific land, but rather in his blood (I Cor. 11:25), the people of God—together with the flesh and the land and "all things"—were reconciled "to himself" (II Cor. 5:18-19). For Jews, however, the only covenant they know is the one which continues to bear that same twofold meaning mentioned above—that of Spirit and of Flesh—or, if one prefers, the threefold relationship of God, His people, and the land.

Jews hold that God made this covenant with his people initially with the Patriarch Abraham, when (according to Gen. 15:9-17) "the furnace of smoke and the flame of fire . . . passed between the pieces" and (according to Gen. 17:7-14) the circumcision of the flesh was commanded as a testimony to the permanent validity of the divine covenant. This covenant, which is basic to Jewry's status as the People of God, was then time and again renewed and confirmed: first for Isaac and Jacob; then for the whole people of Israel at Sinai (Exodus 24) when the Israelites accepted the yoke of the Torah, the Law, "the two tablets of the covenant" (cf. Exodus 31:8; 32:15ff.); once again in Jeremiah (ch. 33:19-21, 25-26), in terms of an everlasting covenant between God and Israel and David; and finally by Ezra, with the definitive establishment of the Jews as the people of the Torah; and it is this last conception which has endured until today, with God's people regarding itself as distinguished from the nations by its halacha, its Torah-based rabbinical jurisprudence.

It is this covenant with the People of Israel which is also inextricably connected with the land of Israel. Historically and politically, this interrelationship has been interpreted in various ways, now complementary and now contradictory. It has been interpreted legally, mystically, symbolically, and even in totally spiritual terms. But theologically, the land has never been regarded except as an inalienable gift of God to his people—hence, as an integral part of the divine covenant. Once again, the covenant is made first of all with the Patriarchs, when God promised Abraham, "Unto thy seed have I given this land" (Gen. 15:18-19) and later assures him, "And I will make my covenant between Me and thee . . . and I will establish my covenant between Me and thee . . . and I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee,
the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God” (Gen. 17:2ff.). This promise is re-affirmed in Numbers 34:2-12, where the Lord tells Moses, “this shall be the land that shall fall unto you for an inheritance . . .” ; it is renewed in Deuteronomy (ch. 11:off.), where Moses speaks of “the land, whither ye go over to possess it, . . . a land . . . which the Lord thy God careth for . . .” ; and it culminates in Deuteronomy (ch. 30:1ff.): “. . . thou . . . shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and hearken to his voice according to all that I commanded thee this day . . . that then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity . . . and will return and gather thee from all the peoples, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee.” From the Torah, through the Psalms, the Aggada (the homiletical and folk literature of the post-biblical centuries), the Talmud, and the liturgy developed through the centuries of exile and in use this very day, the land of Israel is understood to be an integral part of the un-broken covenant between God and the Jewish people.

A Stumbling Block to Christians

This basic theological self-understanding of Judaism has been troublesome to non-Jews. Indeed, many a Christian seems to face serious difficulties fitting into his understanding of the divine scheme of salvation both the very survival of the Jews as God’s covenant people, and also the revival of the State of Israel. To be sure, new interpretations of the continued existence of Judaism emerge today (often of the basis of Romans 9-11), but the traditional approach remains very much alive in many Church circles. Some Christians still maintain that with their rejection of Jesus as the Messiah, the Jews lost their right to exist —their survival is unjustified. According to the Gospels of Mark (ch. 13) and Luke (ch. 21), divine reprobation and chastisement were to overtake the Jews. Both the Temple and also Jewish statehood were to suffer destruction. To the extent that the Jews still continued to exist among the nations, they were divinely ordained to survive in pain and in dispersion, so that by their sufferings they might bear witness to their own iniquity and to the truth and redeeming power of the Christian faith.

As Christians saw it, with the fulfillment of the Law in Christ, Christ became the “end of the Law” (Romans 10:4). Whereas the original Jewish self-understanding conceives the Torah and the Jewish people as indissoluble, this basic Pauline doctrine, essential to all
Christianity, cannot but mean the end of the old covenant (not simply its being abolished, but its having been accomplished and transcended)—and hence the end of the Jewish people as a valid religious entity. Moreover, since the people of God is the “body of Christ” (according to the New Testament), it is no longer in the Hebrew Bible (the Old Testament) that either the Jews, as God’s covenant people, or all the promises of God, “find their Yes.” Not only the Hebrew Bible but also all subsequent sources of authority which Jews consider theologically binding and obligatory are set aside, for it is now “in Him” (to use the terminology of II Cor. 1:20) that the covenant has its grounding and that divine promises “find their Yes.” In short, as Paul would have it, the old covenant has fulfilled its original purpose—“to prepare for the coming both of Christ, the universal Redeemer, and of the Messianic Kingdom . . .” (cf. Lk. 24:44; Jn. 5:39; I Pet. 1:10). The Jewish faith has been superseded by the redemption which Christ brought. Both the Jewish people and the Jewish particularity of the land, which had originated in and been justified by the Jewish faith, have now lost all rationale for continued existence outside the New Covenant.

Moreover, some Church circles are at pains to qualify even the Second Vatican Council’s renewed affirmation of Romans 11:28-29—an affirmation according to which the Jews still remain “dear to God on account of their Fathers,” since God does not repent of “his gift and his call,” and since all his promises are irrevocable. Some Christians maintain that this reaffirmed, spiritual affinity of the Jews to the people of God by no means creates any geo-political rights. To give the Jewish people any special right to election by virtue of its heritage “according to the flesh” would be to contradict the whole doctrine of the New Testament, or most particularly, the emphatic preaching of Paul. The Jewish people have a special relationship to the “olive tree,” to the new people of God, the Church—but not to a land.

Clearly, despite these traditional views of the Church, there are Christians who wish to come to terms with the facts of Jewish—and Israeli—survival. Those who do might find it helpful to look more deeply into the theological self-understanding of the Jews in Israel. And it is to this question that we now turn.

Exile and Zionism—The View of the “Observant” Jew

The theological and moral self-understanding of Israeli Jewry rests basically on two different—sometimes contradictory, yet at the same time complementary—trends in Judaism: the observance and the non-
observance of traditional sancta. The “observant” trend consists largely of two types of faith and ways of life, the mystical and the Halachic (rabbinic-legal). The “non-observant” trend, while not being devoid of biblical motifs, is rooted primarily in rationalism, enlightenment, and historical consciousness—or in what Martin Buber defines as “Hebrew humanism.” Each trend fosters its own distinctive view of Zionism.

The neo-mystical approach. The mystical—or symbolic and messianic—interpretation of Zionism was initiated in part by the Rav Jehuda Alkalay and Rav Zvi Hirsch Kalischer, the originators of pre-political Zionism in the middle of the nineteenth century. It was developed further under Chassidic, moralist, and pietist influences, but it was the late Rav Abraham Yitzchak Kook, Chief Rabbi of Palestine from 1921 to 1935, who brought this type of religious thought and life to its fullest expression.

The Rav Kook, one of the greatest twentieth-century Jewish thinkers and one of the most influential leaders of Religious Zionism, appeals, in different ways, of course, to both observant and non-observant Jews in Israel. His teachings are rooted in the Halacha and Aggada—i.e., in traditional Jewish Law, and in the non-legal, literary heritage, including legends, folklore, biblical exegesis, moral doctrines, and preaching. They are rooted in Jewish rationalism as well as in the Kabbala (Jewish mysticism of the 13th and 16th centuries), and in East European mystic, pietist, and revivalist schools. Today, the Rav Kook’s teachings serve to nourish a renewed and enthusiastic faith in Jewish statehood, not as an end in itself, but as a potential beginning of the future redemption of Israel in its own land.

As one of its first principles, the mystical self-understanding contends that the antithesis of Zion—Galut, or Exile—should not be understood exclusively in terms of empirical history, but also with regard to the larger cosmos. “Exile,” therefore, connotes a situation of crisis which embraces the world, the universe, and even the nature of existence itself. This crisis came upon the world through the very act of creation, i.e., the bringing-into-being of particular things, the shrinking of eternity into time and of unlimited extension into limited space. Absolute infinity was turned into relative, finite beings; undivided wholeness was broken into creatures, into separate, isolated, and uprooted beings.

Hence, “Exile” is, according to the mystical and Chassidic roots of
this reasoning, a metaphysical process whereby fullness exiled itself into creation, into its own diaspora. And the particular exile of the Jewish people among the nations is seen as a reflection of this universal exile, of the crisis into which the universe has fallen.

The Jewish people, the people chosen to reflect in its own exile this cosmic crisis, has a vocation to dedicate its existence, its works, its joys and sorrows, to the purpose of restoring the present state of affairs to its original fullness. In short, the Jews are called upon to take part in the process of completing creation, the process of redeeming creation from its incompleteness.

At this point, the theological motif of fullness seems to be common to both Christianity and the mystic trend in Judaism. According to the New Testament, however, it is Jesus Christ in whom men find the Fullness of life, the Way, the Truth, and the Life (Jn. 14:6); it is the Christ in Whom God has reconciled all things to Himself (II Cor. 5:18,19). Jewish mystic thought would have it that man, and actually the Jew himself, must work towards the restoration of creation to its fullness. This vocation is to be carried out always and everywhere, in his daily life—by his fulfillment of the 613 Commandments of the Torah, both in their juridical, revealed meaning and also in their mystic, hidden meaning.

One of the ancient mystic symbols used frequently in Chassidism (and also by the Rav Kook) teaches that, since the act of creation, the divine sparks—the aspects of divine Holiness—are buried everywhere in this world; they are held captive, or covered up, by defiled and impure shells. They—actually the whole world—long to return to their origin, to the great, infinite light, to the divine spheres. It is man's task to foster this process of restoration, of gathering the exiles, i.e., the individual aspects of Holiness, and reuniting them with their divine origin. It is the task of man, the task of the Jew, to liberate the scattered aspects of Holiness from their bondage in sin, imperfection, and incompleteness, so that the basis for the future redemption may be prepared, and thus also repaired.

According to these teachings, there is no moment and no place when and where man cannot be engaged in the metaphysical activity of working towards the liberation of the sparks, the redemption of these aspects of Holiness from their immurement. The mystics live in an uninterrupted religious tension wherein the individual's every deed—even his daily (so-called "secular") life, and inevitably also his relationship to Jewish statehood—is to be evaluated and interpreted ac-
cording to its contribution towards the symbolic act of repairing the damaged, defective state of the world.

It is here that the same spiritual Weltanschauung engendered two antithetical attitudes towards Jewish statehood—one of strong, even fanatic opposition, and another of enthusiastic support. The extremist orthodox groups headed by the Sattemer Rebbe are far from granting the state of Israel any eschatological significance. Some, the less moderate among them, deny this state even any specific Jewish meaning, since they accept no possibility either of Jewish statehood or of any realization whatsoever of eschatological expectations in pre-Messianic times. According to the instructive, though rather aggressive, writings of the Rav Joel Teitelbaum, the spiritual leader of these extremist wings, and according to the teachings of the more moderate spiritual leaders among certain Chassidic sects (for instance the Reb Ahra’le Roth group), Zionism challenges the divinely ordained fate of the Jewish people, rebels against Providence, and upsets the divine order of a causal relationship between sin and punishment, between reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked. Zionism, by changing the worldly situation into which Providence thrust the Jew, challenges the very metaphysical power which rules the world and human destiny, and which always and everywhere guides everything in accordance with its hidden purposes.

Although he is heir to the same metaphysical (or perhaps pantheistic) understanding of God’s omnipotence and omnipresence, Rav Kook comes to exactly opposite conclusions. For Rav Kook, the Jewish renaissance embraces all the movements and parties—all the religious as well as anti-religious (or even Marxist) interpretations of Judaism—into one organic whole, one holy Jewish Tree of Life.

According to one of the oldest teachings in Jewish mysticism, as elaborated by the Rav Kook, “there is no place devoid of Him.” Hence, the Jew can hope, pray, and work for the coming redemption everywhere, including the Diaspora. Yet at the same time, as the Rav Kook stressed, in the realm of the divine Omnipresence, the land of Israel bestows upon its inhabitants a unique inspiration; their efforts toward the repair and completion of the world-in-crisis are also endowed with a unique spiritual and mystical power. Hence, the logic of this reasoning inevitably led the Rav and his present-day disciples to a strong conviction of the national, as well as cosmic, significance of the rebirth of Israel in its land and sovereignty.

In this organic worldview, the very separation between matter and
spirit—even the divorce of the cognitive process and the faculties of the soul—have been set aside. Instead, the reality of the land and its people emerges from an unrelated, simple, and empirical state to become a part of the harmonious structure of the world. According to this organic view, true religion or true spirituality can be attained only through a material fulfillment, including such "mundane" things as political freedom and sovereignty. Similarly, true materiality remains defective, impure, and unredeemed, when unrelated to spirit. In the same way, the Jewish people without its land is incomplete, just as the land, without its legitimate, divinely ordained habitation, also remains barren and in need of redemption.

The Halachic Approach. The other type of religious, "observant" understanding of Israel—the people and the land—is the halachic one, rooted in the Law and its historical and exegetical development. It has been articulated and taught by authorities like the Rav Yitzchak Jaakow Reines, one of the spiritual leaders of religious Zionism and the founder of political religious Zionism; Schmuel Chaim Landau, one of the founders of the religious labor movement; the religious Kibbutz movement, one of the most original, creative, and ethical phenomena in contemporary Jewish life; and recently also in academic circles, where a more rational, moral, and apolitical Zionism is developing. This type of religious thought and life, rooted as it is in the halachic approach, stresses that Judaism intends to relate the realm of the spirit to physical reality. More precisely, the Jewish religion is concerned less with the imminence of God and more with the forms (the ways of life, hence the term halacha) in which aspects of God's immanence are reflected in the world, in life. The very verse in Genesis 1:28 which contains the first commandment of the Torah, "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth," goes on to convey a basic feature of the Jewish religion: "... and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." It is man's destiny not to withdraw from the created world, but to rule over it, to have dominion over reality, to bestow on the worldly spheres—hence also upon society and statehood—form, order, meaning, norms. The Torah, therefore, does not prescribe only for moral conduct in the realm of spiritual values; the Torah also prescribes for man's relationship to things—to the land, and not only to heaven. Hence, one of the most essential concepts of the Jewish religion is the term Avoda: this word literally means "work,"
"labor," although historically as well as theologically it denotes the sacrificial cult in the ancient biblical Temple, and subsequently (in post-sacrificial times) worship, service, prayer, and sanctification.

It is against such a background that the halachic type of religious thought and way of life has developed a rather balanced approach to the question of the redemptive, messianic characteristics of the state of Israel. The proponents of this view recognize on the one hand that a total eschatological status, if ascribed to present-day Jewish statehood, would entail far-reaching clerical—as well as undemocratic political—implications. Hence, one should interpret Jewish statehood in a more reserved, less "messianic" way. On the other hand, this world of creation knows no phenomenon which is not guided by Providence toward the realization of a divine purpose. Therefore, an historical and empirical phenomenon like Jewish statehood must have an inherently religious (though not necessarily eschatological) significance. History, including the emergence of Jewish statehood, is the work of God; historical reality is the medium in which the divine meaning of God's work is unfolded. Judgment, reward and punishment, hope and despair, are some of the forming principles through which this course of history—and as an inseparable part of it, Jewish statehood—is conceptualized and hence also recognized.

The View of the "Non-Observant" Jew*

We confront something substantially different when we turn to the type of self-understanding developed by the non-orthodox and "non-observant" among the Jews of Israel. This is basically an historical and rational type of self-understanding, resting mainly on a profound historical consciousness. This consciousness focuses on biblical antiquity, sometimes with a romantic attachment to the early days of the birth of the people of Israel and the conquest of Canaan. But perhaps even equally so, this historical consciousness is focused on the Holocaust, the genocide which twentieth-century European Jewry underwent. Intellectually, this trend in Jewish-Israeli self-understanding is rooted in the eighteenth-century European rationalism and Enlightenment, in the process of secularization and industrialization of modern Western society, in some of the European labor movements, and finally, in the

* Many of the ideas analyzed in this section are accepted also by observant, orthodox Jews. Until now, however, they have been articulated mostly in terms derived from non-religious schools of thought.
ideological (political as well as emotional) reactions of modern anti-Semitism which have arisen since the 1880's in Eastern, Central, and Western Europe.

This approach maintains that granting statehood an eschatological status would necessarily bring about all the horrors of "political messianism," which the modern world has known since the French revolution, which has been foretold time and again by authors like Jacob Burckhardt, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Dostoyevsky, and which mankind has experienced under the totalitarian regimes of our present day.

The spiritualization of statehood, of nationalism, or of any other form of political reality (which would be the inevitable result of an eschatological interpretation) is looked upon as irrational, amoral, and undemocratic—unacceptable to those for whom Jewish historical experience is something vital and morally obligating. Those who see Jewish life in this perspective draw back from any exaltation of political power—indeed from the exaltation of anything. They reject the deification of man, society, state, or institutionalized hierarchy; and they reject the veneration of rulers, heroes, saints, indeed, of anyone. Jewish rational thought and historical consciousness see this deification as contravening elementary monotheism.

Any totalitarian pseudo-messianism in political life—an inevitable result of the bestowal of absolute metaphysical and theological authority upon statehood—appears in most Israeli eyes to be contradictory to those basic human rights and obligations which the state of Israel was established to realize. At the same time such pseudo-messianism is like a nightmare, reminding Israelis of what preceded Jewish statehood in our century. Their life-experience (whether personal or historical) in addition to the rational principles of modern democracy, seem to be for this section of Jewry—as, in fact, for observant and orthodox Jews, too—a major argument against any eschatological interpretation of Jewish statehood.

According to the rational criteria of this self-understanding, the non-observant Jews contend that the state of Israel should be regarded not as an ecclesiastical institution, but as a social and judicial entity alone. Its purpose is to make possible for its citizens what had not been possible for Jews in the Diaspora under the rule of both European Christendom and Near Eastern Islam—that is, the realization of their essential human rights and obligations.
These rights and obligations have been summarized in Jewish thought and in the Hebrew literature of the last three generations as follows: the affirmation of one's physical, psychological, and intellectual freedom; the preservation of personal individuality despite the levelling and conforming impact of modern culture; the actual practice of one's sovereignty, as man and citizen, to shape one's way of life in freedom. This is understood as fulfilling the most elementary living conditions, so that man must not be pressed to renounce his own dignity or his inherent capacity for critical thought, intellectual judgment, and rational self-determination.

At the same time, however, this sovereignty of the state of Israel is rooted, like every sovereignty, in the idea of autonomy. Autonomy, when realized in a living community, implies the crystallization of this very community on the basis of its own unique historical heritage. Since this heritage is Jewish, Israeli rational (as well as historical) thought and ideology become increasingly aware of the fact that this Jewish-Israeli heritage is inseparable from religion. This does not mean, according to non-orthodox thought, that the Jewish state must be a religious one. It does mean that Jewish statehood, since it is rooted in the idea of autonomy, can only exist by confronting its **autos-nomos**, its own **nomos**, its Torah, its religious heritage.

It is at this point that once again, although in an entirely new way, non-religious self-understanding encounters Jewish religion and tradition. One of the most revealing examples of this renewed emotional quest for (and serious intellectual preoccupation with) religion is that of a small yet growing group of the Six Day War generation. At first sight it looks as if the young people are far from any "religious" way of life, thought, or feeling. Because of the non-religious, often anti-religious education the secular youth have received in Israel, it is usually assumed that here a new generation of Jews grew up—one that learned to reason only according to strict materialistic or secular cognitive criteria. Their ways of behavior, their speech, and their relationship to others may seem rather restrained, sophisticated, cynical, critical, and even "non-believing." Many among them try consciously to resist the temptation of transforming nationalism into a pseudo-biblical chauvinism, rational and social philosophy into mystical, romantic, or apocalyptic cravings. These non-observant youth are antipathetic to the sort of mystical interpretation they see developing these days among some of the extremist religious nationalists (such as the settlers
of Hebron). They reject any system of belief in which man becomes totally engulfed by his faith, and all differentiations between time and space, spirit and body, statehood and land are blurred, so that in consequence man loses his intellectual and perhaps even emotional freedom. Therefore, non-observant thought tries to strengthen the basic differentiation between the realm of social and political reality and that of metaphysics, between a prophetic vision of redemption and empirical reality.

Yet at the same time, a growing number of the members of this generation feel a need to turn to Judaism—and no longer as a socio-political entity alone, but also as the living history of a religious people. The fear of a new holocaust—of another total annihilation of Jews—filled the hearts and minds of many Israelis during the months preceding the Six Day War. Then suddenly there was an experience of salvation—not just a physical survival but rather a redemptive survival. Both these experiences brought into new focus the questions with which religion is essentially concerned. The meaning of life and death, of anxiety and release, of evil and justice, of use and abuse of power, of self-indulgence and self-restraint—all this inspired an urge to turn to one's own traditions and religious sources.

Moreover, there was an inner need to inquire into historical causation and to shape a logical, theological, or ethical justification for their victory. Their very existence—at this historical moment and in this land—deepened even more the wish to be free of secular alienation from religion.

Rabbinical exegesis, such as Rashi to Genesis 1:1, teaches that the ownership of the Holy Land is in itself not an absolute value: "all the Earth belongs to the Holy one praised be He"; and it was by His wish, not by man's might and sword, that the people of Israel returned to the land of Israel. Such interpretations of scripture are being studied once again by a generation that earlier had practically no interest in it. Chassidic sources are being re-discovered—like the Prayer for Peace by Rav Nachman of Brazlaw: "may it be your will Lord our God . . . to abolish war and bloodshed from the world . . . may all who live on the earth recognize the supreme truth that we have not come into the world for strife and contention . . . neither for hatred nor bloodshed." Such interpretations are now issued time and again in publications produced by the youth themselves—in Arabic as well as Hebrew. The Midrashic source in Megillah 10/b, according to which God forbade the angels to sing a hymn after the destruction of the Egyptians at the Ex-
odus through the Red Sea—"My children lie drowned in the sea, and you would sing?"—is being taught and studied not only in schools and synagogues, but also by those who have to bear arms.

It is much too early to determine the direction in which this renewed confrontation with religion will develop. Is it a return, a Teshuva, to Judaism as a framework of metaphysical thought, as the divine manifestation in history? Is it a renaissance of Judaism in terms of an existential experience, one that has been called by Martin Buber "Hebrew humanism"? Or, as some positivists might claim, is this renewal of religion simply a rationalization—nothing but an ideology of a national movement, or a psychological need of a war generation?

Answers to these questions cannot be supplied yet, for we are only at the beginning of a new era in the intellectual and religious development of Judaism in the state of Israel. However, in terms of a phenomenological history of ideas and religion, we can safely conclude that today Jewish sovereignty in the Holy Land is understood as a way of life. And it is the purpose of this way of life to enable the Jew to realize his inalienable rights as man and citizen in two spheres, the sphere of autonomy and that of theonomy: autonomy, in the sense of self-determination, hence of freedom; theonomy, in the sense of a renewed process in which the divine Presence is unfolded, revealed, and in the Holy Land—dwelling in the midst of His people, the Jews.
The purpose of this selected bibliography is neither to provide a complete guide to the source material on the topic of this essay, nor to represent equally and fully all the theological and ideological trends in Jewish self-understanding with respect to Israel. The only purpose of this list is to supplement the various aspects with which this essay deals by providing part of the necessary documentation and interpretive literature.

This list includes three types of literature: (a) primary sources and documents, (b) research and analytical treatises, and (c) essays that reflect mainly the belief, opinion, or ideology of their authors.

While I have tried to suggest as much literature in English as possible, a number of the sources are in Hebrew. The understanding of current Israeli self-expression requires, so it seems, a study of the growing documentation in its own authentic context, i.e., the linguistic, conceptual, and symbolic framework of the renewed language of the Bible: Hebrew.
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