

Heidegger in Hebrew: Translation, Politics, Reconciliation

Daniel Herskowitz/ University of Oxford

Introduction

Within the ever-expanding scholarly corpus on *l'affaire Heidegger*, a curiously neglected topic is the Jewish reaction to the political siding of Heidegger. To illuminate this topic, I wish to focus on a little-known episode which is of particular interest because Heidegger played an active role in it. In the summer of 1968, Heidegger's *The Origin of the Work of Art* was translated to Hebrew by Shlomo Zemach and published in Israel.¹ Examining the charged context, uneasy formation, and ambiguous reception of this translation sheds light on this largely unaddressed topic of Heidegger's reception. It is generally agreed that *Origin*, initially a lecture from the mid-1930s on the role of art in the manifestation of being and as the event of truth, already reflects the philosopher's distancing from the National Socialist party, which he came to see, to his dismay, as deepening rather than offering an alternative to the technological perversion of modernity. The turn to art in the 1930s, as articulated in his work on Nietzsche, Hölderlin and in *Origin*, exhibits his attempt to elucidate and prepare for "another beginning". Yet there is little irony in the fact that it is this work that propelled the Jewish intelligentsia in Israel to publicly debate Heidegger's politics. For as we learned from Heidegger's recently published private notebooks, some of the most fervent anti-Jewish statement in his *oeuvre* were composed *after* his personal disassociation from the party.

This essay is divided into two sections. The first outlines the blunders involved in the preparation of Zemach's translation, primarily through unknown archival material, including correspondences between Zemach, Vittorio Klostermann (Heidegger's German publisher), and Heidegger himself. The second section discusses the debates in Israel over Heidegger and his work provoked by the translation. Particular focus is given to the question of the implied ties between translation and reconciliation, and the specific political, moral, and theological challenges of putting Heidegger's philosophy into Hebrew words.

Part I

¹ Heidegger, *Mekoro shel Ma'ase Ha'Omanut* [The Origin of the Work of Art]. Originally from the Polish city of Plonsk, Zemach was raised in a traditional Jewish home and underwent Yeshiva education. An avid Zionist, he was an early emigrant to Palestine, where he also left the faith of his youth. Understanding that in order to be a 'Hebrew writer' he must broaden his education, he moved to France and studied Literature and Philosophy in the Sorbonne and then Agricultural Engineering in Nancy. After returning to Palestine, Zemach was a driving force behind the establishment of various institutions and educational programs and held a long-lasting and deeply intricate friendship with a fellow Plonsker, David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister. An agronomist by profession, Zemach was a widely acclaimed literary figure who in 1965 was awarded the Israel Prize, the State's highest honor, for his literary achievements. These biographical points highlight that Heidegger's translation was made not by a rebellious youngster or an unknown, peripheral figure, but by an established and acclaimed scholar, a member of society's elite.

Translating Heidegger: Motivation and Context

“I have recently finished [...] the translation of a 70-page essay by Martin Heidegger on ‘The Origin of the Work of Art’ – ‘Ürsprung des Kunstwerkes’”, Shlomo Zemach wrote on November 21, 1966 to Kalman Aharon Bartini, the editor of *Moznaim*, a prominent journal in the cultural and academic Israeli world, inquiring if he would be interested in publishing shorts excerpts from it. “As of now, nothing of Heidegger has been translated [to Hebrew] since he is a ‘tough nut to crack’ [*Egoz kashe*]”, Zemach continued. Further justifying his effort, he noted that Heidegger put forth “ideas and styles that everyone is benefiting from them indirectly and it is preferable that the Hebrew reader will ‘taste’ them in their original”; and moreover, “also [Martin] Buber drew from this well and suffused his own writings with ten buckets-worth of its water.”² Bartini responded with enthusiasm, and the translated excerpts - the opening section, the famous passages dealing with Van Gogh’s painting, and the analysis of C.F. Meyer’s poem ‘The Roman Fountain’ - appeared in the April 1967 issue.³ In a preface preceding the translated passages, Zemach explained that the planned publication of a new edition of his 1938 monograph, *On Beauty*, on theories of aesthetics from Kant to Husserl, led him to embark on the task of translation of Heidegger’s essay on art – “for it is agreed that he is the top authority and everyone draws water from his well”.⁴ This would not be the first encounter of the Hebrew speaking public with Heidegger’s philosophy. Prof. Shmuel Hugo Bergmann, who lectured on Heidegger’s existentialism in the nascent Hebrew University in Jerusalem already in the 1931-2 academic year, dedicated a long and elaborate chapter on *Sein und Zeit* in his first major book on contemporary philosophers, *Hogey Ha’Dor* [Contemporary Thinkers] (1935), based on essays published earlier.⁵ Martin Buber critically addressed Heidegger’s philosophy in his 1938 lecture series in the Hebrew University, as well as in other writings.⁶ Also Raphael Seligmann, Julius Guttman and Walter Kaufmann,

² Zemach to Bartini, November 21, 1966, Avraham Bartini Archive [henceforth ABA] 162 65427-a. All the translations from Hebrew and German are my own unless otherwise indicated. I would like to thank the staff of the Gnazim Archive in Tel Aviv, and especially Hila Tzur, for their assistance and enthusiasm.

³ Bartini to Zemach February, 20 1967. Shlomo Zemach Archive, 40026.a [henceforth SZA]. Heidegger, “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes”.

⁴ Martin Heidegger, “Mekoro shel Ma’ase Ha’Omanut (Prakim Mi’Mishnato)” [The Origin of the Work of Art (Sections from his Thought)], 387-393; Shlomo Zemach, *Al Ha’Yafe: Shitot Hesber La’Yofi U’mekorotav* [On Beauty: Explanatory Methods of Beauty and its Origins].

⁵ Hugo Bergmann, *Ho’gay Ha’Dor*. A typed Hebrew and English transcript of these lectures is found in the Shmuel Hugo Bergmann Archive, 4*1502 04 101b, Israel National Library.

⁶ Among others, Martin Buber, “Beayat Ha’adam” [The Problem of Man] and “Likuy Ha’Or Ha’Elohi” [Eclipse of God]. On Bergmann’s and Buber’s readings of Heidegger, see my “Heidegger as a Secularized Kierkegaard: Martin Buber and Hugo Bergmann Read *Sein und Zeit*”.

to list a few important examples, authored essays on Heidegger's philosophy that appeared in Hebrew before Zemach's translation.⁷

Ostensibly, the motivation seems to be entirely personal. In the final chapter of his life – Zemach was celebrating eight decades that year - he was to complete the unwritten chapter of this early book. It would be an intellectual and biographical *grand finale*. Moreover, from a later piece, where Zemach replies to a “good friend” who asked “why did you see fit in your old age to dedicate so much effort in translating Heidegger?”, it becomes apparent that Zemach sensed an intellectual kinship with Heidegger on issues of aesthetics and philosophy more generally.⁸ In his diary he wrote: “already in my *On Beauty* my path of thinking was close in essence to Heidegger's, and already then I use the terms: Being, entity, thing, actuality, and so forth, which are the main principles and foundations of [his thought].”⁹ To this intellectual kinship we may add an ideological one. In “A Parable without A Moral” (1963), a critical newspaper review of a compilation of short stories authored by Abraham B. Yehoshua (born 1936), then then rising star in the Israeli literary scene article, Zemach bemoans what he identified as disrespect towards physical labor reflected in Yehoshua's narratives, which was in stark opposition with what he took to be the authentic Zionist approach.¹⁰ For support, Zemach translated and cited Heidegger's romanticized and mystified musings on Van-Gogh's painting of the shoes and the rural world of the peasant revealed by them. “All I want is that this young man [Yehoshua] shall know [...] that even Heidegger's position is not simply unwarranted; the filthy working shoes of a peasant woman are a highly sublime instrument”. Zemach calls upon Heidegger's organic-nationalistic rhetoric to support his ethos of old-school Zionism and its idealized approach toward agriculture, land, and labor, from which the younger generation of Hebrew writers, he sensed, are now woefully distancing themselves. It also seems that the difficulty of Heidegger's prose was taken as a personal challenge for Zemach. On the day he commenced on the project, he exclaimed: “I have a need to prove to those wise-guys how one translates Heidegger's writings! And I'll shut their mouths up [*nivlom pihem*]”.¹¹

⁷ For a sporadic account of Heidegger's reception in pre-state Israel with connection to the founding of the Hebrew University, see Hagi Kenaan, Shmuel Rottem, Dana Barnea, “Heidegger Be'Ivrit: Perek Be'Toldot Hitgabshuta shel Philosophia Mekomit” [Heidegger in Hebrew: A Chapter in the Formation of a Local Philosophy]. A broad outline of the central stages of Heidegger's reception in Israel can be found in Michael Roubach, “Die Rezeption Heideggers in Israel”.

⁸ Zemach, “Assiya U'farshata” [Action and What it is About], 86-99, reprinted in Shlomo Zemach, *Dapei Pinkas* [Pages from a Notebook], 165-184.

⁹ Zemach, *Pinkasey Reshimot 1962-1973* [Diaries], 270.

¹⁰ Zemach, “Mashal Lelo Nimshal” [Prabel Without a Moral], 5; appears also in Shlomo Zemach, *Shtey Ha'Mezuzot* [The Two Doorposts], 149-160.

¹¹ Entry dated July 23, 1966 in Zemach, *Diaries*, 214.

However, to perceive this translation as springing solely from personal motivations would mistakenly overlook the highly charged cultural context within which it was undertaken. The Nazi horrors left a scathing imprint on the Israeli consciousness. For many, any contact with Germany - its industries, culture, even its language – was considered a desecration of the commemoration of the holocaust victims. While a public debate over the appropriate attitude toward Germany and its cultural legacy was launched with the rise to power of the Nazis, the 1960s saw it forcefully reemerge. Triggering this were a number of momentous events, such as the capture, trial and execution of Adolf Eichmann (1960-62) (and the ‘Arendt controversy’ sparked in its wake), the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic of Germany (1965), and a decision to lift the ban over the music of Richard Wagner (1966), who, for different reasons, already assumed symbolic status in this regard.¹² A dispute waged over other German figures associated to Nazism as well, among them the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, the composer Richard Strauss, and the poet Gottfried Benn.¹³ Heidegger too was occasionally mentioned in this context. For example, reasoning against cultural embargos on figures whose negative attitude towards Jews is known, Shmuel Hugo Bergmann warned that it will not be long until the question will be raised “how is it that it is allowed to teach Voltaire, Goethe, Kant, Fichte, Schopenhauer, Von Hartmann, for were they not ‘anti-Semites’, as this or that book proves [?]. And Hitler and Mussolini loved Nietzsche and Heidegger was a Nazi. There is no end to it.”¹⁴ Responding to this with more than a pinch of cynicism, Hayim Ya’ari, a central figure in the Israeli intelligence service, wrote: “Prof. Bergmann, a thinker who possesses the skill for delicate nuance, may be able to distinguish between the genius and satanic sides of Wagner’s personality. But us, simple people, simple Jews, lack the talents for such a fine distinction”. The towering figures of Goethe and Kant will continue to be taught and studied, Ya’ari assured, but “when Prof. Bergmann continues to ask: And what about Heidegger the Nazi? – to this we reply: Heidegger was a Nazi, and if he did not atone for his sins and repent – we shall treat him as a Nazi. Would Prof. Bergmann wish to invite a Nazi philosopher to lecture in Jerusalem?”.¹⁵ As this exchange exhibits, Heidegger was a debated figure, and thus translating his works into Hebrew with this cultural backdrop was not merely an act of

¹² On this see Na’ama Sheffi, *The Ring of Myths: The Israelis, Wagner and the Nazis*. For a general overview of the German-Israel relations in those years, see Yeshayahu A. Jelinek, *Deutschland und Israel 1945-1965: Ein neurotisches Verhältnis*; Tom Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, especially the chapter on the Eichmann trial and the Israeli reaction to Arendt’s book, 323-366. Neither Jelinek’s politics-focused work nor Segev’s culture-focused work mention Heidegger.

¹³ It is no coincidence that the noted German-Israeli publisher Gershom Schocken initiated the project of translating Nietzsche’s writings to Hebrew in 1963. On this see David Ohana, “From Right to Left: Israel Eldad and Nietzsche’s Reception in Israel”; Idem, “Zarathustra in Jerusalem; Nietzsche and the New Hebrews”.

¹⁴ S. H. Bergmann, “Thanks to the Philharmonic”, 3.

¹⁵ Hayim Ya’ari, “Beyn Ha’Nibelungs Le’Auschwitz” [Between Nibelungs and Auschwitz], 3.

making accessible the writings of an important philosopher, it was taking a side in a painful national debate over the Jewish-Germans relations in the wake of the holocaust.

Zemach, it should be clear, was deeply aware of the thorniness of his project. This is expressed in the preface to the published excerpts, where he states that while he should have translated this work “a while ago”, he repeatedly pushed it off. “My heart was not at peace with this decision. Heidegger did not act appropriately in the early days of he who ‘*mazkirin u-meshachkin*’. And although he quickly withdrew and distanced himself from defilement [*tum’aa*], for many years my heart did not permit me to approach this task. Now in my old age, knowing that no one else will do the task in my place, I overcame [my resistance] and finished the translation.” The phrase ‘*mazkirin u’meshachkin*’ is originally found in the Babylonian Talmud in Aramaic, and means, as Zemach explains, “those who upon mentioning their names are immediately cursed, and by this I mean Hitler”.¹⁶ Acknowledging Heidegger’s importance as a philosopher despite his political past, Zemach called for a distinction between the two. The latter, doubtless, must be condemned unreservedly; yet to ignore the former would be a non-cultural, indeed, anti-cultural act.

To Translate is to Betray? Approving the Translation

In order to publish the translation in full, Zemach ushered a letter to Vittorio Klostermann Verlag that published Heidegger’s *Origin*: “Dear Sir, I allow myself to turn to you with the request to grant me the permission to translate and publish the essay ‘Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes’ by Martin Heidegger in Hebrew [*Hebräische*]”. After elaborating on the circumstances that led him to translate Heidegger’s essay, Zemach then mused: “The Hebrew language, which knows neither prefix nor suffix in its word formation, and whose sentence structure is fundamentally different from the sentence structure of the German language, nevertheless offers the possibility, to repeat what Heidegger ‘literally’ said following what Heidegger himself has requested from a translation: ‘it is only faithful when its words are words that speak out the language of the matter [*der Sprache der Sache*]’¹⁷.” Making sure to mention that he intends to publish the translation with the publishing house ‘Devir’, which “was founded about 40 years ago by the poet Bialik”, and then concludes: “I hope you will kindly allow me the requested permission and would be grateful if my request would be submitted to Herrn Professor Heidegger as well.”¹⁸ Zemach’s request for Heidegger’s approval of his assignment is significant, and as will be seen, he insisted on Heidegger’s involvement throughout the unexpected stages of its preparation. On March 9, 1967, Klostermann forwarded “a letter from Jerusalem” [*Schreiben aus Jerusalem*]” to Heidegger, where he requested “to be informed whether I should carry out the necessary negotiations for this translation of ‘The Origin of the

¹⁶ Zemach to Bartini, February 16, 1967, ABA 162 65433-a.

¹⁷ From Heidegger, *Holzwege*, 297.

¹⁸ Zemach to Klostermann, 1 March 1967. SZA 52 14153/1.

Work of Art’.”¹⁹ Heidegger wrote back on March 13, 1967: “I request to enter into negotiations with Jerusalem”, wishing it would be the reworked 1960 edition of *Origin* that is translated. Two weeks later, Vittorio Klostermann returned to Zemach with an official reply: “After consultation with Herrn Prof. Heidegger I can inform you that we have agreed to the translation of the above mentioned essay into Hebrew”.²⁰ Zemach quickly notified Bartini of the German publisher’s permission, making sure to note that it has been granted “after having consulted with the author”.²¹ Just as Zemach was well aware of the implicit sensitivity around the translation, it is unlikely that this had gone unnoticed by either the publishers in Frankfurt or Heidegger. Perhaps a hint to this can be detected in Klostermann’s letter to Zemach: “Dear Sir, I gather from your kind letter [...] that you are interested in the rights for the Jewish translation of this title [*jüdischen Übersetzungsrechten*].”²² Zemach, obviously, spoke of translating Heidegger to *Hebrew*; yet Klostermann, confusingly, replies with respect to translating into *Jewish*.

A year later, Zemach wrote to inform Klostermann that the Hebrew manuscript was on its way to print. As part of a lengthy letter, he revealed that he had written a preface to the translation where he discusses Heidegger’s political past. “It seems unacceptable to me to pass over in silence the National Socialist episode in Professor Heidegger’s life. The Jewish reader [*jüdische Leser*] would have otherwise rightfully accused me of hypocrisy and cowardice. I therefore have presented in brief [*in Kurze*] the sequence of the known facts without particularly emphasizing them, but also without covering up anything. I have however pointed out that Professor Heidegger’s temporary error [*der vorübergehende Irrtum*] is unable to affect the great importance of his philosophy and the depth of his thought”. The preface will also discuss issues concerning translating Heidegger to Hebrew. As he points out, “The difficulty lays not in finding a suitable Hebrew word-form for ‘Sein’, ‘so-Sein’, ‘Wesen’, ‘der Dinge’. The Hebrew language has adopted suitable word forms from the Jewish medieval philosophers (Maimonides, Ibn Gabirol, Crescas etc), and it was not difficult to adapt them for the present requirements here. For example the term: Das Sein; Das Seiende; Seiender als das Seiende, for which the English language has only the one word ‘Being’, in Hebrew one can easily infer from the root-word ‘Jesch’, such as ‘Jeschut’; ‘Jeschi’; ‘Jeschii’ etc. [...] Incidentally, it was customary previously in Hebrew to translate the word ‘Dasein’ in Heidegger with the word ‘Hawajah’; that is how it was rendered by Professor Hugo Bergmann in his essay on Heidegger and also by Martin

¹⁹ The incomplete correspondence between Heidegger and Klostermann is found in an uncatalogued file marked as “DLA Marbach, A: Klostermann” in Martin Heidegger’s papers at the Deutsches Literaturarchiv in Marbach am Neckar. Zemach’s letter does not appear in the file. I would like to thank Mr. Gudrun Bernhardt from Heidegger’s archive for his gracious assistance and information on the Klostermann-Heidegger correspondence regarding Zemach’s translation.

²⁰ Klostermann to Zemach, 14 March, 1967. SZA 14165/1.

²¹ Zemach to Bartini, March 17, 1967. ABA 162 65435-a.

²² Klostermann to Zemach, March 31, 1967. A copy of this letter appears without a call number in the ‘Klostermann’ file in Zemach’s archive.

Buber. I however cannot overlook the fact that the word is composite and thus translates to: ‘He’joth’ (Sein)-‘K’an’ (Da), together in Hebrew: ‘He’joth-K’an’.”²³ Concluding, Zemach proclaims: “In the Talmud one finds the saying: “the baker cannot attest to the quality of his dough’ [*Der Bäcker kann nicht für die Güte seines Teigs zeugen*’]²⁴, and certainly the translator cannot attest to the quality of his translation. But my expert friends have assured me that it manages to bring the author’s ‘world of reflection’ [*Welt der Besinnungen*] close to the Hebrew reader [...] Should you be of the opinion that the honored author could be of interest in my performance, I would be grateful if you were to take the trouble to forward this letter to Professor Heidegger – for which I hereby thank you in advance.”²⁵

Clearly, Zemach tried to ‘soften the blow’ by stating his discussion will be “brief”, promising to recap the episode “without particular emphasis”, and speaking of Heidegger’s “temporary error”. Klostermann sent Heidegger on February 26, 1968 “a letter from the Jewish translator [*jüdischer Übersetzers*] of ‘The Origin of the Work of Art’ with my response”. Klostermann’s response dealt almost exclusively with Zemach’s plan to write on Heidegger’s Nazism. “That the translation of ‘The Origin of the Work of Art’ by Martin Heidegger should be published with a forward”, asserted Klostermann with undeniable abnegation, “had to have been agreed upon when the contract was concluded”. Moreover, “it is generally uncustomary to begin a text with a discussion about the life-course [*Lebensweg*] of the author.” He then demanded, “It seems to me necessary in any case that you send the text of this preface to the Publishing House, so that it can make a judgment as to whether a publication of the translation can be made with this preface. However, the publisher shall reserve its right to leave the final decision to Professor Heidegger. Whether the text can appear with explanations, it is for Professor Heidegger alone to decide. In any case, the text can appear only after the clarification of the issues you raised.”²⁶ This response, which Heidegger apparently approved as it was sent to Zemach, can perhaps be seen as reflecting the shattered hope that the Hebrew translation will follow through without references to Heidegger’s political past, as well as the desire to affect the way this episode is depicted, if the decision is made to publish it.

Zemach quickly translated the preface from Hebrew to German, and once again tried to smooth things over. “I very well understand your position and concern”, he affirmed to Klostermann, “and therefore let me assure you in advance that there is no point that my work [...] will appear without the approval of Heidegger”. However, mentioning Heidegger’s political episode “is in no way out of my personal interests in things that happened in the past, or in order to please some of my audience”. Rather, it is addressed “only

²³ See also Zemach’s comments in MMH, 92-93.

²⁴ “Eyn ha’nachtom me’id al isato”. This saying is not Talmudic, but a modern adaptation of a statement from Midrashic literature. Cf. *Bereshit Rabbah* 34:10.

²⁵ Zemach to Klostermann, 19 February, 1968. SZA 52 14154/1.

²⁶ Klostermann to Zemach, February 26, 1968. SZA 14166/1.

for the sake of the issue itself, that is, for the sake of my project, to give the Hebrew (and to some extent, *only* to the Hebrew) reading audience and in particular to the younger generation a sample of Heidegger's thinking, his philosophical approach and his style of language". Zemach urged Klostermann to recognize the inevitability of mentioning Heidegger's Nazi episode, for if *he* does not, someone *else* no doubt will. "This is the first time that an essay by Professor Heidegger is translated into Hebrew; and understandably, I want to avoid from the outset the work being explained by ignorant newspaper-reviewers." He thus enclosed, per Klostermann's request, "the part of the preface which deals with Professor Heidegger's stance toward the National Socialist movement." Again trying to calm the waters, Zemach asked Klostermann "to appreciate that I did not portray the issue itself and I also held back my own judgment. Instead, I quote the statements of two of Heidegger's adherers [*Anhängern*] who seek to defend the philosopher against the accusation that he gave in [*gebeugt*] to the National Socialists – without hiding any of the facts. It seems to me that this is the most noble [*vornehmste*] way to bring our audience a little closer to the psychological [*seelischen*] difficulty in which so many German people found themselves at the time." Once again drawing upon his Jewish heritage, Zemach added: "An old saying of our Sages [*Väter*] states: "do not judge your fellow man before you are placed in his position" [*‘Veurteile nicht Deinen Mitmenschen, ehe Du nicht in seine Lage greten bist’*].²⁷ So we do not want to judge, but we can also not forget". As a possible compromise, he suggested to put his remarks as an epilogue instead of as a preface - "If you or Professor Heidegger so wishes". The letter ends as follows: "To conclude I would like to say that I will be very happy if you were to leave the decision of the raised question to Herrn Professor Heidegger himself, as you indicate in your letter. I feel certain that Professor Heidegger will understand me and that his approval will not be withheld."²⁸

Despite Zemach's claim that he had little personal interest in Heidegger's past, there is evidence to the contrary. As a Jew whose members of his family were murdered by the Nazis, Nazism and the holocaust constantly concerned him. Indeed, as mentioned above, part of his aim was to underscore that Heidegger's thought was valuable *despite* his politics. Moreover, Zemach had addressed Heidegger's Nazism already in 1940. In an essay dedicated to establishing a link between Schopenhauer's philosophical pessimism and his hatred of Judaism and Jews, Zemach offered an analogy between Schopenhauer's views and Heidegger's support of the Nazis.²⁹ Alongside its great compassion and idealization of beauty, Zemach maintained, Schopenhauer's system "constitutes a philosophical, moral, spiritual, anthropological and legal basis for aggressive and murderous anti-Semitic madness that is one with the raging anti-Semitism of the racist third Reich!". An analogy is then drawn between Schopenhauer's pessimism and the focus on nothingness and

²⁷ "Al tadin et havercha, ad she'tagia limkomo", (Pirkey Avot, 2:4).

²⁸ Zemach to Klostermann, March 7, 1968. SZA 52 14155/1.

²⁹ Zemach, "Nazism, Sin'at Yisrael, Ve'Schopenhauer" [Nazism, Jewish-hatred and Schopenhauer].

angst in Heidegger, the philosopher-prophet of contemporary Nazi anti-Semitism. “If Martin Heidegger pokes reed in the sandbank of the ‘naught’ and of melancholy”, this early essay reads, “so then this doctrine too bears something from the depth of hell. And from the Schopenhauerean plane it draws the roar of the predatory beast, which is its voice”. Here, it should be noted, Zemach argues against the position he is advocating now, namely, the distinction between Heidegger’s thought and political conduct. Zemach’s statement to Klostermann regarding his overall disinterest in Heidegger’s past thus probably reflects his desire to assure that his essay is published more than his actual view on the matter.

Evidently, Zemach’s efforts bore fruit. On March 19, 1968 Heidegger penned a response and asked Klostermann to forward it to Zemach. To Klostermann Heidegger wrote: “Here is my letter to Prof. Zemach [...] I think you can agree; of course there would be still much to be said about it, but I have always refused to get myself engaged in a polemic [*aber ich habe es ja immer abgelehnt, mich auf eine Polemik einzulassen*].” Referring to his most faithful defender (alongside Jean Beaufret), François Fédier, Heidegger added: “I had repeatedly asked Fédier not to deal with the matter, but did not want oppose his sincere desire to put things straight [*zur Richtigstellung*].” It appears that Heidegger had decided to approve Zemach’s addition *against* Klostermann’s advice. This is adduced from Klostermann’s letter to Heidegger from March 21, 1968, where he confirms that the letter to Zemach has been forwarded, adding: “Mr. Friedrich, however, was, as I myself, for the alternative: either the printing of the text without the addition or the renunciation of the publication in Israel”.³⁰

In the note he attached to Heidegger’s reply to Zemach, Klostermann wrote: “I have sent your forward for ‘The Origin of the Work of Art’ to Professor Heidegger. He has addressed your position in a letter. I add this letter to mine”. He sealed the letter with a suggestive comment: “How you want to use Professor Heidegger’s remarks is your decision.”³¹ Heidegger’s letter is brought here in full.

“Dear Herr. Zemach,

Through my publisher V. Klostermann, I received your letter to the publisher and the extract about your text of the Hebrew translation of my essay ‘The Origin of the Work of Art’; which was presented in 1935 and 1936 in Freiburg and Frankfurt.

I must certainly take a position with regards to one point in your text. From the lecture ‘Introduction to Metaphysics’ which was delivered in 1935 and published verbatim in 1953, time and again one sentence, from p. 152, is picked out and the entire lecture is passed over, from which it is evident

³⁰ “Mr. Friedrich” is probably the Romanist Hugo Friedrich (1904-1978), who was close to the Verlag.

³¹ Klostermann to Zemach, March 20 1968. SZA 14167/1.

that my position toward National Socialism was already at the time clearly adversarial [*gegnerisch*]. The attentive listeners of this lecture have hence grasped how the sentence should be understood. Only the informers of the party [*die Spitzel der Partei*] who – as I knew – sat in my lectures, understood the sentence differently, as they should have. One must throw these men a crumb [*einen Brocken*] here and there in order to preserve the freedom of teaching and speech.

Parenthetically, it should be noted that it is a great mistake [to think that] I am against technology (cf. ‘Die Frage nach der Technik’, *Vorträge und Aufsätze* 1953).

Finally, I would like to refer you to my Nietzsche lectures from 1936-1940, which every listener has clearly understood as a fundamentally critical engagement with National Socialism.

I would be glad if your text would be brought as an epilogue, as has been done by Prof. Gadamer in the special edition of ‘The Origin of the Work of Art’ (Reclam’s Universal-library 8446/47).

It is my wish to thank you for the interest you take in my philosophical work and for the effort of translation, in order to make a treatise of mine known to the younger generation of your people [*Ihres Volkes*].

With the best wishes on your ongoing work, I cordially greet you

(signed) Martin Heidegger³²

Brought here to the best of my knowledge for the first time in English, this letter has received little scholarly attention thus far perhaps due to the lack of knowledge of its context. The letter does appear in volume 40 of Heidegger’s *Gesamtausgabe* as part of the editor’s *Nachwort* on the scandalous passage of “inner truth and greatness” of the movement of National Socialism in Heidegger’s 1935 *Introduction to Metaphysics*.³³ But no information is provided either regarding the identity of Zemach or the context within which the letter was composed.³⁴ The opening and two closing paragraphs of the letter, in which the context is disclosed, are omitted.³⁵ It is instead introduced blithely: “On March 18, 1968 Heidegger wrote a letter to

³² Heidegger to Zemach, March 18, 1968. SZA 52 14162/1. In Heidegger’s famous letter to Herbert Marcuse, he reiterates the view that the Gestapo sat in his lectures. “Herbert Marcuse and Martin Heidegger: An Exchange of Letters”; “Heidegger’s Politics: An Interview with Herbert Marcuse by Fredrick Olafson”. And see also Heidegger’s more elaborate account of those times in Heidegger, “The Rectorate 1933/34: Facts and Thoughts”.

³³ On the peculiar editorial history of this passage, see Tom Rockmore, *On Heidegger’s Nazism and Philosophy* 239-240; Otto Pöggler, *Martin Heidegger’s Path of Thinking*, 278; Julia A. Ireland’s “Naming Φύσις and the ‘Inner Truth of National Socialism’: A New Archival Discovery”.

³⁴ Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe*, 40, 233. Heidegger’s letter to the editor of *Die Zeit* is reprinted here.

³⁵ “Sehr geehrter Herr Zemach, durch meinen Verleger V. Klostermann erhielt ich Ihr Schreiben an den Verlag und den Ausschnitt Ihres Textes zu der hebräischen Übersetzung meiner Abhandlung “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerks”; deren Text wurde 1935 und 1936 in Freiburg und Frankfurt vorgetragen [...] Es wäre mir lieb, wenn Sie Ihren Text

Herrn S. Zemach in Jerusalem”. The *Gesamtausgabe* version gives the impression that a mysterious person from Jerusalem requested some clarification regarding the perplexing passage from *Introduction to Metaphysics*. But as we now know, this is not the case. In fact, Heidegger here is discussing his Nazi past with a Jew who, to some extent, is consulting with him how to present this episode to a Jewish readership. Did Heidegger write the letter for Zemach’s eyes only, or did he intend it to be eventually published as an official statement regarding his actions under the Nazi regime? This, after all, was Heidegger’s opportunity to address his Nazi affiliation directly, and specifically to Jews. However, what is noteworthy about this letter is what is missing from it: It is, like other recorded expressions of Heidegger’s ‘official position’ on the topic, a self-justifying document that lacks remorse or readiness to take responsibility for his support of Hitler. Indeed, we are presented here with another case – along with Marcuse, Arendt, Jonas, Celan, and in a certain respect also Buber - in which Heidegger is confronted (or expected to confront) with his Nazi past by a Jewish intellectual after the war. And like these more familiar examples, this one too is marked by evasion. The letter holds only an implicit yet unarticulated claim that his support of Hitler was swift, and an expression of annoyance over the continued disturbance over the notorious sentence. Heidegger even dons the mantle of victimhood by noting that he was forced under the scrutinizing eye of Nazi informers to employ circumspection in his lectures. But particularly striking is that the only instance where Heidegger, indirectly, refers to the Jews, the readership of Zemach’s discussed essay and translation, is in his final sentence, “your Volk”. This is a confusing utterance, first, precisely because there is nothing specific about it, second, because *Volk* is a sensitive word in this context, and third, because only a few decades earlier Heidegger all but deprived the Jews of the title.³⁶

This means that this letter should not be read, as per *Gesamtausgabe*, as pertaining to the limited context of the problematic passage of p. 152, but as Heidegger’s correction of specific elements of Zemach’s presentation of his ties with Nazism, and consequently, as Heidegger’s implied approval of the rest of the essay’s content. Indeed, this is precisely how Zemach understood it. In his diary he recorded: “regarding Heidegger’s Nazi episode – the issue reached Heidegger himself to make the decision. And not only did he not oppose what I wrote, but he even sent me a letter with a reservation concerning one argument against

als Nachwort brächten, so wie das auch durch Prof Gadamer in der Sonderausgabe von “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerks” (Reclams Universalbibliothek 8446/47) geschehen ist. Es ist mir ein Bedürfnis, Ihnen zu danken für das Interesse, das Sie an meinen philosophischen Arbeiten nehmen und für die Mühe der Übersetzung, um eine Abhandlung von mir der jüngeren Generation Ihres Volkes bekannt zu machen. Mit den besten Wünschen für Ihre weitere Arbeit grüsse ich Freundlich. (signed) Martin Heidegger”. Charles Bambach offers one of the rare and brief mentions of the letter by “Stefan Zemach” in scholarship. I found no occasion in the correspondence in which Zemach signs his name as anything other than ‘S. Zemach’. See Bambach’s *Heidegger’s Roots: Nietzsche, National Socialism, and the Greeks*, 268. Another passing mention is in Rockmore, *On Heidegger’s Nazism*, 269. Neither are aware of the context of the letter.

³⁶ Heidegger, *Nature, History, State, 1933-1934*, 56.

him”.³⁷ In other words, Zemach’s introduction (or at least its German version), with these minor but very specific reservations, should be considered as another personal testimony of Heidegger regarding his Nazi involvement.³⁸ Of course, as hinted by Heidegger’s reference to Gadamer, this letter was written amidst a wave of investigations and accusations against his political affiliation in the time of Hitler.³⁹ We can therefore suggest that Heidegger’s request that the essay be published as an afterword demonstrates his understanding that dealing with the issue was unavoidable.

Heidegger’s letter to Zemach should be situated within a wider context of other contemporaneous initiatives concerning contacts between Heidegger and Jewish-Israeli intellectuals. A few years earlier, in 1957, a meeting between Heidegger and Martin Buber was arranged as part of a conference on ‘Language’ they agreed to organize together.⁴⁰ In 1969, shortly after the communication with Zemach, Gadamer, who “used the encounter between Buber and H. as an encouraging precedent”, offered Gershom Scholem to meet with Heidegger. Reporting to an inquiring Emil Fackenheim, Scholem wrote: “I can’t say anything more than this. My refusal to accept Gadamer’s invitation can be traced to the fact that I would have been incapable of conducting a discussion with H. without every second being reminded of his past, and of course without directly raising the issue. It should be clear to everyone that this would have been senseless and would have led to the immediate interruption of the discussion”.⁴¹ The letter to Zemach is the only direct communication with a Jewish-Israeli intellectual that I am aware of; communication with both Scholem and Buber were indirect, through third parties.

While Heidegger approved Zemach’s essay on his ties with the Nazis, this essay has a telling history of modifications and corrections. The archival material reveals no less than five versions. The first, a handwritten draft in Hebrew; the second, a typed draft in Hebrew; the third, the translation into German for Klostermann and Heidegger; the fourth, a restructured and reformulated handwritten draft in Hebrew in light of Heidegger’s response; and the fifth, final, published Hebrew version.⁴² The various drafts record Zemach’s own dilemmas and struggles vis-à-vis Heidegger’s Nazism. Unsurprisingly, of the three sections

³⁷ See entry of August 18, 1968 in Zemach, *Diaries*, 246.

³⁸ See note 41 above; his “Only A God Can Save Us” interview for *Der Spiegel*, in English in *The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader*.

³⁹ Concurrently, prompted by a review in *Der Spiegel* no. 7 February 7, 1966 on his ties to the Nazis, Heidegger agreed to give the interview to *Der Spiegel* that will be published posthumously. See also Holger Zaborowski, ‘*Eine Frage von Irre und Schuld?*’ *Martin Heidegger und Nationalsozialismus*.

⁴⁰ Heidegger’s “Der Weg zur Sprache” and Buber’s “Das Wort, das gesprochen wird” were composed for this conference. On this episode, see Paul Mendes-Flohr, “Martin Buber and Martin Heidegger in Dialogue”.

⁴¹ In *Gershom Scholem: A Life in Letters, 1914-1982*, edited and translated by Anthony David Skinner (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 2002) 476.

⁴² The German version is entitled “Vorwort des Übersetzer (S. Zemach), An den hebräischen Leser”. There are only insignificant differences between the fourth and fifth versions. The drafts are found in the ‘Miscellaneous’ file in Zemach’s papers, call number 52.

of the essay it is the section dedicated to Heidegger's Nazi episode that is subjected to substantial alterations. The most significant of these is evident in the German and the following versions. As will become immediately clear, Zemach patched up some passages in the German version, minimizing the accusations against Heidegger in content and tone, in order to present an account more appealing to Heidegger. His personal notes convey the suspension over the fate of his piece and more generally, a sense of caution and wariness hovers over his communication with Klostermann, which he claimed "required prudence in formulating the letters".⁴³ This is not to say that the document sent to Klostermann and Heidegger does not manifest a high resemblance to the Hebrew original and remained a poignant document. Moreover, it is important to emphasize that it is the approved, moderated version that ultimately became the basis for the published version. And yet it is clear that the version that Heidegger approved had been significantly altered from the version Zemach had planned to publish. And perhaps more importantly, some of the more accusatory passages that had been omitted from the draft sent to Heidegger found their way, after its approval, back to the version that was ultimately presented to the Israeli public. I now turn to present some noteworthy changes in various drafts connected to Heidegger's Nazi episode.

1. The first handwritten draft begins immediately with Heidegger's Nazism, stating that "his philosophical doctrine, that has completely taken over today's world, does not cover up an obscene act which is unattonable. The more his contemplative paths are respected in our eyes, the more severe is his sin and crime". In the second Hebrew version as well as in the German translation, his "sin and crime" becomes "error" [*Irrtum, taut*]. This phrasing is retained in the published version. Moreover, in the German version, preceding this, Zemach adds an introductory paragraph drawing on Professor Julius Guttmann's praise of the importance of Heidegger's existentialist philosophy.⁴⁴ In concert, Zemach affirms: "this is also what I hold in relation to Heidegger's teachings on beauty. For me Heidegger's position is authoritative" [*für mich massgebend*]. The published version has "Heidegger is authoritative" without the personal attribution.
2. Describing the events of 1933, Zemach wrote in the first version: "And thus came the damned year of 1933. Hitler and his gang came to power and established the Nazi regime. Heidegger joined them in Freiburg and publicly announced his complete agreement with the Nazis' ideas and even explained how they are a necessary conclusion from his main principles." Already in the typed draft "Hitler and his gang" became "the Nazis" and the sentence announcing the necessary relation between Heidegger's philosophy and Nazism is crossed out by pen. In the German version sent to Klostermann and Heidegger it is written: "the retched year of 1933 came. National Socialism came

⁴³ Entry of January 16, 1969, in Zemach, *Diaries*, 253.

⁴⁴ See note 14.

to power, and Heidegger publicly declared his agreement [*Zustimmung*] with the fundamental thought of National Socialism". The crossed out sentence regarding the agreement of his philosophical system with the ideas of Nazism reappears in the published version.

3. In the earliest version, Zemach simply maintained that "I would like to present before the reader the Nazi episode of Martin Heidegger". In the typed version: "with the rise of the Nazis this philosopher succumbed to Hitler. Thus I see myself obligated to present to the Hebrew reader this episode and discuss it at the outset". In the German version sent to Klostermann and Heidegger, there are important qualifications: "As known, with the rise of the National Socialist movement the philosopher committed the mistake and in the beginning gave his moral support to this movement." Zemach also adds that he attends to this episode "to prevent its distortion by other parties". Now the 'episode' receives a somewhat acquitting judgment ("the mistake"), its purported duration is limited ("in the beginning"), and the benefit and necessity of the discussion is stressed ("to prevent its distortion"). The published version omits these reservations and returns to a formulation resembling the earlier typed draft.
4. In the first Hebrew draft, there are two paragraphs on Heidegger's relation to Husserl. The first describes their philosophical relations, maintaining that Heidegger was the brilliant student of Husserl who eventually blazed his own path in phenomenological research. Yet Husserl's hope to remain close to his rebellious student, it is stated, "only caused him grief". The second paragraph portrays their personal relation under Nazi rule: "The situation became such that when the new rulers began to harass the old and sick Husserl, Heidegger did nothing in his aid and did not persuade the persecutors to leave his teacher and mentor alone", Zemach described. "If it were not for some faithful friends who helped Husserl out of Germany and transported him secretly to a monastery in Belgium", the paragraph continues, "he surely would not have died a natural death; certainly his soul would have departed in one of the extermination camps in Germany". In all following versions, the entire damning paragraph of Heidegger's neglect and mistreatment of Husserl is deleted, perhaps due to its serious historical inaccuracies.⁴⁵ In its stead, already in the typed Hebrew version, the rather exonerating account of the course of events with respect to Heidegger and the party between 1933 and 1934 by Fédier is added. In the German account, Zemach also added a letter by Prof. Walter Biemal, cited by Fédier, describing Heidegger's unambiguous opposition to the Nazis in the 1940s. Both additions were eventually published.

⁴⁵ This is a terrible confusion with the story of the smuggling of Husserl's writings out of Nazi Germany to Belgium in 1939 by the Franciscan priest Herman Van Breda. Husserl in fact died at Freiburg on April 27, 1938 (Heidegger did not attend the funeral). See H. L. Van Breda, "The Rescue of Husserl's Nachlass and the Founding of the Husserl Archives", translated by David Ulrichs and Basil Vassilicos, *Geschichte des Husserl-Archivs/History of the Husserl-Archiv* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), 39-69. Similarly, there were no death camps on German soil.

5. The following passages, which appeared in the first and second draft, disappears in the German translation, as well as in the final published version: “It seems that still in 1935 Heidegger was a follower of Hitlerism. In his lectures ‘Introduction to Metaphysics’ he still praises ‘National Socialism’. After that he probably began to have doubts. In any event he distanced himself and took a vow of silence, as if he admitted to his mistake through this silence.”
6. In the earliest draft, Zemach praises “some German intellectuals who did not forgive Heidegger for his fellowship with Nazism and demanded him to admit to his mistake and publicly publish his regrets.” He then cites the known article by Jürgen Habermas from *Die Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, where he complained about the retainment of the controversial passage about the ‘inner truth and greatness’ of the National Socialist movement and announces: “It is time we think with Heidegger against Heidegger’.”⁴⁶ Zemach concludes by stating: “And if this is the view of his own people, how could we think otherwise?”. He also claims that “Heidegger’s despised deeds are evident and we should not mitigate their judgment. And yet his philosophy cannot be disregarded and one cannot deprive himself from it”. This paragraph is still extant in the typed Hebrew draft, but is missing in its entirety in the German edition and the published version, except for the sentence on the inability to disregard Heidegger’s thought and a somewhat detached explanation of what is meant by thinking with and against Heidegger. In place of the omitted paragraph, Zemach inserted Heidegger’s letter to him.
7. After bringing Fédier’s exempting version in the German account sent to Germany, Zemach draws on Jean Wahl’s discussion in his *Vers la fin del’Ontologie: Etude sur l’Introduction dans la Metaphysique par Heidegger* of “page 152, which is very saddening to anyone who admires Heidegger’s philosophy”. Introducing this, Zemach writes: “but a testimony must still be noted here, that, at least in its external appearance, speaks against Heidegger”. The qualification – “at least in its external appearance” is added into the German version, but disappears in the published account. There he writes “I cannot make a conclusive judgment regarding these matters, but it is my duty to present an additional adversary testimony against Heidegger”. Also added in the German account is a previously absent citation from Wahl’s suggestion that by linking Nazism to planetary technology as he does, Heidegger is in fact criticizing National Socialism in the controversial passage.

Heidegger, therefore, approved the version of Zemach’s essay that was sent to him, although it is doubtful whether he would have agreed to the final version that was published. At the same time, the interchange

⁴⁶ Habermas, “Mit Heidegger gegen Heideggers Denken: Zur Veröffentlichung von Vorlesungen aus dem Jahre 1935”. Christian E. Lewalter defended Heidegger in an article published the following month in *Die Zeit*, and Heidegger himself wrote to the editor of *Die Zeit* as well. See “Heidegger über Heidegger”.

with Klostermann and Heidegger had a direct effect on the way Heidegger's Nazi affair was offered to the Israeli public.⁴⁷

It is worth mentioning in passing that about a year earlier, Paul Celan met with Heidegger in his hut in Todtnauberg, "mit einer Hoffnung auf ein kommendes Wort im Herzen". While Celan's reactions to this meeting were somewhat equivocal, Zemach reacted to the personal letter from the world-renowned philosopher, which was also the first direct communication with him, with delight. And despite its evasive nature, he decided to amend his essay once more in its wake. He quickly penned a reply and sent it to Klostermann, who was asked to forward it to Heidegger.⁴⁸ Klostermann forwarded the letter to Heidegger on April 4, 1968, writing: "I forward to you now the letter Prof. Zemach addressed to you, and I believe that with it the question of the afterward has found a satisfactory settlement". In his reply to Zemach he granted: "I hope that herewith all is well and I wish your edition good success".⁴⁹ To Heidegger Zemach wrote that he was "particularly pleased about the clarification regarding Prof. Wahl and other inaccurate gassed-up [*aufgegassten*] sentences from p. 152 of your book *Einführung in die Metaphysik*", because "your explanation removes any doubt regarding the intent of this point - as the 1935 lecture, which is recited in the book word for word, also contains an obvious rejection of the back-then prevailing forces." He then promises to "point to Prof. Wahl's mistaken view" in the now-afterword (which, in fact, he did not do, publishing these passages unaltered). Signing off the letter, Zemach wrote: "may I express my wholehearted thanks to you, dear Herr Professor Heidegger, for your addressing the questions dealt with by my remarks, and for the kind words that you have devoted to my work of translation in your letter."⁵⁰

Recognizing the importance of a document in which Heidegger explicitly addresses his notorious political involvement, Zemach chose to consult Shmuel Hugo Bergmann on the matter. He sent Bergmann a copy of Heidegger's letter and recounted the unfolding events, noting that Heidegger's publisher "panicked" upon hearing his intention to write about "the Nazi episode of the author". He wishes to consult, however,

⁴⁷ Zemach's grandson, Yurik (Yoram) Verte, who as a teenager spent the summer of 1966 at his grandparents and with whom I spoke in preparation of this essay, clearly recalls conversations he held with his grandfather on translating Heidegger and on the letter. He recalls taunting his grandfather, "he took advantage of you!" to which Zemach responded, offended, "I'm warning you!". Zemach's daughter, Ada Zemach, a renowned literary critic, felt that her father did not actually come to terms with Heidegger in his afterword, and wrote an (unpublished) essay in Hebrew entitled "Three Professors and One Van Gogh", analyzing Heidegger's *Origins* and his Nazism through a constructive discourse with the famous critiques of Meyer Schapiro and Jacques Derrida. I would like to thank Yurik for the informative conversation on April 25, 2016, for Ada Zemach's unpublished essay, and for some comments on an earlier draft of the present article pertaining to Zemach's biography. I would also like to thank Michael Roubach for connecting me with Zemach's family.

⁴⁸ Zemach to Klostermann, March 31, 1968, SZA 52 14156/1.

⁴⁹ Klostermann to Zemach, April 4, 1968, SZA 14168/1.

⁵⁰ Zemach to Heidegger, March 31, 1968. SZA 52 14151/1.

about what to do with Heidegger's letter. He had planned to publish the parts about the 'Introduction to Metaphysics' passage, but "a few of my friends demanded that I to publish the entire letter word by word, since it is an 'important document', for it is known that Heidegger did not deny his Nazi affair and remained silent the entire time. Here he explicitly announces that he opposed the Nazis and it is said that this is the first document of the sort". He also added: "P.S. The publisher wrote me; "wie sie die Bemerkung von Professor Heidegger verwenden wollen, ist Ihr Entscheidung". According to this it seems that I am allowed to do with this letter as I wish."⁵¹ Bergmann's reply arrived shortly after, thanking for the letter and noting that "the facts were known to me. I don't remember if I learned them from a similar letter from Heidegger himself or from things that were published by his friends at his request". He advised to publish the letter in German and in Hebrew translation in the beginning of the book, adding, interestingly, "it seems that this was Heidegger's intention when he wrote the letter."⁵² To Bartini Zemach bragged about the significance of the letter, both as a contribution to understanding Heidegger's relation to the Nazi party and as a pertinent document for present-day political issues. "It is said that this is the first document [by Heidegger] appearing publicly that states that its author opposes Nazism, and that he had done so already in 1935", he declared. "In these days, as the neo-Nazis are on the rise in western-Germany there is importance, so they say, in an outspoken declaration of this sort from an influential figure such as Heidegger."⁵³

Towards the end of 1968, the Hebrew translation of Heidegger's *Origin* finally appeared in print as a slim booklet of ninety-five pages.⁵⁴ Zemach's supplementary essay was placed, as promised, as an afterword.⁵⁵ Heidegger's letter is cited in full, in Hebrew and German side by side, although not in the beginning of the book, as Bergmann advised, but as part of the afterword essay. Upon publication, Zemach wrote to Klostermann to inform him of the occasion. "Meanwhile", Zemach added, "I am sending you by airmail the personally designated enclosed copy for Professor Heidegger together with the also enclosed accompanied letter."⁵⁶ On December 6, 1968, Michael Klostermann, on behalf of Vittorio his father, confirmed- "letter and book have been forwarded to Professor Heidegger".⁵⁷ In the letter Zemach detailed a synopsis outlining every section of the work, and he also reported to Heidegger what he has decided to do with his letter: "Because the letter you kindly sent my way in March of this year is a document of

⁵¹ Zemach to Bergmann April 12, 1968. Bergmann's archive, ARC. 4* 1502 01 2409, National Library, Jerusalem.

⁵² Bergmann to Zemach April 17, 1968, *ibid.*

⁵³ Zemach to Bartini May 8, 1968. ABA 162 65438-a.

⁵⁴ Devir publishing house has switched ownership a number of times since the described episode. Responding to my inquiry, the current company claims to hold no archive or past records. Thus any documents from these negotiations, which would perhaps shed some light on the publisher's point of view of Heidegger's potential readership in Israel, are unfortunately unattainable.

⁵⁵ Republished as "Heidegger U'fniyato" [Heidegger and his Turn], 65-76.

⁵⁶ Zemach to Klostermann, October 1, 1968.

⁵⁷ Michael Klostermann to Zemach, December 6, 1968. SZA 14169/1.

significance for me, and your publisher left the usage of the letter to my discretion, I have taken the liberty of printing the letter's complete text in German and in Hebrew in the appendix." After conveying a few other matters, the letter end as follows: "It is my desire to conclude this letter to you, very respected Professor Heidegger, to express to you my sincere thanks for the permission to translate your treatise 'Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes' into Hebrew. With the expression of highest regards, and with kind wishes, yours S. Zemach".⁵⁸ Nearly three months later, Heidegger finally wrote back to Zemach:

"Dear Herr Dr. Zemach,

I apologize for replying so late to your kind letter with your remarks and thank you for the consignment of the translation.

Although I learned Hebrew at school and also later during my theological studies, [I have] unfortunately unlearned it in the meantime, so I cannot read your text. That is why your synopsis is important to me; it indicates that your translation is founded on real expertness.

I would like to thank you once again for your interest in my work and for your efforts with the translation, through which my essay has become known to a wider circle of philosophically interested people. With kind regards and best wishes for your wellbeing and future work,

(signed) Martin Heidegger"⁵⁹

The arrival of this letter, which invites at least a partial revision of some scholars' assumptions regarding Heidegger's complete ignorance of Hebrew and the Hebrew Scriptures, was of much relief to Zemach, who until then had no indication that his book had safely reached Heidegger.⁶⁰ "The profound burden that distressed me the entire time, that Heidegger did not confirm receiving my small book – was finally relieved

⁵⁸ Zemach to Heidegger, October 1, 1968, SZA 52 14152/1.

⁵⁹ Heidegger to Zemach, January 5, 1969. SZA 52 14163/1. "Sehr geehrter Herr Dr. Zemach, ich bitte sehr um Entschuldigung, dass ich so spät Ihren freundlichen Brief mit seinen Erläuterungen beantworte und für die Zusendung der Übersetzung danke. Zwar habe ich am Gymnasium und später während meines theologischen Studiums das Hebräische gelernt, aber inzwischen leider auch wieder verlernt, so dass ich Ihren Text nicht lesen kann. Darum ist mir Ihre Inhaltsangabe wichtig; sie deutet darauf, dass Ihre Übersetzung auf ein echtes Sachverständnis gegründet ist. Ich möchte Ihnen noch einmal danken für Ihr Interesse an meinen Arbeiten und für Ihre Mühewaltung bei der Übersetzung, durch welche meine Abhandlung einem weiteren Kreis philosophisch interessierter Menschen bekannt geworden ist. Mit freundlichen Grüßen und den besten Wünschen für Ihr Wohlergehen und Ihre weitere Arbeiten. (signed) Martin Heidegger"

⁶⁰ For example, John Caputo states that Heidegger "knew next to nothing in a direct way about the Hebrew scriptures [...] He did not read Hebrew, and when he studied theology, he confined himself to the Greek New Testament". John D. Caputo, "People of god, People of Being: The Theological Presuppositions of Heidegger's Path of Thinking", 95.

yesterday”, he reported in his diary, where he translated Heidegger’s reply to Hebrew. “Now this episode is completed and it won’t bother me anymore”.⁶¹

Part II

Translation as Reconciliation?

The translation and publication of a work of philosophy is not usually an event warranting special attention. Yet translating *Heidegger* into *Hebrew*, after the holocaust, for an overwhelmingly Jewish readership, is no doubt a charged event. Zemach’s translation and particularly his essay with Heidegger’s letter had an important effect on the way Heidegger’s philosophy and the ‘Heidegger controversy’ was presented to the Israeli public. After all, not only did it make accessible an original piece of the philosopher’s writings, it also constituted the most updated account of Heidegger’s ties to the Nazis presented in Hebrew. Examining the responses to it provides a view into Heidegger’s reception among Jews in the tumultuous times after the holocaust, and it also sheds light on an unknown offshoot of ‘the second wave’ of *l’affaire Heidegger* that rampaged chiefly in France. As we shall see, some of the rumors and misinformation that circulated at the time informed the Israeli moment as well. In my survey of the spectrum of views concerning Heidegger’s philosophy, his politics, and the relations between them, I will focus on the theme of translating Heidegger into *Hebrew*, perceived both as the language of the Jews and as the holy language. I argue that an important element of the responses to Heidegger here extended beyond the realm of the politico-philosophical, in which questions such as ‘Was he a Nazi?’, or ‘Is his philosophy infected by fascism?’ are discussed, and signaled toward what can be considered the theological realm, in which questions regarding the desecration that may result from translating the thoughts of a Nazi collaborator into the holy language, are raised. What emerges is also a concealed debate over the very essence of translation as a semantic, intellectual, but also *moral*, endeavor. The implications of the possible moral ties between translation and reconciliation thus come to the fore.

Zemach sent a copy of the translation to a few friends and colleagues, who found it to be a significant contribution to the cultural and intellectual environment in Israel. Dr. Gideon Katzanelson (1914-1989), Zemach’s younger friend and short-termed faculty member of the department of Literature in Tel Aviv University, extolled him for his literary achievement. “To present to the Hebrew reader a small portion from Heidegger’s thought – in your translation, style, and with your comment”, Katzanelson wrote, “it is no doubt a big matter in itself.”⁶² Avraham Shapira (born 1935), then a professor of Jewish Philosophy and

⁶¹ Entry of January 25, in Zemach, *Diaries*, 255.

⁶² Gideon Katzanelson to Zemach, May 25, 1968. SZA 14101/1.

History at Tel Aviv University, thanked Zemach for the “new and important book which you are granting the Hebrew reader”, and added, “after I heard from you about the effort of the translation and about all that was involved in adding your supplements and explanations to the book, I’ll read it with excessive interest”.⁶³ Yisrael Cohen (1905-1986), an author and literary critic, also praised Zemach upon receiving a copy,⁶⁴ as did Prof. Joseph Weiss from University College London, who noted: “I did not see this work by Heidegger in the original, although almost all his works are on my library shelves – and thus your gift will expand my general education and I thank you for that in particular”.⁶⁵

Appropriately, Heidegger’s letter to Zemach attracted special attention in the wider public, eliciting a dual reaction: it was either perceived as a confirmation of Heidegger’s minimal and short-termed association with the Nazis, or taken as a suspicious attempt to minimize and even vindicate a more sinister political commitment. In the *Moznaim* volume of January 1969, for example, Reuben Rabinovitch published an essay entitled “Heidegger’s Account of Aesthetics” on *Origin*, in which the description of Heidegger’s Nazis episode is impacted by (and mentions) Heidegger’s letter, and the citations from the essay are taken from Zemach’s translation.⁶⁶ Also recognizing the importance of Heidegger’s letter for determining the end date of his affiliation with Nazism, the literary critic Yoram Bronowski, in a review of the translation, asks: “does this episode, which is insufficiently clear, derive from his philosophy?”. His reply is unambiguous: “we can answer confidently: in its essential points, it does not derive, does not touch, does not deal [with it]”.⁶⁷ For Rabinovich and Bronowski the appearance of Heidegger’s work in Hebrew was an event of intellectual and cultural significance. His Nazism has nothing to do with his philosophy, and thus the question of rehabilitation is extraneous and unrelated. Another reviewer, Alexander Barzel, disagreed. In a long review essay entitled “Art and Truth in Heidegger’s Thought”, he admitted that the younger Israeli generation was “enriched now by one of the most interesting and thought provoking works of thought”, although he was deeply critical of the translation itself - “I consulted the original in order to understand the translation”, he wrote spitefully.⁶⁸ “The old German philosopher, whose work is presented now to the Hebrew reader, could serve as an awkward allegory for the horrors of this century, in the time of western

⁶³ Postcard from Avraham Shapira to Zemach September 29, 1968, SZA 14133/1. I would like to thank Prof. Shapira for the valuable information he provided me in our numerous communications about Heidegger’s reception in Israel, and to his wife Iris who facilitated this communication through her knowledge of the medium of email.

⁶⁴ Entry from October 5, 1968 in Zemach, *Diaries*, 249.

⁶⁵ Joseph Weiss to Zemach November 18, 1968, SZA 14039/1.

⁶⁶ Reuben Rabinovitch, “Mishnato Ha’Estetit Shel Heidegger” [Heidegger’s Account of Aesthetics], 132-134. This is repeated in another article from that year. Rabinovitch, “The Origin of the Work of Art’ According to Heidegger: At the Margins of the Hebrew Edition Translated by Zemach”, 27.

⁶⁷ Yoram Bronowski, “Hamilim Hahoshvot” [The Thinking Words], 6.

⁶⁸ Barzel, “Art and Truth in Heidegger’s Thought”, 19.

civilization's throes". Commenting on the contemporary public debate, Barzel contended: "certainly we should not be deterred from directly engaging with the thought of this man [...] We are strong enough to listen also to the views of our haters and wrongdoers – Heidegger was not the first and will not be the last in this frenzy-coursed world." Heidegger's letter, a "barely-apologetic response regarding his failed actions in time of trial", changed nothing of this judgment. In the wake of this review, Zemach dashed off an angry letter to Barzel, who replied by furthering his critique and contesting Zemach's decision to translate the term *Sein* at all. "I do not share your conviction that there is reason to change it to a different term, which, in my view, does not capture it correctly."⁶⁹ Barzel felt in position to pass judgment because he himself had experienced translating sections of *Sein und Zeit* for a philosophy seminar on time in Tel Aviv University led by Dr. Meshulam Groll.⁷⁰ It is noteworthy that unlike Zemach's, in Barzel's translation, 'Dasein' is rendered by the biblically resonant 'hinenut', encompassing the imports of existing-here, readiness and responsiveness.

It is clear from Barzel's comments that translating Heidegger was merely the transmission of ideas from one language to the other – whether it was Hebrew or any other language mattered little - and implied nothing regarding a reconciliatory attitude toward the philosopher. Zemach, it seems, held a similar view. When he wrote of "the difficulty of translating [Heidegger's essay] into Hebrew", he was referring to the burden of transferring the philosopher's dense and idiosyncratic German to a different language. And yet, as noted, for 'technical' reasons, he believed Hebrew was in some way privileged in capturing the intricacies of Heidegger's thoughts. Interestingly, Zemach occasionally drew lines from Heidegger's thought to his own Jewish heritage. For example, in his brief overture of Heidegger's belief in the superiority of the German language, Zemach observed that "it seems that Heidegger believes that the world was created by the German [*Ashkenaz*] language, and any change in German speech immediately generates a change in human fate and world order". However, he continued, "for us Hebrews [*beney-Ever*], it is well known that if there was a language with which the Creator created his world – it would have been the holy tongue [*lashon hakodesh*]"! (MMH 72). Zemach also explains and justifies some choices of translation by resorting to the traditional Jewish lore. Verses from Psalms, Jerimiah and Isaiah as well as passages from various rabbinic tractates are evoked to legitimize some oddities in his Hebrew formulations.⁷¹ For example, *aletheia*, which Heidegger often renders as *das Unverborgene*, is translated as 'that which does not hide' [*she'eyno mistater*], employing the root *str*. In a draft Zemach explains his translation by drawing on Isaiah 45:15 - "You are a God who hides Himself [*El mistater*]" – claiming that unconcealment in Heidegger's account is similar to the hiding and revealing character of God as depicted in this verse. Likewise, Zemach

⁶⁹ Barzel to Zemach February 8, 1969.

⁷⁰ Heidegger, *Al Ha'Zman: Mesifro Sein und Zeit* [On Time: From his Book *Sein und Zeit*].

⁷¹ This is similarly found in his diary. See both entries from June 9, 1967 in Zemach, *Diaries*, 222.

explains Heidegger's image of the forest clearing [*Lichtung*], which he translates *Mahsof*, (something exposed, made bare, root *hsf*), by resorting to Psalms 29:9, "The voice of the Lord makes the deer to calve and strips the forests bare" [*va'yahsof Yearot*].

Others, however, noted the specific complication of putting Heidegger's thought into Hebrew. Gavriel Moked, a known literary critic, praised Zemach's translation as "a mighty achievement", but found it difficult to respond to Heidegger on purely intellectual grounds.⁷² "When considering Heidegger's essay in Hebrew, we are not exempt from doubts that arise from the memory of the philosopher's Nazi past", he insisted. Moked noticed that "also the publishers and the translator thought of this past, as indicated by the correspondence between Heidegger and S. Zemach". He, too, was hardly convinced by Heidegger's letter, as he observed that "Heidegger tries, of course, to downplay the significance of the affair in his life". For Moked, the fundamental issue is this: "It is one thing to read his work for the sake of study, in the original and in a translation to another language – but it is another thing to 'own it', adorned by the language of the Bible and the Mishna. I do not know what the decree of this moral (and aesthetic) judgment should be in a case like this". He therefore acknowledged the importance of Heidegger's philosophy and accepted that translation does not necessarily entail intention towards rehabilitation. Indeed, one can greatly benefit intellectually from studying Heidegger in any other language. But having the ideas of the philosopher tainted with Nazism in the language of "the Bible and the Mishna" – *this* gives reason for recoil.⁷³ And note: the issue is not only that Hebrew is the language of the Jews, the victims of the Nazi death machine, but that it is the holy language, of which Heidegger's philosophy is unworthy. Despite its prominence, then, Heidegger's philosophy is not to be clothed by the Hebrew language.

A reminiscent argument was made, in an exceedingly blunter manner, by Johanan Arnon, a young right-wing revisionist and recent convert from Protestantism. Arnon found translating *Origin* a deplorable affirmation of Heidegger and a gesture of tolerance and forgiveness for the philosopher's unrepented sins. In acerbic cynicism he wrote: "What shall a philosopher or German writer who capitulated in the Nazi period do to best clear his good name and rectify his stained past? Should he try to deny everything? Burn all his documents from that period? Suddenly suffer from a bout of amnesia? No, there is something better than all this: he should find a Jew who publishes for his sake something or translates some of his writings into Hebrew and publishes the translation in the State of Israel. And when anyone will blame the philosopher for his dubious past, he would be able to smile a forgiving smile and say: 'what is wrong with

⁷² Moked, "Ontologya Shel Omanut" [Ontology of Art], 7-8.

⁷³ Similar rhetoric was invoked by the critic S.B Urbach in his harsh review of Israel Eldad's Nietzsche translations: "It required no little audacity to render the crazy reflections of Nietzsche in the language of the holy prophets". Quoted in Ohana, "From Right to Left", 385.

you, my friend, what are you talking about? For even the Jews in Israel published my writings in Hebrew translation". Finally abandoning the cynicism, Arnon mourned: "Who would have even imagined that "Jews" would go on and translate into their holy language books by collaborators of Hitler?"⁷⁴. To do so, he implied, is a desecration of the language. While only one passing statement is dedicated to the translation itself - "Zemach's translation is no doubt excellent" –the entire review is devoted to express dismay over its very appearance. It is also clear to him that in writing the letter to Zemach, "the philosopher seeks to clear his name". And in response to Heidegger's claim regarding the lip service to the party informers in his lectures, Arnon exclaimed: "Really? Perhaps there was also the option of keeping silent? Perhaps it was possible to leave the Third Reich, as the great philosopher Karl Jaspers and all the elite of German thought and letters had done? No. Mr. Heidegger did not leave; he caved." And to "the voices of the intelligentsia from central-Europe among us" - probably insinuating to the Prague-born Bergmann - who believe that "without the treasures of German thought, the spiritual life in Israel will collapse: 'he is a great philosopher, and that is what counts'", Arnon retorted emphatically: "No, gentlemen! He was a vile person [*naval*] then and is likely still so today. And despite the importance of his thinking and great contribution of spirit, this man failed as a human and even more so as a philosopher". Translating Heidegger to Hebrew is therefore "a slap in the face of the Hebrew reader", and if there is a desire to translate a contemporary German philosopher to Hebrew, "why is Karl Jaspers' powerful work not translated? [...] let us translate those who opposed Hitler and not collaborators!". For Arnon, the political and theological are one: translating Heidegger to Hebrew is despicable not only because it is the language of those who were the bitter victims of the party to which Heidegger pledged alliance, but because it is the "holy language" into which nothing by a Nazi collaborator is to be articulated.⁷⁵

Perhaps the most striking review of the translation was penned by Bergmann himself. Zemach specifically solicited this review, and in his response, Bergmann congratulated for an "important work" and for nobly handling the complexity vis-à-vis Heidegger. "As far as I can judge", he lauded, "you have dealt with the psychological tangle [*hatisbochet hapsychologit*] with dignity – dignity to yourself and dignity to Heidegger". He agreed to review the work and concluded his letter by saying, "we shall hope that your translation will be a blessing to both sides."⁷⁶ In their exchange, Zemach divulges to Bergmann his surprise upon receiving a letter from Heidegger. "I could not have known that Heidegger himself would write me", he intimated, "since the negotiation was with his publisher from Frankfurt throughout the entire time. And

⁷⁴ Arnon, "Martin Heidegger – Be'Ivrit?!" [Martin Heidegger – In Hebrew?!], 5. Double apostrophes on "Jews" in original.

⁷⁵ Zemach responds dismissively to Arnon's review in Zemach, *Diaries*, 271, April 3, 1970.

⁷⁶ Bergmann to Zemach November 10, 1968. Bergmann's archive, ARC. 4* 1502 01 2409.

after I received the letter I could not help but change around the order of things in my introduction in order to incorporate and give room for the letter”. However Zemach makes clear that “the changes are not significant – changes in phrasing but not in substance.”⁷⁷

Bergmann’s began his review, “Heidegger in Hebrew Garment”, with the following judgment: “It was no easy task that Zemach took on himself, and I speak here not of the language side of this translation, but of the political [side].”⁷⁸ Contextualizing Heidegger’s translation with the contemporary Israeli public discourse, he observed: “It is known how sensitive our Hebrew public is concerning artists who were, correctly or incorrectly, branded as anti-Semites”, and now, in light of Zemach’s translation, under discussion is “a philosopher about whom it was known that he had belonged to the National Socialist party”. Yet despite the palpable difficulties, “Zemach has succeeded in the difficult task with great tact, courage and honesty”. In the review Bergmann justified Heidegger for not openly expressing his estrangement from the “methods and aims” of the party. “Naturally”, he wrote, “in those days Heidegger could not make his mistake [*Irrtum*] known publicly without becoming a martyr. Who has the right to accuse him of this?”. Yet more difficult to justify is Heidegger’s silence after the war. “Admittedly, why Heidegger [...] did not find it necessary after the catastrophe to admit to his mistake publicly and unambiguously and rather left his readers still suspecting and guessing, this remains incomprehensible to us.” Before citing Heidegger’s letter in its entirety, Bergmann granted that asking Heidegger directly about the “embarrassing” 1953 passage “was a very correct and important move” on Zemach’s part.

It is, however, the conclusion of the review that is especially revealing. In an evocative remark, Bergmann wrote: “Franz Rosenzweig once said that every translation is a messianic act; probably because it brings the nations [*Völker*] close to each other and thus hastens the coming of a messianic humanity. If this is true of any type of translation, so [it is true] in a particular way of this first translation of Heidegger in our Hebrew – together with its epilogue.” In this pregnant statement, a silent acknowledgment of the thorniness of accepting Heidegger in a ‘Hebrew garment’ is betrayed, as is an approval of its necessity nonetheless. The presupposition of the unique status of the Hebrew language is apparent as well: if any translation possesses messianic impetus, then putting Heidegger in a Hebrew garment is especially so. Thus, in a surprising coupling, Bergmann, like the revisionist Arnon, believed that there is an element of reconciliation

⁷⁷ Zemach to Bergmann, November 12, 1968, *ibid.*

⁷⁸ An identical review was published as Bergmann, “Heidegger in hebräischem Gewande”, 53, 55; Bergmann to Zemach, November 28, 1968, SZA 13965/1.

in the act of translation. However, they are in profound disagreement as to whether this rapprochement is desirable.⁷⁹

The various positions surveyed here presuppose a stance regarding the political, ethical, and theological stakes of translating Heidegger to Hebrew. Some, like Zemach and Barzel, believed Heidegger should be translated – to Hebrew, or any other language - because of the importance of his philosophy and despite his political shortcomings –the duration and nature of which are debatable. Translation is a literary feat; it remains morally – and surely religiously – neutral. As such, translating Heidegger does not imply a reconciliatory gesture of any sort. Moked would concur with respect to translating Heidegger to any language, although he had strong reservations as to the appropriateness of Heidegger’s thought to Hebrew. For him, the stakes of translating to Hebrew are moral and religious. Likewise, Arnon held that regardless of his philosophical contributions, Heidegger is undeserving of the holy language. His political travesty makes the translation a charged moral and theological transgression. At first glance it would seem that Bergmann sides with Zemach and Barzel. However, under closer examination, the logic of his messianic position leads to a more radical view: Heidegger should be translated *because* of his Nazism, and *especially* to Hebrew, for the messianic prospect, the *Tikun*, is in this case amplified. The translation is not merely of literary significance, but rather suffused with moral and theological quality as well. It *is* indeed an indication toward reconciliation, but precisely for this reason, it should be welcomed.

Heidegger in Hebrew: A Jewish Reception

Quite naturally, Heidegger remained a controversial figure in Israel. Zemach, for his part, found pride in his efforts and their provocative cultural implications. When, from his *Elternheim* in Jerusalem, he had once again brought the rage of the younger generation against him for admonishing the new rising star of Israel poetry, Yehuda Amichai, he culled Heidegger once again to his defense. Warding off accusations that he was simply too conservative for the new literary taste, Zemach proclaimed: ‘They called me a conservative. I, who struggled to bring Heidegger to the Hebrew reader, I am a conservative to them!’⁸⁰ The responses to the translation of Heidegger’s *Origin* to Hebrew participate in the larger context of the Jewish and Israeli intelligentsia’s coping with the world after the holocaust. It constitutes an important moment in the largely untold chapter of the Jewish reception of Heidegger, the person and the philosopher. Upon observation, it

⁷⁹ It is relevant to mention the entry on Heidegger in the *Hebrew Encyclopedia* written by Bergmann approximately a decade earlier. While appropriately condensed and terse, the short biographical note in the beginning of the entry is marked by an undeniable downplaying of Heidegger’s previous political affiliation. Bergmann, “Heidegger, Martin”, 51-54.

⁸⁰ Isaac Ramba, “Sofrim Be’Na’aley Bait: Shlomo Zemach Be’Veyt Ha’Horim Be’Baka’a” [Writers in Slippers: Shlomo Zemach in the ‘Parents Home’ in Baka’a], 14.

is difficult to ignore the particularly 'Jewish' perspective taken in the various responses to this translation. And by 'Jewish' I do not mean only the painful perspective of Jews as the victims of the Nazi murder, but also the presence and constant employment of vocabulary and conceptions drawn from Jewish tradition. The ease and frequency with which Zemach cites from the Talmud and the Rabbis when writing to Heidegger and Klostermann is noteworthy, as are the recurring references to the bible in translating or explaining Heidegger's categories and ideas. Indeed, that the issue of Hebrew as the holy language is raised and discussed at all testifies to a particularly 'Jewish' inflection of this episode.

References

Arnon, Johanan. 1968. "Martin Heidegger – Be'Ivrit?!" [Martin Heidegger – In Hebrew?!]. In *Hayom*, October 18.

Bambach, Charles. 2003. *Heidegger's Roots: Nietzsche, National Socialism, and the Greeks*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bar-On, Avraham Z. ed. 1977. *Mivchar Textim Philosophim Me'Parmenides ad Hoge Yameynu: Mikra'a Be'Ontologiya* [A Selection of Philosophical Texts, from Parmenides to Contemporary Thinkers]. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Bergmann, Hugo, S. 1968. "Heidegger in hebräischem Gewande". In *Israelitisches Wochenblatt für die schweiz (IW)*, December 6: 53, 55.

_____. 1968. "Heidegger in hebräischem Gewande". In *Mitteilungsblatt (MB)*, the publication of *Die Vereinigung der Israelis mitteleuropäischer Herkunft*. December 13: 3.

_____. 1960. "Heidegger, Martin". In *The Hebrew Encyclopedia* vol. 14. Tel Aviv: 51-54.

_____. 1935. *Ho'gay Ha'Dor*. Tel Aviv: Mitspa.

_____. 1966. "Thanks to the Philharmonic". *Davar*, June 27.

Bronowski, Yoram. 1968. "Hamilim Hahoshvot" [The Thinking Words]. In *La'Merchav*, October 11.

Buber, Martin. 1962. "Beayat Ha'adam" [The Problem of Man]. In *P'ney Adam: Behinot Beantropologia Philosophit*. Jerusalem: Bialik.

_____. 1962. "Likuy Ha'Or Ha'Elohi" [Eclipse of God]. In *P'ney Adam: Behinot Beantropologia Philosophit*. Jerusalem: Bialik.

Caputo, John D. 2000. "People of god, People of Being: The Theological Presuppositions of Heidegger's Path of Thinking". In *Appropriating Heidegger*, edited by James E. Faulconer and Mark A. Wrathall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1953. "Mit Heidegger gegen Heideggers Denken: Zur Veröffentlichung von Vorlesungen aus dem Jahre 1935". In *Die Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 25 July.

Heidegger, Martin. (no date). *Al Ha'Zman: Mesifro Sein und Zeit* [On Time: From his Book Sein und Zeit], translated by Alexander Barzel. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.

_____. 1950. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes". In *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.

_____. 1958. *Einführung in die Metaphysik*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

_____. 1983. *Gesamtausgabe*. Vol. 40. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.

_____. 1953. "Heidegger über Heidegger". *Die Zeit*, September 24.

_____. 1967. "Mekoro shel Ma'ase Ha'Omanut (Prakim Mi'Mishnato)" [The Origin of the Work of Art (Sections from his Thought)], translated by Shlomo Zemach. In *Moznaim* 24 (47) no. 5-6: 387-393.

_____. 1968. *Mekoro shel Ma'ase Ha'Omanut* [The Origin of the Work of Art], translated by Shlomo Zemach. Tel Aviv: Devir.

_____. 2013. *Nature, History, State, 1933-1934*, translated and edited by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. London: Bloomsbury.

_____. 1993. "Only A God Can Save Us". In *The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader*, edited by Richard Wolin. Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press.

_____. 1990. "The Rectorate 1933/34: Facts and Thoughts". In *Martin Heidegger and National Socialism: Questions and Answers*, edited by Günther Neske and Emil Kettering, translated by Lisa Harries, 15-32. New York: Paragon House.

Herskowitz, Daniel. 2017. "Heidegger as a Secularized Kierkegaard: Martin Buber and Hugo Bergmann Read *Sein und Zeit*". In *Heidegger and Jewish Thought: Difficult Others*, edited by Elad Lapidot and Micha Brumlik, 155-174. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ireland, Julia A. 2014. "Naming Φύσις and the 'Inner Truth of National Socialism': A New Archival Discovery". In *Research in Phenomenology* 44 no. 3: 315-346.

Jelinek, Yeshayahu A. 2004. *Deutschland und Israel 1945-1965: Ein neurotisches Verhältnis*. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.

Kenaan, Hagi, Shmuel Rottem, and Dana Barnea. 2012. "Heidegger Be'Ivrit: Perek Be'Toldot Hitgabshuta shel Philosophia Mekomit" [Heidegger in Hebrew: A Chapter in the Formation of a Local Philosophy]. In *Theory and Criticism* 40: 35-66.

Koestenbaum, Peter. 1967. "Introductory Essay". In Edmund Husserl, *The Paris Lectures*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Mendes-Flohr, Paul. 2014. "Martin Buber and Martin Heidegger in Dialogue". In *The Journal of Religion* 94, no. 1: 2-25.

Moked, Gavriel. 1968. "Ontologya Shel Omanut" [Ontology of Art]. In *Davar*, November 8.

- Ohana, David. 2009. "From Right to Left: Israel Eldad and Nietzsche's Reception in Israel". In *Nietzsche-Studien*, 38: 363-388.
- _____. 1995. "Zarathustra in Jerusalem; Nietzsche and the New Hebrews". In *Israel Affairs*, 1, no. 3:38-61.
- Pöggler, Otto. 1987. *Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking*, translated by Daniel Magurshak and Sigmund Barber. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.
- Rabinovitch, Reuben. 1969. "Mishnato Ha'Estetit Shel Heidegger" [Heidegger's Account of Aesthetics]. In *Moznaim* 28 no. 2: 132-134.
- Ramba, Isaac. 1969. "Sofrim Be'Na'aley Bait: Shlomo Zemach Be'Veyt Ha'Horim Be'Baka'a" [Writers in Slippers: Shlomo Zemach in the 'Parents Home' in Baka'a]. In *Ma'ariv*, February 21.
- Rockmore, Tom. 1992. *On Heidegger's Nazism and Philosophy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Roubach, Michael. 2009. "Die Rezeption Heideggers in Israel". In *Heidegger-Jahrbuch* 9: 419-432.
- Segev, Tom. 1993. *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, translated by Haim Watzman. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Sheffi, Na'ama. 2001. *The Ring of Myths: The Israelis, Wagner and the Nazis*, translated by Martha Grenzeback. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Skinner, Anthony David. ed. 2002. *Gershom Scholem: A Life in Letters, 1914-1982*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- Wolin, Richard. 1977. "Heidegger's Politics: An Interview with Herbert Marcuse by Fredrick Olafson". In *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 6 no. 1: 28-40.
- _____. trans. 1991. "Herbert Marcuse and Martin Heidegger: An Exchange of Letters". In *New German Critique* 53:28-32.
- Ya'ari, Hayim. 1966. "Beyn Ha'Nibelungs Le'Auschwitz" [Between Nibelungs and Auschwitz]. *Davar*, July 1.
- Zaborowski, Holger. 2010. *'Eine Frage von Irre und Schuld?' Martin Heidegger und Nationalsozialismus*. Frankfurt: S. Fischer Verlag.
- Zemach, Shlomo. 1939. *Al Ha'Yafe: Shitot Hesber La'Yofi U'mekorotav* [On Beauty: Explanatory Methods on Beauty and its Origins]. Tel Aviv: Bialik.
- _____. 1971. "Assiya U'farshata" [Action and What it is About]. In *Ba'Arov Hayamim*, 86-99. Ramat Gan: Masada. Reprinted in Zemach, Shlomo. 1972. *Dapei Pinkas* [Pages from a Notebook]. Jerusalem: Bialik.
- _____. 1963. "Mashal Lelo Nimshal". *Davar* June 14. Reprinted in Zemach, Shlomo. 1965. *Shtey Ha'Mezuzot* [The Two Doorposts]. Ramat Gan: Masada.

_____. 1940. "Nazism, Sin'at Yisrael, Ve'Schopenhauer", [Nazism, Jewish-hatred and Schopenhauer]. In *Moznaim* 10 no. 1-5: 232-247.

_____. 1996. *Pinkasey Reshimot 1962-1973* [Diaries], edited by Hannan Hever and Ada Zemach. Tel Aviv: Am Oved.