



---

סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. ג (תשל"ג - ד), חוברת א - ב, pp. I-IV

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70051512>

Accessed: 22/11/2011 07:00

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Historical Society of Israel/* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zion /*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## SHECHEM STUDIES

by Menahem Haran (pp. 1–31)

This part of the series consists of four studies. In the first, the difference is shown between the cultic open places, *temenoi* (each containing an altar, a pillar-stone, a sacred tree, and the like), which were found in the close vicinity of Shechem (Gen. xii, 6–7; xxxvii, 18–20; xxxv, 2–4; Deut. xi, 30 et al.; also Josh. xxiv, 25–27), and the temple of *ba'al berit* (Judg. ix, 4, 46; possibly unearthed in the excavations), which was located within the city proper. The former were devoted to the worship of Yahweh and the foundation of some of them was ascribed to the Patriarchs, whereas the latter was a Canaanite institution. In the second study, the altar on Mount Ebal as described in Deut. xxvii, 1–8 is discussed. It is the author's contention that the pre-Deuteronomic nucleus of that passage comprises details not only about the altar (vv. 5–7) but also about the stones (vv. 1–4, 8). The unusual form of the altar on Mount Ebal, being built as it was of big stones plastered over and engraved with inscriptions, gave rise to the aetiological story concerning its construction. A parallel aetiological story concerning another altar connected as well with the crossing of the Jordan, underlines the narrative of Josh. iii, 9–iv, 24. Both altars were located in places called Gilgal (Josh. iv, 19–20; cf. Deut. xi, 30).

In the third study it is demonstrated that in Judg. ix Shechem is conceived of as a Canaanite city. After having been destroyed by Abimelech it was rebuilt as an Israelite city only under the reign of Solomon (stratum XII of the excavations) in the wake of his building activities (cf. I King ix, 15–19). Lastly, the story of Gen. xxxiv is defined as a novelistic tale, arising out of the conditions prevailing in the period of the Judges, prior to Abimelech, without historical basis in the period of the Patriarchs. The inclusion of Shechem in the Levitical cities as well as in the cities of refuge (Josh. xx, 7; xxi, 21) tallies with the author's argument that its rebuilding as an Israelite city took place during the reign of Solomon.

## THE STATUS AND ORIGIN OF THE GARRISON AT THE AKRA ON THE EVE OF THE RELIGIOUS PERSECUTIONS

by B. Bar-Kochva (pp. 32–47)

Most scholars agree that Antiochus Epiphanes established in the Akra of Jerusalem a military settlement manned by the local garrison. This assumption which underlay Tcherikover's well known explanation of the religious persecutions is based on I Macc. 1.38 which mentions a *katoikia* in Jerusalem, and Daniel 11.39 which is interpreted as implying the establishment of military settlements in Judea.

The term *katoikia* in I Macc., however, as can be seen in the LXX, is a translation of the Hebrew *moshav* (residence, etc.) and the poetical context of I Macc. 1.38 obviates the possibility of its being used in the technical meaning of military settlement. In any case, Jerusalem could not have been a *katoikia* because the term designates rural military settlements without the status of *polis*, and these were concentrated in Asia Minor alone. It is also difficult to understand why in this case the status of *polis* was not granted as was usually done with regard to the 'European'

settlements south of the Taurus. The denial of municipal rights to the existing Hellenistic *polis* in the city would have first of all affected the Hellenized Jews, while the existence of a *katoikia* besides the *polis* would have discriminated against the soldiers which is rather unlikely in view of their 'European' descent and the politico-cultural purpose which lay behind the organization of military settlements. And finally, the special circumstances which generally prevailed in Jerusalem and especially in 168 B.C., prevented the development of any close connection between the settlers and their allotments which was a precondition for the success of a *katoikia*. This consideration excludes the possibility that Jerusalem was a military settlement with the status of a *polis*, or that lands were allocated to the soldiers not in preparation for settlement but as part of their ordinary salary (cf. Palai-Magnesia and Babylon). In state of emergency the lands which were far from the fortress would not have been tilled by tenants and serfs.

The verse in Daniel does not refer to military settlements. Its beginning "he shall do to the strongest fortresses" refers to the reinforcement of the garrisons in various citadels in Judea as in the Akra, Beith-Zur, Gazara, Jaffa and Iamnia. The second part "who he shall acknowledge increase with glory and he shall cause them to rule over many" undoubtedly refers to the Hellenized Jews, and would not make sense if we interpret it as meaning the soldiers. The end of the verse, "and shall divide the land for a price" which was the basis for the assumption that a military settlement was established in Jerusalem, is connected with the preceding sentence and refers to the allocation of lands (presumably confiscated) to Hellenized Jews. The lands were given בַּמַּחֲרִי (for a price), i.e., against certain payment, as was usual in the allocation of lands by the Seleucid authorities. It may even indicate selling lands confiscated in the *chora* to the *polis* of Jerusalem. The verse cannot be connected with the instruction to Lysias to establish military settlements on the borders of Judea (I Macc. 3.36) as this instruction was not carried out and Dan. 11.39 refers to the past.

As to the provenance of the soldiers recruited, Tcherikover and others regard them as autochthonic Syrians and try in this way to support the interpretation of שְׁקוּץ מְשׁוּמֵם (abomination of desolation — Dan. 11.31; I Macc. 1.45) as referring to Ba'al Shemin, the Syrian God. But all the testimony on Seleucid soldiers in Judea mention only Mysians, Cyprians, Thracians and Macedonians, while the evidence for the Seleucid army indicates a definite reluctance to allow the participation of Syrians in the Seleucid armies. The few occurrences of "Syrians" (esp. Livy 37.40.11) undoubtedly refer to military settlers in Syria who were of Macedonian descent.

#### BI-METALLISM IN RABBI'S TIME, TWO VARIANTS OF THE MISHNA "GOLD ACQUIRES SILVER"

by Ephraim Kleiman (pp. 48–61)

The two Talmuds provide conflicting versions of the Tannaitic rule of purchase ("silver acquires gold" and "gold acquires silver"). The Talmudic story which dates the change in Rabbi's ruling to his old age is analyzed in economic terms, against the background of contemporary developments in the Roman monetary system. The continuous debasement of the silver coinage in the Second Century must have resulted

ultimately in the manifestation of Gresham's Law: "bad" (debased silver) coins pushing "good" (undebased gold) ones out of circulation. While this process may have been observable already earlier, Caracalla's monetary reform of 215 must have brought it to a sudden culmination. The change in Rabbi's ruling reflects this final demonetization of gold. It supports the tradition of his being still alive in 219 and, chronologically at least, allows for the possibility of his having met with Caracalla.

### THE HEP-HEP RIOTS IN GERMANY OF 1819 THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

by Jacob Katz (pp. 62-115)

The anti-Jewish outbreaks known as the Hep-Hep riots erupted in the Bavarian town of Würzburg, Germany on the 2nd of August, 1819. Within a few days, rioting spread to townlets and villages in Bavaria and the other southern regions, reaching Frankfurt on the 8th and Hamburg on the 19th of the month. By the end of September disturbances had already broken out in Darmstadt in Hessen, Heidelberg and Mannheim in Baden, and Danzig in Prussia. Rumors that the Danish Government would admit Jews fleeing Hamburg was sufficient provocation for riots to break out in Copenhagen as well. Anti-Jewish sloganeering was being heard throughout Germany and extended beyond her borders, causing anxiety if not actual physical suffering.

This article is an attempt to reconstruct the exact sequence of events to reveal the basic social and political motivations of the movement. Emphasis is placed on the early stages of the movement and the identification of the participants. The movement is followed from its origin in Würzburg to its subsequent spread to Frankfurt and Hamburg.

The Jews of Würzburg were relative newcomers. They were first admitted in 1803, the year Würzburg lost its independent status as the capital of a bishopric principality and was joined to Bavaria. This event, which occurred in the wake of the Napoleonic victories, precipitated debate on the question of Jewish rights. The town's new rulers viewed the Jews expediently as potential agents of modernization, while the local population, notably the merchants, feared their admission because of the increased competition that would result.

The status of the Jews was on the agenda of the Bavarian Landtag in session in Munich from February, 1819. Despite their admission as subjects of the Bavarian king, the Jews encountered restrictions not imposed upon their Christian neighbours. During the Landtag the Jews, supported by some liberal sympathizers, fought for the extension of their rights, which were especially limited with respect to housing and choice of occupation. Their Christian adversaries, meanwhile, wanted these same restrictions to be further intensified.

Pressure in Würzburg mounted as a result of a literary controversy between a pamphleteer, Theodor Scheuring, and a liberal-minded law professor, Sebold Brendel. Brendel, in the pages of the local *Intelligenzblatt*, severely attacked the anti-Jewish thesis of Scheuring's pamphlet. Scheuring's rebuttal, in equally harsh phrases, appeared in the Thursday, July 29 edition of the newspaper. Tension in the city rose, and four days later on the 2nd of August, attacks on the Jews began.

The Würzburg situation epitomizes the state of Jewish affairs throughout Germany at that time, and particularly in the two great Jewish centers of Frankfurt and Hamburg. During the Napoleonic era Jews had largely been accepted as subjects of their respective countries and towns, albeit with limited rights. Their status had been passionately debated during the Congress of Vienna. One of the objectives of this Congress had been to establish a "new order" for Germany including a uniform status for all German Jews. At the Congress the Christian adversaries of the Jews were in tune with the prevailing national and romantic sentiments. The Christian tinge of the national movement did not allow for Jewish participation in the life of state and society. Thus the Congress of Vienna failed to resolve the Jewish issue. Agitation against the Jews continued to mount, occasionally approaching open violence. Würzburg provided the spark that set off the inevitable explosion. It spread with the new slogan *Hep-Hep*, falsely projected into the Middle Ages as the abbreviation *Hierosolyma est perdita*.

In most areas official measures to prevent violence were adopted when the danger of public disturbances became imminent. Germany was already in a state of excitement because of the activities of a semi-clandestine radical movement, which was engaged in political assassination and other efforts to overthrow the established political order. When the anti-Jewish riots broke out, the authorities, especially in Bavaria, feared that they too were the actions of this radical group.

The theory of a connection between increasing violence in German society and the anti-Jewish riots has been posited by historians and elaborated upon by Eleonore Sterling (*Historia Judaica*, 1950). The theory maintains that disaffected elements within German society, though seeking to vent their hostility, were not hopeful of success in direct attacks on the establishment. The social protest was therefore "displaced" and redirected against the Jews.

This article aims at disproving this theory. Contrary to what had been recounted by historians, the historical sources reveal that students played no role whatsoever in the anti-Jewish activities. Rather, students at Heidelberg University actually saved their town's Jews. The conflicts were unrelated to other conflicts within German society, though they had certain parallel characteristics. Intellectuals used the already heated state of emotions to create an anti-Jewish atmosphere, which gave rise to the mob riots.

Contemporaries misinterpreted the upheavals as an expression of the general malaise within society or the work of revolutionaries. But, in the perspective of time, the turmoil is seen as a manifestation of the on-going Jewish-Gentile conflict. The riots reflected the intense feelings of the German people, especially those who saw themselves as injured by any increase in Jewish economic and civic rights.

The Jews shared the interpretation of their contemporaries. The initial reaction of many was simply to leave Germany and no longer suffer the insults and restrictions placed upon them. A change in attitude occurred upon the reestablishment of order. Many merely tried to forget what had happened; others dismissed it as an unfortunate episode, while still others saw in it a reaffirmation of their idea of the destiny of the Jews in Germany. Ludwig Börne became increasingly convinced that the Jews must fight for the establishment of a democratic Germany, within which Jew-hatred would be obsolete. Eduard Ganz, the first president of the Verein, the Society for Culture and Science among Berlin Jews, concluded that the Jews could fit into the general European environment only by eliminating their cultural peculiarities.

## BARON EDMOND DE ROTHSCHILD AND THE ZIONISTS, 1918-1919

by Evyatar Friesel (pp. 116-136)

At the end of World War I relations developed between the Zionist leadership and an array of political leaders both inside and outside of government. Among the latter, an important figure was Baron Edmond de Rothschild, whose efforts on behalf of the Jewish colonization of Palestine went back at least as far as modern Zionism.

Rothschild was for cooperation with the Zionist leadership, but on his own terms. He recognized the opportunity Zionism had obtained with the Balfour Declaration, and appreciated its strength as a movement. He even helped in weakening the anti-Zionist tendencies in the French Foreign Office. Yet, he doubted the Zionists' political maturity and suspected the Zionist leaders, Weizmann in particular, of extreme nationalism. Perhaps there also existed an element of jealousy between the great individual patron and the new successes of the mass movement.

Rothschild proposed the idea of forming a general Jewish body, composed of both Zionists and non-Zionists, that would be responsible for Jewish development in Palestine.

The Baron acted through Silvain Levi, a professor at the College de France. Levi participated in the Zionist Commission, and later travelled to the United States to make contact with the American Zionist organization and explain there the Baron's ideas. At last he participated, strangely enough, in the Zionist delegation that was received by the "Council of Ten" of the Peace Conference on February 27, 1919. There he read a paper prepared by the Baron and, among other things, criticized the Zionist position, introducing — much to the Zionists' embarrassment — a sharply dissonant note to the meeting.

## THE HISTORY OF THE "BLAU-WEISS" THE PATH TO ZIONISM OF THE FIRST GERMAN JEWISH YOUTH MOVEMENT

by Chaim Schatzker (pp. 137-168)

Its first group was organized in Breslau by Joseph Marcus in 1907. In 1912 it merged with a similar group founded in Berlin by Drs. A. Sachs and L. Weissenberg. In 1914 five such groups proclaimed a united Jewish German youth movement. The anti-Semitic stance taken by the Wandervogel and other German youth movements certainly aided the growth of the Jewish movement.

The principles of the Blau-Weiss were:

1. Nature, natural behaviour, true humanity and nationalism are connected.
2. The Jewish people by going away from nature had turned into a people lacking in "inner truth". It was a people that refused to admit the truth about itself and its Jewishness.

3. A return to nature by means of hiking (wandern) would bring about a changed attitude and a reordering of emotional life. This change would come about through immanent laws. Hiking was therefore seen as an end in itself.

From the beginning some of its members saw it as a Zionist movement. There were others who conceived of it mainly as a youth movement whose purpose was to shape attitudes which would influence Jewish youth towards Zionism.

After World War I, the Blau-Weiss underwent great change under the leadership of Walter Moses. This change was caused by the war and the criticism of the ineffectiveness of the former romantic and "exhilarated" outlook of the movement. An instance of this is the "Scholem controversy". The new outlook brought about a new attitude towards Judaism, Eastern European Jews and Zionism. Foundations were laid for agricultural and technical *hachshara*, aliyah to Palestine and the establishment of a "Blau-Weiss Colony" there. The well-trained and disciplined Western Jew would provide the leadership for the unskilled workers who would be recruited from Eastern Europe.

This program led the Blau-Weiss (which in 1922, in Prunn, wrote itself a new constitution with totalitarian tendencies) to an antagonistic meeting with reality. This resulted in the failure of the two attempts of the Blau-Weiss to settle in Palestine.

#### PRINCIPLES OF IDENTIFICATION OF PLACE NAMES IN ERETZ-YISRAEL IN THE RESPONSA LITERATURE

by David Tamar (p. 169)

The author proposes a rule — based mostly on certain abbreviations after place names — to help to determine whether a place name denotes an actual locality in a Responsum, or serves only as a sign for anonymity.

#### ON THE IDENTITY OF R. ISRAEL ASHKENAZI OF JERUSALEM

by Abraham David (pp. 170–173)

R. Israel Ashkenazi, head of the Ashkenazic Yeshiva in Jerusalem during the second decade of the sixteenth century can be identified as R. Israel of Poruja, the author of the famous letter of 1522/3.

Prior to his coming to Jerusalem in 1520/1 he lived in various Italian cities and was a disciple of R. Judah Minz and was one of the teachers of the chronicler R. Eliyahu Kapsali. Two of his halachic decisions from the years 1518/19, while head of the Yeshiva in Rome remain.

#### ABRAHAM BEN YOSKE'S POSITION IN THE EMDEN EIBESCHÜTZ CONTROVERSY

by Isaiah Trunk (pp. 174–178)

Amongst many Rabbis and leaders, both from Poland as well as from Germany engaged in this famous controversy, Abraham ben Yoske stands out as one of the most mitigating and diplomatic participants. His epistles (one of them is published here for the first time in pp. 176–178) as well as his actions, seemed evasive to Jacob Emden, though Abraham ben Yoske was related to him. The stance and activities of the Council meeting of 1753 at Yaroslaw, show at first the same attitude. In the course of that meeting Abraham ben Yoske lost his leadership position, and as a result, the Council majority came out unequivocally for Eibeschutz. After short hesitation Abraham ben Yoske strongly supported Emden against Eibeschutz. Perhaps the appearance of the first Frankists contributed to his clear cut anti Eibeschutz stand, as much as the fact that he was now out of office and felt free to express his personal convictions.