



---

סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. (תשל"ה), חוברת ג-ד, (מ'), pp. XXXIX-XLIV

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70053506>

Accessed: 22/11/2011 06:54

---

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

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



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

<http://www.jstor.org>

## SUMMARIES

### THE SERVICE OF SACRIFICE IN SECOND TEMPLE TIMES

by I. F. Baer (pp. 95-153)

It is the intention of the present study to find a way of understanding the significance of the sacrifice offered in the Second Temple in Jerusalem. The key to the solution of this problem is found in a work of Philo of Alexandria entitled: "*Περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θεῶν ἐστὶν κληρονόμος καὶ περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ ἴσα καὶ ἐναντία τομῆς*".

In the author's opinion, this book is underlaid by Hebrew tradition concerning the laws of sacrifice, which came to Philo from the Sages of Israel. This tradition is based on a homily on the "Covenant between the Pieces" (Genesis 15). According to this homily, the covenant assured Abraham the Patriarch that, by virtue of the sacrifices made in the Temple, the inheritance of the Land of Israel would be maintained by his legitimate heirs. The Hebrew homily received by Philo from the Sages of his time is preserved and repeated with adequate changes in still extant tannaitic and amoraitic Midrashim. The promise given to Abraham in the above covenant serves as an introduction to the main point of the homily, which treats the significance of the service of sacrifice (still offered in the Temple.) The sacrifices were tannaitic and amoraitic harmony between the contradictory trends existing in the One and unique God and in His world. For the God of Israel is denoted by the platonic appellation *Hashaweh*, "The Equal One". Only God has the ability to divide matters in an equal manner. This is the concept presented in Jewish tradition, for instance, in the Mekhilta on the passage: "'At midnight . . ." (Exodus 12:29), it is impossible for mortal man to know the middle of the night but here the Creator (of night) divided it." According to Philo, divine division is executed by means of the "commanding word (*λόγος τομεύς*). By this means the divine being is initially divided into two forces (*δύναμις*), denoted in the accepted Hebrew tradition by the term *middot*, "qualities".

*Hashem*, "The Divine Name" (*νόμος*) is the appellation for the *midda* (quality) of Mercy or Compassion, and *Elohim* is the appellation for the *midda* (quality) of Justice or Stern judgement can be disregarded by the fact that the Christians, who copied Philo's writings, intentionally corrupted the original versions of the divine appellations.

As symbols symbolizing the two divine forces in the Temple, the two cherubim above the *Kaporet* of the Ark of the Covenant (Exodus 26:18) are discussed. As symbols of the two divine forces, the two cherubim should have been equal, unified and unique. The meaning of the two cherubim on the Seat of Mercy has been interpreted in several places in Philo's works, even in allusion to the mystical law involved in the matter, while in the extant Hebrew sources such interpretations repeatedly appear only in the works of Nahmanides and his colleague, R. Ezra.

In his books here discussed, Philo then turns to the types of sacrifice and other symbols of ritual in the Temple which should have been equal in order to activate the harmony in the divine forces. In proof of this principle he cites the two *tamidim* (daily offerings), the twelve shewbread, the two goats of the Day of Atonement, the components of the incense, the candles of the candelabrum. Parallel to those sacrifices and symbols cited by Philo are the sacrifices and symbols given in the Mishna, Menahot 3:6-7, which it connected with the rule of "impairing" ("the one can impair the validity of the other") and in the Baraita and in Midrashei halachah

is said of them that they should be equal absolutely and explicitly. The Mishnah relates concerning the two goats of the Day of Atonement that they impair one another and that they should (this, in any case, is the original text!) be equal "in appearance, in size, and in value, and have been brought at the same time" (Mishnah, Yoma 6:1). Thus, we have seen that the tradition drawn upon by Philo and the accepted, extant halachah confirm and complement one another, and comparison of the halachah with the early tradition used by Philo enables an understanding of the original significance of the service. Initially, the sacrifices were offered so as to activate the harmony of the forces (*middot*—qualities) of Compassion and strict Judgement within One God. This was the original significance of the service, which significance was blurred by the accepted versions of the halachah. This original significance was passed down secretly to succeeding generations, and was rediscovered or restated explicitly and openly by the Sages of the mystical Kabbalah. Thus we can understand that Mishnah, Yoma 6:1, concerning the service for the Day of Atonement, emphasizes by means of a detailed and specific text the importance of the equality between that goat sacrificed within the Holy of Holies (the Temple) and the goat which is sent into the wilderness. Philo does not explicitly mention this law, but he notes the miracle revealed by the lots distinguishing the two goats, in accord with divine decision. This matter was again blurred in the halachah, but was re-emphasized by the Kabbalists. On the other hand, the urn of lots, denoted *qalpei* in the Mishnah, denotes the divine decision, in accord with the Greek concept. It should also be noted that Philo appends to several citations of the halachah known to him several sayings of the Aggadah, extant only in the late Midrashim, in order to strengthen his intention.

Besides the laws of sacrifices, interpreted with the aid of Philo's book, the author treats in detail the similarities and differences which can be recognized in the service for the Day of Atonement and the act of the Red Heifer. Concerning the rules of the Red Heifer, the Mishnah points to several details seemingly taken from the ritual practices devoted in Greece to *chthonian* gods, whereas for the Day of Atonement is performed in order to activate in God the triumph of the *midda* (quality) of Compassion over that of stern Judgement. This point is well symbolized by the act of offering incense on the part of Yishmael ben Elisha (Tal. Bab., Berakhot 6a), the High Priest who seemingly belongs to actual history and who was one of the High Priests recognized by the Sages who served in the Temple shortly prior to the Great Revolt against the Roman Empire.

All in all, the present study seeks to demonstrate that the service of sacrifice in the days of the Second Temple can not be interpreted outside the framework of the rituals of worship and of the concepts commonly held amongst the nations of Antiquity. According to the principle of their concepts, the sacrifices were offered up in order to strengthen the might of divinity. Such a concept is alluded to in Jewish literature, as well, though in few passages explicitly, but the strengthening of the divine force in Jewish thought was actually the activation of the triumph of the *midda* (quality) of Compassion over that of stern Judgement.

Compassion and Judgement are forces or qualities of One God Himself, to whom sacrifices are offered in the One Temple in Jerusalem. The service outside, the act of the Red Heifer, relates by specific laws to the service within the Temple. The elements of this service serve to overcome the forces of impurity in the world. But these forces are not ascribed with individual value, as in Greece was ascribed to the *chthonian* gods or to the souls of the dead. The entire service is devoted solely to

One God. Israelite worship is entirely devoid of any sexual or orgiastic element. The intention of rejecting all such abominable signs is dominant, especially in the rules of the reaping of the Omer of barley (Mishnah, Menahoth 10:1–2), which ritual received its specific form as a demonstration against the forms of worship which were devoted in Greece to Demeter. The service in the Temple served to strengthen and broadcast monotheistic belief throughout the world. The service of sacrifice was joined by the prayer which accompanied the service in the Temple and in synagogues all over, and this latter service in the heart persevered even after the destruction of the Temple.

In his conclusion the author briefly treats the Piyutim (liturgical hymns) of R. Yannai, in which the appellation “The Equal One” appears for the first time in a Hebrew work, in denoting the God of Israel who “equalizes” (harmonies) the contradictions existing in His world.

#### THE MIGRATION OF THE KALONYMOS FAMILY FROM ITALY TO GERMANY

by A. Grossman (pp. 154–185)

In several sources, all stemming from the *beth-midrash* of R. Eleazar of Worms, a noble Jewish family, the Kalonymos family, is noted as having been brought from Lucca in northern Italy to Mayence in 917 C.E. by ‘King Karl’. The data they contain are sparse and in several details even contradictory. Even so, the fact of the migration itself is proven from other sources. This subject is of considerable importance for the study of the beginnings of Jewish settlement in Germany, and of Bible studies and spiritual creativity in Ashkenaz in the Middle Ages; the connections of this creativity with the Italian school and, by its means, with the focal point in Eretz-Israel, are directly related.

Despite the extensive discussion of this migration since the 19th century, there remain numerous doubtful points. Moreover, the bulk of research has dealt with the matter of the family, the date of the event and the identity of ‘King Karl’—rather than with the importance, historically speaking, of the extent of influence of the migration upon the culture of the Jewish community in Germany. In 917 C.E., Conrad I ruled in Germany, rather than any ‘Karl’; he did not control Italy and cannot be considered as the one who brought the family to Germany. Several suggestions have been raised by various scholars in solution of this enigma. It has been proposed to put the event earlier, in the reign of Charlemagne, but the chronology and history of the family absolutely negate this possibility.

In modern research, opinion is divided. Some hold that Charles the Bald is intended, in the year 877 C.E.; and others hold that it was Charles the Fat, in 881 C.E. Others place the event later, in the days of Otto II, at the end of the 10th century, basing on what is related by Thietmar of Merseburg—that a Jew named Kalonymos helped in saving Otto II after his defeat near Catrone in 982 C.E. The identifications with Charles the Bald and Otto II are entirely at odds with what is known of the lives of these two emperors. The identification with Charles the Fat, too is very doubtful.

A different approach is to be taken, accepting the date of 917 C.E. as that of the migration. The chronology of the family would support this. The family migrated

quite wilfully and was not brought to Germany. The ascription of the event to 'Karl' is typical of the tendency common throughout Germany in the 13th century, of ascribing later events to Charlemagne, to imbue them with a certain glory. This story is not found amongst Jewish sources earlier than the 13th century.

The migration had much influence in four realms: the development of religious poetry; the preservation and development of Ashkenazi kabbalism; the administration of the communities of Mayence and Speyer; and the crystallization of the *Weltanschauung* of many of the Jews of Ashkenaz at least until the end of the 11th century. On the other hand, the assumption that the migration made Mayence into a center of study for the communities of Europe in the 10th century is exaggerated. Some of the family — including R. Meshullam, the greatest of the Jewish sages in Europe at that time — were active not in Germany but in Italy.

The remnants of Ashkenazi rabbinical literature from those days indicate that the share of the Kalonymos family did not exceed that of the other five noble families in religious teaching and spiritual creativity.

#### 'PUBLIC OPINION' IN NATIONAL SOCIALIST GERMANY AND THE 'JEWISH QUESTION'

by O. D. Kulka (pp. 186–290)

This article seeks to examine possible approaches to research into the attitudes of the various strata in German society toward the Jews and the 'solution of the Jewish Question' in the Third Reich. The author regards this as a necessary complement in the study of Jewish History in that period which, until now, has been examined in only two basic aspects: the ideology and politics of the regime, and the internal life of Jewish society and the activities of its leadership.

The first part of the article deals with methodological problems concerning the various sources and their evaluation. The second part examines the subject of public opinion, choosing three crucial stages, in the years 1935, 1938 and 1941–43.

*Part One* raises the problem of public opinion in a totalitarian state, a matter seldom dealt with in connection with the Third Reich. Sources relevant to public opinion in the Third Reich can be classed in two categories: *public sources*, published either by the government (or under its control) or by critics and opponents of the regime; and *secret sources*, not intended for publication but for official use as a means of gaining reliable information on attitudes of the public. The majority of works describing this aspect of the Third Reich tend, almost habitually, to affirm the monolithic portrait which the regime itself sought to foster.

With the discovery of wide-ranging archival material on public opinion from various party and government sources, possibilities of research have changed radically. The government and party organizations regarded the setting up of a mechanism to provide constant, reliable and secret information on public mood in all walks of life as a necessity for efficient functioning. The system of Periodical Reports (*Lageberichte*) conducted by the S.D. (the Security Service of the S.S.) and the Gestapo was the most important information system; these reports actually continued the tradition of periodical reports to Ministers of various *Länder* from their *Regierungspräsidenten*. Their remarkable reliability was born of their professional purpose, and since '*Judentum*' figured among the main enemies to be tracked down and fought,

special sections were devoted to this subject in the bulletins. Some of these reports have survived in complete record groups in the original archive, while others have been dispersed in various archives.

The description emerging from the reports on the changing and various attitudes of the population toward the government and its policies in certain spheres contradicts the wholly monolithic portrait which the government invariably presented as its achievement and justification of its regime. This contradiction provoked dissension within government circles and, in turn, led to conflict on the question of continuing the reports and the extent of their internal distribution. The reports on the activities within the Jewish community served as a basis for assessing government bodies involved in various aspects of the 'Jewish Question'; moreover, they were a factor in policy deliberations and decisions.

Also treated are reports of representatives of foreign legations on the mood in Germany, memoirs and diaries of such figures and of members of the opposition; judicial material gathered for trials held after the war, against participants in the pogroms of November 1938, and material based on testimonies of persons interviewed during study projects after the war. All these yield partial information: without the material found in the reports it would be impossible to propound general conclusions.

The methodological analysis has shown that it is indeed possible, on the basis of these sources, to undertake a systematic study of the attitude of the population toward the Jews and toward the government's policy toward them.

*Part Two* deals with the three specific situations in which the 'Jewish Question' might be supposed to have been a crucial issue of public discussion.

1. *Reactions to the promulgation of the Nuremberg Laws.* The demonstrative declaration of the laws at the party convention in September 1935 was intended to realize a basic idea in Hitler's original program and an explicit paragraph of the party's political platform. The sources reveal that the timing of the promulgation was chosen to cope with the polarization in public opinion concerning the politics of the regime, including the 'Jewish Question'. The atmosphere was characterized by a crisis of confidence and ideological weariness, on the one hand, and strong demand for consequent radicalization in anti-Jewish policy, on the other hand. The reactions to the laws show a continuous lack of unity in public opinion prevailing beneath the surface. The main attitudes were (1) acceptance of the laws as an effective and lasting provision for social separation between Germans and Jews; (2) criticism on an ideological, religious, social and regional background (mainly on the part of the churches, the liberal intelligentsia and the left); (3) opposition to the 'moderate' character of the laws and instigation of local violent actions against the Jews (mainly within the S.A.); and (4) a lack of reaction to the issue, stemming from indifference to all ideological or political matters.

Two general conclusions may be drawn from this examination: (a) 'public opinion' as revealed here — before and after the Nuremberg Laws — shows a picture quite different from the current image based on public sources and presented by historiography; (b) this was the picture of public opinion at the disposal of the regime and it served as a basis for the subsequent shaping of its policy. These general conclusions are valid also for the two other crucial stages treated within this article.

2. *The 'Kristallnacht'.* It is generally accepted that the pogrom of 10 November 1938 was organized from above. According to the documents from previous years treated here, we know of attempts to organize similar events prior to 1938. But examination

of the *Lageberichte* proves that the riots started at local anti-semitic initiative in various parts of Germany, more than a month before the 'Kristallnacht', in connection with the war tensions at the time of the Munich Crisis and after. Thus, the November riots appear as an extension of an already existing activity, which was consequently organized by the authorities on a large scale.

The reactions were similar to those concerning the Nuremberg Laws. Nevertheless, the expressions of criticism, and even of public denouncement, were more explicit and widespread. However, most did not denounce the atrocities against the Jews, but protested against the destruction of German property as being contradictory to the declared economic policy of the regime, stressing the need for avoiding waste of national wealth. This reaction bears in it signs of a basic tendency in the attitude toward the fate of the Jews in subsequent years.

3. *The mass deportations and annihilation (1941-1943)*. The significant change in the public attitude during the war was characterized by an almost total lack of interest in the existence of the Jews, this in spite of the intensified anti-semitic war propaganda and various strong reactions in matters concerning the general population (e.g. the 'mercy killings' of mentally sick, persecution of the churches, economic problems, criticism of war policies). Concerning the deportations and annihilation, there is a striking lack of any active reaction in daily conversations, although the progress of deportation in each locale was followed and people were acquainted with the ultimate fate of the deported Jews.

Active reactions and vivid public discussion are outstanding in the first half of 1943, following the Stalingrad debacle and the heavy bombardments of German cities. These center around the fear for the fate of German prisoners-of-war 'who might be executed by the Russians in the same way as were the deported Jews by the S.S.' The heavy air raids were in part similarly explained as possible revenge for the German policy toward the Jews. Widespread knowledge of the annihilation of hundreds of thousands of Jews is revealed indirectly in reports from all over the Reich surveying the public reaction to official propaganda denouncing the 'atrocities of Bolshevik mass-murders of Polish army officers at Katyn'. Nevertheless, with rare exceptions (cf. appendix), public opinion ignored the moral problem posed by the extermination of the Jews and focused instead on criticism of credibility and effectiveness of German war propaganda.

With rare exceptions (cf. appendix) most of these reactions reveal a frightening 'practical' attitude, on the one hand, and an abyssmal indifference concerning the fate of the Jews as human beings, on the other hand. We witness here the culmination of a process of almost total depersonalization in the attitude toward the Jews and the policy of the 'solution of the Jewish Question', which had by then reached its 'final stage'.

The article includes *facsimiles* of selected documents as well as an appendix. *Lageberichte* from 1935 and 1938 appear on pp. 260-290. *Lageberichte* from 1941-1943 appear opposite p. 208 and on pp. 288-290.