



סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion* / ציון, Vol. ספר היובל – ציון, חוברת א', (תרצ"ו-תשמ"ה) נ', חוברת א', ציון – ספר היובל, pp. VII-XXIII

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70031424>

Accessed: 10/11/2011 17:05

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

ZION AND CONTEMPORARY JEWISH HISTORICAL RESEARCH

by Shmuel Ettinger (pp. 5-15)

Ben-Zion Dinur (Dinburg) and Yitzhak (Fritz) Baer, the founders of *Zion* fifty years ago, saw themselves as pathfinders who gave a new direction to Jewish historical research. Instead of adopting the old apologetic and confessional approach of the adherents of the German *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, they claimed to introduce objective nationalist-Zionist historical concepts. In reality, the first editors of *Zion*, like their predecessors, clung to the German historiographical tradition on the one hand, and continued the activities of the Jewish Historical and Ethnographical Society in St. Petersburg on the other. In the same way they shaped the form of the 'Jerusalem historical school,' whose concepts became dominant in the development of Jewish history in the Hebrew University and other Israeli universities. They succeeded in establishing *Zion* as the major journal of Jewish historical studies, embracing the history of the Jews in *Eretz Yisrael* and in all the lands of the Diaspora, in all periods. The influence of the journal (and of the 'Jerusalem historical school') has grown with the increase in the importance of the *Yishuv*, and later of the State of Israel, in the life of the Jewish people.

Despite the belief of the editors of *Zion* in the unity and continuity of Jewish history, the journal did not reflect their intentions during World War II and for some years thereafter. The Holocaust and the destruction of the great European Jewish centers, and the passing away of many of the early contributors, narrowed the circle of participants, and very few studies on the Biblical period, the period of the Second Temple, political and economic history, etc. were printed in *Zion*. The majority of articles in these years dealt with religious-social and mystical movements, particularly with Sabbatianism and Hassidism. Only from the late 1960s onwards did the scope of the topics printed in *Zion* begin to widen.

The loss of the majority of the early editors during the 1970s did not change the character of the journal, not even its external form. Only in the last few years were new sections added, particularly that of book reviews. The difficult task of the present editorial board is to find ways to combine (in times of specialization and in view of the existence of publications devoted to the various specific fields and branches of Jewish history) the ability to publish detailed and specialized studies on various topics, with preservation of the interest of the majority of Jewish historians (and interested laymen) in an organ dealing with general aspects and problems of Jewish history.

DIVERSE HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL REFLECTIONS IN THE SHAPING OF PATRIARCHAL HISTORY

by Ze'ev Weisman (pp. 1–13)

This article reexamines the common hypothesis in biblical research and in associated areas (history, archaeology and anthropology) regarding the united, common, historical-sociological and cultural background of all three Patriarchs. On the basis of internal-biblical evidence, the differences between the stories about Jacob, on the one hand, and those about Abraham, on the other, are viewed according to the following categories:

- (a) The Ethnographic and Geopolitical Nomenclature
- (b) The Historical-Geographical Nomenclature
- (c) The Societal Model: (1) family-structure; (2) family interrelationships; (3) naming of the children; (4) status of the Patriarch; (5) function of the clan.

In view of the ethnographic, geographic and sociographic differences between the stories about Jacob and those about Abraham and Isaac, the self-evident conclusion is that the former were created and given shape in a social and cultural environment different from that of the latter. Since, with regard to most of the elements relating to these fields, not only do the stories about Jacob not continue those about Abraham and Isaac but even reflect more ancient traditions, we are led to historical and literary conclusions regarding the formation of the Patriarchal stories.

The common hypothesis in biblical criticism since the Documentary Theory became established, i.e. that the source **J** is the earliest among the sources from which the Pentateuch was compiled (**J,E,P**), and that it had already included the stories about the beginning of Israel, needs to be reexamined in view of these findings. Furthermore, with regard to the stories about Jacob, it is possible to reach the opposite conclusion: It is source **E** which forms the main basic stratum of the stories, while **J** constitutes a top stratum only. The 'Jehovist' was responsible for uniting the stories about Jacob and those about Abraham and Isaac into a single historical and literary continuity.

BETHEL AND BETH-AVEN: AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE LOCATION OF THE EARLY ISRAELITE CULT PLACES

by Nadav Na'aman (pp. 15–25)

Beth-äben ('House of the Stone Pillar') was the original name of Bethel's early sanctuary which was located east of the town. It was probably identical with Bochim/Bachuth, a sacred site near Bethel. Several cultic legends concerning the foundation and consecration of the cult place appear in the Bible. The name Beth-aven ('House of Wickedness') was developed by the prophets of the eighth century B.C.E. as a pejorative substitute for Bethel and its sanctuary.

Like the sanctuary of Bethel, most of the cultic places in Israel during the pre-monarchical

and early-monarchical periods were built outside of their respective towns and were called by different names. This constitutes remarkable evidence for the radical break of the Israelite religion and cult from the former Canaanite practices and culture.

THE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE AMORITES AND JEBUSITES IN THE BOOK OF SAMUEL: HISTORICAL FOUNDATION AND IDEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

By Samuel Abramsky (pp. 27–58)

The author, who has claimed recently in his research, and mainly in his book *The Kingship of Saul and the Kingship of David*, the conceptual-literary unity of the Book of Samuel, offers here a pertinent conceptual argument in order to establish this thesis. He presents proofs in order to show that the Book of Samuel is the one book in the Bible which contains no expression of hatred or condemnation of the ancient inhabitants of Canaan or their surviving descendants. The main proof is in the verse 'And there was peace between Israel and the Amorites' (I Samuel 7:14). The author of this article considers this statement as echoing historical reality during the time of Samuel. The author of the book apparently wished to draw attention to the fact that even during Samuel's days, and in all likelihood due to his initiative and conduct, there was peace between Israel and the Amorites; notwithstanding the fact that the Amorites are counted among the nations (and in some places they are referred to as the epitome of Canaan in general), which God had commanded the Israelites to annihilate, as is stated mainly in the Book of Deuteronomy.

The author of the Book of Samuel wished to emphasize that David followed in the footsteps of Samuel. Not only do we have here an attitude of conciliation, but also the continuation of Samuel's way, in contrast to Saul's behavior toward the Gibeonites. Samuel is considered the prototype of David, from the point of view of his qualities as a leader; Samuel was the first to make peace with the Amorites and David, by following his example, in carrying out the divine commandment. The emphasis on 'the remnant of the Amorites' probably serves to hint at the fact that the ancient commandment concerning the annihilation of the Amorites no longer applied to their remnants in the time of Samuel, David and Solomon (I Kings 9:20).

David acted in a similar way toward the Jebusites. Although the Jebusites were one of the Canaanite nations whom the Israelites were commanded to annihilate, the 'remnant of the Jebusites' (in the terminology of the author of the article) was treated by David in the same way as the 'remnant of the Amorites.' The king had a similar relationship with the Philistines, the King of Tyre and the King of Hammat. This was in absolute contrast to the policy of enslavement applied to the subjugated peoples of Transjordan and Aram.

The author of the Book of Samuel presents this policy as if it were a Divine commandment and a continuation of Samuel's leadership. There is no mention of derogatory words against the Amorites and the Gibeonites. During the time of David, the validity of the injunction to annihilate the Amorites had already expired. This attitude is evident in all parts of the book and bears testimony to the unity and antiquity of the Book of Samuel, which may be dated to the end of Solomon's reign. It is doubtful whether, after the division of the kingdom, any author would have adhered to such a scheme which was typical of the days of David and Solomon.

HISTORY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY DURING THE TIME OF THE DIVISION OF THE KINGDOM: TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TERM *EDAH* IN I KINGS 12:20

by Hanoch Reviv (pp. 59–63)

The author shows that the attribution of Jeroboam ben Nebat's coronation to the *Edah* (I Kings 12:20) – an institution which had ceased to exist during the pre-monarchic era – is an expression of the desire to present the Division and the establishment of the Northern Kingdom as normative, legitimate deeds.

The mention of *Edah* in this context has a foothold in the general atmosphere of the generation of the Division. It testifies to the awakening of an awareness of tribal belonging, as a reaction to the centralized government of the House of David, as well as to the tendency of renewing ancient traditions, which was anchored in the national-political renaissance of this breakaway group of tribes.

SENNACHERIB'S CAMPAIGN TO JUDAH: HISTORICAL AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

by Hayim Tadmor (pp. 65–80)

The paper is devoted mainly to a reappraisal of the Assyrian account of Sennacherib's campaign to Judah in 701 B.C.E. The literary and ideological conventions in the Royal Assyrian literature, especially that of depicting the defeat of an enemy, form the framework against which Sennacherib's account is evaluated. Further analysis reveals its structure, composed of five units, each separated and self-contained, and an appendix.

The defeat of Hezekiah, the last and the longest unit, is outstanding in that it does not contain the expected climax: the deposition of the rebellious king and the capture of his capital. Faced with such irregularity, the royal scribes sought to rectify it by employing others conventions, some of them *ad hoc* inventions.

The biblical narratives in II Kings 18–19 and Isaiah 38–39 – the authors of which appear to have been familiar with the Assyrian literary practice – resorted to conventions of their own in the narration of Sennacherib's campaign, telescoping the events retrospectively and introducing a miraculous climax.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE HASMONEAN KINGDOM AND
PTOLEMAIC EGYPT, IN VIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION
DURING THE 2ND AND 1ST CENTURIES B.C.E.

by Menahem Stern (pp. 81–106)

The article stresses the important role which Ptolemaic Egypt played in the political history of the Hasmonean state. The most striking intervention of Egypt in Palestine was during the end of Ptolemy Philometor's reign, when it seemed as though the land was returning to the Ptolemaic rule. However, the king's death (145 B.C.E.) prevented this development. Later on, and especially during the days of Alexander Yannai's reign, the Ptolemaic kingdom was a factor of prime importance in the history of Hasmonean Judea. The Egyptian influence over Judea ended only during the almost-final decline of Ptolemaic power, after 80 B.C.E.

The article portrays the relations between Hasmonean Judea and Ptolemaic Egypt, in view of the international situation during the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C.E., and devotes special attention to the relationships of each of these with the Seleucid kingdom, the Roman Republic and other factors in the area.

The article relies on papyrological, epigraphic and numismatic material to shed light on the events which are discussed here.

ALEXANDER YANNAI'S WARS WITH THE NABATAEANS

by Aryeh Kasher (pp. 107–120)

Alexander Yannai managed to take advantage of the historical development resulting from the accelerating decline of the Seleucid kingdom in the north and the internal struggles in the Ptolemaic kingdom in the south. During the early stage, Yannai anticipated the Nabataeans in conquering areas in Gil'ad (near Gadara and Hamta), as well as in the southern section of the coastline (Gaza and its surroundings), without allowing himself to become involved as yet in a direct military dispute with the Nabataeans. However, the barring of the Nabataeans' traditional sea-outlet in Gaza, and the increasing Hasmonean threat to take over completely the 'King's Way,' led Yannai, after a short time, to a direct military confrontation with Petra's rulers. The main battle was focused in the northern Gil'ad and the Golan regions, and Yannai's successes forced his enemies to turn instead to more easterly trade routes on the way to Syria and Damascus, such as Wadi Sirkhan and its branches.

Josephus' battle descriptions, which were based on foreign and hostile sources, among which Nicolaus of Damascus was the most significant, were consciously designed to minimize Yannai's glorious achievements and victories, in order to diminish his historical greatness. However, in spite of this tendentiousness, and the confused, fragmentary and contradictory reports, it is still possible to read between the lines about Yannai's great achievements in the battlefield.

Nevertheless, it was Yannai who sowed the seeds of the deep hatred between the Nabataeans and the Jews, which continued for many generations, at least until the destruction of the Second Temple.

‘SCRIBES AND PHARISEES, HYPOCRITES’: WHO WERE THE SCRIBES?

by Daniel R. Schwartz (pp. 121–132)

It is suggested that the ‘scribes’ of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles are, generally, to be identified as Levites (not Pharisees). This is based, primarily, on the fact that they most often appear either as subordinate judicial officials (alongside the high priests) or as teachers and spiritual authorities (alongside the Pharisees); this combination of roles best fits the Levites. Correspondingly, *grammateus* does not only mean ‘scribe’; it is also the usual Septuagint rendition of *shoter*, a subordinate judicial or police functionary, and *shoterim*, according to Chronicles and other texts of the Second Temple period, were drawn from among the Levites. Note also, among other arguments, that the Gospel of John does not mention scribes (apart from the spurious reference in 8:3), while the Synoptic Gospels, which frequently refer to scribes, do not mention Levites (apart from one in a parable, Luke 10:32); while John (1:19) mentions Levites in a delegation (sent to interview John the Baptist), the Synoptic Gospels, in similar situations, mention scribes (e.g. Mark 3:22, 7:1).

It thus appears that when New Testament texts refer to the scribes and the Pharisees, they allude to the representatives of the two major versions of first-century Judaism: Priestly (Sadducean) and Pharisaic. The scribes could claim the right to sit in Moses’ seat (Matthew 23:2) not only on the basis of their learning and abilities, but also on the basis of their Levitic descent, which they shared with Moses.

THE PIOUS (*HASSIDIM*) AND THE MEN OF DEEDS

by Shmuel Safrai (pp. 133–154)

This article provides some additional characteristics of the *Hassidic* (pietist) movement, which existed from the days of Honni Ha’mé’agel, in the 1st century B.C.E., until the end of the Amoraic period.

(A) The Galilee is the location of the *Hassidic* movement: All the *Hassidim* mentioned in the Tannaitic literature, who were active during the time of the Temple and during the days of Yavneh, and of whose place of activity we have some knowledge, were Galileans. Such were R. Hannina b. Dosa, the pious priest (*ha’Cohen ha’Hassid*) in Ramat Beit Anat, and the *Hassid* from K’far Eimi, which can be identified with Yavne’el in the Lower Galilee. To this list one should also add Jesus of Nazareth, who was close to the world of the *Hassidim*.

(B) Poverty is one of the characteristics of the *Hassidim*: The various traditions about the *Hassidim* exalt their poverty, and the virtue of poverty is emphasized in their teaching.

(C) The place of women in the stories about *Hassidim*: In almost all the traditions about the deeds of the *Hassidim*, women are mentioned in a variety of ways, far beyond the usual in the Talmudic tradition.

(D) The pious are men of deeds: The *Hassidim* are defined as 'men of deeds' whose uniqueness lies in emphasizing the good deed and in placing it above the value of Torah learning. In the literature which is thought to belong to the *Hassidic* stream, the value of the act is always emphasized, and has priority over learning.

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF RAV'S ACTIVITIES IN BABYLONIA

by Moshe Beer (pp. 155–172)

The author traces Rav's activities in Babylonia after the accession to power of Ardashir I (226). He examines the changes in the internal policies toward the religious minorities in Sassanian Persia. It transpires that the most decisive change found expression in the increase in political-religious influence of the fanatical-missionary Mazdi priesthood. This change was liable to endanger the continued existence of the Jewish Community, particularly in localities where knowledge of the Torah was limited and the observance of the precepts had become lax. Rav (d. 247) feared that these Jews might assimilate – as had been the case at Elam, Media and Messene. He thus constantly advocated the study of the Torah in the hope that it would serve as a bulwark. He vehemently combatted the influence of the Mazdi priests by forbidding all relations with them, as well as by disseminating knowledge of the Torah among all classes and age-groups. The crowning glory of these activities was the establishment of the 'Be-Rav' (a seminary or a college) for the training of scholars capable to overtake religious leadership. His success in this direction saved some sections of Babylonian Jewry from assimilating with their surroundings.

LINEAGE BOUNDARIES OF BABYLONIA

by Aharon Oppenheimer and Michael Lecker (pp. 173–187)

Babylonian sages were proud of the purity of descent of the Jews there when compared with that of the Jews in neighboring districts. For this purpose the Amoras of Babylonia fixed the boundaries of their land, but it had also a demographic and economic significance. It seems that the fertile area between the Tigris and the Euphrates delimited Jewish Babylonia.

The border demarcations in the Upper and Lower Tigris and the Upper Euphrates were fixed in the Babylonian Talmud, Kidushin 69b–71b. The position of the northeasternmost border is given by Rav as two settlements which lie opposite one another on the banks of the Tigris –

Ukhbara (according to Vatican MS 111), which has retained its name to the present day, and Awana, the remains of which are still known as the Wana ruins. According to Shmuel, the location of the border is Moshkani, which can be easily identified with Maskin, mentioned by Arabic geographers, and which lies not far from Ukbara and Awana.

The southeasterly border position is localized by R. Papa b. R. Shmuel (according to Munich MS and Vatican MS 111) between Upper Apamea and Lower Apamea. A settlement by the name of Apamea is mentioned in Greek and Latin sources as well, and can be identified with a village by the name of Fāmia, which is mentioned by the Arabic geographers and lies on the east bank of the Tigris near Kūt al-Imāra. The two borders in the Upper and Lower Tigris are congruent with Babylonia's district borders during the Sassanid period.

The northwesterly border position is marked by Rav as Aqra de-Tulbanqe, which can be reasonably identified with a village by the name of Niqyā in the Anbār district, mentioned in an Arabic source as a boundary between Persia and Rome. According to Shmuel, the location of the border is at Gishra de Be-Perat, which probably marks a bridge over the Euphrates not far from the settlement Bait Fāriṭ which is mentioned by Yāqūt and lies on the bank of the Euphrates, a parasang (*parsah*) away from Anbār (=Pumb'ditha). According to R. Yochanan, this border is the Gizma crossing.

The talmudic discussion does not mention the location of the southwesterly border, but some assistance in its identification can be found in Shmuel's words, in which he fixes the easternmost boundary of Ereẓ-Israel (in the framework of the promised boundaries) in a settlement by the name of Tarbiqna (Bereshit Rabba, 16:3, Theodor-Albeck ed., p. 145). It is probably correct to identify it with Bāniqyā, mentioned in Arabic literature, which lies near Nagaf, southwest of Kūfa in south Iraq. The Arabic geographers inform us that the Euphrates reached as far as Nagaf, where its tributary flowed into what was formerly an extension of the Persian Gulf. The Arabic sources further provide us with the information that the Jews used to bury their dead in Bāniqyā. Therefore, it can be surmised that this was done in order to include the buried ones within the limits of Ereẓ-Israel. Another burial zone, west of the Euphrates, was directly opposite the northwesterly corner of Babylonia's boundary for lineage, in the Anbār district.

FROM FATHER TO SON: THE INHERITANCE OF THE SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

by Avraham Grossman (pp. 189–220)

During the early Middle Ages, the heads of *Yeshivot* (Talmudic Academies) in Palestine and in Babylonia started bequeathing their posts to their sons. This was in total contrast to the custom during the Mishnaic and Talmudic period. Apparently, the phenomenon started first in Palestine as early as the sixth century. The reason for it was the political role which the *Yeshiva* assumed after the abolishment of the institution of *Nasi* (Patriarchate) at the end of the fifth century, and after some members of the family of the Exilarch of Babylonia seized the leadership of the Palestinian *Yeshiva* (Mar Zutra, ca. 500 C.E.).

In Babylonia the inheritance of leadership started at the end of the eighth century and was, apparently, enhanced by three factors:

(A) The growing role of the *Yeshivot* in the leadership of the community as a whole, and their concurrent transformation into more institutionalized and closed bodies, whose leaders, as well as many of their attendants, earned their livings from them.

(B) The triple competition of the Babylonian *Yeshivot*: with the Exilarch; with the other *Yeshivot* (Sura or Pumb'ditha), and with the *Yeshiva* of Palestine. The regal pomp was introduced in order to increase the honor and raise the status of the *Yeshivot*.

(C) The spreading of the dynastic inheritance principle in Muslim society during the Abbasid period (749 C.E. onwards) and the acceptance of a luxuriant, ostentatious way of life, together with the power.

The inheritance of the spiritual leadership influenced other strata in Jewish society as well, and brought about a growing polarization. Its first signs are also clearly visible in the learning arrangements. In general perspective, it led to disastrous results in a number of areas, and it can be considered as one of the important factors in the decline of the Babylonian *Yeshivot*.

In the centers in Spain and North Africa, the inheritance of the spiritual leadership did not succeed in striking roots. However, in Italy, Germany and France (including Provence) its marks were clearly visible until the end of the eleventh century, even though not quite as extremely as in Babylonia. The additional rights and the great influence held by the noble families in Christian European society made its acceptance easier. Although the phenomenon became attenuated in Jewish communities in Christian Europe after 1096, it left its mark for generations to come because of the *Yeshivot* heads' habit of choosing the best students as bridegrooms for their daughters.

CRIME AND VIOLENCE AMONG THE JEWS OF SPAIN (13TH – 14TH CENTURIES)

by Yom Tov Assis (pp. 221–240)

The deep involvement of the Jews in Spanish society affected Jewish society in a variety of fields. This article is an attempt to examine certain aspects of the social life of the Jews: crime and violence. In many respects the daily behavior of the Jews was a reflection of the conditions that prevailed in society at large.

Thieves among Jews were to be found throughout Spain, and neither heavy fines nor severe punishments deterred them from stealing from fellow-Jews or even from non-Jews. We have evidence of large-scale enterprises in stolen goods, especially in the kingdom of Aragon. Jews stole also from near relatives and friends. In some cases, once caught, they claimed they did so in the name of science or the Torah.

Jewish society in 13th–14th century Spain witnessed a sharp rise in the number of disputes in which no insults and curses were spared. Rabbis too were subjected to verbal harassment. Quarrels in the family were either symptoms of disintegration or of its immediate causes. Heated arguments in synagogues interrupted the services, often necessitating the issuance of preventive ordinances by the community. A wide range of curses and derogatory terms pronounced by Jews were a source of income to the royal treasury which collected the fines imposed.

Verbal disputes often led to physical violence which even penetrated into the synagogue. Resort to violence among the Jews was not a rare phenomenon. In numerous instances Jews

were wounded by coreligionists who used swords, knives and other instruments. The culprits came from all communities and social classes.

Most shocking was the number of murders committed by Jews, some of whom were the *protégés* of the king. Greed, political ambitions and jealousy were among the most widespread causes for murder. In several Jewish communities, unscrupulous and violent men imposed dread on the public, forced people to act against their will, and disrupted communal life and judicial procedure. They did not hesitate in using non-Jewish gangs against their brethren.

Criminal and violent behavior among the Jews of Spain must be seen as part of the mode of conduct prevalent in Iberian society. This fact, however, did not diminish the concern of the community leaders who took preventive measures and imposed heavy legal sanctions in order to eradicate crime and criminals. Furthermore, they sought the king's help and introduced a system of criminal punishment contrary to halacha and unique in the medieval Jewish world.

It must be remembered that crime and violence in Jewish society in Spain cannot be isolated from other aspects of Jewish life, and must be considered as part of the price that Hispano-Jewish society paid for the remarkable integration it enjoyed.

R. ELIJA OF MASSA LOMBARDA IN JERUSALEM

by Joseph R. Hacker (pp. 241–263)

The epistle of R. Elija 'of Ferrara' from Jerusalem to his sons in Italy is the most important document available portraying the life of the Jewish community in Jerusalem during the first half of the fifteenth century. In this epistle the economic as well as the spiritual life of the Jewish community in Jerusalem is described in detail, as viewed by a critical, discerning eye. In addition, it expresses the nature of the Italian Jews' interest in Palestine at that time.

The author's personality had been obscured, and the only known facts about him were that his name was Elija and his origin was in Ferrara. The epistle itself has been printed a few times, with omissions of paragraphs both in the letter itself and the inscription which was written on it, and in a poor transcription. As a result, scholars had difficulties in ascertaining the matters dealt with in the epistle, and in arriving at a realistic evaluation of its contents.

This article is devoted to the identification of the writer and to the publication of various texts which are connected with him (including the epistle from Jerusalem) – new ones as well as those previously known – in a critical, revised fashion.

The research made it apparent that R. Elija's origin was in the town Massa Lombarda, and that members of his family were residents there, as well as in Bagnacavallo and Ferrara, during the 1430s. It is suggested that his name was Elija b. Menachem, and that during the year 1425 he was dwelling in Padua. At that time there was a *Yeshiva* (Talmudic Academy) in Padua, and the well-known R. Yochanan Treves lived and taught there. R. Elija received the title 'Morenu,' and he taught in the *Yeshiva* and in public first in Italy and then in Jerusalem. He also compiled a *Shitta* – a commentary on Talmudic issues (on one tractate or more?), which was used by the students. During the year 1433 or thereafter (however before 1437), he went on a pilgrimage to Palestine via Egypt. The community of Bologna (or perhaps another community?) appointed him and his friend as its emissaries, in clarifying the rumors which had previously been spread in the Pope's court and among the Jews in Italy, regarding the reappearance of the Ten Tribes and

their wars. A letter of recommendation, which was also an appointment to the mission, was written by the community on his behalf, and was addressed to R. Amram, the leader of Egyptian Jews – The *Nagid* – in 1433. In 1437 he reached Jerusalem, and from there he wrote his famous letter. At the present we have no further knowledge of his life and activities after that letter.

The following are appended at the end of the article: (1) texts connected with his residence in Padua; (2) the epistle sent by the community (of Bologna?) to R. Amram the *Nagid* in 1433; (3) R. Elija's epistle from Jerusalem in 1438; (4) another version of one paragraph from the Jerusalem epistle.

DID MICER ALFONSO DE LA CABALLERIA INTERVENE AGAINST THE EXPULSION OF THE JEWS FROM SPAIN?

by Haim Beinart (pp. 265–275)

Micer Alfonso de la Caballeria, son of Pedro de la Caballeria (convert and author of *Zelus christi adversus Judaeos*), and grandson of Bonafos de la Caballeria, had close and diverse relations with Jews in Saragossa. His trial by the Inquisition clearly describe those relations. Nevertheless, he managed to have his trial stopped through the intervention of King Fernando, whose vice-chancellor he was in the kingdom of Aragon.

A safe-conduct by King Fernando [found in the British Museum (BM MS 12, 860 fol. 13r), and brought to light in this article], addressed to the Inquisitors of the Saragossa Court, absolves Micer Alfonso from any accusation of intervention on behalf of the Jews in order to revoke the order of the expulsion of the Jews. Previously, it had been presumed that only Don Isaac Abravanel and Don Abraham Senior, Rab de la Corte, acted on behalf of the Jews.

Light is also shed on the personality of Micer Alfonso de la Caballeria and his way of life.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE NATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL TEACHINGS OF RABBI JUDAH LOEB BEN BEZALEL OF PRAGUE: A SUGGESTED NEW APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF MAHARAL

by Otto Dov Kulka (pp. 277–320)

Rabbi Judah Loeb (Liva) Ben Bezalel (1525–1609), known as the MaHaRaL of Prague, has attracted the attention of scholars thanks to his unique, almost 'modern,' educational, national and historiosophical theories, which earned him a reputation as the only systematic thinker of medieval Ashkenazi Jewry. Most scholars, however, treated these theories as detached not only

from previous Jewish thought but also from Jewish and European ideas prevalent in his time, and from the historical background in general. This article attempts to point out new approaches to the study of MaHaRaL's theories, placing them in their proper historical context and tracing the possible links of communication between him and other thinkers of his time.

MaHaRaL's national and historiosophical theories have, at times, been compared with those of individual European philosophers who were defined as 'representative' of the period (e.g. Machiavelli, Calvin, Grotius). Martin Buber, for example, pointed out particularly the affinity between some basic concepts of MaHaRaL and those of Calvin, yet ruled out any possibility of actual communication between the two. We would like to suggest the striking possibility that MaHaRaL could have read the Calvinistic catechism in a Hebrew translation which was presented as a Jewish work. (Calvin's name was not mentioned in the book, and in his introduction the translator presented himself as a Jew speaking to his fellow Jews.) The book was brought to Moravia by humanists, members of the sect of Bohemian Brothers, which had its origins in the fifteenth century Czech Reformation. The sect lived as a partly tolerated and partly persecuted minority in the areas where the MaHaRaL officiated, and could provide the missing link between the ideas of MaHaRaL and those of Calvin. It is assumed that, besides several other decisive factors examined in the article, the challenge of a Christian sect that considered itself 'chosen' in the Calvinistic sense, may have, dialectically, stimulated MaHaRaL to develop his ideas on nationhood within the framework of 'natural law' and the uniqueness of the choice of Israel even in times of exile.

The Bohemian Brothers could, in a similar way, be the link between the educational ideas of MaHaRaL and those of Jan Amos Comenius, founder of modern pedagogical thought. We must recall that Comenius, the last bishop of the Bohemian Brothers, exiled from his native land, relied heavily on his predecessors within the sect, especially on MaHaRaL's contemporary, the humanist Jan Blahoslav. The educational and cultural center of the sect was located in Eibenschütz, Moravia, not far from Nikolsburg, where MaHaRaL served as rabbi (1553–1573). One of the main enterprises of the center was the translation of the Bible into Czech. The openmindedness of the Bohemian humanists on the one hand, and, on the other, the readiness of MaHaRaL to learn from Gentile works (though he forbade students to do so) and to engage in polemics with Christians, may encourage scholars to try and find the 'missing link' between MaHaRaL and Comenius here.

Similarly, MaHaRaL's theories were seldom examined against the actual historical circumstances of his time in Bohemia, Moravia and Posen. At most they were set against abstract 'conceptual realities' such as 'the thought of the Renaissance Era' on the one hand, or 'the world of Ashkenazi Jewry at the end of the Middle Ages' on the other. Here too, when we check the universal parts of MaHaRaL's theories of nationalism, we might well find evidence of the direct influence of his historical environment. Many of the ensuing theoretical definitions, such as those concerning the 'natural right' of the Czechs to their land, and the role of the national language, correspond to the basic concepts of MaHaRaL's thought. Research into a large variety of sources, from declarations of the Czech Estates, through humanistic and Church literature, to market and pub talk as reflected in judicial files, may well illustrate these points.

The German demands for autonomy were answered by strong Czech resistance. The demographic reality in Bohemia, Moravia, and Posen, where MaHaRaL lived and worked, was that of a number of national groups, each with its own religion and language. In contemporary Bohemian sources the Jews are considered one of these national groups, together with the Lutheran Germans, Catholic Italians, the Czechs, united around the Bohemian Confession, etc. This was also true of Posen where the Poles, the Germans and the Jews each constituted a

distinct national and religious entity. A large variety of sources prove the existence of intensive contacts between the Jews and the other groups. These contacts ranged from physical and commercial mingling (the penetration of Gentiles into Jewish districts and vice versa), to appealing to non-Jewish courts of law, and to social intercourse. We also find many indications of religious disputations and conversions. MaHaRaL's warnings against close contact with Gentiles and the fact that he gave a systematic presentation of his ideas in the specific context of Christian-Jewish polemics seem to indicate a connection between his theories and the realities of his time.

The attempt to place MaHaRaL's theories in their proper historical context need not deprive them of their originality. These ideas, though connected with actual reality, derive from sources which go far deeper than it, and carry implications which greatly transcend it.

RABBI SHNEUR ZALMAN OF LYADY AS A HASSIDIC LEADER

by Emanuel Etkes (pp. 321–354)

The current view in the research literature is that R. Shneur Zalman (Rashaz) was a 'spiritual' *Zaddik*, namely a leader who does not intervene in fulfilling the earthly needs of his flock. This assumption requires qualification as well as amplification. Rashaz considered the main part of his mission to be the spiritual instruction of the *Hassidim*. Nevertheless, in this matter too, he paved his own way. Unlike the outlook according to which a *Hassid* can achieve a high spiritual level through his attachment to the *Zaddik*, the view held by Rashaz was that the *Hassid*, on his own merit, should attempt to ascend to a higher spiritual level in the worship of God. The *Zaddik*'s role is limited to setting out the goals and the proper means, and to creating the motivation. This concept was the basis for the modes of leadership which were formulated by Rashaz, and which manifested themselves both in his own 'court' and in the various groups of his followers – the *Hassidim*.

The modes of behavior which were formulated and fostered by Rashaz were a direct result of the antagonism between his understanding of his role as a leader, and the circumstances and compulsions in which he was acting. The visits of *Hassidim* to Rashaz's court were not conceived as events which were significant in their own right, but rather as a starting point in their efforts in their day-to-day worship of God. Rashaz established a highly developed and organized system, directed at regulating the *Hassidim*'s visits to his court. A basic trend in this system was the positive discrimination of newcomers over the old *Hassidim*. In addition, Rashaz devised a method of guidance, instruction and enforcement, which enabled him to be currently involved in molding the *Hassidim*'s conduct in their various groups.

The ever-growing number of people who turned to him, confronted Rashaz with a severe dilemma: this brought about the limiting of the personal touch between himself and his *Hassidim*, and a considerable growth in the role of the intermediate levels. Rashaz's decision to enlarge the circle of *Hassidim* seems to reflect upon his view regarding the mission of *Hassidism* in Jewish society in general.

JEWISH ENTREPRENEURSHIP DURING THE SECOND INDUSTRIAL
REVOLUTION: THE ROTHSCHILDS AND THE RUSSIAN OIL INDUSTRY,
1886–1911

by Michael Graetz (pp. 355–377)

This paper deals with the fate of the family enterprise at the turn of the century, a time of accelerated economic growth and concentration in industry, commerce and finance. Does monopolistic capitalism signal the gradual disappearance of the kind of entrepreneurship which, during the early stages of industrialization, was centered around the family, as several historians have contended? We have chosen the involvement of the Paris branch of the Rothschild House in the Russian oil industry (1886–1911) as a test case in order to elucidate this question.

Notwithstanding the brevity of this enterprise, it constituted a considerable economic success. Together with the Nobel brothers, the Rothschilds contributed their share in transforming pre-1905 Russia into the world's biggest oil supplier, which could easily compete with Rockefeller's Standard Oil in the European market. The mere fact that the Rothschilds managed to withdraw from the Russian oil business before the outbreak of World War I and the October Revolution, enabled them to score an appreciable profit. But that is not the major issue at stake here.

In our view, the importance of this episode lies in its connection with the stage of monopolistic or 'organized' capitalism, and the light it sheds on the ability of the family enterprise to adapt itself to changing conditions.

(A) By the early 1870s a process of 'restructuration' was launched within the Paris branch of the Rothschild House. An industry department was set up, headed by an engineer, a graduate of the esteemed École Polytechnique. His task was to keep a watchful eye on technological innovations and their application in industrial enterprises. As the new department expanded, incorporating units for chemical, metallurgical and electrical industry, the affiliation of a unit for the oil industry was a natural evolution. Meanwhile the bank lost its character of a 'family bank' in the old sense. No longer was all the managing power or all capital shares to be concentrated in the hands of family members only.

(B) The entry of the Rothschild's Bank into the Russian oil industry reflects its integrative ability to incorporate all stages – extraction, refining, transportation and distribution – in a differentiated, but nevertheless cohesive network, extending from south Russia, via numerous substations, to the clients in Central and Western Europe, to the Russian interior and through Siberia all the way to Manchuria. At a time when the Russian transportation system had not yet reached an advanced stage of integration, a great deal of logistic inventiveness and skill was needed in order to make possible the profitable flow of the oil over thousands of miles – from the points of extraction to the clients.

(C) The successful adaptation of a Jewish family bank to technological and structural change brought about by the Second Industrial Revolution can also be attributed to the particular path of economic development in 19th century France, to the timing of the 'takeoff' of the Industrial Revolution in this country, to the role played by a unique entrepreneurial élite, the Saint-Simonians, Jews and non-Jews, and to the long-term impact of their appearance.

Apart from these aspects of mainly economic character, one should bear in mind a specific political and Jewish facet of the Russian oil episode. We are not merely alluding to the

diplomatic back-door policy and to the use of economic power: the refusal of the Rothschilds to take part in the launching of a loan of major importance for the rescue of the Czarist Government after the Japano-Russian war and the Revolution of 1905. We are hinting also to the 'employment policy' of the Rothschild House.

At this stage there was the clear preference for Jews as members of company boards and in key managerial positions. Due to the changing conditions of 'organized' capitalism, the Rothschilds felt compelled to embark on a 'restructuration' of their enterprise, which lost some of its original 'family' character. The Rothschild corporations appointed Jews and drew on Jewish capital from all over the world and subsisted as a kind of 'Jewish territory' in Gentile surroundings.

CENTRAL AUTHORITY IN THE HUNGARIAN JEWISH COMMUNITY, 1870–1939

by Nathaniel Katzburg (pp. 379–395)

Hungarian Jewry was divided into two national organizations of communities, the Neologs and the Orthodox, each of which had a central authority which directed its internal and external affairs on the national level. The present article deals with the origins, development and functions of the central communal authorities.

In December 1868 a national Jewish congress was convened to establish the autonomous unitary organization of the communities in Hungary and Transylvania. The congress consisted of elected representatives, 57.5% of whom belonged to the Neolog Party, 42.5% to the Orthodox. The deep conflict between the parties – the origins of which date back to the early decades of the nineteenth century – became an open strife in the course of the Congress, and this led to the secession of the Orthodox. Eventually, they succeeded in obtaining government permission to organize in separate communities.

The Neolog organization had two super-communal bodies: the district unions of communities, and a National Office, headed by a president elected by the presidents of the district unions. Over the years the National Office became the government's chief advisor on all questions pertaining to Jewry. Thus, in usage and practice, the National Office had become the central executive and representative body of Neolog Jewry. The regional presidents were not in a position to exercise parliamentary control over the National Office. Another problem was the contention between the National Office and the Pest community, the largest and most powerful in the country. Its leaders resented what they regarded as the guardianship of the Office. The struggle between the two bodies came to an end only in 1932, when the presidency of both the National Office and the Pest community were united in one person.

With the establishment of the Orthodox organization in 1871, a provisional central committee was set up, and was recognized by the government as the national representative body of Orthodoxy. Though provisional, this body acted for over twenty-five years. Like the Neolog National Office, the Orthodox committee also encountered opposition from within. The gist of the controversy was supremacy in the direction of communal policy on the national level, i.e. whether it rested with rabbis or laymen. In 1906, the respective status of rabbis and laymen in the national governing bodies was fixed at 60% laymen and 40% rabbis in the National Representation of 100 elected members, and at two-thirds laymen and one-third rabbis in the

executive organs. However, in all matters pertaining to religion the rabbis had the de voice.

From 1938, with the beginning of the anti-Jewish legislation, the National Office led and directed the defense campaign against the discriminatory laws. The national representative bodies of both the Neologs and the Orthodox cooperated in this activity. The major role, however, was played by the Neologs, who were more involved in non-Jewish society and had wider political connections.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE JEWISH QUESTION IN ENGLAND AT THE END OF WORLD WAR I

by Shmuel Almog (pp. 397–431)

The Great War and its aftermath was a period of upheaval that changed, among other things, the status and image of the Jews. The Balfour Declaration, the Russian Revolution and other international events had a cumulative effect on the so-called Jewish Question. This study analyzes the impact of these events on the Jews in England, and also traces their responses to them.

This is an attempt to transcend the boundaries of a two-dimensional relationship between Jew and Gentile, in order to render a dynamic view of these relations on numerous levels. Thus, the international role of Britain at the time and the development of English society are portrayed in conjunction with the variegated attitudes of Jews both in England and elsewhere.

In the final analysis England withstood the assault on the Jews, as exemplified by the rate of diffusion of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in the early twenties. The article focuses on the high tide and low ebb of antisemitism as a many-faceted process of interaction. On the other hand, it reveals the wider ramifications of the Jewish Question, far beyond plain antisemitism. In contrast to some research carried out in this area, the twenties are not portrayed here as a mere backdrop to the climate of appeasement that prevailed in the late thirties, but as a period worthy of evaluation on its own merits.

IN THE TANGLE OF PERPLEXITY ABOUT NORMALIZATION

(Jewish Public Thought in U.S.A. during the Years 1942–1950,
on the Question of the Historic Place of the Jews in the Aftermath
of the Holocaust and the Establishment of the State of Israel)

by Joseph Gorni (pp. 433–456)

The article deals with the public discussion which took place among American Jewry, on the question of defining the essence and place of the Jews in the surrounding society, in the aftermath of the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel. The core of the discussion was the term ‘normalization,’ and to the extent it applies to the twofold Jewish existence: in the Diaspora and in the sovereign Jewish state.

Three approaches to this issue are traced, which are defined here as ‘General Normalization,’ ‘Unique Normalization,’ and ‘Jewish Normalization.’

Those who adopted the first approach ruled out, for various and even contradictory reasons, any national uniqueness in the Jewish existence. Among the advocates of this approach were secular radical intellectuals who maintained a universalistic outlook, religious thinkers who understood Judaism only in its religious context, and national activists who wished to draw a distinction between the Hebrew nation in Israel and the Jewish religion, whose status was, according to their view, similar to that of Christianity or Islam.

Those who believed in ‘Unique Normalization’ converted the term exile into Diaspora, and maintained that the ‘new’ phenomenon of the Jews’ existence in their sovereign state and in the Diaspora is, in a way, a repetition of the historic situation at the time of the Second Temple. They tried to put a seal of ‘normality’ to this kind of existence, while relying on the pluralistic, ethnic and cultural reality in U.S.A. Thus, while considering themselves linked to Jewish history through its uniqueness, they also saw themselves, from the ‘normal’ perspective, i.e., as being similar to their fellow-citizens of Irish or Italian origin, who, without abandoning recognition of their origin, form an integral part of American society. Most of those who held this view came from the modern religious movements, and among them were also some Zionist leaders, whose intellectual outlook was strongly bound to the Anglo-Saxon culture.

The third approach, known as ‘Jewish Normalization,’ was that of ideological opponents, such as the remnants of the Bund from Poland, Yiddishist intellectuals and Zionists, whose cultural world had taken shape in Eastern Europe. They all shared the assumption that Jewish existence is first and foremost nationalistic, and mainly secular. In spite of the disagreements between them regarding the historic status of the *Golah* (exile) following the establishment of the State of Israel, they considered the exile a normal Jewish phenomenon.