



סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. (תש"ן), (נה), חוברת ב (תש"ן), pp. VII-X

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70040111>

Accessed: 04/12/2011 10:29

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 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF 4QTEST IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES

by Hanan Eshel (pp.141–150)

The archaeological finds that were discovered in the Hasmonean Winter Palace at Jericho may support Starcky's proposal to identify the builder of Jericho in 4QTest and in 4QPssJos with John Hyrcanus I, whose two sons, Antigonus and Aristobulus I, died within one year (130 B. C. E.). This interpretation may suggest that the four passages in 4QTest deal with John Hyrcanus I. In the author's opinion the interpretation of Joshua 6:26 in 4QPssJos was quoted from 4QTest, and not vice versa.

THE STANDING AND ACTIVITIES OF RABBAN GAMALIEL PRIOR TO HIS MOVE TO YAVNEH

by Ben-Zion Rosenfeld (pp. 151–169)

The biography of Rabban Gamaliel following the destruction of the Temple and until his move to Yavneh is unclear. This article examines sources from that period which provide evidence of an enhancement of his standing at the time. In Lod, where he maintained a Bet Midrash, Rabban Gamaliel grew into a prestigious and authoritative scholar. He became wealthy and acquired property, perhaps through the support of the Romans who were seeking a leader among the Jews as part of their policy of establishing a new order in Palestine. The relationship which would advance Gamaliel as a spiritual leader was the one he cultivated with the sages in Lod, already the largest Jewish town shortly after the destruction, where the foremost students were his disciples. This was the background to his appointment as Patriarch (c. 85 C.E.), which together with his arrival at Yavneh consequently forced Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai to suspend his own activities at that center.

THE TRIAL OF MENAHEM, ALIAS BARTOLOME GALLEGO,
BY THE INQUISITION IN TOLEDO

by Haim Beinart (pp. 171–182)

Menahem left Spain as a child with his father Abenyule in 1492. Orphaned at the age of six, he was the ward of various communities in Northern Africa, where he apprenticed first with Jewish merchants and later with a group of Christian merchants who had been peddling merchandise in the region. In the course of his wanderings he encountered a group of 200 Jews who had been expelled from Spain, and who were stranded in Tlemcen and later in Cagliari (Sardinia) on their way to the Holy Land. Menahem converted to Catholicism in Cagliari and then returned to his birthplace in Montalbán. After learning a new trade he settled as a tailor in Talavera de la Reina. There he met two Moroccan slaves, with whom he talked about his days in Morocco while yearning for and praising his Jewish past. Denounced by the slaves, Menahem was tried and condemned to prison in 1525 but managed to escape. He was retried and burned in effigy on the 30th of November 1527 in Toledo.

THE HASIDIC MOVEMENT AFTER 1772:
CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

by Ada Rapoport-Albert (pp. 183–245)

The year 1772 is usually considered a critical juncture or at least a turning point in the history of the Hasidic movement. The events which converged to alter its course were the start of the Opponents' (*mitnaggedim*) campaign against Hasidism in the spring, the first partition of Poland in the summer, and the death of the Maggid of Mezhiroch (miedzyrzec) in December of the same year. This has led the majority of scholars to divide the history of the movement into two clearly distinct stages: (1) From around 1740 to 1772 – an initial period of cohesion during which Hasidism – a regional phenomenon of limited scope – was headed by a single supreme leader, first its founder, the Besht, and later his disciple and heir, the Maggid of Mezhiroch. (2) From 1772 on, when, in response to the spread of Hasidism beyond its immediate area of provenance, the political disintegration of Poland which in turn broke up the regional integrity of the movement, the absence of a suitable heir to the Maggid of Mezhiroch and the exposure to intense persecution by the Opponents, the movement was de-centralised and began to operate as a network of distinct circles, each led independently by its own supreme leader.

In fact, it is argued, de-centralisation did not constitute an abrupt organisational change,

nor was it imposed by the events of 1772. From its earliest beginnings, Hasidism operated as loosely affiliated circles of devotees, each clustered around its own charismatic leader. The conventional view of the Besht and the Maggid of Mezhirech as unique central leaders of the Hasidic movement, as a whole, is an anachronistic projection of the cohesive structure of each particular Hasidic 'court' in the post-1772 period on the entire network of Hasidic circles before 1772. The Besht and the Maggid of Mezhirech – clearly distinguished in the collective memory of the movement as the most influential spiritual leaders and teachers of their time – did not exert their influence through any centralised organisational channels: they did not preside over a hierarchy of leaders and did not generate any other mechanism for central control. Even during their lifetime, their associates and disciples, however indebted to them spiritually, functioned as independent, and sometimes rival leaders, each among his own circle of followers. The events of 1772, and the continued expansion of Hasidism, simply exposed and enhanced the pluralistic organisational structure which was inherent in the movement from the start.

The most significant organisational change in the post-1772 period is not, therefore, the alleged decentralisation of the movement but the emergence from the early 19th century onward of hereditary succession in the leadership of each particular, centralistic Hasidic 'court'. This was not the mechanism by which succession was regulated in the leadership of early Hasidism. The failure of the Besht's only son to succeed him or, in turn, the failure of the Maggid's son to succeed his father was not, as it is often presented, a breakdown of 'normal' procedures resulting from exceptional circumstances in each case, but rather the inevitable consequence of the absence at that stage of any expectation of formal succession – hereditary or otherwise – within their respective circles of devotees. The Maggid of Mezhirech did not succeed the Besht, nor did the Maggid's disciples succeed him in any formal, institutional sense. The pluralistic organisational structure in which they operated could accommodate the demise of one charismatic leader and the spontaneous emergence of another, or several others, without this being perceived as a direct succession or, conversely, as a crisis of succession in the leadership of the movement as a whole. On the other hand, the distinct organisational and ideological identity of each independent Hasidic circle had not yet become established enough at this stage to generate the expectation of survival beyond the lifetime of each founder by means of an heir.

The distinctive identity of each circle and the collectively distinct identity of the movement as a whole were established simultaneously at a later stage. This was initially a response to the outbreak of Opposition in 1772, which for the first time defined coherently the loosely affiliated hasidic circles in reference to the non-Hasidic, now anti-Hasidic camp. The clear differentiation by the Opponents of a collective Hasidic identity triggered off a process of internal Hasidic differentiation of 'paths', each becoming increasingly distinctive, both ideologically and in terms of formal organisation. The dynamics of this process have found their literary expression in various Hasidic adaptations of the Kabbalistic doctrine of the affinity of 'families' of souls, each stemming from a particular divine 'root' or 'spark'. This doctrine was to serve the Hasidic movement from the start as a universal principle by which to explain and legitimate the pluralistic structure of its leadership.

*REJOINDERS*ON THE ANXIETY OF GERMAN JEWS DURING
THE HUSSITE CRUSADE (1421)

by Zvi Baras (pp. 246–248)

This rejoinder to I.J. Yuval's article: 'Jews, Hussites and Germans according to the Chronicle "Gilgul Bnei Husim" ' (*Zion*, LIV [1989], pp. 275–319) refers to one point only, namely the conjecture that the anxiety of the German Jews during the Hussite crusade of 1421 was shaped 'by the collective memory of the persecution of 1096' (*ibid.*, pp. 285, 297). A careful study of the chronicle, meticulously edited by Yuval, in fact makes it clear that the Rheinland Jews were not worried by the dangerous circumstances of war time; in this respect they were promised support and protection by the local population and government. In fact, they dreaded the Crusading forces from Holland and Brabant who were about to pass through the Rheinland communities on their way to fight the Hussites. It is known from other sources that the Crusaders indeed attacked the Rheinland Jews and in Neustadt some forced conversions were reported.

This fearful expeditionary force from Holland and Brabant – described by the chronicle as 'ancient haters of Jews' – brings to mind another violent Crusading mob, also from Flanders and Brabant (see this author's article: 'Persecution of Jews in Brabant in 1309', *Zion*, XXXIV [1969], pp. 111–116). It therefore seems more likely that the relatively fresh memory of the 1309 persecution of the Jews of Brabant, by a similar Crusading mob, may have been the immediate cause for the German Jews' anxiety in 1421.