



סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. ב (תשנ"ב), pp. V-VI

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70036209>

Accessed: 04/12/2011 08:44

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 HASMONEANS IN GRECO-ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

by Israel Shatzman (pp. 5–64)

Although the Hasmoneans figure in the writings of many Greek and Roman historians, there has not yet been any in-depth study of these references. This has not prevented various modern scholars from claiming that ancient historians espoused an anti-Hasmonean position, and this assumption also guided their interpretation of this or that ancient historian. The present study assembles all references to the Hasmoneans in Greek and Roman historiography. True, study of these texts indicates that they are only fragments of much larger accounts of the Hasmoneans, so our conclusions concerning these authors' opinions of the Hasmoneans must remain limited. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Greek and Roman historians did not follow a single line; some criticized and condemned various activities of the Hasmoneans, while others praised them or their policies. Indeed, the Greco-Jewish confrontation was of lesser significance for these writings than were the generally-accepted rules of historical writing.

In particular, two widespread errors of modern historians are singled out: (1) the description of the Hasmoneans as 'tyrants' was invented not by Gentile historians, but seems rather to be of Jewish origin; and (2) the Hasmoneans did not follow a general policy of destroying Hellenistic cities in Palestine, and the Gentile historians did not mislead their readers in this regard.

DID THE FIRST ALIYA PIONEERS HAVE A GENERAL SETTLEMENT POLICY?

by Margalit Shilo (pp. 65–88)

The Biluim were the only First Aliya pioneers who dreamt of the revival of the Jewish State. But even they described in detail only the building of an individual settlement: the central Moshava of the Bilu members. The difficult conditions in Eretz Israel and the lack of adequate financial resources prevented any all-embracing country-wide settlement plan. The first settlers were busy building their individual moshavot.

Correspondingly, Baron de Rothschild, the famous financier whose aid to the first pioneers was absolutely essential, thought that the settlements were 'paradigms for the future'. This was also the settlement concept of Rabbi Mohaliver, who initiated the Ekron settlement, and of Ze'ev Levin-Epstein, who was the director of the builders of Rehovot.

The Jewish workers of the period criticized the system which favored settlements that were geared only for the wealthy, settlements with only a handful of settlers. They thought of a regional settlement plan which would include many more people in a dense settlement system.

A natural outcome of the 'Moshava' concept of the first Aliya colonists was their avoidance of almost all urban settlement plans. Similarly, their interest in settling Jerusalem was almost nil. An all-embracing country-wide settlement policy was first introduced by the Second Aliya idealists, who were busy building the new Jewish town, Tel-Aviv, as well as other types of settlements. Their settlement policy was accompanied by a growing national consciousness.