



סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion* / ציון, Vol. ב' (תשנ"ב), pp. XXVII-XXX

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70036242>

Accessed: 04/12/2011 08:43

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

RISHONIM AND AHARONIM, ANTIQUI ET MODERNI (Periodization and Self-Awareness in Ashkenaz)

by Israel Jacob Yuval (pp. 369–394)

The tension between old and new in the Christian world is frequently defined by the two terms: *antiqui* and *moderni*. The words that represent this very same tension within Judaism are: *rishonim* and *aharonim*. The purpose of this study is to examine the historical development and uses of the terms *rishonim* and *aharonim* as they were employed by the Jews of Germany in the late medieval period, and to point to an affinity between this usage and that of *antiqui* and *moderni* in the universities.

Up to the fourteenth century there was no periodized barrier in the minds of the rabbis of Ashkenaz separating them from their post-Talmudic predecessors, and consequently the years from the redaction of the Talmud down to their own generations were viewed as one continuous period. The dividing line between an earlier, authoritative era and subsequent generations was deemed to be located somewhere in the sixth century. This perception, however, underwent change in the fifteenth century, when the cognizance of a distinction between *rishonim* and *aharonim* began to set in. The dividing line for this distinction was established at the middle of the fourteenth century, with two consequences for the world of halakha: 1) The license for an *aharon* to disagree with a *rishon* was abolished. 2) In unsettled disputes among *rishonim*, an *aharon* was no longer permitted to render a decision in accordance with his own reasoning, but rather was required to embrace the opinion of the concluding generation of *rishonim*, whose sages came to be known as *batra'ei*. The logic here was that later authorities had an advantage over their predecessors in that they knew the opinions of all who came before them, and not vice versa.

However, this advantage of all later authorities (*batra'ei*), came up against the barrier of periodization following 1350. The halakhists living after the 'black death' were no longer deemed *batra'ei*, notwithstanding their advantage in having access to all previous knowledge and decisions.

The distinction between *rishonim* and *aharonim* and the granting of precedence to the *batra'ei*, reflects a diminished self-esteem on the part of the halakhists of the fifteenth century, but the concept of periodization was destined to become established for posterity. Henceforth no one doubted the distinction between *rishonim* and *aharonim*, nor the

authority of *batra'ei*, and all this occurred notwithstanding the flourishing of Torah-study in Poland at the time.

In the Christian world the distinction between *antiqui* and *moderni* usually signified the differences between the Church Fathers and the scholars of the Middle Ages. In the fourteenth century this barrier was moved and re-established around the year 1310. During the fifteenth century these definitions of periodization evolved into the names of two schools, the *via antiqua* (realists) and the *via moderna* (nominalists). It thus appears that there are definite similarities regarding the consciousness of periodization in the Jewish and Christian communities, and these similarities are likewise discernible in the stages and chronological frameworks of the parallel process in both communities. Nevertheless, significant differences relating to the content of these contemporaneous processes of periodization must also be stressed.

HEINRICH MARX, KARL MARX AND ELEANOR MARX: THREE GENERATIONS AND THE CHALLENGE OF CIVIC EQUALITY

by Shlomo Na'aman (pp. 395–427)

Sources on the life of Marx and his family are dispersed among various archives, and until recently access to these archives was difficult if not totally impossible. The relevant material was collected in *Marx Engels Werke (MEW)*, vols. 1–39 (Berlin 1963–1968), as well as in *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe (MEGA)* (1975; with the addition of the correspondence of Heinrich Marx). The image of the family that emerges here is different and sometimes surprising, when compared with earlier descriptions.

Eleanor Marx, the youngest daughter of Karl Marx and third generation after Heinrich and Karl Marx, was active at a time when an organized labor movement already existed in Europe, and was therefore the focus of a popular as well as critical curiosity that emerged on the pages of periodicals and memoirs of the period. The nature of the raw material about her is totally different, and far more abundant, than the extant source material that served for depictions of her father and grandfather.

The purpose of this study is to examine the three generations of the Marx family and their reactions to the challenges of emancipation. The place of Judaism as it relates to the representative of each generation is also examined, but caution is required lest we extrapolate from the behavior of these unique figures to the overall changes that were effected in each generation. The three members of the Marx family described in this study were extraordinary, and do not necessarily reflect the attitudes of their respective generations.

Heinrich Marx consciously abandoned a Judaism with which he was intimately familiar. He knowingly opted for life in what may be described as a Prussian-Protestant ghetto within the larger Catholic community. Throughout his life he expected to ultimately be appreciated

by the Prussian bureaucracy. He took pride in his loyalty to the Prussian king, which served as the basis for his monarchic ethos. Nevertheless, remnants of his Jewish background survived due to his incomplete acculturation and innate Jewish mentality.

Karl Marx was a Christian devoid of Christianity, aware of his Jewish background but with no sense of a lack of Jewish values. Indeed he scoffed at those values and thus felt no need to react to anti-Jewish behavior, even when such behavior was aimed directly at him. If he related at all to Jews, he did so only as representatives of the bourgeoisie. He lent his support only to Jews who were in the process of leaving the fold, or who had already totally abandoned their Jewish roots. He thereby influenced the lives of individual Jews, but in no way can be considered as representing Jews.

Eleanor Marx sensed the isolation of her family and suffered from the stifling effect of her father's behavior during his lifetime. She was sensitive to her Jewish background and inquisitive about her roots, and this did not go unnoticed by the Jewish immigrants who, while having abandoned any formal religious practice, had nevertheless grown up in traditional surroundings. They accepted Eleanor as Jewish even though this was not the case according to halakha. Eleanor developed strong ties with these immigrants.

The three generations of Marx's family thus combine to represent a family saga, while at the same time each individual also represents a particular Jewish aspect typical of that person's generation.

A NEW APPROACH TO JEWISH-ARAB RELATIONS: THE ECONOMIC INITIATIVE OF ZVI BOTKOWSKY

by Yoram Nimrod (pp. 429–450)

The crisis that engulfed the *yishuv* and the Zionist leadership in the wake of Arab violence in 1929 led to a call for the establishment of a special body devoted both to determining ongoing reaction as well as formulating a long-term policy aimed at maintaining relations with the Arabs. Consequently the 'Joint Bureau of Jewish Public Institutions in Palestine' was set up, and alongside it an advisory committee comprised of public figures.

Two approaches towards the nature of the desired relations with the Arabs emerged in the committee, both of which drew upon the split within Arab society. One group strove to take advantage of that split by forging a political coalition with a segment of the Arab population, thereby advancing the goals of Zionist policy without assuming to effect a socio-economic change within the Arab community. This served as the background for attempts by Haim Margolis-Kalvaryski to establish parties and associations supported by Zionist funding.

The espousers of the alternative approach repudiated any attempt at purchasing political backing, preferring instead to support the early signs of change and modernization within a society long suffering from internal terrorism. They hoped that changes in the economic

system would lead to the development of an economic democracy, which in turn would ultimately – if not initially – encourage political cooperation.

There appears to be a correlation between the approach of the first group and the tradition of behaviour evinced by the officials of the baron towards the settlements of the first *aliya*, who preferred some sort of symbiosis with the conservative elements of Arab society. On the other hand the second group brings to mind the rebellion against the baronial protectorate, a policy that emerged from the circles of Herzl, Weizman and those settlers represented by figures such as Zvi Botkowsky. These served as a model for the idea of an economic democracy, that in turn would serve as the basis for cooperation between the two nations living in one land, with each recognizing the crucial interests of the other group and encouraging the productive elements of both societies.

The Joint Bureau failed to achieve its goals, but not due to a lack of potential Arab partners. In fact, there were Arabs willing to cooperate with each of the contesting parties within the Jewish Agency, the Va'ad ha-Leumi and the Joint Bureau. The Joint Bureau failed because of the endemic struggles within the Jewish establishment. At a crucial time for decision on Botkowsky's initiative, the Jewish Agency and the Va'ad ha-Leumi were paralyzed by their struggle, each claiming the primary role in shaping Zionist Arab policy. This struggle was multifaceted and would continue up to the establishment of the State of Israel.