



(סיכום) בשפה האנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. תש"ו, חוברת ד (תש"ו), pp. I-IV

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70061505>

Accessed: 15/11/2011 03:22

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>

SUMMARY

THE STORY OF THE CAPTURE OF JERUSALEM IN THE TIME OF DAVID AND ITS HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

by B. DINABURG

(pp. 153—167)

The author endeavours to explain the historical significance of the story relating to the capture of Jerusalem in the time of David, one of the obscurest episodes in the historical records of the Bible. On the basis of a minute collation of the two sources regarding the conquest that have come down to us (Samuel 11, 5, and Chronicles 1, 11) the author arrives at the conclusion that they constitute one source, the story in Chronicles being simply a continuation of the one in the Book of Samuel. The historical framework of the story is the conquest of Jerusalem as a first step in the rise and great military victories of David. From a literary point of view the story relates the heroic deeds of David and his followers which are connected with his accession to the throne. A close examination of the structure of the story reveals that the verses which speak of the "tunnel" (צינור) and of the "blind and the lame" relate to the manner in which the city of Jerusalem was captured. An analysis of the language and style of these verses and a comparison with the various translations (especially the Septuagint) shows that the version in our possession is correct and exact and that the various differences in the translations arise from the attempts made by the ancients to explain the words which were already then obscure.

The key to the understanding of the story lies in a comprehension of the point of the story. The story simply conveys to us the fact that the city was captured by David through the spring and the tunnel which led from it to the castle or fortress. David discovered this route due to his understanding aright the veiled talk of the Jebusites who apparently declared that he would not be able to capture the city. The true significance of the declaration of the Jebusites is: Except thou take away the blind and the lame that are with thee, who do not see the way and cannot walk therein, thou shalt not come in hither. Through Davids having discovered the tunnel he removed the blind, and through Joab's going up first (as related in the continuation of the narrative in the Book of Chronicles) he removed the lame. For that reason Joab became "chief" of the valiant men and "captain" of the city. The author finds support for the contention in other places in the scriptures. Joab's name was purposely removed from the account in the Book of Samuel, in order to reduce his importance and share in the events leading to the accession of David, which had reached their climax with the capture of Jerusalem. The date of the capture of the city was after David's victories over the Philistines. In the scriptural story the capture of Jerusalem is related after these victories with the intention of separating the narrative regarding the conquest of Jerusalem from the heroic deeds of David's followers who were headed by Joab.

A LETTER FROM R. HAJIM MALACH

by G. SCHOLEM

(p. 168 — 174)

A new document adds to our hitherto rather scant knowledge concerning the Sabbatian leader Hajim Malach. An important letter of his has been found by the editor in a manuscript in the Hebrew University Library. Although undated the letter can be

shown to have been written in the late summer of 1696. Hajim Malach announces to his former teachers R. Benjamin Cohen and R. Abraham Rovigo in Italy that he has left their wing in the Sabbatian movement and joined another one under the spiritual leadership of R. Samuel Primo of Adrianopol, the former secretary of Sabbatai Zevi. He expresses a critical view of certain other Sabbatian personalities and gives some new details concerning Nathan of Gaza, Heshel Zoref of Vilna and Solomon Ayllion.

The text of the letter is published and explained.

THE DIPLOMATIC NEGOTIATIONS OF THE JEWISH TERRITORIAL ORGANISATION (JTO) AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THEIR FAILURE

by D. I. MARMOR

(pp. 175—208)

IV. *Angola*. Several people, independently of one another, had conceived and expressed the idea of Jewish immigration and settlement in the Portuguese Colony of Angola. The scheme became topical after the republican revolution in Portugal in the year 1910. The aims of German colonial expansion in Africa constituted a serious danger to the Portuguese Colonial Empire generally and to Angola in particular in that it bordered on German South-West Africa. The negotiations conducted between England and Germany in regard to mutual understanding at the expense of the Portuguese colonies brought home the necessity to political circles in Portugal, of taking some decisive steps towards the colonising and development of Angola. Since the Portuguese themselves preferred to migrate to Brazil rather than to Angola the proposal made by local Jewish circles that Jewish immigration and settlement in that country be encouraged, was readily entertained. The Portuguese Government was generally free of anti-Jewish bias, and the descendants of the Marranos who occupied a leading place among the statesmen of the Portuguese republic and now openly and proudly confessed their Jewish ancestry, were very glad of the opportunity of helping their oppressed brethren, especially as the scheme was beneficial to Portugal. Some regarded this step as a means of attracting the goodwill of famous Jewish financiers, and so facilitating for Portugal the obtaining of loans that she stood so much in need of. In these circumstances a Bill was drafted, authorizing Jewish settlement in Angola, and in June 1912, the bill was passed unanimously by the Portuguese Parliament and sent up to the Senate for ratification. The Bill empowered the Government to grant Jewish immigrants concessions of land on the high plateau of the Angola Colony. The immigrants had to take up Portuguese citizenship and to use the Portuguese language exclusively in educational activities and in public life. Jewish organisations were entitled, subject to previous approval by the Portuguese authorities, to recommend immigrants, to give them financial assistance and to set up public institutions in the area of Jewish settlement.

Even before the Bill was passed by the Parliament contacts were established by the Jewish Territorial Organisation and the Portuguese Government. A JTO delegation visited Lisbon and endeavoured to change the wording of the bill in accordance with its own aims but did not succeed.

Shortly afterwards the Angola proposal was discussed at a world conference of the JTO. The wording of the bill and its contents did not meet with the approval of the conference. The British Branch of the Organisation was charged with the duty of continuing the negotiations in regard to amending the conditions and to send out an Inquiry Commission to Angola if need should arise. The JTO's demands in conformity

with the resolutions of the Conference were: a) Concessions over appreciable areas of land bordering on one another, and suitable for concentrated settlement. b) The granting of a concession of land to the JTO or to any other Colonising Organisation as a sort of Charter Company, to be set up for the purpose. c) Supervision of immigration to the concession area and the supervision of settlement to be vested in the holders of the charter. d) The granting of possibilities for the economic development of the Colony so that it may become a place of refuge for the Jewish masses, without undue interference on the part of the authorities, by such acts as the granting of schedules or the introduction of limitations etc. An Inquiry Commission left for Angola in the Summer of 1912. Its findings were not unfavourable. Several sparsely populated plateaux were found suitable for the settlement of Jewish refugees, on the understanding that on fleeing from poverty and persecution they would be prepared to suffer the difficulties and hardships of work and life there, in order to set up for themselves a colony where, in the course of time, they would become an overwhelming political factor.

Meanwhile a turn for the worse took place in Portuguese public opinion. The decision of the Vienna Conference aroused a storm of bitter feelings; Catholic circles were active against the plan on religious grounds, while business circles looked askance at the plan, seeing therein dangers of competition, and so put forward plans of their own for Portuguese settlement in Angola.

In addition, suspicions were aroused lest the JTO's plans and activities were connected with the German imperialist aims. An assurance on the part of the British Foreign Office to the contrary would have been sufficient to dispel the suspicion, but the British Government refrained from doing so, since it was bound by the Anglo-German Treaty in regard to the Portuguese Colonies. When the Bill for the Settlement of Jews in Angola came before the Portuguese Senate in May 1913 several Senators found the Bill in its existing form, with all its limitations, a danger to Portuguese sovereignty in Angola and the Bill was referred to the Parliamentary Committee for Colonial Affairs for further investigation.

In the second half of 1913 it became clear to the Portuguese Government and colonial circles in Lisbon that the plan for the development of Angola through Portuguese settlement had failed. It appeared as though the Portuguese Government were prepared to renew negotiations with the JTO if the latter were in a position to prove that it was in possession of the necessary financial backing to the settlement scheme. As formerly, Zangwill also now endeavoured to set up a financial institution for the purpose, but his efforts were unavailing. His colleagues on the British Branch of the JTO did not give him their support. They opposed the Angola scheme in that they did not see any possibility of carrying out the settlement work with white labour.

Zangwill came to the conclusion that if the Angola scheme should be defeated and the financial institution should not be set up the JTO would have to disband. It was decided to bring up the two matters at the JTO World Conference at Zurich in September 1914. The outbreak of the War, however, prevented the convening of the conference, and thereby, possibly also a prolonged agony of an idea and organisation to which both Zangwill and in his wake various Jewish groups in the Diaspora, had devoted their best efforts in their endeavours for redemption.

*

The territorialist idea was current in the 19th century among several circles which were interested in the fate and future of the Jewish people. The Jewish Territorial Organisation and its political activities was the first serious and practical attempt to solve the problem of the landless people in some place other than its historical fatherland. The Jews not having an army and navy like other peoples, diplomatic negotiations were

IV

the only means of effectuating the JTO's aims. The negotiations were based on two principal foundations: a) the necessity of solving the Jewish problem, b) the benefit which the country owning the territory stands to reap from the concentration of an appreciable number of Jews in one of its colonies. True, the two foundations were very frail. The JTO sought territories in countries where no Jewish problem was in existence, such as South America, Australia, Portugal, Canada etc., so that the necessity of solving the Jewish problem did not arise with them. Even in England which was interested to deflect the wave of Jewish immigration from its shores did not regard the Jewish problem sufficiently pressing as to be induced to undertake far reaching political action and found a Jewish colony in one of her possessions. Several territorialist plans, such as Uganda, Angola, and to a certain extent, Australia, were based on the imperial strategical importance of a Jewish colony, and others, such as Australia and Canada, on the benefit of Jewish immigration to sparsely populated areas. Strategical needs, however, changed from time to time, and a Jewish colony could not have any political weight *per se*, for the territorialists anticipated favourable conditions—such as a charter—to settlement proper.

Also the form of the colonising authority—the charter—which Herzl introduced to Jewish political thought, and through the means of which the JTO endeavoured to effectuate its aims, did not tally with the charter procedure of those days. The charter companies were granted concessions on territories which were not occupied by recognised states, whereas the JTO and Herzl endeavoured to receive charters in countries which were already under the sovereignty of recognised governments. In addition the territorialist plan of territorialist concentration and a certain measure of autonomy was opposed to the very existence of a modern state, which aimed at a concentration of legislative powers and at a national and cultural consolidation.

In addition to the general circumstances and factors, other temporary and local factors had their influence on the territorialist plan, such as general limitation of immigration, apprehensions of competition etc. Also the inimical attitude of certain Christian circles towards the Jews generally and towards the autonomic aims of the JTO in particular greatly hampered the effectuation of the territorialist plan.

Sources. By way of an addendum to the article there is a selection of documents relating to the history of the JTO's diplomatic negotiations. All the documents, 15 in number, are published here for the first time in the original English and are taken from the Archive of the JTO preserved in the Zionist General Archives, Jerusalem.