

REMEMBERING THE TEMPLE:
COMMEMORATION AND CATASTROPHE IN
ASHKENAZI CULTURE

Jacob J. Schacter
Yeshiva University

Shortly after its founding, the State of Israel was faced with a challenge as to how to commemorate the Holocaust that had only recently come to an end. Ever since November, 1942 when news of the then unfolding atrocities reached the Yishuv, and certainly after the war when tens of thousands of survivors found their way to Palestine, knowledge of what had occurred was well known and there was a sense that some public national commemoration was necessary. Yosef Shprinzak, the first speaker of the Knesset, appointed a subcommittee of that body to examine the issue and, after heated deliberations, the decision was made to designate the twenty-seventh day of the Hebrew month of Sivan as the date for that purpose.¹

There were many in Israel who opposed this decision and felt that while Holocaust commemoration was certainly warranted and appropriate, it belonged solely on the ninth day of the Hebrew month of Av, the date already set aside in the Jewish calendar as a fast day in morning for the destruction of both Temples in Jerusalem in ancient times. In support of this position, in 1977 the rabbinic journal *No'am* reprinted a notice that had appeared earlier in the Israeli newspaper *Hamodia*⁶ announcing that the journal would shortly publish an article by its editor, Rabbi Menahem M. Kasher, arguing for the commemoration of the Holocaust on that day. Although noting in a postscript that the article would not soon be forthcoming, the two sources

¹ I am very grateful to my teacher, David Berger, for his many thoughtful suggestions. My thanks, as well, to Elisheva Carlebach and Benjamin Gampel for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article, to my students in my Fall 2009 Yeshiva College "Remembering Communal Catastrophe" class who forced me to sharpen and more clearly formulate many of the points presented here, and to Matthew Williams for his stylistic assistance.

For the issue of Israel's establishment of a day to commemorate the Holocaust, see James E. Young, "When a Day Remembers: A Performative History of *Yom ha-Shoah*," *History & Memory* 2:2 (1990):54-75, and the secondary literature cited below, n. 54.

Rabbi Kasher claimed as support of his position in the brief printed announcement are themselves a significant enough point of departure in attempting to analyze the place of collective communal memory in Ashkenazi culture.²

Members of a culture experience the present by drawing upon a set of received or inherited traditions consciously and deliberately passed on to them by previous generations. A culture is determined by its images of the past; perceptions of the past define and inform the present. This kind of collective memory, a set of transmitted values and experiences relevant to a broad group as opposed to a specific individual, is a central component in the construction of social and cultural identity. The process of “how societies remember” is fundamental to defining what societies are.³

This is true for all sorts of memory of the past, including memory of catastrophe and suffering. The role of “memory, trauma, and the construction of history”⁴ in shaping a culture’s conception of itself is an important and significant one. Much of a culture’s identity depends on how that culture remembers, and chooses to convey, the catastrophes it experienced, and Jewish culture is no exception. David Nirenberg

² Rabbi M. Kasher, “Haza’ah Likboa’ Zikhron ha-Shoah be-Tet be-Av,” *No’am* 19 (1977):373–74.

For the larger question of the Ninth of Av as the day on which to commemorate the Holocaust, see my “Holocaust Commemoration and *Tish’a be-Av*: The Debate Over *‘Tom ha-Sho’a,’*” *Tradition* 41:2 (2008):164–97.

³ This issue continues to be discussed at great length. See, for example, Barry Schwartz, “The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory,” *Social Forces* 61:2 (1982):374–402; Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge, 1989); John R. Gillis, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton, 1994); American Historical Review Forum on “History and Memory” in *American Historical Review* 102:5 (December, 1997):1371–1412; Kerwin Lee Klein, “On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse,” *Representations* 69 (Winter 2000):127–50; Daniele Hervieu-Leger, *Religion as a Chain of Memory* (Cambridge, 2000); Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago and London, 2003); Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (New York, 2004), 10–24; and Doron Mendels, ed., *On Memory: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (Bern, 2007).

I have been particularly influenced by the work of my teacher, Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle and London, 1982; repr. 1996). For an interesting perspective contra Yerushalmi, see Amos Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History* (Los Angeles, 1993), esp. 1–21. See also David N. Myers’s exchange with Funkenstein, “Remembering *Zakhor*: A Super-Commentary,” *History & Memory* 4:2 (1992):129–48.

⁴ See Michael S. Roth, *The Ironist’s Cage: Memory, Trauma, and the Construction of History* (New York, 1995).

wrote that “the memorialization of episodes of violence (beginning with the destruction of the First and Second Temples) came to occupy, and still occupies, a central but complex place in Jewish religion and culture” but, he added, “one that in my opinion remains insufficiently understood.”⁵ This paper attempts to shed light on this phenomenon by analyzing one example of it, the role of the memory of the destruction of the Temple in the commemoration of calamity and catastrophe experienced by Ashkenazi Jews living in medieval and modern times.⁶

In 1096, the Crusaders attacked Jewish communities in Germany on their way to liberate the holy city of Jerusalem from the infidel Muslims. A significant number of communities were destroyed and several thousand Jews were killed.⁷ Several decades later, a liturgical poet by the name of Qalonymos b. Yehudah wrote several *kinot* (elegies) specifically addressing the destruction wrought in the Rhine Valley communities of Speyer, Worms and Mainz that he intended to be recited on the ninth day of Av. One, “*Amarti she’u minni*,” poetically laments the terrible pain and suffering experienced by the victims, highlights their extraordinary faith and even voluntary martyrdom, accepts the justness of God’s decree although it was so unbearably hurtful, and calls for God’s vengeance against the perpetrators.⁸ These are themes that are generally found in *kinot* written in the aftermath of calamity

⁵ David Nirenberg, “The Rhineland Massacres of Jews in the First Crusade: Memories Medieval and Modern,” in Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried and Patrick J. Geary, eds., *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography* (Washington and Cambridge, 2002), 281.

⁶ Although Jewish tradition focuses on the destruction of two temples, both of which were believed to have taken place on the same day (see *Ta’anit* 26b, 29a), I will refer here to this event in the singular.

For an analysis of this phenomenon also relevant to the Sephardi Jewish community, see Mark R. Cohen, “Persecution, Response, and Collective Memory,” *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1994), 162–94.

⁷ There is a large body of literature on the impact of the First Crusade on German Jewry. For the text of various Crusade Chronicles describing the devastation, see, most recently, Eva Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs* (Hannover, 2005). For English translations, see Shlomo Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades* (Madison, 1977) and Robert Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusades* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 2000), 223–97. For a recent book length study on this subject, see Jeremy Cohen, *Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories of the First Crusade* (Philadelphia, 2004), and see the additional secondary literature cited there.

⁸ See Shimon Bernfeld, *Sefer ha-Dema’ot*, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1926), 305–10; Israel Davidson, *Ozar ha-Shirah ve-ha-Piyyut*, vol. 1 (repr. Ktav Publishing House, 1970), 272, #5971; Abraham Rosenfeld, *The Authorized Kinot for the Ninth of Av* (London, 1965), 139–42; Daniel Goldschmidt, *Seder ha-Kinot le-Tisha B’Av* (Jerusalem, 1977), 106–09.

and suffering. Another, however, “*Mi yitten roshi mayim*,” is unusual in that it presents detailed historical information, rarely included in a standard *kinah*, explicitly mentioning the dates on which these communities were attacked (the eighth and twenty-third days in the month of Iyyar and the first and third days in Sivan) and the number of Jews killed in one of them.⁹

Towards the end of this *kinah*, Qalonymos wrote that one must mourn for the loss of the scholars who populated these communities with an intensity equal to the mourning in which one must engage for the destruction of the Temple itself (“שקולה הריגתם להתאבל ולהתעפרה” (“כשריפת בית אלהנו האולם והבירה”). And then, he continued, addressing an obvious question: If this catastrophe was so enormous that its impact is deemed equivalent to that associated with the destruction of the Temple, why did it not merit its own separate and independent fast day of commemoration? Why is it remembered on the date designated to commemorate the Temple’s destruction if, as was just indicated in the *kinah*, these cities were not attacked on that date (the ninth of Av) but a few months earlier, in the months of Iyyar and Sivan?

In response, Qalonymos invoked what appears from his formulation to have been a well-known principle: “Since we do not add times (of mourning) for destruction and conflagration... therefore today I will cause my cry of woe to rise (וכי אין להוסיף מועד שבר ותבערה... תחת) וכי אין להוסיף מועד שבר ותבערה... תחת).”¹⁰ Yes, he wrote, this catastrophe is itself equivalent to that of the destruction of the Temple, but that earlier catastrophe still takes primacy in terms of commemoration. The destruction of the Temple is so significant and repercussive that the commemoration

⁹ I have followed A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat* (Jerusalem, 1945; repr. 1971), 64, that the author of “*Mi yitten roshi mayim*” was Qalonymos, father of R. Eleazar of Worms, author of the *Sefer Rokeah*. Cf. Leopold Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie* (Berlin, 1865), 319, who cites a source that attributes it to R. Eleazar himself.

For incomplete lists of *kinot* composed in the wake of the First Crusade, see Avraham Grossman, “Shorashav shel Kiddush Hashem be-Ashkenaz ha-Kedumah,” in Yeshayahu Gafni and Aviezer Ravitzky, eds., *Kiddush ha-Hayyim ve-Heruf ha-Nefesh: Kovez Ma’amarim le-Zikhro shel Amir Yekutiel* (Jerusalem, 1993), 102, and Avraham David, “Zikhronot ve-He’arot al Gezerat Tatn”u—Bi-Dfus u-ve-Kitvei Yad Ivriyyim,” in Yom Tov Assis, et al., eds., *Yehudim Mul ha-Zelav: Gezerot Tatn”u be-Historiyah u-ve-Historigrafyah* (Jerusalem, 2000), 197–98.

¹⁰ See Shimon Bernfeld, *Sefer ha-Dema’ot*, vol. 1, 202–07, esp. 205; A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat*, 66–69, esp. 68; Abraham Rosenfeld, *The Authorised Kinot for the Ninth of Av*, 132–34, especially 134; Daniel Goldschmidt, *Seder ha-Kinot le-Tish’ah be-Av*, 93–98, esp. 96.

of subsequent catastrophes, even those of great and perhaps equal magnitude, and even those that unquestionably did not occur on the ninth of Av, still needs to be subsumed under it, assimilated into it and commemorated on the day set aside to remember it.¹¹ The ninth of Av is the date designated to remember and commemorate all Jewish catastrophes, whether they occurred on that date or not.¹² It is this text that served as the first proof for Rabbi Kasher that the Holocaust should not have its own day of commemoration but that it too, like the Crusades, should be remembered on the ninth of Av, the day already designated to commemorate the destruction of the Temple.

This principle, that one subsumes subsequent catastrophes under the catastrophe of the Temple's destruction, that "We do not add times (of mourning) for destruction and conflagration," is simply assumed here as a matter of fact. No evidence for it is adduced, no support is deemed necessary. This formulation is found in seven extant manuscripts of this *kinah*¹³ and it has been suggested that this *kinah* in general "must have enjoyed a good degree of fame among later generations."¹⁴ It was included in the fourteenth-century *Mahzor Nuremberg*¹⁵ although

¹¹ For more on this *kinah*, see Leopold Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*, 166; Israel Davidson, *Ozar ha-Shirah ve-ha-Piyyut*, vol. 3, 120, #1122; Daniel Goldschmidt, *Seder ha-Kinot le-Tish'ah be-Av*, 13.

¹² There is also another kind of subsuming going on in the Crusade Chronicles, a desire to frame the current calamity in the context of previous calamities (Abraham's near sacrifice of Isaac, the martyrdom of Rabbi Akiva, the story of Hannah and her seven sons, and more). On this, see the secondary literature cited above, n. 7. It is quite clear that this was a conscious attempt on the part of their authors to provide some coherence and structure for the calamity so that it not strain—and, God forbid from their perspective, even break—the close relationship between the Jewish people and God. In order to avoid the significant theological challenge potentially posed by the suffering experienced by the Jews, an attempt was made to subsume it into the larger phenomenon of Jewish suffering, particularly here in the context of Jewish martyrology, with which the community was already familiar and to which it had long become accustomed. Later calamities were assimilated into previous ones in an attempt to allow the classical covenantal construct to remain intact in the face of potential discontinuity and even rupture. For more on this, in the context of the Holocaust, see below.

¹³ I examined them in the Manuscripts and Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts Division of the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem: Parma ms. #13269, p. 49b; Parma ms. # 13729, p. 166; Parma ms. #13779, p. 153b; Parma ms. #13939, p. 24b; Vatican ms. #319, p. 19; Vatican ms. #362, pp. 60a–b; ms. #41225, p. 63a.

¹⁴ Susan L. Einbinder, *Beautiful Death: Jewish Poetry and Martyrdom in Medieval France* (Princeton and Oxford, 2002), 83.

¹⁵ See Yonah and Avraham Frankel, *Tefillah u-Piyyut be-Mahzor Nuremberg* (Jerusalem, 2008), 42, 72–73. This work can be accessed at http://jnul.huji.ac.il/dl/mss-pr/mahzor-nuremberg/pdf/fraenkel_j_a.pdf.

it is not included in the lists of R. Judah Löw Kircheim (d. 1632) or R. Yuzpa Shamash (d. 1678) of *kinot* recited on the ninth of Av in the Worms community in the seventeenth century.¹⁶

Rabbi Kasher then cites a second text as proof that Holocaust commemoration should be subsumed under the commemoration of the Temple's destruction, again calling attention to the central role that Temple destruction commemoration had in medieval Ashkenaz. The Bible draws attention to the great achievements of King Josiah and states (2 Chron. 35:25) that, after his death, "And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah; and all the singing men and singing women spoke of Josiah in their lamentations, unto this day; and they made them an ordinance in Israel." In his commentary (s.v. *vayittenum le-hok*), the medieval Ashkenazi pseudo-Rashi notes, "When any grief or weeping befalls them for which they lament and weep, they mention this grief [i.e., the death of King Josiah] with them. An example of this is the ninth of Av when we recite lamentations (*kinot*) for those slain in the persecutions that occurred in our times." The scholarly consensus, first raised as a possibility in the sixteenth century, is that this commentary, identified as having been authored by Rashi (d. 1105), was really not written by him but by an author who lived a generation or two later.¹⁷ But, in any case, it is assumed that the historical reference here to "the persecutions that occurred in our times" is describing the Crusades.¹⁸ In the view of Rabbi Kasher, this text also proves that the devastation wrought by the Crusaders did not merit its own separate memorialization but was subsumed under that of the destruction of the Temple on the ninth of Av.

¹⁶ R. Judah Löw Kircheim, *Minhagot Vermayza* (Jerusalem, 1987), 271; R. Yuzpa Shamash, *Minhagim de-K"K Vermayza* (Jerusalem, 1988), 125–26.

¹⁷ For a definitive discussion of this, see the recent dissertation by Eran Viezel, "Ha-Perush ha-Meyuhas le-Rashi le-Divrei ha-Yamim: Mekorotav, Shitotav, Terumato le-Perush Divrei ha-Yamim, u-Mekomo be-Toledot ha-Parshanut he-Yehudit la-Mikra" (Hebrew University, 2008), and the literature cited there. A revised version of the thesis is scheduled to be published as *Ha-Perush ha-Meyuhas le-Rashi le-Sefer Divrei ha-Yamim* (Jerusalem, 2010). My thanks to Dr. Mordechai Cohen for bringing this work to my attention. See also Jordan S. Penkower, "The French and German Glosses (*Le'azim*) in the Pseudo-Rashi Commentary on Chronicles (12th century Narbonne): The Manuscripts and the Printed Editions," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 16 (2009):255–59.

¹⁸ See, for example, Eran Viezel, "Ha-Perush ha-Meyuhas le-Rashi le-Divrei ha-Yamim," 336–37. Yehudah Kil's appendix to his *Da'at Mikra* commentary to 2 Chronicles (Jerusalem, 1986), 91, is less definitive.

This proof itself does not seem to me to be definitive, for this text does not necessarily assert that Tisha B'Av was the *only time* that Jews recited “lamentations (*kinot*) for those slain in the persecutions that occurred in our times.” Furthermore, the principle here is one of commemoration, not prohibition. In other words, even if in this case there was no other commemoration, this does not mean that a decision to establish such a commemoration would have necessarily been prohibited. But, even more so, the general conclusion that Rabbi Kasher draws from both of these medieval Ashkenazi texts, that Jewish tradition subsumes the commemoration of one calamity under another and, in particular, that later calamities were, and should continue to be, subsumed under the calamity of the destruction of the Temple, can be more broadly challenged, and this on a number of levels.

Did Ashkenazi Jews really follow the principal enunciated in Qalonymos's *kinah*? First, it must be pointed out that twelfth and thirteenth century Ashkenazi Jews were well aware of *Megillat Ta'anit Batra*, a list of some two dozen fast days, in addition to the fast of the ninth of Av and other fasts mentioned in the Bible, that were meant to commemorate a wide range of catastrophic events. Known to them first through the circa ninth-century work entitled *Halakhot Gedolot* and later through other sources, this list included fasts to commemorate such calamities as the death or murder of great biblical and rabbinic Jewish leaders (e.g. Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, Samuel, Rabbi Hananyah b. Teradyon), the sin of the golden calf, the abolition of the practice of bringing the first fruits to the Temple in the tenth century BCE, the extinguishing of “the western candle” of the Temple's menorah some two hundred years later, and more. How, then, could one assume the existence of a universally accepted requirement to subsume commemorations of later tragedies under the Fast of the Ninth of Av if it was clearly known that separate and additional fast days were, indeed, instituted for separate calamities? Perhaps, however, one might suggest that Qalonymos and his contemporaries knew very well that none of these dates were being observed by the members of their communities as fast days and, therefore, it was possible for them to assert that, as far as practicing fast days were concerned, “we do not add times (of mourning) for destruction and conflagration” and that, therefore, “the

persecutions that occurred in our times” should be recollected on the day designated to commemorate the destruction of the Temple.¹⁹

This suggestion still does not resolve the issue, however, because the historical record shows that medieval Ashkenazi Jews in various generations indeed fasted on a number of dates other than the ninth of Av in commemoration of catastrophes they had experienced on those dates. It would thus appear that the principle asserted by Qalonymos and, according to Rabbi Kasher, by pseudo-Rashi was simply ignored both by contemporaries and by those who lived in later generations.

Most significant here are the fast days that were established to commemorate the very destruction wrought by the Crusaders. There is substantial evidence that fast days were established in Worms on the twenty-third of Iyyar and the first of Sivan and in Mainz on the third of Sivan to commemorate the catastrophes that occurred then in these communities.²⁰ In addition, in seventeenth-century Frankfurt, a fast day was established on the twenty-seventh of Elul, as was a day of celebration on the twentieth of the first Adar, to mark the great danger to and subsequent deliverance of its Jews from an uprising led by Vincent Fettmilch.²¹ Other fast days were also established in the seventeenth

¹⁹ *Megillat Ta'anit Batra* and related material are the subject of the important book by Shulamit Elizur, *Lamah Zannu? Megillat Ta'anit Batra u-Reshimot Zomot ha-Kerovot Lah* (Jerusalem, 2007). For knowledge of the work in medieval Ashkenaz, see 229. For the issue of how widespread the fasts mentioned in it were, see 230–39. In fact, Elizur points out there that it is likely that they were never widely observed as such.

²⁰ See the many sources collected in David Wachtel, “The Ritual and Liturgical Commemoration of Two Medieval Persecutions” (MA Thesis, Columbia University, 1995), 9–17. Although unpublished, this important essay continues to be cited in the scholarly literature on this subject. See Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, “Preface to the 1996 Edition,” *Zakhor*, xxvii–xxviii; Susan Einbinder, “The Jewish Martyrs of Blois,” in Thomas Head, ed., *Medieval Hagiography: An Anthology* (New York and London, 2001), 557 n. 40; idem, *Beautiful Death*, 57, 148, 208; Gershon Bacon, “The House of Hannover: *Gezeirot Tah* in Modern Jewish Historical Writing,” *Jewish History* 17 (2003):202–03, n. 2; Kenneth R. Stow, *Jewish Dogs: An Image and its Interpreters* (Stanford, 2006), 101, 104, and elsewhere; Jeffrey Hoffman, “*Akdmut*: History, Folklore, and Meaning,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 99:2 (2009):172, n. 28.

²¹ See Yoseph Yuzpa Hahn, *Sefer Yosef Omez* (Jerusalem, 1965), 211–12, #953; see also 242–43, #1107, 1109. In addition, see Christopher R. Friedrichs, “Politics or Pogrom? The Fettmilch Uprising in German and Jewish History,” *Central European History* 19:2 (1986):186–228; Chava Turniansky, “The Events in Frankfurt am Main (1612–1616) in *Megillas Vints* and in an Unknown Yiddish ‘Historical’ Song,” in Michael Graetz, ed., *Schöpferische Momente des europäischen Judentums in der frühen Neuzeit* (Heidelberg, 2000), 121–37, esp. 125; Rivka Ulmer, “Piety as Subtext: The Historical Poem *Megillas Vintz* of Seventeenth Century Frankfurt am Main,” *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 28 (2001):79–102; idem, *Turmoil, Trauma and Triumph: The Fettmilch Uprising in Frankfurt am Main (1612–1616) According to Megillas Vintz* (Frankfurt am Main and

century (Worms after 1349 and in 1617, Prague in 1611 [or 1613] and again in 1618, Cracow in 1637 and Metz in 1669).²² But here too perhaps one could argue that Qalonymos's position was accepted in principle but that Ashkenazi Jews distinguished between a national fast day and one that was expected to be observed only in local communities. Perhaps Qalonymos meant to insist that only new fast days more national in scope, meant to be observed by significantly large numbers of Jews, could not be established because they needed to be subsumed under the all encompassing national fast day established to commemorate the Temple's destruction. But, perhaps, he would allow for other fast days to be established independently of the Fast of the Ninth of Av, like those instituted and observed in Worms, Mainz, Frankfurt, Prague, Cracow and Metz which commemorated only local tragedies and were limited only to the members of their own communities.

Similarly, another fast day established in the thirteenth century on "Erev Shabbat Parshat Hukkat" to commemorate the burning of some two dozen wagon-loads of manuscripts of the Talmud and other Jewish writings in Paris in 1242²³ also need not be seen as contrary to

New York, 2001), esp. 46–47. Most recently, see Elisheva Carlebach, "The Boundaries of Memory: A Central European Chronograph from 1665," *Polin* 22 (2010):77 and n. 28.

²² For the Prague fasts to commemorate the danger posed by and subsequent rescue from an invading army, see Jiřina Šedinová, "Hebrew Literature as a Source of Information on the Czech History of the First Half of the 17th Century," *Judaica Bohemiae* 20:1 (1984):7–15; Joseph M. Davis, *Yom-Tov Lipmann Heller: Portrait of a Seventeenth-Century Rabbi* (Oxford and Portland, 2004), 47–48, 105–07. For the Cracow fast in memory of seven martyrs, see Feivel Wetstein, *Devarim 'Atikim mi-Pinkasei ha-Kahal be-Krakow* (Cracow, 1900), 15. For the Metz fast to commemorate the killing of a Jewish peddler there as a result of a ritual murder charge, see Natalie Zemon Davis, *Women on the Margins: Three Seventeenth-Century Lives* (Cambridge and London, 1995), 17. For a half-day annual fast established in Prague in 1620, see J. Šedinová, "Hebrew Literature," 11–15. For the Fast of the Tenth of Adar established in Worms to commemorate the destruction wrought there in the wake of the Black Death in 1349, see R. Judah Löw Kircheim, *Minhagot Vermayza*, 214; R. Yuzpa Shamash, *Minhagim de-K"K Vermayza*, 253; Lucia Raspe, "The Black Death in Jewish Sources," *JQR* 94:3 (2004):485. For the one established there to commemorate the 1615 expulsion from and 1616 readmission to that city, see R. Judah Löw Kircheim, *Minhagot Vermayza*, 209–10; R. Yuzpa Shamash, *Minhagim de-K"K Vermayza*, 248.

²³ For relevant sources, see R. Zedekiah, *Sefer Shibbolei ha-Leket* (repr. New York, 1959), 252, #263; *Sefer Tanya Rabbati* (repr. Jerusalem, 1963), 63b; R. Moshe b. Yekutiel, *Sefer ha-Tadir* (New York, 1992), 233–34; *Magen Avraham, Orah Hayyim* 580, end; Susan Einbinder, *Beautiful Death*, 81; R. Yizhak Shimshon Lange, ed., *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Hayyim Paltiel* (Jerusalem, 1981), 527; R. Yom Tov Lipmann Heller, *Megillat Evah* (Jerusalem, 1999), 56–58; R. David Conforte, *Sefer Kore ha-Dorot* (repr. Jerusalem, 1969), 23a-b; R. Yehiel Heilprin, *Seder ha-Dorot* (repr. Bnei Brak, 2003),

this principle because while its intended scope is unclear, the earliest source for its existence notes explicitly that it was observed only by select individuals (“*yehidim*”).²⁴

There are two fast days, however, which do appear to contradict the principle articulated by Qalonymos and perhaps by pseudo-Rashi. In both cases they were observed—or in one case thought to have been observed as we will see—by large numbers of Jews in different countries. An analysis of these fast days, both remarkably occurring on the same date, will be especially significant in assessing the scope, and limits, of Temple commemoration in the medieval and early modern Ashkenazi community.

Just seventy-five years after the Crusades struck along the Rhine Valley, in the early Spring of 1171, a Jew by the name of Isaac the son of Elazar was watering his horse along the banks of the Loire River as it coursed through the town of Blois in north-central France. It was

364; R. Yehiel Mikhel Epstein, *‘Arukh ha-Shulhan, Orah Hayyim* 580:4; *Mishnah Berurah, Orah Hayyim* 580:16; R. Yosef Patsanovski, *Pardes Yosef he-Hadash* (Bnei Brak, 1996), 770–71. There is some question as to the particular day of the month of Tammuz on which the fast was established as well as the year the event it commemorated occurred; further analysis is necessary to clarify these issues. For the time being, see S. H. Kook, “Yom ha-Shishi Parshat Hukkat,” *‘Edut* 2:3–4 (1947):281–83; Y. Y. Rozen, “Ha-Ta’anit bi-‘Erev Shabbat Kodesh Parshat Hukkat,” *Magal* 13 (2002):267–73; Shulamit Elizur, *Lamah Zammu?*, 221–22. See also Ephraim Kanarfogel, “Peering through the Lattices:” *Mystical, Magical, and Pietistic Dimensions in the Tosafist Period* (Detroit, 2000), 228–29. In any case, it is clear that a new fast day was established to commemorate this catastrophe without any compelling consideration to associate its commemoration with that of the destruction of the Temple.

²⁴ *Sefer Shibbolei ha-Leket*, above, n. 23. It is interesting that this detail is missing from some later descriptions of this fast day, giving the impression that some may have considered it to have been a fast day established for all.

The precise meaning of the word “*yehidim*” is unclear. See *Ta’anit* 10a where *yehidim* (also in the context of fasting) are identified as “*rabanam*,” or “*rabbis*.” On *Ta’anit* 10b the Talmud further states that “all scholars (*talmidei hakhmim*) are *yehidim*” and further identifies a *yahid* as “anyone who is fit to be appointed a leader (*parnas*) of the community.” Elsewhere it would appear that the category of *yehidim* refers to individuals somewhat but not fully distinguished. See *Vayikra Rabbah* 30:7 which presents three categories (again in the context of fasting), “the leaders of the generation (*gedolei ha-dor*),” “*yehidim*,” and “all citizens (*kol benei ha-medinah*).” In the formulation of this midrashic passage cited in *Tur, Orah Hayyim* 581, end, the three categories are presented as “the leaders of the country (*gedolei ha-medinah*),” “the ‘intermediate ones’ of the city (*benonei ha-‘ir*; cf. *Rosh Hashanah* 16b),” and “all the inhabitants of the city (*kol benei ha-‘ir*).” Regardless, however, it is clear that we are not speaking here of a fast day that was observed by the total community. For *yehidim*, see also *Sefer Shibbolei ha-Leket*, 260, #273.

dusk and the edge of an animal skin that he was carrying slipped out from under his cloak. At the same time, a Christian servant also came to the river to water his horse, but when that horse saw the whiteness of the protruding hide in the hazy darkness, it felt frightened. The Christian immediately went to his master and reported that at the bank of the Loire River he had just seen a Jew disposing of the corpse of a Christian child. For all sorts of reasons, this charge was taken seriously and, less than three months later, on the twentieth of the month of Sivan 1171, some thirty-one or thirty-three Jews (the sources have conflicting numbers) were burned in Blois as a punishment for this grievous act.²⁵

This event is a complex one and has merited much scholarly attention.²⁶ Here I want to focus on only one aspect of the aftermath of

²⁵ There are two primary sources where this story is told, albeit in different ways. One is a letter written by members of the nearby Orleans community printed in Adolph Neubauer and Moritz Stern, *Hebräische Berichte über Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1892), 31–34; reprinted in A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat*, 142–44, and trans. into English in Robert Chazan, *Church, State, and Jew in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1980), 300–04, and idem., “The Timebound and the Timeless: Medieval Jewish Narration of Events,” *History & Memory* 6:1 (1994):14–16. The second is the *Sefer Zekhira* by Rabbi Ephraim of Bonn, printed in Adolph Neubauer and Moritz Stern, *Hebräische Berichte*, 66–69; A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat*, 124–26; reprinted in A. M. Haberman, ed., *Sefer Zekhira: Selihot ve-Kinot* (Jerusalem, 1970), 30–33; and trans. into English in Jacob Rader Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World, A Source Book: 315–1791* (Cincinnati, 1999), 142–46.

Israel Jacob Yuval suggests that this chance meeting took place on Maundy Thursday prior to Easter Sunday which corresponded to the first of the intermediate days of Passover in 1171. See his “Ha-Safah ve-ha-Semalim shel ha-Khronikot ha-‘Ivriyot Bimei Mas’ei ha-Zelav,” in Yom Tov Assis, et al., eds, *Yehudim Mul ha-Zelav*, 106; idem., *Shnei Goyim bi-Vitnekh: Yehudim ve-Nozrim, Dimmuym Hadadiyim* (Tel-Aviv, 2000), 185–86, 203; idem., *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 2006), 171–72, 190.

²⁶ In addition to Yuval’s books cited in the previous footnote, Index, s.v. “Blois,” see, for example, Shalom Spiegel, “Mi-Pitgamei ha-‘Akedah: Serufei-Blois ve-Hithadshut ‘Alilot ha-Dam,” in *Sefer ha-Yovel le-Khevod Mordechai Menahem Kaplan* (New York, 1953), 267–87; Robert Chazan, “The Blois Incident of 1171: A Study in Jewish Intercommunal Organization,” *PAAR* 36 (1968):13–31; Robert Chazan, *Medieval Jewry in Northern France: A Political and Social History* (Baltimore, 1973), Index, s.v. “Blois;” William Chester Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1989), Index, s.v. Blois; Yosef H. Yerushalmi, *Zakhor*, 48–52; Robert Chazan, “The Timebound and the Timeless,” 5–34; idem., “Ephraim ben Jacob’s Compilation of Twelfth-Century Persecutions,” *JQR* 84:4 (1994):401, 407–10; Susan Einbinder, “Pucellina of Blois: Romantic Myths and Narrative Conventions,” *Jewish History* 12 (1998):29–46; Robert Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History: The Hebrew First Crusade Narratives* (Berkeley, 2000), Index, s.v. “Blois tragedy (1171);” Susan Einbinder, “The Jewish Martyrs of Blois;” idem., *Beautiful Death*, 45–69; Kenneth R. Stow, *Jewish Dogs: An Image and its Interpreters* (Stanford, 2006); Shmuel Shepkaru, *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian*

the catastrophe. A letter written by the Jews in the neighboring town of Orleans describing the event shortly after it occurred includes the sentiment that “it is appropriate to establish it [the twentieth of Sivan] as a fast day for all the people of our nation (לכל בני עמנו).”²⁷ An elegy by Rabbi Hillel of Bonn, entitled “*Emunei shelomei yisrael*,” that was later incorporated into the *Selihot* section of the Musaf service on Yom Kippur in some Ashkenazi rites, notes that this day was “worthy of being established as a day of fasting and strong prayers.”²⁸ His brother, Rabbi Ephraim of Bonn, also noted in his *Sefer Zekhirah* that “it was proper to establish it [the twentieth of Sivan] as a fast” to commemorate what had occurred. But here he takes this one step further and records that, indeed, such a fast was mandated by none other than the great twelfth-century Tosafist and communal leader, Rabbenu Tam, and that, in fact, it was actually accepted as such by all the Jewish communities in France, England and the Rhineland.²⁹ A reference to the actual establishment of this fast day also appears in a commemorative *kinah* Rabbi Ephraim penned for this event, entitled “*Le-mi oy le-mi avoy*,” “Profound was the shame of that day [the twentieth of Sivan], to be recalled eternally as a day of fast and shock by a suffering people.”³⁰

It has been argued, and mostly accepted, by scholars that Rabbi Ephraim of Bonn was mistaken; that, in fact, Rabbenu Tam never did establish a new fast day on this date and in fact may even have been opposed to it.³¹ The issue is an important one and deserves further analysis. But, for the purpose of this paper, it does not matter whether,

Worlds (Cambridge, 2006), Index, s.v. “Blois;” Kirsten A. Fudeman, *Vernacular Voices: Language and Identity in Medieval French Jewish Communities* (Philadelphia, 2010), 60–88, 191–97.

²⁷ A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat*, 142.

²⁸ A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat*, 139; Daniel Goldschmidt, *Mahzor le-Yamim ha-Nora'im*, vol. 2 *Yom Kippur* (Jerusalem, 1970), 553. Later generations of East European Jews knew about the Blois Massacre through reciting this *Selihah* every Yom Kippur. See below, n. 47.

²⁹ A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat*, 125–26; *Sefer Zekhirah*, 32–33. This assertion by Rabbi Ephraim was included in the sixteenth-century work by Joseph Hakohen, *Emek ha-Bakha* (Toronto, 1991), 58; trans. into English by Harry S. May, *The Vale of Tears (Emek Habacha)* (The Hague, 1971), 31.

³⁰ Shimon Bernfeld, *Sefer ha-Dema'ot*, vol. 1, 228 and n. 23; A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarefat*, 135; *Sefer Zekhirah: Selihot ve-Kinot*, 94. For the English translation, see Robert Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 5–6.

³¹ See David Wachtel, “The Ritual and Liturgical Commemoration of Two Medieval Persecutions,” 21–28.

in fact, Rabbenu Tam did or did not establish the date of the twentieth of Sivan as a fast day. What is important is that the author of the Orleans letter as well as Rabbi Hillel of Bonn believed that it was *worthy of being so established* and that Rabbi Ephraim of Bonn believed that Rabbenu Tam *did, in fact, establish it*. They, and those who later took the author of the Orleans letter and the brothers from Bonn at their word, clearly had no problem with the establishment of a new date to be observed by Jews as a fast in commemoration of a catastrophe that occurred, a date separate and distinct from the date designated to commemorate the destruction of the Temple, and were not at all surprised that the great Rabbenu Tam would establish such a fast. And here far more than a local fast day was being proposed; it was worthy of being observed by “all the people of our nation” and was believed to have been observed by Jews in the very broad geographic areas of France, England and the Rhineland. Nowhere is there evident any impulse to subsume commemoration of the Blois episode under that of the Temple’s destruction; nowhere is there any assumption that “we do not add times (of mourning) for destruction and conflagration.” These rabbis simply assumed that a new—even so called national—fast day could be established when they considered it to be warranted, totally oblivious to any consideration that would lead them to subsume the memory of subsequent catastrophes under the overarching centrality of the memory of the Temple’s destruction. A new catastrophe occurs and a new fast day is established, separate from and irrelevant to the Fast of the Ninth of Av. The assumption presented as a matter of course by Qalonymos, and perhaps by pseudo-Rashi, is simply not taken into consideration.³²

But, nevertheless, the impulse to assimilate subsequent catastrophes into previously established fast days did find expression later and, here, once again, in a remarkable set of circumstances, it is precisely the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan that plays a significant role. Although its very establishment—or the assumption of its establishment—in 1171 is a clear indication that subsuming was considered unnecessary and maybe even inappropriate, once it is established, it, itself, became a day under which subsequent catastrophes, in turn, became subsumed.

³² Salo Baron noted that the fast day allegedly established by Rabbenu Tam in the wake of the Blois massacre clearly indicates that the “legalistic reason” presented in this Crusades *kinah* “certainly was not a binding principle.” See Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, vol. 4 (New York, 1957), 145.

While the very existence of the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan suggests that it is not necessary to assimilate the memory of subsequent Jewish catastrophes into the memory of the Temple's destruction, that date itself became a time on which some of those Jewish catastrophes were memorialized. Ironically, the very date which represents a rejection of the impulse to subsume later became a date which reflected that very impulse to subsume, and this in a number of different ways.

Let us move to a series of events that occurred almost five hundred years after the Blois 1171 massacre. From the second half of 1648 through 1649, Bogdan Chmielnicki and his followers attacked dozens of Jewish communities in Eastern Europe and killed thousands of Jews.³³ In 1650 there was a respite, and the super-communal organization in charge of governing the Jewish community, the *Va'ad Arba' Arazot*, wanted to commemorate the catastrophe. But this time they were faced with a challenge. It was easy to determine when the Blois massacre of 1171 should be commemorated because the entire catastrophe occurred on one day; all thirty-one or thirty-three Jews were burned on the twentieth of Sivan. But the so-called Chmielnicki Massacres lasted for a year and a half. What date would be an appropriate one to choose then as the date of commemoration through fasting? What criteria should be utilized to deem one date more appropriate for this purpose than another date?

Rabbi Nathan Nata Hannover wrote in *Yeven Mezulah*, the best-known work describing the massacres, that the decision was made to choose the date on which they began. When confronted with the challenge of which single date to choose to commemorate a year-and-a-half long catastrophe, this is certainly a logical solution. And since he already earlier informed his readers that the massacres began in the city of Niemirów on the twentieth of Sivan, he wrote that that date would be the one chosen as the fast day for all future generations. "They established a public fast day (*ta'anit zibbur*) for the entire country of Poland on the day of the twentieth of the month of Sivan for all

³³ Much has been written about this event as well. For recent treatments, see Joel Raba, *Ben Zikkaron le-Hakhashah: Gezerot Ta'h ve-Ta'ti be-Reshimot Benei ha-Zeman u-be-Re'i ha-Ketivah ha-Historit* (Tel-Aviv, 1994), trans. as *Between Remembrance and Denial: The Fate of the Jews in the Wars of the Polish Commonwealth During the Mid-Seventeenth Century as Shown in Contemporary Writings and Historical Research* (Boulder and New York, 1995); the series of articles published in *Jewish History* 17:2 (May 2003); and the secondary literature cited in both.

future generations (*le-dorot*) on the day that the massacres occurred in Niemirów which, as is known to all, was the first community that gave itself over to death in sanctification of God's name."³⁴

This assertion, that the Chmielnicki Massacres began with the destruction in Niemirów, also appears in *Petah Teshuvah* by Rabbi Gabriel b. Joshua Schussberg, another, less well-known, text about the massacres that was published two years before *Yeven Mezulah*. Making reference to a talmudic passage (*Ta'anit* 29a) explaining the choice of the ninth of Av as the date set aside to commemorate the destruction of the first Temple, Rabbi Schussberg wrote, "The wicked ones of that town unsheathed their sword. It was the beginning of the punishment, and one always follows the beginning, just as we do with respect to the Fast of the Ninth of Av when we fast on the ninth even though most of the Temple was destroyed on the tenth."³⁵ Although there is no explicit reference here to the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan, it is clear that this is what Rabbi Schussberg has in mind.³⁶ An explicit connection between the attack on Niemirów, deemed to be the beginning of the catastrophe, and the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan, similar to the one made by Rabbi Hannover, also appears in another chronicle written about the massacres, *Za'ar Bat Rabbim* by Rabbi Abraham b. Samuel Ashkenazi.³⁷

Once again, a fast day on the twentieth of Sivan. This time there is no doubt that an entirely new day of fasting was established and, once again, one meant to be observed by far more than one local community or a handful of people. Absent now for sure is any interest in subsuming the commemoration of this catastrophe under the commemoration of the destruction of the Temple; absent now for sure is the self-evident assumption of "we do not add times (of mourning) for destruction and conflagration." Once again it was obvious that a

³⁴ R. Nathan Nata Hannover, *Sefer Yeven Mezulah* (Tel-Aviv, 1966), 37, 78; trans. into English by Abraham J. Mesch, *Abyss of Despair* (New York, 1950; repr. New Brunswick and London, 1983), 50, 104.

³⁵ See R. Gavriel Schussberg, *Petah Einayim* (Amsterdam, 1651), 4a; repr. in Hayyim Yonah Gurland, *Le-Korot ha-Gezerot al Yisrael*, vol. 6 (Odessa, 1892), 31–32.

³⁶ On the attack on Niemirów in particular, see Mordekhai Nadav, "Le-Mashma'utah shel Shevu'at Emunim shel Yehudim le-Kozakim be-Gezerat Ta" h be-Nemirov," *Zion* 47:1 (1982):77–82; idem, "The Jewish Community of Nemyriv in 1648: Their Massacre and Loyalty Oath to the Cossacks," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8:3–4 (1984):376–95.

³⁷ See Hayyim Yonah Gurland, *Le-Korot ha-Gezerot al Yisrael*, vol. 2 (Cracow, 1888), 12; repr. as a separate pamphlet by Hayyim Doberish Friedberg (Lemberg, 1905), 6.

new fast day could be established when deemed warranted, without concern for assimilating the memory of the catastrophe it was meant to commemorate under the overarching centrality of the Temple's destruction. A new calamity occurs and a new fast day is established, separate from and irrelevant to the Fast of the Ninth of Av.

But is there a connection between the twentieth of Sivan of 1650 and the twentieth of Sivan of 1171? Scholars have already drawn attention to the coincidence of these dates³⁸ but the exact nature of the connection requires further analysis and will have great significance for understanding the pervasive impulse in the Jewish community to subsume subsequent catastrophes under previous ones.

Some scholars see this connection just in the decision to choose the twentieth of Sivan as the day to commemorate the destruction wreaked during the Chmielnicki Massacres. They point out that, as Rabbi Hannover himself indicated earlier in his work, Jews had in fact been attacked and murdered a few weeks earlier.³⁹ In addition, he explicitly stated that "the beginning of their rebellion took place before Purim 408 [1648]."⁴⁰ And, therefore, they contend, the focus on the twentieth of Sivan, the date of the Niemirów disaster, must have been "predicated by something else," namely the association of that date with the earlier catastrophe in Blois which took place then. "In this case it seems to have been the fact that 20 Sivan was already recognized as a fast day: it had been set by the great French rabbi, Rabbenu Tam, to commemorate the victims of the medieval blood libel at Blois in 1171."⁴¹

³⁸ S. M. Dubnow, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1916), 152; Nahum Wahrman, *Mekorot le-Toledot Gezerot Ta"h ve-Ta"t* (Jerusalem, 1949), 6–9; Shalom Spiegel, "Mi-Pitgamei ha-Akedah: Serufel-Blois ve-Hithadshut 'Alilot ha-Dam," 269–70; Yom-Tov Levinsky, "Zekher le-Hurban Aharon," in Yom-Tov Levinsky, ed., *Sefer ha-Mo'adim*, vol. 8 (Tel-Aviv, 1962), 214; Yosef H. Yerushalmi, *Zakhor*, 48–52.

³⁹ R. Nathan Nata Hannover, *Sefer Yeven Mezulah*, 31–32; Abraham J. Mesch, *Abbyss of Despair*, 42–44.

⁴⁰ R. Nathan Nata Hannover, *Sefer Yeven Mezulah*, 28; Abraham J. Mesch, *Abbyss of Despair*, 39.

⁴¹ Adam Teller, "Jewish Literary Responses to the Events of 1648–1649 and the Creation of a Polish-Jewish Consciousness," in Benjamin Nathans and Gabriella Safran, eds., *Culture Front: Representing Jews in Eastern Europe* (Philadelphia, 2008), 21. See also Gershon Bacon and Moshe Rosman, "Kehillah 'Nivheret' bi-Mezukah: Yahadut Polin bi-'Ikvot Gezerot Ta"h-Ta"t," in Shmuel Almog and Michael Hed, eds., *Ra'ayon ha-Behirah bi-Yisrael u-ve-'Amim: Kovez Ma'amarim* (Jerusalem, 1991), 215; Edward Fram, "Creating a Tale of Martyrdom in Tulczyn, 1648," in Elisheva Carlebach, J. Efron

I think, however, that these scholars are reading too much into these texts. If the date of the 1171 Blois Massacre was a factor here, as they claim, both Rabbis Hannover and Schussberg should have explicitly made the connection to it, as did a number of others whose formulations will be analyzed shortly. In fact, scholars have suggested that one of Rabbi Hannover's primary sources of information was precisely one of those chronicles that did make this connection explicitly, *Ẓok ha-Itim* by Rabbi Meir b. Samuel Szczebrzeszyn, as will be noted below.⁴² It would thus appear that Rabbi Hannover went out of his way to avoid making the same association as did the earlier text from which he drew. Furthermore, these scholars do not pay attention to the fact that Rabbi Hannover explicitly associated the choice of the twentieth of Sivan when Niemirów was attacked with the fact that that city "as is known to all, was the first community that gave itself over to death in sanctification of God's name." I think that these two chroniclers considered the destruction of the Jewish communities by Chmielnicki and his followers to have formally commenced with the first attack on a major city, Niemirów. Whatever preceded that catastrophe was clearly seen by them as preliminary to the slaughter.⁴³ However, the connection between 1648–1649 and 1171 was explicitly drawn in four seventeenth-century texts, and by each one in a slightly different way.

Rabbi Shabbetai Kohen, the author of the *Sifteï Kohen* commentary on parts of the *Shulhan Arukh*, the celebrated sixteenth-century code of Jewish law, survived the massacres and penned penitential prayers or *Selihot* to be recited on the twentieth of Sivan. At the end of his introduction to those texts, he described a number of factors

and David Myers, eds., *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi* (Hannover, 1998), 99, n. 22.

⁴² Jacob Shatzky, "Historish-kritisher araynfir zum 'Yeven Mezulah' fun R' Nasan Nata Hannover," in *Gezeyros Ta"kh* (Vilna, 1938), 16; Abraham J. Mesch, "Introduction," *Abyss of Despair*, 9; Joel Raba, *Between Remembrance and Denial*, 43, n. 144; 56; Edward Fram, "Creating a Tale of Martyrdom in Tulczyn, 1648," 89. See below at n. 49.

⁴³ Indeed, this point is acknowledged by G. Bacon and M. Rosman themselves in "Kehillah 'Nivheret' bi-Mezukah," *ibid.* They also suggest that, perhaps, Niemirów was singled out because the Torah portion of the week it was destroyed was Parshat Behukotai which includes a section known as "the *Tokhahah*," describing terrible curses that would afflict the Jewish people if they were to disobey God's word, and also because it was destroyed on a Wednesday, a day known to be "unlucky" in European and Jewish folklore.

related to the choice of that date to commemorate what happened, which, he claimed, he instituted for himself and the members of his family: “I therefore established for myself and my [future] generations, for children and grandchildren, a day of fasting...on the twentieth day of the month of Sivan...because that day was the beginning of the decrees, anguish, and severe and enduring sufferings. *In addition (ve-gam ki)*, that day marked a doubling of grief and multiple destruction because the decree of 1171 was also on that day and at that time. *In addition (ve-gam ki)*, this day can never fall on the Sabbath under any circumstances.”⁴⁴

It is difficult to imagine that Rabbi Kohen considered each of these three considerations to be equally significant. For example, it is hard to believe that he suggested the third consideration, the fact that the twentieth of Sivan cannot fall on the Sabbath, as, itself, a compelling enough reason to explain why that date was chosen. It seems to me more likely that he considered the first consideration, and the only one offered by Rabbi Hannover, to be the real one, namely that is when the massacres began. And then—and only then—after having chosen the date based on that primary consideration it was also noted that this date can never fall on a Sabbath, a fact that provided an additional significance to that choice.

It would appear that the same applies to the second consideration he cited for the choice of that date, namely the association of this twentieth of Sivan fast day with the twentieth of Sivan of 1171. I do not believe that he considered this either as a separate, compelling enough reason as to why that particular date was chosen. The real motivation was that the massacres began on that date and, once having been chosen as the date of the commemoration for that reason, it, in retrospect, elicited the memory of the previous catastrophe that also occurred on that very date.⁴⁵ In both cases, the “in addition (*ve-gam ki*)” of both the second and third considerations serves as more of a

⁴⁴ This text has been published a number of times. See, for example, R. Shabbetai Kohen, “*Megillat ‘Efaf*,” in Israel Halperin, ed., *Bet Yisrael bi-Polin*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1954), 255. See already earlier, p. 253, where Rabbi Kohen noted the parallel to 1171 and the fact that Niemirów was the first community to be destroyed.

⁴⁵ It is important to note that the phrase “doubling of grief (הוכפלו צרות)” is a talmudic one. See *Rosh Hashanah* 18b. There is no doubt that Rabbi Kohen deliberately utilized the familiar language of that rabbinic passage, introduced in the context of the destructions of both Temples, to describe both 20 Sivan medieval catastrophes he was discussing.

historical association or calendrical circumstance than an independent explanation or rationale.⁴⁶

Rabbi Yom Tov Lipmann Heller, a contemporary of Rabbi Kohen and a prominent scholar and communal leader, also composed *Selihot* to be recited on the twentieth of Sivan. In explaining the choice of that date as the date of commemoration of the Chmielnicki Massacres, Rabbi Heller wrote that it was on that date “that the catastrophe began in the holy community of Niemirów,” and then he added, “And on that day the grief was doubled because earlier there also occurred on it an evil decree in 1171.”⁴⁷ Here the formulation, I believe, is more precise. The date of the twentieth of Sivan is chosen because that is the date when the calamity began and, continued Rabbi Heller, “*it so happens* that this day is especially appropriate to fast because it reminds us of what happened in 1171.”⁴⁸

The formulation in yet another contemporary source, Rabbi Meir b. Samuel Szczebrzeszyn’s *Ẓok ha-Itim*, is, I believe, most precise. Rabbi Szczebrzeszyn starts by simply stating that the reason the twentieth of Sivan was chosen is because it was the date when the massacres began. “They established a fast day on the twentieth of Sivan, the day of the Niemirów massacre (יִוֵּם הַרִיגַת נְעֻמְרוֹב).” And then he adds that “this day corresponds to the decree of 1171 (לְגִזְרַת) לְגִזְרַת (תַּתְקַל”א הוּא מְכוֹן).”⁴⁹ The tragedy at Blois is not presented here as

⁴⁶ It is, parenthetically, interesting to contrast the assertion behind Rabbi Kohen’s third consideration—that the twentieth of Sivan can never fall on Shabbat—with a report by a contemporary of his, Jacob Najara, that Nathan of Gaza arrived in Adrianople on the nineteenth of Sivan, 1671, and came to pay his respect to Shabbetai Zevi the next day, “on the Sabbath day, the twentieth of [the month].” See Avraham Amarillo, “Te’udot Shabbeta’iot mi-Ginzei Rabi Shaul Amarillo,” *Sefunot* 5 (1961):260; David J. Halperin, *Sabbatai Zevi: Testimonies to a Fallen Messiah* (Oxford, 2007), 142, 212–13. It would thus appear that the twentieth of Sivan could fall on Shabbat.

⁴⁷ This text, from the preface of the printer (R. Nahum Meizlish) to the *Selihot* of Rabbi Heller (Cracow, 1650) written to be recited on the twentieth of Sivan, is cited in Hayyim Yonah Gurland, *Le-Korot ha-Gezerot al Yisrael*, vol. 6, 55; Israel Halperin, *Pinkas Va’ad Arba Arazot* (Jerusalem, 1945), 78; Michael Hendel, *Gezerot Ta”h ve-Ta”t* (Jerusalem, 1950), 37; Avraham M. Haberman, “Piyyutav ve-Shirav shel R. Yom Tov Lipmann Heller,” in Judah Leib Hakohen Maimon, *Likvod Yom Tov: Ma’amaram u-Mehkarim* (Jerusalem, 1956), 125–26. See Joseph M. Davis, *Yom-Tov Lipmann Heller: Portrait of a Seventeenth-Century Rabbi*, 205–13.

⁴⁸ Once again, note the recurrence of “the grief was doubled” phrase. See above, n. 45.

⁴⁹ This work was first published in Cracow, 1650. It was republished in Hayyim Yonah Gurland, *Le-Korot ha-Gezerot al Yisrael*, vol. 4 (Cracow, 1889–1890), 7–25. For

a rationale or justification for the choice of this date but, rather, as an afterthought. Having chosen that day for the reason given, Rabbi Szczebrzeszyn continues and notes that, behold, it also happens to correspond to the date of the 1171 massacre in Blois. This is an example of what Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi calls “the almost fortuitous character of the commemoration of what happened at Blois.”⁵⁰

Taken together, so far, none of these sources serves as example of a propensity to subsume or incorporate a later catastrophe (1648–1649) under a previous one (1171). None of them indicates that the twentieth of Sivan catastrophe in Blois was a foremost consideration in the choice of that date for commemoration of the catastrophe of the Chmielnicki Massacres in Eastern Europe. They rather describe the interest of relating or associating them to one another via the date of the twentieth of Sivan that they had in common. However, that the date of the twentieth of Sivan actually reflects the phenomenon of subsuming, of becoming in that way a kind of alternative to the subsuming that Qalonymos suggested should take place under the memory of the Temple’s destruction, is evident in one other, later, very illuminating text.

the passage about the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan, see p. 25. See also *Sefer Gezerot Ta”h ve-Ta”t* (Jerusalem, 2005), 98.

⁵⁰ Yosef H. Yerushalmi, *Zakhor*, 51–52.

This issue was previously addressed in a number of different ways, all problematic. For example, one suggestion was that in 1650 the leaders of the East European community wanted to commemorate the tragedy of their time as well as that which occurred in 1171 and decided to make it easier for their community by choosing a day on which fasting was already taking place. See Meir Letteris in his notes on *Emek ha-Bakha*, cited in Gurland, *Le-Korot ha-Gezerot al Yisrael*, vol. 4, 41, n. 1. This is wrong for a number of reasons. First, there is no evidence that in 1650 there was also an interest in commemorating what happened in Blois and, second, there is no evidence that any Jews were fasting on the twentieth of Sivan for what had happened in Blois. On the contrary (see above, at n. 31). Jay R. Berkovitz formulated the connection as follows: “Survivors of the Chmielnicki massacres decided to ordain a fast day for mourning and lamentation on the twentieth day of Sivan, as this was the day when thirty two Jews in the French town of Blois were burned at the stake in 1171.... But why choose a day with no connection to their own suffering? It is clear that the twentieth of Sivan represented an existing structure into which more recent events could be incorporated.” See his “Does Jewish History Repeat Itself?: Paradigm, Myth and Tradition,” *The Solomon Goldman Lectures* 7 (1999), 147–48. But, as has been repeatedly indicated, this day did have a real “connection to their own suffering.” See too Yoel Raba, *Bein Zikhron le-Hakhashah*, 38, 60; David G. Roskies, *Against the Apocalypse: Responses to Catastrophe in Modern Jewish Culture* (Cambridge and London, 1984), 50–51; idem, “Memory,” in Arthur A. Cohen and Paul Mendes-Flohr, eds., *Contemporary Jewish Religious Thought* (New York and London, 1987), 583; Shulamit Elizur, *Lamah Zamnu?*, 226, n. 30.

In his *Sha'arei Teshuvah* commentary to the *Shulhan Arukh Orah Hayyim*, Rabbi Hayyim Mordecai Margalioth (end eighteenth-beginning nineteenth century) writes regarding the fast day established to commemorate the calamity of the Chmielnicki Massacres that “the reason they established it [the fast] on the twentieth of Sivan, even though the calamity lasted for two successive years and beyond, is because in earlier years, in the year 1171, there was also a time of trouble for Jacob (cf. Jer. 30:7) on that day.” He then cites Rabbi Kohen, who wrote that this day can never fall on the Sabbath.⁵¹

Here, remarkably, there is no reference *at all* to the rationale of choosing the twentieth of Sivan because that was when the massacres began. There is no compelling independent reason offered to choose any date over another on which to fast in commemoration of the Chmielnicki Massacres other than the fact that the Blois Massacre happened on that date; this is the *only* rationale provided for the choice of that date. The Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan now assumes the role hitherto played by the Fast of the Ninth of Av for *it* becomes the date under which later catastrophes are subsumed. For if Qalonymos had gone so far as to place the commemoration of catastrophes that were known to have occurred on a particular date on the ninth of Av even though that was definitely not when they took place, it should follow that if one would want to choose a date to commemorate a catastrophe where the ninth of Av would be as appropriate as any other date for that purpose, it should surely have been the date chosen. Yet, the date of the twentieth of Sivan was chosen. That date became so important as a date to commemorate medieval catastrophes that it assumed the role one would have expected, following Qalonymos's position, the Fast of the Ninth of Av to have. The impulse to subsume first formulated by Qalonymos remains, but once the twentieth of Sivan is believed to have been established in 1171, it is *that date* that comes to assume the role of the date under which later catastrophes are subsumed and on which they are commemorated.

To return, in conclusion, to Rabbi Kasher and the Holocaust. In the middle of the twentieth century, the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan

⁵¹ *Shaarei Teshuvah, Orah Hayyim* 580:9. On Rabbi Margalioth and his *Sha'arei Teshuvah* commentary, see Menahem Elon, *Ha-Mishpat ha-Ivri*, vol. 3 (Jerusalem, 1973), 1200–01.

played a central role in support of those who were in favor of the establishment of a special date for commemoration of the Holocaust, contrary to the opinion espoused by Rabbi Kasher, and this in two ways, national as well as religious. In the years shortly after the founding of the State of Israel, discussions took place regarding the formalization of some official national commemoration of that most horrific catastrophe. The first speaker of the Israeli Knesset, Yosef Shprinzak, understood how important that would be and, as noted earlier, appointed a subcommittee which he charged with the responsibility of determining what form it should take. On April 11, 1951, Rabbi Mordecai Nurock, its chairman, ascended the Knesset podium to report on the subcommittee deliberations. He noted that the decision was made to establish a special date for commemoration for the Holocaust and, remarkably, the only historical precedent he adduced by name for this decision was the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan. "Our ancestors instituted for various events days of fasting and mourning, like the twentieth of Sivan and others," he said, "that cannot, in any way, be compared to the enormous tragedy of our times."⁵² If a separate date (read: not the ninth of Av commemorating the destruction of the Temple) was established for the Chmielnicki Massacres and also, perhaps, for the massacre in Blois, then, he argued, certainly one should be established for the Holocaust. He was not suggesting here that the Holocaust should be commemorated on the twentieth of Sivan; there were others who felt that way.⁵³ He was, rather, using the existence of that date as a precedent for allowing the establishment of a day of commemoration for the Holocaust separate from the ninth of Av.⁵⁴ Once again, the

⁵² See *Divrei ha-Knesset* 9 (April 12, 1951), 1656. In addition, see *Divrei ha-Knesset* 24 (June 18, 1958), 2119.

⁵³ For attempts to establish the Holocaust commemoration day on the twentieth of Sivan, see Roni Stauber, *Ha-Lekah La-Dor: Shoah u-Gevurah ba-Mahshavah ha-Zibburit ba-Arez be-Shenot ha-Hamishim* (Jerusalem, 2000), 50–52; trans. as *The Holocaust in Israeli Public Debate in the 1950s* (London and Portland, 2007), 33–34. The Hungarian community did, in fact, mark its Holocaust commemoration on that day. See Yehudit Tydor Baumel, "Kol Bikhyot:" *Ha-Shoah ve-ha-Tefillah* (Jerusalem, 1992), 64, 150; R. Yisakhar Duber Schwartz, *She'elot u-Teshuvot Minhat Divshi*, vol. 1 (Antwerp, 2003), 26, #6.

⁵⁴ For the establishment of a Holocaust memorial day by the Israeli Knesset, see Charles S. Liebman and Eliezer Don-Yehiya, *Civil Religion in Israel* (Berkeley, 1983), 101–107; James E. Young, "When a Day Remembers: A Performative History of *Yom ha-Shoah*," *History & Memory* 2:2 (1990):54–75; Saul Friedlander, "The Shoah Between Memory and History," *The Jerusalem Quarterly* 53 (1990):115–26; Yehudit Tydor Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot*, 65–68; Tom Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*

Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan becomes the prime historical example of moving away from the primacy of the Fast of the Ninth of Av as the sole day devoted to commemoration of Jewish catastrophe. It serves as a kind of counter-ninth of Av, allowing for additional dates of commemoration to be established, although we have seen that, once established, it itself assumes a ninth of Av-like character in that, for some, subsequent catastrophes become subsumed under it.

In fact, the precedent of the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan was utilized not only in support of a day of commemoration for the Holocaust but also in support of a ritually mandated fast day to commemorate it. In a responsum written a few months before the end of the war, Rabbi Yizhak Isaac Halevi Herzog, then Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi of Palestine, favored the establishment of such a fast day and justified his decision largely on this precedent.⁵⁵ Like Rabbi Nurock a few years later, he too was not suggesting that the Holocaust should be commemorated on that date but was, rather, utilizing the existence of that date to argue that allowing for the establishment of a fast day to commemorate it would not violate any traditional norms. He argued that the existence of the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan clearly indicates that the commemoration of the destruction of the Temple does not have a monopoly on the commemoration of all subsequent—even so called national—Jewish communal catastrophes. A new catastrophe occurs and a new fast day can be established, separate from and irrelevant to the Fast of the Ninth of Av.

But Rabbi Kasher disagreed. He and others based their opposition to the establishment of an ad-hoc fast day during the war and a special Holocaust commemoration day after the war primarily on the first twelfth-century text mentioned above. Rabbi Yizhak Ze'ev Halevi

(New York, 1993), 436–40; Dalia Ofer, “The Strength of Remembrance: Commemorating the Holocaust During the First Decade of Israel,” *Jewish Social Studies* 6:2 (Winter 2000):36; Eliezer Don-Yehiya, “Memory and Political Culture: Israeli Society and the Holocaust,” *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* 9 (1993), 148–49; Hanna Yablonka, “*Ma Lizkor ve-Keitsad? Nitsolei ha-Sho'a ve-Izuv Yedi'atah*,” in Anita Shapira, Jehuda Reinharz and Jay Harris, eds., *Idan ha-Tsiyyonut* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 2000), 305–13; Roni Stauber, *Ha-Lekah la-Dor*, 56–60.

I have twice been privileged to be granted permission to have access to the Knesset archives and examine the old yellowed pages containing the meetings of this subcommittee. I hope to publish the results of that research in the near future.

⁵⁵ See his *She'elot u-Teshuvot Hekhal Yitzhak, Orah Hayyim* (Jerusalem, 1972), 155, #61; repr. in *Pesakim u-Ktavim: She'elot u-Teshuvot be-Dinei Orah Hayyim*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1989), 438, #99.

Soloveichik, Rabbi Moses Feinstein, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, and others noted that Qalonymos had already written in his twelfth-century elegy for the Jewish communities destroyed by the Crusaders that “we do not add times (of mourning) for destruction and conflagration.”⁵⁶ Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik also cited pseudo-Rashi’s comment that “we recite lamentations (*kinot*) for those slain in the persecutions that occurred in our times” on the ninth of Av to make the point that no new days of commemoration are to be added to the Jewish calendar; everything must be subsumed under the age-old commemoration of the Temple’s destruction that took place on the ninth of Av, including the Holocaust.⁵⁷

But how can we understand the position of these twentieth-century rabbinic authorities who based their opposition to the establishment of

⁵⁶ For Rabbi Yizhak Ze’ev Halevi Soloveichik’s position, see R. Moshe Sternbuch, *She’elot u-Teshuvot Teshuvot ve-Hanagot*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1989), 408, #721. For R. Moshe Feinstein’s position, see his “Bi-Devar Kevi’at Yom Ta’anit le-Kedoshai ha-Shoah,” *Am ha-Torah* 2:10 (1985):17–18; repr. in R. Moshe Hershtler, ed., *Sefer Halakhah u-Re’fuah*, vol. 5 (Jerusalem, 1987), 74; repr. again with a slightly different title (“Be-Ta’am Shelo Tiknu Yom Kavua’ le-Ta’anit u-Tefillah le-Zekher Harugei ha-Shoah”) and a few additional words in *Iggerot Moshe, Yoreh De’ah*, vol. 4 (Jerusalem, 1996), 289, #57:11. I assume this is an authoritative rendering of Rabbi Feinstein’s position on this matter even though he did not personally publish it. For Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik’s position, see *The Lord is Righteous in All His Ways: Reflections on the Tish’a be-Av Kinot*, ed. Jacob J. Schacter (Jersey City, 2006), 299–301. See also R. Shmuel Tuvyah Stern, “Yom Ha-Shoah le-Or ha-Halakhah,” *Ha-Pardes* 59:10 (June 1985):12; idem, *She’elot u-Teshuvot ha-Shavit*, vol. 7 (New York, 1987), 9–10, #4.

It is interesting that Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin also wanted to move Yom Hashoah, Israel’s Holocaust commemoration day, from 27 Nissan to Tisha B’Av. See his speech to the Israeli Knesset on August 2, 1977, less than two months after he took office, printed in *Divrei ha-Knesset* (August 2, 1977), 566.

It is noteworthy that this issue surfaced recently regarding the request of some to establish a fast day to commemorate the disengagement from Gaza in the Summer of 2005. See R. Yonah Metzger, “Kevi’at Ta’anit ve-Kinot al Hurban Gush Katif,” *Tehumin* 30 (2010):44–50. Rabbi Feinstein’s position regarding the Holocaust plays a central role in the discussion.

⁵⁷ See *The Lord is Righteous*, 213, 291–93.

It is also interesting to examine how Rabbi Feinstein, Rabbi Soloveitchik, and Rabbi Avraham Yeshayahu Karelitz (Hazon Ish) who also opposed a separate day of commemoration for the Holocaust dealt with the precedent of the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan. For R. Feinstein and R. Soloveitchik, see the sources cited above, n. 56. For the Hazon Ish, see Hazon Ish, *Kovez Iggerot* (Jerusalem, 1955), 113–14, #97; Shlomo Cohen, *Pe’er ha-Dor*, vol. 3 (Bnei Brak, 1970), 123–25. This is by no means a simple matter. Also interesting, and equally not simple, is how Rabbi Herzog attempted to deal with the Qalonymos text. See the postscript to his letter cited above. I dealt with this issue in my “Holocaust Commemoration and *Tish’a be-Av*,” and plan to return to it on another occasion.

any special day—fast or even just commemoration—for the Holocaust on texts that do not provide anywhere near the kind of support they claim for them? Neither text they cite had influence in the Middle Ages and, as indicated above, there is significant evidence that points to the contrary. And all this apart from the fact that neither of these comments are found in the standard kinds of halakhic sources that rabbinic authorities typically adduce in their rulings. One (Qalonymos) is found in a liturgical context and the other (pseudo-Rashi) in an exegetical one, hardly the sort of sources that would normally determine religious behavior.⁵⁸

One consideration, in particular, may explain this phenomenon. Supporting a separate day of commemoration for the Holocaust, in whatever form it may take, rather than attaching its commemoration to the Fast of the Ninth of Av, the traditional day of remembering Jewish catastrophe, meant singling out the Holocaust for special treatment, and for them this led to a huge problem. Acknowledging that this catastrophe was so horrible, so unique, so unprecedented, and so *sui generis* that it was deserving of its own day of commemoration opened up the possibility that the age-old traditional “explanations” that had been presented in connection with previous tragedies might not also be applicable to the Holocaust. For example, “*mipnei hata’enu galinu me-arzenu*,” the fundamental and oft-cited “explanation” or “justification” for Jewish suffering, that it is a punishment for sin, could not be used to “explain” the Holocaust. How could this possibly account for the cruel murder and torture of six million people, including a million and a half children. And when familiar, time-tested “interpretations” of Jewish suffering were no longer considered sufficient, the resultant challenge to one’s faith might become something too difficult to bear. In order to avoid—or, maybe, attempt somehow to deal with—the theological challenge posed by the Holocaust, it was much easier to subsume and absorb this catastrophe—as horrible, unique, unprecedented, and *sui generis* as it was recognized to be—into previously established patterns and archetypes, allowing whatever “explanation” given to them to apply now as well. Such a conception, in which even the unprecedented was assigned a precedent, was a

⁵⁸ To the best of my knowledge the only one who acknowledged this was Rabbi Yizhak Ze’ev Halevi Soloveitchik, above, n. 56.

comfortable and reassuring one, allowing for the classical covenantal construct to remain intact in the face of potential discontinuity and even rupture. This continuity with the past helped avoid a crisis of faith in the present and helped provide great hope for the future.⁵⁹ Given this perspective, one or two texts were cited in support of associating the Holocaust with the ninth of Av even though they were not halakhic in nature, did not have much influence in medieval times and, in one case, closer scrutiny may reveal that the conclusion drawn from it is not warranted. Texts which reflected the sentiment that the memory of all Jewish tragedies need be subsumed under the memory of the Temple's destruction perfectly suited this frame of mind and were conveniently adduced in support of it.

In conclusion, I return to a point I made at the beginning of this paper: much of a culture's identity depends on how that culture remembers, and chooses to convey, the catastrophes it experienced in addition to its positive achievements and accomplishments, and Jewish culture is no exception. But the leaders of the Jewish communities that experienced catastrophe confronted a dilemma. On the one hand, it was very important for them not to forget what happened, eternally to recall for all future generations the memory of their communities that were destroyed and their members who were killed, as they would have formulated it, *al Kiddush Hashem*, for the sanctification of God's name. And they determined that the best way to do this would be by designating a special date to commemorate the catastrophe. Each one was significant and each one merited its own separate date of commemoration. Thus, both local and so-called national dates of fasting were instituted in addition to the Fast of the Ninth of Av, the fast established to commemorate the destruction of the Temple.

However, at the same time, they understood that survival was their most important priority and that a constant recurring focus on suffering and catastrophe, calamity and disaster, so much a part of the medieval and modern Jewish experience, would be debilitating and counter-

⁵⁹ For this consideration, see Menachem Friedman, "The Haredim and the Holocaust," *The Jerusalem Quarterly* 53 (Winter 1990):86–87; Binyamin Brown, *Ha-Hazon Ish: Halakhah, Emunah ve-Hevrah bi-Pesakav ha-Boletim bi-Erez Yisrael (5693–5714)* (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 2003), 432. See too above, n. 12.

See also R. Yom Tov Halevi Schwarz, *'Einayim Lir'ot* (New York, 1997), 121; trans. as *Eyes to See* (Jerusalem and New York, 2004), 175–76 for a challenge to the association of the Qalonymos Crusade *kinah* to the Holocaust.

productive. Reflecting a sentiment reminiscent of a talmudic passage in Tractate Shabbat, they reasoned that if every catastrophe—even only every “major” one—would warrant its own day of commemoration, Jews would be commemorating catastrophe virtually every day of the year.⁶⁰ As a result, they connected one to the other, attempting to subsume later disasters under earlier ones, to frame overarching archetypes and paradigms of suffering rather than focusing on the unique individual character of each one.⁶¹ The Fast of the Ninth of Av, and later the Fast of the Twentieth of Sivan, then, became days on which many tragedies were commemorated, freeing the community to focus—to the extent to which it was possible—on constructive living the rest of the year. Such were the experiences and needs of both past and present—and even future—considered and respected.

⁶⁰ See *Shabbat* 13a for Rabbi Shimon b. Gamliel’s statement that while he would like to celebrate the deliverance from each one of the calamities that struck the Jewish people separately, were he to do so he would be celebrating virtually every day of the year.

⁶¹ I discussed this tendency to subsume in my (and Judith Tydor Baumel’s) “The Ninety-Three Bais Yaakov Girls of Cracow: History or Typology?,” in Jacob J. Schacter, ed., *Reverence, Righteousness, and Rahamanut: Essays in Memory of Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung* (Northvale and London, 1992), 109–11, and my “Holocaust Commemoration and *Tish’a be-Av*,” 173–74. See also Yosef H. Yerushalmi, *Zakhor*, 51; Robert Chazan, “Representation of Events in the Middle Ages,” in Ada Rapoport-Albert, ed., *Essays in Jewish Historiography (History and Theory, Beiheft 27 [1988])*, 40–55; David Nirenberg, “The Rhineland Massacres of Jews in the First Crusade,” 279–309, esp. 285–89, 294–95.

The Temple of Jerusalem: From Moses to the Messiah

In Honor of Professor Louis H. Feldman

Edited by

Steven Fine

The Center for Israel Studies
Yeshiva University



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2011