



PROJECT MUSE®

Petah Tikva, 1886: Gender, Anonymity, and the Making of
Zionist Memory

Liora Halperin

Jewish Social Studies, Volume 23, Number 1, Fall 2017, pp. 1-28 (Article)



Published by Indiana University Press

➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/671590>

Petah Tikva, 1886: Gender, Anonymity, and the Making of Zionist Memory

Liora Halperin

ABSTRACT

The first significant clash between European Jewish agricultural colonists and Arab peasants in Palestine, a conflict over peasant grazing rights in Petah Tikva, took the life of one Jewish person, an older woman named Rachel Halevy. This article traces the commemoration history of the event in Zionist sources, particularly local Petah Tikva sources, between its occurrence in 1886 and the mid-1960s. It looks at both the evolving ghostly presence of the central Jewish female victim, who disappears, reappears, and lurks on the margins of the story, and Halevy's son, Sender Hadad, who becomes increasingly prominent over the years as he is configured as an archetypal Zionist guardsman and hero. Through the commemoration history of these figures, the article traces shifting Zionist narratives about heroism and victimhood in Petah Tikva; the construction of Petah Tikva, founded before the Zionist movement, as a locus of foundational Zionist bravery; and the gendered notions by which men and women are remembered and forgotten.

Key words: First Aliyah, Zionism, collective memory, gender

On March 29, 1886 (22 Adar II 5646), Arab peasants from the village of Yahudiya attacked the new Jewish colony (*moshav*) of Petah Tikva (founded in 1878) and injured five Jews. One of them, Rachel Halevy, died several days later, possibly from an underlying condition aggravated by shock from the attack.

Liora Halperin, "Petah Tikva, 1886: Gender, Anonymity, and the Making of Zionist Memory," *Jewish Social Studies: History, Culture, Society* n.s. 23, no. 1 (Fall 2017): 1–28. Copyright © 2017 The Trustees of Indiana University. doi: 10.2979/jewisocistud.23.1.01

[2]

*Jewish
Social
Studies*

●
Vol. 23
No. 1

The culmination of reciprocal and building tensions over land and grazing rights in the wake of the first Jewish purchases of agricultural land in Palestine, this event was the first significant physical clash between Jewish agricultural settlers and local Arab peasants in Palestine.¹ Moshe Smilansky, the head of the Jewish Farmers Federation and one of the most important chroniclers and commentators on these early colonies, called it “the first [violent clash] in the history of the Yishuv.”²

Historians have discussed the significance of the 1886 incident, as they have the early colonies in general, in terms of its relationship to ongoing grazing conflicts and disputes over land ownership in late Ottoman Palestine and as a perceived initial test of Jewish settlement in Palestine in the years just after deadly pogroms in the Russian Empire.³ The incident is largely absent, however, from studies of Zionist memory and commemoration in the Mandate and early state periods, which focus both on the more numerous casualties of the post-1908 and post-World War I periods and on the Labor Zionist institutions so central to the making of hegemonic Zionist collective memory in the twentieth century.⁴ But the 1886 incident has a local narrative history of its own, written by actors who had an interest in constructing a national narrative with the bourgeois colonies at its core. Local histories are often created by nonprofessionals engaged in preserving the memory of a particular past close to their own hearts. As Jean O’Brien notes regarding similar texts about the early American colonies, such local commemorative agents produce “consolidated versions of the past” that are perpetuated in print and in periodic public celebrations that have a generative power as “locations of ideological production and dissemination.”⁵

The omissions, modifications, emphases, and glorifications in this story, and the way they change over time, are indicative of a process of national narrative creation that not only adopts national trends at the local level but also generates local meaning and manages local anxiety. The location of a shadowy female actor at the center of the story offers a further, unusual opportunity to explore the making of particularly gendered types within this local commemorative process. By using sources like diaries, school documents, and records of marriages and births, scholars of the First Aliyah colonies have brought to light the stories of usually young female diarists, writers, and defenders and explored the social history of figures who are assumed to have been little remembered beyond their own life spans. However, they rarely find instances where ordinary female figures from this period maintain legacies beyond their own lifetimes.⁶ The 1886 incident, with its female casualty at the center, juxtaposes an older, feeble woman who

by all accounts would have no role in subsequent commemoration and a seemingly iconic heroic figure who began his commemorative life equally invisible but who came to play a starring role in an evolving historic narrative about an iconic “first.”

This article traces this local commemorative effort between the event itself and the mid-1960s, exploring the interrelation of two key processes, both of which were essential to the (re)making of the First Aliyah narrative more broadly. First, the making of memory involved the omission or renarration of the weakness and passivity of the attack’s central Jewish female victim and, by extension, the colony at large. Halevy was only sketchily mentioned both in the publications that immediately followed the attack and in later historical and commemorative texts; but her shadowy presence remained visible, intermittently illuminated by the klieg lights of violence and the rising star of her son, Sender Hadad. Second, the emerging story identified and elevated the heroic figure of Hadad and made a myth that was more easily promoted in ideological and pedagogic texts, ones that wished to portray Petah Tikva itself as strong and masculine in the face of broad public denigration of this settlement as weak, religious, and ambivalent to the national project. Hadad was mentioned only in passing in the earliest accounts but was significantly elevated as a legendary masculine hero and defender in the local narratives that followed in the Mandate and early state periods. The narrative omission of Halevy and elevation of her son, Hadad, worked together to alleviate a perpetual anxiety about the strength of the national project in general and the early colonies in particular, by effacing actors not marked as defenders and elevating a circumscribed variety of national defender, who himself was rewritten and reimagined.

This process occurred over three stages. The first texts, produced around the period of the event, enable us to reconstruct, as best as possible, what did in fact happen. As Richard D. Brown writes, whereas fiction writers “possess the freedom to move far beyond facts, to invent episodes, conversations, people, and outcomes,” historians “move beyond facts in constructing our interpretations, but we move on a short leash.”⁷ Sketching the historical features of the incident enables us to identify later narrations that are clearly fictionalized or far-fetched rather than simply selective or ideologically tinted. But these texts also participate in the first stage of narrative construction by alternating between allusions to East European pogroms, concerns about the viability of the settlement project, and assurances that the incident was unusual and nonrepresentative. Tropes of basic viability, not heroism, dominate characterizations of the colony in the wake of the 1886 event.

[3]

Petah Tikva,
1886

•
Liora
Halperin

Commemorative texts, memoirs, and diaries produced during the Mandate period—the second stage of the process—constructed heroic national narratives under the influence of emerging normative Zionist models of masculine Jewish self-transformation. Written during a period of consolidation of both national and local Zionist institutions, these texts began to build a narrative of self-sufficiency and self-defense rooted specifically in the First Aliyah colonies (not in the Labor Zionist communities that followed). This reshaping centered on the elevation of particular iconic defenders, including Halevy's son, Sender Hadad, but also isolated female defenders, and created patterns of gendered narrative omissions and substitutions that would remain in play in subsequent decades. Finally, during the 1950s and 1960s, the story of the 1886 incident and of Hadad was canonized through commemorative publications and biographical texts intended to disseminate the history of the moshavot to national audiences during a time of perceived declining interest in origin narratives more generally. These texts demonstrated the making, publishing, and entrenchment of local myth for a subsequent generation of children in the years after Israeli statehood.

The dominant outlines of the Zionist-Arab conflict over Jewish immigration and land settlement took shape after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 and the Balfour Declaration of 1917, as did iconic Zionist narratives about Jewish self-sufficiency and self-defense associated with the Labor Zionist movement, which began its rise to prominence during this same period. The Jewish colonies that antedated these watershed moments—and indeed the Zionist movement itself—thus gained an ambiguous character. Marked as the First Aliyah, or first wave, in the periodization widely accepted in the Yishuv after World War I,⁸ colonies like Petah Tikva, Rehovot, and Rishon LeZion, located mainly in the Jaffa region, along the Mediterranean coastal plain, and in the upper Galilee, acquired pride of place as founders and foundation builders. But their relationship to the iconic values of the emerging labor hegemony ranged from ambiguous to highly uneasy. The first colonists, known as *ikarim*, farmers, were largely religious, bourgeois, and dependent in part on Arab labor and foreign Jewish philanthropic aid, all of which were anathema to the secular, socialist, Hebrew-labor ethos ascendant in the early twentieth century. If the farmers as a group were painted as weak and unheroic, particularly in the context of ongoing labor disputes throughout the 1920s and 1930s, Petah Tikva's Jewish residents were derided for the religious character they maintained even as secularizing currents took hold elsewhere.⁹ The tension between its presumed centrality as *Em Ha-moshavot*, the mother of the colonies, and its presumed political

and cultural marginality both defined Petah Tikva and motivated its own attempts at self-narration over time.

Petah Tikva, initially founded in 1878 by a handful of religious Jews from Jerusalem and bolstered by the financial assistance of Baron Edmond de Rothschild after 1883, was built on 14,200 dunams of land purchased from Anton Bishara Tayan and Salim Kaiser. Both were Christian Orthodox merchants from Jaffa who had acquired the lands of Umlabes and Yahudiya while keeping the peasants as tenant farmers, a common move following Ottoman centralization and land-management laws.¹⁰ When Tayan sold the land to the founders of Petah Tikva, the parameters of the sale were not clear: Tayan claimed to have sold the whole land, but about 2,600 dunams of it appear to have been owned by tenant farmers. In any case, the purchase was not recorded in the Ottoman records because of restrictions on land sales to Jews. By 1886, Petah Tikva had expanded somewhat and become one of eight similar settlements founded by Ashkenazi Jewish settlers motivated by the ideals of revitalizing Jews and productivizing them, in the parlance of the era, provoking concern and ire from the local Arab peasantry.

Ottoman custom dictated that new owners would continue to let tenant farmers graze their animals on the land even after it changed ownership, and it appears that the first settlers of Petah Tikva maintained this practice.¹¹ But in 1883, a new group of Jews arrived from Bialystok, and they demanded that the tenant farmers and grazers vacate. This angered the Arab peasant farmers: they had already completed the first part of a two-year crop cycle and wanted to plant the next phase, the valuable winter crop. Thus began a fight that used animal theft as a proxy for broader ownership claims and would culminate in what some regarded as the first major conflict in the history of the Yishuv.

To secure their claim, we learn from several contemporary sources, peasants from Yahudiya plowed a field and seized a Jew's horse. Jews responded by confiscating nine or ten donkeys they found on already-harvested fields. The peasants sent their elders to Petah Tikva and offered nine piasters for each animal (far less than the approximately 130 piasters a donkey would cost in the Jaffa market).¹² The Jews of Petah Tikva demanded more, but the elders refused. The following day, according to a Jewish account, "the people of Yahudiya assembled and a group came with their sticks and clubs to Umlabes, and said that they would take their animals by force." Upon realizing that the stolen donkeys were missing, the peasants broke the windows of the houses and "rained their blows" on four people. As the Jewish-owned animals came back from the fields, the peasants captured them and brought them to Jaffa.¹³ Another account suggests that Arabs came looking that day for Yehoshua Stampfer, one of the

[5]

Petah Tikva,
1886

•
Liora
Halperin

[6]

*Jewish
Social
Studies*

•

Vol. 23
No. 1

people responsible for confiscating the animals, but Stampfer was not in the colony at the time, having gone to Jaffa. Only after they failed to find him, according to this account, did the Yahudiya residents attack other colonists: they “broke into their houses, broke their windows and started to act wildly [*lifroa’ pera’ot*].”¹⁴ The term *pera’ot* would have directly evoked recent pogroms in the Russian Empire and implied irrational, religiously motivated violence.

Rachel Halevy, originally of Krinik (between Grodno and Bialystok), may have heard about these conflicts from her son, Sender (Alexander). Sender (see figure 1), in an act of eliding his own East European diasporic past in favor of an adopted Middle Eastern one, had thrown off his Jewish diasporic surname (Halevy, or possibly Kriniker, after his place of origin) and taken on the more typically Mizrahi or Arab name Hadad (blacksmith), a testimony to his trade since his immigration to Palestine around 1872.

By the time the first avengers came to Petah Tikva to try to seize back their animals, the small group of young Jewish men who had not left for the fields or for Jaffa opted to gather the women, children,



Figure 1. Danny Kerman, drawing of Sender Hadad, in Mordechai Naor, “Agadat Sender Hadad,” in *Sefer ha-gevurah: Mi-nesharim kalu, me-arayot gaveru*, ed. Michael Bar-Zohar (Tel Aviv, 1997), 15.

and older men together into the main house, an imposing two-story edifice built in 1883 by the Jewish benefactor Emil Lachmann of Berlin, who had also facilitated Arieh Leib Frumkin's purchase of 900 dunams in Petah Tikva.¹⁵ The house, despite its substantial size and stone construction (see figure 2), would ultimately not be sufficiently secure to protect those huddled there. After the initial group of avengers came to the colony, a much larger group—estimates ranged from around 300 to as many as 500—followed.¹⁶ On March 29, 1886, a Monday, they injured five individuals; the most seriously harmed was Halevy. Sender, returning to the colony, found his mother—it is unclear exactly where. By Friday, her condition had worsened, and he took her to Jerusalem in a horse-drawn carriage. She died just as the Sabbath began and was buried on the Mount of Olives, the traditional Jewish burial site overlooking the Temple Mount.

With the help of Ottoman soldiers, the Jews of the colony managed to capture 31 Arab peasants and bring them to Jaffa, where they were imprisoned. European consulates, representing most European Jewish settlers, worked to bring them to justice: Samuel Hirsch, the manager of the Petah Tikva colony, had sent a letter to the governor of Jaffa to demand a trial.¹⁷ Despite pressing for a trial, however, the

[7]

Petah Tikva,
1886

•

Liora
Halperin



Figure 2. Image of the Lachmann House, circa 1899. Isaiah Raffalovich and M. E. Sachs, *Ansichten von Palästina und den jüdischen Colonien* (Berlin, 1899), 19; reprinted as *Mareh Erets Yisrael veha-moshavot* (Jerusalem, 1979), 41.

episode ultimately concluded with a *sulhah*, a traditional mediated reconciliation associated with a blood-money payment: “the people of the village and the people of the colony made sacrifices and made a covenant of brothers between them.”¹⁸

The Death in Question

Having considered the broad outlines of the event, we now turn to its protagonists, the mother and son Rachel Halevy and Sender Hadad, and the process by which they emerged, and were submerged, in local and commemorative texts with evolving preoccupations and interests. The first report on the event, on April 2, 1886, referred to Halevy as “the wife of R. Yosef Ha-Levy from Grodno” and noted that she was hit and was taken by her son to Jerusalem, where she died.¹⁹ Shmuel Rafaelovich wrote in the St. Petersburg-based Hebrew daily *Ha-yom* (calling her only “the woman”) that she “was sick even before this, but the blows took her to the edge of death [*she’arei sheol*].”²⁰ Contemporary articles offer little detail about Halevy except the fact of her injury and the complexity of her burial. We know almost as little about Sender, except that he was the son who took his mother to Jerusalem. Both figures come into initial, shady view in the wake of the attack, but they go on to have very different commemorative trajectories.

Three subjects of discussion dominated contemporary coverage of the event, none of which focused on the individual heroism that would dominate later accounts: the Ottoman context of the subsequent investigation; the implications of the attack for the land-settlement program; and the absence of male defenders. First, in coming to Jerusalem to die Halevy was subject to the rationalizing protocols of the Ottoman state as well as the dictates of the religious Jewish community. As an article in *Ha-tsvi* indicated, after the Ottoman authorities in Jerusalem learned of the claim that an Arab attack had led to a woman’s death, the pasha (governor of Jerusalem) declared that a doctor should do an autopsy to determine the cause of death. However, the Sabbath was approaching and the Hevrah Kadishah, the Jewish burial society, could not wait to bury her, so they buried her without doing the autopsy. This angered the pasha, and he demanded that she be disinterred for an autopsy on Sunday. As a result of this state involvement in the medical and legal aspects of the death (in tension with religious protocols), a Jewish doctor, referred to only as Dr. Schwartz, performed the autopsy; the authorities declared that “she

had a long-term illness and the blows and disturbances hastened her death.”²¹ It may have simply been convenient for the authorities to rule that the attack had not caused the death (such that no murder charge could be brought); or perhaps this assessment was true—we cannot know. In general, Jews at the time suspected Ottoman authorities of complicity, corruption, and collaboration with Arab communities.²² A report on April 19 suspected that “the government clerks in Jaffa [had] a hand in this. With their knowledge the Arabs did what they did.”²³

Second, the individual characters in the story were far less important than were the implications for the future of Jewish land settlement in Palestine. Contemporary accounts focused instead on the lead-up to the incident, the particulars of the land conflict, and, ultimately, on denying that this incident spelled doom for Petah Tikva or the Yishuv. The first report, published in *Havatsselet* just three days after the incident, was the swiftest to cast Jews as outright victims. It describes the broken windows and utensils in language evocative of the pogroms that had recently swept through the southern parts of the Russian Empire and spurred the beginnings of the modern Jewish settlement project. The individuals mentioned were those injured: “Some of the men of the colony [here: *moshav*] who happened to be there, as well as a few women, were hit with very serious blows.”²⁴ There are no heroes in this story, only Jewish victims.

Other accounts downplay the pogrom-like aspects of the event and insist on describing a local, resolvable economic conflict.²⁵ In his May 7 letter to Leon Pinsker, head of the Hibat Tsiyon organization in Odessa, Samuel Hirsch, from the Rothschild administration in the colonies, insisted that rural Palestinians were an undeveloped people with a great respect for the head of their tribe and that, therefore, conflicts in Palestine could be resolved through negotiation. Most important, he said, the incident did not stem from religious or national hatred but rather from the specifics of Turkish land-tenure rules. If the Yishuv could better understand these contextual details, the issue could be resolved.²⁶

Yet other accounts enumerated the specifics of the clash. A writer identified by the initials A. P., writing for *Ha-tsefirah* in Paris on April 13, wrote, “There was already something like this some years ago, when Arabs went onto Jewish-owned land in Petah Tikva and destroyed three houses.” Jews, he editorialized, should have known that something like this would occur again. After all, the Jewish landowners from Russia and Hungary (the Austro-Hungarian Empire, mainly Romania) were buying land but not living on it, instead leasing it to

[9]

Petah Tikva,
1886



Liora
Halperin

Arabs for whom, his words make clear, he cared little. Thus, “for every two parcels of land that belong to our brothers working the holy land really with their own hands, there are sometimes five or six Arab evildoers and thieves and by their hands there are a lot of obstacles.” This should send a message, A. P. held, that the system of land ownership and governance in Petah Tikva needed modification.²⁷

Local Jewish community officials as well as subsequent articles nonetheless insisted that there was nothing systemic or overly alarming about this violence: “the damage is not great,” wrote an author identified as S. P. R. in *Ha-melits*, noting that Hirsch had written in his letter that “this event will be the first and the last” and that quiet had indeed already returned.²⁸ An anonymous letter to *Ha-magid* sought to assure readers abroad that “the Muslims are not hostile and do not hate us at all.”²⁹ An editorial note affixed to the letter affirmed that those sending letters from afar “tend[ed] to exaggerate and overinflate the events.” The editor concluded happily that this letter writer was correct in his rosy prognosis, unlike other writers who emphasized that someone was “fatally injured, etc.”³⁰ Given the contemporary context of the 1881–82 pogroms in the Russian Empire, a victimhood narrative might suggest that Jews were existentially unsafe in Palestine, too. The editor was glad, therefore, to dismiss diasporic hysteria as unwarranted even if that meant implying (falsely) that no one was “fatally injured.” Again, rhetoric about Jewish heroism was largely missing from the earliest descriptions of the 1886 events; resilience at that time meant not faith in muscular nationalism but instead confidence that violence was insignificant, not rooted in deep hatred, and ultimately the product of resolvable circumstances.

Third, and most relevant to the later commemorative developments that would take shape during the Mandate period, early coverage began to create typological narratives of gender roles and violence that would later inform more individuated constructions of victimhood and heroism, in part through the exclusion of Rachel and elevation of Sender. These early reports presented two sets of actors: Arab males, angered by affronts to their presumed grazing rights, and young Jewish male colonists, who, as an undifferentiated group, would do their best to fight back, defend, and possibly escalate the situation by confiscating more animals.³¹ These details are well corroborated historically. As we shall see, this story of Jewish male defenders was later expanded, embellished, and simplified with the substitution of the heroism of Sender Hadad in place of his mother’s victimhood.

In the early accounts, the Jewish men fought back but were ultimately too weak to prevail. The peasant neighbors had come to the colony on a day when the Jewish men were gone, “spread out in the fields far from the settlement, and some were in Jaffa.”³² “Only the women, the old men, and weak people” remained.³³ The anonymous letter to the editor of *Ha-magid* specified that only ten able-bodied men were left, six of whom came out to fight (the author claimed to have been one of them); another text mentions five young men.³⁴ We start to see a picture of a quotidian social arrangement: though depictions of the colony featured the actions of men, the physical space of the colony was mostly free of men during the day, as they fanned out over a broader range of territory to work in agriculture or ply the route to and from Jaffa as they did business.

Ultimately, this small group of men lost, though not for lack of trying: “And even though the Hebrews defended themselves, they were the minority and therefore they did not win this war.”³⁵ Their bravery was admirable but insufficient. The few able-bodied men left behind stood in defense of the others “with drawn swords and for an hour and a half fought bravely, and they injured some of the marauders.”³⁶ The anonymous letter writer claimed that he personally protected the women and children: “I myself was at the place of the disturbance and when I heard what was happening I closed the gate of the yard behind the children and women and weak men.”³⁷ But ultimately the defense failed: “Two young men brought all the women to one house and closed the door after them and they stood with swords drawn to defend the women. There were many injured.”³⁸ These sources describe a defense by men but not a typology of successful masculine defenders.

Fashioning Heroic Women

The women who become (briefly, partially) visible in the wake of violence are commonly connected with—and made visible by their proximity to—“heroic” men. It would be wrong, however, to conclude that the mechanisms of omission in Zionist narrative simply marked women for exclusion and men for inclusion. In practice, the omission of Rachel Halevy, an older and probably sick woman, from the story occurs through a more complex construction of heroism that also includes particular types of female heroines.

Hannah Leah Segal’s diary, undated but probably written around or soon after 1927,³⁹ is notable not only for providing an unparalleled,

[11]

Petah Tikva,
1886

●
Liora
Halperin

though still minuscule, level of detail about Rachel Halevy (though she is not named) but also for moving immediately from mentioning the casualty to offering a heroic narrative of another woman involved in the same events. Moreover, the diary's treatments of Segal's father, Aryeh Leib Frumkin, as both a victim and a heroic defender of property suggest the beginnings of an alternative type: a man whose suffering or victimhood is both legitimate and emphasized precisely because he has distinguished himself through heroic acts. Such moves characterize other texts from the Mandate period that we will consider in what follows.

Segal reviews neither the grazing conflicts that preceded the incident, the origins of Arab opposition to the Petah Tikva colony, nor the decisions to place women and children in the Lachmann house. In fact, she starts her account by mentioning Halevy:

Aside from the damage to windowpanes and fences and more, they found the mother of Sender Hadad, an old and weak woman, who lay alone, sick, at home, almost without the breath of life. She was sick mainly from sudden terror [*pahad ha-pitom*] and apparently also from the blows that the Arabs had delivered. They found the windowpanes in her house broken, and lots of shards of glass on her bed, and her soul departed after two or three days.⁴⁰

This account suggests, contrary to the other accounts, that Halevy was in her own house, perhaps not even deemed suitable for protection, perhaps simply forgotten. There is simply not enough information to determine whether this account is correct or if she was indeed in the Lachmann house. Segal's repeated depiction of her as "old and weak," "alone," and "sick" implies a certain ambivalence: the attack on her was particularly cruel, but at the same time she was deeply compromised: her condition placed her outside the rhetoric of self-defense and individual bravery with which Segal would continue.

Whereas most other accounts emphasized male heroism, Segal offers a description of female bravery during the same incident. On the surface, her version of events appears to rectify the omissions of the other texts, but I would argue that it participates in the same historiographic project as do the more numerous accounts about Sender Hadad that we will consider in a moment: it responds to a pervasive sense of collective weakness, epitomized not only by weak women but also by weak men, by downplaying the importance of women's victimhood and playing up isolated instances of unusual bravery:

They told of Hava Feinstein, one of the brave women [*neshot hayil*] in the colony, that she stood in the cowshed and went out with a pitchfork in her hand to save my father from those pursuing him, running toward her house and only after she realized she did not have the strength to save him did she return home.⁴¹

[13]

Petah Tikva,
1886

●
Liora
Halperin

Feinstein's juxtaposition with Halevy is curious: implicitly, Segal suggests that Halevy's death was caused not by the failure of male defenders but by the woman's inherent failure, as an old and weak person, to be in the position of a female defender. In Segal's diary, heroism is displaced onto Feinstein, who in classic form turns a tool of work into a tool of defense, suggesting emphasis on the Zionist values of agriculture and self-defense that would become more prominent in the 1920s texts we will consider next.

The tables are turned in this second part of the story, which I have not found corroborated elsewhere; the defender is the female Feinstein, the attacked is Aryeh Leib Frumkin. Interestingly, though, Feinstein's defense is limited; she ultimately realizes she lacks the strength to mount a defense and fades into the story's background, as Frumkin's injuries take precedence: "They also hit Sh. D. But it seems that my father suffered from the blows of the Arabs more than anyone."⁴² In effacing the person who ostensibly suffered the most—the one who died—and replacing her with a more established heroic figure, Segal writes Halevy out of the narrative just as soon as she is included, even highlighted, in it.

If Feinstein displaces Halevy, Frumkin displaces Feinstein in Segal's diary by taking on a persona of both hero and authorized victim. Read as a whole, he is the diary's chief heroic protagonist. Though she devotes considerable space to the Lachmann house, Segal foregrounds her father's role as its builder and ultimate defender. He built it, Segal writes, in order to be as safe as possible, with "a tall, fortified fence" and a "big gate," "just like the gates of knights' cities in the Middle Ages where they built their buildings in a way that they were able to best their enemies."⁴³ Frumkin himself described it as "a sort of small fortress closed on all sides."⁴⁴ Having constructed her father as a medieval knight, an image highly influential to Central European conceptions of masculinity and, in turn, to Zionist conceptions of bodily strength, Segal describes how he defended the fortress with a rifle and a shotgun.⁴⁵ Though the house was in reality built with foreign Jewish philanthropic aid, a trope that would be part of a broader narrative in the Yishuv of First Aliyah weakness, Segal presents it as an image of proud local Jewish self-defense. The

construction of Frumkin as a defender respected by Arabs authorized him to be a victim—indeed, the chief victim—in Segal’s account of the 1886 event.

Billie Melman has explored the ebbs and flows of collective memory about another key female defender in a subsequent generation. Sarah Aharonson, a figure from the Zikhron Ya’akov colony (founded 1882), participated in the anti-Ottoman espionage network Nili during World War I and committed suicide in 1917 after being captured and tortured by Ottoman forces. After being initially forgotten, Aharonsohn’s memory was revived in light of a new Mandate-era identification between native “nationalism, activeness, and femininity” and nurturing “maternalism.”⁴⁶ As Aharonson was pushed to the center of the story, some of her male colleagues became even more marginal.⁴⁷ But precisely because of this shift, Halevy became less, not more, narratable as a casualty; the move toward a more active Zionism meant her age, sickness, and passivity rendered her even less suitable for inclusion in a national narrative.

Reworking the Narrative: The Elevation of Sender Hadad

Sender Hadad only emerged in contemporary accounts as the man who took his injured mother to Jerusalem to receive care; but he later rose to become a full-fledged protagonist. “On Sabbath eve, last week,” reported *Ha-tsevi*, “R. Alexander Hadad took his dying mother to Jerusalem, where she died. According to him, the disturbances [*pera’ot*] that happened there the previous Monday had caused the death of his aged mother.”⁴⁸ Hadad appeared in that news story as an advocate for calling the act murder, against an Ottoman doctor’s assessment that her death was imminent and simply hastened by the attack.

After World War I, during the period of the British Mandate, memoirs and commemorative accounts would rewrite the event to elevate Hadad as a protagonist. This reworking helped not only Zionist defense organizations but also the colonies themselves rework the insecure and uncertain First Aliyah period by contrasting a small number of true defenders with those painted as weak, dependent, and insufficiently nationalistic. Socialist-influenced immigrants of the so-called Second Aliyah, who established armed Jewish self-defense units—Bar Giyora (1907) and Ha-shomer (1909) and, later, the highly lauded Haganah (1920)—could find in Hadad and a few others “sparks” of pioneer heroism that they believed fully flourished later. At the same time, right-wing Zionists who glorified

Nili, the World War I-era espionage organization that arose in the nonsocialist First Aliyah colonies, could also find founding models in heroes like Hadad, who preceded the period of Labor dominance in the Yishuv.⁴⁹

The new Zionist orientation, associated with the socialist ideologues of the later-named Second Aliyah but influential for a range of Zionist figures, was rooted in an anxiety about differentiating heroic casualties from death at the hands of persecutors, seen as quintessentially diasporic. In a 1912 article for the labor Zionist *Ha-ahdut*, Ya'akov Zerubavel distinguished "passive" Jews who died as holy people (*kedoshim*) and "who did not water the soil of their homeland with their blood" from heroes (*giborim*) whose deaths "revealed how strong their life force was."⁵⁰ In considering a period in the 1880s during which many Jews died as passive victims in Russian pogroms, it became imperative to find the modern descendants of "proper" Jewish defenders. Jacob Goldstein, writing in 1994, adopts this kind of mythic periodization in calling the 1880s "the heroic period," in contrast to periods of dependence on the financial support of the Baron de Rothschild and the Jewish Colonization Association in the 1890s and early 1900s. During the heroic period, Goldstein explains, Arab neighbors would "try to test the strength or weakness of the Jewish settlement," and Jews would prove their strength and eventually come to a resolution with their neighbors. "In this period," he writes, "settlers were forced to rely only on themselves [and] several Jews stood out who had physical and mental abilities and showed exceptional bravery in defending their colony." Goldstein's first example is Sender Hadad of Petah Tikva.⁵¹

Goldstein was surely influenced in this description by Mandate-era treatments of the 1886 incident that likewise tended to obscure victims altogether and emphasize heroism. Zerah Barnett's 1929 memoir of Petah Tikva emphasized the fact that the defenders were able, to a great extent, to hold off the attackers; it did not mention Halevy at all. Yehuda Raab's memoir (published in 1956, based on testimony he dictated before his death in 1948) made a similar omission and spoke of men who stood in the courtyard and held "unsheathed swords that were left over from the Purim holiday." We might note, however, that though the writers were using the prime symbol of traditional male Bedouin and Arab bravery, the sword, their use of weapons "left over from the Purim holiday," a holiday of costumes and fantasy, suggests that the colonists may have been more comfortable playacting Arab-style bravery than fully embodying it.⁵² Where women were mentioned, the tendency was to present them as heroic, generative

[15]

Petah Tikva,
1886

●
Liora
Halperin

characters in their own right. Barnett's account, which, as was previously noted, did not mention Halevy or her death, nonetheless suggested that while men armed themselves outside the Lachmann house "to show the Arabs a strong defense," "the women and children were brought inside the house and placed next to the windows to serve as lookouts."⁵³ Barnett concluded, "for hours we stood in the face of the enemy and he was not able to destroy the house because of our fortifications."⁵⁴

The tendency to find and elevate heroic figures led to a curious narrative outcome in the Halevy case: two accounts from the late 1940s reinserted the otherwise absent Halevy into the narrative by entirely fabricating details about the event in order to impart either maternal or heroic qualities to her. After acknowledging other injuries and material damages, Moshe Smilansky, in his 1945 history of the Yishuv, wrote of blows to "one pregnant woman, who later died from her injuries in Jerusalem."⁵⁵ This can be nothing other than a mistaken reference to Halevy—she was the only fatality of the event, but she was too old at the time to bear children. But Smilansky, perhaps unwittingly eager to restore vitality to women in the story or drawing from the recollections of others who fabricated this detail, transformed the victim from an old sick woman to a woman in the process of bearing the next generation. The second case of clear fabrication comes from the 1948 Petah Tikva anniversary volume, which initially tells the story of the 1886 attack without mentioning Halevy at all. Curiously, however, a later section on "first casualties" (*nirt-sahim rishonim*) lists "Rachel, mother of Sender Hadad" as the first casualty but attaches her to an invented incident in which she was "hit by Arabs who had gone out to plow the land of Petah Tikva when she prevented them [from plowing] by lying down on the ground."⁵⁶ These two modifications, one maternalizing her and the other remaking her as an active defender, create a casualty narrative that fits better into emerging heroic frameworks, those that also helped shape the Sarah Aharonson commemoration.

The 1929 Petah Tikva anniversary volume devoted a chapter to the event, also framing it in terms of heroism. Soon after the farmers had resettled in Petah Tikva after leaving because of malaria, the first attack of the Arabs of Yahudiya on Petah Tikva "came suddenly like a storm" (a reference to Proverbs 1:27) and "shocked all the Hebrew newspapers." The volume acknowledged the conflict over grazing rights at the heart of the event but added an element not present in the earlier sources: a suggestion that Arabs were angered by Jews' heroic return to the soil and to self-defense. "There was another thing that the fellahin couldn't

forgive,” it explained, “that the Jews, those ‘*wlad al-mayit*’ [children of death], had taken up the spade and the plow and took up arms to defend their fields.”⁵⁷ This echoes Hava Feinstein’s story, with young defenders using the tools of agriculture to defend themselves, but it takes the image a step farther: the very use of these implements served as a shocking and proud provocation to Arabs who, in these narratives, preferred to see Jews as weak and incapable of self-defense.

The 1929 anniversary volume presented Sender Hadad as the main defender, the embodiment of the Jewish transformation from weak to strong. When attackers from Yahudiya came at night to trample crops, it recounted, “Ten young men from Petah Tikva, led by Sender Hadad and, second to him in heroism, Yehuda Raab, got up and went out at night to ambush the shepherds and capture them.” These ten men fought “dozens” of Arabs with no help to be found. “In particular,” the text insisted, “Sender Hadad and his friend Yehuda distinguished themselves with their heroism and eventually they overcame their trouble [*nitshu arelim et ha-metsukim*] and the shepherds retreated.” In the process, the young Jews captured ten donkeys.⁵⁸

The anniversary volume recalled Halevy’s death in a series of direct quotations from the newspapers of the time but offered no editorial commentary on them; its final word was from Moshe Smilansky, whose takeaway from the event became the anniversary volume’s overarching frame:

These things did not pass over the young colony without making an impression. The farmers realized that, in this land under Turkish rule, “there is no justice and no judge”⁵⁹ and “If I am not for myself who will be for me?”⁶⁰ And a long line of heroes [*giborei hayil*], starting from Sender and Yehuda Raab . . . knew how to defend the honor of their people and they quickly proved to their neighbors that they had come to this land to revive it, not as “*wlad al-mof*” [children of death, a variant of *wlad al-mayit*, above] but as the grandchildren of the Maccabees.⁶¹

This highly ideological conclusion, with its themes of revival, transformation, and emulation of ancient heroes, was echoed in Smilansky’s 1940s *Perakim be-toledot ha-Yishuv* (Chapters in the History of the Yishuv), which concluded that “clashes between the colony and its neighbors continued for many years, and through these clashes there grew up the generation of the heroes and guards of Petah Tikva.”⁶² In the course of relating the general events, the anniversary volume derived a set of lessons that not only elevated the heroism of Hadad (and others) but also presented armed conflict as the sole viable

[17]

Petah Tikva,
1886

●
Liora
Halperin

strategy for responding to belligerent locals and unresponsive authorities, a political philosophy with important implications for a society developing protomilitary organizations under British rule.⁶³

Hadad's persona as archetypal defender was further developed in biographical accounts of him during this period. In a 1920 piece in English for the journal of the Zionist Association of America (based on an original 1919 text in Yiddish), Jacob Poleskin (Ya'akov Ya'ari Poleskin) wrote that Hadad

[w]as described to me as a giant of a man, six feet high and of a girth to match his height, with muscles like whip-cords, huge fists, and a temper that made him court danger by day and night. A heavyweight mounted on a splendid Arab horse, he rode into the thick of every fight, scattering, by sheer fury of onslaught, superior numbers of Bedouin invaders with a handful of dare-devil followers.⁶⁴

Here Hadad is transformed not only into an Eastern Jew, a son of the land, and a strong defender but also a mythic, larger-than-life hero.⁶⁵ The Mandate-era texts about the 1886 incident and its associated characters, then, underwent two transformations, first constructing an ethos of heroism, modifying bits of the narrative either to exclude nonheroic characters or to rewrite existing characters to suggest a greater degree of pride, defense, or vitality, and then beginning to mythologize individual heroic figures who embodied key features: physical strength, aptitude for defense, and the capacity to be admired by the Arabs of Palestine for precisely these qualities.

Statehood

As the Israeli state consolidated its army, schools, and political institutions after 1948, writers with no personal memory of the period of the First Aliyah began to revisit and rework its narratives, constructing texts that offered legacies of heroism to a new generation of Jewish Israelis. These texts, both from mainstream Labor Zionist organizations and from local memory-making institutions and individuals, built on a process of mythologizing select heroes.

The 1954 volume *Sefer toledot ha-Haganah* (History of the Haganah) presented the 1886 events as part of the later justification for the creation of a Jewish self-defense force in the Yishuv. It offered a narrative centered on the preservation of female honor: "The women grabbed whatever they could in order to defend their honor,"⁶⁶ that

is, to prevent themselves from becoming victims of rape. The men were on the front lines protecting them; indeed, the texts suggest that Frumkin, one of the more gravely injured, was captured when he “went out to check on the women and children.”⁶⁷

David Tidhar’s biographical encyclopedia of Yishuv pioneers and builders, which came out in 19 volumes between 1947 and 1971, reflected the editor’s love of national heroes, illustrated in his entries on the heroes of the First Aliyah moshavot in particular. His 1952 biographical entry on Hadad constructed a heroic figure that further built on Poleskin’s 1920 assessment. He suggested that Sender began a transformation from weakness to strength while still in the Pale of Settlement, one that would foreshadow his encounters with Palestine’s Arabs (and implicitly, the State of Israel’s encounter with Arab states): “While still a boy, he instilled fear in the non-Jewish boys of the village when they tried to mess with Jews.” In 1872, Tidhar continued, Hadad moved to Jerusalem and began work as a blacksmith and thus “earned” the name Hadad. Before coming to Palestine, Sender lived in Istanbul for a year and learned Turkish; eventually he married Mazal De-Roza, from an Aleppo Jewish family, thus taking on a Middle Eastern Jewish familial link. Sender became known as a strong man: when Petah Tikva was first founded in 1878, Sender was invited to be a blacksmith and a guard. He was an imposing figure, Tidhar emphasized: he “rode on a beautiful Arab horse” out alone into battle. “He was a strong man [*gibor hayil*] who brought down his heavy hand on all. The Arabs were afraid of him.” Indeed, “with his handsome and tall stature he proved to the marauders and robbers that they should be careful of falling under his hand.”⁶⁸ All of these features—the Eastern mien, the horseback riding, and the imposing figure who has access to violence and deploys it effectively in a way that wins him Arab respect—were part of a broader gendered and orientalist typology of First Aliyah bravery corralled in the service of a state both boastful and doubtful of its capacity to neutralize pervasive local and regional opposition and win respect through force of arms.

Local narratives also took the form of explicitly didactic texts. Barukh Oren, a noted Israeli educator and head of the local memorial to fallen soldiers in Petah Tikva (*Yad la-banim*) from 1953 to 1980, helped concretize the Hadad myth and others on a local level by compiling mythological stories from the early days of the colony, including in a book called *‘Alilot rishonim* (Adventures of the Founders), published in 1964. His story about Sender Hadad (“Sender Hadad’s Stick”) is seemingly based on a story he heard from the family. The story is constructed as a dialogue between Rivka, Sender’s daughter,

[19]

Petah Tikva,
1886

•
Liora
Halperin

and her granddaughter Liora, who has just injured herself on Hadad's sharp stick after hunting around for it in her grandfather's bureau drawer. Placated by her grandmother, she asks to hear the story about this object.

Rivka's story, based on the past but told in the genre of legend, brings together several tropes of masculinity, both successful and failed: the story's frame is a conversation between women, who are also implicitly upholding these gendered narratives. Rivka begins with the sorry state of the colony at the time:

At that time the founders suffered greatly from attacks by the neighbors, who saw them as wretched "*Walad il-mut*," "Sons of death," incapable of defending themselves and their property. Therefore it was necessary to rein in the "*shabab*" [young Arab men] from the neighboring villages, to teach them a lesson, and with that to accustom the Jewish settlers to responding with war [*lehashiv milhamah*] in the hour of need. Your great-grandfather appeared in the colony like an angel of salvation.⁶⁹

Sender was not just a strong man according to this story, he was the agent of redemption for the whole colony, which had been seen as emasculated and under attack by implicitly virulent Arab male youths (it repeats the "children of death" trope from the Mandate-era texts, with yet another transliteration). After proving his bravery in the Russian army, he came to Palestine and achieved the combination of imposing physical force and respectability among Arabs that would be the holy grail of later Zionists. Local Arabs would bring their horses to be shod and would call him *Hawajeh Skander* (Sir Skander), using an Arabic version of his name. Nonetheless, he would come out fighting, never with live weapons, "purifying [*metaher*] the landscape of thieves and robbers."⁷⁰ Drawing on a familiar trope of traditional weapons being preferable to modern, live ones, the text suggests a "purifying" effort that evokes Israeli rhetoric about removing Arab threats from Palestine during the 1948 war and establishing a policy to punish Palestinian saboteurs and returnees, all marked as "infiltrators," in the 1950s.

Sender was a strong man in the legend, but he was also enshrined as dying a hero's death in these state-era texts. Rivka called it his "last battle" in the story she told Liora.⁷¹ Though he stood up to Arab attackers, wrote Tidhar in his 1952 entry, "he also was attacked by them, and his last act of bravery resulted in the destruction of his health." Ultimately, though injured, he refused to stay in bed and recover, and one day, as he drove from Gedera to Kustina (colonies

to the south), his cart flipped over and he died of his injuries on November 20, 1899.⁷² At the end of the day, it seems, neither Hadad nor his mother died typically heroic deaths. Both were injured and only later died of their wounds. Both were in positions of weakness at the time of death. But because Sender was labeled with the rhetoric of heroism, the iconography of the independent, transformed Jew on horseback, he became an authorized and therefore mournable victim. Poleskin's narrative modified and heroized his death to be more narratively fitting, saying that he was "shot from ambush one night as he rode out on duty."⁷³ His mother's death, in contrast, was not revisited or reclaimed: with the exception of a couple scattered texts, she had not been constructed either as a hero or an object of defending or as the sort of devoted wife and mother who would dominate several collections about women in the 1950s.⁷⁴

[21]

Petah Tikva,
1886



Liora
Halperin

Hierarchies of Bravery: Discussion

I have suggested in this article that the oblique relationship between Halevy's death and the stories that emerged afterward reveals changing commemorative paradigms in action, stories demonstrably appropriated and shaped to particular narrative ends through traceable omissions and elevations. Broadly based, nonindividuated assessments of the future of Jewish agricultural colonization in Palestine gave way to narratives of local exemplary heroism. Female victims, writes Elissa Helms in her work on Bosnia, would seem to be of great rhetorical utility to nationalist movements: "The symbolism of female victimhood effectively invokes innocence and non-implication in the processes leading to conflict; female victims and mourning mothers easily stand in for the nation and its territory and point to the barbarity of the enemy in attacking 'even' women and children." But rhetorical attention to female victims, she continues, has its dangers. It threatens to impugn not the enemy but the masculine "we." "It is the danger that 'our' men will be implicated as not fulfilling their masculine duties, that the dishonoring of 'our' women will come to light—a danger suggested by the nationalist logic itself—that threatens whenever women victims become visible."⁷⁵ Helms's observations about the workings of gender and nationalism help frame the efforts of the Zionist settlement movement, particularly over time, to pride itself on strong, masculine self-defense, in this case in opposition to supposed diasporic (male) weakness. Petah Tikva's colonists, like Jews in other early colonies in Palestine, felt unease about the colony's viability and

security and also about its very claims to firstness. The making of memory about an iconic first incident helped enshrine that incident within a lineage of heroes that could be appropriated even by Labor leaders, including the founders of the Haganah, who generally denigrated the late nineteenth century moshavot as weak and diasporic.

Stories about women, like those of queer or colonized individuals, are often stories of gaps.⁷⁶ As Margalit Shilo has observed, “in Zionist historiography, the normative, triumphant story, the story of the growth of the Hebrew colony, is the male story, while the female story is its negative, the shadowy story, replete with suffering.”⁷⁷ But our consideration of several generations and sites of commemorating 1886 suggests that the heroic, triumphalist male presence in the story is neither inherent nor inevitable, nor is the female figure wholly absent. As Andrea Siegel writes, “women are not invisible in Zionism, they may be startlingly present, they may be intriguingly absent, but they are not invisible.”⁷⁸ Both male and female figures emerge and are constructed through and in the aftermath of the attack on the colony, and their commemoration changes over time through processes of manipulation, emphasis, and at times fabrication.

Instances of dramatic and dramatized violence, particularly Arab-Jewish conflict, figure most prominently in local sources as evidence of need for self-defense, of growing Jewish heroism, or of the nefarious or retrograde tendencies of Arab peasants and Bedouin.⁷⁹ But in this process such records of violence, selective and partial at every stage, also obscure (and sometimes partially reveal) the omissions at the heart of narrative making. Foucault has discussed the pronounced visibility of lower-class perpetrators within the architecture of incarceration, the Panopticon, which “assures the hold of the power that is exercised over them. It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always to be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection.”⁸⁰ Subaltern groups become visible in part as some of their members enter into the colonial state apparatus as criminals.⁸¹ But violence also briefly shines a light on victims of, witnesses to, or those widowed by instances of violence. The very political and social structures that must be corralled in the aftermath of a death—legal processes, financial arrangements, inquests, support for survivors—mean that occasionally passive figures, older people like Rachel Halevy who are unlikely to enter the historical record even in studies explicitly focused on women, appear as a flash in the archive, through little initiative of their own. But, almost by definition, the figures that become visible after a brush with violence come into focus only hazily, their own already-untold stories cut short, their however-fleeting legacies rapidly

co-opted—or disregarded—by those who followed them. This flash, or anecdote, “exposes history by momentarily betray[ing] the incompleteness and formality of the historical narrative.”⁸² Anecdotes are the “residue of the struggle between unruly persons and the power that would subjugate or expel them.”⁸³ The women (and men) momentarily exposed to the historian in the flash of a gunshot or the swipe of an axe—or the shattering of windows—function like these anecdotes, not because they concern unruly or disruptive protagonists but rather because they briefly reveal that which is typically omitted. They thus offer a glimpse into an alternative narrative of the past. Their sudden appearance makes their subsequent disappearance more profound, and more telling, than if they had remained entirely absent.

[23]

Petah Tikva,
1886

●
Liora
Halperin

Conclusion

Ironically, but fittingly, Rachel Halevy would eventually reemerge. Unmentioned by name in most contemporary and historiographic sources, Rachel’s name reappeared on the Israeli government’s 2010 official memorial webpage for “casualties of Israel’s wars,” which incorporates and suggests a direct historical continuity with pre-1948 casualties, who are framed as participants in “the beginnings of the Zionist struggle in the land.” But Halevy’s existence, a century and a quarter after the incident, required a heroic narrative if it was to be commemorated this way. And indeed, the online narrative briefly suggests that she “tried to oppose [the attackers].” This brief but telling phrase makes Halevy into something she was not, either at the time or in the memory of most who looked back on that period: a defender, a hero. In the “story of her life” on the website, however, she is identified as “the mother of the legendary guard Sender Hadad.”⁸⁴

Rachel Halevy is one of a particular category of historical subject, one who by all accounts would have been denied visibility, and even more so, subjectivity, were it not for a context of violence in which she happened to play a part, unintentionally. This context was constituted as a relevant set of historical facts over time, subject in particular ways to the evolution of collective memory in both Petah Tikva and the Yishuv/state about a period largely excluded from treatments of Zionist “beginnings.” Halevy’s role in the drama does not make her a nationalist protagonist, at least not in any traditional sense. But her very marginality (and the brief visibility, and then disappearance, of these margins in the aftermath of violence) highlights the selective inclusions and exclusions and narrative transformations that make national myth.

Notes

- [24] 1 Perceptions of threat antedated this incident, however, and physical violence is not the only measure of tensions between the colonists and local Arabs. Note that I use *colony* as the English translation for Hebrew *moshavah*, following the practice of early Zionist settlers themselves.
- Jewish Social Studies* ● 2 Moshe Smilansky, *Perakim be-toledot ha-Yishuv*, 6 vols. (Tel Aviv, 1939), 1: 75. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are mine.
- Vol. 23 3 Gershon Shafir, *Land, Labor and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914* (Berkeley, 1996), 200–202; Natan Schechter, “Pogrom Petah Tikva, 1886,” *Keshet he-hadashah* 6 (2003): 137–52; Neville J. Mandel, *The Arabs and Zionism before World War I* (Berkeley, 1976), 35–37; Rashid Khalidi, *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness* (New York, 2010), 100.
- No. 1 4 See Meir Chazan, “Force, Commemoration, and Morality in the Worldview of Manya Shohat and Yosef Aharonovitch,” *Jewish Culture and History* 10, no. 1 (2008): 87–114; Yael Zerubavel, “The Historic, the Legendary, and the Incredible: Invented Tradition and Collective Memory in Israel,” in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John R. Gillis (Princeton, 1994), 105–23; idem, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* (Chicago, 1995).
- 5 Jean M. O’Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis, 2010), xvii.
- 6 Yaffah Berlovitz, *Sipurei nashim: Benot ha-‘aliyah ha-rishonah* (Hod ha-Sharon, 2001); Barukh Oren, *Neshot hayil bi-yemei reshithah shel em ha-moshavot*, item 14592, Petah Tikva Archive, Petah Tikva, Israel (hereafter PTA); Reut Green, “Defusei hekerut ve-shidukhim ba-moshavot bi-tekufat ha-‘aliyot ha-rishonah vеха-sheniyah,” *Iyunim bi-tekumat Yisrael* 25 (2015–16): 179–213; Margalit Shilo, *Etgar ha-migdar: Nashim ba-‘aliyot ha-rishonot* (Tel Aviv, 2007); Deborah Bernstein, “The Study of Women in Israeli Historiography: Starting Points, New Directions, and Emerging Insights,” in *Jewish Women in Pre-State Israel: Life History, Politics, and Culture*, ed. Ruth Kark, Margalit Shilo, and Galit Hasan-Rokem (Waltham, Mass., 2008), 7–17; Yossi Ben-Artzi, “Have Gender Studies Changed Our Attitude toward the Historiography of the Aliyah and Settlement Process?,” in Kark, Shilo, and Hasan-Rokem, *Jewish Women in Pre-State Israel*, 18–32.
- 7 Richard D. Brown, “Microhistory and the Post-Modern Challenge,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 23, no. 1 (2003): 5.
- 8 On the emergence and history of the numbered periodization of Jewish immigration to Palestine, see Hizky Shoham, “Meha-‘aliyah ha-shelishit la-‘aliyah ha-sheniyah uve-hazarah: Hivatsrut ha-halukah li-tekufot lefi ha-‘aliyot ha-memusparot,” *Tsiyon* 77, no. 2 (2012): 189–222.
- 9 Yehoshua Kaniel, “Ha-yehasim bein ha-yishuv ha-yashan vеха-yishuv he-hadash bi-tekufat ha-‘aliyah ha-rishonah vеха-sheniyah, 1882–1914” (Ramat Gan, 1977); Yosef Lang, “Sefarim ve-yovlot: Petah Tikva mitmodedet ‘im ‘avarah,” in *Le-Fetah Tikvah* (Petah Tikva, 2012), 23, 48–49.

- 10 Ilan Pappé, *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples* (Cambridge, Engl., 2006), 14–18, 22–24.
- 11 “Ultimately,” writes Gershon Shafir, “even disregard for local custom was not just a matter of ignorance, but the unavoidable opposition to two types of property systems, and at stake was the very legitimacy of European overseas settlement”; Shafir, *Land*, 202.
- 12 A donkey would cost 130 piasters in the Jaffa market in 1889; Johann Bussow, *Hamidian Palestine: Politics and Society in the District of Jerusalem, 1872–1908* (Leiden, 2011), 564.
- 13 “Mi-kerev ha-arets,” *Ha-tsvi*, Apr. 9 (4 Nisan), 1886, pp. 1–3.
- 14 E. T., “Mi-huts la-arets,” *Ha-yom*, Apr. 23 (2 Nisan), 1886, pp. 2–3.
- 15 The house sat on a plot of 900 dunams that also contained grape plantings, which eventually proved unproductive and were uprooted; Isaiah Raffalovich, *Erets Yisrael veba-moshavot* (Jerusalem, 1979), 13, 41.
- 16 E. T., “Mi-huts la-arets,” *Ha-yom*, Apr. 19, 1886, p. 3.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 2; Shmuel Rafalovitsh, “Mi-huts la-arets,” *Ha-yom*, Apr. 23 (1 Nisan), 1886. See also Shafir, who reviews the event and suggests that 31 were arrested before the episode culminated with a “compromise”; Shafir, *Land*, 201.
- 18 Mordechai Harizman and Jacob Poleskin, *Sefer ha-yovel li-melot hamishim shanah le-yisud Petah Tikvah* (Tel Aviv, 1929), 638–88. On early Zionist colonies’ negotiations between the Ottoman court system and the local *sulh* ritual, see Liora R. Halperin, “A Murder in the Grove: Conceptions of Justice in an Early Zionist Colony,” *Journal of Social History* 49, no. 2 (2015): 427–51.
- 19 “Hadashot shonot,” *Havatsalet*, Apr. 2, 1886, p. 227. A dispatch from Jerusalem published in the Warsaw Hebrew newspaper *Ha-yom*, after citing the four other individuals injured in the incident by name, called her “one woman from Krinik.” The account lists as injured parties Rav Frumkin, the ritual slaughterer, Ya’akov Mi-Danzig, and Ben Shtil from Panevezh (Panevezys, Lithuania); Rafalovitsh, “Mi-huts la-arets,” 3.
- 20 *Ibid.*
- 21 “Mi-kerev ha-arets,” 1–3; E. T., “Mi-huts la-arets,” 2–3.
- 22 Avi Rubin, “British Perceptions of Ottoman Judicial Reform in the Late Nineteenth Century: Some Preliminary Insights,” *Law and Social Inquiry* 37, no. 4 (2012): 991–1012.
- 23 E. T., “Mi-huts la-arets,” 2.
- 24 “Hadashot shonot,” 227.
- 25 Schechter, “Pogrom Petah Tikva,” 137–52.
- 26 Samuel Hirsch to Leon Pinsker, 28 Adar (Apr. 4), 1886, originally published in *Ha-melitz*, May 7, 1886, and reprinted in *Ketavim le-toledot Hibat Tsiyon ve-yishuv Erets Yisrael*, ed. Alter Druyanow, 7 vols. (Tel Aviv, 1982), 1: 117–19 (document 791).
- 27 A. P., “Hovevei ha-yamim,” *Ha-tsefirah*, Apr. 13 (8 Nisan), 1886, p. 3.
- 28 S. P. R., “Le-hargia’ Yisrael,” *Ha-melits*, Apr. 23, 1886, p. 1.
- 29 “Le-yishuv Erets Yisrael,” *Ha-magid*, Apr. 29, 1886, p. 135.

[25]

Petah Tikva,
1886

●
Liora
Halperin

- [26]
- Jewish Social Studies*
●
Vol. 23
No. 1
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Such narratives are particularly common in post facto memories, such as Zerah Barnett, *Zikhronot Zerah Barnet* (Jerusalem, 1928), and Yehuda Raab, *Ha-telem ha-rishon: Zikhronot ish Petah-Tikvah, 1864–1930* (Tel Aviv, 1956).
- 32 Rafalovitsh, “Mi-huts la-arets,” 2.
- 33 “Mi-kerev ha-arets,” 1–3.
- 34 “Le-yishuv Erets Yisrael,” 135; E. T., “Mi-huts la-arets.”
- 35 Rafalovitsh, “Mi-huts la-arets,” 2.
- 36 E. T., “Mi-huts la-arets,” 2–3.
- 37 “Le-yishuv Erets Yisrael,” 135.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 According to an introduction to a later printed edition of the diary, written by Segal’s son Ben-Zion in 1998, Hannah Leah left Palestine for England and then returned: “Eventually she settled in the Land of Israel with her husband Moshe Tzvi Segal in 1927 and it was there that she wrote her memoirs”; Daniel Ofir, *Be-reshit Petah-Tikvah: Zikhronot Hannah Leah Frumkin-Segal ‘al yaldutah bi-yemei reshit Petah-Tikvah* (Petah Tikvah, 1998), 3.
- 40 Hannah Leah Segal, memoirs, item 923, p. 73, 003.007/27, PTA.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid. I was not able to determine who Sh. D. was. The newspaper accounts mention Ben Shtil and R. Ya’akov Mi-Danzig as casualties.
- 43 Segal, memoirs, 37–39.
- 44 Ben-Zion Dinur et al., *Sefer toledot ha-Haganah*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem, 1954), 1a: 94.
- 45 Segal, memoirs, 37–39.
- 46 Billie Melman, “Motah shel sokhenet: Migdar, zikaron, ve-hantsahah,” in *Ha-ivriyot ha-hadashot: Nashim ba-Yishuv uva-tsiyonut ba-rei ha-mugdar*, ed. Margalit Shilo, Ruth Kark, and Galit Hasan-Rokem (Jerusalem, 2001), 413–33.
- 47 Ibid., 421.
- 48 “Mi-kerev ha-arets,” 1–3.
- 49 *Sefer toledot ha-Haganah* has a section on these heroes, as does *Sefer Ha-Palmach*: “Self defense, like agricultural settlement and the revival of the Hebrew language, were the products of the Jewish will to live and fight for life”; Zerubavel Gilead and Matti Megged, *Sefer ha-Palmah* (Tel Aviv, 1954), xvii. For an example of a connection between Nili and the early heroes of the moshavot, see A., “Ha-tsabar ha-rishon,” *Herut*, May 20, 1949, p. 4.
- 50 (Ya’akov) Zerubavel, “Yizkor,” *Ha-ahdut* 3, no. 11–12 (1912): 31–32.
- 51 Jacob Goldstein, *Ba-derekh el ha-ya’ad: “Bar-Giyora” ve-“Ha-shomer,” 1907–1935* (Tel Aviv, 1994), 8.
- 52 Barnett, *Zikhronot Zerah Barnet*, 29–30; Raab, *Ha-telem ha-rishon*, 99–100.
- 53 Barnett, *Zikhronot Zerah Barnet*, 29–30.
- 54 Ibid., 30.
- 55 Smilansky, *Perakim be-toledot ha-Yishuv*, 1: 74.

- 56 Eleazar Trope, *Reshit: Li-melot 70 shanah le-Fetah Tikvah (638–708)* (Petah Tikva, 1948), 36.
- 57 Harizman and Poleskin, *Sefer ha-yovel*, 361. Transliterated forms of the Arabic phrase *wlad al-mayit* are ubiquitous in Zionist treatments of Palestinians' default assumptions about Jews in the late nineteenth century.
- 58 Harizman and Poleskin, *Sefer ha-yovel*, 361. The phrase *nitshu ha-arelim et ha-metsukim* is normally used when a great Jewish person dies, but it appears to be used differently, and more literally, in this text to mean that the Jewish protagonists overcame their attackers.
- 59 *Leviticus Rabba* 28: *leit din ve-leit dayan*.
- 60 *Pirke Avot* 1:13: *'im ein ani li mi li*.
- 61 Harizman and Poleskin, *Sefer ha-yovel*, 364.
- 62 Smilansky, *Perakim be-toledot ha-Yishuv*, 1: 75.
- 63 On the evolution of Zionist conceptions of self-defense and the formation of a military ethos, see Anita Shapira, *Land and Power: The Zionist Resort to Force, 1881–1948* (Stanford, 1999).
- 64 Jacob Poleskin, "The Three Stalwarts of Petach Tikva," *Maccabean* 33, no. 2 (1920): 53. Compare Ya'akov Ya'ari (Poleskin), "Di drey helden fun Peysakh Tikvoh, part 2," *Di Varhey*, Feb. 19, 1919, p. 5.
- 65 The phenomenon of self-Arabization and the rejection of names and attributes seen as particularly diasporic has been discussed by, among others, Lital Levy, *Poetic Trespass Writing between Hebrew and Arabic in Israel/Palestine* (Princeton, 2014), 29–32; Oz Almog, *The Sabra: The Creation of the New Jew* (Berkeley, 2000); Gil Eyal, *The Disenchantment of the Orient: Expertise in Arab Affairs and the Israeli State* (Stanford, 2006).
- 66 Dinur et al., *Sefer toledot ha-Haganah*, vol A, part 1, book 1, 96.
- 67 *Ibid.*
- 68 David Tidhar, "Sender Hadad (Kriniker)," *Entsiklopediyah la-halutsei ha-Yishuv u-vonav: Demuyot u-temunot*, 19 vols. (Tel Aviv, 1947–71), 5: 2319. See also Oded Yisreeli and Yoskeh Grinboym, "Hawajah Skandar: Ish ha-barzel," *Erets ve-teva* 116 (Aug. 2008): 32–35.
- 69 Barukh Oren, *'Alilot rishonim* (Tel Aviv, 1964), 27.
- 70 *Ibid.*, 28–29.
- 71 *Ibid.*, 30.
- 72 Tidhar, "Sender Hadad," 2319.
- 73 Poleskin, "Three Stalwarts," 53.
- 74 Judith Eisenberg Harari, *Ishah ve-em be-Yisrael: Mi-tekufat ha-Tanakh 'ad shenat he-'asor li-medinat Yisrael* (Tel Aviv, 1958); Oren, *Neshot hayil*.
- 75 Elissa Helms, *Innocence and Victimhood: Gender, Nation, and Women's Activism in Postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina* (Madison, Wisc., 2013), 230.
- 76 Estelle B. Freedman, "The Burning of Letters Continues: Elusive Identities and the Historical Construction of Sexuality," in *Feminism, Sexuality, and Politics: Essays* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2006), 159–73.
- 77 Shilo, *Elgar ha-migdar*, 25.
- 78 Andrea Siegel, "Women, Violence, and the 'Arab Question' in Early Zionist Literature," (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2011), 15.

[27]

Petah Tikva,
1886

●
Liora
Halperin

- [28]
- Jewish
Social
Studies*
●
Vol. 23
No. 1
- 79 See Avraham Etz-Hadar, *Ilanot: Le-toledot ha-yishuv be-Erets Yisrael 590–680 (1830–1920)* (Tel Aviv, 1967); Getzel Kressel, *Em ha-moshavot Petah-Tikvah, 638–713, 1878–1953: Shiv'im va-hamesh shenot hayim* (Petah Tikvah, 1952); Yehuda Slutsky, *Rishonim li-shemirah ule-haganah* (Tel Aviv, 1963).
- 80 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York, 1995), 187.
- 81 Arlette Farge, *The Vanishing Children of Paris: Rumor and Politics before the French Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991); Shahid Amin, *Event, Metaphor, Memory: Chauri Chaura, 1922–1992* (Berkeley, 1995).
- 82 Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago, 2000), 51.
- 83 *Ibid.*, 69.
- 84 “Hadad Halevy, Rachel,” *Yizkor: Atar le-halalei ma‘arakhot Yisrael*, accessed Aug. 17, 2015, <http://www.izkor.gov.il/HalalKorot.aspx?id=505810>.

LIORA HALPERIN is associate professor of international studies, history, and Jewish Studies and the Jack and Rebecca Benaroya Endowed Chair in Israel Studies at the University of Washington in Seattle. She is the author of *Babel in Zion: Jews, Nationalism, and Language Diversity in Palestine, 1920–1948* (2015). lhalper@uw.edu