

Errata list for 1st opponent review:

1. Indeed, the expression used by Jabotinsky and the Revisionists is “the Conquest of the Hebrew Sea” – this fact is mentioned throughout the dissertation, more than 80 times, not least of all in the table of contents. The dissertation also discusses other aspects of conquest (*kibush*) in Zionist ideology, such as the conquest of labor and land (see pages 8, 34 and 122).

The reason the title of the dissertation is “The Myth of the Hebrew Sea” is because a significant part of it focuses on Jabotinsky’s active attempts to mythologize the Mediterranean and its history with relation to Zionist ideology. This aspect of the dissertation is discussed in detail, also with relation to Jabotinsky’s general interest in myths and mythologizations, in chapter 6.

Jabotinsky’s vision of “conquering the sea” should be seen with relation to the socialist vision of “conquering the land”, “land” and “labor” – concepts that were actively used during his time – and not with the occupation of the Palestinian lands. The evolution of the word “*kibush*” took place after Jabotinsky’s death and with relation to a different stage of Zionist-Palestinian relations.

2. The short history of Zionism offered in the introduction focuses on the stages most relevant to the dissertation. The rivalry between cultural and political Zionism is far from relevant to the topic of this dissertation, which is Ze’ev Jabotinsky’s vision of the “Hebrew Sea”. Just as many other rivalries in Zionism (between linguists, socialist and communists, “eastern” and “western”, religious and secular, supporters and opposers to the Uganda plan) are only discussed in as much as they are relevant to the topic of the dissertation.
3. About paraphrasing “the Jews and the Arabs” – throughout his Zionist career Jabotinsky repeatedly addressed the so-called Arab problem, and not the problem of the Druze, the Circassians or other minorities. As is evident from the discussion in question, Jabotinsky’s ideas on the future state’s relation to the Arab population reflected his ideas on nation-states’ treatment of minorities in general – an exhaustive list of all minorities living in Israel/Palestine would not further illuminate this issue. About the use of the word Arabs, see footnote 3 on page 12.
4. The use of the transcription *sertifikat* reflects the repeated and enduring use of the word, in spite of the fact that it has Hebrew equivalents. “Certificate” is general – *sertifikat* specific.

The same transcription and capitalization of the word are used throughout the dissertation. Phonetic transliteration is used throughout, except when a different form is more prevalent, or when official papers use specific transliterations.

5. Page 40 footnote 5: yes, with relation to Revisionism's quarrel with socialist Zionism, the Holocaust and *Altalena* have been the main, and the most passionate, clashing points (from a non-ideological perspective). *Altalena* is not the topic of the dissertation, but Jabotinsky's vision of the sea is.
6. The letters quoted on page 62, just like all other letters in the dissertation, are quoted from the Jabotinsky archive, they follow exactly the same reference structure as other references to letters in the dissertation.
7. Although the word "race" is debatable today it should not be written in quotation marks. No notable scholar of Jabotinsky, including Shavit, Bilski Ben-Hur, and Natkovich, puts the word in quotation marks when discussing this issue, although none of them subscribe to Jabotinsky's views on the topic. Readers are generally expected to understand that the text analyzes a historical idea, and that the text does not support these ideas.
8. The dissertation uses more than a dozen papers and books on the revival of Hebrew, including the works of prominent scholars such as Benjamin Harshav and Ilan Eldar. Maurice Olender wrote an original and illuminating chapter about Renan's relation to Hebrew, but this is far from central to the aspects of linguistic revival which the dissertation discusses.
9. The point is to avoid the use of the term "orientalism" – Jabotinsky did not employ this term because it did not exist at the time in the sense that Said gave it – this would be anachronistic. In addition, Jabotinsky did not criticize "orientalism" from the perspective of the victims (i.e., those who were being reduced to a stereotype), but from the perspective of a national thinker who objected to an eastern stream in Zionism. Jabotinsky criticized what he thought was the lack of meaning of the term "east" – which he strictly associated with backwardness – in the national vision of Buber and his associates. In more ways than one Jabotinsky himself could be described as a condescending European who employed orientalist stereotypes of the Arab and Muslim people. The discussion is actually *not* central to the topic at hand.

10. "Assyrian square script" is the expression used by Jabotinsky in order to present the script as foreign to Hebrew (in this sense Jabotinsky was right because Hebrew is not written in the ancient Hebrew alphabet). Furthermore, Jabotinsky's use of the term "Assyrian" is acceptable in the field.
11. Der Moment was a Yiddish newspaper, not German.
12. The sentence in which "Sephardic (i.e., non-European)" appears, discusses a debate that sometimes resurfaces in current Israeli media about Jabotinsky's relation to Sephardic Jews (see for example B. Michael "*jabotinsky haya chotef beitzim*" [Haaretz, <https://www.haaretz.co.il/opinions/.premium-1.2598595>, originally published March 25, 2015], and the response by Joseph Kister "*jabotinsky he'eritz et yehudei hamizrach*" [Haaretz, <https://www.haaretz.co.il/opinions/.premium-1.2606376>, originally published April 4, 2015]). As is shown in the dissertation, Jabotinsky regularly differentiated between Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jews for cultural, political, and even racial purposes (see especially section 5.1). Once again, Jabotinsky did not refer to Ethiopian or Cochin Jews, but discussed the two main predominate ethnic groups. The debate about the topic in contemporary Israel, in connection to which Jabotinsky's pronouncements on the topic come up, focuses mainly on the relations between Ashkenazi Jews, who supposedly pursue a European (western) orientation, and Sephardic Jews (or *mizrachim*) who ostensibly seek Israel's social and cultural integration in the region (i.e., in the east). The story of the Jews of Thessaloniki appears in the relevant section on mythologization and Sarah the First's voyage.
13. There is no formal or even informal requirement to cite Hebrew sources in Hebrew letters, not to mention this is far from an established norm.
14. Links between Antisemitic and Zionist race narratives are discussed on pages 11-12.
15. Mizrachi relation to Ashkenazi Jews is entirely irrelevant to the topic of the dissertation
16. Azaryahu's paper, although it employs the term "Hebrew Sea", discusses it strictly from the perspective of socialist Zionism. The dissertation refers to Kobbi Cohen-Hattab's monograph, *The Maritime Revolution*, in order to show that the Revisionists exaggerated the Socialists' "neglect" of the sea.
17. *Shayetet 13* is irrelevant to the topic of the dissertation.

18. The dissertation relies heavily on archival material – both from the Jabotinsky Institute, as well as from the Historical Jewish Press. These include more than 80 references to personal letters by Jabotinsky and others to more than 30 recipients; several dozens of articles by Jabotinsky and others; and more than two dozen references to *Beitar* booklets, Revisionist and *Beitar* drafts, plans, programs, and memoranda (e.g., for the instructors' school and Sarah the First's visit to Palestine).