



סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. (תש"ן), pp. XV-XVII

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70039911>

Accessed: 04/12/2011 10:28

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Historical Society of Israel/ is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zion* /.

<http://www.jstor.org>

SUMMARIES

THE SAMARITANS IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

by Uriel Rappaport (pp. 373–396)

Scholarly research on the Samaritans in the Hellenistic period has recently been enriched by new epigraphic, numismatic and archaeological discoveries, which require some revision and re-evaluation of early Samaritan history. After reviewing these discoveries and related material, the author takes up the question of the authenticity of the correspondence between the Samaritans and Antiochus IV (Ant. 12:257–264). The analysis of this document, as proposed here, leads to the conclusion that it is not authentic, as against a widely-held opinion among scholars, all of whom were influenced by E. Bickerman's study of the same document. The author proposes that this correspondence was fabricated by an anti-Samaritan Jewish author in Alexandria, during the second half of the reign of Ptolemy VII Philometor (180–145 BCE).

The author goes on to suggest that the Jewish-Samaritan schism is to be dated late in the second century BCE and that the problem concerning the epithet of Zeus of Mt. Gerizim (*Xenios* according to II Macc. 6:2; *Hellenios*, according to Ant. 12:261) can be resolved by the assumption that the above-mentioned correspondence is a fabrication.

THE TERM 'CROWN OF TORAH' IN RABBINIC LITERATURE AND ITS SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

by Moshe Beer (pp. 397–417)

This article examines the development of the statement of R. Simeon b. Yohai regarding the three crowns: 'The crown of Torah and the crown of priesthood and the crown of kingship' (Mishna Avot 4:13). During the reign of Alexander Yannai there is mention of two crowns only; one of the Pharisees turns to Yannai and declares: 'Be satisfied with the crown of kingship, and leave the crown of priesthood to the seed of Aaron the priest' (BT Kiddushin 66a). These 'crowns' serve as one of the literary expressions of the struggle between the priesthood and the monarchy for control over the nation. One hears explicitly of the 'crown of Torah', in the context of a position of leadership assumed by the rabbis, only after the

destruction of the Second Temple. The monarchy by that time had disappeared, and the status of the priesthood was greatly diminished. On the other hand not only did the religious influence of the rabbis grow, but this was joined by their enhanced political power as well, both within the community and as representatives before the authorities. This development increased in the wake of the Bar-Kokhba war, and was expressed by R. Simeon b. Yohai, who determined a new order between the various crowns, with 'the crown of Torah' now assuming a supreme position.

MARX'S IDEAS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JEWS AND CAPITALISM: FROM SOMBART TO WEBER

by Daniel Gutwein (pp. 419–447)

During the stages of Marx's theoretical activity, he frequently returned, in a variety of contexts, to the question of the relationship between Jews and capitalism. Scholars have usually examined his views on the matter within the general framework of his attitude towards Jews and Judaism. Consequently, the discussion of these attitudes frequently focused on the evaluation (predominantly negative) of Jews, usually pointing to the continuity of this value judgement in the various writings of Marx. At the same time there has been here a noted lack of interest in the economic content of Marx's opinions, as well as in the profound revisions that they underwent concurrent with Marx's general theoretical development. The present article takes up the economic contents of the ideas expressed by Marx (and Engels) regarding Jews and Judaism, and attempts to explain the revisions that these ideas underwent.

In his early writings, and particularly in *The Jewish Question*, Marx identified Jews with capitalist economic activity, and Judaism with the capitalist ethos, both comprising, in his view, economic progress as well as a social alienation. Marx held this opinion for only one year (1843–1844), after which he retreated from it and developed an alternative one. This latter theory presented the economic activity of the Jews as running counter to the progress of capitalism, and now protestantism would take the place of Judaism as the embodiment of the capitalist ethos. He now described the Jews as bearers of commercial and financial activity in pre-capitalistic society, or as the practitioners of a financial activity opposed to the process of industrialisation which was linked to the political reaction in developed capitalist societies.

The changes in Marx's attitude may be understood within the framework of the diverse ideas held by M. Weber and W. Sombart regarding the place of the Jews in the establishment of modern capitalism. In this dispute Marx's earlier views are close to those of Sombart, whereas his later stand is far more similar to that of Weber. Consequently, it would appear that the revision of Marx's opinions grew directly out of the basic theoretical changes that influenced his understanding of the essence and uniqueness of capitalism. His earlier opinions were shaped by the identification of capitalism with money and commerce, which

had practically always been a part of society. In the course of his subsequent intellectual development and as he became aware of the importance of political economy, he gradually concluded that the essential aspect of capitalism was the change in the production process, and it was through this new perspective that he began to re-appraise the economic activity of the Jews.

RESEARCH NOTES

WHO CONQUERED MASADA IN 66 CE, AND WHO LIVED THERE UNTIL THE FORTRESS FELL?

by Hannah M. Cotton and Jonathan Price (pp. 449–454)

The Sicarii, led by Menahem, conquered Masada on the eve of the Jewish rebellion against Rome and held it continuously until their group suicide in 73 or 74. Scholars' attempts to resolve an apparent contradiction between BJ 2:408 and BJ 2:433–4 – proposing, for example, that the passages represent two versions of BJ or two different conquests – are unnecessary. BJ 2:408 records the Sicarii's original conquest: Menahem led some of the group up to Jerusalem to join the other rebels fighting the 'peace party', returned to Masada to arm his followers (BJ 2:433–4), and then went back up to Jerusalem to try to gain control of the rebellion; the Sicarii, including Eleazar ben Yair, fled back to the fortress after Menahem was killed (BJ 2:447–8). Thus the chronological and factual integrity of Josephus' account stands. But the Sicarii were probably not alone at Masada. The discovery there of texts associated with the 'men of the community' and even, surprisingly, the Samaritans, suggests that other groups found refuge at the desert fortress during the war.