



סיכומים באנגלית

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zion / ציון*, Vol. (תשנ"ז), (סב, חוברת א), pp. V-VIII

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/70042712>

Accessed: 01/12/2011 14:44

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 JEWS OF EGYPT BETWEEN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS, THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM, AND HEAVEN

by Daniel R. Schwartz (pp. 5–22)

The Temple of Onias in Leontopolis, founded by an exiled Judaeen high priest, is very rarely mentioned in Jewish Hellenistic literature. This has led many scholars to suppose that it was of only marginal significance and that Egyptian Jewry, by and large, remained enthusiastically loyal to the Temple of Jerusalem. In this article, it is first argued that the Land of Onias – of which the temple was the linchpin – was quite important, being viewed by Gentile observers as parallel to the Jewish center in Alexandria. In this connection, special attention is devoted to the text and translation of the passage from Strabo preserved by Josephus in *Antiquities* 14.117. Next, it is argued that, on the one hand, there is indeed evidence for Alexandrian Jewish opposition to the Temple of Onias (*Ant.* 13.62ff. and Septuagint of Isaiah 19:18–19), and, on the other hand – and this is the main point – that lack of opposition to the Temple of Onias need not, indeed cannot, indicate enthusiastic devotion to the Temple of Jerusalem. Jews enthusiastic about the Temple of Jerusalem could not remain passive *vis à vis* a competing Temple, the very existence of which constituted a crass violation of biblical law. Rather, the general lack of Alexandrian Jewish interest in the Temple of Onias is to be understood as a facet of a general lack of interest in temples and sacrificial religion – consistent with the circumstances of Jews of the Diaspora, who would rather have God in heaven and worship Him by prayers. This point is illustrated especially from *II Maccabees*, which shows much interest in the Jerusalem *polis* but not in the Temple cult – and where the enthusiastic references to Onias, in chapters 3–4 and 15, are taken to reflect Oniad hopes to return to the Jerusalem high priesthood, prior to the Hasmonean usurpation of that post.

MORE ON 'BETWEEN 1096 AND 1648–1649'

by Jacob Katz (pp. 23–29)

Jacob Katz responds to E. Fram's article 'Between 1096 and 1648–1649: A Reappraisal', published in *Zion*, LXI (1996), pp. 159–182, and contends that the author misread various sources relating to the massacres of 1648–49 and misrepresented his original position. He maintains that Fram's distrust of the veracity of the chronicles regarding *kiddush hashem* leads him to false conclusions. Katz sees no reason to adjust his argument on the basis of Fram's article.

AND STILL A GAP EXISTS BETWEEN 1096 AND 1648–1649

by Edward Fram (pp. 31–46)

The author admits to having misread a source in his article yet claims that the rest of the evidence he presented was not refuted by Katz. He presents a more detailed analysis of *Yeven Metzulla* and compares this text with one that seemingly influenced it. Fram brings further evidence to bear that the chronicle of Nathan of Hanover is marred and unreliable in relating to the events that took place in Nemyriv in 1648 and cannot serve as the basis to an understanding of *kiddush hashem* during 1648–1649. Fram holds to his previous position that in the face of the riots of 1648–1649, Polish Jews acted in different ways, ranging from acceptance of Christianity out of fear to performing the sanctification of the Name.

HERZL AND THE STRUGGLE WITHIN THE JEWISH PLUTOCRACY:
THE ROTHSCHILDS, BARON DE HIRSCH AND SAMUEL MONTAGU

by Daniel Gutwein (pp. 47–74)

This article challenges the conventional scholarly interpretation that Herzl began his Zionist endeavors with the hope for support from the Rothschilds and other Jewish millionaires, and

that only their rejection of his plan encouraged him to embark on mass political activity, culminating in the first Zionist congress.

Based on Herzl's writings from the formative period of Zionism, the author claims that Herzl never relied on the Jewish magnates; he thought that if he failed to gain their support, he would realize his plan by enlisting the Jewish masses. Moreover, from the outset Herzl considered the Rothschilds to be irrevocably hostile to Zionism, viewing the Jewish 'medium millionaires' like Baron de Hirsch or Samuel Montagu, the Rothschilds rivals in many arenas, as more supportive.

Herzl's differentiation between the Rothschilds and the 'medium millionaires' refutes the conventional interpretation that Herzl considered the Jewish plutocracy to be a monolithic group with homogenous interests. Herzl did not specify the causes of the rivalry between the Rothschilds and the 'medium millionaires', and their opposing attitudes to Zionism. Based on an analysis of the economic, political and community interests of the Rothschilds on the one hand, and those of Hirsch and Montagu on the other, the article offers a new explanation of this rivalry. The article concludes that in Herzl's view the crucial division in the Jewish community was not class-based, but rather along the lines of a plutocracy.

RESEARCH NOTES

'IN YOUR LIFETIME AND IN THE LIFETIME OF OUR LORD MOSES MAIMONIDES'

by Mordechai A. Friedman (pp. 75–78)

Nahmanides, in his epistle to the rabbis of northern France wherein he objects to the ban they had pronounced on the writings of Maimonides, stresses the ban's divisive effect on Jewry. Yemenite Jewry was an example par excellence of a community with absolute reverence for Maimonides, the extent of which Nahmanides epitomized by citing hearsay testimony that during the former's lifetime they pray on his behalf in the *kaddish*: 'in your lifetime and in the lifetime of our lord Moses Maimonides'.

The author notes that such invocations in the *kaddish*, for the exilarch and heads of the Yeshivot in Babylonia and Eretz Israel, as well as for the heads of the Egyptian Jewish community are well attested, though Nahmanides was evidently unfamiliar with the practice.

The veracity of his hearsay evidence is thus established but its weight as support for Yemenite Jewry's unique loyalty to Maimonides is greatly weakened. In fact, from documents published by S.D. Goitein, we know that the heads of Egyptian Jewry were mentioned in the *kaddish* in Yemen at least by the time of Masliah ha-Kohen (1127–1139).