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"MENASSEH BEN ISRAEL'S MISSION TO OLIVER CROMWELL."

In 1655, Menasseh ben Israel came to England in the hope of obtaining from the Lord Protector and the Council of State permission for Jews to settle in England, and to practise without secrecy or restraint the rights of their religion. After two and a half centuries, the history of Menasseh's mission, its origin, its incidents, and its consequences, has for the first time been set forth in the volume prepared by Mr. Lucien Wolf for the Jewish Historical Society of England. In an admirable narrative, Mr. Wolf tells the story of the Resettlement; and indirectly he makes it clear why the story has never before been fully told. Whoever is at all acquainted with the sources from which the history of the seventeenth century has to be written, knows that of all periods it is the most perplexing and intractable. "Dreariest continent of shot-rubbish the eye ever saw," said Carlyle, "trackless, without index, without finger-post." Mr. Wolf has had to be his own Dryasdust before he could become a historian. Pamphlets which

had long vanished from human sight have had to be rediscovered and perused. Private letters, begging petitions, a Marrano merchant's will, the depositions of a common informer, the gossip reported in News Letters, the information conveyed in the dispatches of ambassadors, have all had to be collected, interpreted, and judged before the historian could say with any accuracy or completeness what led Menasseh to England, what he achieved here, and what he failed to achieve.

Naturally, a certain portion of the material that Mr. Wolf has used was known to earlier writers who have attempted to deal with the Resettlement; some papers, also, of which the earlier writers could not have known, have now been made easily accessible through the publication of the Calendars of State Papers: but the greater part of the documentary evidence that Mr. Wolf has used has been brought to light through his own researches extending over nearly twenty years. His predecessors had no notion of bestowing such pains on history. Tovey gave a scanty and inaccurate account of Menasseh's mission, and embellished it with reflections which are based upon the supposition that poor Menasseh, who probably never knew a year's freedom from pecuniary troubles, was the master of great treasures with which he bribed the Protector and the more godly members of the Council of State. Dr. Kayserling, in his biography of Menasseh, kept close to the facts which were within his knowledge: but he was not intimately acquainted with the general course of English history in the seventeenth century, nor did he use the best sources of information. Some additions to the common stock of knowledge were made by Graetz, Picciotto, and Dr. Hermann Adler; but without disparagement to their historical zeal it may be said that their contributions are very modest as compared with the results of Mr. Wolf's researches.

The writers who have been named were, of course, familiar with Menasseh's pamphlets, with some of the State
Papers, and with two or three publications by Christian authors of the time relating to the Jewish question in England. From these sources they were acquainted with Menasseh's peculiar views as to the bearing of Scriptural prophecies on the resettlement of the Jews in England, and with some details of his visit to this country, and of the proceedings of the Whitehall conference. They were aware of Cromwell's friendly attitude, of the favourable opinion expressed by the Judges in 1655 as to the right of Jews to remain in England, and of the fact that before the end of the Commonwealth a small Jewish community was established in London. But these scraps of knowledge were as tantalizing as scattered pieces of a puzzle until Mr. Wolf, equipped with a copious supply of new facts relating to the founders of the Jewish community, and with a minute knowledge of the history of the Commonwealth, was able to show how the puzzle should be fitted together. It would have been impossible for any writer who had not studied with equal care the English and the Jewish history of the period to deal adequately with the Resettlement: as, indeed, it is impossible without similar preparation to do justice to any important episode in the history of the Jews of England. Just as the history of the English Jews before the Expulsion exhibits not only the fortunes and sufferings of some hundreds of Jewish families, but also (and as clearly) the shifting relations of the Kings of England with their baronage, the citizens of their towns, and the Papal power; just as the records of the Emancipation struggle serve both as a chronicle of an epoch of vital importance to the Jewish race and as a faithful epitome of the progress of Liberalism in the English nation; so the Resettlement movement, now that its course has been adequately described, is seen to be at once a result and an illustration of the working of two sets of forces—of which the one compelled the Jews of Europe in the seventeenth century to seek new homes and new opportunities for the exercise of their commercial activity, while the other caused
a portion of the English nation, partly through tolerant feeling, partly through a peculiar view of religious duty, partly through commercial ambition, to desire the unconcealed residence of Jews in this country. It is due to Mr. Wolf's researches, of which the results are set forth in his present essay and in his many earlier writings on kindred subjects, that it is now possible to understand the nature of the forces at work and their reciprocal action.

The Inquisition in Spain and Portugal and in the dominions outside Europe possessed by those countries was the most potent of the causes that imposed on the Jews of the seventeenth century the necessity of looking for new homes in countries from which they had hitherto been excluded. Great numbers of crypto-Jews remained in Spain and Portugal after the great Expulsions of 1492 and 1496, and many of them acquired or retained wealth and distinction. But, when once they fell into the hands of the officers of the Inquisition, their fate was torture and spoliation. There is, unhappily, no lack of evidence to show how cruel were the outbursts of persecution by which the Spanish and Portuguese Marranos were at all times liable to be attacked. Experience of suffering, and the sense of insecurity which must have surrounded them even at the time of their greatest apparent prosperity, drove one family after another of Spanish and Portuguese crypto-Jews to seek a home in countries where they might hope to live unmolested. The stream of emigration flowed steadily on during the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth century. Marrano refugees settled in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Antwerp, Bordeaux, Nice, Hamburg, Reggio, Pernambuco, and Bahia. In the reign of Charles I and the early years of the Commonwealth, a few merchants from Spain and Portugal, attracted to this country no doubt by its Protestantism and its growing commercial importance, founded a Jewish settlement in London. They sought no authorization; they raised no questions as to their right to live and carry
on trade within the British dominions; nor for many years was any question of the kind raised to their detriment. Their houses were unmolested, and their business affairs flourished. Thanks to Mr. Wolf's researches, a considerable amount of information has been collected bearing on the history of this community up to 1656, the year in which the Government of the country first had official cognizance of its existence. The names of twenty-six Jewish heads of families who lived in England before that date are known: and information is available as to the early history of five. Of these, four are known to have been driven from home either by the experience or the prospect of persecution by the Inquisition; and there is good reason to believe that this was the case with the fifth. One of them, Antonio Robles, had first fled from Spain to the Canary Islands to escape tortures such as those under which his father had died and his mother had been crippled, and from his new home in the Canary Islands he had come to England, because orders had been sent out by the Inquisition for his arrest. Another, Domingo de la Cerda, had for the same cause left Spain, and taken refuge in England: Duarte Henriques had been despoiled of his estates in the Canary Islands because he was a Jew: David Abarbanel Dormido had been arrested by the Inquisition, put to cruel torments on the rack, and kept in prison for five years: Antonio Ferdinando Carvajal had probably been compelled by the Inquisition to leave his early home at Fundao.

In the middle of the seventeenth century the need for new homes for refugee Jews became more pressing than it had ever been before. There was no cessation of persecution in Spain and Portugal: the rising of the Cossacks under Chmielnicki in 1648 drove thousands of Jews from Poland: the conquest of Brazil by Portugal in 1654 threw back on to the old world many Jewish families who had for a time enjoyed prosperity in Pernambuco and Bahia. And whether they came from Spain or Portugal, from
Eastern Europe or from America, the refugees turned first for succour to their happily-placed brethren who formed the Jewish communities of Holland. To the Jews of Holland, desirous of helping their co-religionists, but confronted with a task to which their resources were unequal, the fact that a small crypto-Jewish settlement had recently been established in London would by itself have been enough to suggest that what had already been done in this country secretly and on a small scale might be done on a larger scale and with the express permission of the Government.

If Mr. Wolf's only considerable discovery had been that of the existence of a crypto-Jewish community in London in the early years of the Commonwealth, he would have done more than any of his predecessors to explain the origin of Menasseh's mission. But this represents only one branch of his researches. While the Jews of the seventeenth century were enduring in many parts of the world troubles which compelled them to look for new harbours of refuge, there had risen into temporary prominence in the political and religious thought of England two ideas which inevitably suggested proposals for legalizing the residence of Jews in this country. In the fifth decade of the seventeenth century, many of the sectaries and soldiers who were to become keen supporters of the Commonwealth adopted the principle of the unrestricted toleration, not only of all forms of Christianity, but also of Judaism and other religions. Within the same period men of a different cast of mind endeavoured to persuade their fellow countrymen that it was one of the duties of England as a Christian country, more especially with a view to hastening the Millennium, to seek all possible opportunities for converting the Jews. Mr. Wolf has studied with great care these two movements of thought and their bearing on the Resettlement; and he has been rewarded by discovering among the pamphlets and official documents of the period a remarkable number of proposals and expressions of opinion favourable to the readmission
of the Jews, which are of a date antecedent to the publica-
tion of the first suggestion on the subject by a member
of the Jewish race.

In 1643 Roger Williams, in his Bloudy Tenent of Per-
secution for Cause of Conscience Discussed, argued, with
frequent reference to the Jews, that all forms of worship
should be freely tolerated, and that non-Christian systems
of religion "are only to be fought against with that sword
which is only, in soul matters, able to conquer; to wit, the
sword of God's Spirit, the Word of God." In 1646 there
was published a reprint of the pamphlet on Religion's
Peace, in which Leonard Busher had advocated forty years
earlier a policy of complete freedom of conscience, in
accordance with which the Jews should "inhabit and
dwell under His Majesty's dominion, to the great profit
of his realms and to their furtherance in the faith; the
which we are bound to seek in all love and peace, so well
as others, to our utmost endeavour." In 1647 Hugh
Peters published A Word for the Army and Two Words
to the Kingdom, in which, among other remedies for the
ills of the kingdom, he proposed "That merchants may
have all manner of encouragement .... and strangers, even
Jews, admitted to trade and live with us; that it may not
be said, we pray for their conversion, with whom we will
not converse, we being all but strangers on the earth." In
the same year the Council of Mechanics at Whitehall voted
"A Toleration of all religions whatsoever, not excepting
Turkes, nor Papists, nor Jewes." In 1648 appeared An
Apology for the Honorable Nation of the Jews, by Edward
Nicholas, in which the admission of the Jews was advocated
in order that the English people might escape the punish-
ment that was due to them on account of their cruel
treatment of Jews in earlier times, and might in the future
share the blessings which according to Divine promise the
Jews were to enjoy. In 1649 there was presented to
Fairfax and to the Council of Officers a Petition from
Johanna Cartwright and her son, asking that "under the
Christian banner of charity and brotherly love," the Jews might "again be received and permitted to trade and dwell amongst you in this land as they now do in the Netherlands." This Petition "was presented to the generall Council of the officers of the army under the Command of his Excellency, Thomas Lord Fairfax, at Whitehall on Jan. 5 [1649]. And favourably received with a promise to take it into speedy consideration, when the present more publike affaires are dispatched." In the same year there appeared three further pamphlets of strongly pro-Jewish tendency, viz.:—Sadler's Rights of the Kingdom, Dury's Epistolical Discourse, and Thorowgood's Jews in America, while Chilmead published an English translation of Leon de Modena's Historia dei Riti Ebraici. It was not only in print that pro-Jewish sentiment showed itself: in various parts of England and Wales Christian enthusiasts took to the practice of Jewish rites and ceremonies, while the epitaphs in the Jewish cemetery at Amsterdam show that a whole family of English Christians migrated to that city to be received as members of the Synagogue.

Any member of the Jewish race whose thoughts had ever been occupied with speculations as to the methods by which the troubles of his fellow Jews in Spain, Portugal, and elsewhere could be relieved, must have been deeply interested by this outburst of feeling in England. Doubtless there were many Jews in the Netherlands, in Italy, in Spain, and in Portugal, by whom the new movement was watched. But there was one man who for many reasons followed its progress with peculiar attention. Menasseh ben Israel, one of the ministers of the Jewish congregation of Amsterdam, had lived in Holland since his boyhood; but, as the son of a Marrano who had left Lisbon after being persecuted by the Inquisition, he had a personal concern for the fortunes of "such as sat in the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal"; and, as a scholar who was in frequent correspondence on questions of Hebrew learning with English students of theology, he was exceptionally
well informed as to the progress of religious feeling in England. His disposition was such as to make him very ready to aspire to a prominent part in any movement for the improvement of the condition of the Jews. He was a restless, public-spirited man, full of confidence that by the workings of Divine Providence a glorious future was being prepared for the scattered remnant of Israel, and far from disinclined to believe that Providence might well regard him as one of the most suitable agents to be used in carrying out its designs. Well acquainted with the existence of the crypto-Jewish community of London, he could not fail, when his Christian correspondents wrote to him about the progress of pro-Jewish sentiment in England, to be struck with the idea that it might be possible to derive therefrom some practical advantage for his co-religionists.

And there was a peculiarity of his Christian friends in England which strengthened the other motives leading him in this direction. Among his English correspondents were men who attached great importance to what are known as Millenarian speculations. They believed that the Millennium, the period of a thousand years of peace and prosperity for the saints on earth, of which they found predictions both in the Old and the New Testaments, was near at hand. Now it was generally recognized, in accordance with the text of Scriptural prophecies, that the Millennium must necessarily be heralded or accompanied by the restoration to the Holy Land of the Jews from all parts of the earth: and on this subject Menasseh's friends sought from him information and guidance. Some questions which one of them put before him in 1649 set at work in his mind a train of ideas, which led to a curious result. It chanced that in the year 1644 a Portuguese Jew named Antonio Montezino, or Aaron Levi, visited Amsterdam, and related, in the presence of Menasseh ben Israel and other Jews of the city, how in South America he had encountered Jews of the tribe of Reuben. Five years afterwards, when Menasseh was
consulted by his Millenarian friends in England as to the restoration of the Jews, it occurred to him that this story might have an important bearing on the matter. He had convinced himself from his Scriptural studies that, before the Jews could be restored, it was necessary that their dispersion over the earth should be complete. The discovery of the tribe of Reuben in America showed that their dispersion was already much wider than had been known. Indeed, if they could only gain admission to England—so the thought must have flashed on him—their dispersion from one end of the earth to the other would be complete, and their restoration to the Holy Land, that event which to Jews and Christians was equally momentous, would be so much the nearer. Satisfied with the validity of his own reasoning, Menasseh published in 1650 a pamphlet entitled the *Hope of Israel*, in which he repeated and defended the story of Montezino, hoping that the English people might recognize that it was their duty to expedite the ultimate restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land by allowing them to settle in England. The practical object of the publication could be easily detected by a careful reader, but was not definitely stated in the body of the pamphlet. In order, however, that there might be no uncertainty on this point, Menasseh dedicated his little book to "the Parliament, the Supream Court of England and the Right Honourable the Councell of State." In his Epistle Dedicatory he explained his reasons for doing so. "As for me (most renowned Fathers)," he said, "in my dedicating this Discourse to you, I can truly affirm that I am induced to it upon no other ground than this, that I may gain your favour and good will to our Nation, now scattered almost all over the earth; neither think that I do this as if I were ignorant how much you have hitherto favored our Nation; for it is made known to me and to others of our Nation by them who are so happy as near at hand to observe your apprehensions, that you do vouchsafe to help us not onely by your prayers; yea, this hath
compelled me to speak to you publickly, and to give you thanks for that your charitable affection towards us, and not such thanks which come only from the tongue, but such as are conceived by a grateful mind. Give me leave therefore (most renowned fathers) to supplicate you that you would still favor our good, and farther love us.” That Menasseh’s intentions were fully understood by English readers was made clear by the controversial literature which his pamphlet called forth. Shortly after the publication of the Hope of Israel, he applied for facilities to visit England in order to plead for the admission of the Jews, and he was supplied, as he relates, with “a very favourable passe-port!.”

From what has been said above, it will be seen that there is no uncertainty as to the causes which led Menasseh to conceive the idea of his mission to England. In view of the conditions that have been indicated—the need of a new home for the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, the hopefulness of the prospect in England as disclosed by the prosperity of the small crypto-Jewish community in London, the spontaneous display by English writers and public men of friendly feeling towards the Jews, and finally, Menasseh’s belief in the connexion between the return of the Jews to England and their restoration to the Holy Land—it may fairly be considered that the inception in 1650 of the Resettlement movement has been adequately explained.

The explanation is almost entirely due to Mr. Wolf: and it is he also who was the first to recognize the next important link in the chain of events.

When Menasseh first thought of advocating the admission of the Jews to England, he counted no doubt on a large measure of support from influential sections of the English nation: but he cannot have anticipated that the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth would be one of his most ardent helpers. Yet Mr. Wolf has shown that this was the case; and, by devoting the necessary attention to the trade

1 Vindiciae Judaeorum, p. 144 of Mr. Wolf’s edition.
policy of Cromwell and the commercial conditions of the time, he has been able to show why it was the case.

In 1651 the English Parliament, on the recommendation of the Council of State, passed a Navigation Act, which provided that henceforth there should not be imported into any part of the British dominions the produce of any country in Asia, Africa, or America, except in vessels owned by Englishmen, and that European products should be imported only in English vessels or in vessels owned by natives of the exporting country. The object of this Act was to transfer to England the commercial supremacy of Holland. Hitherto the latter country, by virtue of the commercial ability and large capital of its merchants, had enjoyed a predominant share in the carrying trade and financial business of the world; but, if the Act should be effective, the Dutch "would be disabled from bringing into England or her colonies anything but the scanty produce of their own soil." Now the Act could not succeed unless England was able to command an abundant supply of capital and of business enterprise and ability. The English nation, which within the preceding half-century had magnificently inaugurated its career of colonial expansion by establishing outposts in the East Indies, the West Indies, and the continent of America, was not wanting in the qualifications that commercial greatness required. But a statesman with Cromwell's breadth of view and wide-reaching ambition for English commerce, could not fail to be anxious that the country's resources should be further strengthened by the immigration of large capitalists experienced in the successful conduct of foreign trade. He was well aware that the continental Jews had won for themselves a pre-eminent position in the trade between the different countries of Europe, and between Europe and the East and West Indies and Brazil; he knew also that some crypto-Jews were

1 S. R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, II, 82-3.
2 An interesting passage in a letter written by one Royalist agent to another shows that Englishmen abroad realized the importance of
already in England carrying on the same pursuits. It was inevitable that, when he heard of Menasseh’s suggestion that the right of Jews to live in England should be recognized, he should at once welcome a proposal that was so closely in accord with his commercial ambitions and with his inclination towards toleration in matters of religion.

The time and manner of Menasseh’s first communication with the English Government are not known with any exactness. From the passage in the Vindiciae, to which reference has been made above, it appears that he wrote to the Council of State immediately after the publication of Cromwell’s action in 1655. In a letter to Sir E. Nicholas, dated Brussels, September 20, 1655, Sir Marmaduke Langdale writes: “I am very sorry that they [the Jews] agree with Cromwell. The Jews are considerable all the world over and the great masters of money. If His Majesty could either have them or divert them from Cromwell, it were a very good service. I heard of this 3 years ago, but hoped the Jews who understand the interest of all the princes in the world had been too wise to adventure themselves and estates under Cromwell when they may by his death or other alteration in that kingdom run the hazard of an absolute ruin.”—Nicholas Papers (edited by G. F. Warner for Camden Society), III, 51.

1 On p. xxix of his Introduction Mr. Wolf says that “the Readmission of the Jews to England was one of Cromwell’s own schemes. . . . there is ample evidence that he was the mainspring of the whole movement and that Menasseh was but a puppet in his hands.” On p. xxxiv, referring to Dormido’s visit to England, he says: “Cromwell’s action can only be explained by the theory that he was, as I have suggested, the instigator of the whole movement.” I am unable to agree with these statements. Menasseh was certainly acting on his own initiative when, in 1650, he inaugurated the Resettlement movement by the publication of the English and Latin editions of the Hope of Israel, with the remarkable dedication to the English Parliament and Council of State. According to his own statement, he was acting equally on his own initiative when, almost immediately after the publication of his pamphlet, he applied for permission to visit England (Vindiciae, p. 144 of Mr. Wolf’s volume). It appears to me that, in the absence of any direct evidence to the contrary, Menasseh’s account should be accepted. Of course, my dissent from the suggestion contained in the sentences quoted in this note does not lessen my appreciation of the remarkable service which Mr. Wolf has rendered by drawing attention to Cromwell’s vigorous and consistent support of the Resettlement proposals and to the causes to which it was due.
the *Hope of Israel* in 1650. There is no doubt that in the spring of 1651, it was believed in Amsterdam that Cromwell intended to sanction the residence of the Jews in England, and on this account, as Menasseh wrote a few years later, "the Ambassadors of England were received in the Synagogue with as great pomp and applause, Hymns and cheerfulness of minde, as ever any Sovereigne Prince was. For our people did in their owne mindes presage, that the Kingly Government being now changed into that of a Common-wealth, the antient hatred towards them would also be changed into good-will." In October, 1651, another letter from Menasseh was received by the Council of State, and it is probable that a second passport was then issued to enable him to come to England. Similar passports were issued in November, 1652, December, 1652, and September, 1653; but the war between England and Holland (July, 1652, to April, 1654), and the difficulties of his own position in Amsterdam, deterred him from making the journey. In 1654 David Abarbanel Dormido, Menasseh's brother-in-law, a merchant who had fled from Brazil to Amsterdam at the time of the Portuguese conquest, came to England, and acting, no doubt, in accordance with Menasseh's advice, presented to Cromwell a petition asking that the Jews might be permitted to settle in this country. Cromwell urged his Council to return a favourable answer, but they declined to take any action. Within the next few months, however, Cromwell was able to give two remarkable indications of the good will with which he regarded the Jewish cause. In February, 1655, he took the unusual step of writing a letter to the King of Portugal asking that payment might be enforced of certain debts due by Portuguese subjects in Pernambuco to relatives of Dormido, who of course was not a British subject and had no claim to the Protector's good offices. In August, 1655, he granted a patent of denization to Antonio Ferdinando Carvajal and his two sons, who were all members of the crypto-Jewish community of London.
In October, 1655, after five years of waiting, Menasseh at length decided to visit England. "I could not," he says, "be at quiet in my mind (I know not but that it might be through some particular divine providence) till I had anew made my humble addresses to his Highnesse the Lord Protector (whom God preserve). And finding that my coming over would not be altogether unwelcome to him, with those great hopes which I conceived, I joyfully took my leave of my house, my friends, my kindred, all my advantages there, and the country wherein I have lived all my life time, under the benign protection and favour of the Lords, the States General, and Magistrates of Amsterdam; in fine (I say) I parted with them all and took my voyage for England."

Several of the incidents of his stay in England are well known from accounts given by himself and by contemporary writers: but on some points of the first importance Mr. Wolf has been able by careful study of the authorities to correct statements hitherto repeated in all works on Anglo-Jewish history. When Menasseh arrived in London in October, 1655, he brought with him petitions from the Jews of various parts of Europe, and the English manuscript of his own "Humble Address." The latter was at once printed and published, and on October 31 he went to Whitehall and presented copies to the Council of State. The "Humble Address" asked "in behalf of the Jewish nation" for the free exercise of the Jewish religion, "that we may have our Synagogues, and keep our own publick worship, as our brethren doe in Italy, Germany, Poland, and many other places." A detailed list of the concessions that the Jews desired was then drawn up and embodied in a petition presented by Menasseh to Cromwell in person. The concessions were (1) security of life and property, (2) liberty of public worship, (3) the right to acquire a cemetery, (4) permission to trade "in all kinds of merchandise like other merchants," (5) the appointment by Cromwell of an officer to examine the passports of Jewish
immigrants and to compel them to swear allegiance to the
government, (6) jurisdiction to be exercised by the "Chief
of the Synagogue" in disputes between Jews, with a right
of appeal to the civil courts, (7) that "if peradventure there
existed any laws against the Jews, they might for the sake
of greater security be rescinded."

Menasseh's detailed petition was referred by Cromwell
to the Council of State, and the Council appointed a com-
mittee of six of their number to consider it. On Nov. 14
it was decided, in view of the novelty and importance of
the issues raised, to summon a conference, representa-
tive of outside public opinion, to assist the Committee of Council
with their advice. The persons summoned included three
judges, two well-known politicians, seven eminent mer-
chants, and seventeen clergymen. The conference met
four times, viz. on December 4, 7, 12, and 18, under the
presidency of Cromwell. Of the proceedings of these days
several accounts are extant, and, though none is complete,
there is enough evidence to show what was the general
course of the discussion. The two questions submitted by
Cromwell were (1) whether it was legal to admit the Jews,
and (2) supposing it to be legal, what were the conditions
on which it was fitting that they should be received.
The first question was soon decided. Of the three judges
who had been summoned to the conference only two
attended, viz. Chief Justice Glynne and Chief Baron
Steele. They both stated that there was no law forbid-
ding the Jews to return to England. The discussion
therefore resolved itself into a consideration of the second
question. Cromwell spoke several times, indicating clearly
his desire that the full concessions for which Menasseh
asked should be granted; but he professed that "he had
no engagements [to the Jews] but on Scripture grounds."
Sir H. Laurence, the president of the Council, and General
Lambert spoke to the same effect as the Protector.

Among the clergy, who were more than half of the
non-official members of the conference, a clear majority
favoured the view that there was no objection to the return of the Jews, provided that suitable conditions were imposed to prevent them from attacking the Christian religion. Some of the clergy were prepared to go much further, and to support a resolution setting forth that it was not only permissible but was actually a Christian duty to receive and harbour Jews, and to allow them to carry on divine worship. This view was supported by an appeal to the prospect that England might, by admitting the Jews, take its share in the glorious work of converting them, and might also escape the divine retribution to which the nation was liable on account of the cruelty with which Jews had been treated before the Expulsion in 1290.

On the other hand, a minority among the clergy, fearing lest Jews might be more likely to convert Christians than to be converted by them, desired that nothing should be said or done to encourage them to return to England.

The most strenuous opposition to the grant of any concession whatever was offered by the representatives of the mercantile interest. The explanation of their action is, of course, very simple. Being in possession of England’s foreign trade they objected to a proposal that they should share it with Jewish rivals. Merchants who each had his own affairs and his own profit to consider were naturally little touched by Cromwell’s far-reaching anticipations of the increase in the total trade of the country that might result from the introduction of Jewish capital and ability. There is nothing remarkable in this: but there is some interest in observing that the spirit displayed towards the Jews by the chief representative of the mercantile interest at the conference was precisely the same that was displayed on other occasions towards English merchants. The chief opponent at the conference of the admission of the Jews was Sir Christopher Packe. “Of all the head pieces that were there,” says a contemporary politician, “he was thought to give the strongest reasons against their coming in.” Now Sir Christopher Packe was
the governor of the Company of Merchant Adventurers, which existed in order to maintain and exploit the principle that the right to engage in foreign trade should be the exclusive privilege of a close corporation; and frequent complaints were made to Parliament in the seventeenth century by English manufacturers and "free merchants" of the oppressive rigour with which the Company of Merchant Adventurers exercised the monopolies which it enjoyed\(^1\). On all such occasions during the Commonwealth Sir Christopher Packe showed himself the most active and capable defender of the vicious economic principle on which the Company was founded. It is well to bear in mind these facts, because they show that the violent opposition of the merchants to Menasseh's proposals was neither an outcome of anti-Semitic feeling nor an isolated instance of commercial exclusiveness, but the application to a particular case of an economic theory which was still widely accepted.

Apparently the view of the merchants was that, although under the existing law Jews were at liberty to settle in England, the Government should adopt measures to prevent them from doing so. This view had no chance of acceptance, since Cromwell himself, several members of the Council of State, and the majority of the clergy, had declared themselves in favour of admitting the Jews under certain conditions. But some of the clergy were willing that the conditions should be stringent; and accordingly attempts were made to arrange a compromise. One ridiculous proposal was made by a benevolent clergyman who, in the hope of overcoming the opposition of the merchants, suggested that the Jews should be confined to certain decayed seaports, and should pay customs duties on goods transported between those ports and the rest of England, besides the duties payable on goods transported between

\(^1\) Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, Book V, chapter i, part 3: "Of the public works and institutions which are necessary for facilitating particular branches of commerce."
England and other countries. In another resolution, which appears to have been drafted by a responsible official or a member of the Government in order to express in definite form the wishes of the majority of the conference, a different set of restrictions was suggested. The draft resolution sets forth that to allow Jews to have synagogues and places of worship "is not only eville in itselfe, but likewise very scandalous to other Christian churches"; and that "great prejudice is like to arise to the natives of this commonwealth in matter of trade, which besides other dangers here mentioned we find very commonly suggested by the inhabitants of the City of London." A series of conditions is accordingly proposed, of which the most important are "that they be not admitted to have any publicke Judicatores, whether civil or ecclesiasticall, which were to grant them terms beyond the condition of strangers," that "they bear no publicke office or trust in this commonwealth," and that "so farre as may be [they be] not suffered to discourage any of their owne from usinge or applyinge themselves to any which may tend to convince them of their error and turn them to Christianity. And that some severe penalty be imposed upon them who shall apostatize from Christianity to Judaisme."

To Cromwell who, as a matter of statesmanship, wished to hold out liberal inducements to the Jews to bring their capital to England, the adoption by the conference of any recommendation in favour of admitting them subject to onerous restrictions would have been useless, and worse than useless. The legal right of the Jews to settle in England had been authoritatively declared: and, under the laws of the Commonwealth, any person living in England was practically at liberty to celebrate any form of religious worship that was not Papistical, Prelatical, or licentious.

1 The Recusancy Acts, by which heavy fines were imposed on all persons neglecting to attend the Parish Church, were repealed in 1650 (S. R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, pp. 300-3). The "Instrument of Government" of 1653 provided that no person was
When, therefore, the inclination of the conference in favour of imposing special disabilities became manifest, Cromwell at once dealt with the situation in the true Cromwellian manner. He dissolved the conference without allowing it to formulate any conclusion, and told the members that he and the Council of State "had much need of all their prayers that the Lord would direct them so as may be to His glory and to the good of the nation."

In spite of Cromwell's concluding remark, no official communication was made by the Council of State to Menasseh, nor do the records of their proceedings show that they devoted any further consideration to his proposals. Menasseh's public participation in the attempt to secure the legal resettlement of his co-religionists in England may, therefore, be regarded as having ended with the dissolution of the advisory conference. His name is found, indeed, among the signatures to a petition presented to Cromwell on March 24, 1656, by six members of the Marrano community of London; and in April of the same year he published the most interesting and impressive of his English writings, the Vindiciae Judaeorum, in which he defended the members of the Jewish race against some of the wild accusations that had been circulated during the discussion of the proposals for the Readmission. But this tract, admirable as it is, does not appear to have excited at the time any large measure of public interest. Apparently it was less read than its mystical predecessor, the Hope of Israel.

Nevertheless, during the months following on the Whitehall conference the position of the Jews in England was greatly strengthened. Cromwell informally assured the members of the Marrano community that he would assist them to maintain the rights which they had been shown to
possess, provided they exercised them quietly and with discretion. They acted in accordance with his advice, carrying on their occupations as before and worshipping in a private house. Their numbers were no doubt increased by the occasional arrival of new immigrants. The security of their position was successfully tested in the spring of 1656, in the course of an inquiry relating to the affairs of a Jewish merchant of London, Antonio Robles. Under the authority of a proclamation of the Privy Council declaring all Spanish money, merchandise, and shipping to be lawful prize, property belonging to Robles was seized by the Government. He claimed restitution on the ground that he was a Jew of Portuguese origin; and several of his co-religionists testified before the court of inquiry that he and they professed the Jewish religion. In due course the goods of Robles were restored to him, and the right of Jews to live in England was thus implicitly recognized by a quasi-judicial authority. Two facts of purely communal interest also indicate the security of the Jewish position in England during the later years of the Commonwealth. In 1657 Carvajal and Caceres signed a lease for a Jewish cemetery at Mile End; and in 1659 Carvajal made a will in which he bequeathed £30 to the Jewish poor of London.

Thus, in spite of the failure of the Whitehall conference and the silence of the Council of State, Menasseh's mission led directly to the establishment on a recognized legal basis of the Jewish community of England. The result came about in a very different fashion from that which he desired; and his disappointment was possibly due to some extent to his mistaken method of advocacy. The restrictive proposals made at the conference by divines whose inclination was friendly to the Jewish cause may have been partly suggested by the complacent references in Menasseh's pamphlets to cases in which Christians in other countries had been converted to Judaism. Other passages in which he showed how large a share of the profits of foreign trade
had fallen into the hands of Jews in countries where they were well treated, may have alarmed the London merchants and intensified their opposition. Nevertheless, in spite of his errors of judgement and the apparent incompleteness of his success, Menasseh had performed a great and timely work for the Jewish race. The favourable condition of the English law, which the Judges set forth at the conference of 1655, had been previously unknown. It was due to Menasseh's mission that the true state of the law was declared by Chief Justice Glynne and Chief Baron Steele; and this declaration was a greater boon to the Jews than any success that the most brilliant advocacy could have achieved. There is no passage in Mr. Wolf's essay which shows a more masterly understanding of the forces which were shaping the fortunes of the Jews in England during the critical period of the Commonwealth, than that in which he points out how much English Judaism gained through the unostentatious manner in which the Resettlement question was settled. "If the solution of the Jewish question arrived at towards the end of 1656 was not wholly satisfactory, it was precisely in that fact that its real strength lay. Experimental compromise is the law of English political progress. From the strife of wills . . . . . . had emerged a compromise which conformed to this law, and which consequently made the final solution of the question an integral part of English political evolution. The great merit of the settlement was that, while it disturbed little, it gave the Jews a future in the country on the condition that they were fitted to possess it. The fact that in its initial stage it disturbed so little rendered it easy for Charles II to connive at it. Had Menasseh ben Israel's idea been realized in its entirety, the task of the restored Monarchy would have been more difficult. London would have been overrun by destitute Polish and Bohemian Jews driven westward by persecution, some fanaticised by their sufferings, others plying the parasitic trades into which commercial and industrial
disabilities had driven the denizens of the Central European Jewries. Many of them would have become identified with the wild Judaical sectaries who were the bitterest enemies of the Stuarts, while others would have given new life to the tradition of Jewish usury, which for nearly four hundred years had been only an historical reminiscence in the country. Under these circumstances, we can well conceive that a re-expulsion of the Jews might have been one of the first tasks of the Restoration. From this calamity England and the Jews were saved by the restricted character of the compromise of 1656."

To Menasseh, worn out prematurely by the sorrows of a troubled life, the outcome of his mission may well have presented itself under a different aspect. Mr. Wolf states that he regarded it as "a compromise of a purely selfish nature," and conjectures that it was his refusal to rest content with the new settlement that prevented him from becoming the Rabbi of the London congregation. The statement as to Menasseh's attitude is somewhat more definite than the evidence justifies. But it is certain that the man who had ventured into a strange country, in the hope of securing a home for the Jews of his own and future generations, found there no resting-place for himself. Within a year after the conclusion of the Whitehall conference, he was sick and destitute: and yet it was not to the rich Jewish merchants of London that he turned. "I make my moan to your Highness," he wrote to Cromwell, "as the alone succourer of my life in this land of strangers to help in this present exigence." Cromwell, in order to relieve his necessities, granted him first a gift of £25 and then a pension of £100. In September, 1657, his son died, and on his deathbed exacted from his father a promise to bury him in his native Holland. Again Menasseh turned, not to his co-religionists, but to Cromwell, and undertook to surrender his pension (of which no part had yet been paid to him), on condition that he should receive £200 wherewith to discharge his debts and meet the expenses of his journey.
This sum was never issued. Menasseh left England in the autumn of 1657, and died at Middelburg in Zeeland on November 20.

In the preceding pages some of the chief results of Mr. Wolf's researches have been summarized; but any student who would appreciate the remarkable value of his contribution to historical knowledge must familiarize himself, not only with his latest essay and with his earlier writings on the subject, but also with the accounts of the Resettlement that had previously been published. In this way alone is it possible to realize how much more complete, intelligible, and interesting is his narrative than that of any of his predecessors. The elements of the story which he was the first to make known include the existence of the crypto-Jewish community in London before Menasseh's mission, the personal history of its members, the growth of pro-Jewish sentiment in England before 1650, the relation between the Jewish question and Cromwell's commercial policy, and the quasi-legal recognition in the period between the Whitehall conference and the end of the Protectorate of the existence of the Jewish community in London. Until these pieces of knowledge were supplied, it was impossible that the first chapter of modern Anglo-Jewish history should be intelligibly written. All that was possible was either an honest statement of disconnected facts, or a narrative invested by hazardous conjectures with an appearance of completeness. When such was the state of knowledge, there was little to be gained from the study of this period of Anglo-Jewish history. As Mr. Wolf has now told the story, it is one of romantic interest, so great are the issues with which it deals, so varied the influences by which the result was shaped, so unexpected the vicissitudes which six years witnessed. And there is more than interest to be found in the story. If the Jews of Europe are to be well equipped for meeting the troubles which may threaten them in the future, they must be acquainted with the relations that have existed in the
past between their co-religionists and their non-Jewish fellow citizens; and, when the history of a crisis in the affairs of the Jews in any country is faithfully told, a great service is rendered to the race. Such a service Mr. Wolf has rendered. He has for the first time made it clear who were the friends and who the opponents of the Jews in England in the seventeenth century, against what prejudices they had to contend, and what were the forces that worked in their favour. By his treatment of one great episode he has shown how the history of the Jews in England should be written; and in so doing he has shown why it should be written.

LIONEL ABRAMS.
NOTES ON A NEWLY ACQUIRED
SAMARITAN MANUSCRIPT.

The number of Samaritan Pentateuchal MSS. accessible to European scholars has been increased by one recently presented to Westminster College, in Cambridge, by Mrs. Lewis, LL.D., the well-known discoverer of the Sinaitic Gospel Palimpsest, and her sister Mrs. Gibson, LL.D. It was purchased for them at Jerusalem in the summer of 1900. Something of its recent history can be learned from the colophon cited below; but whether the individual who is there said to have paid for the rehabilitation of the MS. is the same as the one who ultimately sold it, I have not been able to ascertain. The vendor's own statement was that the book had been in the possession of his family for many generations. Although by no means one of the oldest known MSS. of its class, it has nevertheless a certain interest; and a short account of its contents and characteristics may not be out of place in this Review.

The volume contains 308 leaves of a vellum MS. dating from the beginning of the sixteenth century (see below). The size of the leaf is 10½ in. broad by 15½ in. deep. These leaves are mostly intact, but a considerable number are more or less mutilated; and where this is the case the rent edges are neatly pasted to a piece of paper on either side, making the fragment up to the proper size; and on these the missing text is written. Both at the beginning and the end several leaves have been entirely lost; and accordingly the opening chapters of Genesis (i. 1–vi. 21) and the close of Deuteronomy (xxxii. 4 to end) are written on paper sheets of the same size as the vellum. Fol. 307 (numbering from the beginning of the paper) is also re-
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placed by a complete sheet of paper. Foll. 293–306 are detached from the binding; singularly enough these are the very leaves which contain the acrostic (see below) giving the date, &c. of the writing. As it stands, therefore, the MS. is a complete copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the whole being bound in red leather, stamped in nine places with the motto: "Let none touch it but the pure."

The vellum, which is rather coarse in quality, is written on both sides; on the inside of the skin the characters are almost as distinct as when first written, while on the hair side they are frequently barely decipherable. The faded lettering has sometimes, but not regularly, been retouched or rewritten by the hand that wrote the paper portions; and other corrections appear to have been made at different times. Each page contains two columns: on the right is the Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch (seven to ten Massoretic verses in a column), and on the left an Arabic translation. Both are written in the Samaritan character, although in the left-hand column the later scribe occasionally resorts to the ordinary Arabic script, when pressed for room. I have not found any instance of this in the original (vellum) MS. Both columns exhibit a common feature of Samaritan MSS. in the tendency to isolate the last two letters at the end of the line; but very often the lines are too crowded to allow of any interval.

On the last paper page there is a colophon of seventeen lines, describing the circumstances under which the MS. was patched up, and fixing the date of that operation with absolute precision. It is written in a cursive Samaritan script, and in a very compact and regular hand. Transliterated in Hebrew letters it is as follows:

1 ביכלחת. יוה. רוחמן. ורב. צדיק. ויה.beckan. ו.
2 מ одном. אה. חרות. ועורשת. ומכהנת. ומעעד. ומכנה:
3 כמ. יראות. וארתה. כמ. אותת. ומכהת. ובchers. ווי. וכרית.
4 הנ. כמ. ויה. שואלא. ובשר. ויה. ורביע. כמ. ויהשון. וכריב.
(1) By the power and mercy of the Lord and the greatness of his righteousness, the end was (reached) of (2) the restoration (?) of this holy law, and of the writing of what was defective in it (3) at its beginning and its end, of obliterated letters, on the evening of the fourth day, (4) the 28th of the month Shavuot, which is the fourth according to the Hebrew reckoning, (5) of the months of the year 1306 of the dominion of the sons of Hagar—the Lord (6) chastise it speedily (?)—and I his poor servant, laden with sins, seeking (7) of the Lord indulgence and mercy and pardon, Shlomoh the priest, son of (8) Amram, son of Shlomoh, son of Tobiah, son of Jichaq the Levitical priest, Shammash of (9) the sacred school (?) and the great name (?) in the synagogue of Shechem: and I restored (?) this (10) law by the aid of him in whose hand it was at the time when I restored it, the good (11) man, my brother in religion, Jichaq, son of Jichaq, of the sons of Merhib; may the Lord (12) by the holiness of this law (?) lengthen the days of his
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life, and give him children (13) and grandchildren—may they be good!—of such as keep his holy law: (14) Amen. And the foresaid man gave me my hire of what belonged to him: the Lord (15) make it up to him (or "renew his leaves?" see Job xiv. 7)! (16) Amen. And the peace of the Lord be on our lord Moses, son of Am(ram), (17) who recorded what God created from the beginning to the day of vengeance 1.

There are one or two points here which call for remark. The year 1306 of the Hegira corresponds to 1888–89 of the Christian era, the exact date of the colophon being apparently June 26 in the latter year. The writer, Shlomoh or Salameh, seems to have belonged to the Levitical family of Uzziel; and his genealogy can be traced in the succession of High Priests of that house given in Neubauer's Chronique (l. c., pp. 429, 465). His father Amram was High Priest at Nablus during Petermann's visit to the country in 1853 2, and during those of Mills in 1855 and 1860 3. Salameh the father of Amram is well known to scholars as the correspondent of Silvestre de Sacy and the French Foreign Office during the period from A.D. 1808–26 4. Of the younger Salameh I have not been able to find any trace, although it is possible that

1 For the above translation I have been much indebted to hints kindly given me by Dr. Schechter of Cambridge University, who has pointed out in particular the occurrence of several strange words in the Samaritan Liturgies published by Heidenheim. Much of the phraseology is still obscure to me, although the general sense is clear enough. The words רֶבוּךְּ and רֶבּוּךְ I have ventured to connect with a meaning given in Brockelmann's Lexicon for the Syriac حيث : viz. executus est, perfect. The "sons of Merhib" are mentioned in the Chronique Samaritaine, published by Neubauer in 1869, as one of four families into which the Samaritan community at Shechem is divided (see Journal Asiatique, XIV, p. 466). The eulogy on Moses at the close has a parallel in Heidenheim's Die Samaritanische Liturgie, Heft III, p. 41, ll. 15, 16.  
2 Petermann, Reisen im Orient, I, pp. 266–292. 
3 Mills, Three Months' Residence at Nablus, &c. (1864). 
4 The letters were published by De Sacy in Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la bibliothèque du roi, Tom. XII, pp. 1–235 (Paris, 1831).
some mention of him may exist in the works of recent travellers. At all events a son of Amram (presumably too young to be made High Priest in his father's lifetime) might very well be alive at the very recent date of the colophon. According to the Chronique (l.c., p. 466) Amram appointed his nephew Jaqob ben Haroun as his successor in A.H. 1273 (A.D. 1856-57); and in the fifth edition of Baedeker's Palestine (1900), Jaqob is given as the name of the present High Priest. Salameh appears, therefore, to have held only the subordinate office of Shammash or deacon in 1889.

All this, however, throws no light on the more important question of the age of the older (vellum) MS.; and since the last part of the document has been destroyed, it would not have been surprising if we had been left to determine this point from palaeographical indications. Happily this is not the case. The needful information is furnished by an acrostic, worked into the text in the curious manner characteristic of Samaritan scribes. In folios 293 to 305 of this MS., for instance, a clear space, about a quarter of an inch wide, is observed running straight down the centre of each column, like a passage between the pews of a church. This space is reserved for the letters forming the acrostic. The scribe goes on with his work, carefully avoiding the narrow central column, until he comes to the letter he wants in a suitable position; then he brings it out into the clear space in the middle; and thus, without altering a letter of the text, he slowly puts together, in perpendicular order, a short account of his own work. Unfortunately the later scribe has not been careful to preserve the alignment; and hence it is very difficult to trace the acrostic through the passages supplied by him on paper. But so far as I can make it out it reads, in the Hebrew columns, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{כְּתִב} & \quad \text{אָחָת} & \quad \text{הוֹרְאָה} & \quad \text{הָקִירִית} & \quad \text{הָעְבֹר} & \quad \text{תָּעוֹן} & \quad \text{הָסָכְנָה} & \quad \text{הָרָפִּינוֹן} & \quad \text{אלָך} \\
\text{רָחוֹת} & \quad \text{יוֹתָה} & \quad \text{רָחֲמָוָה} & \quad \text{אַבְרַמְיָה} & \quad \text{כֹּן} & \quad \text{שָׁת} & \quad \text{כֹּן} & \quad \text{רְחָמִי} & \quad \text{אֲוֵרִי}
\end{align*}
\]
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There is a similar acrostic in the Arabic columns which reads thus:—

It would appear, therefore, that the MS. was written at Damascus in the last month of the Mohammedan year 909, i.e. A.D. 1504. It may be mentioned in this connexion that the MS. has two features which are said not to be found in the very oldest MSS.: one is the numbering of the Ten Commandments on the margin, and the other the addition of a note to the end of each of the five books, stating the number of דְּנָת, or sections, which it contains. The style of the writing will be seen from the accompanying plate, on which part of the acrostic appears, and which at the same time illustrates the patchwork additions made by the writer of 1889.

The text of the MS. so far as I have yet examined it, exhibits all the salient features of the Samaritan Version

---

1 See Rosen in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, XVIII, p. 588 f.
of the Pentateuch; individual aberrations are frequent, but very slight, and for the most part probably mere scribal errors. In order to give some idea of the soundness of its text, I here append a list of divergent readings in Genesis, based on a comparison with Petermann's list of variants, whatever that be worth. I have divided them for convenience into three classes: I. Readings in which the MS. differs from the Massoreteic Text, while Petermann gives no variant. II. Those in which the MS. agrees with the M.T. against Petermann's Samaritan. III. Cases where the MS. reading differs both from the M.T. and Petermann. This method has, of course, the disadvantage of not bringing out the really interesting peculiarities of the Samaritan Pentateuch; but it affords the readiest means of representing the idiosyncrasies of the particular MS. we are concerned with. I have not thought it necessary to include in the lists differences in the use of the matres lectionis; with regard to these it is enough to say that the MS. fully shares the partiality of the Samaritan Version for the scriptio plena.

I. Differences from Massoreteic Text not noted by Petermann. (The first reading of each pair is that of the MS., the second that of M.T.)


1 Versuche einer hebräischen Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutigen Samaritaner, &c.; in Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Bd. V (1868), pp. 219 ff.
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above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
21 omitted: x. viii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
above the line!): 14 already | 18, 19 omitted entirely:
21 14 | 21 omitted above the line: viii. 2 | 21 omitted:
23 vii. 16 | 21 omitted:
II. Agreements with Massoretic Text as against Petermann's Variants. (The reading common to the MS. and M.T. stands first.)

Gen. i. 2. על אלים | על ב Crimes: 2 
iii. 9

II. 11 | על蜻蜓

xvi. 11

xiv. 20 | עלם | על Crimes: 20

xxvi. 25 | על Crimes: 25

xxv. 25 | על Crimes: 25

xviii. 7 | על Crimes: 7

xxvii. 12 | על Crimes: 12
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III. Cases where the MS. differs both from M. T. and Petermann's variants. (In the following order: MS. | M. T. | Petermann.)


Between xxx. 36 and xxx. 37 the Sam. has a long insertion, in which the MS. gives two readings different from Petermann's, viz. 31 ש for 31 נ and 3 נ for 3 נ: xxxi. 33 | ממ | ממ (sic): xxxii. 14 | קמא | קמא: xli. 56 | ח"ס | ח"ס (sic): xlv. 1 | ה"ס | ה"ס (sic): xlvi. 16 | ה"ס | ה"ס (sic): xlvii. 12 | י"ע | י"ע: xlix. 17 | י"ע | י"ע (sic): 17 | ייבס | ייבס.

As has been said, the Hebrew text is accompanied by an Arabic translation, which follows the original closely line by line. Substantially the same version is found in a much older Samaritan Pentateuch in the Cambridge...
University Library (No. 714, dated A.H. 616), which again for the most part corresponds, page for page and line for line, with the recently discovered MS. A comparison of the two in a few passages shows a good many variations in the Arabic; and of these a large proportion must have been deliberately introduced. The version is undoubtedly that of Abu Said, which is believed to have supplanted amongst the Samaritans the older Jewish version of Saadya in the eleventh or twelfth century. The text of Abu Said, as far as the end of Leviticus, has been edited by Kuenen (1851-54), from three MSS. whose age is not stated. Now, so far as my examination has extended, the two Cambridge Pentateuchs do not seem to differ much more from each other than Kuenen's three MSS. differ amongst themselves; and while his text agrees now with the one and now with the other (frequently, of course, diverging from both), in the great majority of the instances examined it is the younger MS. which coincides with Kuenen's edition. As a specimen of the kind of variations that occur, I may take the following from the famous crux interpretum in Gen. xlix. 10 (ךז י ב ו הנפל סולומון). In one of Kuenen's MSS. הנפל is simply transliterated סולומון: the other two boldly substitute סולומון. The Cambridge MSS. both read הנפל; but in the older the word is followed by the gloss יִקְרָא אֵלַי הַנָּפָל (“and he shall be called Solomon”). Here again the younger MS. comes nearest to Kuenen's text; the other perhaps represents a compromise between a traditional interpretation and the desire to be faithful to the original. I do not venture to draw any general conclusions from these facts, my object being mainly to bring the new MS. under the notice of Samaritan scholars. It is not unlikely that its chief value will be found to consist in the light which it throws on the history of the principal Arabic translation current among the Samaritans.

J. Skinner.

GENIZA SPECIMENS

SAADYANA.

First Article.

The following pieces, with the exception of piece VII, belong all to the T.-S. Collection, Cambridge. They are not classed yet, but are all deposited in a box labelled "Saadyana," containing fragments from works composed by the Gaon, R. Saadyah, or bearing in some way upon his life and activity, and mostly marked A, B, C, &c. These fragments are reproduced here line by line and page by page, and are provided with such short descriptions and brief comments as seem necessary in this place.

I

Fragment A, paper, size 17.7 x 13.5 cm. (writing 14 x 10.2), consists of a quire of two leaves, of which the middle pages are missing, and counts eighteen lines on each page; written in a square, ancient Rabbinic hand, not later probably than the eleventh century, and is divided into verses, and provided with vowel-points and accents "like as one of the twenty-four sacred books." The importance of the MS., however, is to be found in the fact that it restores to us the initial pages of the Sepher ha-Galui (תנ"ע ח"ג) by R. Saadyah as well as a portion, however small, of its later contents. As is well known, there existed two versions of this work, the original Hebrew and an Arabic translation of it prepared

1 See Graetz, vol. V, ch. x, about R. Saadyah. For our purpose here it is enough to point out Dr. Harkavy's edition of the Arabic S. b-G., forming a portion of his Studien und Mittheilungen (과학 אָבָּה), V, 133 a-238 b.
by the Gaon himself. A part of the latter was recovered by Firkowitz and edited by Dr. Harkavy, whilst the following four pages represent the original Hebrew. This is clear from the description given by the Gaon of the original work. According to it, the work commenced with the lines רבעי וכר היל intermediary phrases, all of which lines and phrases are found in our MS. The Gaon also tells that he spoke in the second chapter of his book of the number of years during which the gift of prophecy continued in the nation as well as of the date of the compilation of the Mishnah, which subjects indeed are dealt with in the second page of our MS. We know also that the Gaon spoke of himself in this book in the third person, a fact which brought on him the reproach of his antagonists, reminiscences, however, of which rather strange style are to be found in this fragment. A further subject of reproach was also the external form of the book, the author having divided it into verses and provided it with vowel-points and accents. This his antagonists maintained was done with the purpose of giving to his writings the appearance, and hence the importance, of Scripture; as already mentioned above, and as can be seen from the facsimile accompanying, this is also the case with our MSS.

The condition of the fragment is on the whole fairly satisfactory, with the exception of leaf 1 recto, which, as it seems, was turned to the ground, and thus received a coating of mud, obliterating a great portion of the writing. From the

1 Harkavy, ibid., pp. 150–180.
3 Harkavy, ibid., p. 160, l. 21. Cf. our MS., I, p. 2, ll. 2 and 3. See also Harkavy, ibid., p. 55, l. 10, and note 41 to it.
4 Harkavy, ibid., p. 152, ll. 14–17.
5 Harkavy, ibid., p. 190. Cf. our MS., I, p. 3, l. 1, and p. 4, l. 15.
6 Harkavy, ibid., p. 160, ll. 15–18.
7 I have to express my thanks to my friend Mr. S. M. Harris, of Southport, who prepared for me from this page an enlarged photograph, which helped me greatly in the deciphering of this MS.
little I was able to read, the drift of the Gaon's thought was that Wisdom is the highest treasure, shining brighter than the brilliant stars; that she is a sort of emanation from God, and is serving as the light of the soul. Then the Gaon passes over to manifestation of God's will as revealed to us through the Torah (l. 8?), the Prophets (l. 10), and the Hagiographa (l. 11), which have become our spiritual food (l. 12). The last four lines, in their present mutilated and uncertain condition, give hardly any connected sense, and may perhaps have contained some words or phrase directed against her (Wisdom's) detractors. Of course, it is not impossible that our scribe had a defective copy at his disposal, or that he omitted matter seeming to him to be of a mere personal nature, and which he found repeated in another place. In the second page the Gaon expresses the opinion that the composition of the Mishnah began after the discontinuance of prophecy (leaf 2 recto, ll. 5–9), whilst the gathering of the gleanings—which as mere details or branches of laws (l. 10) could be entrusted to the nation as long as Israel remained in their country—commenced 500 years later, and received the name of Talmud (ll. 14 and 15). In the last three lines the Gaon speaks of the princes, interpreters, and those having compassion with the people (l. 16), who had the Lord's message to teach "Israel the Torah with a perfect heart," when the MS. breaks off. Probably these lines were followed by a list of the names of the prophets and of the heads of the fathers, the bearers of Tradition. The last two pages, which probably formed a portion of the third chapter of the S. h-G., give us the Gaon's prayer against "the robbers of our people" (leaf 3, l. 4), by which apparently his antagonist, the Head of the Dispersion, David b. Zakkai, is meant. R. Saadyah's appeal to "the God of judgment" may perhaps have some reference to the story according to which the quarrel between Ben Zakkai and the Gaon arose

1 Harkavy, ibid., p. 152, l. 10 וּמַעֲלוּתָם. Cf. also pp. 142 and 143.
2 Harkavy, ibid., p. 152, ll. 22 sq.
as a result of the latter's refusal to confirm an unjust verdict given by the former.

II, II a, and II b.

Fragment H, paper, size 21 x 16 cm., consisting of one leaf, written on one side only, in an ancient hand with a strong turn to cursive. Some words are provided with the superlinear punctuation.

Fragment B, paper, size 20.5 x 15 cm. (large writing 14.5 x 9.5), consisting of two leaves and written in a large square hand, but with a strong turn to cursive. Fragment C, paper, size 18 x 13 cm. (writing 15 x 15.5), consisting of one leaf, and written in a square, rather small, hand, but also with a strong turn to cursive. The three fragments are divided into verses, whilst the two latter are also provided with vowel-points and accents. They undoubtedly represent three MSS. of the Sepher ha-Moadim (ד اللغة מזמ) of R. Saadyah, which work was marked by these characteristics. The text, edited by Mr. Elkan N. Adler and Mr. I. Broyde, represents a fourth MS. of the same work, but all four MSS. overlap each other. My scanty knowledge of the subject does not allow me to enter upon any real comment of the controversy or to express any opinion on the merits of the various MSS. This I must leave to specialists. But apart from the difference of opinion about certain calculations, was also involved the question of principle as to the ancient prerogative of Palestine in the fixing of the calendar which Ben Meir, the "Prince of the Holy Land," wished to reassert, and the Gaon thought

1 See Harkavy, ibid., note 7.
2 Harkavy, ibid., p. 212. For subsequent publications and literature bearing on the subject see among others M. I. Lévi, Revue des Études Juives, XL, p. 261, and XLI, p. 229 sq. See also A. Epstein's essay containing a new edition of all the texts with introduction and notes, ibid., XLIII, pp. 173-210. As many of my notes were written before the appearance of this article, I must refer the reader to it here in bulk, as I could not always disturb my MSS. to make particular references to it.
3 See Revue des Études Juives, XLI, p. 225 sq. See also notes to our texts.
had long ago become obsolete. As it would seem, the controversy, though mild at first, was subsequently conducted on both sides with great bitterness, the aid of the secular arm was invoked, so that Ben Meir was submitted to torture; but this is the fate of all minorities, whether orthodox or heterodox.

III

Fragment D, paper, size 19 x 14 cm. (writing 15 x 10-5), consisting of one leaf written in an old square hand, and, like the former two, divided into verses and provided with vowel-points and accents. It is not quite clear what the point at issue is, but the reference to the Passover and the Day of Atonement would suggest that it formed a part of the Sepher ha-Moadim, though its style is rather different from that in which the two last fragments are written.

IV, IV a, V, and V a.

Fragments E and F, and the one marked IV a, paper, size 15 x 19 cm. (writing 11·7 x 14·2). The leaves are torn off at the end, so that it is impossible to say what the original length was. Fragments E and IV a consist of one leaf each; fragment F counts two leaves. They are all written in the same cursive (Rashi) hand, and come from one MS., which probably represented a collection of letters, and perhaps also treatises bearing on the Ben Meir controversy. Besides these four leaves there was also discovered a fifth leaf coming from the same MS., and containing the following words: 

This, probably, formed the conclusion of fragment E (IV) or IV a, of which there is strong reason to believe that they were written by the

1 See Harkavy, ibid., 212, as well as Dr. Poznański in the J. Q. R., X, p. 152 sq.
2 See Text V a and p. 58, note 3.
3 Perhaps the Chiffre כ' ; cf. Zunz, Zur Geschichte, p. 358.
Gaon. Fragment F (V and Va) was probably written by Ben Meir himself, addressed, as it seems, to a wavering adherent, warning him and others not to be intimidated by the threats of their antagonists, and holding himself up as an example of suffering for the truth. In this connexion it would also be interesting to reproduce the contents of another fragment composed by Ben Meir. The first lines correspond, making allowance for a few variants, with those published by Harkavy, p. 214, l. 14 to p. 215, l. 11, whilst the following lines in brackets, probably restore to us a portion of the missing page of Harkavy’s edition:—

The text is in Hebrew, and the first lines correspond, making allowance for a few variants, with those published by Harkavy, p. 214, l. 14 to p. 215, l. 11, whilst the following lines in brackets, probably restore to us a portion of the missing page of Harkavy’s edition.

These, together with VIII, probably represent the correspondence between him and Ben Meir to which he refers in the Sepher ha-Moadim.
I will only remark that the words נו והיון והיון=allude to Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezar, XLVI, according to which Moses, during the forty days on Mount Sinai, studied Bible by day and Mishnah by night. There is therefore no necessity for any emendation.

VI.

Fragment G, paper, size 21.5 x 16 cm., consisting of one leaf, written in a square, Rabbinic character, with a strong turn to cursive. It comes from an ancient calendar, a branch of literature strongly represented in our collection. The matter reproduced here represents the verso of the leaf, and gives the fixing of the New Year and the Passover both according to the Gaon and Ben Meir. This fragment suffered greatly from age, and it is only through the aid of my friend the Rev. Dr. Brann, of the Breslau Seminary, who assisted me in reading this proof, that I was able to reproduce this interesting monument of this controversy. For this assistance, as well as for various other suggestions on the subject, I wish to recognize my indebtedness to him.

VII.

Fragment, paper, size 14.2 x 9 cm. (writing 10.2 x 6.5), consisting of two leaves, and written in a square hand. This precious MS., though originally coming from Cairo, belongs now to the Hon. Judge M. Sulzberger, of Philadelphia, America, who kindly placed it at my disposal, for which liberality I express herewith my best thanks. This text represents a letter directed against Ben Meir, and recalls strongly the contents of a fragment also coming from the Geniza reproduced by Dr. Neubauer in this Review¹. The two were probably composed by the same author (R. Saadyah?), if not representing two versions of the same composition.

¹ IX, p. 37. Cf. the expression וּכְפָא, the allusion to רַבָּא, and his reference to the לָכַזְעַר, the לָכַזְעַר, and the לָכַזְעַר, with ll. 3, 29, 34, and 35 of this text. See also Epstein, Revue des Études Juives, XLII, p. 200 seq.
Fragment I, paper, size 18 x 14.2 cm., consisting of one leaf, and written in a cursive (Rashi) hand, but both paper and writing seem to be of a much earlier date than Fragments E and F (IV and V). It is torn and mutilated in some places, but what remains is sufficient to show that it forms one of the letters bearing on the Ben Meir controversy. It is to be remarked that this MS. does not read regularly, the last line of recto being written on the back of the first line of verso.

**SEFER ha-GALUL.**

I. (Leaf i recto)

This noun was used by Kalir; cf. Zunz, *Syn. Poesiedes Mittelalters*, p. 392. The letters in brackets are supplied after Harkavy, *ibid.*, p. 180, ll. 16-23.

The sign of the letter א between the lines represents probably the word סל政务服务.

Cf. the final נ ננ (Harkavy, *ibid.*), p. 58, ll. 8 and 9... and the mark א at the beginning of the line.
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Perhaps we should read נִצָּאָה.

Perhaps allusion to Berachoth, 5 a, where the Torah forms one of the three מְצוֹיו מְכַלָּה מִנָּה which God gave to Israel.

Read יָשֵׁרָה.

See Harkavy, ibid., p. 195, note 6, for references. The 300 probably represent a round number.
(Leaf a recto)

םדרות
לטני והאמור: "עבת אלחה ישראל
ואלה המפשטים את התחתי ישמש
את השמשי עליה ירבות עליה יננו
ו מראית עطني בהרי ער למשנה: ואתה
5
יאום הנבואהирован כי היה חתת המשלחת
שוחט ביני ובשחת התשאך להריתון עלולה
משבךינו אראים נכנאת הדרים ורורות נעשו:
יחם כל ברו: "אני neuen ותמשי כי נהלת
ביורימ שבכן יוש אמק חסם אתי אשת
10
הופמי אל וריעותיה הלך כי אם על ששך, אני
墟ך אריכים מים מר מעלה הנה שמש נעורה על
אם לא זכרה כי למשך גישה את اكثر כו
לעריתון אapot לא לא设置: להתריני מערית
אוה קדש המשמשין ניקום כו 물 נמשיח
15
כשדות בנו על ר_PWRך התשאך попу
כברantine הלאה סמו י"ח עור את המשמש
כשך לא תרצה י"ובבו בחוניי"ו: חוחアクセ
י"י לآلותרות וויתין לשים את סך

(Leaf a verso)

כ ואם שיש庭审 בינינו מנינמה יcameo רוחני
יכ לא קרית האמק אומר: "נור אשלריך
אל חות הלכות נשים וינוותו עד כי כל
מקור שבחש יכון שער", עוכר אל אשת
5
כשאן שמח כי החומק את הוא י"וי ובמשתת
שערוי היצא במלוא יין: את כי אליהים ירצה
יאה עתה כי לא לובד ההנה עליך ישיאל.

1 The word preceding וישר was probably י"ש. Cf. Harkavy, p. 162, l. 22.
2 In opposition to 'ו מיך, Isa. lviii. 6.
3 Here we have a marginal gloss which is, however, faded. Perhaps it read
בישר
4 Perhaps allusion to Genesis Rabbah, XVI, 4, where the Torah ("ותרה
'דנשת הלומד" ו"י' are the gold of the land of Genesis ii. 12 compassed by the
Pison originating from the Eden (ibid., verses 10 and 11).
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Sepher ha-Moadim.

II.

5 probably בֵּית נָטַן נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו שֵׁדֶֽה נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו

1 Pointed שֶׁיְּכַלֶּנַּו שֵׁדֶֽה נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו.

2 Pointed정보 See Obadiah 12 בְּזִמְנָה שֶׁיְּכַלֶּנַּו שֵׁדֶֽה נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו. Cf. RV.

3 See Retour des Ét. Juives, XLI, p. 227, where Ben Meir is also called שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו שֵׁדֶֽה נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו.

4 So in the MS.

5 Probably probably for בֵּית נָטַן נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו שֵׁדֶֽה נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו; whilst Elul is chosen as one of the יְנָטַן נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו שֵׁדֶֽה נַפְשׁוֹ שֶׁיְּכַלֶּֽנַּו. Cf. below II a, leaf 2 verso, l. 15.
ניקרים;载于文献无，编者引用，未有引注。äl מוחל קלקר בבל
זכן הזז הצלח ול שם ובifestyles חבר עם שמיים
לא נמצאה עשרה;מסת動物 חס帏 חס帏 חס帏 חס帏 עשר מופעים

II a. (Leaf 1 recto)
usher המה זוחל על תאר

1 So in the MS.
2 The contents intervening between this word הָנְפָר and the word ו in line 26 is also to be found in the next fragment.
3 Pointed זֶה.
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From this word to יב below, line 8, our text corresponds with Mr. Adler's Fragment in the Recus des Ét. Juives, XLI, p. 227, whilst the whole of this page and the one following correspond with the text of the next Fragment II b, recto, l. 11 to verso, l. 14 (the word וה).
See the letter of R. Sherira Gaon about the error of the text.

For the next fifteen lines (till the word רבד) see Mr. Adler's Fragment as above.
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(verso)

למען מאבב יתורב להдачи על כל
נדבר אינדי חקל לא ו purchaser
ואל על נболותך ולאו אומדך לבר
על כלך שקר בוכך אלה הטמל על ענייך
צומח טש טש [משתף] ואשר בברם:"לא
מכ נה כביר אל... עני ו.TODOות להמציא על
שלכתך [יבי] להפר נורית להמשו

10
איכי לבקך את עד לחווכ עד את
הברים בחשאותו והשמם בפי
כבר כל אינדי אומד על כל חוסך מה: והר
בי היד חל השっと והבר מצלמה
המדברים אלא לשלב מרטה וגו
כותבים על ספר חבר החים לארשי

15
הש訇ה ואינ די"ם

כתמאו: א"כ ברעם החובי דת את
אגרתו" א"כ בברים ויהיוIMENT
על עני עדאא א"ש בי אברים במלול

(נְדוּקְרָה לִדְבְּרִים צְורָה)

יחורל' תוד טעמהי... יביר הניף לים
בניחי ענparable הלשון: יחיוים אוחי
לצומח סעובה השם על כל מה שיא
והשOneToMany הקד האור מאת ה萜ר האור
לפפידי: א"ר בר לחיי על המכינים מ"ד
למשה לאמר א"ש[w][ש] ויבי אומד יב[ש] הלשון
סם היחה צורה: א"כ הנכון בא"ש וזכרו
10
לeroon א"והי בול תוקם כמות
יחובר בברים ובלו הוגה חץ לע
כבר beherו על זה והשขาด מ
יתשר בוכות הכות בי מובע טעמה: במשריו

י 2
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III. (recto)

... (text continues on the next page)

1 Perhaps by this is meant Babylonian David b. Zakkai.
2 Ezek. xxi. 28.
3 Job ix. 47.
4 See Prov. viii. 13.
5 See Job xxx. 1, 12.
6 See Isa. xxv. 5.
7 Psa. xxxv. 5.
8 The MS. is obliterated and torn in this place. Perhaps it is a corruption of something similar. The preceding word can also be read כותב.
9 See Deut. xxxii. 13.
10 Perhaps by this is meant the son and the brother of Ben Meir. Cf. Revue des Ét. Juives, XLI, p. 286.
(verso)

V.

IV.

Job xxxi. 38.

Pointed כ. Perhaps corruption of יכ; cf. Isa. xxiv. 5.

Perhaps מ"ה, but the sense of the verse is not clear to me.

Pointed כ. 2

Pointed כ. Perhaps originally הבנה (substance).

Pointed כ. Perhaps corruption of בקול.

See Ps. xxxviii and Isa. xlvii. 11.

Cf. Pinaker, Lik. Kadmonieth, p. 40 (text) By בך מ"ה המשנים. By מ"ה מ"ה כמ"ה probably the well-known מצ"ה תוכי ר"ד, ל"ה (especially ch. 8, cf. M. Lévi, Revue des Ét. Juives, XI, p. 363, note 11) are meant. מ"ה would then have to be taken in the sense of paragraphs, not of a passage in the Mishnah. But this page and the next one seem to come from R. Saadyah or one of his adherents.
The Jewish Quarterly Review

The passage is a translation of a biblical text, likely from Deuteronomy, into Hebrew and then back into English. The text discusses the historical and religious significance of the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem.

---

1 See Sanhedrin, 11 b, and parallel passages.
2 Deut. xii. 5. For the Rabbinic passages see Sanhedrin, ibid.
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IV a. (recto)

... inexplicable text...

IV a. (verso)

... more inexplicable text...

Digitized by Google
1 See Isa. iii. 24.
2 See Harkavy, p. 216, l. 1, and the editor’s explanation of this word, ibid., p. 212.
3 See Tractate Shabbath, 75 b, for this phrase. But here it has probably the meaning of striking with some such instrument as a hammer to call the faithful to prayers.
4 See Harkavy, ibid., p. 233, text and notes. The fact that R. Saadyah’s father died in Joppa is new.
5 Isa. xix. 14.
(Leaf i verso)

(Leaf ii recto)
This seems to be in contradiction to Text II b, p. 2, ll. 4 and 5, according to which they did not appeal to the king against Ben Meir. But our text here may have reference to a later stage in the development of the controversy.

This would suggest that the Karaites also were in some way mixed up with this controversy, though it is possible that it may be a corruption of אבר.

See Harkavy, 309. The letter of Ben Meir there contains many terms and allusions to facts turning up again in our text.

1 a Chron. xxx. 18.

...
VI.

Calendar.

(lettero)

It seems that the scribe wrote first and corrected it into .

VII.

Letter bearing on the Saadyah and Ben Meir Controversy (MS. Sulzberger).

(lettero)

It seems that the scribe wrote first and corrected it into .
See Ps. xxxi. 23.

I was unable to identify this place, but the name sounds Persian.

Originally ס and subsequently corrected into ס.

Here follow a few Arabic lines, but experts who have examined them assured me that they have no bearing on the preceding matter.
The text is in a combination of Hebrew and Latin script, with some Hebrew characters written in Latin script. It appears to be a passage from a Jewish text, possibly a letter or a narrative, written in Hebrew and translated into Latin. The Latin text includes parts that are not fully legible due to the handwriting style and the quality of the image. The text is written in a flowing, continuous manner, typical of handwritten documents.

**The passage begins in Hebrew script and transitions to Latin script.**

---

**Translation:**

The text is a mixture of Hebrew and Latin characters, indicating a translation from one language to another. The text seems to be a passage from a religious or scholarly work, given the context of the language and the style of writing. The handwritten nature of the document suggests it might be a historical or ancient text.

---

**Notes:**

1. The translation of the Latin text is not entirely clear, and some parts may require further study to fully understand the context and meaning.

---

**Digitized by Google**
S. SCHECHTER.
בשנים אחדים ושתים לאחר מכן, המשיכו הדרים את ניתוחם המורחב של המ꿀ים, והם התמקדו בקצתים מחקרים חדשניים. הם הועלו במאמר ב-5 אפריל, שבו הם נתנו מדריך נוסף של מנהיגים, נכון, והם הראו כי ניתן לפגוע בetskוף ולשחזר את התוצאות בהצלחה. זה היה צעד חשוב בתהליך של תקיפת התוצאות והחזרה על ה compte יד啮 שבדל בין המקרים. הפרשות של המשנה הצהירה, אמת, שה reklם לעם, אך זה לאستانות בנתים של שלום ושלום. בחודשים הבאים, הם הוזדו במאמר, שבו הם הראו כי ניתן להשתמש בשיטות הזרummy כדי לשבור את הבן והלאה של המקרים בלהיות. זה היה צעד חשוב בתהליך של תקיפת התוצאות והחזרה על ה compte יד啮 שבדל בין המקרים. הפרשות של המשנה הצהירה, אמת, שה reklם לעם, אך זה לאستانות בנתים של שלום ושלום. בחודשים הבאים, הם הוזדו במאמר, שבו הם הראו כי ניתן'utilisation בשיטות הזרummy כדי לשבור את הבן והלאה של המקרים בלהיות. זה היה צעד חשוב בתהליך של תקיפת התוצאות והחזרה על ה compte יד啮 שבדל בין המקרי

1 The 1 is doubtful.
RELIGIOUS LIFE IN THE HOME.

It is a favourite commonplace with preachers—I have done my part in spreading it—that the centre of gravity of Jewish religious life has been shifted in these latter days from the home to the synagogue. The statement requires some modification.

In the first place, whatever shifting of the centre of gravity has occurred has been partial, not general. There are unquestionably many Jewish homes in which religion is on the wane. But there are also many, I am glad to think, in which it is as vigorous as ever. If there are families who are thrown back upon infrequent visits to the synagogue for the sustenance of a feeble spiritual life, there are others for whom attendance at the house of God is but the outcome and the complement of private devotions. At both extremes of our social organization, and at countless points between them, are to be found examples of a domestic religious life sufficiently strong to stand alone, if the need were to arise, without the buttress of public worship. In this respect the poor are no better off than the rich, nor the rich better off than the poor. It is easy to indulge in cheap generalizations, and affirm that the West Ender who bemoans the spiritual destitution of the Ghetto, exposes himself to the retort anent the mote and the beam. A little thought will show the fallacy of such contrasts. There is doubtless more ceremonial observance in the Ghetto. But if it would be wrong to infer from the fact that there is less religion among the poor, it would be equally wrong to infer that

1 A Paper read before the West London Synagogue Association on June 30, 1901.
there is more. The truth is that the extent to which ceremonial is put to religious uses is largely a matter of individual temperament. While some people cannot get on religiously without a great deal of it, others can comfortably dispense with all but a minimum. And if Whitechapel is not to be blamed, but praised, because it gives effect to its abundant need for ceremonial, Hyde Park must not be censured because, feeling that need less, it shows greater reserve in the expression of its religious sentiments.

Secondly, it may fairly be questioned whether such a shifting of the centre of gravity as that to which I have referred is possible—possible, that is to say, without involving the danger of instability. The preachers who repeat the commonplace with which I started, do so with no satisfaction. If Judaism has come to this pass, that it has to depend for its existence upon its public worship, then I fear it is in a bad way. The meagre proportions of the average congregation are a solemn warning against the comfortable illusion that the synagogue may be trusted to replace the home as the citadel of religion. It is not accomplishing this task now, and it never will accomplish it. It is obviously idle to suppose that one Kippûr in the year, even with a Passover thrown in, can furnish the materials of a healthy religious life. It may save a man for Judaism; it may rekindle in some measure his Jewish consciousness; it may keep him within the pale. But at most it may prove him to have the promise and the potency of religion. But that is all. Much more is needed to make him a religious Jew, one consciously living his life under the influence of Jewish ideals.

The synagogue then, by itself, can do little for religion; though, joined to a mightier, because a more continuous, a more pervasive force, it may do very much for it indeed. The true stronghold of Judaism, even in these days, is the home. In the ages of persecution Judaism lived a vigorous life because it had this fortress in which to entrench
itself. The Jew in his wanderings often had no syna-
gogue. But wherever he halted, he had some semblance of a home, which his religion at once ennobled into a sanctuary. The "domestic shrine" was for him no empty phrase. The home was almost as truly God's house as the synagogue itself. The symbol that was displayed at the doorpost proclaimed the fact to him in mighty tones. Deprived of his synagogue he was able, nay, he was bound to carry on its worship in miniature in the "little sanctuary" which he set up with his family tent. Sabbaths and festivals could live independently of the house of prayer, for their advent was honoured by special domestic rites. Nay, in every detail the home was a temple, and the commonest incidents of family life were transfigured into worship. The table was an altar, the food a sacrifice, the parents were priests, the children a congregation. It is impossible to exaggerate the part which the home has played in the preservation of Judaism.

It must continue to play that part. Our interpretation of Judaism may change, and with it our ideas of what constitutes home-religion. But the primary need remains. Judaism, if it is to live, must be rooted in the hearts of the children, and therefore it must be rooted in the home, whence the affections of the children draw their life-blood. There is reason to believe that we are once more beginning to realize this truth. The decline of home-religion during the past quarter-of-a-century is a fact patent to every one who has eyes to see and ears to hear. The movement is not Jewish, but general. It is part of a larger movement, moreover, which has injuriously affected religion itself. But the sensitive gaze will detect symptoms of a happy reaction. The tide of unbelief, which seemed to have submerged the thinking public three decades ago, has begun to flow back; and the Jewish mind, ever sympathetic to external influences both for good and for evil, has been caught in the ebb. The clear insight that has enabled thoughtful persons of every creed to see that the teachings
of a Darwin and a Spencer, a Tyndall and a Huxley, are not necessarily destructive of religion, has found its counterpart, doubtless its consequence, in a renewed disposition on the part of Jews to give the things of the spirit their rightful place among the realities of life. The indications of the change may be faint, but they are unmistakable. Congregations are certainly not larger, but they are inclined to be more devout. A new standard of teaching seems to be demanded from the pulpit. Those sermons appear to be most satisfying that help to reconcile the soul, oppressed by the cares of life, with the great verities of religion, with the conception of a just and loving God. The preacher is thanked more than ever for what are called "helpful" discourses, for words of comfort and encouragement that send some bruised heart to fight its battle anew with the fortitude that faith in the Unseen alone can give. This is a sign, not of blind belief, but of that "will to believe" which is incomparably more valuable. People at any rate listen while the preacher justifies the ways of God to men; not so long ago they would have been indifferent or impatient. A reawakening of interest in the Bible and Jewish history is also among the signs of a better day. Twenty years ago a Jewish Study Society in England would have been an impossibility. Finally, there is the improvement that has taken place in recent years both in the quantity and quality of Anglo-Jewish devotional and religious literature. All these are facts which, without exaggerating their significance, we may fairly regard as containing the promise, at least, of a religious revival. Judaism, then, we may justly hope, has not fallen so low as to have to depend upon the synagogue alone for the sustenance of its religious life. Its beliefs and ideals are once more taking root in the heart. But if the new movement to which I pin my faith is a reality, it will grow in healthy fashion. It will be no superficial manifestation. It will strike its roots downward. It will take its rise in the home, the spring
of all wholesome activities, the nursery of every exalted sentiment.

Thus I approach the practical side of my subject. I ask you to bear with me while I attempt to show how the new aspirations, in the existence of which I am sanguine enough to believe, may be realized, how the religious life of the home may be cultivated and deepened.

A religious life, as we usually understand the expression, is impossible without prayer. And so, without prayer, there can be no domestic religious life. The morning devotions are the foundation of the day's moral and spiritual activities, just as breakfast is the foundation of the day's physical and mental labours. It is the inspiring "send-off" given us by God himself as we set out on another stage of our life's journey. Upon that point we are all agreed. If there is to be religion in the house, it must have, as its starting-point, solitary prayer, the daily submission of one's need and oneself to infinite wisdom, the communion of "the alone with the Alone." But shall there not be collective worship as well? May not prayer in one's chamber be advantageously supplemented by family devotions? I would say Yes, for the sake of the children more especially. In former times, we are told ¹, the Bible and the Prayer-book were regularly studied by Jews in family conclave. Nay, the pious Israelite of old, wrapping himself daily in his talith, would recite the whole of the morning service; but he loved to have his boy by his side, though the child was old enough to repeat only a few sentences. For us the Prayer-book is no longer sacro-sanct, and we have assumed the right to choose our devotional materials for ourselves. But the old idea that brought parent and child together in prayer may well survive. There is something beautiful in this spiritual bond. The family stand together in the presence of God. That sacred communion unites them, and becomes the type and suggestion of a spiritual kinship transfiguring, rather

¹ Abrahams' Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, p. 131.
than transcending, the ties with which nature has bound them together. Through periodical family worship the home becomes hallowed ground in the sight of its indwellers, in the sight of the children more particularly. For them too prayer itself is clothed with a deeper sanctity, a heightened lovableness, by being associated with the parents. And their reverence for it lives when childhood and youth have long passed away. The prayerful habit is often fed by filial sentiment. The man goes on praying because years ago he used to pray at his mother's knee. He loves the act because she taught it him. The memories of childhood give it an added consecration which forbids him to let it die. Family prayer, moreover, is an excellent preparation for the public worship of the synagogue. Even in these days when children's services are beginning to be the fashion, it is well to have family worship both as an introduction and as a supplement to them.

It need hardly be said that all such worship should be simple and brief. A very few minutes will suffice for it on working days. As to the form of the service, the details may be left to the individual choice. But I would suggest that to a brief prayer or two, a psalm or some other scriptural passage should be added. The Psalm consecrated by traditional use is the twenty-third, "The Lord is my Shepherd." It has long been regarded as the children's Psalm. The first paragraph of the Shemang, which, by virtue of its associations and its contents, is well worthy of the distinction, should be a fixed ingredient. It would be well to say it, if possible, in Hebrew as well as in English, so as to accustom the little congregants to the sacred tongue. But the rest of the service will doubtless be in English. Even the Rabbins allow us to offer private prayer in any language we please.

I have spoken thus far of morning prayer. But that ought not to complete the devotional exercises of the day. Nor does it. The parent usually sees that the child does not lie down to rest at night without holding speech with
God. But there is an obvious danger in thus hallowing only the extremes of the day. Religion is apt to become a matter of times and seasons instead of an affair of life itself, a spasmodic influence instead of a continuous inspiration. The Rabbins sought to guard against this danger by associating a prayer with every act of the daily life, however familiar, on smelling the scent of a flower, for example, or partaking indeed of any enjoyment. The specific act was thus sanctified, and with it the whole domain of the daily life. Some of the Rabbinic ordinances, that of the Grace before and after meals, for instance, might well retain our allegiance. It may be objected that Grace tends to become a stereotyped formality. It is often said hurriedly, with an eye to the good things that are coming or to the welcome freedom from the restraint imposed upon well-bred children at table. But the objection can be urged with equal force against all devotional exercises that are not absolutely spontaneous. It is for the parent to warn the children against a merely mechanical performance of any religious rite by explaining from time to time the solemn significance of communion, either in word or in act, with the Supreme. My religion classes begin and end their work with prayer. Many of the children take part in it with closed eyes and bowed heads. They do this of their own accord. I have never told them to do it. I prefer to leave the matter to their own initiative rather than run the risk of making them formalists. But whenever I notice that a child's eyes are wandering or that his attitude or manner is unbecoming, I privately remind him of the lessons on the sacred import of prayer which he has so often been taught in class.

I am an advocate, then, of a short form of Grace for children. Properly explained, it helps them to realize the great duty of hallowing secular things which Judaism has done so much to inculcate. Even so commonplace an act as eating or drinking may be done for the glory of God, made one of the avenues to the higher life. Moreover, as
the Talmud finely says, to taste of earthly joys without thanksgiving, is to commit sacrilege. The recital of a Grace over food obviously fosters a sense of dependence upon the divine hand for the most elementary blessings, and with it the gratitude which is its corollary. These are invaluable factors of the religious consciousness; and a rite that helps to furnish them so readily is assuredly worth preserving.

Prayer, however, is not the only aid to the religious life. We Jews, with our religious history before us, certainly cannot afford to forget the truth. Judaism has largely to thank its ceremonial system for its survival. Nay, to speak more generally, ceremonial is the elementary requirement of the average religionist, whatever his creed. His very need of uttering himself in prayer proves it. For what are prayerful exercises but ceremonial? As soon as the religious sentiment becomes articulate, as soon as such feelings as gratitude or adoration or submission find expression in words, we have already entered the domain of ritual and confessed its necessity. But if this need be common to all, how greatly is it increased in the case of children, who can best seize the abstract through the concrete, and to whom religious truth comes home most surely when it appeals to their imagination and their wonder. The old Rabbins, who ordained that the observance of the Seder night should be made as strange and unusual as possible, so that the children might be provoked to ask questions and thus pave the way for the instruction which they had themselves courted, were clearly sound psychologists. And when we remember that Judaism is an historic system, with the moving life-story of Israel for one of its chief inspiring forces, the need of a ceremonial that shall make the past live vividly in the child's imagination retains, even in these days, all its old imperiousness.

Mr. Israel Abrahams quotes from Benjamin II the following striking custom, which formed part of the Seder ceremonial:—"A boy, dressed as a pilgrim, with a staff in his hand and a wallet containing bread on his
No; with all our praiseworthy desire to spiritualize our religion, we cannot dispense altogether with ceremonial observances. They are like the pictures in a book, which illustrate its meaning, and fix its story in the mind; and the children love them just as they love the pictures.

I hold no brief, of course, for Jewish observances as a whole. It is obviously impossible to use the entire ceremonial apparatus provided in the code-books. Not a little of it is obsolete for one reason or another. But then not a little of it is still living, and deserves to live. A notable example is the observance of Friday night. The gradual decay of this beautiful element of home-religion is being attended with serious spiritual loss. The hallowing of the Sabbath eve has perhaps done more than any other ceremonial act to preserve the religious consciousness in the Jewish mind. Nor is it difficult to account for its power. With the Sabbath there enter into the home that welcomes it those angelic visitants, peace and love. It is the time for family reunion, all the more precious in these days when parents and children see less of each other than of old, and when it is possible almost without absurdity to tell of a child asking with reference to his father, who the gentleman is that carves the joint on Sundays? And family reunion means the strengthening of the ties that bind youth to virtue. Friday night too is the season of family worship, with all its benign influence upon the religious sentiment. Into its observance ancient practice has woven many a picturesque rite—the solemn kindling of the Sabbath lamp, the benediction of the children by the father, the recital of the Sanctification, the breaking of the bread—symbols charged with impressive meaning for all, but especially full of charm for the young. These acts are

shoulders, enters, and the master of the house inquires: 'Whence comest thou, O pilgrim?' 'From Egypt.' 'Art thou delivered from bondage?' 'Yes; I am free.' 'Whither goest thou?' 'To Jerusalem.' 'Nay, tarry with us to read the recital of the Passover.' "—Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, p. 187.
still precious to many, and those who thus cherish them are assuredly not without their reward.

But whatever its precise details, let the custom of honouring the Sabbath eve continue. For its effects upon the young are immeasurable; nay, they are lasting. The memory of the Friday night of his childhood is the last to fade from the mind of the grown man; it is the last that is dislodged from his heart. Love binds him to the old observance and to the old religion—love all the mightier because, as in the case of prayer, filial sentiment enters largely into it. He clings to these rites with all the more affection because with them is inseparably blended the memory of the parents who presided over them in the dear old days.

But apart from all this, is there not something gracious in the act of consecrating a season out of the week of work and play to the service of the Highest? Granted that some people cannot sanctify the Sabbath day, it does not follow that they cannot hallow the Sabbath eve. And this remnant, at least, of the ancient obedience ought to be saved if the Jew is not to lose something more precious still, and to admit the sordidness of which it is the fashion to accuse him. Heine's *Princess Sabbath* is familiar enough. A maleficent sorcery has changed Israel, the King's son, into a dog.

But every Friday evening,
In the gloaming, suddenly
The enchantment passes, and the dog
Becomes again a human creature,
A man, with manly feeling,
With head and heart erect once more.

And if the down-trodden Jew of Ghetto-times was redeemed and transformed for the nonce by the coming of his Princess, her advent shall surely do no less for his more fortunate descendants in these days. It will preserve one oasis for them among the all too arid desert. It will keep a corner of their lives sweet and calm and joyous in an age that is
not too cleanly, and which is rather gay than glad. It will give their higher selves a chance; it will give God a chance.

To some of my hearers my language may seem exaggerated. But if so, I can only say experto crede. "How you enjoy your Sabbath meal!" cries a Roman emperor to a Talmudic sage. "Yes," is the answer; "we use a wonderful spice." "Give me some of it," says Caesar. "Impossible," is the reply; "for the spice is the Sabbath itself, and only those who sanctify it can appreciate its nameless delights." Yes, it is only those who hallow the Sabbath eve that can understand all the elevating happiness it yields. The old Sabbath poem calls it "a fountain of blessing," and that is exactly what it is. And of that blessing the children necessarily have a goodly share. For they breathe the religious atmosphere that the Sabbath brings into their home, and it feeds and nourishes them.

In the same category with the Sabbath eve we may place the Seder night, with all its wealth of old-world rites, all its store of old-world memories, an institution which, more directly than any other, brings us into sympathetic communion with the Israel of the past, and makes us the sharers of his griefs and his joys, his history and his hopes. But every festival, I submit, deserves a more honoured place in the home than is often assigned to it. Too many of us are content with celebrating our sacred days in the synagogue alone, and at a season of light the domestic sanctuary is left cold and dark. Surely if there is one place where "the Feasts of the Lord" should be welcomed, it is under the family roof-tree, where the children gather, children whom the holy guest may nobly inspire with his story.

And if we ought to reverence the consecrated seasons, why not the sacred symbols too? Take, for example, the Mezuzah. Might it not, at any rate, hang at the door of the nursery or the schoolroom, thence to carry its silent message to the receptive hearts within? No emblem makes
more surely for spiritual religion. Reserved as it is exclusively for the home, its characteristic lesson is the duty of sanctifying the home-life by personal goodness. And the gracious lesson is reinforced by the words it contains and by the Divine Name written across it. "The home," it cries, "may be made the abode of God if its indwellers will but enshrine him there by their own beautiful lives." Explain the emblem thus to the child, and you teach him a priceless lesson. It can be taught, no doubt, without recourse to the Mezuzah or any other symbol. But I question whether it can be taught as effectively.

And this suggests a word in favour of the old Jewish custom of consecrating a new house with prayer. It is a graceful and suggestive practice, which, it is good to think, is becoming more widely honoured among us in these days. But those who are faithful to it should not overlook its effects upon the young. At all such ceremonies—for the consecration of the house is only one of its kind—the children should be present. Even if they do not fully realize the significance of the rite, they will have the memory of it to weave into their religious consciousness, and perhaps to become a spiritual influence in the after-years. Who shall say how and when the good seed may germinate in a child's mind?

That ceremonialism is a valuable adjunct to religious training we seem now to be recognizing more clearly. We are beginning to see that a halt must be called to that process of wholesale demolition which has swept away indiscriminately the good with the bad in Jewish practice. A striking instance of this awakening is furnished by our brethren across the seas. A few years ago American Judaism was almost a synonym for destructiveness. But it is manifesting a new spirit. Retaining all its theological liberalism, it is showing signs of a more conservative temper with regard to ceremonial. An attempt is being made in many congregations of the United States to revive long-disused observances, to bring out the old symbols once
more, and by exhibiting their poetic meaning, to win fresh acceptance for them. At present I can discern no symptoms of a kindred movement in this country, but it is time that it came if our religion is not to fade away into a vague and colourless theism.

This again may be a hard saying, coming from me. It may be interpreted as a confession of the inadequacy of Reform, and as an indication of a desire to retrace our steps towards conservatism. But only those who are ignorant of the facts will so understand it. The movement of sixty years ago aimed not at the destruction of ceremonialism, but at its purification. The proof is in our Prayer-book, which retains the Kiddush for Sabbaths and Holydays and the Seder Service for Passover. And I rejoice to think that there are still many members of our congregation whose home-life is brightened and uplifted by the hallowing of Sabbaths and Festivals, clinging jealously as they do, especially for their children's sakes, to an observance which has been fruitful in blessing for themselves ever since the days of their own childhood. But even if I were conscious of advocating quite a new departure in the direction of conservatism, I should not be uncomfortable. The true reform is that which seeks for the constituents of its religion within the entire Jewish domain. And he who wanders in a garden ought not to be deterred from gathering a tempting flower because he will have to retrace his steps in order to reach it, and so confess that he has been heedless of some of the beauty around him. The task of the religious reformer is to rebuild. But in a system like Judaism he builds best who does not disdain the old materials.

But this by the way. Earnest-minded parents are sometimes at a loss to know how their boys and girls should spend Saturdays when in the country. Public worship is not available, and while the young people ought to have their due recreation, the day, we feel, ought not to pass without some formal recognition of its sacred character.
That there should be some sort of service, however simple, we shall, I trust, all agree by this time. Even in households where daily family prayers are not the rule such a service should be held, first in order to mark the sanctity of the day, and, secondly in order to prevent a violent breach between the religion of the town and that of the country. The home, for the time being, must take the place of the synagogue. Children must not be allowed to think that religion is a matter of geography, and that Sabbath devotions, while quite de rigueur in London, may safely be dispensed with—let us say—at Folkestone.

Short devotional meetings, then, ought to be held, at which prayer is supplemented by suitable readings from the Bible and other religious books. Valuable helps for such exercises are fortunately ready to hand in Mr. Alfred Cohen's little Prayer-book, Miss Lily Montagu's newly compiled service for children, Mr. Montefiore's Bible for Home Reading, and, for the younger children, the small volume on the Pentateuch written by my wife and her sister. There are also various collections of sermons by Jewish preachers which will furnish suitable passages for reading. These devotional exercises will doubtless take place, as a rule, in the house. But they may occasionally be advantageously carried on in the open air. A lady told me a few days ago that she was accustomed, when spending the summer holidays in the country, to take her children, with their prayer-books and bibles, into the fields or on to the hills. It is a good plan. It ensures variety, and Nature's glorious temple lends its impressiveness to the worship. Wherever they are held, the parent will strive to make these prayerful exercises as unconstrained and as lovable as possible, not only by wise choice of material,

---

1 Among other suitable books may be mentioned Little Miriam's Bible Stories and Boys of the Bible, both by Lady Magnus; Mrs. N. L. Cohen's Infants' Bible Reader; Mrs. Philip Cohen's Bible Readings with my Children; the late Miss Emily Harris's Narrative of the Holy Bible; Mrs. Henry Lucas's Jewish Year, and Miss Nina Davis's Songs of Exile.
but also by infusing into them as much fervour, as much of his own personality, if I may say so, as possible. The children ought to be able to look back upon these simple acts of worship as some of the most cherished incidents in their experience.

Saturday in the country—I might almost say every day in the country—is an excellent opportunity for those little informal talks on sacred and semi-sacred topics that help so largely to fashion the fabric of religion in the child’s heart. That opportunity especially presents itself in the walks that parents and children take together. Direct instruction the wise parent will know how to avoid. The child must gather in the firstfruits of the higher knowledge in almost complete unconsciousness of the fact that he is being taught. And these outdoor walks afford this special opportunity just because the instruction is spontaneous. No books will be used save Nature’s eloquent volume. The most familiar objects—sea and sky, meadow and mountain, the shore, the cliffs, the flowers, beast, bird, and beetle—all may furnish texts for little sermons about God and duty. “Speak of them to thy children when thou walkest by the way,” says the Bible; and surely it says well. These walks and talks are one of the child’s most coveted joys. But, like everything else, they will only be prized as long as they are not overdone. The Sabbath is to be a delight, not a weariness of the flesh. It is to be honoured by play as well as by prayer, by eloquent silence as well as by inspiring speech. Religion we should always have with us, but the religious teacher must efface himself from time to time if, when he does speak, his words are to be acceptable.

A hint, you will say, to myself. I take it, and will only stipulate for a peroration, the preacher’s dearest prerogative. I am not so sanguine as to believe that the ideas I have put forward are likely to be adopted by those who have long

---

since built up their home life on other lines. In the religious ordering of one's household it is, I admit, very difficult to begin de novo. But to those who have already anticipated my suggestions, this paper may possibly be useful in encouraging and confirming them in their practice. Nor can I forget that the generations come and go, and that one day youth, yielding to one of the most sacred of impulses, will be setting up a home for itself. When that day comes to one or other of my younger hearers I would fain hope that my pleading this afternoon may be found to have fallen on sympathetic hearts.

Morris Joseph.
GLEANINGS FROM SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE ARCHIVES.

I.

While writing the article "auto de fé" for the Jewish Encyclopaedia, I drew up a list of those autos in which Jews were concerned. Since then the excellent collection of Mr. E. N. Adler has appeared (Auto de Fé and Jew; J. Q. R., XIII, 392 et seq.). I have gone over my own lists and have drawn out whatever seems to have escaped the notice of Mr. Adler. Wherever the auto has been noticed by him, but where I can give further particulars, I have enclosed the note in parentheses. Those items marked "Efemerides" are taken from a list preserved in MS. in the Archivo Municipal at Seville, of which I have a complete copy; those marked "Catalogo" are from the Catalogo dos Manuscritos da Bibliotheca Publica Eborense (Lisbon, 1870), of which also I have a copy; Kayserling, N. = Die Juden in Navarra; Kayserling, P. = Gesch. der Juden in Portugal; Revista = Revista de España (Green Book of Aragon). During a visit paid to Spain and Portugal in September, 1900, I gathered a good deal of material which I purpose to publish in these "gleanings."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 28, 1484</td>
<td>R. E. J. x. 287</td>
<td>The chanoine Pedro Fernandez de Alcandele, treasurer of the Cathedral of Cordova, burned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 17, 1487</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 251</td>
<td>Son of Micer Luys de Santangel burned in effigy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 18, 1487</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 250</td>
<td>Mossén Luys de Santangel burned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 24, 1487</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 264</td>
<td>Galcerán de Almenara of Tamarit burned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14, 1487</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 268</td>
<td>Ruiz and Joan Pujol burned in effigy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 18, 1488</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 263</td>
<td>Bones of Jayme Ram burned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 1488</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 266</td>
<td>Father of Fernande Ram of Balbastro burned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 1489</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 251</td>
<td>Mother of Gabriel Galcerán burned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 11, 1490</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 251</td>
<td>Leonardo de Santa Maria (alias de Santangel), Graciana, and Joan Diez, merchant of Balbastro, burned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 1491</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 567</td>
<td>Juan Sanchez burned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 1491</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 265</td>
<td>Simuel Eli (alias Leonardo de Eli) burned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 8, 1495</td>
<td>Revista cvi. 270</td>
<td>Francisco de Avila, merchant, burned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 179</td>
<td>4 Jewish women burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 179</td>
<td>3 Jews burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 179</td>
<td>62 burned in effigy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 179</td>
<td>62 burned in effigy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 20, 1540</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 184</td>
<td>5 burned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 227</td>
<td>4 burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>Porto</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 238</td>
<td>4 burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 23, 1543</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.184 List of Autos in Evora, made by Diego Barbosa Machado</td>
<td>21 Lutherans and 40 other “Gravissimos delitto.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 1559</td>
<td>Valladolid</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.188 Efemerides</td>
<td>12 Lutherans burned, 2 of them clericals; 2 brothers; 40 penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sept. 24, 1559)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>6 burned; 40 penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April 26, 1562)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>6 burned; 35 penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(July, 1563)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>8 burned; 48 penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1564, Sunday of Lazarus)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Sept., 1566</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 5, 1567</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.183 in list of Autos made by Diego Barbosa Machado</td>
<td>5 Lutherans burned; 1 Spanish Dominican; 50 reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 25, 1567</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>4 burned; 60 reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May 8, 1569)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>2 burned; 55 reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oct. 29, 1571)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>4 burned; many penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec. 18, 1571)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>70 penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jan., 1573)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>2 burned, 1 alive; 50 reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jan. 8, 1575)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>2 relaxados; 70 penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Feb. 10, 1577)</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>81 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April 13, 1586)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>7 burned (3 men, 4 women); 80 reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 7, 1588</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.184</td>
<td>Sentença de Maria da Visitação, Prioreza da Annunciada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 1592</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>(General Auto) 3 burned; 17 casados; 2 vesas; 4 for false testimony; 85 reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 30, 1596</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>James Bolen of Scotland burned alive; others say that this was on the 13th of the month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 1600</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>15 young men burned; others say it was on April 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 3, 1603</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 185</td>
<td>Fr. Diogo da Assumpção burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2, 1604</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>&quot;Quemaron al viejo Gordo, sordo y ciego, que vendia cartillas en Friana, por el peccado nefando.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 6, 1604</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>General auto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 3, 1608</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 1615</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12, 1615</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1624</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>&quot;Personas que salieron al auto de la fée en Sevilla, en 1624.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 29, 1624</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>23 penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nov. 30, 1624)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>Sentence of Luiz de la Penha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 28, 1627</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 21, 1627</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>R.E. J. xxx. 96</td>
<td>58 Judaizantes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(July 22, 1628)</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 296</td>
<td>Not July 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sept. 2, 1629)</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 1630</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 188</td>
<td>Sentença contra Francisco Garcia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 172</td>
<td>57 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1634</td>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>Fernando de Perea, Portuguese, burned in effigy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 23, 1637</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>Rio de la Plata</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Jews were burned at this auto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 23, 1639</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 308</td>
<td>63 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April 2, 1642)</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Jews burned alive, 4 garroted, 80 sent to the galleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18, 1643</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Un Sacristatem que cogio el Santissimo Sacramento&quot; burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 1644</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Tres penitenciados, una Berberisca, un Casado dos vezes, y el Docttor Fernand Vaez de Silba, Judio Portuguez nacido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1, 1652</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.185</td>
<td>Sentencia de Manuel Leonandes, Villa Real.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 3, 1653</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemérides</td>
<td>21 men and 4 women penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18, 1655</td>
<td>Sant'Iago</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 15, 1658</td>
<td>Porto</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 313</td>
<td>5 men and 1 woman burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April 13, 1660)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemérides</td>
<td>2 women, 5 men burned; 2 men, 1 woman burned alive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oct. 17, 1660)</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 313</td>
<td>8 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 30, 1661</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Efemérides</td>
<td>24 men and women penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 1663</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 penitents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 1664</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 313</td>
<td>23 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6, 1666</td>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>Kayserling, Bibl. 17</td>
<td>Fernando de Espinosa, alias Benjamin Gil, Portuguese, native of Madrid, condemned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 1667</td>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>Catalogo of Inq. of Toledo, p. 185</td>
<td>Lopez, son of Abraham, burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 1679</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 181</td>
<td>52 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 1679</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 181</td>
<td>62 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1679</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 181</td>
<td>46 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28, 1679</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 181</td>
<td>13 victims.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (Oct. 28, 1680 | Madrid | Olmo, 299   | Auto particular: The following were "reconciled":
|            |        |            | Joseph Alonso, Beatriz de Castro, Isabel Perez, Elena González, Francisco Furtado, Antonio Pérez and his wife, Marie de la Peña, Gracia de Velasco (= Engracia de la Peña), Francisco González Carrion, Antonio Cardoso, Melchior Hernandez Carrion, Blanca Teresa Rodriguez, Blanca Nogueira, Ana Maria Díaz, Gerónimo Sabadini. |
| Aug. 8, 1683  | Lisbon | Catalogo iii. 185 | Sentença de Diogo Rodrigues Henriques Mougadouro. |
| (Mar. 3, 1691 | Seville | Efemerides | Victim is called "Don Jose Navarro." |
| Mar. 7, 1691  | Palma  | Kayserling, N. 182 | 3 burned; 34 strangled. |
| May 1, 1691   | Palma  | Kayserling, N. 182 | 25 victims.                                |
| May 6, 1691   | Palma  | Kayserling, N. 182 | 3 burned; 22 strangled. |
| June 2, 1691  | Palma  | Kayserling, N. 182 |                                             |
| Mar. 11, 1691 | Seville | Kayserling, N. 182 | "1 Licenciate, Juan Battista de la Barrera, 2 ubo casados 2 vezes, Lechizeras 2, outro embuster, un blasfemo Pastor, una testigo falsa, otro Galligo que fingiendo Ministro.... doscientos azotes, seis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 18, 1692</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>Berberiscos...dozeJudíos casí todos con carcel perpetua.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 30, 1693</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 1694</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 185</td>
<td>Auto particular in Convent of St. Francis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1701</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Kayserling, P.</td>
<td>Sentença de Anna Martins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(twice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 16, 1701</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 183</td>
<td>Sentença de Archangela do Sacramento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 2, 1704</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 6, 1705</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 185</td>
<td>Sentença de Manuel da Cunha Falcão.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec. 6, 1705)</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 321</td>
<td>1 Jew burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(June 30, 1707)</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 322</td>
<td>6 burned; 54 reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 1713</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(June 17, 1718)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15, 1721</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 186</td>
<td>1 man from Livorno burned in effigy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 188</td>
<td>Sentença contra Isabel de Castilho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Feb. 24, 1722)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 186</td>
<td>Alonso de Bargas of Palma condemned to perpetual imprisonment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April 12, 1722)</td>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 151</td>
<td>Catharina de Reyna y Medina, wife of Gabriel de Torres, and her son,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April 2, 1724)</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 151</td>
<td>Antonio Gabriel de Torres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 1722</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 10, 1723</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 185</td>
<td>Sentença de Francisco de Sá de Mesquita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April 2, 1724)</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 151</td>
<td>Simon de Alarcon of Valencia sentenced to perpetual imprisonment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2, 1724</td>
<td>Palma</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec. 16, 1725)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 186</td>
<td>Juan Alvarez de Espinosa condemned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aug. 18, 1726)</td>
<td>Llerena</td>
<td>Kayserling, N. 151</td>
<td>Juan Rodrigues of Bayonne condemned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 13, 1726</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii. 185</td>
<td>Sentença contra o Padre Manuel Lopes de Car-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 1728</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.183</td>
<td>Sentença de Catharina Fernandes. Auto particular; sentença de João Batista de S. Miguel. Also “Sentença contra José Rodrigues Mendes, queimado no mesmo dia”; and against D. Paula Thereza de Miranda, Madre Thereza de S. José.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6, 1732</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 23, 1736</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 328</td>
<td>4 men, 8 women burned, 30 condemned to imprisonment for life. (Antonio José da Silva, his wife and mother burned.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1, 1739</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Kayserling, P. 333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18, 1739</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.181</td>
<td>Abjuration of Antonio Rebeiro Sanches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 1741</td>
<td>Evora (?)</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1744</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20, 1748</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20, 1762</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.183</td>
<td>Luis Castellanos of Puerto de Santa Maria, physician, was victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 1767</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 18, 1767</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Catalogo iii.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1776</td>
<td>Seville (in Chapel of the Inquisition)</td>
<td>Efemerides</td>
<td>Maria de los Dolores Lopez garroted and then burned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aug. 24, 1781)</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.

In the Bibliotheca Publica of Evora are preserved a number of documents which are of interest to the student of Jewish history. I have made the following calendar of them from the catalogue mentioned above:—

Catalogo dos Manuscritos da Bibliotheca Publica Eborense, Tomo 3.

P. 15 (1). Justificação original de Thómas Pinto Brandão e seu irmão não terem raça de christãos novos.

(2) Relação da procissão de penitencia, que se fez em Coimbra na noite de 24 de fevereiro de 1738; pelo beneficiado Antonio Rodrigues de Almada.

P. 26 (3). Justa repulsa de murmurações contra o louvável procedimento do Bispo de Beja, nas ordens que conferir aos filhos dos denominados judeus . . . , por D. Manuel Evangelista Mascarenhas Oliveira e Silva, consultor do santo officio.

P. 47 (4). Carta do Cardeal Archiduque em 22 de Março de 1588, remettendo ao Arcebispo de Évora o Breve de 25 de janeiro de 1588, que exclui os christãos novos dos benefícios eclesiasticos.

P. 55 (5). Aviso de 12 de dezembro de 1601, em que Christovão Soares remette ao Arcebispo um exemplar impresso do Breve (datum Romae die 18 octobris anno nono Clementie 8) para não serem providos em benefícios eclesiasticos os judeus.

(6) Estatutos determinando as inquirições que se devem tirar dos que pretendem qualquer beneficio na Sé de Évora, para os que não sejam christãos novos.

P. 58 (7). Provisão do mesmo contendo a versão dos dois breves (de 18 de outubro de 1600 e 18 de janeiro de 1612), contra os judeus.

P. 75 (8). Relação do facto sobre a questão entre o Vigario Geral de Lamego, e o Juiz de Fóra da mesma cidade, na immunidade de D. José Coutinho Lencastré.

(9). Certidão dos títulos dos autos de inquirições de puritate sanguinie dos ordinandos do Bispo de Lamego.

P. 77 (10). Carta do agente do Duque de Bragança ao Papa Xisto 5, sobre o Bispo de Leiria não querer dar posse do Priorado de Ourem ao padre n'elie provido pelo Duque, por ter raça de judea.

P. 78 (11). Compromisso da irmandade e confraria de Santa Maria Magdalena, situada na igreja do mesmo orago de Lisboa. Iraza carta original de confirmação dada em Lisboa a 4 de fevereiro de 1566, por D. Jorge de Almeida, governador do Arcebispado.

P. 189 (12). Rei de 14 de junho de 1532, prohibindo a saída dos christãos novos, e autos de sua publicação em varias terras.
(13). Carta do Cardeal Infante D. Henrique a Peró Domenico, acerca da inquisição e christãos novos.


(15). Carta do Mestre Simão a El-Rei, dando conta dos christãos novos refugiados em Ancona.


P. 172 (17). Consulta de S. M., sobre as competências da inquisição das Índias e Audiência do México.

P. 173 (18). Proposta que se fez a El-Rei a favor da gente de nação, pelo Padre Antonio Vieira, sobre a mudança dos estilos do Santo Ofício, físico e distinção dos christãos novos e christãos velhos, na qual pondera muitos inconvenientes que se seguem do que se tem praticado nesta matéria, &c. (1646).

(19). Memorial a favor dos christãos novos, pelo Padre Antonio Vieira.

(20). Razões que o Padre Antonio Vieira representou a D. João 4 a favor dos christãos novos, para se lhes perdoar a confiscação dos bens, sendo sentenciados no Santo Ofício.

(21). Discurso sobre se é útil e justo desterrar dos reinos de Portugal os christãos novos, convencidos de judaísmo pelo tribunal do Santo Ofício, e reconciliados por elle com suas famílias, aquelas contra os quais ha prova bastante para o desterro.


P. 175 (23). Outro do mesmo a S. S., quando queria dar licença aos christãos novos para haverem perdão geral. Leiria, 6 de agosto de 1673.


P. 177 (27). Enxanxo judaico (atribuído a Mendo de Foyos Pereira).

(28). Noticias recônditas e posthumas dos procedimentos das inquisições de Espanha e Portugal, compiladas por um anônimo.

(29). Papel em que se mostram os danos que se têm feito ao reino no modo de proceder do Santo Ofício, pelo Padre Antonio Vieira.

P. 178 (30). Breve de Innocencio II, sobre os recursos dos christãos novos; e novo regimento nas causas dos judeus.
P. 178 (31). Outra do mesmo Bispo a S. S., mostrando as razões que o impossibilitavam de tomar conhecimento das causas dos judeus do seu Bispado.

P. 180 (32). Memorial sobre a Companhia da India pelos christãos novos.

(33). Denúncia que den Diogo Margalho, escrevente, contra os bens da confiscada Isabel Rodrigues, 1687.


P. 182 (35). Collecção de listas dos autos de fé nas tres Inquisições do Reino.

P. 183 (36). Listas dos autos de fé que celebram a Inquisição de Coimbra, desde 5 de outubro de 1567 a 20 de outubro de 1762, colligidas e dispostas por Diego Barbosa Machado.

Coimbra.

(37). Lista das pessoas que saíram no auto da fé em Coimbra, a 3 de agosto de 1608.


(39). Deferimentos do juízo, processo e sentença na causa do Padre Antonio Vieira, representados ao Summo Pontifice Clemente 10, e ao Padre Geral da Companhia, de que resultam o Breve do mesmo Papa isentando—o da jurisdição de todas as Inquisições de Portugal.

(40). Informações pro causa Patris Antonii Vieira Summo Pontifici Romae ab ipso praesentatae et expositae.

(41). Noticia do que passam o Padre Antonio Vieira com a Inquisição.

(42). Sentença que no tribunal do Santo Officio se proferin contra o Padre Antonio Vieira.

(43). Sentença de Archangela do Sacramento, no auto celebrado em Coimbra, em 16 de dezembro de 1701.

(44). Sentença de Catharina Fernandes, no auto de fé em Coimbra, em 9 de maio de 1728.

Evora e Goa.

P. 184 (45). Listas dos autos de fé celebrados pela Inquisição de Evora, desde 23 de setembro de 1543 até 31 de maio de 1767, colligidas e dispostas por Diogo Barbosa Machado.

(47). Lista do auto de fé celebrado em Evora, a 21 de junho de 1615.
(48). Sentença contra Luiz de la Penha, dada na Inquisição de Evora, em 29 de novembro de 1626.
(49). Apontamento sobre dois autos de fé em Evora.
(50). Sentença contra o Padre Matheus Francisco.

Lisbon.

P. 184 (51). Listas dos autos de fé que celebraram a Inquisição de Lisboa, desde 20 de setembro de 1540 até 18 de dezembro de 1767, coligidas e dispostas por Diogo Barbosa Machado.
(52). Catalogo dos autos de fé celebrados pela Inquisição de Lisboa, por João Baptista de Castro.
(53). Sentença de Maria da Visitação, Priora da Annunciada. Lisboa, 7 de novembro de 1588.

P. 185 (54). Sentença de Fr. Diogo da Assunção, queimado em Lisboa a 3 de agosto de 1603.
(55). Sentença de Manuel Fernandes Villa Real, no auto de fé de Lisboa ao 1º de dezembro de 1652.
(56). Sentença de Diogo Rodrigues Henriques Mogadouro, que se leu no auto celebrado em Lisboa a 8 de agosto de 1683.
(57). Sentença de Anna Martius, viúva, que saiu no auto de Lisboa em 16 de maio de 1694.
(59). Sentença de Francisco de Sá de Mesquita, no auto de Lisboa, em 16 de outubro de 1723.
(60). Sentença contra o Padre Manuel Lopes de Carvalho, queimado em Lisboa a 13 de outubro de 1726.
(61). Papel do Padre Gregorio Barreto, Jesuíta, sobre a diligencia que fez para reduzir à nossa fé o Padre Manuel Lopes de Carvalho.
(62). Sentença de João Baptista de S. Miguel, no auto (particular) da fé em Lisboa, em 6 de julho de 1732.
(63). Sentença contra José Rodrigues Mendes, queimado no mesmo dia.
(64). Sentença de D. Paula Thereza de Miranda, no dito auto de fé.
(65). Sentença da Madre Thereza de S. José, no mesmo auto de fé.

P. 186 (66). Sentença do Santo Ofício e da Relação, contra o Padre José de Sequeira, Lisboa, 26 de novembro de 1745.
(68). Relação dos processos do Santo Ofício, que tem o Padre Fr. Antonio do Espírito Santo, Franciscano.
(69). Relação dos processos do Santo Ofício, que tem Francisco Ferreira Pinheiro.
Sentenças de varias Inquisições.

(70). Sentença contra Fr. Alexandre de Murcia, na Inquisição de Lisboa em 1717, por libidinoso com as confessadas.  
(71). Sentença contra Fr. André da Conceição.  
(72). Sentença contra Anna Rodrigues, beata da Terceira Ordem de S. Francisco.  
(73). Sentença contra o Padre Antonio de Affonsoeira.  
(74). Sentença contra o Dr. António Homem Leitão, em 25 de maio de 1624.  
(75). Sentença contra Boaventura de S. João.  
P. 187 (76). Sentença contra o hereje que arremetiu ao Sacramento, em 1552.  
(77). Sentença de Catharina Maria (Preta).  
(78). Sentença de Domingos Maria, natural de Lisboa.  
(79). Sentença de Domingos Lopes, natural de Mirandella.  
(80). Sentença de Fernão Dias de Silva, Conego de Coimbra.  
(81). Sentença de Fr. João de Santa Thereza.  
(82). Sentença de Leonor Francisca, natural de Chamusca.  
(83). Sentença de Padre Luiz Alves de Aguiar, em 1726.  
(84). Sentença de Magdalena da Cruz, e sua confissão.  
(85). Sentença de Padre Manuel Pinto dos Reis.  
(86). Sentença de Maria da Encarnação.  
(87). Sentença de Mecia da Costa.  
(88). Sentença de Pedro de Rates Hannequim.  
(89). Sentença de Sebastiana Maria de Jesus.  
P. 188 (90). Allegacion por el fiscal del Santo Officio de la Inquisicion de Aragon, sobre competencia de jurisdiccion.  
(91). Sentença contra Izabel de Castilho, no auto de fé em Cordova, em 1721.  
(92). Auto de fé celebrado em Logroño, em 7 de fevereiro de 1610.  
(93). Papéis sobre os feiticeiros que saíram no auto de fé em Logronho.  
(94). Notícia das culpas da Mª. Agueda e suas sequazes, punidas pela Inquisição de Logroño.  
(95). Relación del auto de fé en Sant’ Iago Gallicia, en 18 de outubro de 1655.  
(96). Personas que salieron al auto de la fé en Sevilla, em 1624.  
(97). Memorial de lo que resulta del processo de la Inquisicion contra el Dr. Aegidio Canonigo de Sevilla.  
(98). Pastoral e edito contra os Alumbrados por D. Andres Pacheco, Inquisidor Geral.  
(99). Sentença contra Francisco Garcia, na Inquisição de Toledo,
em 27 de abril de 1630. Auto de fé em Valladolid, 27 de maio de 1559.

P. 189 (100). Sentença contra Fr. Pedro Maçuelo e Fr. Francisco Maçuelo, em Valladolid, em 1600. Parecer do Marquez de Castello Rodrigo, sobre lo que escrevio D. Melchior de Teve de las deudas del fisco, y obras que el Inquisidor Geral hace a costa d'aquella hacienda.

(101). Memorial de los Temblores al Rei de Inglaterra, en 1685.

(102). Livro do registo de todas as sentenças definitivas do visitador neste juizo da visita do fisco (na primeira metade do sec. 17).

(103). Livro do registo das provisões dos oficiaes do fisco da Inquisição de Evora. (1622-1821.)

(104). Livro segundo do dinheiro depositado no fisco da Inquisição de Evora. (1637-39.)

(105). Livro da receita do Thesoureiro do fisco da Inquisição de Evora. (1678-8a.)

(106). Livros da receita do cofre do fisco. (1750-51, 1751-54, 1754-57.)


P. 190 (108). Papeis varios relativos á Inquisição, herezias, &c.

(109). Diploma de Mestre Passado a Temilhat Diquilhen na Loja Soleil, ao oriente de Bordeos, no dia 17 do segundo mez do anno da verdadeira luz de 5805.

P. 482 (110). Noticia do Dr. Antonio Teixeira da Matta, natural do Rio de Janeiro.

Tomo 4.

P. 5 (111). Pentateuco em hebraico.


(113). Decalogo em hebraico.

P. 6 (114). Exercitationes hebraicae in librum Genesis.

(115). Annotationes ad Cap. 15um Exodi, et commentaria in Psalmum 84.


(117). Commentaria in librum primum Regum a fratre Francisco Mendonça.


P. 48 (119). Sermão do Auto de Fé, prégado pelo Padre Luiz Alvares, em 10 de dezembro de 1585, na Praça de Evora.

P. 55 (120). Exhortation faite à l'église de Saint Sulpice par le Curé le 2 février 1742 au bapteme d'un juif nommé Isaac Passe, dont
furent parain et maraine le Conte de Saint Sulpice, et la Contesse de Senneterre.

P. 68. Dialogo evangelico sobre os artigos da fé, contra o Talmud dos Judeos, por João de Barros.

(121). Triunfo da fé contra a perfídia judaica, e obstinação herética, dividido em dons Aratados. Composto por D. Fr. Joseph de Jesus Maria, Bispo de Patara.

P. 70 (122). Observações sobre a mal fundada repugnância dos Judeos á santa igreja. Victoria pro Messia adversus judeos a Magistro Viegas (Braz), Jesuïta.

(123). In praecipuos Judeorum errores, auctore Petro Paulo Ferrer.

(124). Collecção hebraica on compendio de varias matérias perten- centes ao presente estado da Nação Judaica, refugiada nos Reynos da Gran-Bretanha e Estados de Hollanda. Dividido em 32 relações. Nas quaes se responde pela mesma seria da ordem, que determinon esta diligencia, a cada hum dos artigos, que a constituem, com aquellas noticias que foi possível indagaremse para se dar alguna informação sobre os pontos recomendados. Étudo escripto em Londres, anno de 1740.

P. 71 (125). De como os Judeos Doutores de les falsificáro as escrypturas sagradas, &c. Origem das Synagogas.

(126). Mixna Rabinica.

(127). Inetube ou carta d'arras e cazamento entre judeos. (1483.)

P. 73 (128). Preguntas hechas a los Xpianos y otras cossas tocantes a sus Evangelios por la orden de ellos Feytos por o autor du Jisuq Emuna i agora copeado por Ishak Mussaphia na Haya do año da criação do Mundo 5483 (1722).

(129). Brebe discursó politico sobre las Expulsiones de los Hebreos, en diversos Reynos y Provincias de Europa. Ine pondera un retirado sujeto, sin sospecha de passion, ni interesado, por ninguna de las dos partes.

P. 97 (130). Lei de 27 de fevereiro de 1600, inhabilitando os christãos novos para cargos publicos.

P. 103 (131). La Horden que se ha de guardar en occasion de pelea. Capitania, a 29 de julho de 1635. Orden à la mesma armada en 1 de agosto de 1635.

(132). Reg. de armada. Velem, 30 de julho de 1635.

P. 107 (133). Artigo 5º do tratado assignado em Londres, em 10 de julho de 1654, exemptando os inglezes residentes em Portugal da alcada da Inquisição.

(134). A. de 2 de fevereiro de 1657, sobre o confisco dos bens dos christãos novos.

P. 148 (135). Artigo do tratado de 19 de fevereiro de 1810, que isenta os Inglezes da Inquisição.
SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE ARCHIVES


P. 166 (137). B. de Gregorio 13, mandando que se não guardem letras apostólicas de benefícios em favor dos Christãos Novos. Romae, 21 die januarii 1584.

P. 171 (138). Dito do mesmo, confirmando um Breve de Gregorio 13, para que se não, &c. Dat. Romae die decima octava octobris 1600.


(140). B. de Innocentio II ao Arcebispo Inquisidor Geral, que entregue cinco processos de judeus negativos para serem remettidos a Roma. É de 24 de dezembro de 1678.

P. 179 (141). B. para as Inquisições de Portugal, dandolle novo regimento para sentencarem as causas dos judeus.

(142). B. estabelcendo as regras dos processos da Inquisição em Portugal. Roma, 22 de agosto de 1681.


RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL.
THE DESIRE FOR IMMORTALITY.

In the *Fortnightly Review* for October there appeared a fresh and interesting article, by Mr. F. C. S. Schiller, called, "Do men desire Immortality?" The writer attempts to show that at the present day among cultivated and semi-cultivated persons in Europe and America, there is no real longing for a future life. It is still considered the proper thing to assume that we all desire it and frequently think about it, but Mr. Schiller believes that it is not difficult to show that this assumption has little or no basis in reality.

Men live their lives without reference to death or to the life which death may bring: when "the ordinary man for the first time truly realizes that his days are numbered," it is usually a "tremendous shock." The future life and its conditions are seldom written or talked about; it is bad form to dwell on death in conversation, except in a most casual and distant way; the Society for Psychical Research has a very limited number of subscribers; "Spiritism," which, unlike all other religions, "treats the future life as a hard (and somewhat crude) fact, and not as a mere dogma of faith," has not become a success. "Christian Science" may be foolish, fraudulent, or false, but its vogue shows that it answers to a want. The failure of "Spiritism" shows that it does not.

To what is this supposed lack of interest in the chance or prospect of a future life really due? Mr. Schiller is not wholly clear about this part of his subject. First of all, so far as I understand him, men actually believe less. A future life is not exactly denied, but it is a mere vision which
THE DESIRE FOR IMMORTALITY

floats before the eye of faith at certain seasons of unhappiness or pain, and is then comfortably forgotten. "Men no longer dream themselves in Heaven nor dread themselves in Hell." But, secondly, men on the whole like this life on earth so well that they do not want even to think of another. They wish to postpone death as long as possible, and meanwhile to ignore it. This feeling, Mr. Schiller holds, grows stronger with age, and he even goes so far as to say that "the only sort of future life which would have any attraction for the old would be one in which they could go on very much as on earth." Thirdly, we are told that men do not want to know the truth about a future life because, while it would not make them die the sooner, it would be inconvenient. People would have to "act on their knowledge, and that might upset the habits of a lifetime." It is not clear what is meant by this. Are we to suppose that if I knew that my personal consciousness would continue or be revived after death, I should live a nobler life? Or is Mr. Schiller referring to future punishments and rewards? He does not say. Fourthly,

1 Jowett says: "The wicked man, when old, is not, as Plato supposes, more agitated by the terrors of another world when he is nearer to them, nor the good in an ecstasy at the joys of which he is soon to be the partaker. Age numbs the sense of both worlds; and the habit of life is strongest in death. Even the dying mother is dreaming of her lost children as they were forty or fifty years before, 'pattering over the boards,' not of reunion with them in another state of being. Most persons, when the last hour comes, are resigned to the order of nature and the will of God. . . . Nature, like a kind mother or nurse, lays us to sleep without frightening us; physicians, who are the witnesses of such scenes, say that, under ordinary circumstances, there is no fear of the future. Often, as Plato tells us, death is accompanied 'with pleasure.' When the end is still uncertain, the cry of many a one has been, 'Pray that I may be taken.' The last thoughts even of the best men depend chiefly on the accidents of their bodily state. Pain soon overpowers the desire of life; old age, like the child, is laid to sleep almost in a moment. The long experience of life will often destroy the interest which mankind have in it." (Dialogues of Plato, vol. II, pp. 176, 181, 3rd ed.) The feelings of old people towards the future life are surely more subtle and various than Mr. Schiller would seem to allow.
there still half-unconsciously lurks over the whole subject a certain discomfort or uneasiness. It is uncanny. In regard to it, it is especially true that "Society entertains a fierce fear of knowledge, a savage suspicion that to eat of the fruits of the tree of knowledge is a sin deserving of death." Hence the subject is guarded and kept away by a vigorous social taboo. Hence too, as Mr. Schiller supposes, the real reasons, which man is partly ashamed and partly afraid to confess (and partly, too, he successfully deceives himself) have engendered a number of mock reasons and pretences. To inquire into these things is said to be a "morbid craving." It may lead to insanity. It encourages fraud. It is unscientific, because you are dealing with a subject which lies outside the boundaries of legitimate science. It is irreligious, because religion says that you are to take the future life upon trust, as a dogma of faith or an assurance of revelation. It is irrational because you are asking the answer to a question which on earth can never be known.

In its issue of September 7 the Spectator makes, to my mind, various powerful replies to Mr. Schiller's arguments. I will quote much of what the Spectator says in lieu of saying some of the same things less cogently myself:—

Mr. Schiller forgets, we think, that there are questions about which men are silent because they are too deeply interested to discuss them, and that reverence produces in this respect precisely the same result as indifference. Nobody in Germany, or at least none of the educated class, would publicly discuss the character of the Emperor, much less make it the subject of free newspaper discussion, least of all move for a Committee to investigate it by cross-examination or otherwise, yet to every politician it is matter of the deepest interest, of much thought, and of perpetual inquiry. That an enormous number of men try to avoid thinking of the future life is true, and has been true in all ages, but that is because they are afraid of it as too weighty, too absorbing, too fatal to immersion in the business of daily life, not because they think it of second-rate importance. If it is not so, how does it happen that religion, which is only the study of what is to follow after death, and how to make the state which succeeds death pleasant
or unpleasant, is of all subjects that which most deeply divides mankind, and on which opinion is considered most important, not only as regards the future but as regards the present? What else but interest in the future state, or things directly connected therewith, divides Catholic and Protestant? We should say, in exact opposition to Mr. Schiller, that an immense majority have the greatest difficulty in turning their thoughts from it, and that anybody who brought them any fresh and clear light about it, or even professed to bring it, would receive the most eager attention. The real reason why men do not investigate the question of what follows after death, as they investigate secular problems, is that they are convinced that investigation can have no result, that light can come only from revelation, and that consequently the thing to investigate is the truth or falsehood of whatever professes to contain that revelation. Surely there is interest enough in that; why all society, all the systems of life prevalent throughout the world, are based on that, and the conclusions deduced from that. That men do not inquire carefully enough into the phenomena of spiritualism may be true—the present writer thinks it is true—but the reason is hopelessness of obtaining light by that method, not indifference to light if obtainable. Let men but see a reasonable hope, and till the hope was dispelled nothing else would attract their attention at all. Politics, business, pleasure, all would be forgotten in the presence of so absorbing an interest. The thing has happened in history several times, and whenever it has occurred the moving force governing the peoples and constantly producing religious wars has been interest in the "Whither."

Some things in this long quotation might be contested, and others might be differently expressed, but I venture to think that in the first sentence there is a great deal of truth. "There are questions about which men are silent because they are too deeply interested to discuss them." And there is even more than this involved. The late Master of Balliol truly observed: "At the approach of death there is not much said: good men are too honest to go out of the world professing more than they know. There is perhaps no important subject about which, at any time, even religious people speak so little to one another." Why do they, however, Mr. Schiller would say, not want to know? Mr. Schiller seems rather
disposed to laugh at the way in which the religions, responsive to man's fears and apprehensions, have expressly disavowed the obligation of raising the dogma of faith to positive knowledge. But it may be questioned whether the disavowal does not correspond to a higher feeling than fear or inconvenience. Do we not regard immortality much in the same way as we regard God? God is not a fact among other facts. He is not an object of knowledge. He is the condition of knowledge. We believe in him; we do not "know" him, as we know that wool comes from the sheep's back. To search for God or to prove him by ordinary scientific processes seems absurd and vulgar. And with the future life the same feeling holds good. If I knew that there was a future life, it would not be inconvenient to me. The kind of life I lead at present on earth would not be changed: I doubt whether scientific knowledge would influence my life otherwise than my present mental condition, which may be said to oscillate between hope and faith, affects it, but if it did, it could only affect me (I suppose) in making me live better or yield less often to temptation. And in that case knowledge would be not inconvenient but useful and welcome. But how can one have a knowledge of the future life that is not vulgarizing? For whatever that life may be, it seems obvious that it is not lived under conditions of sense. Whatever knowledge could be obtained about it here, must be dragged down and accommodated to sensuous limitations. I do not by any means deny that there have been real communications from the spirit world, but if these communications were real they have (so far as I am aware) also been cheap and unsatisfying. And how can this be otherwise so long as our earthly conditions continue? Mr. Schiller seems to think that if you do not care to try to communicate with the beloved dead, this must be due either to the fact that you do not really and intensely believe that they are still alive and conscious, or that your love has grown cold. The cynical story which he tells with some satisfaction on p. 436 seems to show that
this is his meaning. Forcing myself to be truthful, so far as I can, I still disagree with him. I know of a lady who in a state of trance speaks words and gives messages which no theory of chance or fraud can apparently explain. Why was I disinclined to be taken to see her? So far as I can read my own mind, it was not because I disbelieved in her trances and thought them rubbish and fraudulent (though I did not intensely believe in them), not because I thought such communications with the dead sinful or harmful, not because my interest in and love for certain dead persons had waxed cold, and finally not because I did not believe that they were still "conscious" and alive, but because the whole thing seemed to me so vulgar and demeaning. What could I hear that would be really spiritual? The conditions made that impossible. I could not bear the idea that a third person, even in a trance (and I fully believed that the medium was unconscious of what she said) should be the bearer of unsatisfying communications between the beloved and me. The noble words of Mr. Browning seemed applicable in quite another sense than that in which he wrote them:

Is the remainder of the way so long,
Thou need'st the little solace, thou the strong?
Watch out thy watch, let weak ones doze and dream.

I preferred to wait for the time, when, if God see well, spirit may draw nigh to spirit without intermediary or interruption. If death mean the destruction of consciousness, then indeed the results of those trances must be, one would suppose, either accidental or fraudulent. If death be not the destruction of consciousness, I can afford to wait. Just in proportion as the belief in a future life is closely connected with the belief in God, does our faith in it share the qualities of our faith in him. To know would deprive faith of its rapture and its glory—there is a glory of knowledge and there is a glory of faith,—and as with our belief in God, so with our belief in immortality.
That educated persons desire a future life seems to me more certain than to Mr. Schiller. Here again I will first quote the *Spectator*:

At present, when new creeds are manufactured every year, they all profess to affirm a future; and true agnosticism, though it spreads among the educated, takes little hold upon the body of any people. The hope of a better world may be vague, but it is always a hope, and a hope implies a wish. The hope, indeed, seems to increase rather than decrease as belief in dogma dies away, the truth being, we fancy, that as the supreme dogma, the existence of a personal God, becomes more lonely, the confidence in God as necessarily good increases, and produces the belief, so startlingly strong among the masses, that he will grant compensation for the injustices of this world. There must be a wish to live again behind that faith. The writer would be inclined to say, as the result of his personal observation, that the doubt of a future state is strongest among the happy, the unhappy clinging to it as their only consolation. As those who are unhappy, at least at intervals, are infinitely the more numerous, Mr. Schiller's question on his theory answers itself. Moreover, human instincts, bad or good, are facts to be always taken account of, and it is difficult to imagine that the universally diffused fear of death can exist without, what is really an extension of it, the fear of extinction. The answer that men do not dread sleep, but rather seek it as a refuge, is no answer at all, for we all instinctively think of sleep as a condition sure to have an awakening. It is often assumed that suicides must expect death to be the end, but the evidence is directly to the contrary, for suicides die every day hoping or praying that God will forgive them, though, if death is extinction, prayer and hope are alike absurd formulas. We cannot but think that the great majority of men expect a future state, and would gladly, if they knew how, pierce the veil which God for some purpose we none of us perceive has dropped between our minds and any knowledge of our kind of future condition.

The last sentence of this quotation seems to me to need modification in accordance with what has previously been said. I am also not quite sure as to what the *Spectator* says about the fear of death. Mr. Schiller has, I think, left that fear too much out of account in speaking of the common disinclination to talk and think about death except in an external sort of way. What is feared is not
so much extinction as the *process* of death. Will it hurt? What does it feel like? Even if we fully believe that there will be a continuance or revival of consciousness, still to get to this new life we must pass through the gates of death. And it is this passing through of which every now and then we feel a dread. We sometimes shrink from the thought of death not because we care so intensely for our present life, not because we fear non-existence, and certainly not because we are afraid of "punishment" (that feeling might perhaps even wisely be less dormant than it is!), but because we are frightened of the actual process or moments of dying.

In order "to test and bring out the feelings with which the prospect of a future life is actually regarded at the present day," the American branch of the Society for Psychical Research has issued "a circular or questionnaire," dealing with the subject in some detail. The answers to the circular are, for England, to be sent to Mr. Schiller at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and "all names will be regarded as strictly confidential." In the remainder of this paper I shall attempt to answer the questionnaire, and the appearance of my article in this Review means that I can answer it with sincerity. It is quite true that I may sometimes be self-deceived. The *Spectator* says: "People are not truthful enough to themselves to make such a return of much value." All I can say is, I have done my best.

The text of the circular runs as follows:—

I. Would you prefer (a) to live after "death" or (b) not?

II. (a) If I (a), do you desire a future life whatever the conditions may be?

(b) If not, what would have to be its character to make the prospect seem tolerable? Would you, e.g., be content with a life more or less like your present life?

(c) Can you say what elements in life (if any) are felt by you to call for its perpetuity?

III. Can you state *why* you feel in this way, as regards questions I and II?
IV. Do you now feel the question of a future life to be of urgent importance to your mental comfort?

V. Have your feelings on questions I, II, and IV undergone change? If so, when and in what ways?

VI. (a) Would you like to know for certain about the future life, or (b) would you prefer to leave it a matter of faith?

To the first question: "Would you prefer to live after death or not?" I reply in the affirmative. To the first part of question II the answer seems to be as clear. If, for instance, I were supernaturally informed that for my unorthodoxy and other defects I was either to be annihilated at death or condemned to perpetual torments, it is obvious that annihilation would be preferable.

Difficulties begin with II (b). The character of the future life is, and must always be, wholly unknown to us. Whatever else it may be, it must be utterly (and not merely "more or less") unlike the present life. Therefore I am totally unable to make up a "character" for it which would make its "prospect ... tolerable." One can of course speak in generalities and negatives, and say that for another life to be desired there must be moral and mental development, or an increasing love of God; but, after all, such wide conditions carry one a very little way. Because it seems to me that "the truest conception which we can form of a future life is a state of progress or education," therefore doubtless these conditions suggest themselves to my mind. But one's habitual attitude is rather to leave the matter in the hands of God. We earnestly hope that it may please him to grant unto us the chance of deeper love and fuller knowledge, but beyond this we do not go.

I am not sure that I understand the meaning of II (c). I find it difficult to believe in an all-wise and all-good God without clinging also to the doctrine of immortality. The problem of sin, of idiocy, of madness and of misery press otherwise too heavily upon me. A future life seems more necessary for the bad than for the good, not that they may be punished, but that they may have "a better chance."
I am also influenced by the usual arguments about human reason and human love, though in a less degree. I sometimes venture to hope that the intense puzzles about savages, about the Australian aborigines for instance, may find their solution in another life. I believe in "immortality," not because I desire it, but because it seems to be the necessary corollary of my belief in a righteous God. If a divine voice should say: "There is no immortality for you, but God is righteous all the same," I sometimes feel as if I should be satisfied and at rest.

Perhaps it may seem strange that I have said nothing about meeting again those whom we have loved and lost upon earth. But it does not seem to me as if the desire for reunion, however strong or legitimate, is one of the "elements in life" which "call for its perpetuity." Divine righteousness must, as it seems to me, grant "another life" to the idiot, or to the woman who by man's intolerable villany has been condemned to a life on earth of agonizing shame, misery and ruin, but I cannot see that this perfect righteousness must grant me a conscious reunion with the beloved dead, though I earnestly hope that such may be the case.

I find it extremely difficult to answer III. I observe that in the remarks which precede the questionnaire it is stated that there "may be a marked divergence between conviction or belief and sentiment." It is, however, personal "preferences, sentiments, or desires" which are to be elicited by the circular, quite irrespective of religious faith or reasoned convictions, "the influence of which, where it exists, may be recorded in answer to question III." But in my own case faith and sentiment correspond. In other words, my "sentiments" are not suffered to grow beyond my "faith." Hence "why I feel in this way, as regards I and II," so far as I can extract any intelligible

---

1 The *Fortnightly Review*, p. 440, has "religious faith of reasoned convictions," but I conclude that "of" is a mere misprint for "or."
and intelligent answers from my mind, has practically been mentioned already. Perhaps I ought to add that I do not desire to live after death because I am unhappy on earth. Nor does it seem to me that such a desire, based on the wish for fuller knowledge, for self-purification, for continued progress, and for reunion with the beloved dead, is inconsistent with a very vividly felt regret for the life on earth. Mr. Schiller has hardly taken this dual feeling into account. If I have to leave a home where I have spent many years of mingled joy and sorrow for another, I may leave it full of hope and interest in the new and unknown future, but yet also with feelings of wistful sadness. If I were stricken to-day with a mortal disease and knew that I had only a year to live, I should feel a regret that does not seem to me inconsistent with a very real faith in a desire for immortality. The question, Would you prefer to die now or in (say) ten years' time? and the question, Would you prefer, whenever you do die, to live again or to become extinct? must surely be kept apart.

The life of the butterfly may be higher than the caterpillar's, but the caterpillar's life may contain joys peculiarly its own. And not merely joys, but even tender sorrows, quaintnesses, humours, which cannot possibly recur. One sometimes thinks: Shall we laugh in another life? Surely it is consonant with the goodness and wisdom of God, that he has made us, under normal circumstances, like and be interested in this life, even though it be also the preparation for another.

Question IV, by implication, has been answered already. If I can imagine that a divine revelation informed me that individual consciousness did continue after death, I should, I suppose, rejoice that my faith was confirmed; but somehow or other the supposition of something which I believe to be impossible (i.e. the authenticated divine revelation) produces no effect upon my mind. I cannot clearly imagine how I should feel if something happened which I do not believe could happen. Again, if the supposed divine re-
velation informed me that God in his infinite wisdom and goodness did not grant individual consciousness after death, it would not, I think, make any marked difference to my manner of life. It would still seem best, and most in accordance with the divine will, to live worthily to-day, though we are utterly extinguished to-morrow. One would be less ready to die, sorrier to lose what was to be one's only chance of consciousness, of knowledge, of love. But though one's own life, which has been formed under the stimulus of the belief in immortality, might not be greatly changed, I should feel that mankind had received a blow from which it could hardly hope to recover. Jowett said: "The denial of the belief takes the heart out of human life: it lowers men to the level of the material." "Mental comfort" is such an odd phrase; but what I have already said proves that the question of a future life does enter greatly into my working conception of the world. It is so closely connected with my faith in a righteous God that the one seems to follow from the other. And if, per impossibile, I make the supposition that I have learned from a divine and certain source that the righteous God is, but that there is no survival after death, then, though my own life might not be changed, yet life's most precious hope and consolation would be gone. My own self would seem unutterably poorer. Therefore I think I may truthfully answer IV in the affirmative.

But here I wish to make a remark which may seem utterly inconsistent with all that has hitherto been said. I hope that I may retain my identity at death, and that I may enjoy a conscious reunion with the beloved dead. But I am not prepared to say that I always and absolutely identify a future life with the survival of individual consciousness and memory. Jowett has said:—

We must also acknowledge that there are degrees of the belief in immortality, and many forms in which it presents itself to the mind. Some persons will say no more than that they trust in God, and that they leave all to him. It is a great part of true religion
not to pretend to know more than we do. Others when they quit
this world are comforted with the hope “that they will see and know
their friends in heaven.” But it is better to leave them in the hands
of God, and to be assured that “no evil shall touch them.” There are
others again to whom the belief in a divine personality has ceased to
have any longer a meaning; yet they are satisfied that the end of all
is not here, but that something still remains to us, “and some better
thing for the good than for the evil.” They are persuaded, in spite of
their theological nihilism, that the ideas of justice and truth and
holiness and love are realities. They cherish an enthusiastic devotion
to the first principles of morality. Through these they see, or seem
to see, darkly, and in a figure, that the soul is immortal.—Dialogues

I do not understand how the righteous God can grant
us immortality without continuity of individual conscious-
ness, but how can I understand the methods of God? For
“we acknowledge that these are the things which eye hath
not seen nor ear heard, and therefore it hath not entered
into the heart of man in any sensible manner to conceive
them” (Jowett, ibid., p. 182). But whatever immortality
may mean, the belief in it rests (to my mind) on the belief
in God. “If there is a good and wise God, then there is
a progress of mankind towards perfection; and if there
is no progress of men towards perfection, then there is no
good and wise God. We cannot suppose that the moral
government of God, of which we see the beginnings in the
world and in ourselves, will cease when we pass out of
life” (Jowett, ibid., p. 180).

I have nothing much to say in answer to V. In my
own family we were very wholesomely brought up in
regard to these matters. We were told that God was good
and forgiving. He might indeed punish us for our sins,
but only as a loving father would punish his sons. Such
punishments would be temporary and disciplinal. The
notion of eternal punishment and of a material hell was
openly scouted. Rightly or wrongly, it was called un-
Jewish. The future life never had any terrors for us, only
attractions. Yet so far as I remember, we did not dwell
on it very greatly. As I grew up the usual doubts began, but these doubts seldom or ever extended to the fundamental doctrine of the righteous God and to that which ever seemed its corollary, the doctrine of a future life. Just before or just after I went to Oxford, I read Jowett's essay on the Immortality of the Soul, and it seemed to me then, as it seems to me now, the truest and wisest thing that ever had been, or could be, said upon the subject. Since I read it, my opinions have never changed, and if I have read it once, I have read it fifty times. The exquisite final sections (added in the third edition of the Plato) are quoted in full in my florilegium, "The Religious Teaching of Jowett" (J. Q. R., vol. XII, pp. 372–374).

I had already dealt with question VI before I attempted the questionnaire. How am I to "know for certain" about the future life? I imagine the implied answer is by investigation and inquiry, not by fresh and novel revelation. How investigation and inquiry can "make me know for certain," I do not at present understand. Even beyond accident and fraud, there may still conceivably be explanations of supposed proofs which would deprive them of all validity. The notion of seeking sensuous proofs for spiritual truths seems to me incongruous and unsatisfactory. It has the incurable taint of cheapening and of vulgarity. It is, as I said before, something like "proving" the existence of God. Though in moments of gloom, one might be glad to have such doubts put finally to rest, still one would feel that life had lost a certain peculiar joy. That joy is not uncertainty, but the joy of believing in God, the joy of believing that the souls of the righteous (yes, and of all mankind) are safe in his hands. Belief may be subject to ups and downs: it is now stronger, now weaker; but it yields an added richness to existence; life, on earth at any rate, would be the poorer if there were nothing but knowledge. Hence if I must answer VI without qualification one way or the other, I vote without hesitation for leaving the "future life a matter of faith."
I have sought to answer the circular as truly and as simply as I can. It would be a matter of great surprise to me if the majority of the replies bear out Mr. Schiller's anticipations. They will rather, I think, tend to show that our belief in the immortality of the soul has become inseparably connected with our belief in God, and that the future life is still desired both for its own sake and as the pledge and guarantee of the Eternal Righteousness.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.
THE JEWS IN SOUTHERN ITALY.

In an open courtyard of the Museum at Taranto (the Tépar of the Greeks and the Tarentum of the Romans) are some interesting Jewish tombstones of which the following are transcriptions:—

A.

כוב
יוסף
בר יוסף

Joseph son of Joseph is buried (here).

The stone with this inscription had been placed upside down in the Museum.

B.

הרי נשה אשת
ליאת בן דוד
דוד מתי
מלו

Here lies the wife of Leon son of David from Melos (?)

This is a grammatical error for נשה. The emblem of the shield of David preceding the name דוד is interesting. The emblem מילו can hardly be Milan, the ancient name for which was Mediolanum. It may possibly be the island of Melos.

C.

מה יינו שבתיי בן
לאון מבש ששת
עשתה שבתי
יידי שלום על
מנחת
Here lies Sabbattai son of Leon aged sixteen years. Peace be upon his rest.

There are several other such inscriptions, some commencing with the words the memorial of a righteous man. Some stones have inscriptions in Latin as well as in Hebrew, the Latin inscription being as a rule on one of the four sides and the Hebrew on another. For example:

D.

Here lies in good remembrance Samuel son of Silanus. with Ezechiel his father’s brother, who lived forty-two years. Peace be upon their rest!

Ascoli has already edited this inscription, or rather a portion of it. (Iscrizioni, Turin, 1880.)

Besides these there are some epitaphs in Greek, e.g.:

E.

γνωθι καρακεται Ἡλίας υἱὸς Ἰαα[κώβ]. Here lies Elijah son of Jacob (?).
Here lies Laudatus' son Azaria, also Susanna; may their rest be in peace!

\(\text{ΛΑΝΔΑΤΟΥ} \) is no doubt the genitive of \(\text{ΛΑΝΔΑΤΟΣ} = \text{laudatus, 'praised'}\); possibly, as Rabbi Coha of Corfu has suggested, it may be an ungrammatical equivalent for the Hebrew name \(\text{נַעַדַּס} \).

\(\text{ΚΟΚΑΝΑ} \) is not the only spelling of the name \(\text{נָעַדַּס} \); in Alexandria I found a Jewish tombstone with a Greek inscription in which the name occurs spelt \(\text{Σούσαρα} \). The last two lines are a rendering of the common Hebrew prayer \(\text{יְהוָה} \) \(\text{נָעַדַּס} \) \(\text{שֵׁם} \) \(\text{נַעַדַּס} \). It will be seen that the spelling of these two inscriptions differs considerably from that of classical Greek; it is clearly phonetic and proves that at the time from which they date the pronunciation of Greek had undergone considerable modifications in the direction of modern Hellenic.

So far as I can find, none of these inscriptions, with the exception of \(\text{D} \), have been edited before. With regard to the character of the Hebrew writing, a distinct and fairly uniform style runs through all of them; the shape of the letters \(\text{ח} \), \(\text{י} \), \(\text{ג} \), \(\text{ד} \) is remarkable. In fact the open side of the letter \(\text{ד} \) of itself is sufficient to furnish a "terminus ad quern" as to the date of these tombstones, for it is not met with elsewhere after the eleventh century; on the other hand it occurs as early as the first century after Christ. A striking point in the inscriptions is their similarity with those discovered in 1853 in the catacombs of Venosa. In the first place the Hebrew handwriting of the two shows a distinct resemblance, and secondly the same combination of Hebrew with Latin and of Hebrew with Greek is there met with. For instance:

\(\text{ΩΔΕ ΚΙΤΕ ΑΣΕΛΛΑ} \)

And

\(\text{אֶלֶל} \)

Here again we find \(\text{אֶלֶל} \) phonetically spelt \(\text{אֶלֶל} \). The non-Jewish name \(\text{Asella} \) has its parallels in others of the Venosa inscriptions, as for example \(\text{Faustinus, Pretiosa} \); and it strengthens the conjecture made above that \(\text{סַלְוָן} \) and \(\text{SIL} \) in inscription \(\text{D} \) stand for \(\text{Silanus} \).

One naturally turns to the Venosa inscriptions in order to obtain a clue to the solution of the interesting question of the date of our

\(^1\) Ascoli, \text{Inscrizioni}.
tombstones. Hirschfeld ascribes the former to the fifth or sixth century A.D., whilst de Angelis and Smith, judging from the character of the Greek and Latin letters, come to the conclusion that they cannot be older than the third nor later than the sixth century. It is interesting also to compare our inscriptions with the tombstones discovered in the cemeteries of Rome, which are believed to belong in the main to the third and fourth centuries. Of these the oldest are in Greek. The following is an example:

\[\text{[ΕΝ]ΘΑΓΕ ΚΙΤΕ ΣΥΝΗΛΙΚΗ} \\
\text{ΔΟΥΓΑΘΡ ΟΥΡΣΑΚΙΟΥ} \\
\text{ΕΝ ΕΙΠΙΝΙ ΚΥΜΙΚΙΕ ΑΥΤΗ}\\
\]

It is remarkable that the word for "lies" is in the Roman inscriptions sometimes correctly spelt κεῖται and sometimes κεῖται, κεῖται and even χεῖται, but never as at Taranto κεῖται. Some light no doubt can be thrown from this quarter upon the date of the Taranto tombstones. But internal evidence is forthcoming from the latter themselves. I showed a squeeze of the Greek inscription F to Professor Staik, Director of the National Museum at Athens, and he stated without hesitation that the writing was of the third century A.D.

It appears then that at this early date a Jewish community and a Jewish cemetery existed at Tarentum. Tarentum was one of the Apulian communities, and Zunz mentions it as such together with Trani, Bari, Otranto, Lecci, Siponto, and Melfi. In Bari there is still to be found a Via Sinagoga, but of the Synagogue there are now no remains. Zunz does not mention Brindisi, but evidently Jews once lived there in some numbers, for some old Jewish tombstones have been discovered there and there is still a Via Judeca in the town.

It is an interesting fact that numbers of Italian Jews emigrated to Corfu when Ferdinand and Isabelle exiled them from the kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

Corfu was then under Venetian rule. Zunz, though he mentions the fact that during the sixteenth century Apulian and Calabrian fugitives founded synagogues in Arta, Valona, Salonica, Constantinople and other places in Turkey, omits all reference to Corfu. Even at the present day the Jews of Corfu are divided as to Minhag and even as to language into Greeks and Apulians ("Pugliesi"), as the

1 Vogelstein-Rieger, Geschichie der Juden in Rom, p. 55.
2 Garrucci, Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei, p. 54.
3 Ritus des synagogalen Gottesdienstes, p. 78.
Italian section is called. The latter is now the more important of 
the two communities, and its members, as indeed many other Corfiotes, 
speak a bastard Italian called "Pugliese," representing the Apulian 
dialect of the fugitives from Italy.

It is certainly remarkable that notwithstanding the complete 
religious toleration which Jews now enjoy in Italy, hardly any have 
as yet found their way back again to its southern provinces.

HERBERT M. ADLER.
EIN HEBRÄISCH-PERSISCHES LIEDERBUCH.


1 Auch besonders erschienen: The Persian Jews: their books and ritual.


Der mit der grössten Anzahl von Gedichten vertretene Autor ist Israel Nağara, der in der Überschrift zu No. 3 ausdrücklich genannt ist: n"y mtt33btt~
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zugeschrieben, der Anfang lautet:

VnjJO);4 (S«i>ö0^» TTI33if, mit einer einleitenden Strophe, die
beginnt: 8, mit der Überschrift "Hebrew-Persian Diwan") ist daraus die persische
Übersetzung abgedruckt; ebenso von No. 1 desselben (=*17, ^TTM "PDIN), so dass unsere
Sammlung mit demselben Gedichte schliesst, mit welchem Israel
Nagara seinen Diwan beginnen lässt.

Die persische Übersetzung beider Gedichte edire und erläutere ich
Ein hebräisch-persisches Liederbuch


Von anderweitig bekannten Dichtern finden sich in unserer Sammlung folgende:


Auch in unseren nachweisbaren Dichtern finden sich in unserer Sammlung folgende Verfasser bei hebräischen Gedichten angegeben.

Aharon, No. 5 (10 b). Sieben Strophen mit dem Akrostich Nissim WD. Ein Liebesdialog zwischen Gott und Israel. Anfang: 1TO '35 DN

Aharon Kohen (vielleicht identisch mit dem Vorigen). No. 17 (27 a): 1TO '35 DN. Sieben Strophen mit dem Akrostich: 1TO '35 TN.

Chizkija. No. 23 (30 a). Die erste Strophe lautet:—

Auch in den andern fünf Strophen, die den Namen Nissim im Akrostich zeigen, wiederholen sich in den ersten zwei Zeilen die Apostrophe ḫnw j i j ' t h und ḫnw j i j ' t h, die an die Thora gerichtet sind, während die dritte Zeile bei allen Strophen dieselbe ist. — No. 9 (57 b), Sabbathlied in 6 Strophen mit dem Akrostich Nissim WD, und ḫnw j i j ' t h, dem Anfangswort der letzten Strophe. Die Strophen haben denselben Schluss wie das oben unter Moses b. Aharon gebrachte Gedicht, das unmittelbar nach diesem steht. — In Cod. Adler, B. 38, finden sich niK'pamit dem Akrostich IV.

David b. Aharon b. Husein (dies ist nach Steinschneider, J. Q. R., X, 539, die wahrscheinliche Aussprache von pDn), No. 25 (31 a), Akrostich: 1TO '35 DN. Die erste Strophe lautet: 1TO '35 DN. Der Reim ḫnw j i j ' t h oder ḫnw j i j ' t h wird in einem Theile der Strophen durch aramäische Pluralia gebildet. Es ist ein Hymnus auf die Stadt Tiberias, mit Erwähnung der Gräber von Tannaiten und Amoräern. Dann wird das Grab Moses Mainumino's erwähnt und zum Schlusse einer der Wohlthäter der Stadt aus der Familie Abulafia (pshait akhir en-Aba) verherrlicht.

Eleazar Kohen. No. 27 (32 a), Akrostichon: 1TO '35 DN. Anfang:
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Es ist vielleicht derselbe, von dem Cod. Adler, B. 36, ein persisches Prosastück enthält (s. ZDMG., LIII, 422).


Anonyme hebräische Gedichte stehen unter folgenden Nummern:


No. 45 (46a): שמחה לmıים חורה ע"ט "שלמה א"ב. Anfang: שמחה לmıים חורה ע"ט "שלמה א"ב.
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D'Jinnro. Und sofort mit zwei Epithetis Gottes in alphabetischer Reihenfolge. Nach dem ersten Satze und ebenso nach dem letzten stehen folgende, wohl nach jedem Satze zu sprechende Sätze:

No. 46 (46b): Dieses die Hauptsammlung Israel Jezdi's abschließende Stück ist das bekannte Sabbathlied: Σabbαθλied:

Unter den Autoren der persischen Übersetzungen in Israel Jezdi's Sammlung ist vor allem zu nennen: Josef oder Jüsuf, von dem vier Gedichte Israel Nagara's übersetzt sind, nämlich No. 6, 11, 13, 14.

18.64a steht der Anfang eines Gedichtes mit dem Refrain: Ράχα "ηδή

Die erste Strophe lautet: Ράχα "ηδή

Nach der ähnlichen zweiten Strophe die Angabe: Ράχα "ηδή
"O Herzensräuber, du bist wie die Rose, ich bin verliebt wie die Nachtigall!"

In No. 11 steht am Schlusse, nach der Übersetzung der letzten Strophe, eine weitere freie Strophe, die ebenfalls das Bild von Rose und Nachtigall enthält. Dasselbe ist bei No. 14 der Fall. In der Übersetzung des Ḥer ḫel al Ḩāfiz bringt Jūṣuf auch das Akrostichon des Originals (ישראַל) in Anwendung und wendet denselben Reim an wie das aramäische Gedicht.


Molla Etmîn (אלימטימן) ist der Übersetzer des Gedichtes Jona's (No. 10). Die Übersetzung der Schlussstrophe enthält den Namen des Übersetzers.

Endlich ist als Übersetzer genannt Siman-Tōb, dessen Buche "Leben des Geistes" Israel Jezdi einen Theil seiner Sammlung entnahm. Wie bereits oben erwähnt war, übersetzte er sein eigenes, hier unter No. 1 stehendes Gedicht; dasselbe gilt auch von dem unter No. *13 (60 b) stehenden Gedichte.


Von den in der Sammlung enthaltenen persischen Originaldichtungen nennen zwei in der Schlussstrophe den Verfasser: 1. No. *4 (53 a–54 b); es ist das auch in Cod. Adler, B. 36, stehende Gebet für den Hausherrn mit Erwähnung der zwölf Stämme, aus dem
ich ZDMG., LIII, 420, Proben veröffentlicht habe. Der Schlussvers lautet hier:  

**Der Autor hiess also Benjamin. (Benjamin ist auch der Dichter des ZDMG. a. a. O. besprochenen zweisprachigen Gedichtes.)**  

Als Dichter des unten stehenden zweisprachigen Gedichtes (No. 12) nennt sich in der Schlussstrophe Jehuda (geschrieben יוחנן). 

Die kleinere Sammlung unseres Werckchens enthält folgende anonyme persische Gedichte: No. *2, ein Vierzeiler; *3, ein Ghasel von sieben Strophen; *5, ein Ghasel von 10 Strophen mit der Überschrift:  

**Die kleinere Sammlung unseres Werkchens enthält folgende anonyme persische Gedichte: No. *2, ein Vierzeiler; *3, ein Ghasel von sieben Strophen; *5, ein Ghasel von 10 Strophen mit der Überschrift: **  

Als Dichter des unten stehenden zweisprachigen Gedichtes (No. 12) nennt sich in der Schlussstrophe Jehuda (geschrieben יוחנן). 

Die kleinere Sammlung unseres Werckchens enthält folgende anonyme persische Gedichte: No. *2, ein Vierzeiler; *3, ein Ghasel von sieben Strophen; *5, ein Ghasel von 10 Strophen mit der Überschrift: 

**Die kleinere Sammlung unseres Werckchens enthält folgende anonyme persische Gedichte: No. *2, ein Vierzeiler; *3, ein Ghasel von sieben Strophen; *5, ein Ghasel von 10 Strophen mit der Überschrift: **  

Als Dichter des unten stehenden zweisprachigen Gedichtes (No. 12) nennt sich in der Schlussstrophe Jehuda (geschrieben יוחנן). 

Die kleinere Sammlung unseres Werckchens enthält folgende anonyme persische Gedichte: No. *2, ein Vierzeiler; *3, ein Ghasel von sieben Strophen; *5, ein Ghasel von 10 Strophen mit der Überschrift: 

An Ergänzungen und korrigierenden Anmerkungen ist noch folgenderen zu entnehmen: 

**An Ergänzungen und korrigierenden Anmerkungen ist noch folgenderen zu entnehmen:**

ANHANG.

I. Israel Na'gar's Sabbathlied נְּודֵי יְמֵי תַּשׁוּבָה in persischer Bearbeitung von Jusuf Jehudi (אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל, No. 13), mit Beibehaltung des Akrostichs נְּודֵי יְמֵי תַּשׁוּבָה. Persisch transcribirt.

Das Metrum ist das von Jusuf Jehudi auch sonst angewendete נְּודֵי יְמֵי תַּשׁוּבָה, mit einigen Lizenzen.

1. 

2. 

3. 
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II. Zweisprachiges (hebräisch-persisches) Gedicht von Jehuda (Ar. 22, No. 12, p. 23a). Mit Punktation der hebräischen und Transcription der persischen Zeilen. Das Metrum ist dasselbe wie in I.

1.

 телеа דְּתָה יִפְטַה וּרְדוֹתָה

אמר רזד בְּרֵגֶז נַבִּי

מסומם ביש אֶזְתָּן בַּר דַּלְגָּה יָבֵר

תקין לְיַמָּה לִבְנַי

2.

בְּרֵנְטָה מַכָּנָה מִרֵשָׁה

זֶפַע בּאֶזְרִי בַּשָּׁמִי

 الأحد דָּנדָק כְּחַמְמָי בִּי טוֹשֵׁק

בָּמֶשׁ הָאָבִּי בֵּצֵלֶת שָׁאוּל

3.

ןַרְחַה מְלֶא לַמִּלְכֶּה

בְּמוּרָת דָּרוּ דָּרְשָׁה וּתְגַנֶּנֶא

ךָמָה מַגְנָן אָרְבַּה עַמְּלָה וּפַשְׁרוּד

ינֶאַ אֵלֶּה יָנֵיָהוּ קַוּלֵי

4.

המגרכ שָׁלוּ אָז מַואָי

אֶזְזָה דְּלַאָה דְּמֶן סָר פַּרְזָי

בַּה יֵלֵשָׁנָה יִגְּרוּ疯ָד פֶּמֶן

זָהַת נֵבָּה נַבִּי בֶּרֶדְּה

5.

לְבַא בִּגְּהָה תְוָוְשָׁפ שָׁפַח שָׁפַח

בָּקָא בַּכְּרָה חַתָּן הַבְּרַבָּה

שָׁוֵד מָרָא בּרַגָּה יָבֵר וָבֶּט

כְּהַ תְּסִילָה רָא אָבָד קֶדְּבָה
4. בלייה לייחת גמחות להבילה
звон גלגל נזא מזני
ליב ממלת זון גלגל משאה
ישה לייחת גמחות להבילה

5. יואז יאדו גמחות להבילה
beschäft יתיר אל תרנוקי גנוני
culo נאם בו דאם בזנאי
יואז יאדו גמחות להבילה

6. יאדו גמחות להבילה
יולג ביטוי והר גמסיני
מגאמ ביש אצין זיני אז מ孵ש
נחלות הקבירה חלובבינה

7. ולא ארוניה מיה פשקו החפואת
קוך אחיה עם הסולגין ויה
אוצר קדום בנאודי ניאומי
מסל פשקו שבבער יבלגה פלגי

8. יאדו גמחות להבילה
זה בכסה בשיא הרצים הרצים
יודע הזמן שב뼐 אزع רוש
וספייה יאדו גמחות להבילה

W. Bacher.

Budapest, Mai 1901.
ZU SCHECHTER’S NEUESTEM GENIZA-FUNDE.


* * P * * N ' * * * B * * * I * * * V O L. XIV. K

einem Bibelkritiker oder Häretiker zu thun haben, jede sichere Grundlage fehlt.

Die Schrift des unbekannten Verf. ist unstreitig eine polemische: der Gegner wird oft, bald in der Einzahl, bald in der Mehrzahl angeredet, bald wird von ihm oder ihnen in der 3. Pers. masc. oder von der Gegenpartei im fem. gesprochen, z. B. 10, 4: 

1, 19 und 7, 20: 
10, 5 ff.: 

Gegen wen aber ist die Polemik gerichtet? Der Abschnitt 1 belehrt uns darüber, wie ich glaube, mit voller Deutlichkeit. 1, 3 ff. beweist, dass der Verf. sich gegen die Schule der Accentuatoren und Punktatoren wendet, die sich um die Regeln von run und roiND, von run und roi, von einer und einer, um die musikalische Bedeutung der Tonzeichen (1, 5 ff.), um das lange Gämez (ibid. l. 8), um die Verstheilung (ibid. l. 10) hin und her streiten, aber nicht Bescheid wissen, sondern in Verlegenheit gerathen, wenn man sie nach einigen Stücken der Bibelworte und dem schlichten Sinne fragt, und sich auch in den biblischen Satzungen und Vorschriften nicht zurechtfinden (ibid. l. 12 und 13). Dass die babylonische Schule der Accentuatoren gemeint ist, geht aus 10, 9 hervor. 

Die gehäuft zum Theil sehr schwierigen Fragen, die der Verf. vorbringt, sind für ihn selbst nicht etwa Einwände oder Angriffe gegen die Bibel, auch nicht Beweise für die Unzulänglichkeit des Schriftwortes, denn er lässt deutlich durchblicken, dass der rechte Bibelklärer auf jede der gestellten Fragen eine Antwort bereit haben müsse. Aber die Männer, die statt mit dem Inhalte der Bibel und mit eigentlicher Bibelklärung sich ausschliesslich mit den Vocal- und Tonzeichen u. dgl. sich beschäftigen, sollen durch solche schwierige Fragen, an die sie niemals gedacht haben und auf die sie nichts zu antworten vermögen, ad absurdum geführt werden. Der Verf. ist kein Häretiker und kein Skeptiker, sondern ein Bibelgläubiger, und zwar ein Rabbanit, der all sein Wissen, auch das
biblische, nur der gaonäischen Schule verdankt. Von einem bei Karäern genossenen Bibelunterricht ist mit keinem Worte die Rede. Schechter's Behauptung (p. 353 und Anmerkung derselben), dass der Verf. von den bei Karäern üblichen Ausdrücken reichlich Gebrauch macht, ist unerwiesen. Auch finden sich nicht ausschliesslich bei karäischen Schriftstellern. Selbstverständlich ist alles Lob, das unser Autor den gaonäischen Hochschulen spendet, durchaus ernst gemeint, und von der scheinbar gegen die Bibel gerichteten Kritik und Polemik bleibt bei näherer Betrachtung nichts weiter übrig als der geschickt geführte Nachweis, dass jene, die nur äusserlich mit dem Texte der Bibel sich befassen, die heilige Schrift nicht verstehen und gegenüber den mannigfachen Schwierigkeiten und anscheinenden Widersprüchen, die der Bibel erklärer hinwegzuräumen hat, völlig rathlos und hilflos dastehen. Wenn der Verf. z. B. in Abschn. 3, 1 zu einer chronologischen Schwierigkeit bemerkt: נשתן, so ist das nicht so zu verstehen, als ob nach des Verfassers Meinung die Bibel das Denken verwirrte oder gar zu verwirren beabsichtigte, sondern so, dass bei jenen, die unfähig sind, den chronologischen Widerspruch zu lösen, durch die Bibel eine Confusion im Denken hervorgerufen werden müsse. Der Verf. weiss wohl, dass meine Antagonisten genau so wie er an die Heiligkeit und Unantastbarkeit des Bibelwortes glauben, aber er wirft ihnen mit Recht vor, dass wer die inhaltlichen Schwierigkeiten der Bibel ignoriert und nicht einmal zu beseitigen versucht das Gotteswort und den Gottesglauben der Anzeifung und Verkennung, ja der Missachtung und dem Spotte preisgibt.

Dass der unbekannte Verf. vor Saadjia gelebt habe, wie Bacher (p. 741) annimmt, kann ich nicht glauben. Mir scheint der etwas unklare Sinn von 7, 25-28 nur der zu sein, dass die Jünger der Accentuatoren schule behaupten, die Schrift sei ihr Erbtheil (l. 25), während die Schule der Gaonim, die sich mit Talmud und Mischna beschäftige, ihren Jüngern den Bibeltext zwar gut eingeprägt habe, aber eine bestimmte Meinung darüber nicht zu erkennen gebe. Das Wort וּצָרֵד in l. 27 ist schwer zu verstehen. Weder passt die Bedeutung von וּצָרֵד in den Zusammenhang, noch auch ist es ersichtlich, wer unter dem Subject "wir" in וּצָרֵד gemeint ist. Bacher's Übersetzung "konnten wir nicht" wäre richtig, wenn es nicht וּצָרֵד, sondern וּצָרֵד hiesse. Es geht aber keineswegs daraus hervor, dass zur Zeit des Verfassers Bibelauslegung in den gaonäischen Schulen nicht gelehrt worden ist, wir es also, wie Bacher meint, mit einem vor saadjianischen Bibel erklärer zu thun haben. Ich glaube vielmehr sowohl aus dem, was 1, 3 und 4 über die Accente gesagt wird, als auch aus den in Abschn. 7 gemachten grammatischen und
lexicalischen Bemerkungen schliessen zu dürfen, dass der Verf. nach Saadja gelebt hat. Die Accentlehre war vor Saadja noch nicht so ausgebildet, die hebr. Grammatik noch nicht so weit fortgeschritten, wie es unser Text verräth. Die Gegner aber, die darin bekämpft werden, konnten auch, nachdem durch Saadja die Bibelauslegung in die gaonäischen Lehrsitze eingeführt war, replicierend von den babylonischen Hochschulen behaupten, dass diese keine masoretische Kenntniss des Bibeltextes verrathen.

N. Porges.

HARZBURG, im August 1901.
ISAIAH XLV. 18, 19.

לֹא תֶּחְדֶּשֶׁה לֵשָׁבָת מִצְרַיִם

The usual translation of the above words from Isa. xl. 18 is: "he created it not a waste, he formed it to be inhabited." Taken by itself, no exception can be taken to the idea conveyed by this sentence, and, as far as I am aware, all commentators understood the words in this sense. God's object in creating the earth was not to produce a waste, but he meant it to be a place on which the human race should develop, and expand, and fulfil the destination assigned to it.

But on looking at the context, the phrase seems to be out of keeping with the tenor of the immediately preceding, and the immediately following exhortations. The whole of the expostulation contained in the verses between xliv. 5 and xlvii. 11 is directed against the senselessness of worshipping gods made by the hands of man, the utter helplessness of these gods and their impotency of doing anything for themselves. Man not only had to make them, but must continually nurse and tend them, and the inert blocks are, for all that, believed to be the creators of those who created them and everything else. The prophet points to the Universe and all it contains, and, by contrasting the true Creator and Supporter of everything with those torpid masses of matter, to the utter insanity of those who worship the latter. This is the tenor of the unparalleled exposure of those who make their gods, which commences xliv. 5. The prophet constantly points out that it is God, and God only, who has created and formed everything. "I, God, and no one else, and nothing else, could do all that." After some special applications of the theme to Israel and its history, it is again taken up with renewed vigour in xlv. 5. The prophet does not tire of pressing that truth upon the people, at the same time showing the utter imbecility of assuming clay vessels to be the creators of the potters who made them (xlv. 9), the helplessness of the made creators who collapse if not held up by those who made them (xlv. 20; xlvii. 1-3, 7), whereas the eternal God
needs no support, but himself made everything, and bears everything (xlvi. 4). This is also expressed in our verse, xliv. 18: “For thus says the Lord that created the heavens; he is God that formed the earth and made it, he established it... I am the Lord and there is no one else.” In the midst of the admonition as to God’s sole authorship of all that exists, a new idea is introduced by the parenthesis: “He created it not to be waste (or, in vain), he formed it to be inhabited”; and the uniform tenor of the address is broken.

I therefore consider the word הוהי not as an apposition to the object (it, namely, the earth), but to be the subject to the verbs יארה נבאו and ייצא נבאו, and the negation לא to apply to both verbs. By the word הוהי are designated those inert and impotent masses of matter which, people imagine, did all these things, and the verse ought to be translated: “For thus says the Lord that created the heavens, he is God; that formed the earth and made it, he established it. It is not the vain (idol) that created it, that formed it for habitation, it is I, God, and no one else.”

There is no difficulty in the word הוהי being used to denote idols. They are called הוהי in 1 Sam. xii. 21 צֹאֲה הַיָּהָה אֵשׁ הָאָרֶץ לֵא יִתְקֵל לָא. Isaiah says in the same exhortation (xliv. 9) נבאו על הוהי, צֹאֲה, and lxix. 4 he uses the word as a noun: הוהי בִּכְלָלָה כָּלָל הוהי.

I feel also inclined to take the word הוהי in the next verse (xliv. 19), in the same sense, as an apposition to the object בְּכָלָל, and opposed to עַל הוהי and מַעָּשֵׂים עַדָּר and לְךַשֵׁם מַעָּשְׂים at the end of the verse. It brings out vividly the contrast between God and הוהי, indicated in the preceding verse.

S. A. HIRSCH.
AUTOS DE FÉ AND JEWS.


Si es venido, no es venido
El Mesias prometido,
Que no es venido.

Ein ausserordentlich grosses Auto de fé fand 1625 in Madrid statt.


Beim dem Sonntag den 18. Mai 1721 in Sevilla abgehaltenem Auto de fé wurden Antonio Carillo, dessen Frau und dessen 95jährige Mutter

lebenslänglichem Kerker bestraft wurden, und in Saragossa, wo 21 Judaisirende, nicht einer, wie Adler angiebt, reconciliirt wurden.


einer unterirdischen Synagoge den Gottesdienst geleitet und Predigten gehalten hatte, den Feuerstoss.

1629, 1. April, gab es in Evora und 2. September in Lissabon Autos da fé.

1642, 2. April, wurden in Lissabon zwei reiche Juden verbrannt und mehrere garrottirt, und—

1647, 15. (22.) December, erlitt in Lissabon der junge Isaac de Castro Tartas den Feuertod.


M. Kayserling.
CRITICAL NOTICES.

DR. KRAUSKOPF ON THE OBERAMMERGAU PLAY.

A Rabbi's Impressions of the Oberammergau Passion Play: by Dr. JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF. (Philadelphia, 1901.)

This book consists of six addresses on the subject of the Oberammergau Passion Play, together with three supplemental chapters which set forth at greater length some leading statements laid down by the author. The addresses were given in Dr. Krauskopf's synagogue at Philadelphia, but unlike most sermons they well deserved publication. They are fresh, stimulating and suggestive; here and there we come across passages of genuine rhetorical power. They illustrate the delightful freedom of the American Jewish pulpit; at the same time they emphatically disprove some of the fabulous nonsense which is commonly reported as to the "sort of things which Dr. Krauskopf is wont to say." Christianity is freely discussed; the texts are taken both from the Old and New Testaments; Jesus is spoken of with high reverence and honour; at the end a strong liberal or reform position is taken up; but sermons more emphatically Jewish it would be impossible to find.

Christians of every school would disagree with most of the author's conclusions. Unitarians as well as Trinitarians would deny the validity of his criticism and the accuracy of his main results. I myself have grave doubts whether the life of Jesus and the rise of Christianity are to be explained and accounted for upon Dr. Krauskopf's lines.

Thus our author writes as a Jew and with the most intense Jewish sympathies. In one or two instances even he has not (to my mind) quite freed himself from the common ruck of Jewish prepossession about the New Testament and Jesus. But yet any open-minded Christian would read his book with interest and pleasure. It is throughout written in a spirit of tolerance and respect. Dr. Krauskopf puts his own case strongly; he speaks out in no uncertain voice (and well he may) about the calumnies and bitter persecutions from which
the Jews have suffered and are suffering, but for himself good will, forbearance and brotherly love are his watchwords; these are the qualities which he desires to see prevail and it is to advance their cause that his book was written.

The central object of the addresses is to give the true and historical account of the brief events which culminated in the crucifixion, and to contrast this both with the inaccurate statements of the Gospels and with the scenic representation of those statements in the Oberammergau play. Dr. Krauskopf wants to show that Pilate and the Romans have been unhistorically whitewashed while the Jews with equal falsity have been blackened and maligned. He wishes to prove that the death of Jesus was due exclusively to the Romans and that the Jews had no hand in it. He holds that the teaching of Jesus was not opposed to the teaching of the Rabbis, that the attacks upon them, put by the Gospel writers into his mouth, are unhistorical, that there was no violent hatred on either side, that the Judas story is a concoction of impossibilities, and that Jesus, when he saw that his cause was hopeless and that the messianic expectations in which he had only gradually grown to believe through the enthusiasm of his followers, were a baseless delusion, voluntarily surrendered himself into the hands of the Romans.

It is needless to say that though Dr. Krauskopf makes several acute and damaging criticisms of the traditional story, he does not go anywhere near to proving his own version of the case. That would need not a small collection of sermons, without footnotes and references, but a long volume with all the paraphernalia of scholarship and learning. Till Dr. Krauskopf produces such a volume he cannot hope to make any impression upon the orthodox position. It is no good to say that “his sources are at the command of all and his conclusions can be weighed and tested by all” (p. 13). Conclusions without the evidence are of little value and will be but little regarded. It is an inversion of the regular order of things when Dr. Krauskopf “asks for disproof” of the various statements which he has made. It is for him to disprove the ordinary view; not for the supporters of the ordinary view to disprove his as yet unsupported assertions. I do not by any means desire to imply that the ordinary view (in any one of its endless modifications) is right or that Dr. Krauskopf’s view is wrong, but only that what is wanted is an elaborate book, not a few sermons, even though they be, as doubtless they are, the outcome of wide reading and patient investigation. Our author cannot surely suppose that the ordinary view is so hopeless and so ridiculous that a popular volume of 216 small pages and large print is sufficient to overthrow it?
It may be questioned whether Dr. Krauskopf does not exaggerate the wickedness of the rôle assigned to the Jews in the Gospels (at any rate in the Synoptics), and perhaps also whether he does not exaggerate the effect of that representation in modern times in the more civilized countries of the West. For even if the Gospel narrative be true, we might still argue that the Jews were essentially in the right. Has not modern criticism largely excused them? It has shown that even though the new conception of a suffering Messiah whose kingdom is not of this world be higher than the old conception, the two are radically different, and that it was the second which was foretold in the Old Testament and not the first. It has also shown that none of the Biblical passages on which Jesus is made to rely for the truth of his claims could possibly have referred to him. Again, if Jesus did assert or admit that he was the "Son of God" in a special or peculiar sense, the assertion or admission was blasphemy to those who did not believe in it. As the proofs of his messiahship were wanting or false, why should any one have believed in his Divinity? And why, with their intense and passionate monotheism, should not the Jews have shown their hatred of a blasphemer? Hence though there is doubtless a great deal of exaggeration, of theatrical effect and of designed contrast between light and darkness, good and bad, in the alleged behaviour of the Jews at the catastrophe at Jerusalem, the main outlines seem to me neither antecedently improbable nor morally atrocious. Human nature being what it is, these main outlines, as we may conceive them to have actually occurred, seem to me neither unnatural nor deserving of unqualified condemnation. Doubtless the fact or the supposed fact that the Jews crucified the Son of God, the World's Redeemer, has had an enormous deal to do with the vile treatment they have received from Christian peoples, with the prejudices and hatred under which they have suffered, and with the atrocious persecutions they have undergone and still undergo. But even this fact or supposed fact is happily not strong enough to prevent justice and good feeling, just as, if it were not for many other concurrent causes, it would not probably, even in Austria and Germany, be strong enough in its irrationality to secure the maintenance of an uncivilized and deplorable Anti-Semitism. In England, a judicial murder (let us assume it to be so) committed nineteen hundred years ago happily does not prevent the most excellent fellow feeling and good will. Here at least it would be untrue to say, "we came in contact and yet are distant; we are branded, distrusted, ostracized" (p. 138). I should hope that it is

1 As things are in Roumania, for instance, "atrocious" is too light and insignificant a word.
equally untrue of every English speaking community where Jews are to be found.

One of the most excellent things about Dr. Krauskopf's book is the clear and ingenious way in which the author weaves his New Testament criticisms and his capital descriptions of the play together. In the first five sermons (pp. 17–133) we are never allowed to forget that we are listening to some one who has been to Oberammergau, and that his immediate purpose is to give us a description, as well as impressions, of what he actually saw and heard. It is no mere dry criticism therefore which the preacher gives us; no mere assertions of what he conceives the course of events to have actually been, but while these criticisms and assertions are in a sense the real object of the whole book, they are apparently subordinated to the impressions and description. The total result makes very good reading and leaves a pleasing effect upon the mind.

This is not the place and I am not the man to criticize adequately our author's main position. Dr. Krauskopf puts forward his conclusions with great confidence, but as I have already said, the evidence upon which they are based is necessarily wanting. A few unguarded statements, such as those about the dates of the Gospels, arouse occasional suspicion. Dr. Krauskopf must surely know that 70 to 80 A.D. is the commonly accepted date for the Gospel of Mark, and that from 30 to 80 is only 50 years. Of course our author is perfectly at liberty to say that he does not adopt this date, but in that case he must give us elaborate proof, and no mere assertion, that the "ordinary view" is wrong. I will only add a personal doubt with regard to Dr. Krauskopf's estimate of the teaching of Jesus. Here our author takes up and even exaggerates a favourite Jewish line. Whatever Jesus says in favour of the Law and of the Rabbis is true and authentic; passages which point the other way are "unhistorical." He admires Jesus highly. "I will yield to none," he says, "in recognizing the civilizing influence of the man of Nazareth; I am ready to bestow on him as high a tribute as any one has yet bestowed; if I cannot say that it was he who made divinity human, I am ready to rank him among the foremost of those who have made humanity divine" (p. 43). And again, "There has probably never been a Christian who has studied the life of the preacher and teacher of Nazareth with greater reverence than I have, or who values his real teachings more highly than I do" (p. 151). Nevertheless Jesus "never preached a doctrine, advocated a reform, that was not strictly Jewish" (p. 145). "There was nothing that Jesus ever preached or taught that had not the heartiest endorsement of the Rabbis of Israel. Not a precept had he ever uttered that had not proven him a Hebrew
of the Hebrews. His every word breathes of the religious and moral and social atmosphere of his time. His every act is the translation into deed of the aspirations of the pious and cultured Jew in the days of Palestine's bondage under the cruel Roman. His every declaration to the people is a restatement of his fundamental position that he had not come to make common cause with the Gentile, but to preach to Israel; that he had not come to antagonize or to destroy, but to fulfil; that he had not come to remove as much as a jot or tittle of the Law and the prophets, but to preserve their institutions and to conserve their spirit. His every admonition to the people was a reiteration of the teaching of Moses to worship the One God, and to love him with all their heart and soul and mind, and to love their neighbours as themselves. His every teaching with regard to the Scribes and Rabbis, members of the Sanhedrin, was that they sit in Moses' seat, and whatsoever they bid that should be done. His very manner of teaching, his aphorisms and quotations, his parables and illustrations, is the manner of the Rabbis of his time. Not a reform principle that he taught, which they had not taught; not a ceremonial abuse to which he objected, which they had not objected to; not an ethical lesson that he enjoined, which they had not enjoined; not a prayer that he offered, which they had not offered; the very 'Lord's Prayer' was a specimen of the kind of prayer they prayed; the very 'Golden Rule' was the rule taught in every school" (p. 73).

After all this it is not surprising that Dr. Krauskopf holds that "there is not one word of truth in all these trumped up charges against the Rabbis, in all the Gospel-recorded bitterness of Jesus against the Scribes and Pharisees, or of the Scribes and Pharisees against Jesus" (p. 75). For "if ever there was a time when peace was needed among Israel itself, that was the time; and if ever there was a man to knit the people in closest bond of mutual sympathy and helpfulness in the hour of the country's direst distress, Jesus was that man. Not he the man to brand the teachers of his people 'hypocrites,' 'scorpions,' 'whited sepulchres.' There was not enough of gall in him to force such words to his lips. He who preached to love the enemy, to bless those that curse, to do good to those that harm, to resist no evil, certainly could not harm or curse them that had not harmed or cursed. This bitter denunciation of the teachers of Israel is the language of the later-day Romanized vindictive theologians of the church militant. From his earliest childhood, at his mother's breast, he had drunk in the Jew's reverence of the teacher in Israel, of the judge who judges in God's stead; and in all his studies of the history of Israel he had not come across a time
when the teachers of Israel were more deserving of reverence than in that age that produced a Philo, a Hillel, a Gamaliel, a Jochanan ben Saccai" (p. 64).

I venture with all deference to doubt the accuracy of these statements. The Jesus of Dr. Krauskopf might have been a milder and gentler man than the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, but, in spite of Paul, such a Jesus was not and could not have been the founder of Christianity. Not even all the "parallels" drawn up by Dr. Krauskopf between Talmud and New Testament (the dates and contexts of which would, by the way, need careful examination) will suffice to destroy the originality of the "man of Nazareth." Without a Jesus, who in life and tenets was not a mere replica of any other contemporary Rabbi, the Gospels are an even greater puzzle than before. If Jewish critics of the New Testament are still bent upon proving that the teaching of Jesus as a whole, both upon its positive and its negative side, for both are almost equally important, and taken in close connexion with his life, contains no originality, no departure or deflection from the current and average Rabbinic teaching and practice, their labours are, I fear, doomed to sterility. Dr. Krauskopf can "reverence" Jesus; but while Amos may be original, Jesus must be only an instance. When will the next step be taken?

Of the three supplemental addresses the third on "Paul—the founder and spreader of Christology" is the most interesting. Dr. Krauskopf gives a clever and impartial sketch of Paul's principles and work, and he writes with perhaps as much accuracy as excessive brevity will allow. The last few sentences well sum up the author's position both as regards Judaism and Christianity.

"With all Paul's faults, with all the injuries his Christology has wrought, we have more reason to be grateful to him than we have cause for censure. As Jews, we are indebted to him for spreading the ethics of Judaism among a Gentile world, for doing for the cause of Israel what never was done by Jew before or since, for showing us how, by the removal of obsolete, meaningless and repellant ceremonies, rites and observances, Judaism, pure and simple, might be made a world-conquering religion. As members of civilized society, we owe him unstinted praise for coming to the rescue of Gentile peoples, at a time when they most needed his aid, and for showing countless successors the way in which light, cheer and comfort, faith, hope and charity, may be introduced in a benighted and a cruel world. And each of us may draw from Paul's epoch-making life and deeds the inspiration of independent thought and courageous daring, fearless of the consequences that may ensue. Each Jew may draw from the
results of his labours the hope that the compromise that could not be affected eighteen centuries ago may yet be brought about. The spirit of our age greatly favours such a compromise. What the Christian world needs is another Jew, to complete the Trinity of Jewish Reformers, one who shall combine within himself the moral and religious purity of Jesus and the zeal and energy of Paul. He will be the long expected Messiah. His coming will constitute the Second Advent of the Nazarene Master. The time for his coming is drawing nigh. Obsolete forms and meaningless rites are crumbling away. Offensive doctrines are disappearing. The Judaic Jesus is slowly regaining his lost ground. The Ethics of Judaism are gradually supplanting the Gnosticism of Paul. When the Jew shall have completely cast away his obstructive exclusiveness and ceremonialism, and the Christian his Christology, Jew and Gentile will be one."

The desire expressed for the new Jewish Reformer who shall be the "long expected Messiah" is a piece of rhetoric or a metaphor. But the underlying thought is brave and clear. Would that such free and fearless utterances, whether we entirely agree with them or not, were spoken from the pulpits of English synagogues as well as in America.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

ABBÉ LOISY'S "ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES."

Études Bibliques: par Alfred Loisy (Paris, 1901).

La Religion d'Israël: par Alfred Loisy (Paris, 1901).

These are two small but important pamphlets by a distinguished Roman Catholic scholar and theologian. The second consists mainly of a very clear historical sketch of the origin and development of the Jewish religion; the former, to which I shall here confine myself, is a collection of six essays bearing upon the Inspiration of Scripture and upon Biblical Criticism. Their object, according to the Abbé Loisy's short preface, is "the reconciliation of Catholic dogma and discipline with the scientific study of the Bible."

We are by this time quite familiar with an attempted alliance between Protestant faith and the "higher criticism." The critical "results" which are accepted as consonant with and indeed con-
firmatory of Christianity relate mainly to the Old Testament. The reason for this limitation is apparent; its justification more dubious. But in the Old Testament, and to a far more limited extent in the New, traditional dates and authorships of books, improbable stories and awkward miracles are freely abandoned. In the Bible, as in so many other things, we hear of a growth and a development. The evolution reaches its term in the person and teaching of Jesus, though whether this sudden arrival at perfection and finality with a particular date and person is as "scientific" as the previous growth we are not clearly and cogently informed. In any case the new way of looking at the Bible (and for my own part I largely agree with the theologians) is said to make it at once "more human and more divine." We are extremely familiar with language and arguments of this kind both from Anglicans and Nonconformists.

It would now appear that the same sort of process is going on and the same sorts of things are being said in the Roman Catholic Church. There too an earnest and sincere body of thinkers—far fewer in number I imagine than among Protestants, but yet not without significance—is seeking to reconcile Catholicism with free inquiry and critical results. There too liberal believers are attempting to show that the critical handling of the Bible does no violence to its inspiration, and can well be carried on within the limits and under the sanction of the Infallible Church.

A Jewish reviewer of M. Loisy's books naturally asks himself, When will the Jews follow suit? Protestant believers tell us that criticism is only truly possible outside Rome; M. Loisy tells us, on the contrary, that it is only Catholicism which can absorb critical results and be essentially unaffected by them. Will not some believing and orthodox Jews tell us soon that it is only Judaism which can withstand unharmed the critic's probing?

To what is Jewish silence on this deeply important question to be attributed? I hope our Rabbis and teachers do not really think that Judaism is in a worse case than Christianity, so far as the criticism of the Bible is concerned? or is there less liberty for Jewish Rabbis even than for Roman Catholic priests? M. Loisy has apparently suffered for his outspokenness (Études, p. 60, note 3), but he remains a priest. Or are we to believe that Jewish teachers have more insight than their Christian brethren and that they see more clearly whither Criticism must ultimately lead?

I do not suppose that this is the reason, but I fancy that there would be a great deal in it if it were! To my thinking, Criticism must end in Christian Unitarianism or in Jewish "Reform." It needs freedom, and in the long run it will produce freedom. Thé
freedom of Unitarianism and the freedom of Reformed Judaism seem consistent with Criticism; it is hard to think the same of the Thirteen Articles and the Nicene Creed or the Infallible Pope. But it is an immense blessing that many believing Protestants and Roman Catholics do not agree, and it would be a great blessing if many orthodox Jews did not agree.

For the more or less thorough acceptance of Criticism keeps many a pious soul to religion and to God. Honest compromises are needed in the passage from authority to freedom. Religion is made to seem consonant with science and with history; the Bible becomes more vivid; "more human and more divine." Who may dare to throw stones at inconsistency? Is the Weltanschauung of the freest of us all of a piece?

Thus it would be well for Jewish divines to consider whether they cannot follow the example of M. Loisy. Criticism led Mr. Addis to leave the Church; but in M. Loisy's case it has apparently only strengthened and confirmed his Catholicism. It is amusing to observe him hitting out every now and then against Rationalism and Protestantism alike. Catholicism alone possesses the key to the full intelligence of the Bible. For the Bible is true, but only the Church can interpret it. Perhaps the orthodox Jew might say by way of parallel that the oral law explains and corrects the Pentateuch; but the Catholic Church, if one can accept its divine authority, is alive and responsive and in a sense susceptible of growth, whereas the oral law has become as much a letter and as moveless a fixity as the written codes themselves.

The problems which are presented to Judaism and to Catholicism by the methods and results of the critics and the historians are not by any means the same. It is not merely that in the one case there is only the Old Testament which has to be considered, whereas in the other case there is the New Testament as well. Christians would argue that the extra book makes an alliance with Criticism far easier, while Jews will insist that the advantage lies with them. But in the special case of Catholicism it would seem that the determining questions must be differently formulated.

In Judaism the crucial problem relates to the Law. If the Pentateuch is not Mosaic, has orthodox Judaism any justification or raison d'être? Or again, if the Codes of the Pentateuch are neither consistent with each other nor perfect in morals and religion, what is the consequence? or lastly, if the events and miracles recorded in the Pentateuch did not actually happen, what becomes of the theoretical basis of the orthodox Jewish religion as laid down in the Thirteen Articles of Creed? These are the questions to which
Jewish divines and Rabbis should address themselves, and concerning which they now maintain so obstinate a silence.

But in Catholicism the main question seems to be: Do the authoritative decrees and decisions of the Church allow a critical attitude towards Scripture?

The Church has laid it down that the Bible is "inspired," but it has never exactly defined what is meant by "inspiration" or wherein precisely inspiration consists. It has also said that the Bible contains and teaches no errors, but it has apparently allowed much pleasant and desirable uncertainty as to what, in this particular connexion, it means by the term.

The Bible, M. Loisly tells us—and herein he agrees with any liberal Protestant—is a book both human and divine.

"Sans doute, comme livre divin, la Bible est au-dessus de la critique. Le savant n'a pas à vérifier le fait de l'inspiration des Livres saints; ce fait échappe nécessairement à toute constatation scientifique; il est attesté par la révélation et par l'Église, interprète de la révélation; le caractère transcendant de la Bible, comparée aux autres documents de l'antiquité, peut servir à le démontrer indirectement, mais non d'une manière absolue. De même, le savant n’a pas à définir l'objet propre de la révélation divine qui est contenu dans la Bible: une autorité infaillible est nécessaire pour cela, et cette autorité n'appartient qu'à l'Église."

But on the other hand the Bible is not only divine, but also human, and as such, like any other book, susceptible of criticism:

"Si la Bible est véritablement un livre divin, elle est aussi, et dans toute la force du terme, un livre humain. La pensée divine s’est humanisée dans l’esprit des auteurs sacrés; elle s’est pour ainsi dire incarnée dans les Livres saints; elle est devenue analysable. La composition des Écritures et leur conservation se sont accomplies sous une direction particulière de la Providence; mais ce sont des faits historiques susceptibles d'être examinés. De ce chef, en tant que livre humain dans sa forme, ayant son origine et son histoire dans l'humanité, la Bible, par cela même qu'elle participe à la condition générale de tous les livres, et particulièrement des livres anciens, peut devenir l'objet de la critique." (Études, p. 11.)

The human and divine elements or aspects of the Bible are welded together into an indivisible unity. You cannot say that one chapter is human and another chapter divine. The whole inspired volume is at once the product of God and the product of man; it is a "supernatural work" which has been interpenetrated from end to end by the divine spirit, so that there is nothing in it which is human and not divine, just as there is nothing in it which is divine and not human (p. 35).
As in a good action of our own it is impossible to analyse that part of it which is due to God's grace and aid, and that part of it which is due to ourselves (the comparison is mine and not our author's), so is it with the Scriptures and their inspiration:—

"L'inspiration des Écritures est à concevoir comme un concours divin dont le but a été de préparer à l'Église une sorte de répertoire pour l'enseignement religieux et moral. Ce concours échappe à notre analyse, comme toutes les opérations divines dans l'ordre naturel et dans l'ordre surnaturel. Mais on peut affirmer, sans crainte de se tromper, que ce concours spécial a prévenu et enveloppé toute l'activité des écrivains sacrés, en sorte qu'il est impossible de discerner dans leurs œuvres ce qui vient uniquement de Dieu et ce qui vient uniquement de l'homme. Tout vient à la fois de l'un et de l'autre." (p. 57).

We shall see later on how well this doctrine of inspiration consorts with the presence of imperfection and inaccuracies within the Sacred Books, and how ingeniously the true Bible demands for its correct interpretation the Infallible Church. It is also fairly obvious how the human side of the Bible provides criticism with a province in which to work. Whether the divine side does not set up looming barriers—"Thus far and no farther"—may perhaps strike some readers with equal force. Meanwhile I wonder whether the orthodox Jewish divines would agree with M. Loisy's doctrine. It is true that to attempt a separation of the human and the divine elements is both difficult and even unfair. It will not do to pick out all the gems (i.e. whatever seems to you to be true and good) and to say, "This is the divine part of the Bible; all the rest is human." For one thing, a great deal which you thus call human may be clad with supernatural sanctions, put into the mouth of God, and attested by miracles. It will not do, as M. Loisy says (quoting a certain M. Dausch, a German Roman Catholic priest, who has written a book on Biblical inspiration), "to vivisection the Scripture. But from a higher point of view it may be doubted whether the attempted vivisection is not as near the truth as we can go. The inspiration of the Bible will always present insuperable difficulties, so long as the Bible is marked off from all other books. To suppose that Esther and Ezra are inspired but that the Republic and the Antigone are not, is revolting to our common sense. M. Loisy truly says that the divine "concours" and the divine "opérations" escape our analysis. Either we believe in this co-operation or we do not. But even if we do, we cannot explain it or put our finger upon its exact location. To say that in the Bible all comes at once both from God and man seems to me to be one of those generalities like "God rules the world." or "Nothing happens
in the world without the foreknowledge and the permission of God." Therefore in a sense God permits, therefore he is responsible for, sin and madness, misery and crime. Yes; but in spite of the logical difficulties, we shall continue to assert that in a special sense he is the author of goodness and of truth, even as he himself is true and good. And therefore whatever has done good in the world, or whatever our God-given reason makes us believe to be good and true, that we shall continue to regard as the gift of God. In this higher and fairer sense—even though it may also be charged with vagueness and looseness—we shall assert with Plato that what is divine is divine because it is good, and that it is not good because a creed or a church declares that it is divine.

We do not seem to get to liberty till we realize and are satisfied with the position that in kind the Bible is "inspired" in the same way that other good and true books are inspired, but that in degree of inspiration it excels them all. It would be interesting to know whether modern Jewish divines accept M. Loisy's view or mine, or whether they adopt a third view which differs from us both.

But the Church and the Popes have apparently declared not merely that the Bible is inspired, but that it is without error. What does that mean?

It does not mean, first of all, that the traditional ascription of particular books to particular persons is true. "Jamais jusqu'à ce jour l'Eglise n'a défini que tel livre de la Bible appartient à tel auteur ou qu'il a été composé de telle manière" (p. 16). Thus it is not in the least necessary to believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Here is a pleasant bit of liberty at a stroke, whereas many a Jewish divine will probably sigh with envy. But how about mistakes as regards facts? Of these, even apart from miracles, there are a large number in the Bible.

I do not quite understand how M. Loisy deals with them. As regards scientific mistakes he is clear enough. Science is not the object of the revealed teaching contained in the Bible, and therefore scientific errors are not errors in the theological or ecclesiastical

---

1 *Euthyphro*, 10 E—a passage to the deep significance of which Ranke has called attention: *Welgeschichte*, i. 2, p. 75.

2 The words of the present Pope's encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*, are very strong and definite: "At nefas omnino fuerit, aut inspirationem ad aliquas tantum sacras Scripturae partes coangustare, aut concedere sacram ipsum errasse auctorem." And again: "Fideliter teneant . . . nihil ex rerum natura, nihil ex historiae monumentis colligi posse quod cum Scripturis reversa pugnet."
meaning of the term (Études, pp. 32, 60). They are merely the human imperfection to which the divine truth was adapted. None of the Biblical writers meant or wanted to write a lesson in astronomy. This seems satisfactory as regards science, and it almost (though not quite) removes the difficulty from accepting the "inerrancy" of (say) Gen. i-xi. But the matter is more difficult when we come to historical narratives. For instance, M. Loisy would not, I imagine, accept the wise men of the East or the massacre of the innocents or the Gadarene swine as historical facts. If not facts, are they errors? Are we to believe that Elisha made iron swim, or that Elijah went up in a chariot of fire to heaven, or that the Spirit of God descended like a dove, or that Jesus walked upon the sea? And yet these things are recorded as facts. M. Loisy does not tell us definitely whether he believes in these stories or not: in fact, the question of miracles is not discussed or mooted. But yet criticism does not stop short of them. Criticism says that miracles are the frequent and customary characteristic of religious revivals and of spiritual excitement. And stories such as those mentioned above it simply brushes aside. They are not facts, but legends or misreported anecdotes, or symbols turned into stories, or spiritual truths materialized, or delusions or visions or inventions. They are not facts in the sense that the battles of Hastings or Carchemish are believed to be facts.

Whether such criticism is rationalist and Protestant, or whether it is legitimate M. Loisy does not clearly inform us. He chiefly confines himself to the comfortable limits of Genesis. His canons for the detection of errors which are not "errors" in the theological sense seem to be these (the formulation is mine):

1. An error is not an error when the sacred writer did not definitely intend to teach it. (This test, as we have seen, disposes of all scientific "errors.")

2. An error is not an error when it is merely adopted for the purpose of conveying a truth, or when the sacred writer did not intend it to be regarded as a fact or truth.

3. An error is not an error when it is only an adaptation of truth to the moral and religious capacity of the time when it was written or told.

4. An error is not an error when it is in accordance with the literary habits of the age.

I am not sure whether we might not add:

5. An error is not an error when it was written in good faith and has no relation to the real object or subject of revelation.

The first three canons suffice for the first eleven chapters of Genesis, but after all these are comparatively easy. I fancy no
Jewish Rabbi would mind saying that he did not believe in the Deluge or in the Tower of Babel or in Adam and Eve. The trouble only begins with Abraham. Of the first eleven chapters M. Loisy says that "ils ne se présentent pas comme historiques." Hence from the historical point of view they contain neither truth nor error. (La Religion d'Israël, pp. 8, 9, 15; Études, pp. 29, 71, &c.) I take M. Loisy to imply that J and P and the Redactor did not mean their stories of the creation and of paradise and so on to be taken as historical narratives, but that they only meant them to teach certain general truths with regard to God and to the world and to the early history of man. But this assumption is itself extremely doubtful. The latest and the most brilliant commentator of Genesis strongly denies it. He holds most emphatically that the tellers and hearers of Israelite legend, like tellers and hearers of legends elsewhere, believed them to be true. (This belief would surely extend as far as J, though we may perhaps hesitate as to P and the Redactor.) The legends and myths give in full earnest the explanation or reason of present and actual phenomena: because the woman was taken out of the man's rib, therefore man yearns for her society: to its teller the story was no poetic dressing up of an idea, but a fact that had actually occurred.

But passing beyond Gen. i-xi, it will not be denied that the authors of the narratives concerning Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses regarded them as facts, and not as mere vehicles or instruments for moral and religious truths. How M. Loisy regards them he indicates thus:—

"Disons tout de suite que l'histoire d'Israël est relativement claire depuis Samuel et Saul; auparavant, en remontant jusqu'à Moïse quelques points se détachent en demi-jour sur un fond obscur; avant Moïse et jusqu'à Abraham, on discerne vaguement dans l'ombre quelques figures indécises; avant Abraham c'est la nuit complète." (La Religion d'Israël, p. 14.)

These words must, I take it, mean that the large majority of the statements made about Abraham and Moses are not accurate; in other words they are errors. But if so, why are they not errors in the bad sense? The first three canons do not here apply; the fourth explains away the "erroneous" attribution of the Pentateuchal laws to Moses, but, in the case before us, is inapplicable. We are left with the fifth, but I am bound to say that I do not find the fifth definitely stated or even clearly implied. I am not sure that our author would desire to adopt it.

1 Gunkel's Genesis, p. xviii and elsewhere.
Moses is not so important to M. Loisy as he would be to a Jewish divine, but he is not without his claims and his difficulties. For it seems that—

"Il importe à la vérité surnaturelle de la religion israélite que la tradition concernant Moïse ait une base historique incontestable, et il suit de là que l'historicité de la tradition est réclamée pour la preuve de la foi." (Études, p. 105.)

It is difficult to gather whether we have to believe that anything of the present Pentateuch was written down by Moses himself (p. 95). The great mass of laws is certainly far later, but in their case, as in the case of the speeches put into Moses' mouth, "en faisant parler Moïse, l'auteur avait conscience d'interpréter comme il le fallait dans le présent la pensée du législateur. Le procédé n'a rien que de conforme aux habitudes de l'antiquité." Hence so far as the "Mosaic" laws and speeches are concerned, the error is covered and sanctioned by the second and fourth canons, and possibly by the fifth also. I have a far higher opinion of P than most (Protestant) critics, but I am bound to say that it seems to me very doubtful whether many of his laws were not put into the mouth of Moses merely in order to get them adopted. And if P and his school thought that all their laws were Mosaic in the sense, that they were true to the Mosaic spirit, they intended the people to regard them as Mosaic in a more literal and less accurate sense.

The case of Moses seems therefore to strain the elasticity of M. Loisy's canons very uncomfortably. I cannot but be grateful that my own personal religion, which I choose to call Reformed Judaism, is entirely unaffected by the question whether Moses did or did not do any of the things which the Bible says he did, or whether he said any of the words which the Bible puts into his mouth, or uttered or wrote any of the laws which the Bible ascribes to him. I admit that if the whole story of Moses were deliberate invention from beginning to end, it would be hard to separate the many noble and true things in the Pentateuch from the alloy of fraud; but such deliberate invention is of course a ridiculous hypothesis. Yet without any such foolish hypothesis, the uncertainty as to what Moses said or did must always remain extreme, and though critics may continue to believe that such a person as Moses really existed and that he was the true founder of the Yahwistic religion, such broad and general statements go a very little way towards establishing the accuracy and truth of the stories about him in the Pentateuch.

M. Loisy has not much to say about the "inaccuracies" in all the other portions of the Bible, and what he does say is by no means wholly clear. So far as I understand him, he seems to imply that
where the writer or redactor adopts a traditional story or statement he is not responsible for its truth. He may even tell two contradictory versions of the same event of which only one can possibly be true, as for example the two accounts of the origin of the Israelite monarchy, or of David's acquaintance with Saul. In such cases, where the sacred writers merely borrow from current stories or chronicles, they are not responsible for their accuracy. The errors of the sources are not their errors, and hence we have here but one more instance where an error in the Bible is not a Biblical error. It is not an error in the technical sense of the word; it has no theological significance (Études, p. 57 n.). To my own mind such explanations possess little value or meaning, but if they honestly bring back many a doubting heart to religion and to God, who shall say that they are without their use? Nor must we forget that those who profit by such resting-places or crutches, call them by what metaphor we will, may lead nobler lives of deeper religious intensity than those who need them not. What after all does God care whether we accept these compromises or no? He looks to what we do and are, we must suppose. Not till the life is equal, may we liberals and reformers boast.

So much about facts. More interesting and no less important is the question about opinions and doctrine. Here M. Loisy takes up a position which is in many respects closely analogous to that assumed by many liberal Protestants. Revelation grew: it culminated in Christ. The teaching of the Old Testament is not erroneous, but it may often be imperfect. It was germinal teaching, providentially adapted to the needs and capacities of the time. It needs interpretation and even correction, whether by way of curtailment or expansion. The interpreter or corrector is the Infallible Church.

"Par ce côté relatif de la Bible la révélation se trouvait proportionnée aux besoins des temps où elle s'est produite" (Études, p. 36).

"La doctrine révélée ressemble à un germe précieux qui vit et grandit" (p. 52).

"Aux époques toutes primitives, la vérité révélée s'est moulée dans les contours d'une pensée presque enfantine" (p. 25).

The imperfections of the Bible were a condition of its success, "on pourrait dire une qualité indispensable. En ce sens, on peut dire que ces imperfections contribuaient à rendre la Bible vraie pour le temps où elle a paru" (p. 54 fin.).

Such statements as these are familiar to every one. How a growing revelation came to a stop at a particular moment, and whether there are not many imperfections in the New Testament as well as in the Old, I will not inquire. On these crucial points, liberal but orthodox
Christians, and Jews, whether orthodox or reform, will never convince or even (probably) understand each other. But it is interesting to notice the special turns which M. Loisy gives to his general propositions.

The Bible, we must remember, is inerrant in this sense, that we never find in it "the formal teaching of any error presented as divine truth" (Études, p. 34).

M. Loisy applies this canon to his favourite subject, the first eleven chapters of Genesis. I hardly think they will stand the test. First of all there are other doctrines in the eleven chapters than those mentioned by M. Loisy. Secondly, of those mentioned by M. Loisy not all are true. On the one hand, for instance, the doctrine of the Divine Envy—the φθινος of the Greeks—is distinctly enunciated in those chapters; on the other hand, the doctrine of "la déchéance primitive" is surely not true. Who nowadays believes in the Fall? It might also be argued that the teachings which M. Loisy elicits from the stories of Genesis are very much sublimated. Genesis à la Gunkel and Genesis à la Loisy seem different things. To this objection, however, our author has a very ingenious reply. It is for the Church to discriminate between the envelope and the truth, it is for the Church moreover to add or to supplement.

"Il est certain que l'interprétation traditionnelle des textes scripturaires, surtout quand il s'agit de l'Ancien Testament, ajoute presque toujours quelque chose au sens vraiment littéral, au sens perçu par les écrivains sacrés . . . . La vérité contenue dans l'Écriture a reçu au cours des siècles une expression plus nette et acquis un développement plus large" (pp. 21, 22).

Does this observation cover, for example, the Old Testament teaching on the subject of immortality or the New Testament teaching on the person of Christ? One can understand that it might possibly cover the second, but how can it cover the first? If the prophets constantly predict that the Messianic age is near at hand, it may perhaps do to say that "l'imminence du règne messianique était un effet de perspective qui avait ses raisons providentielles et psychologiques." But when a Biblical author flatly denies the doctrine of resurrection or immortality, it is hard to see how such emphatic statements can be got over by saying that "Job, les Psaumes, l'Écclésiaste ne contredisent pas doctrinalement l'enseignement des livres plus récents; ils correspondent à un degré moins élevé de la révélation divine" (p. 57).

An observer who stands outside the Catholic Church almost wonders why the Popes should not go a step or two further. Why should they not allow that there are errors in the Bible, not merely
errors that do not count, but real errors; theological errors, historic errors, religious errors, moral errors? Such an admission would make the necessity of the interpreting Church still greater. For even if there were a few downright errors, there would remain a great residuum of truth, and so our author might still say: "La Bible reste vraie, comme le croyaient les Pères, vraie à condition d'être interprétée. La Bible est vraie, mais l'Église est infaillible." He could still make his excellent and telling point: "La critique fait ainsi l'apologie de l'Église contre les sectes fondées sur l'autorité de la Bible seule." He could still aver that the few errors are of no consequence, "puisque le magistère perpétuel de l'Église est là pour discerner infailliblement, sous l'antique enveloppe où elle nous est transmise, la vérité contenue dans l'Écriture" (pp. 58, 59, 36).

The infallible Church, if one could accept that dogma, interpreting in just accordance with the religious needs and capacities of every age, a Bible true in the main, but not true in every statement and detail, is rather an attractive picture! Apart from every soupçon of irony, one cannot but admire the honest efforts of M. Loisy to reconcile both for himself and for others the demands of criticism and reason with the requirements of his faith. It is surely not inconsistent on the part of a Jewish reviewer to express the hope that these efforts may be successful. Liberality in exegesis and liberality in thought usually go together. It is highly improbable that the author of the Études Bibliques could be a reactionary and a bigot in any department of life. Therefore the more the Catholic Church is leavened by such men as he, the better for the Church and for the world. What the ultimate result of such leavening may be, no man can foretell. Finally, I would once more repeat that M. Loisy's writings suggest many special reflections for Jewish as well as for Christian readers. If the Catholic Church can produce a believing divine like M. Loisy, who is ready to speak his mind and say a word in season, should Judaism remain behind?

C. G. MONTEFIORE.
The following pages contain a brief description of the Hebrew MSS. of the Montefiore Library, the bulk of which is now deposited at Jews' College, Queen Square House, Guilford Street, London. The collection comprises:

1. The Halberstam MSS., of which there are 412, acquired through Dr. Gaster in 1892 for the Montefiore College, Ramsgate (marked H. in this Catalogue).

2. MSS. collected in the same College by Dr. L. Loewe (first Principal), during the lifetime of Sir Moses Montefiore.

3. MSS. from the Zunz Library.

4. Later purchases.

The entire collection contains 581 codices. Notices of some of the MSS. have appeared in Geiger's Zeit- schrift, vol. V (Luzatto), the Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, vols. VIII and X (Berliner and Steinschneider), and in other places. A list of Halberstam's collection was compiled by himself in Hebrew, and appeared under the title נおります הוליפן, Vienna, 1890, with many literary references. He often, however, omitted mentioning all the items in composite volumes, and did not alter the leaf numberings of former owners, which are in many cases quite unreliable. It therefore became necessary to number the folia all over again, which I did, whilst at the same time carefully examining each codex once more.

The work was undertaken under the auspices of the Council of Jews' College. A full table of contents with concordance of numbers and indices will be given later on.
I.

BIBLE, TARGUM, MIDRASH, AND COMMENTARIES.

BIBLE.

1. Old Testament in two volumes: 1. Pentateuch (ff. 1-100). The divisions of the weekly portions and Haftaroth are marked on the margin by a later hand. 2. Prophets (ff. 101-286) in the usual order. 3. Hagiographa (fol. 287): Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah. Ff. 289-292 are misplaced, to which attention is called in the marginal note: "At the end index of Haftaroth.

Colophon (different hand): Written by Sāliḥ b. Josef b. Sa'adyah al-Fārisī (fol. 286), fourteenth or fifteenth century, and distinguished by great correctness.


Owners: Yahyā b. Aaron and Samuel . . . .

3. Genesis and Exodus (ending xxiv. 2) with Onqelos and Sa'adyah's Arabic version written after each verse. Ff. 1, 2, 88, 89, 156-159 are written by a later hand and lack the Arabic version. Foll. 103 missing (Gen. xliv. 10 to ver. 27 "לָא מִשְׁמַע") but replaced by a leaf written in a different hand (from לָא מִשְׁמַע to ver. 29 incl.). On the margin corrections and short notes.

4. Genesis (beginning i. 16), Exodus, Leviticus (ending ii. 3 לָא מִשְׁמַע). On the upper and lower margins parallel passages are quoted. The writing is in many places partially effaced.

5. Psalms with Rashi.

Vellum, German char., small 4to, ff. 96 [H. No. 383].
6. Job with an anonymous Commentary. The author is supposed to have been a Provençal Rabbi (see Neubauer, Rabbins français, p. 553). Some of the last leaves are damaged. Written by Israel b. Abraham, 1394 (Berliner Mag., VIII, p. 114, erroneously 1434).

Vellum and paper, French Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 97 [H. No. 198].

TARGUM, MIDRASH.


Written for David b. Nissim Hārōfē b. Vivas (בנעה), and finished 1 Schebat, 5247 (Dec. 26, 1486).

Large Orient. squ. char., fol., ff. 342. The beginning damaged [H. 116].

8. Midrash on Leviticus and Numbers, beginning and end missing. Fol. 146v a notice in Arabic (dated Monday, 16 Tammūz, 1909 (1598)) by Sulēmān b. David b. Musā Al Damērī to the effect that the MS. had been pawned. Marginal notes in Hebrew and Arabic.

Written by David b. Nāsīm Al Qīsī, and finished 3 Tishri, 1906 (Sept. 17, 1594).

Yemen. Rabb. char., fol., ff. 246 [No. 505].


Owner: Joseph b. Zikri.

Span. Rabb. char., fol., ff. 256 [H. No. 92].

BIBLE COMMENTARIES.


Censor: Laurentius Franguellus.

Vellum [ff. 1-20 paper, and written by a later hand], Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 252 [H. No. 15].

11. Fragment of Abraham b. Ezra’s Commentary on Gen. xxiv. 16 to Exod. xxiii. 16.

Orient. Rabb. char., fol., ff. 52 [No. 506].
12. Jacob b. Asher's Commentary on the Pentateuch, fuller than the printed edition, with Glosses by R. Kalan. Pasted over the inside of one of the covers is a vellum leaf bearing Rashi's Commentary on Menahoth, fol. 41v (l. 21) to 42v (b. 20), fol. 41* (r. 21) to 42* (r. 22).

Written by Isaac b. Josefof Portugal, in the province of Aveiro (Aveiro), commenced in Jerusalem, and finished in Safed, Sunday, 7 Tebeth, 5149 (Dec. 6, 1388).


Franco-German Rabb. char., ff. 1, 23, 27, 293 (the last named to replace fol. 292, which is damaged), Ital. curs. char., fol., ff. 293 [H. No. 137].


2. Fol. 12. Nahmanides' short Commentary on the Pentateuch. The greater part of the introduction is missing. After fol. 50 lacuna (Exod. xv. 18 to xvi. 6 towards the end).


Censors: Clemente Carretto, 1623 (ff. 11v and 130); Clemente Renatto.

Owner: Gabriello Cesaro.

No. 1, Ital. curs. char.; Nos. 2 and 3, Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 130 [H. No. 143].


2. Fol. 33. Commentary on Isaiah and Jeremiah (printed under the title ד"ת ז"כ) by the same, but with variations from the existing edition.


Censors: Fra Luigi, 1600; Clemente Carretto, 1623 (ff. 136, 182).

15. Commentary on the Pentateuch, compiled from the Commentaries of Abraham b. Ezra and Levi b. Gerson by Daniel b. Solomon Ḥarofe. The compiler (משה ארנס) styles himself also מְלֶמֶד תֵּרָא. The work begins with what seems to be the compiler's preface, but the first few lines are pasted over. The two commentaries are divided into parts comprising single verses, or groups which follow each other alternately. Fol. 50, a long quotation from Menahem Recanati's קְנַט. Fol. 56, between the portions מִי קֶדֶם אָנֵה הָעָוָה אֶל הָעָוָה, inserted Ibn Ezra's explanations of Exod. i. 4, 9, 11, 14 (as far as מִי קֶדֶם אָנֵה הָעָוָה); ii. 2 (beginning מִי קֶדֶם אָנֵה הָעָוָה), parts of vv. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9; iii. 2 (beginning מִי קֶדֶם אָנֵה הָעָוָה), 14 with the note on the Tetragram, all of which are omitted in their proper places. Fol. 59v follows the other recension of the same note beginning מִי קֶדֶם אָנֵה הָעָוָה, but the end is missing. Ff. 133, 134, fragment of a commentary on Exod. xxii. 1-35. Fol. 294v, on the margin a quotation headed מִי קֶדֶם אָנֵה הָעָוָה. The compiler not only adds many marginal notes on his own behalf, but also frequently refers to Ibn Ezra's grammatical works, Maimoni's Moreh, and the Eight Chapters, Ibn Janāḥ, Qamhi, and mentions Galenus, Avicenna and Immanuel. Fol. 355v, some Glosses on the Moreh, Book II (beginning), and abstracts from the Arūkh, all by the same compiler (cf. Mag., VIII, p. 113, X, p. 101).

The work is in autograph, and was finished in Belmonte (יבן נון), in Ellul, 5208 (1448).


Franco-German curs. char., 4to, ff. 361 [H. No. 213].

16. Commentary on the Pentateuch by Samuel Warburg b. Jacob "מִי קֶדֶם אָנֵה הָעָוָה. At the end an acrostic on the name שְמָוָא מְצַפֶּל. On fol. 180 the German name of the author.

Owner: Lazarus Emanuel in Amsterdam.

German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 180 [H. No. 337].

17. a. , Commentary on the legislative portions of the Pentateuch by Moses . . . in Florence. The author states that this work is a supplement to another of his, styled מִי קֶדֶם אָנֵה הָעָוָה (fol. 7), and which he frequently quotes. The name Moses occurs both in the preface and the concluding poem.

b. Fol. 55v, by the same author. The first is headed , On the plague in Florence; fol. 71v, On an earthquake which
took place in the Florentine district; fol. 75v, On the death of his brother Abigedor in Florence.

2. Fol. 102. Various poems; fol. 104v.

The work No. 1, which is evidently the author's autograph, was wrongly ascribed by a later owner to Abraham b. Shem Tob Bibago. Another owner was a certain Shabbethai.

Owner: Zunz (No. 4).

Vellum, No. 1, Ital. Rabb. char., fifteenth century; No. 2, later curs. char., 4to, ff. 105 [No. 436].

18. Masoretic and exegetical Glosses on the Pentateuch and the Earlier Prophets; Al Shèkh quoted fol. 45v. The beginning is missing.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 53 [No. 461].

19. Stray Glosses on passages of the Pentateuch.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 8 [H. No. 159].

20. Nissim b. Reuben's Commentary on Genesis, beginning בְּמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא רִבְּרָא הָאָמַת הָאָמַת מִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה לְמִשְׁתַּלְגָּדָה כָּרֹא שָׁאָלָה L. Introductory ends 17 and 18. The author quotes Rashi, Ibu Ezra, Maimuni and Nahmanides; Levi b. Gershom is once mentioned on the margin. From the notice on the margin, fol. 10, that the evomer shall be rooted in the earth, the MS. appears to be the author's autograph. The name of another owner is erased, but the notice in question seems to have been written by [hebrew already visible]. Another owner's notice on fol. 1 in the same hand gives the name Solomon Solomon of Dubno (as also on the cover). Next to it appears in square characters the name Solomon of Dubno.

Splendid large Orient. Rabb. char., large 4to, ff. 87 [H. No. 173].


Vellum, German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 8 [H. No. 386].


Owner's notice at the head of fol. 1 destroyed by worms.

Franco-German curs. char., 4to, ff. 147 [H. No. 329].
23. Continuation of above on Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Owners: Jacob and Solomon, sons of Abraham Kohen; of a second notice in Italian written underneath only the name Caesar and the year 1599 are legible.

Franco-German curs. char., 4to, ff. 197 [H. No. 330].

24. Anonymous Commentary on Numbers, chiefly based on Rashi and Ibn Ezra, who are occasionally mentioned by name. In many cases, however, the borrowed passages are reproduced with slight alterations, and without reference to their authors. Beside these Onqelos is quoted, also Moses hak-Kohen [Chiqatilla?], Nahmanides, the הנסיך, and the author's father whose name is not disclosed. The author also often discusses grammatical questions.

Owner: Elhanan, of Portaleone [םוֹסֵר איי'יר ב. מֶנָאַה] b. Menahem (cf. HH., XX, 47).

Ital. curs. char., but frequently illegible on account of water stains, small fol., ff. 93 [H. No. 169].

25. Fragment of a Commentary on the Pentateuch, beginning Gen.iv, ending xxxvii. 21 (בראשית וְרָא). Each portion is introduced by a short poem headed וְרָא.

Yemen. squ. char., fol., ff. 89 [No. 504].


Modern curs. char., 4to, ff. 74 [No. 517].

27. 1. David Qamhi's Commentary on the Haftaroth (printed).


No. 2 vellum, the rest paper, Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 67 [H. No. 302].


German curs. char., large 4to, ff. 32 [H. No. 201].

29. Copy of the Editio Princeps of Levi b. Gershon's Commentary on the Pentateuch with copious marginal notes. At the end extracts from S'forno's Commentary on Genesis.

Censor: Domenico Ierosolimitano, 1610.

Owners: Mašliaḥ גֵּרֶשֹּׁנ (?); Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi in Padua.

The notes in Ital. curs. char., fol., ff. 425 [No. 415].

30. פִּסְח, Homiletic Commentary on the Pentateuch by Judah Leb b. Simon, written 1659 (author's autograph).

German curs. char., 8vo, ff. 216 [No. 580].
31. Fragment of a homiletic Commentary on Genesis (xxxv to xxxvii) in Arabic.

Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 25 [H. No. 454].

32. 1. Rashi's Commentary on the Earlier Prophets, beginning Josh. iii. 4. Some additional Glosses on Josh. xii. 12-20 are inserted after the heading of שמות. Marginal notes indicate the portions used as Haftarah.

2. Fol. 82. Commentary on Pirqē Abōth (ch. I–V) attributed to Rashi (printed).

3. Fol. 97. מפרヶת ה_BYTES, beginning and end missing.


33. 1. Abraham b. Ezra's Commentary on Isaiah.


34. Abraham b. Ezra's Commentary on the Minor Prophets with variations from the printed text. At end: אמי איה ב' על עמק.

Owner: Jacob D'Urmit (fol. 88r).

35. 1. a. Obadyah Sforno's Commentary on the Psalms. The introduction is preceded by a letter to the author's brother Hananel; b. fol. 74v. Remark by the same author on the koń chai; c. fol. 75. הימים של חמשה, and letter to King Henry (II) of France; d. fol. 75, letter to Hananel accompanying the author's Commentary on Job; e. fol. 75v, on dreams; f. fol. 77, Gloss on ממעייך ראש הרשון; g. fol. 77v, short poem printed in Halberstam's Catalogue, p. 59; h. fol. 78, Homilies.

2. Fol. 82. Commentaries on Jonah, Habakkuk (fol. 83v), and Zechariah (fol. 85).

Owner: Jacob D'Urmit.

36. 1. Anonymous Commentary on the Psalms, based on Moses Al Shēkh's Commentary. The preface is written twice, once on a loose sheet.

2. Fol. 109. Commentary on Canticles, by the same author.

German curs. char., eighteenth century, 4to, ff. 200 [No. 516].

87. Homiletic philosophical Commentary on the Psalms (according to Halberstam) by Joshua b. Sho'eib. The first sixteen folios are missing, the MS. begins with the end of Ps. vii and ends Ps. xxxvii. 17. The author mentions Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Maimuni and Levi b. Gershôn. Fol. 133v (Ps. xxx) on the margin דאש לָעְפוּר.


Vellum, German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 96 [H. No. 289].

2. Allegorical Commentary on Ruth, by the same, beginningนาม מְשָּׁה רָדְתָו הָלְאֹא לָכֶנֵי שִׁילָה.

Span. square char., 4to, ff. 106 [H. No. 17].


Vellum, Franco-German Rabb., 4to, ff. 55 [H. No. 351].

41. a. Commentary on Ruth; the author mentions Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Qamhî. b. Fol. 12v, Commentary on Canticles according to Rashi, with abstracts from R. Tobiah's explanations. c. Fol. 25, Commentary on Lamentations according to Rashi and Qamhî. Fol. 31, the author quotes a second version of Rashi's explanation of iv. 6 and concludes See H.B., XXI, p. 30, and VII). d. Fol. 33v, abstracts from the Midrash Ekhâ.

Franco-German curs. char., 4to, ff. 38 [H. No. 303].

42. שִׁשִּׁים שֶׁחֶסֶת. Commentary on Esther by R. Bahya finished 8 Nisan, 5471 (March 28, 1711).

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 19 [H. No. 46].

43. Commentary on Esther by R. Zechariah [b. Sarûq]. The preface begins לא שׁוֹדְרֵיָהוּ וְאֶרְיָה לְלוֹ לְמָחְרָה מְבָרֶךְ מִי שְׁלַשָּׁה וְאֶזֶּה הָלְאֹא, מְבָרֶךְ מִי שְׁלַשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם שִׁשָּׁה יָם Shewî,tam, who finished his work Sivân, 5345 (May, 1585).

Large Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 16 [H. 93].
44. 1. Supercommentary to Rashi’s Commentary on the Pentateuch by a pupil of R. Abraham Hayyim Rodriguez, written 1726.

2. Fol. 71. Similar work written at Leghorn in the same year, beginning earlier, ends later.

3. Fol. 80. Fragment of an encyclopedic work, chiefly of grammatical character.

Nos. 1 and 2 Span. Rabb. char., No. 3 inverted, larger Span. Rabb. char., 12mo, ff. 104 [No. 462].

45. Supercommentary on Rashi on the Pentateuch by Eliezer Sopino.

Written by Isaiah b. Jacob of Sefer, and finished Sunday, 20 Tammuz, 5445 (July 2, 1485). The name of the person whose behalf the copy was made is blotted out.

Owner: Rafael David [ff. 39, 47, 91].

German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 112 [H. No. 216].


Finished Tuesday, 22 Tammuz, 5442 (July 28, 1682).

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 138 [H. No. 88].

47. Supercommentary on Ibn Ezra’s Commentary by Moses b. Judah b. Moses [fol. 3r], who composed his work at the age of 25 years (fol. 3r). The preface ends with the following rhymes:

כְּתַבּ תֶּפֶן הנב שֶם בֶּתָר יִתְנַה
מרֶעֶת השם נְבֵן כֶּרֶם שָׁלוֹם
הָנָה בְּאָבְרָהָם וּבְשֵׁם הַפִּיוֹר

Written by Menahem.

Owner: Benjamin Pesaro.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 82 [H. No. 111].

48. Samuel Mōtō’s Supercommentary on Abraham b. Ezra’s Commentary on the Pentateuch (printed) with marginal notes.

Censors: Domenico Irosolimitano; Laurentius Franguellus, 1596; Alessandro Scipione, 1596.

Owners: Rafael, Aaron.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 105 [H. No. 86].
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Writer: Solomon b. Josef, Temsän, 1490, written on behalf of Judah ha-levi. (See Mag., III, p. 41 and Steinschneider, ibid., p. 94.)

Owner: Samuel ben Joseph.

Span. Rabb. char., fol., ff. 390 [H. No. 195].

50. 1. Supercommentary on Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch headed נַטִּיָּה בֵּית נַטִּיָּה וְאֵשֶׁת בֶּן טוֹבֶה הַנִּקָּרָא. Beginning: וְאֵשֶׁת בֶּן טוֹבֶה הַנִּקָּרָא וְאֵשֶׁת בֶּן טוֹבֶה הַנִּקָּרָא. Besides older authorities such as Sa'adyah, Ibn Janah and Rashi, the author quotes Samuel b. Tabbon, David Qamhi, and his own teachers Levi Hakkohen and Meir b. David. The work seems to have been written in the fourteenth century.


Paper and vellum, Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 82 [H. No. 218].

51. Supercommentary on Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Five Scrolls, by Solomon b. Gottlieb Stern in Rechnitz (Hungary), in five parts, each of which has a separate title, viz.:

1. קסוד פֶּסֶת, on Canticles; 2. כָּתוּב רוּת, on Ruth; 3. מַקְרָה, on Lamentations; 4. וְחָזַה חַמָּה, on Ecclesiastes; 5. נַרְוֹלָה מִדֶּרֶךְ, on Esther.

Modern German curs. char., 4to, ff. 60 [H. No. 389].

52. Supercommentary to Ibn Ezra's Commentary on Exod. iii. 15, by Isaac Noveira (נְוֵיָרָה), beginning יִשָּׁם ابنו יִשָּׁם אֶת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ; ending ב"כ וניאי פֶּסֶת ברִיתוֹ וּבוֹרָה דְּלַח וּתְחֵית הָלְךָו".

Squ. char., 4to, ff. 38 [H. No. 212].

53. 1. a. Calendar rules; b. fol. 3 פֶּסֶת וּבֵית הַנִּקָּרָא וְאֵשֶׁת בֶּן טוֹבֶה; c. fol. 3v Some Rabbinical definitions; d. fol. 3v Some Rabbinical definitions; e. fol. 4v Some Rabbinical definitions; f. fol. 5v Some Rabbinical definitions; g. fol. 9v Some Rabbinical definitions; h. fol. 10 Some Rabbinical definitions; i. fol. 12 Some Rabbinical definitions; j. fol. 12v Some Rabbinical definitions; k. fol. 14 Some Rabbinical definitions; l. fol. 16 Some Rabbinical definitions; m. fol. 16v Some Rabbinical definitions; n. fol. 17 Some Rabbinical definitions; o. fol. 18 Some Rabbinical definitions; p. fol. 23 Some Rabbinical definitions; q. fol. 30 Some Rabbinical definitions; r. fol. 37 Some Rabbinical definitions; s. fol. 40 Some Rabbinical definitions.

2. Fol. 46. Isaac Noveira's diagrams, drawings and astronomical figures.
3. Fol. 74. The same author's Supercommentary on Ibn Ezra's Commentary on Exod. iii. 15.

4. Fol. 1 (left hand). The same as No. 52, but incomplete, ending ביכך והבלו כליה זאדה לא אל אתיו השחר.

Owner: Solomon Bassano.

No. 1, Span. Rabb. char.; No. 2, Ital. curs. char.; No. 3, German curs. char.; No. 4, Ital. squ. char.; 4to, ff. 86 and 15 [H. No. 211].

54. Fragment of an anonymous Supercommentary to Nahmanides' Commentary on the Pentateuch, headed מ"א על התורה; מ"א על התורה לע ודק המתק הח"מ בלעמה חסכליא bli הלך. Beginning בהראשה המבר רותי ומ"א המבר אתו אסם אל נוטות ככ שרשיווהו וברטני אמר והבר הוא כי שגיאה שפם. הבחר הואavraשה קדום שלבר לבריא והבריאו שלבר.

After fol. 32 lacuna (end of אשת ובא and nearly the whole of הס"א). The copyist has left several spaces blank, viz. fol. 31v (marked יד and nearly fol. 42v. The MS. ends Exod. viii. 8. The Commentary is not identical with any of those mentioned in Neubauer's Catalogue, Nos. 241, 2421, 16452. To judge from the paper and writing the MS. dates from the fifteenth century.

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, a coll., ff. 72 [H. No. 77].

55. Glosses on Rashi's and Nahmanides' Commentaries on the Pentateuch, beginning מ"א על התורה. ס"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התורה אל היה אתי נלחייל מ"א על התора After fol. 72 two leaves missing (end of מ"א and beginning of הלאה). Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 98 [H. No. 76].

56. מ"א ריבא, I, by Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi; a. Hundred notes and comments on passages of the Bible and Talmud, fol. 77, two poems; b. fol. 112v, Inscription on the tombstone of Gershôn called Rafael Hezekiah, son of Isaac Shalôm; c. fol. 114. Addenda to fol. 72. The preface is dated Padua, Tebeth, 5579 (Jan. 1819).

Author's autograph.

Ital. squ. and Rabb. char., many leaves worm-eaten, 8vo, ff. 114 [H. No. 290].

57. מ"א ריבא, II, begins with המברחת, by Jacob David Jeqüethiel Kohen of Jerusalem; Moses b. Samuel of Safed; Samuel סומא; Shem Tob שומא, Dayyân of Salonica; Josef, Rabbi אל מברחת (with seal); Samuel hakKohen of Tiberias; Joshua A. Shalôm, 16
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Adar, 5604 (1844); Levi Nahmias of Hebron; Abraham Solomon Salom of Jerusalem. Fol. 10, Copy of Preface by the author's father (the original on fol. 17); Recommendation by Nathan hak-Kohen of the Crimea; David Hayyim of Rovigo; Abraham Reggio of Gorizia; Josef Menahem of Hebron; Jacob Luzatto; fol. 18, author's preface. The work was finished in 1821. The last part of the volume is devoted to Addenda and Corrigenda. Inside the left-hand cover two verses of poetry.

Many blanks, 4to, ff. 94 [H. No. 291].

58. ורסה ו länger, by Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi, Notes and Comments; fol. 29, poems; fol. 52, Explication episcoporum masoreticorum singulius libris biblicis subiectarum, containing the numbers of verses and letters of the Biblical books; fol. 66, birth dates of various persons; fol. 66, prayer by Qalimani, probably connected with the blessing to be pronounced at the completion of the sun cycle.

Author's autograph.

12mo, ff. 67 [H. No. 299].

59. Writings of Josef b. Jacob Montefiore of Pesaro in Ancona, son-in-law of Isaac Al Qustantis.

1. The work is preceded by various המבȧח in prose and poetry, by Isaiah Romini of Pesaro, Jehiel hak-Kohen of Ancona, Jacob Israel of Pesaro. Then follows a series of prayers, the last of which is one of thanksgiving for having been delivered from a plot made against him on the 21st Kislev, 5499 (1738). The treatise itself is styled נד בורמש, and contains Agadic Glosses on the fifty-three portions (נ'א) of the Pentateuch. Fol. 66, a prayer; fol. 70, prayer by Solomon Al Qabiš.

2. Fol. 71. דבש, history of the author's family, concluding with a sonnet and more prayers.

3. Fol. 101. מארס ו קורי, a work similar to No. 1 on the Psalms. The preface is preceded by the original armorial bearings of the Montefiore family surrounded by three mottoes taken from the Bible. Fol. 331, a copy of Isaiah Romini's Haskama.

The MS. is the author's autograph, No. 1 and 2 being written 1741, No. 3 in 1745. A description of the Codex is given in Dr. L. Loewe's Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore, I, p. 629.

Squa. and curs. char., 4to, ff. 331 [No. 453].


2. Fol. 331. Homilies for Passover and Pentecost; after fol. 345 lacuna; fol. 346, Fragment of a homily on New Year, after which another lacuna; fol. 348, Homilies on Succoth (cf. Mag., X, p. 102).

Paper, Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 352 [H. No. 30].
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2. Fol. 102. Sermon preached in Segovia on Sabbath, June 17, 1452; fol. 112: intron by, etc.


2. Fol. 4v. Homilies.


5. Fol. 17. Gloses on some paragraphs of the Pirqē Abōth.


7. Fol. 41v. מַֽאֲסָרֵיהּ מְרִיָּה.


11. Fol. 69. Gloses on various topics from the Talmud, headed הנחיה.

12. Fol. 79. Funeral sermon by חָזָא (cf. Steinschneider, Mag., X, 102, Josef Taitzak ?) on the death of Elijah Mizrāḥi, Tuesday, March 23, Shebat, 5286 (Feb. 6, 1526).


15. Fol. 117. Ethical observations on Ps. i to xvi (cf. Mag., l. c.).


Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 120 [H. No. 256].

II.

TALMUD AND HALAKHA.

TEXT AND COMMENTARIES.

63. Fragment of Talmud Babli, שבת, fol. 42r, l. 4 from bottom; fol. 2, ibid., 35r, last line והלך and beginning of ch. iii, the whole of the Mishnah being placed at the head. The MS. ends ibid., fol. 37r, l. 20, רמיה והלך.

Vellum, Franco-German squ. char., fol., ff. 2 [H. No. 326].

64. The tractates סנהדרין, סנהדרין, and both, with the Commentary of Judah Abbas. In the last-named tractate chs. iii and iv are written as one chapter. It is also incomplete, and contains only about a third of ch. vi. After fol. 1 lacuna. With regard to the author, see Steinschneider, J. Q. R., 1899, p. 333.

Owner: Hayyim Josef David Azulai.

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 81 [H. No. 346].

65. Tosafot of R. Elhanan b. Isaac of ורבחו התשובה יד for the following names of Tosafists are mentioned: Efraim, fol. 51v, 66v; Hayyim Cohen Ṣeḏeq, fol. 101; Isaac b. Meir Ṣeḏeq [thus being then still alive], fol. 91v, 112v; Jacob of Orleans, fol. 5; Jacob Tam, frequently, also a Responsum of his is reproduced, fol. 57v, and his Responsum Ṣeḏeq quoted, fol. 109v; Josef b. Orleans, fol. 101; Moses b. Abraham [perhaps M. of Pontoise, see Zunz, Zur Geschichte, p. 74], fol. 22v; Moses b. Moses, fol. 9; Samuel b. Meir [וביו], fol. 106v; Shemaya of Joinville, fol. 97; Solomon [the Saint, cf. Zunz, ibid., p. 37], fol. 4v. The end is missing.

Owner: Abraham וני בעמש.

Vellum, large French Rabb. char., custodes ornamented with pen and ink sketches, fol., ff. 116 [H. No. 58].

The work is incomplete.

Paper [ff. i, 10, 11 vellum], Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 20 [H. No. 164].

67. Toseafoth of R. Samson of Sens to *nabim*, ends fol. 41, l. 2 of the printed text, s.v. *nabim* themselves, and is continued (in the MS.) fol. 12, col. 1, s.v. *nabim*, by R. Judah Sir Leon [1166–1224]. The end is missing. On ff. 1 and 2 several blank spaces.

Vellum, Franco-German Rabb. char., 2 cols., fol., ff. 16 [H. No. 96].

68. *Theophila*. Additamenta to *nabim* by Asher b. Jehiel; fol. 1, several gaps left by the copyist.


69. *Theophila*, by the pupils of R. Peres b. Elijah on *nabim*. On fol. 6 v R. Elijah is mentioned; fol. 70 v, *nabim* are mentioned;

besholet veholet, shomai la.

Owner: Isach Zaccuto.

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 219 [H. No. 106].

70. Eliezer b. Jacob Nahlüm's Commentary on *nabim* before *nabim*. Fol. 242, Glosses on Maimuni's *Mishne* Tora on *nabim*; fol. 253, on *Tosifat*. Bahdanim.

Span. curs. char., 4to, ff. 331 [H. No. 135].


Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 56 [H. No. 204].


73. R. Gershon Meor Haggolah's Commentary on *nabim*, copied by Rafael Nathan Neta Rabbinowicz from Cod. Monac. 2167 (1870).

German curs. char., 8vo, ff. 10 [H. No. 252].
74. Fragments of Asher b. Jehiel's [שא"ר יולב] Commentary on a.تروת, begins fol. 50r, col. 1, l. 23 שערב הרבר; fol. 2, ibid., 51r, col. 1, l. 16 אנה, ends 52r, col. 1, l. 23 יארו; fol. 3r, ibid., 51*, col. 1, l. 26 באל; fol. 3v, ibid., col. 2, l. 10 from the bottom, fuller than the printed text; fol. 4, ibid., 52v, col. 1, l. 25 זהרה, ends ibid.v, col. 1, l. 35 ירה.

b. Fol. 5, אשת והבר, fol. 208r, col. 2, l. 22 from the bottom Massa, ends ibid.v, col. 1, last line but one with variations; fol. 6, ibid., 206v, col. 1, l. 25 שערת, ends ibid.v, col. 1, l. 4 שערת; fol. 7, ibid., 205v, col. 1, l. 27 באת; fol. 8, ibid., 208r, col. 1, l. 4 from the bottom; fol. 9, ibid., 209r, col. 2 בינתו; fol. 10v and v, ibid., 207.

c. Fol. 11, סנהרה, beginning; fol. 12, ibid., 114v, col. 1, last line but one.

d. Fol. 13, לוה vb. ובנה, 209r, col. 1, l. 25 נמל_bbv; fol. 14, ibid., 117v, col. 1, l. 26 מ_clicked; fol. 15, ibid., 119v, 1 continued on fol. 17; fol. 16, ibid., 117v, col. 1, l. 11 from the bottom.

German Rabb. char., probably fifteenth century. Nearly all the leaves are incorrectly arranged, and should be read in the following order: 1, 3, 2, 4, 7, 6, 8, 10, 5, 13, 9, 11, 12, 16, 14, 15, 17; fol. [H. No. 325].

75. Judah b. El'azar Hakkohen b. Al Madari's Commentary on Al Fasi on חידושי, ווניט, and (see HB., V, p. 131 sq., rem. 6).

Franco-German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 295 [H. No. 51].

76. Commentary on Aboth attributed to Rashi (see No. 327).


German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 13 [H. No. 265].

77. Solomon b. Addereth's Commentary on the Agadic passages of נרימ, חולם, טבירה ור, מלחי, תענית, רבוחת. The end is wanting. The MS. contains ff. ג"ז to י"כ of an originally larger volume.

Vellum, Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 97 [H. No. 74].

78. 1. Solomon b. Addereth's Commentary on Agadic passages of רֵיֵי, חולם, ובא הפר, מלחי, תענית, רבוחת, beginning missing.

2. Fol. 11v. Responsus on חיות.

3. Fol. 12v. Some Cabbalistic notes and comments, end missing.

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 14 [H. No. 264].

79. Anonymous Commentary on Agadic passages of the Talmud, viz. חיות; fol. 22, פָּנִים; fol. 34, בָּהַמָּה; fol. 51v, שָׁמוֹת (sic); fol. 79v, רוֹדָי; fol. 104v, נַבִּי. Beginning and end are missing. The first three pages are all but illegible. A former owner, Shalōm
THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

The work is ascribed to [Samuel Sarza] Ibn al-Numa, but it is not identical with the latter's (see Halberst., Cat., p. 60).

Vellum and paper, Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 112 (autograph?) [H. No. 336].

NOVELLAE AND GLOSSES.

80. Moses Nahmanides' Novellae on נבש, end missing.
Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 59 [H. No. 87].

81. Nahmanides' Novellae on רכמ (printed), incomplete.
Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 125 [H. No. 55].

82. 1. Novellae on הובא בחמה רבתי, Novellae by R. Jonah Gerondi.
2. Fol. 184. Novellae on גר וסי, Modern copy by Natan Neta Rabbinowicz from a MS. in the possession of Mordecai Wolf Ettinger (אשת) of Lemberg (1862).
German curs. char., 4to, ff. 205 [H. No. 73].

83. a. Solomon b. Addereth's Novellae on למותו מצlıklar; b. fol. 122v (ch. vi to the end), Novellae by Nahmanides.
Owners: Abraham Josef Solomon b. Mordecai Graziano, who bought the MS. from David סל.
Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 170, much stained with water [H. No. 311].

84. Solomon b. Addereth's Novellae on המיל, fuller than the printed edition.
Written by Nissim יוליה h. Abraham.
Owned by the Midrash of Mordecai Graziano (יליה של😬), Judah Zeraḥya Azulai.
Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 89 [H. No. 99].

85. Novellae on הובא בחמה by Asher b. Jehiel in nine chapters (see Neub., Cat., 446').
Ital. curs. char. (same hand as No. 83), 4to, ff. 137 [H. No. 312].

Written by Samuel b. Isaac, commenced Monday (read Tuesday), 1 Tebeth, 5379 (18 Dec. 1618), and finished Wednesday (read Thursday), 28 Ab, 5382 (4 Aug. 1622).
Owner: Hayyim Josef David Azulai.
Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 233 [H. No. 315].
87. Novellae on תור in תור, by Abraham Broda. The work was finished Sunday, 25 Nisan, 5485 (1725).
Written by Josef Ḥa-Magḥribin. Rabbinic, 4to, f. 48 [No. 520].

88. Novellae on תור, by an anonymous author, containing Novellae on תור; fol. 34; fol. 47; fol. 136; fol. 142; fol. 150; fol. 159; fol. 220; fol. 237; fol. 282; fol. 220; fol. 317; fol. 320; fol. 331; fol. 341; fol. 342.
The majority of sections begins with a short rhymed introduction.
Censor: Domenico Ierosolimitano.

89. Novellae on תור by Don Crescas Vidal (see HB., 1871, p. 45). Fol. 177, Small fragment on the same subject, beginning missing.
Owner: Jacob Roderik ( עובר, fol. 99).

90. 1. Glosses on תור תור, as also on the Tosifat and Al Fasi.
4. Fol. 47. Glosses on some passages in תור תור, תור, תור, תור, תור, מ"ע, by Judah b. Nathan and R. Nissim [Gerondi]; the end on fol. 62r.
5. Fol. 59. הָלָה הָלָה שִׁמְתוֹ כִּצְרוֹם.
On fol. 62v some personal notes, one of which is dated Urbino, Monday, 5 (7) Aug. 5299 (1539). There are also the names Isaac b. Josef of מְלָכָלי, Isaac b. Judah.
Owner: Abraham Josef Solomon Graziano.

91. Isaiah Hurwitz's Glosses on תור תור, מ"ע, תור, תור, תור, תור, תור, תור, תור. The author's name is given, fol. 105.

German curs. char., 4to, f. 123 [H. No. 66].

VOL. XIV.
92. 1. Novellae on Al Fasi, by Isaiah b. Elias (יסריא) the younger, containing Decisions on matters of law, rulings, and decisions, cabalistic interpretation, and wisdom.  
2. a. Fol. 519v. Beliebte Makom, with a short appendix; b. fol. 520r., beginning with paragraph 1.  
5. Fol. 60. A treatise on spheres and globes in four chapters, with mathematical figures. The last pages are all but illegible; ch. iv missing.  
6. Fol. 53. Poem by Abraham Provinziale in vindication of a young girl who had been slandered, eighty lines.
7. a. Fol. 54r. Various Notes and Comments; b. Fol. 58. Copy from the repository, Cremona, 5356 (1596), signed Aaron David Nurlingen (גאָיוֹד נאָרִילאָן).  
8. Fol. 60. A treatise on spheres and globes in four chapters, with mathematical figures. The last pages are all but illegible; ch. iv missing.  

Censor: Domenico Ierosolimitano.  
Owner: Judah Isaac Horea (fol. 11v).
95. [Meir Kohens] Glosses to Maimuni's Responsa, beginning missing. The MS. opens with the end of chapter iii. In several pages are left blank, and evidently intended for the middle of chapter vii; fol. 117, fol. 127, fol. 24, fol. 26, fol. 28, fol. 30, fol. 38, fol. 40, fol. 42 (see Jellinek, p. 6).

Ital. Rabbin. char., 4to, much, fol. 1 much, fol. 2 slightly damaged, ff. 45 [H. No. 327].


Ital. Rabbin. char., 4to (the last two leaves are slightly damaged), ff. 174 [H. No. 410].

RESPONSA AND COMPENDIA.


German curs. char., 4to, ff. 102 [H. No. 130].

98. a. She'ivot ha-Aretz. The beginning is missing, but is supplemented on the fly-leaf (probably) by S. D. Luzatto, who also added marginal notes indicating where the Responsa are to be found in She'ivot ha-Aretz, Salonica, 1792. A list of those omitted in the latter is given fol. 140 (see also Joel Müller, Réponses faites par les célèbres Rabbin du Provence, Vienna, 1881, and Id., Responsa der Lehrer des Ostens u. Westens, 1888).

b. Fol. 58v. She'ivot ha-Aretz, introduced by a short poem; fol. 87v, She'ivot ha-Aretz, with corrections (printed, see S. D. Luzatto, fol. 56 sqq).

[Owner: S. D. Luzatto.]

Large German curs. char., fol. ff. 141 [H. No. 179].

99. She'ivot ha-Aretz. Copy made by Jacob Musafia in (Espanol?) with his own additions and corrections. The edition, Lyck, 1864 (Meqise Nirdami) is based on this MS.

Paper, Span. Rabbin. char., 12mo, ff. 35 [H. No. 16].


Owners: Judah Samuel b. Menahem Sinai of Cologne in 1852; Samson, who bought the volume from the widow of Jacob Sinai.
of Cologne; Leon Colonna, son of Rabbi Manuel Sinai Colonna; Isaac Luzatto in Gorizia, 1823, student of medicine.

Vellum and paper, Franco-German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 90 [H. No. 109].

101. Responsa. 
   a. Solomon b. Addereth, R. Nissim, Samuel b. Moses, Jacob Berab; b. Eliezer b. Nathan (fol. 28);

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 128 [H. No. 170].

102. 1. a. Responsa by Solomon b. Addereth. The beginning is missing as far as par. 312, ending par. 498 (printed).

2. Fol. 120. Fragment of another work, of which hardly anything is legible.

No. 1, Ital. Rabb. char., from fol. 50 to end much damaged; No. 2, large Orient. Rabb. char., fol. 131 [H. No. 356].

103. 1. Responsa by Solomon b. Addereth, to which are appended lists of all Responsa by S. b. A., arranged according to subjects.

   b. Quotation from ספר ויתם by Aaron Kohen [of Lunel]; c. fol. 278. From Amram's Siddur.
4. a. Fol. 287. Responsa by Maimuni, of which one (fol. 288) is in Arabic (see HB., XIX, p. 113); b. fol. 288v. Responsa by Abraham Maimuni in Arabic (cf. HB., ibid.); c. fol. 298. Various Responsa.

Various Span. Rabb. hands, 4to, ff. 313 [H. No. 56].

104. 1. Opinions and Responsa on various ritual subjects by Meier of Rothenburg and Peres b. Elijah. Fol. 4 contains remarks on the value of some of the coins current at that period.

2. Fol. 5. Commentary on Abôth attributed to Rashi.


5. Fol. 20. Index to a treatise on Benedictions with the texts of several of the latter.

Owner: Mordecâi Samuel Ghirondi, who wrote [an incomplete] table of contents on the right-hand cover.

Vellum, German Rabb. char. (Nos. 2-5 originally formed part of a different volume, in which they occupied fol. 56 sqq.), 4to, ff. 20 [H. No. 332].


Owner: Samuel היבנ קוק.


106. Responsa by Elijah Mizrâhi. Marginal notes by a later hand contain directions for finding the Responsa in the printed edition (Constantinople, 1845/a), but in the MS. are thirty-five not to be found in the former. After fol. 172 lacuna. Ff. 176, 177 Index; ff. 178, 179, Fragment of a Responsum.


107. Glosses to the Responsa of Asher b. Jehiel by an anonymous author (but ascribed by Halberstam to Solomon Loria). According to a note at the end, the text used was the printed edition, Venice (1552).

German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 56 [H. No. 6].

108. Collection of Responsa, Glosses, Quotations, and Minhagim, containing 980 paragraphs. Beginning and end missing. The compilation was made after 1417, because this date is referred to in No. 971 (fol. 112v). The following lists, giving the names of persons, countries and cities, and French words, are accompanied by the number of the paragraph in which they occur.
A. Persons:—

Aaron of Epernay, 779.
Aaron b. Jacob, 680.
Aaron b. Josef, 405.
Abba Mari, 500.
Abigedor, 918.
Abigedor Kohan, 439.
Abraham [יווה], 463.
Abraham b. David, 127.
Abudimi Gaon, 527.
Amram Gaon, 127.
Asher b. Jehel, very often.
Azaryah of Endias, 782.
Azriel, 285.
Barkh b. Asher, 679.
Barkh Hayyim, 239.
Barkh of Mayence, 225.
Benjamin b. Judah of Lanel, 950.
Benjamin of Cordoba, 790.
Berakhiel, 383.
David hak-Kohen b. Moses, 884.
Efraim, 329.
Elazar of Worms, 233, and often.
Elazar hak-Kohen, 200.
Elazar Qallir, 564.
Elad had-Dani, 483.
Eliezer, 887.
Eliezer of Metz (ל"כ), 501.
Eliezer b. Nathan, 601, &c.
Eliezer b. Simon Qallir, 35 (see Elazar).
Elijah haz-Zaqen, 965.
Elyaqim, 718.
Ezekiel, 362.
Hanan'el (ל"א), 239, &c.
Hayy, 468, &c.
Hayyim, 865.
Hayyim b. Isaac, 679.
Hayyim Kohan, 107.
Hayyim b. Moses of Moen, 384, 881.
Hayyim b. Samuel, 480.
Hayyim of Vienna, 480.
Hezekiah, 668.
Isaac b. Abraham, 87.
Isaac b. Barukh, 368.
Isaac of Chinon, 946.
Isaac of Corbeil, 227, &c.
Isaac of Duren, 402.
Isaac of Evreux, 601.
Isaac Al Fasi, 144.
Isaac Gayyath, 913.
Isaac b. Judah, called הכהן, 384.
[his wife Hannah, daughter of Hezekiah], 384.
Isaac hal-Laban, 499.
Isaac hal-Levi, 403.
Isaac b. Moses of Vienna, 308.
Isaac Nasi, 365.
Isaac of Paris, 112.
Isaac b. Peres, 101.
Isaac the Proselyte [ב"א], 737.
Isaac b. Samuel the Elder, 528.
Isaiah the Great, 396.
Issachar b. Jequithiel hal-Levi, 884.
Jacob Gaon, 128, &c.
Jacob b. Josef Israéli, 980.
Jacob b. Meir [Tam], 164, &c.
Jacob b. Meshullam, 679.
Jacob [Levi] of Moellin 1, 257
[ם"א, ס"א/]
Jacob b. Nathan, 601.
Jacob of Nordhausen, 795.
Jacob of Orleans, 883.
Jacob b. Samuel, 732.
Jacob of Treysa, 571.
Jehiel b. Asher, 236.
Jehiel Bonjean [נ"ב], 379.
Jehiel Gaon, 128.
Johanan in Tarbut (1417), 971.
Jom Tob, 358.
Josiah, 756.
Josiah in Judah ha-Hasid, 128.
Joseph of Epernay, 779.
Josef of Meir, 679.
Joseph, 779.
Josef b. Moses, 469.
Josef of Paris, 130.
Judah of Cologne, 872.
Judah Hagaddol heraus, 128.
Judah ha-Hasid, 128, &c.
Judah Kohan, 118.
Judah of Mayence, 406.
Judah of Paris, 130.
Judah b. Qalonymos, 128, &c.
Judah of Samson, 679.
Mamoa hal-Levi, 915.
Meir of Ebsav, 407.
Meir b. Barukh, 162, and often.
Meir of Dover, 256.
Meri[?], 92.
Menahem of Joigny, 222.
Menahem, called Sir Leon of Paris, 384.
Menahem of London, 376, and often.
Menahem [pupil of R. Samson], 239.
Menahem b. Peres, 368.
Meshullam, 207.
Meshullam, called Meir, 379.
Michael of Pontoise, 782.
Mordecai of London, 129.
Sir Morel, 112.
Moses of Coucy, 291.
Moses of Evreux, 239, 546, &c.
Moses of London, 269, &c.
Moses b. Maimon, 245.
Moses b. Nahman, 327.
Moses of Pontoise, 583.
Moses of Zürich, 683.
Nahshon Gaon, 139.
Nathanael, 400.
Nathanael of Chinon, 406.
Natronai Gaon, 787.
Nissim, 284, &c.
Obadyah, 472.
Paltavi Gaon, 780.
Peres b. Elravim, 111, and often.
Peter, 469.
Qalonymos b. Shabbethai of Rome, 128.
Saadyah Gaon, 127.
Samson b. Abraham of Sens, 109, and often.
Samson of Coucy, 915.
Samuel, 458.
Samuel of Evreux, 123.
Samuel of Falaise, 644.
Samuel Haasid, 124, &c.
Samuel b. Isaac, 679.
Samuel hal-Levi, 401.
Samuel b. Meir, 256, &c.
Samuel b. Rabba, 223.
Samuel of Evreux, 408.
Semiah, 450.
Shalom Gaon, 323.
Shemaryah b. Isaac, 619.
Sherira Gaon, 171.
Simha of Speyer, 401.
### B. Countries and cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addereth</td>
<td>97, 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troyes [Rashi]</td>
<td>15, 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson [pet?],</td>
<td>540,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tam of Chinon</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobias [on behalf of מ&quot;ה],</td>
<td>268.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobias of Vienna</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todros b. Moses</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. French words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De l'Allemagne</td>
<td>407, 444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Montpellier</td>
<td>114, 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Rome</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Troyes</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Venise</td>
<td>374, 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Vennes</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En France</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Italie</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Provence</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Venise</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Vendôme</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Vienne</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Ville</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Ville de Paris</td>
<td>112, 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Ville de Troyes</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Ville de Venise</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owner: Moise Soave, who rewrote many passages on the margins, and added a short notice on the left-hand cover, dated April 8, 1880.

Franco-German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 115 [H. No. 345].

109. Responsa by Joshua b. Josef of Cracow (Part I, printed; see also Shabbethai Kohen's נבירה אבראהים); ff. 56-65, Responsa by Simḥa Luzatto of Venice; ff. 114-121, by R. Nathan; ff. 106-109, 140-146, 148, and 194, by Abraham of Erisk in Litewsk; ff. 228, 229, Query signed Abraham Mendel; fol. 261, Autograph letter, signed Joel; fol. 263, Another autograph letter, but the beginning is missing, ff. 283-292, Responsa by Moses b. Josef de Trani; ff. 339, 340, Index. The leaves have been numbered twice before. Headings written by a later hand indicate where many Responsa may be found in print.

German Rabb. and curs. char., fol. (ff. 223-229, 263, 283-292, 4to), ff. 340 [H. No. 79].


At the beginning table of contents.

Ital. curs. char. (different hands), 4to, ff. 305 [H. No. 59].

112. 1. Letters and Responsa addressed to various contemporary Rabbis by Samuel Abohab in Verona, during the years 1646 to 1657. Author's autographs.

2. Fol. 77. Continuation of above; fol. 93, Queries on ה"Đחפ"לס, dated Verona, 1600. The letters are very rich in names of Rabbinical authorities in Italy and elsewhere during the seventeenth century.

Owners: Abraham and David Abendana.

Ital. curs. and Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 166 [H. Nos. 257, 258].

113. Responsa of Jacob Israel b. Rafael Finzi of Recanate, begins with Index (ff. 1–3); fol. 94. Isaac b. Immanuel Provençal; ibid., Moses b. Mordecai Sarfathi, proselyte in Ancona; ibid., Jehuda Leon, 19 Ellul, 5309 (Sept. 12, 1549); fol. 94v, Solomon...ע"ללו; fol. 285, Isaac b. Shalom (?). At the end one or more leaves missing. Autograph ?.

Paper, Ital. curs. char., fol., ff. 297 [H. No. 9].

114. Responsa and Letters by Moses b. Abraham Provenzale, preceded by a dirge on his death, six strophes with a refrain: 1. 팥?מ"זנ תקע by ob)מ תפ"ג Truyền; 2. (fol. 3v) by VTCD יבדרוב יבכ כ"ס; 3. (fol. 8v) רדסנ רדסנ; 4. (fol. 28v) א"כ by, beginning מ"כ by; 5. (fol. 28v) א"כ by; 6. (fol. 47) יבדרוב יבכ כ"ס; 7. (fol. 49) Responsum to a Query by R. ל"אוצי of Cremona; 66. (fol. 50) Query addressed to R. Eliezer Ashkenazi with the latter's Reply; 67. (ibid.) Responsum addressed to the same; 68. (fol. 51) Responsum addressed to R. Azaryah [de Rossi]; 69. (ibid.) Responsum by Leon Muscato to the same; 87. (fol. 65v) Query by Moses b. Eliezer hal-Levi; 97. (fol. 77) Responsum by Aaron David b. Aaron Nurlingen in Cremona, to which is annexed a letter by the Rabbis of Mantua to those of Cremona, signed also by Elijah Rumili and Samuel Hezekiah Rumili; 102. (fol. 87) Query by Josef Treves; 114. (fol. 97v) Ditto by Hezekiah Finzi; 127. (fol. 106) by Samuel Cazes; 139. (fol. 111) by Hillel of.
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Modena; 149. (fol. 114) by Abraham b. David Provenzale, grandson of the above mentioned; 198. (fol. 116) Query concerning a litigation between the community of Bologna and R. Solomon of Modena. Copious notes by Eliezer Provenzale, another grandson of the author.

Written by Nathaniel Shabbethai in Turin, and finished 40th day of Omer, 5325 (April 27, 1565).

Ital. Rabb. char., fol., ff. 194 [H. No. 189].


Written by Efraim b. Zebi Hirsch b. Leb, and finished Thursday, 17 (read 16) Elul, 5470 (1710), in עֲם.

German cura. char., fol., ff. 348 [H. No. 239].


Written by Efraim b. Zebi Hirsch b. Leb, and finished Thursday, 17 (read 16) Elul, 5470 (1710), in עֲם.

German cura. char., fol., ff. 348 [H. No. 239].


Written by Efraim b. Zebi Hirsch b. Leb, and finished Thursday, 17 (read 16) Elul, 5470 (1710), in עֲם.

German cura. char., fol., ff. 348 [H. No. 239].
Responsyem by Jacob Castro; | 1. Fol. 45. Identical with fol. 37;  
| n. Fol. 62. Responsum by Abraham (with reference to R. David b. Zimra), and Abraham (with different hands), end damaged, 4to, ff. 212 [H. No. 136].
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4. Fol. 133. Solomon Loria's Corrections to ד"עוי ויה, Cremona (1558). 
5. Fol. 137. Annotations by an anonymous writer on מ"עיוו ויה.
6. Fol. 160. Copy of מ"עיוו ויה, according to Solomon Loria. 
   Various Rabb. hands, 4to, ff. 179 [H. No. 5].

118. 1. מ"עיוו ויה, NathanSpiro's Glosses on דעיוו ויה. 
3. Fol. 21v. ה"עיוו ויה, by an anonymous writer on מ"עיוו ויה. 
   Ital. curs, char., 4to, ff. 23 [H. No. 65].

119. 1. a. ר"עיוו ויה, Glosses on דעיוו ויה, by I[rael] (Jacob?) Algazi in alphabetical arrangement; b. Fol. 15. Glosses מ"עיוו ויה, by Isaac Kohen Rappoport, also in alphabetical arrangement; c. Fol. 40. מ"עיוו ויה, also in alphabetical arrangement; d. Fol. 46v. מ"עיוו ויה; e. Fol. 48. מ"עיוו ויה; f. Fol. 52. מ"עיוו ויה; g. Fol. 57. Alphabetic Glosses by Mordecai hal-Levi, called מ"עיוו ויה; h. Fol. 66v. Short note on the מ"עיוו ויה concerning two Amoraim having the same name. 
2. Fol. 79v. a. מ"עיוו ויה, by Amram Ammar, consisting of four short paragraphs; b. Fol. 81. Letter of summons found in the hands of one David Kohen, which, according to the view of the writer, originated from Sa'dyâh Al Zubeib (Alvobic), father of R. Nehorâi Al Zubeib. The affair to which the document refers took place in Algiers in the year 1633. The letter is written in Arabic, and is signed Amram Ammar; c. Fol. 82. Synonyma by Mordecai hal-Levi (cf. above, g); d. Dates of the death of Rabbis of the eighteenth century, copied from the notes of Samuel Kohen Jonathan; e. Fol. 87. Document of י"עיוו ויה, dated Algiers, 1st Iyyar, 5503 (Apr. 25, 1743); Witnesses: Abraham י"עיוו ויה, Judah י"עיוו ויה; David י"עיוו ויה; Josef י"עיוו ויה; Ibid. v. Medical prescriptions. 
   Maghrbine curs. char., 4to, ff. 87 [H. No. 255].

120. by David b. Rafael Meldola, Pts. III and IV. 
Glosses on מ"עיוו ויה in alphabetical arrangement. 
   Modern Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 258 [H. No. 450].
121. Moses of Coucy's סֶפֶר מֶשֶׂרֶת הָהוֹדוֹל, agreeing with ed. Venice, 1547. The following rhymes are at the end of Part I:

בִּזְכֹרֹת אַנטֶרֶקֶטֶת סֶפֶר מֶשֶׂרֶת הָהוֹדוֹל
בָּזְכֹרֹת הָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָ֔
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6. Fol. 54. Chiromancy, charms, medical prescriptions.
7. Fol. 61v. ייחận עני, by Isaac of Corbeil.
10. Fol. 65. Responsa by Solomon b. Addereth, the first concluding ומכ שרו נ strcmp נוח. Some of these Responsa do not exist in print.
11. Fol. 73v. Responsa by Josef Hayyim b. Aaron [מ숍ים], one of them (fol. 78) is addressed to R. Issachar (see Steinschneider, Cat. Bodl., 2344, 2959).
14. Fol. 82v. stories of סכנים, on the ten signs which are to precede the advent of the Messiah.
15. Fol. 84v. Horoscope by Moses Bonite Provinciale, foretelling the advent of the Messiah, and beginning הניה בשמה ימי בחיש נמשכת והיה כי נאלך תק"ד (1504) י"ע השנה הזעירה בחזי ימי בשנה.
16. Fol. 86v. Extracts from the תורי עולמ, amulets and magic cures.
17. Fol. 100. Extract from Mose di Leon’s caballistic work סכנים ההויה.
19. Ibid.v. Chronological Tables, beginning י"ע בלימת תפ"ה, and some abstracts from the גדוה.
20. Fol. 113. Commentary on Jedâyah hap-Penini’s ובנת עלומה, preceded by a poem by the compiler.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 124 [H. No. 300].

125. ספר הרוחים. Ritual work by [the pupils of] Rashi, copied from Cod. Monac. 28°.

German curs. char., fol., ff. 74 [H. No. 162].

126. Part II of ספר העיון, by Judah b. Barzillai han-Nâsi of Barcelona, ch. I headed הלות ערב שבת; ch. II (fol. 70v) הלות עד שבת; ch. III (fol. 86v) ה', רבנו חיה של שפת (in Hebrew):
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ch. IV (fol. 116v) של פְּלָטֵה אֲבָרְמוֹ הֶזְבִּת (n). On the fly-leaf a notice in S. D. Luzatto’s handwriting. Marginal notes by Moses b. Isaac סנ (see also HCat., p. 19, and Steinschneider, Bodl., 1298). Fol. 1 damaged, end missing.

Large Span. Rabb. char., fol., ff. 121 [H. No. 150].

127. 1. ספר הָלְכִּים, Part I, by Zedekiah b. Abraham Anaw, with many variations from the printed editions, containing 372 paragraphs.


Owner: Judah Zerahya Azulai, Leghorn, 1818 (ב’). Vellum, German Rabb. char., fol., ff. 308 [H. No. 236].


Writer: Solomon b. Rafael.

Censors: Fra Luigi da Bologna, 1593; Camillo Jagel, 1613; Renato da Modena, 1626; Gir[olamo] da Durallano, 1640; Giovanni Montif. Inq. da Modena.

Another owner: Abraham Joseph Solomon Graziano.

Vellum, German Rab. char., 4to, ff. 177 [H. No. 237].

129. רָצִּיעַ, Vol. I, Collectanea compiled by a certain Josef [b. Azaryah?]. The short introduction is concluded by the following verses:—

1. Fol. 1. Poem on the Thirteen Articles of the Creed by the compiler, ending:—

1.2. Ibid. י, by Jonah of Gerona (printed).


5. a. Fol. 33. ידוע. Annotations on the prayers and the Passover Haggādāh; b. Fol. 43v. ידוע קריאת התורה והמשנה של הלכות; c. Fol. 47. Jügeroth, German rite, among which Azhāroth for
Passover; 1.חא תמאני' ו (not mentioned by Zunz); fol. 59v, סלך, for the afternoon service of the Day of Atonement, by Abraham b. Ezra, beg. חא תמאני ו (not mentioned by Zunz).

6. Fol. 59. מדר מ으יאת והקרונח ויס בכ"ט שמח, the paragraphs being alphabetically arranged, but ending in ייחנ התומכ ו עירח, which is probably the name of the compiler.

7. Fol. 60. מדר עבריה, attributed to Abraham b. Ezra, beginning אומני' הלילה, not mentioned by Zunz, and not identical with the Пiyyut mentioned ibid., p. 568.

8. Fol. 63. a. דר כ"ט הברכות; b. מלחים, many of which are not known; c. להזרא הנברך, the place for the name having been left empty; d. Jedayyah hap-Penini's Mem prayer, beg. מחרמ ו' אלחניא מרשוש (printed); e. Prayer by Shealtiel Gracian, beg. ו' ייחנ התומכ ו עירח; f. Two Пiyyutim: 1. ייחנ התומכ ו עירח; 2. מדר עבריה, but not mentioned by Zunz.


Copious marginal notes and corrections; many passages are struck out, probably from fear of the censor.

Vellum, German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 153 [H. No. 48].

180. מ"ט, Part II begins with Index to Nos. 1–3.


2. Fol. 11. Responsa by אבי חור (Eliezer b. Joel hal-Levi).

3. Fol. 15. Inquiry by Eliezer b. Judah, Qalonymos b. Gershon, Mordecai; the reply is signed (fol. 15v) יהודה b. Qalonymos, Moses b. Mordecai, Baruch b. Samuel. After fol. 16 there is a lacuna of forty-four leaves.

4. Fol. 17. Fragment of the מ"ט (begins in Coronel's edition מ"ט (מ"ט, fol. 22, l. 18, ייר).)

5. Fol. 24. מ"ט, according to Isaac of Dueren (printed).


7. Fol. 26v. Extract from Isaac Israeli's מ"ט, Book IV, ch. 18.

8. Fol. 29. מדר וסיים זמורתיי.
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11. Fol. 44v. Notes on Nahmanides' Commentary on the Pentateuch (the compiler wrote erroneously מ"ד).  


13. Fol. 46v. Regulations of ḥilẓot, according to R. Peres.  


18. Fol. 57v. WR of Jacob Tam (cf. Kolbō, 117), beg. צימ חמה, והאמר בדיע ובלע בבל שבי, שיתי תרוי by Menahem Lonzano.


22. Fol. 65v. שחי (attributed to Samson b. Šādōq), headed והאמר קמר ותקבל אבר לא מאי יצחק למטה ומא בר חביבה קמר והאמר קמר ו잣 כי ונות נובל מקומ ביאר והאמר קמר ו🤣 שמי אתא לבר מהיח.


25. Ibid. List of Biblical Prophets.


29. Fol. 105v. Logical, metaphysical, physical and theological definitions.

30. Fol. 106. Logical, metaphysical, physical and theological definitions.


32. Fol. 119. Cabalistic permutations of the Tetragram, and other Cabalistic observations.

33. Fol. 122. Masora of Samuel's Sefer ha-Nefesh (printed, fol. 96).


Vellum, German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 130 [H. No. 49].


Vellum and paper, ff. 225 and 225* added by a later writer, large Franco-German Rabb. char., fol., ff. 306 [H. No. 52].

132. Sefer ha-Mekorot, by Isaiah of Trani (the elder) in ninety-two chapters (printed), with Index at the end.

Ital. Rabb. char., 4to (much worm-eaten); ff. 116 [H. No. 202].

133. Sefer ha-Shelihot, ritual treatise by Hiyya b. Solomon b. Habib, in four parts, with four, six, ten, and four chapters (see NCat., No. 665).

Writer: N. N. Coronel, who copied the work from a MS. written by Meir b. Jonathan hak-Kohen in a certain Moses b. Shabbethai, and finished 17 Iyyar, 5069 (Apr. 28, 1309). The second copy was finished 21 Kislev, 5628 (1868).

German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 67 (two parts) [H. No. 153].
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Part I. To the Second Visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem.

Second Edition, Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

Jewish World.—"A book that every Jewish father and mother should
carefully study and keep as a reference book while training their children in
the most important of all subjects of instruction."

Christian World.—"The Biblical text, which is given in large type, is
interspersed with the author's comments, admirable always as specimens of
luminous exposition in language adapted to young minds."

Westminster Gazette.—"His method and conclusions generally will, if we
mistake not, command wide assent. The book, as we have said, is intended
for Jewish parents and children, but persons not Jews might look into it with
advantage."

Part II. Containing Selections from the Wisdom Literature,
the Prophets, and the Psalter, together with
Extracts from the Apocrypha.

Crown 8vo, 5s. 6d. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"The scholarship, the spiritual insight, the attractive
style which distinguished the first part of Mr. Montefiore's Bible for Home
Reading are displayed in their fullest development in the second part, now
happily published. But, good as the older book was, the new is even better.
Mr. Montefiore had indeed a great responsibility. How wonderfully he has
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is the despair of a reviewer. One cannot hope to do justice to such a work
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SAADYANA.

SECOND ARTICLE, INCLUDING ALSO DOCUMENTS BEARING UPON OTHER HEADS OF THE SCHOOL OF SURA.

IX.

Fragment T-S. 10 K 2, three leaves, parchment, size 23 x 16 cm., written in an old square hand of about the twelfth century. It represents portions of the polemical writings of R. Saadyah Gaon against the Karaites regarding the calendar question. The signature, "Abraham, the priest, the son of Amram" (which is in a different hand), gives us probably the name of the owner; and "Nathan b. Isaac of Sicily" was most likely the compiler. My identification, both of this piece and of others composed in Arabic, rests entirely on the Hebrew quotations occurring in them and in the colophons where such are to be found. I am in this respect only "looking through the lattice." My surmises were, however, in most cases confirmed by such Arabic scholars as Dr. Horwitz, of the Breslau Seminary, and Dr. Schreiner, of the Berlin Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft.

1 Leaf 1 recto, l. 4, and leaf 3 verso; 2 verso, ll. 16-19.
3 Probably identical with the book collector of the same name given in Pinsker's Likute Kadmoniyoth, p. 169.
des Judentums, who were constantly ready with their help and advice, for which I feel very grateful to them. My thanks are also due to Dr. Hirschfeld, who kindly collated for me the proofs with the MSS. He also drew my attention to piece XVI, which he also copied for me. I have also to state that our MS. omits the diacritical points except on the י, which is the case in most Arabic MSS. To judge from other MSS., the Arabic text cannot be always free from clerical errors and corrupt passages which require emendation. But this must be left to Arabic students. The Gaon has already passed the pangs of one Geniza not without damage to the world, and he should not be doomed to the purgatory of another. This is my reason for including the Arabic texts in this article.

1. Rosh Hashana, 21 b. See also the Gan Eden by the Karaites Aaron b. Elijah, ch. 5, where this passage is also quoted against the Gaon.

2. Ps. xcii. 6.
אמר זה אלואים אוינו ואתנה אתנה.Length
בכש שמעתי הודות לא allocator שם נמצא אחר עט אלואים Outlet
וזה בור מים כלב או א jobject אלואים Outlet
בנימן Outlet
ולעפה או בבר נט עם בｽים לחיי רוח אמוס לא
כנתן א지원 Outlet
וכמה ברחים ואיתו אשר אתנה אלואים Outlet
שהחל ל으면 לא מתנהו אתנה אלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ולא נתلجنة מח Particle
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ס desprep
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
וארך ברוחה והחלה לשון אומנה עמי纹理
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
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ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
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ואלואים Outlet
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ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
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ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
ואלואים Outlet
יאו לאליא הדרת משות טעם והשועוה. וי vap. לא
1 Ps. cxix. 89, 90.
2 Jer. xxiii. 19.
3 Isa. xl. 6, 7.
P 2

Digitized by Google
A page of a document with handwritten text in Hebrew. The text appears to be a traditional text, possibly from a Jewish source such as a rabbinic text or a prayer book. The text contains multiple references to biblical verses and rabbinic sayings, indicated by the use of abbreviations and citations. The page includes handwritten notes and marginalia, typical of a study or commentary on the text.

1 Ps. xxxvii. 11. 2 Roeh Hashana, 11 b. 3 Ibid. 32 a.
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(Leaf 3 verso)

1 Rosh Hashana, 25 b.
SAADYANA

Fragment T-S. 10 K 1, paper, two leaves, size 20 x 12 cm., representing the remainder of a controversial tractate by a Karaite directed against certain statements made by the Gaon R. Saadyah relating to the calendar question.

(Leaf i recto)

...
סבטי фл möchte ich Ihnen eine kurze Übersicht über die hebräische Sprache geben.

1. Sehe Harkavy in his Appendix to Graetz, History (Hebrew translation), III, 495.
Fragment T-S. 10 F 1, parchment, consisting of two leaves, size 20 x 17 cm., written in a square Rabbinical hand, and representing a piece of the Sepher ha-Gedulah of R. Saadyah. Lines 10–20, leaf 2 recto, and the whole of leaf 2 verso correspond with the contents of the next piece, the colophon of which gives the name of the Gaon.

(Leaf 1 recto)

[XI.

בראשית, 93b, see also 106a. *Isa. xxxi. 4.

Baba Mezia, 93b.
בכרות מצאתי את כל מֵאָלָוֹת, וְשָׁוָה סֵבֶר אַסְגֵּר לָהּ
אֲבֹאָבָו בִּצְלוֹחַ מִדָּיָה מֵאָלָוֹת. אֲבֹאָבָו אֲלָמָשְׁתִּיעָרוּ
מִלְּאָו בַּכּוֹתַנְּאַו לָהּ מֵאָלָוֹת עַל וַחֲזַוְּאָו מֵאָלָוָּאוּ מֵאָלָוָּאוּ
לָא עַיְָהָה לִבְּבָלָוְּלָו שְׁמָאָב הָזָי קְרַהֲוְּיָי
5
לִי נָכוּלְאָו דָּיָא בֵּאָחֵי שְׁמָאָב יָבְנָאָיָו יָבְנָאָיָו יָבְנָאָי
שְׁמָאָב שְׁבֵר שָׁפֵר נִנְנָבְוְּיָי שָׁמָאָב שָׁמָאָב שָׁמָאָב
בַּאָחְיָי שְׁמָאָבָו בַּנְּיָה יִסְגְּרָי
שְׁמָאָב עַד שִׁשְׁיָלְא, שְׁמָאָב יִשְׁגְּרָי תַּלְּוָיְוְּיָי
7
שְׁלֵל יִבְרַהֲרָי לָא שְׁמָאָב נָלְכָּאָי
8
מָזוּרְוָא יָאָוּ מֵאָלָוֹת וָרְיָה מָלוֹם
זָכֶרֲוֲיָא בֵּיַלְמָאָי אְסִמְקָאָי אֲאוֹרָאָי יָאָוּ מֵאָלָוָּאָי
סִילָאָי מִכָּלְּבָלְלָוְּיָי לָוְּל הָֽלֱּבָבָה וָאָאָי רָי
10
כְּבַּזָּאָו רַאָו קָוְּמָאָלָוְּיָי עַלְּיָו זְרַי
זְרַי יָאָוְּוָי הָאִי מַנְּיָבָי מַנְּיָבָי
וּבְּאָזֶרְוָלְיָאָי אֵוָי הָאִי מַנְּיָבָי
11
אֵוָי מַנְּיָבָי מַנְּיָבָי מַנְּיָבָי מַנְּיָבָי
שְׁבַקְוָתָלָו הָאָאָזֶרְוָלְיָי עַלְּיָו הָאָאָזֶרְוָלְיָי
אֵוָי
12
מָזֶרְוָא קָוְּמָאָלָוְּיָא אֵוָי הָאָאָזֶרְוָלְיָי
מָזֶרְוָא קָוְּמָאָלָוְּיָא אֵוָי הָאָאָזֶרְוָלְיָי
13
אֵוָי הָאָאָזֶרְוָלְיָי
14
וּבְּאָזֶרְוָלְיָא
15
אֵוָי הָאָאָזֶרְוָלְיָי
16
וּבְּאָזֶרְוָלְיָא
17
18
עַלְּיָו כְּבַּזָּאָו
19
עַלְּיָו כְּבַּזָּאָו
20
(Leaf a verso)

1 Baba Mezia, 34 a.
2 The source of this passage is unknown to me.
XII.

Fragment marked T-S. 16. 69, parchment, two leaves, containing various matter written in different hands. The following piece, with the exception of the first line, is written in an ancient square hand with a turn to cursive, and probably represents a portion of the Megillah by the Gaon:

... אָמָנָה שָׂאוּל דָּרָס שִׁישָּׁלָה מְאָה מֵאָשׁ אַל מְשָׁל לָעַר לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל לְבָנָה לָא מְשָׁל L

1 *Baba Mezia*, 83 a.
Fragment T-S. 8 K 3, one leaf, paper, size 17 x 14 cm., written in a square hand with a turn to cursive. The MS. represents a fragment of a polemical work by the Gaon R. Saadyah against the Karaite Daniel b. Moses Al Kumsi, of the eighth century, one of the first successors of Anan.  

As far as I remember nothing of the existence of such a work was known till now, whilst the sudden breaking off of our MS. makes it impossible to say what the special object of the Gaon's attack was. The recto of the MS. contains the following colophon:

*מצחק ותלברון*
*הכהן בר
ייך חכמים
.tagName*:תְּנַחֵנָה פּוֹ נָה יִשָּׁר יָּמַי

(Leaf 1 verso)

בָּשֶׁם רַמְנָא
cına אָסֶר מֵר בּ מַעְרִית רָאשׁ הַתֶּבֵּשָׁה מַוצִּוּרָה
cיסָרִי וּבָּטָעַת בּ רְבֵּי אָלְפִּיָּה הַשָּׁר בֵּי
cספֶר מַלְכָּלָא מַסְרָרִי וּרְיָה מְכָשָׁל מַדְּרִי מַעַי
cהָרֹדֶךָ קְומֵס לְחֵכֶשָׁה אֲחַיָּה בְּגִם בְּרוֹשָׁתִים
cחֲנִית אַתָּה לִיבָּה לִחְכֵרָא הָלְחָרָא יָדְוַת
cאֵשֶׁר בְּכָאוּ הָאֵשֶׁר הָלוֹאָה לְעִיְתֵה
c[מ]ַאֲחַיָּה אֲתָה לִאֵשׁ הָהּ קְוֶסֶר יִשָּׁר בּ בְּשָׁשָׁה מַעֲלֵי
c[ו]ו. . . וּרְנַיָּה (ט) מְאָר מְרָדֶר הַחֵכֶשָׁה. הַרָּאְשׁוֹן
cיִכְאָנְיָה מֶבְרָא אֲתָה לִשָּׁמֶךָ דָּרוֹשׁ: כָּיָּשָׁה בּנֵי שׁיָרָאָל
cמאֶשׁ הָאָמָרָא עַלְּבָכֶנָא מֶנֶּקָא עַשְׂרִי מַעְלְבָה
cנָהָאָמָר עַלְּיָהָא מֶנֶּקָא עַשְׂרִי מַעֲלָה בְּהָבָה
cָּלְאָאָה (ט) זָרֵי מְסֶפֶּרֶת לְמֶנֶּקָא עַשְׂרִי מַעֲלָה.

XIV.

Fragment T-S. 8, 232, parchment, one leaf, size 14 x 16 cm., in a square hand, contains various jottings, of which the

1 The MS. is very faint in this place, and this word may also read וּרְכָּךְ

2 This would suggest that Daniel also wrote a ספר חַם, but it may also be a mere quotation from his ספר הַחֲמָד הָעֵשָׂר.

3 1 Chron. xxvii. 25.
following has bearing on our subject. I doubt greatly whether this R. Saadyah is identical with the Gaon of this name.

Fragment T-S.6 F 2¹, paper, one leaf, size 9 x 14 cm., written in a cursive hand, representing the remainder of a work by R. Saadyah on the “Classification of the Law under twenty-four Headings,” with a commentary by R. Samuel b. Chofni. Perhaps the latter is in some way connected with the attribution to the last Gaon of Sura.¹

¹ See Harkavy, Studien u. Mittheilungen, III, p. 5, about the attribution.
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XVI.

Fragment T-S. 6 F i, paper, twenty-six leaves, size 13 x 9 cm., in a cursive hand. The contents of the MS. are mostly liturgical, except the following lines, extending over pp. 5 and 6, containing among others a passage from a work (?) of the Gaon on the various degrees of forbidden marriages 1.

1 See Weiss, Zur Geschichte der Tradition, col. iv, p. 156, and references there to Pinsker. See also Poznański, J. Q. R., X, pp. 243 and 259.
אלמלא בכול אכלותיו ראה כי ינ הולך השבת נו.

תנין בכולו ראה ואמר שמי חלב ב' תוהות אזור.

ידייו בה ראי לא קרא ויהיו אדם אגרה בָּבָּב הוא.

ברכ אלעידי והStanding עשתו לכל פ' ראי והאלואים כלות

כי ר' מצא והאילוים שולח

כט רבי עניני מי שמחה בכל' ע

אל עובד את יד השם ישאנו לכל שניה

אותוănאלאפייה יו מכון ולאוהי תוהו.

אלמשלחת קדי מית לא תהיה קורת' ו

וטמא יין היה אלא פרושה חסמה בקך.

לא מילו א' חוכמן שב כל אלוהים יושב

אלא דר רומ השפה והי מעתה בקך.

והי א' חסר לו על ת' ויהי במקה

אותוănאלאפייה ייו מכון ולאוהי תוהו.

מצור רישון היה המית לא שמי פ' אשתו

אש לא כה שאיר בחר'.

ותי א' חסר לו על ת' ויהי במקה

אותוănאלאפייה ייו מכון ולאוהי תוהו.

 comercים היא אשתו איש רמי על אלוהים כלות

אלמלא ריבא контר איה אולא שיאות בונה.

מען לו' כי הוא עשו מין שבת וכולם אשתו

אילמלאו כלות ושארו גור אולא חנקו ב' כי הוא עשו

אלמלאו כלות ושארו גור אולא חנקו ב' כי הוא עשו

אלמלאו כלות ושארו גור אולא חנקו ב' כי הוא עשו

של חמידו והיה באירה יושב ו' ויהי עשו

וכל עשה אבורי ולא ראוי כלות חמידו

אלמלאו אשמה שתחיון מיאבה תhaled

ואאמן אחורי אייו הכדה כלות לא שמי.

BOL. XIV. Q
XVII.

Fragment T-S. 8 H 5, six leaves, paper, size 15 x 11 cm., written in a cursive hand, and representing the remainder of a liturgical MS. containing *Piyutim* for the Passover. The following represents the recto, and a portion of the verso of the third leaf.

(recto)

אומת אנחל לנטן פיות
דאה על עב על להולך מקלותיו שלמר
כברוחו להמשל לושי לסור
לראי בשלום תורה התורה לאמור

והא הזך עלי החמד

יג לוכי מחלות להראות
תחיימה ונתיא במיל כל להמאות
סולתם ודברים על יצוא
אמרו כל יצוא

(verso)

 대하여 היא להמש על מנשה
ותומת שמע על משכנית מאע

XVIII.

Fragment T-S. 8 H 2, four leaves, liturgical, paper, size 17 x 13 cm., written in a cursive hand. The following represents the verso of the second leaf (a primary Selicha to the Fast of Gedaliah) and the recto and verso of the third leaf:—
(Leaf 2 verso)

פלחה ד"ס מערית
אבולע נמי השאר תאיר, בינ תמאומת
כמש.! בך הארי, ט"ס מערית יאשף
עב תאיר, דרך בוחר בלשכיה.
הים ווירוניפ שממו נריך.
ונמס סקדים בוחר חלפת.
יין שאירת אסתר פלשו בום נכס,
חוכל שעח בי נריל דכ אמות.
אמרו דלת נארין ייחנה חום.
אוכל לברות בתים הורכיש יניבם.
וייבם מוקד תמריניאו.

(Leaf 3 recto)

פלחך לברנ PARTICULAR שאח ביך.
ויסכם תא ר"ז ר"ז, רא"ז אלא Ми זמור\(ו\) [ז"ז]
לכל ביך כבר ררב ישת חוח.
摛מסה ביך על חוק חקר נש.

(Leaf 3 verso)

בשם רחמן
כתרותיך, ז"אלנה הנ히 למטרא, ולרובך
אף חוק מברך, תובותיך אן מיך.
מובלי, תובותיך אן מיך שמש
כ מי יוטיב הקדש, מי ביך
א HDF עמהו, מי בחכ יד הכותיך.
ומי קבל נשמהו,ımı יתקד.
𝜙팍אתי, מי חורף פקודה.
שקףיך, מי משלש שבושך.
ומי זומר על דוד ומשלותיך.
XIX.

Fragment T-S. 8 H 3, paper, size 18 x 14 cm., written in a cursive hand, and reading as follows:

כשות לגופו ז"ב משיח ראה שישבה נוש תוקב
זלו
שהו והו ה"ב זארכו מתחזא לכל לארש מורכש
על כל ברכות מעלה על כל התחלות ונבה מכל גל וו', "כ".

XX.

Fragment T-S. 8 H 6, paper, one leaf, size 18 x 16 cm., written in a square hand, and contains the colophon—

עלית רביע טעירה ו"ב

with the name of the owner

وبر הליא עליא

whilst the verso reads—

והל טרבע טעירה:
שהו, הס offre שתיי
ם והו ידעתי והשבטתי אל וו', "כ".

XXI.

Fragment T-S. 6 H 1, the remainder of a collection of hymns, consisting of two leaves of a quire, of which the middle pages are missing, paper, size 14 x 10 cm., reproduces in the last two lines of leaf 2 verso the following words:

ר"ו
למעת מ$log v$ לא
$כ$

with which the MS. breaks off.

1 See Zunz, Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie, p. 95, No. 5.
2 See Zunz, ibid., p. 96, No. 6.
3 Cf. Zunz, ibid., p. 98.
XXII.

Fragment T-S. 8 H i, consisting of six leaves, paper, size 15 × 10 cm., strongly cursive, probably representing a Machsor for the Day of Atonement. The following piece reproduces the contents of the first leaf, recto (beginning with the ninth line from the top) and verso.

(recto)

(verso)

Digitized by Google
Fragment T-H. 8 H 4, paper, six leaves, size 16 x 10 cm., representing the remainder of a hymnal to Purim, written in an ancient square hand with a turn to cursive. The following piece forms the contents of the first leaf.

(recto)

אל בטח
אל בטח
בכלם ובנהי כי אלה מימיי׃ נוחי לא
סומני רושם לי ירה׃ דניאל הקים
5 נכר ארי הזה 물론 לכל בני שוח׃
הכמה הנכסי להם מלכות
האבה׃ ההובל לפיו כבוד שאב
בזכים אבוא׃ זה לאconc או שאמי
אוריה לוב׃ חסיד העמיה לי יטני
10 יהא מק טננפעםÉtat מלי בושкур
בלא בל לבך כרומ׃ זה ית לא
שנה כלולה הפרע׃ להז לב לורם
לון בוריו חוכמה היתה׃ לא עבורי
emoth להווריהם בר bara לא יכוו מצפור׃
5 כי הוא לילה צופי על החושה׃
נאותו׃ ים בהח חוסה׃ סמכא

(verso)

לא כליל לא אשיבות Connie ר_Close׃
שוריו ככני שומם שלשה על מלכות
שלשיות׃ מירית פרעת נוית
לOrElse׃ זרת התומתה התומתה
10 חורית שמחה ברוך׃ קדיש לאوء
ברחמק עם טבחי הסלמה׃ רבי
חובבי העמיד למלחה מרות המלכה׃
שכנתיUCHו ופי אלולי דרים.
This is followed by a hymn of Saadya.

XXIV.

Fragment T-S. 8. 233, parchment, one leaf, size 13 x 18 cm., written in a square hand, and representing the colophon of a liturgical work (containing private prayers) by R. Saadyah.

XXV.

Fragment T-S. 8. 234, parchment, one leaf, size 12 x 10 cm. The recto contains a colophon written in a square hand of the year 1061, whilst the verso is written in a rather different cursive hand.
Fragment T-S. 8. 235, parchment, one leaf, size 17 x 15 cm., in a square hand, and has on the recto a colophon, and on the verso the well-known poem on the number of the letters of the Old Testament. The MS. seems decidedly of a very ancient date, and greatly guarantees the authenticity of this piece disputed by some scholars.1

1 Cf. reference in Landshuth’s Amude ha-Aboda, p. 299, but our text agrees with none of the editions.
Fragment T-S. 8 K 1, paper, one leaf, size 17 x 12 cm., written in a square hand with a turn to cursive. The recto represents the colophon of a codex once in the possession of a Head of the Dispersion, Daniel b. Solomon (about 1165) of Bagdad, and afterwards (1175) owned by Jacob b. Eli, probably a brother of Samuel b. Eli, the head of the school in the same place. The codex contained various pieces by the Gaon R. Saadyah and the Gaon R. Samuel b. Chofni.

(verso)

لا ... يتمال راب نائنا ... و
راب نائنا كدل أي م
إن رض الال يعك بن عل بن بائلا تما
يرتمل مذ رما أصلتاء عل 1 عب

1 See Graetz, Geschich, vol. VI, p. 276.
On the verso, which is written in a different hand, the first six lines run as follows:—

Fragment T-S. 12. 72a, parchment, 1 leaf, written in square with a tendency to cursive. It comes from a codex representing the commentary of R. Saadyah to Isaiah. As we see from the colophon, dated 1031, the codex belonged at one time to Josiah the son of Aaron the son of Josiah.

1 See Aruch, s. v. משכן, where it seems that R. Hai wrote a treatise on the עשרת הלכות. It is not known to me that R. Saadyah wrote on the same subject. Cf. also Halachoth Gedoloth, ed. Warsaw, 138 a sq. (beg. of Halachoth Bechoroth), Midrash, Lekach Tov (ed. Wilna), Numbers, 83 b sq.
Another colophon above this in larger ornamental letters, but as I believe, of a later date, tells us that the codex was in the possession of Jacob son of Job. There are also written in contemporary Caroline minuscules the Latin words *tacito esse prophete*. This is the first time I have found a non-Semitic title on a fragment coming from the Geniza.

---

(recto)

 womb אלברט

תורן יקב

תובר בור

יאוב י"ת יי"ת

עומ ייצלוה אמסן (?) 5

---

(verso)

ומח אישך הלה

אבר אלמאתאלאה לל לן אמ

ואא אלמאתה מ"ל ל ע

באת מתנתה תב אולת אלת א

אוחס ממק אמקמק לא אינ

ים אלמאתא אלריזא התות: אמא ב

מרח על אלמאתא תעל באוונא מנולתメーカー

על מנולתאה תאני אל שדמיות לא לום

וכל לה אמי תיצתה והו אל ממי ראמה אלך 15
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Fragment T-S. 12. 723, paper, one leaf, size 26 x 16.5 cm. (writing 21 x 11.5), written in an ancient square hand, probably not later than the eleventh century. The writing is much faded in many places, but enough is left to show that it represents the remainder of a letter addressed to the Gaon R. Saadyah by a pupil of one of his disciples. The burden of the letter is, in its present defective state, impossible to ascertain.

1 Below, verso L 3.
Fragment T-S. 12. 724, two pages, size 26 x 18 cm., written in an ancient cursive hand, coming from a codex containing Responsa of the Gaonim. The following, closely written, begins at the fourteenth line from the top, and represents about half a page. A part of its contents is already known from the collection שערי חיתון, No. 87. It will be seen that our text is the more complete one, and gives the
original version of this Responsum, whilst the other reproduces merely an extract.
XXXI.

Fragment T-S. 13 G 2, paper, two leaves, the top broken away, now size 21 x 21 cm., square hand, representing the remainder of a codex of *Responsea of the Geonim*. The following lines occur on the recto of leaf 2, whilst their contents closely recall those of *Responsum 386* in the *Teshuboth ha-Geonim*, ed. Harkavy. The R. Nathan mentioned here is probably identical with Nathan b. Juda, the grand uncle (Aluf) of the Gaon R. Sherira.

XXXII.

Fragment T-S. 10 G 1, paper, five leaves, size 22 x 19 cm., cursive, and representing a portion of *Responsea of the Geonim*. The following piece, forming a part of the contents of the third leaf, recto and verso, is marked as No. 61 (קסא):

---

1 See the letter of R. Sherira, p. 39 (ed. Neubauer).

2 *Sota*, 48 a.
Fragment T-S. 16. 310, paper, size 35 x 24 cm., one leaf, coming from a *Respomea of the Geonim*, and giving a quotation from the commentaries of the Gaon. There are in the Geniza other pieces like this, and as far as I was able to read them *superficially*, they come from Rabbi Samuel ben Chofni.

*Gittin*, 68 b.

**VOL. XIV.**
XXXIV.

Fragment T.S. 10 G 2, paper, eight leaves, size 21 x 17 cm., square writing with a turn to cursive, forming originally a part of codex of Responsa of the Geonim. The following lines reproduce a portion of leaf 4 verso, and represent a responsum by R. Hai Gaon to the people of Segelmessa, in Africa, in which the name of R. Saadyah occurs. Some of its contents were already known from a quotation given by R. Isaac Abbamare in his Ittur.

1 See Musiler in his collection appended to the responsa, by R. Saadyah, p. 149, No. 19.

2 Aboda Zara, 39 b. 3 Shabbath, 90 b.

4 These dots are in the MS.

Fragment T.S. 8 J 1, size 19 x 14.2 cm. (writing 14.5 x 11.3), consists of two quires, each numbering two leaves. It is written in a square Rabbinic hand, probably not later than the twelfth century. Their contents represent a panegyric of a head of the Academy of 1, which fact suggested my giving them a place in this article, dedicated to the greatest master of this school. The style is strictly paitanic, both in its grammatical formations 2 and its allusive diction 3. It is also provided, as most Piyutim are, with rhyme and acrostic. The latter, defective at the beginning, gives in the first piece, in the second, beginning in the third, beginning in the fourth, defective at the beginning, and commencing in the fifth, beginning whilst the sixth, commencing with also defective at the beginning, (leaf 4, r.), whilst the other, beginning forming probably the concluding letter of or as. As to the subject of this panegyric, only one thing is certain that it was, as already mentioned, composed in honour of the head of the Academy of (or Sura?)

1 This vocalization confirms the opinion of Lebrecht (quoted by Berliner in his Beiträge zur Geographie, p. 46, n. 2) that the correct pronunciation is Machseya, not Machasya.

2 See the reference to Zunz, Syn. Poesie, in the notes to the text, to which many other words may be added, as מ"א, טביה, תרבות, תרבות, כחק août, קונס, קנס, קנס, קונס, &c. &c.

3 See e.g. leaf 2 verso, ll. 15-21; leaf 3 verso, l. 7 (א for Israel), &c.

4 In connexion with this eulogy it will not be uninteresting to reproduce here contents to two fragments stored in the Colophon Box of the T-S. Collection; the one reading whilst the other reading See also Benjamin's Itinerary (ed. Asher), I, 48, the title רכז אתשה.
"the broken down," which he will make terrible and mighty again, and which he will re-establish as the school of the religion where certain portions of the Jewish civil law will be studied. The further details, as far as they can be gathered from this turgid style, and the many unintelligible lines, are that the lately installed head was the father of three sons, Baruch, Jannai, and Solomon, and of two married daughters. He had also brothers and sister's sons, who apparently were considered members of his own family. His wife, we further learn, was still alive, but rather advanced in years, whilst he also enjoyed the services of Abraham the priest, the writer of this panegyric, who acted, as it seems, as his secretary, relieving his master in the performance of his heavy duties, who besides his teaching activity was also engaged in works of charity and lovingkindness. Another servant of his was the priest Amram. It is further
clear that the jurisdiction of our Rabbi not only included the whole of Babylon, but also extended to the schools in the Christian countries; for he was "the strength of the dispersion in Babel and in Edom," "and his fame went through all the provinces." All this wide influence, generosity, and learning did not, however, protect our Rabbi against the ill-will of his enemies, among which the people of T'bow were especially distinguished, but who were quite subdued by his authority and the force of his pen. This last feature would especially apply to the Gaon R. Saadyah, who was particularly famous for his controversial skill, and who had especial merits in the restoration of the school of Sura. Indeed, he was called to this chair with the especial purpose of bringing back to this seat of learning its ancient glory. The reference to Joseph may also include perhaps an allusion to the father of the Gaon, who bore this name. But there is this objection, that no reference is made in this panegyric to R. Dosa, the only son of the Gaon, known to history. Another restorer of Sura was the Gaon R. Samuel ben Chophni, the last head of this great school, but there we are confronted with the similar difficulty that no mention is made of R. Hai Gaon, the son-in-law of the former.

The impression conveyed by these lines is that the writer was a contemporary of R. Hananel and R. Nissim, and may thus have been the secretary of R. Samuel b. Hophni. That again the secretary of the Gaon was as a rule a man of learning and enjoying an eminent position is clear from R. Sherira's letter (ed. Neubsuer) in which he mentions with pride the fact that he was the secretary of the Gaon. What speaks against the suggested identification is the omission of the title in the cited passage.

1 Leaf 3 verso, li. 15, 16, and 22; leaf 4 recto, l. 25.
2 Leaf 1 verso, l. 10.
3 Leaf 3 verso, l. 13 seq., and recto, li. 11-16.
5 Leaf 2 recto, l. 15.
6 See Graetz, vol. VI, pp. 1 and 7; Harkavy, Studien und Mittheilungen, III, p. 1, text and notes.
See Isa. vi. 6 and 7, but the allusion is not quite clear to me.

See Gen. xlix. 11.

Denom. from psp. 5. Beadmmm. See Song of Songs, i. 3. Perhaps they had some Midraah on this verse suggesting the dim pn1?, 4c.

See Gen. xviii. 12.
1 See Zunz, *Die synagogale Poesie*, p. 391, sub n.
2 See Ps. cxviii. 3. Cf. recto, l. 25.
3 See below, leaf 2 recto, ll. 24, 25.
4 Perhaps part. pass. from a denom. verb from רדש.
5 Name of a place (?).
6 Seems to be modelled after Lev. Rabba, XXIX, 2.
7 Corrected by the Gloss in l. 22.
See Zunz, ibid., pp. 383, 404.
See Zunz, ibid., p. 416.
See Levy, Dict. sub יְהוּדָה.
See 1 Chron. xxiv. 5.
Perhaps allusion to Dan. iv. 10 and Job xxi. 4, thus meaning the angels in heaven, whilst נֶאֶר refers to Israel. See Midrash to Song of Songs, v. 2.
See Agadath Shir Hashirim, 1. 266, and notes to it on p. 54, about the virtues of the bones of Joseph.
See Gen. xliv. 27.
See Aboth, v. 5.
Perhaps wishing him רְשָׁעִים.
(Leaf a verso)

ז"תו ל"ז יבצ המלך ביבוק יזוחמה. קוח ה' בֵּן חָלֵם. ירוהו לא יגעו אף ולא ייפה: עצורהפרשירות בומרת

לפי המילים והם

ברשיות טיפה ידך. לשת מברכתיי. נוריות

ולשונים פסרוונות. עתיבות ראוות כלו מ忭יה: הרגתי בשרתי כאריך. קלבת עמי ענמי ענמי ענמי ע"פ

רואן אלי ש 위하여 אין כ מכללים: לכל עבר שיש הלאיכולות.

וכשבני ילד חכמ: לא伸びי חור בחרים. לכל תורה שבות:

מי יהנה שבת זה נאהר. מריחתי תורה חורי. וכל עָזי.

לבוניו. ייב חסונuggage牙齿.

בירח בנה יהל שפ: נראות על תורה ושמש

ובגל ל러ות והתבנכה חומר. טפכ בעיים בכמה מלבלה:

המכים זכר איון בן עז. הממסד המה יעשה. בכר.

מי לארים זה עקר איוד. הצרחות יד חליפה. לוסב עלה מביתם. לכל חימאל אולימם רחביה.

\footnote{1} See Zunz, ibid., p. 430, 3 ויקח.

\footnote{2} See Zunz, ibid., p. 418.

\footnote{3} Perhaps this word is meant as a plur. of העיר, see Song of Songs, iv. 14.

\footnote{4} So in the MS. as a sign that it has to be cancelled. See 1. 13.

\footnote{5} See Is. vi. 13. The meaning of the next lines is not clear to me.

\footnote{6} See Zunz, p. 384. Both this and the next line recall certain expressions in the Seder Abodah of Ben Abithur.
See Zunz, ibid., p. 379; idem, chapters of R. Eliezer, III (המשנה יב יב יב), and Gen. Rabbah, I, 4.

2 See Exod. iv. 19.

3 This word may also be read רכוב.

4 Perhaps in the sense of וַיִּקֶף in Ezek. xxvi. 9.

5 The MS. is rather faded in this place, and the word can also be read דַּמָּה. The sense of this and the preceding line is obscure to me.

6 See Jer. vi. 6.

7 See Jer. xvii. 9. Cf. Aruch Completum, VIII, 149.
See Mood Katon, 9 b.

3 See Zech. ii. 12 (ןכץ חון ומכ). See R. Saadya’s poem on the number of the letters of the Bible.

4 See Zunz, ibid., p. 400 (ופר). Perhaps allusion to Vaeius, though it may be a mere corruption of Verver.

5 See Sukka, 50 b, דוד פקש ומכ ראשית.
Aramaic note added between lines.

1 See Num. xxii. 15.
2 See Jer. xxiii. 29.
His wares being sold first: see Baba Bathra, 22 a, אשת רע, פס. 93א, etc.
5 See Ezek. xxvii. 24.
'Perhaps allusion to Ps. xii. 9. Cf. Lévy's Dict. sub פש.
'Perhaps denom. of פש.
XXXVI.

Fragment T-S. 13 G 1, parchment, two leaves, size 25 x 17 cm., written in an old square hand, and representing the remainder of a codex of Responsa of the Geonim. The matter reproduced here represents leaf 1 recto, and the first twelve

1 See Song of Songs, viii. 7.
2 See Jer. viii. 7.
3 Zunz, ibid., p. 385.
4 See Levy, sub yer.
5 See Deut. xxxiii. 22.
6 Who reached the age of 120: see Siphre, p. 150 (ed. Friedmann).
7 Perhaps corruption of ז"ע or טט.
lines of the verso. Their contents are partly known from
the Respansa of the Geonim, No. 17 (attributed to
R. Hai Gaon), which has served to historians as the main
source for the history of the house of the exiliarch Bostanai
but it will be found that our responsum was preserved in
a more full and correct state than the former; representing
the family of MSS. of the Teshuboth Haggeonim to which
R. Isaiah de Trani had access when he wrote ™dd ixy &c. The name of the captured woman
and her mother, and her three sons are also omitted in the
editions. The most interesting facts are as already indicated
that a governor of ßwit (l. 14) or ßwit (l. 23) or
ßwit (XXXVI a, l. 5) here has married the daughter of
R. Chaninai, and that the head of the Dispersion Zakkai
also derived his pedigree from the mixed marriage.

1 See Graetz, Geschichte, vol. V. pp. 119-124, and note 11 at the end of
the book; F. Lazarus in Brüll's Jahrbücher, vol. X. p. 27, and p. 84,
Anm. 1, and the references given there.
3 See Noldeke, Geschichte d. Perser u. d. Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden, p. 390,
ote 2, and p. 433, about the name ßwit (l. 11, read ßwit). With regard
to the name ßwit (l. 11, cf. also below, XXXVI a, l. 2 as ßwit), Prof.
Noldeke, whom I have consulted on this point, thinks that we should
correct it into ßwit — ßwit — ßwit (see Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, p. 146). He also informs me that the three sons of Chosrau II
bore the names of ßwit, ßwit, ßwit (see Justi, ibid., pp. 191 and
196). The last name should read ßwit. For the reference to Justi
I am also indebted to Prof. Noldeke, and I express herewith my best
thanks to him for his kind instruction.

* Below, l. 24; probably identical with the name ßwit mentioned in the
ibid., ibid.

* This Zakkai is probably identical with the one mentioned by R.
Sherira as ßwit (p. 36), cf. Graetz, ibid., p. 430, whilst
immediately after Bostanai is the same as ßwit (XXXVI, recto, l. 16) or
ßwit (XXXVI a, recto, l. 7) mentioned in our texts, cf. Lazarus, ibid.,
p. 174 II and 176 VII. I must remark that there must be some gap
before the word ßwit (XXXVI, recto, l. 21); nor is the meaning of the
words ßwit (l. 23) clear to me. Perhaps we have here a corruption of
ßwit (XXXVI a, verso, l. 4) — Rözbekàn (Justi, p. 267).
This agrees with the Maaseh Beth David, who speaks of "אָבָש וְאָמָן" (pl.). Cf. Graetz, ibid., p. 414.
Another version of the same responsum we have in Fragment T-S.8 G 1, paper, representing the remainder of a different codex of Responsa of the Geonim. The importance of the subject makes it desirable to reproduce the whole of it. It is only necessary to premise that the writing is of much later date than the preceding fragment. It begins in the middle of a line, and runs as follows:—

(recto)

(verso)

1 That is R. Natronai II b. Hilai, who was also known for his correspondence with scholars of Lucena in Spain. See Graetz, ibid., p. 348.

2 See Jobamoth, 47 a.
XXXVII.

Fragment T-S. 13 K 1, paper, one leaf, size 27 x 17 cm., written in a square hand, and representing the remainder of a catalogue of the library of Nathan b. Yeshun, probably of Cairo, in which various works of the Gaon are mentioned. It should be noted that I give this fragment only as a specimen of the fragments deposited in the box marked catalogues, containing mostly lists, in all of which the works

1 Graetz, ibid., p. 172; cf. also Harkavy’s Responsa of the Geonim, p. 357.
of R. Saadyah (and R. Samuel b. Chofni) are more or less represented. As they are sure to be edited soon in toto there is no need to enter into details here. But I will draw the attention of the student to the catalogue-fragment marked A, having among others the following titles: —

In another fragment of the same kind I find among others also noted the work "Dp pjflDC^1D, which is of course identical with Ecclesiasticus.
Fragment T-S. 8 H 7, paper, two leaves, size 19 x 14 cm., written in an exceptionally square hand, represents the remainder of a liturgical MS., containing, among other matter, hymns to the Adonai. The (second) leaf, reproduced here, contains a reference to the Dnyp njmx, playing an important part in the Ben Meir controversy. The first leaf contains also liturgical pieces, one of which has the heading לַחֹזֶה, and commences with אֲלֹהֵינוּ אֲלֹהֵינוּ מִצְחָרָיוֹ, and commences with אֲלֹהֵינוּ אֲלֹהֵינוּ מִצְחָרָיוֹ.

(recto)

בַּשָּׁבוֹת נַכְרָישוֹ. הֶשְׁטַהוּ לוֹ
יתְנִי לִרְאוּץ קָרָשׁוֹ.

יתָלוֹם הְמֵאוֹזִים שְׁנָהָתָם עָדוֹיָם
וּרְאֵה. לְשֵׁלָשׁוּמִים יֵם בַּחֲלֶק זַאֳחִא
בְּמַלְּאָתָם. מִזְוֵרָה מִזוֹצָיא
לָבָּנָה מִזְוֵרָה מִזְוֵרָה
הַקְּנִים (f) בַּשָּׁוְם וּשְׁקַעְתָּה

iyım וְחֹסְרָה שְׁרוֹדָה שׁוּתָה
הַקְּנִים וְשַׁבֲנָה מְנַחַת וּשׁוֹשֵׁנִים
שִׁכַּשְׁנָה הַקְּנִים • שִׁכַּשְׁנָה גָּז.

(verso)

הָיָא מִזְבַּח (f) וּשְׁחֹדֶים יְפֹרָיִם
הַקְּנִים וְחֹדֶשֶׁהוֹ מְפָרִים
cָּסָרִים וּאֵשֶׁלֶם וּאֵשֶׁר יֶסֶר
cָּרַי הַשָּׁבָא מְפָרִים
לְחֹזֶה לָבָּנָה • שָׁנֹתָה יְבָרִים
בְּכָרֵנָה • מְזַהַשָּׁה הַשָּׁבָא •
הַשָּׁבָא שָׁמָּן מִזְוֵרַי.
בְּבַל בֵּית (f) מָר תּוֹרָה
עַל אֶרֶבּוּ שָׁמָּה יְבָרִים
בְּרִי עַל אֶפְּאִים וּרְבִי שָׁתָת
רֵי מָתֵלָם פֶּרֶס כְּלַ צָאִית
הַחֹזֶה מָצְפּוּ לָסְמוֹרָיו.
XXXIX.

Fragment T-S. 12. 725, paper, mutilated, present size 20 x 13 cm., written in square characters of a very ancient date. It contains a reference to the Dnyc njmx and probably had some bearing on the Ben Meir controversy. The verso contains, in a different hand, passages from the minor Tractate Derech Eretz Zuta.

(verso)

בוחנה אלראר דרייב עקר דב helt� שטש מ...
משנאות בעויב הדיח וбриות הדיח ואעל ביני
טמל וית גואנ ביכא בורע העובר אוatemala
קוה לולעה גהל אמלאה באב באבר ריבי שמלא
ה וא אזור חזרה אמלאה לא אמלאה מודה לא ידע

10
דה סמואהנו דבר בהרה פתחת עצהלית חי דרימ
אזא אפורים בחלפר שלבני אריא סיראגלא
tני
ทานא אפור אינ ראה בת דינ אפורים פקרה
לאר לכותן ב ולא שמעין זאף רב חי בחר מדריא
מתוילות מי חזור לעיב הדיח מתחילות מזרא
עמה פרקרות ביעובדה אפי רב יהוריה השנה
אמור ביעובדה לדידא אמרי אלחר עשרים
כלה תמסי שלושים ים [ב.] שקב בעי איי ריבי
לבן אزهر דריל היה שך 15 וכל א 10 אזור ישב בצומה
כא בר יברא מתה דרי וייחו ורב א 27 33 איי התוכן
ניחי לברית אוימ חטשיהם לברי חק בית הרשע
ולדה אלה 1430 מהרכבעה שניהם מי שיעור בן אילוה מהי
וזי הושיא

1 See Jer. T. Rosh Hashana, 58 a, b.

S. SCHECHTER.
THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

THE JEWS AND THE ENGLISH LAW.

III.

The history of the way in which the courts treat endowments for Jewish religious and communal purposes has been sketched in outline, and it has been shown how, though at one time trusts for the maintenance or propagation of the Jewish religion or religious doctrines, as distinguished from trusts for the benefit of poor adherents of that religion, would not be enforced, such trusts, with very unimportant exceptions, have since the year 1846 been carried out by the courts: it remains to deal with the view the courts have taken of claims by Jews to participate in general endowments and charities not specifically confined to any religious creed or denomination. The right of Jews to establish charities in favour of their co-religionists exclusively has been always asserted, and has been firmly established by the judicial decisions previously enumerated; on the other hand, the right of non-Jews to create endowments from which Jews or the members of any other especially designated class or religion are prohibited from deriving any advantage has never been doubted. It may be laid down that Jews are entitled to the benefit of all institutions and foundations which are not by the instrument creating them restricted either expressly or by necessary implication to members of a particular denomination. If duly authorized regulations are laid down for the distribution of a charity, with which it is impossible for a Jew to comply, it is plain that he cannot participate in the benefits of it, but he will not be excluded by the mere fact that the endowment he wishes to
take advantage of was founded at a time anterior to the readmission of Jews into this country.

The principles upon which the courts will act were laid down in the year 1818 by Lord Eldon, sitting as Lord Chancellor, in the matter of the Masters, Governors, and Trustees of the Bedford Charity. Of this case there is an excellent report by Mr. Swanston, which contains a whole mine of learning upon the subject in hand, but as it covers seventy pages, it is impossible to set it out in full here. It must therefore suffice to give an abstract of the facts, together with the most important portions of the judgment. The Bedford Charity had been originally established in the reign of King Edward the Sixth by Sir William Harper, Knight, and alderman of the city of London, and Dame Alice, his wife; and two Acts of Parliament had been passed, the last in 1793, for its regulation. The charity consisted of (1) a free school in the town of Bedford for the education, institution, and instruction of children and youth in grammar and good manners, and the Wardens and Fellows of New College, Oxford, were constituted Visitors of the grammar school: (2) a provision of £800 per annum for the marriage portions of forty poor maids of the town of Bedford, of good fame and reputation, in equal shares; all poor maidens resident in the town of Bedford, and being of the age of sixteen years or upwards, and under the age of fifty years, whose fathers had been occupiers of a house in the town for the space of ten years or had been born in the town and had occupied a house therein for three years, were to be at liberty to send to the Mayor an account in writing of their Christian and surnames, their ages, the places of their birth, and the names of their parents; and, if not of bad fame and reputation, were to be permitted to draw lots for sums of £20 each; and each of those who drew the beneficial lots was to be entitled to receive on the day of her marriage £20 for her portion, provided that she

\[1\] Swanston, pp. 470–539.
should marry within two calendar months from the time of claiming such beneficial lot, and that she should not marry a vagrant or other person of bad name or reputation: (3) a house or hospital for the habitation of poor boys and girls, born and resident within the town of Bedford, who were proper objects of charity, where they were to be suitably maintained until they were of a proper age to be put out to trade, agriculture, or other business: (4) a provision of a yearly sum of £700, to be applied, by two half-yearly sums of £350, in placing out twenty poor children apprentices every half-year, viz. fifteen boys, not being under the age of thirteen nor above the age of fifteen years, and five girls, not being under the age of twelve nor above the age of fifteen years, whose respective fathers had been occupiers of a house in the town for the space of ten years or had been born in the town and occupied a house therein for the space of three years. All such poor boys and girls, whose names had been sent in at the proper time, were to be permitted to draw lots; and the sum of £20 was to be paid as the apprentice fee with each of the fifteen boys and £10 as the apprentice fee with each of the five girls who should draw the beneficial lots upon their being respectively placed out apprentices to masters and mistresses of good character and respectability. The boys were to be bound for the space of seven years, and the girls for the space of five years; and every boy and girl so put out to apprentice, who should actually serve the full term of apprenticeship, and in all respects comply with the tenor of the indentures of apprenticeship, should, on producing to the trustees of the charity a certificate signed by their respective masters or mistresses and by the minister and churchwardens of the parish where they should have respectively served their apprenticeship, testifying such actual service and compliance with the tenor of their indentures as well as their good morals and behaviour respectively, be entitled to receive such sum of money, not exceeding £20 nor less than £10 each, as the trustees should judge proper and expedient.
(5) The surplusage of the funds, remaining after the before-mentioned objects had been carried out, was to be distributed in alms to the poor of the town for the time being.

In the year 1816 Sheba Lyon, whose father, Joseph Lyon, had been an occupier of a house in the town of Bedford for more than ten years, being then between twelve and fifteen years of age and duly qualified by the Act of Parliament, and her name having been given in in the usual form one calendar month before the time of drawing lots as directed by the Act, presented herself to the masters, governors, and trustees of the Bedford Charity as a candidate to draw a lot for the apprentice fee to be paid to girls. Permission to draw a lot was refused upon the ground that her father, Joseph Lyon, was of the Jewish persuasion, and afterwards the trustees of the charity passed a resolution not to permit any persons of the Jewish persuasion, whatever in other respects might be their qualifications under the terms of the Act of Parliament, or the children of such persons, to partake of any benefit under the Bedford Charity. In answer to an application by Mr. Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, who interceded on behalf of Sheba Lyon, the Mayor of Bedford wrote to him that the trustees, finding the number of Jews increasing in Bedford, entertained considerable doubts whether such persons were objects of the charity, and that they had been advised to refuse and had refused to admit Jews to participate in the benefit of the charity, leaving it to the persons so refused, if they should think proper, to bring the matter before the Lord Chancellor.

Accordingly a petition was presented praying that it might be declared that the poor inhabitants of the town of Bedford in other respects duly qualified were entitled to the benefit of the Bedford Charity for themselves and their children, whether they were Jews or Christians, and that Sheba Lyon should be permitted to draw lots for the apprentice fee to be paid to girls.

The evidence showed that Michael Joseph had twice voted in the annual election of trustees of the charity, that
he settled at Bedford and became a housekeeper there about thirty-one years before, and at that time there was no other person professing the Jewish religion there nor had been in the memory of man; that he had had two sons and seven daughters, all of whom were born in Bedford, and that both his sons were admitted into the free school of the charity and were educated there in the usual manner, his eldest son being in the lower or writing school, and his youngest both in the grammar and writing school; and both of them drew for and received apprentice fees from the charity, and the eldest, on being out of his apprenticeship, received the benefaction of £10; that his four eldest daughters drew for apprentice fees given to girls; the three eldest of them did not draw beneficial lots, but the youngest having drawn a beneficial lot, the apprentice fee was paid with her; that all his daughters had since claimed and received the marriage portions given to poor maidens; that no Jew had ever been proposed or elected a trustee of the charity, but that such trustees had always been elected from among the most opulent and considerable inhabitants of the town; and no Jew, during the time of Michael Joseph's first residence there, had been by his circumstances and mode of living entitled to the distinction of being elected a trustee; that no Jew boy or girl had ever been admitted into the hospital, nor any Jew into the almshouses belonging to the charity, and that no Jew girl ever received the donation given to maidservants, and no Jew ever received any part of the moneys distributed annually under the provisions of the Act among the poor inhabitants of Bedford; but that no one professing the Jewish religion since Michael Joseph's residence in the town had ever applied for or been a fitting object to partake in any of those benefactions (inasmuch as no Jew had been incapacitated by age or infirmity, so as to fall within the description of persons for whose benefit the almshouses were erected) or to receive the surplus of the charity funds annually distributed; and no Jew girl,
the daughter of an inhabitant of Bedford, had ever gone out to service; that there were then three Jew housekeepers in the town and no more, and that since Michael Joseph first came to reside in the town there had been four other Jew families resident as housekeepers there, all of whom had either left the town or ceased to be housekeepers there. The other two Jewish housekeepers resident in the town, Godfrey Levi and Joseph Lyon, also swore affidavits stating that their daughters had been admitted into the preparatory free school.

Evidence was filed on the part of the trustees setting out the regulations laid down for the government of the schools, from which it appeared that there were three schools attached to the charity, namely, the grammar school, the writing school, and the preparatory school; and affidavits were sworn by the gentlemen who were or had been masters of the schools. The education in the grammar school was similar to that in other public schools, and consisted of instruction in the Latin and Greek languages. Every boy was also instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, and required to read the Bible and New Testament. Nathan Joseph, the son of Michael Joseph, had been one of the scholars in the grammar school; he had never made further progress than learning the Latin grammar, and remained altogether not more than twelve months in the school when his father took him away; Michael Joseph had requested Dr. Brereton, the master, to dispense with his son's attendance in school at the time of morning and evening prayer, on account of its being inconsistent with his faith as a Jew, and for the same reason to dispense with his attendance on the Saturday, being the Jewish Sabbath, and also on the Jewish holidays; Nathan Joseph never attended the grammar school on a Saturday nor on certain other days which were Jewish holidays; he was very irregular in his attendance in school, of which Dr. Brereton frequently complained to his father, who uniformly described his
absence to be of necessity, on account of his being of the Jewish persuasion. No other boy of the Jewish persuasion had at any time applied for admission or been admitted into the grammar school.

All the boys in the writing school, without exception, were educated in the principles of Christianity, and taught to read and actually read the Bible and New Testament and learn and repeat the Church Catechism. The only boys of the Jewish persuasion who were admitted into the school were Joseph Joseph, eldest son of Michael Joseph, and Lemuel Lyon, son of Joseph Lyon. Michael Joseph, on the occasion of his son's admission, requested that Joseph Joseph might not be desired to attend the morning and evening prayers, on account of his religion; the master, however, did not dispense with Joseph Joseph's attendance, but permitted him to sit instead of kneel during the prayers. At his father's request Joseph Joseph was permitted to be absent from school every Saturday and also on such days as were Jewish holidays; Lemuel Lyon was also absent (though apparently his father made no request on his behalf) every Saturday and on the Jewish holidays; and neither Joseph Joseph nor Lemuel Lyon, on account of their religion, ever read the New Testament or learned the Church Catechism, as all the other boys did.

In 1815 a school had been founded for instructing the poor boys of the town upon Dr. Bell's system of education, by the name of the preparatory school; but no Jew boy had ever been educated in the preparatory school. On the afternoons of Tuesday and Thursday in each week, being the half-holidays of the boys, the school was opened for the education of girls residing in the town, in reading, writing, and arithmetic. Two daughters of Michael Joseph, three daughters of Joseph Lyon, and two daughters of Godfrey Levi, came to the preparatory school for education for about six months. The daughters of Michael Joseph informed the master that, being Jewesses, they were not allowed to read the New Testament, and he permitted
them to read the Commandments and the Bible only. The children of Joseph Lyon and Godfrey Levi, being little children, were on the above afternoons put with children of the same class to read the parables and miracles of the New Testament. All the Jew children stayed away from the school on certain days which were Jewish holidays.

The petition was presented by the before-mentioned Joseph Lyon, his daughter Sheba Lyon, and Michael Joseph, all of the town of Bedford, by five of the elders of the congregation of the Dutch and German Jews assembling at the Great Synagogue in Duke's Place, and by a similar number of the elders of the congregation of the Dutch and German Jews assembling at the New Synagogue in Leadenhall Street. A considerable part of the arguments and judgment was directed to the right of the elders of the synagogues to be petitioners, and it is upon this point that the case is usually quoted in the law books. This, however, was a purely technical question, a discourse on which would be out of place here, though it may be stated that Lord Eldon decided against the claim of the elders to be petitioners, as they had no direct interest in the administration of the charity. The arguments were put forward with great ability by Sir Samuel Romilly on behalf of the petitioners, and the Solicitor-General, Sir Robert Gifford, on behalf of the trustees. Want of space necessitates their omission here, except in so far as the Lord Chancellor commented upon them in his judgment. Among the remarks he made before giving final judgment, he said: "A doubt has also occurred to me, whether

---

1 Mr. Picciotto in his *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History*, at p. 289, mentions this case, and informs us that the matter was originally laid before the authorities of the Great Synagogue, who at once appointed a committee to investigate the subject, and sought the co-operation of the other Synagogues in London; but that the Hambro' Synagogue and the Sephardi Synagogue declined to entertain the matter, referring it to the Board of Deputies. He says that the court decided that a Jew was not a "parishioner." It is remarkable that this word is not to be found throughout the seventy pages of the very learned and accurate report.
admissibility into the school is within my exclusive jurisdiction; whether it does not belong to the Visitors, the Warden and Fellows of New College. They have introduced a variety of regulations for the conduct of the boys’ school, with which no Jew boy could comply. Without now giving final judgment, I have no doubt that a Jew boy cannot have the benefit of that school, because he cannot comply with these regulations.

At length, on May 11, 1819, in finally disposing of the petition, Lord Eldon suggested that a new petition should be presented by the trustees, stating that doubts had arisen as to the construction of the Act in regard to Jews, and submitting to the court what they take to be the true exposition, as far as those persons are concerned. He added: “On the letter stated in the petition, as on a great deal urged to me in argument, those liberal ideas about worshipping God in church, chapel, or synagogue, I purpose to make no observations; it is not necessary. The decision in Da Costa v. De Paz has established that no one can found by charitable donation an institution for the purpose of teaching the Jewish religion; but it is quite a different question whether property can be given to perform charitable acts to persons who happen to be Jews; and it appears to me that the present is a mere question whether these individuals are or not, within the four corners of this Act of Parliament, objects of the charity thereby given. I have no concern with general principles: I am only to construe the Act.”

A new petition was accordingly presented by the trustees, praying a declaration whether the poor inhabitants of the town of Bedford who were of the Jewish persuasion were entitled with Christians to the benefit of the Bedford Charity for themselves or their children. And it was not until Aug. 23 that Lord Eldon pronounced his decision on the whole case. In the course of his judgment he said: “This charity had its foundation in letters patent of

1 a Swanston, p. 520.  
2 Ibid., p. 522.
Edward the Sixth, who founded a grammar school at Bedford as in many other parts of the kingdom, and this is the foundation of a school, pro institutione et instructione puerorum et juvenum in grammatica literatura et bonis moribus.” He then, having gone through the provisions of the Acts of Parliament and summarized the evidence, proceeded as follows:—

“Many arguments were addressed from the bar on the practice and principle of toleration. I apprehend that the present question is perfectly simple in its nature, and neither more nor less than this, whether the letters patent of Edward the Sixth and these Acts of Parliament have or have not comprehended within the true construction of their provisions persons of the Jewish persuasion? Whatever my sentiments may be of the opinions expressed in some clauses of the letter written on that occasion, I apprehend that it is the duty of every judge presiding in an English court of justice, when he is told that there is no difference between worshipping the Supreme Being in chapel, church, or synagogue, to recollect that Christianity is part of the law of England; that in giving construction to the charter and Acts of Parliament he is not to proceed on that principle farther than just construction requires; but to the extent of just construction of that charter and those Acts, he is not at liberty to forget the law of the land.

“With respect to usage, as far as usage is to be looked to for an exposition of the charter, it may be convenient first to consider it with reference to the question whether Jew boys can be admitted to the school, and next to the admission of Jewish maidens. I am not sure that the first question does not belong to the Visitors; but I have no difficulty in giving my opinion on it.

“An observation not without weight is, that this school was founded as a grammar school by Edward the Sixth, who founded many throughout the kingdom, and the words ‘grammar school’ have generally been construed to mean
a school for instruction in the learned languages; but I believe that it has been the practice from the beginning, and I hope that it still continues and will long continue, that in these schools great care is taken to educate youth in the doctrines of Christianity; to teach them their duty to God and their neighbour in the terms in which those duties are taught in the Catechism; and I remember the time when boys so educated were attended to church every Sunday by their master, thereby giving to them the opportunity of learning the principles of that establishment which the law certainly favours.

"The result of the affidavits is, that it does not appear that any Jew ever partook of the benefits of the charity till within the last thirty years; that a Jew has voted in the choice of trustees, being canvassed for his vote by one of the aldermen of Bedford, and that two or three Jewish children have been admitted into this school (in what manner conducted will be seen presently), that they have not received the benefits of other parts of the charity, the affidavits accounting for that, because, from their circumstances of age or otherwise, they were not in a situation to solicit charitable assistance, or to be appointed trustees. Here are the regulations of the school approved by the Warden and Fellows of New College; and I can find nothing to raise an argument that would authorize me to say that they have not authority to make regulations for the conduct of the school. Even though the charter and the Acts had not excluded Jews, the charter and the Acts giving to the Warden and Fellows the power of making regulations, if these regulations in a Christian country operate to exclude Jew boys, it will remain to be considered whether that is not a due exercise of visitatorial authority and such as must be submitted to.

"There is another way of considering it, whether the Visitors have not, in excluding Jews, rightly construed the charter and the Acts. I have no doubt that Edward the Sixth had not any intention for the education of Jews.
Whatever may be our sentiments, it does not appear to me that they were within the scope of the charter, nor do I think that they are within the scope of the Acts; the Acts could not mean to comprehend persons who were not comprehended by the charter. How is it possible that the education of boys professing Christianity and of boys professing Judaism can proceed together? It is in evidence that Jew boys were absent on Jewish holidays and while the New Testament was read. They cannot comply with the regulations for education at this school in what must, according to the construction of the charter, be held to be 'boni mores.' The master always chooses the Latin and Greek books, and I know none of the grammar schools in which the New Testament is not taught, either in Latin or in Greek. In prescribing the school hours, directions are given for the attendance of the boys on every day in the week except Sunday; it is impossible that Jew boys can give that attendance consistently with the observance of Jewish holidays. Prayers are to be read every morning. What kind of prayers? They are prayers in a grammar school, where the master is a clergyman, and where the scholars are to have exhibitions to the universities, to which it is impossible that any Jew boy can be sent. It is not necessary to go through all these particulars, because it seems to me that Jews resident in Bedford, acting conscientiously, could not permit their sons to attend this school. I am therefore clearly of opinion that there is no pretence to say that they are entitled to attend.

"With respect to the other objects of the charity, the only question before me relates to Jewish maidens. First, can it be that, at the time of the letters patent, Jew girls were within their scope and meaning? Next, if it is clear that boys must be educated in the principles of Christianity, is there anything in the charter to authorize me to say that, it being the intention to found an institution a great object of which was the education of boys in the Christian religion,"
other objects of the charity were to be persons not professing Christianity? Various articles interspersed all tend to show that the design of the charity was to benefit persons professing the Christian religion. I shall mention only one, that girls are required to send in their Christian names. It is said that Christian name means only first name, and that on the other construction an Anabaptist could not be admitted. Be it so; but I apprehend that Christian name does not necessarily mean baptismal name. Though Anabaptists do not baptize till later in life than other Christians, I think that the name which they give to their children is, in a sense, a Christian name. Another circumstance is, that the children are to attend public worship every Sunday. It is stated, and I doubt not truly, that Jewish children do attend worship every Sunday; but can any one contend that the words of the letters patent, 'attending worship every Sunday,' mean more than attending on a day on which, under the Christian religion, attendance at worship is more imperative than on any other day?"

Mr. Swanston gives the order as drawn up: "His Lordship doth declare that the poor inhabitants of the town of Bedford who are of the Jewish persuasion are not entitled to any benefit of the Bedford Charity in the said petition mentioned, for themselves or their children."

It may be mentioned that the Bedford Charity was fundamentally reorganized in 1874, when the Endowed Schools Commission enacted a scheme by which the whole amount of the funds is expended upon the schools except a comparatively small sum which is allotted to the endowment of forty-five almshouses. Under the new scheme there is no provision which excludes Jews from participating in the charity.

The judgment of Lord Eldon is now no longer of practical importance in regard to the particular charity in respect of which it was pronounced; but the reasoning upon which

1 Sir S. Romilly had argued that the synagogue was open every day, and a Jew might attend worship there on a Sunday.
this decision (delivered by one of our ablest and most careful judges after mature deliberation) was based, and the principles underlying it, are still of great moment in discussing the question which is now being dealt with. A few comments upon it will therefore not be out of place. On the admission of Jewish boys to the school the Chancellor felt no doubt, and upon this point his judgment is conclusive, founded, as it really is, if carefully examined, upon the impossibility of Jewish boys complying with the regulations properly laid down for the government of the school by the duly constituted Visitors of it. He, however, as his custom was, supports this reason by others which, though cogent, are not so convincing. For instance, the fact that there were no Jews living in England at the time no doubt leads to the inference that Edward the Sixth had no intention to provide for the education of Jewish children, but it by no means compels the conclusion that it was his purpose, in the event of Jews being in the future allowed to settle in the country and openly practise their religion, to exclude their children from the advantages of the institution he was founding by the charters; and though of some weight in estimating the power of the Visitors to make the rules they had drawn up, this fact, taken by itself, could not operate to deprive any class of persons of the benefits to which they would be otherwise entitled. The impossibility of educating Christian and Jewish boys together is not now so apparent as it was at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the mere fact of calling a school a grammar school would not at the present time be taken to necessarily imply that instruction in the doctrines of Christianity should form part of the curriculum. But men's notions upon these matters have changed; indeed, even in Lord Eldon's time they had been relaxed, for he mentions with regret that it was no longer customary for the scholars of a grammar school to attend the church service every Sunday accompanied by their master.

With regard to the portions for poor maidens and the
apprenticeship fees, Lord Eldon felt some doubt; but his
decision is justified by the regulation requiring attendance
at public worship on Sunday. The ingenious argument
upon this point, that, inasmuch as the Jewish synagogue
was open every day, Jews could comply with this require-
ment, was rightly overruled. On the other hand, the
reasoning founded on the meaning of Christian names is
far from conclusive. It will be remembered that the
surplus of the funds of the charity was to be distributed
in alms to the poor of the town. The effect of the order as
drawn up was to exclude poor Jews from such distribution.
Upon this point no argument was addressed to the court,
nor is there anything in the judgment to indicate that this
result was deliberately contemplated. In any case it is
submitted that this particular result was not in accordance
with law, and that the true principle is, as stated at the
outset and borne out by the judgment delivered in the case,
that charitable endowments may be confined to members of
a particular faith only if words imposing such restriction
are used in their creation, and that all persons, to whatever
race or faith they may belong, who can and do comply
with the conditions properly laid down for the distribution
of an endowment are entitled to participate in it.

H. S. Q. Henriques.
THE "PAULINE" EMANCIPATION FROM THE LAW A PRODUCT OF THE PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH DIASPORA.

The view which I presented in my essay on "Judaism in the pre-Christian Greek World," namely, that the Jewish Diaspora of that time was divided into two opposite religious camps—one law-abiding and national, the other addicted to philosophical analysis of the original text of Scripture and advocating unlimited universalism, has failed to receive the critics' approval.

One very weighty authority against this view need only be named. Schürer, in his notice of my essay, says: "Such a split of the Diaspora into two opposing parties is incapable of demonstration. Certainly there were many shades and degrees of thought. But the freest and most emancipated retained certain fundamental points of ceremonial Judaism, such as the Sabbath and the elementary regulations concerning diet and hygiene. If therefore the author postulates that both tendencies were merely transferred from Judaism to Christianity, his theory is vitiated at its source. The particular renunciation of the Law which Paul started is certainly not Jewish, and the influence of Hellenistic Judaism on Christianity in apostolic times, even in those of Paul, was very moderate. On the other hand, in the post-apostolical period it must have been of considerable importance." Obviously Schürer and other eminent critics regarded my views as insufficiently supported and therefore unacceptable. I will therefore

1 Theolog. Litteraturzeitung, 1897, No. 12.
make another attempt to defend and strengthen my position.

As soon as the Jews began to take root on Greek soil and became acclimatized amidst Greek surroundings, they had to mould and modify their religion in order to make possible their continued existence among the Gentiles. The narrow national and religious limits marked out by the Mosaic Law had necessarily to be expanded; and this perforce produced wide chasms and yawning gaps. That the Jews in the Diaspora soon found the national and religious cloak which they had brought away with them from their homeland too tight, and that they commenced to tear it to tatters, is demonstrated by the desperate attempts of their noblest leaders at already an early period to patch up the threadbare garment with new pieces of cloth, and refill the old bottles with new wine.

That the patches soon gave way and the old rents became wider, that the bottles burst and were utterly broken, one can learn from the history of the Diaspora, and the phenomenon is also most unmistakably repeated in Christianity soon after its birth.

In order, therefore, to adjust the Mosaic Law to the changed conditions of the dispersion, and to exhibit Judaism to the Gentiles as a system cognate with their sublimated philosophical conceptions, an act of gross self-deception was unconsciously perpetrated. The Mosaic Law received an allegorical interpretation at the hands of Jews who had quenched their thirst at the springs of Greek philosophy. Under their busy hands the whole of the Mosaic legislation was unconsciously transformed into a revealed divine philosophy. As Moses lived before the Greek sages, they must, it followed, have drawn their wisdom from him. This view was firmly held not merely by the pious allegorists of the dispersion, but also by Christianity’s most eminent teachers in the first century.

That the allegorical interpretation of the Pentateuch had at an early period vogue amongst the Jews of the
dispersion, is abundantly proved in every line of Philo, even if there were no other traditions to the same effect. Philo exhibits a masterly skill in this method of exegesis, such as only a long course of development could have produced. He nowhere claims to be the first inventor of the method, but regards it as a divine inspiration, and repeatedly refers to predecessors and teachers. There were indeed many exegetists of this class. One need only name Aristobulus, Pseudo-Aristeas, Pseudo-Solomon, the first of whom had exhibited prodigious feats in the use of the allegorical method.

And who will venture to doubt that from the completion of the Septuagint up till Philo's time there must have flourished, besides those already mentioned, a large band—both teachers and disciples—of allegorists. Philo's writings are by themselves sufficient to enforce this view. This method necessarily divided the community into those on the one hand who followed the letter of the Law, and those on the other who disregarded ceremonialism. But it may be urged that a division, such as is here indicated, is purely an assumption incapable of proof. I venture to think otherwise. Eusebius, who, on this question, had access to numerous sources, explicitly tells us: “The Judaism of the (Diaspora) falls into two divisions eis δύο τρεῖτα διήρηται. The multitude scrupulously adhere to the Law. There are, however, also philosophical Jews who excel in virtue, have obtained a profounder insight into the spirit of the Law, and have learnt to look beneath the surface".

This is clear testimony as to the existence of two religious parties, one Conservative, the other Liberal. Philo

1 Eusebius, Præp. ev. VIII, 10 Ἐξῆς ἄν εἰς καὶ τόδε ἐπισημανωθαι, ὅτι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἠθος εἰς δύο τρεῖτα διήρηται, καὶ τὴν μὲν πλῆθος ταῖς τῶν νόμων κατὰ τὴν ῥήσιν διάκοιν παρηγγειλμέναι ὑποθέκαις ὑπῆργες τοῖς ἠθοποιοῖς τῶν ἔξω τάγμα ταύτης μὲν ἥρθε θεοτόκα καὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπαναβεβηκός φιλοσοφὸς προσέχειν ἥξιον θεωρήμα τε τῶν ἐν νόμωι κατὰ διάκοιν σημαίνομεν. Ἡν δὲ τούτῳ φιλοσόφῳ Ἰουδαίων γένος ἦν τὴν τοῦ βίου ἀσκησιν καὶ τῶν ἐρευνητῶν κατεπλάγησαν μερίς.
himself is a classical witness to the marked contrast between these parties, which was forced upon his notice to his great grief. He, in vigorous terms, blames the radical party which first explained ceremonial Judaism allegorically and then rejected it. The passage which illuminates the obscurity that envelops the development of this sect reads as follows: "God said to Abraham, 'I will make thy name great.' This I take to mean that as it is excellent to be honourable and good, so is it advantageous to have a reputation for goodness. Whoever is in possession of both benefits is truly happy. For a good name is not to be despised. Only the man who observes the national laws and customs and does not attempt innovations is worthy of this fortune. There are, however, unfortunately men who, regarding the written precepts as mere emblems of spiritual truths, carefully search for the latter while contemning the former. Such individuals I cannot but blame, for they should bear in mind the hidden meaning and at the same time observe the precepts in their literal sense. They, however, live for themselves alone, as if they dwelt in a solitude or had disembodied souls. They ignore the town, the village, the home; will hold no intercourse with others. Their ideal is to soar above the common herd and to apprehend the naked truth; whilst the scriptures exhort us to seek a good name and to alter nothing in our laws which have been framed by uniquely gifted and inspired men.

"For, although the Sabbatical institution embodies the sublime conception, that activity belongs to God alone. While to his creatures mere passive receptivity is left, we nevertheless ought not, on that account, to permit ourselves to violate the commandment to hallow the Sabbath day by kindling fire, tilling the soil, bearing burdens, prosecuting lawsuits, administering justice, seeking the recovery of pledges or debts, or engaging in any occupation permitted on the other days of the week. Although every feast is in truth but an emblem of spiritual joy and gratitude to God,
we should not therefore neglect the solemnities and customs associated with the feasts. Thus also, though the Abrahamic rite indicates the avoidance of voluptuousness and unchaste thoughts, we ought not therefore to neglect the observance of the precept. For if we resolved to retain these commandments only in their spiritual sense, we should consistently be compelled to give up the rites of self-sanctification in the temple and innumerable other necessary ceremonies. The literal sense of a precept is its body; the inner meaning, its soul. And as we take thought for the body as the mansion of the soul, so should we heed the commandments in their literal sense. Only thus can we hope to attain a clear comprehension of their true inwardness, apart from the fact that in this way alone shall we escape the censure of the multitude\(^1\).

Thus far Philo. Has our Alexandrian Jew in these remarks been merely addressing himself to the outside world of Gentiles? When, with sad heart, he places his finger upon a gaping wound in the body politic, is his motive anxiety to prevent a disastrous schism among his people, or is it to be regarded as adulation of the Greeks? Philo's wholesale censure upon an entire section of Jews was the cry of an anguished heart wrung from him by the peril of a complete split amongst the Jews of the dispersion. That these radical Jews, who fall under his censure, formed an influential class is indubitable. Else, why should Philo have thought it necessary to inaugurate an open, undisguised attack upon their system of life and thought, and expose the scandal of religious splits in the Jewish community to the gaze of the Greek heathen. Philo's indictment rests on a solid and unchallenged foundation of truth. What is the inference to be drawn? Surely nothing more nor less than this: That before the dawn of Christianity there already existed in the dispersion a Jewish party, or, rather, to be more precise, a Jewish sect which, on the

\(^1\) De Migrat. Abr. I, 450.
ground of allegorical interpretation repudiated ceremonial law, rejected the rite of circumcision, Sabbaths and festivals, and other religious institutions; took their stand outside national Judaism, and incurred the severe censure not only of the masses of simple believers, but also of liberal and cultured men of Philo's stamp.

How one can still maintain that there is no trace of a division of the Diaspora into two diametrically opposed sections passes my understanding. It is positively inconceivable how, in face of Philo's positive statement, an assertion of the following character can be made: "Certainly there were degrees of piety; but even the most heterodox observed the principal ceremonial institutions, such as the Sabbath and the elementary dietary and sanitary regulations." Surely the passage quoted above should convince us that if Philo severely censures a section whose system of exegesis meets with his entire approval, and of which he is so able an exponent, it can only be because the party pushed the system to an extreme, renounced all national and religious institutions, and so provoked a reaction of resentment even among those cultured Jewish circles who knew no better reason for their advocacy of the observance of forms than reverence for the illustrious dead who were their originators. This party which, last not least, is reproached with having severed its connexion with Judaism, must have been Antinomians and must gradually have arrived at its principles by an allegorical interpretation of the Mosaic Law. A distinctly organized body who consciously expounded Holy Writ on exclusively allegorical lines and aimed at eliciting the naked truth was the sect of Therapeutae. The characteristics with which Philo scathingly qualifies the radicals seems to fit the Therapeutae like a glove. The only discrepancy consists in the assumption that these sectaries were a source of irritation to their co-religionists. On the contrary they were looked upon as specially pious, because of their observance of certain
ancient religious rites, to which however the allegorical exegesis had given a foreign tinge.

Concerning the Therapeutae, Philo says: "They expounded the Mosaic Law allegorically, in the conviction that the words were merely emblems and symbols of mystical truths; they furthermore possessed writings of all those sages who were founders of their sect and as such had bequeathed to them several monuments of allegorical wisdom which served them as aids to devotion." And in another passage he says: "The allegorical interpretation of Holy Writ helped them to fathom its deeper import. The whole of the Mosaic legislation presented itself to their minds as a living organism, of which the literal meaning was the body, while the occult sense was the soul. Reason regards the words as a mirror which reflects with marvellous beauty and excellence an entire range of connected ideas, gradually elucidates the inward truths connoted by the symbols to those capable of comprehending them, and from apparently insignificant data lead to an apprehension of the invisible in the visible."

One may justly ask wherein lay the difference between the Radical party attacked by Philo and the Therapeutae. Why were the latter praised, the former blamed? Of the Radicals, it is said that they regard the Laws as symbolic of spiritual truths for which they search most scrupulously, soaring above the masses in order to arrive at the naked truth. Did not the Therapeutae do the same? Almost the identical words are used to describe their efforts—to bring to light the real meaning of the written law.

The Therapeutae are praised because they compare the Law to a living organism, whose body is the literal sense and whose soul is the underlying meaning. But the

---

1 Philo, De Vita Contempl., II, 475 l.
2 Ibid., p. 483.
3 Philo, De Migrat. Abr. I, 450 τὴν ἀλήθειαν γνωρίζειν αὐτὴν εἰς ἀυτὴν ἱππεῖν.
4 De Vita Contempl., II, 483 γεγυμεν εἰς τὸ φῶς προαγάγουσα τὰ ἑρμήματα.
5 Ibid. ἀπεσεῖ γὰρ η νομοθεσία δοκεῖ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις ἴκνειν ἑαυτῷ σειρά καὶ
Radicals, whom he reproaches, also teach, says Philo, that "the word is the body, the occult sense is the soul." Exactly the same figure is used which suggests that it has been borrowed from the Therapeutae. Why then are the Therapeutae eulogized and the Radicals severely censured? The answer may, without much difficulty, be obtained from Philo himself. Attention should be fixed on the development of the simile. Philo continues: "Just as we take care of the body—the soul's mansion—so should we respect the laws in their literal meaning. For only by observing the latter shall we rise to a clear comprehension of the spirit; and only thus moreover can we escape popular censure." One fact is quite clear. The Radicals did, the Therapeutae did not, openly exhibit their contempt for the Law. They met, after the old-fashioned manner, in Synagogue on Sabbaths, observed festivals, conformed outwardly to Judaism; although, under the influence of their philosophical interpretation, religious ceremonies had assumed a foreign and un-Jewish aspect, which last fact, however, would by no means have been admitted by the Jewish Hellenists themselves. They were sincerely convinced that Moses would not have desired his laws to be otherwise understood than in the sense of Jewish Alexandrianism. This Philo's works sufficiently prove. To the same category belongs the religious community named in the fourth Sibylline book, whose author was a Hellenistic Jew. That community survived to a later period when Christianity had already assumed form and consistency and continued for some time to co-exist side by side with it. It was undoubtedly Hellenistic; and, like the Essenes had, by the path of allegoristic exegesis, arrived at a contempt for the temple worship and

σώμα μὲν ἔχειν τὰς ρητὰς διατάξεις ψυχῆς δὲ τῶν ἰναποκλίματος ταῖς λέξεις ἀδόρατον νόον . . .

1 ἀλλὰ χρῆ ταῦτα μὲν σώματι νομίζειν ἑτοικέας ψυχῆς δὲ ἑκάτα, ἀπετέρωθεν οὖν σώματος, ἵναι ψυχῆς ἀτίνις ὄλος, προσορρύθην οὖν καὶ τῶν ρητῶν νόμων ἀναμελητήν.
sacrificial ritual, for which it substituted more spiritual exercises. The Sibyl characterizes as truly pious and happy individuals those who love the great God and praise him before every meal, while repudiating the efficacy of worship in the temple which is deaf and dumb, a pain and humiliation to mankind; who, furthermore, bathe in flowing waters as a penance and preach repentance.” These “pious Israelites” had already abjured national Judaism as well as the ceremonial law and renounced the temple service and its sacrificial cult as unworthy of the great God. In their gospel there was no room for the little word “law.” Towards their brethren as a nation these pious souls showed themselves cold. This sect is no doubt identical with those mentioned by Celsus and Origen, and known to the former, while in the time of the latter Church-father they were already extinct. As Origen was personally unacquainted with them he attempts to account for Celsus’ Sibylline sect by the assumption that Celsus might have heard Christians blaming some of their co-religionists for regarding the Sibyl as a true prophetess, and that he therefore called them Sibyllists.

Moreover, Celsus’ report that Sibyllists existed at his time amongst the Christians is confirmed by a contemporary, the pastor Hermas, who was also the first Christian author to mention the Sibyl. Hermas relates the following vision: A youth of majestic figure appeared to him in a dream and asked him who he thought was the old woman who gave the book. “She is,” Hermas replied, “the Sibyl.” “Nay,” answered the apparition, “she is the Ecclesia.” To Hermas’ question why she is styled an old woman, the reply is vouchsafed because the Ecclesia was first in creation and the world exists for her sake.


2 Orig., c. Cels., V, 61 f. εἶπε δὲ (καὶ Ἰούσαν Ἰωάνναν Σιβυλλιστὰς—τάχα παρακούσας τινῶν κυκλούστων τοῖς αλμένους προφήτην γεγονόντα Σιβυλλαν καὶ Σιβυλλιστὰς τοῖς τοιούτως καλεόντως.
alone. This vision also indicates the mode in which, and the period when the Ecclesia supplanted the Sibyl, as well as the manner in which the Sibyllists were won for the Church. Christian tradition dating from the first centuries prove the existence of Jewish sects in the Diaspora before the birth of Christianity. Had one followed up these traces, instead of obliterating them, as was the practice started by the later fathers of the Church and still followed, a clearer view would have been obtained of the origin of Christianity and of the still obscure and unexplained function of sects within the Church.

Besides pre-Christian Jewish sects mentioned by Josephus and in the New Testament, Justin the Martyr and Hegesippus know others which undoubtedly belong to the Diaspora. Next to the Sadduceans, Pharisees, Baptists, and Galileans, he mentions Genists, Merists, and Hellenians. If we pay regard to these traditions and do not hastily conclude that the Genists, Merists, and Hellenians, Marbothians, &c., do not count—as far as the history of Christian heresy is concerned—we should easily discover a relationship between the pre-Christian Jewish heretics and Christianity with its oldest sects.

Justin's tradition, which for our purpose is of the utmost importance, is as follows: "If," says Justin to Tryphon and his colleagues, "you have met with people who style themselves Christian, but have no claim to the title, seeing that they dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, deny the resurrection of the dead, contend that the soul goes direct to heaven, do not regard such as Christians; just as little as any one with sound judgment will allow that the Sadduceans and other heretics like the Genists, Merists, and Hellenians were Jews; the only

---

1 Hermas, Vis. II, 4. i 'Απεκαλύφθη δέ μοι, ἀδελφοί, κομμωμένω ὑπὸ νεανίσκου εὐδειστάτου λαχατός μοι Τὴν πρεσβυτέραν παρ' ἥλαβε τὸ βιβλίον πίνα δοκεῖ εἶναι; ἐγὼ ψηφι. Τὴν Εἰβυβλάν. Πλανάσαν, ψηφιν, ὅμε ήσιν. Τις οὖν ίστον; ψηφι. Ἡ Ἑκελησία, ψηφιν. εἶπον αὐτῷ. Διαίτη οὖν πρεσβυτέρας; Ὁμι, ψηφιν, πάντων πράτη κενάθη, καὶ διὰ ταῦτά ὁ κύκλος κατηρτίσθη. Cf. Vis. II, 1. i.

2 Hilgenfeld, Ketzergesch., p. 86.
feature these have in common with the body of their brethren is the name they bear and their descent from Abraham."

The Hellenistic company in which the Genists and Merists are included clearly points to heretics of the dispersion; and surely it is not without purpose that Justin places the antinomian Christian heretics, who deny the resurrection of the body and regard the soul alone as immortal, side by side with the Judaeo-Hellenistic sects—the Genists, Merists, and Hellenians, they seem of the same class— with the sole difference that the latter are styled Jews, the former Christians. More exact traditions pointing to the pre-Christian origin of heresy we owe to Hegesippus, who introduces us to a sect omitted by Justin and called the Marbothians. He also thinks that all heresy is traceable to pre-Christian Judaism, which opposed it as much as Christianity afterwards did. Jewish heresies led by a gradual transition to Christian heresies; and the arch-heretic Simon Magus constituted the link between them. A marked silence concerning the sects into which the Jewish Diaspora split is observable at the beginning of the third century. Hand in hand with this studied reticence an effort is apparent to attribute all heresy to Christianity itself.

Thus the first arch-heretic mentioned is Simon Magus, who enacted his rôle during the infancy of Christianity, which he tried to counteract by heterodoxies. After Simon, Magister et Progenitor omnium hereticorum—as Irenaeus calls him—all bridges leading to the Diaspora were destroyed.

Heresy, as till to-day has been generally admitted,
developed a marked activity in the early Christian community. "In its very cradle," Hilgenfeld rightly says, "a pair of serpents coiled round Christianity—the ethnical and the Judaising heresies; from infancy orthodoxy had to battle against the monster heresy!" Little curiosity has been expressed as to the origin of this monster, which is, on its first appearance, already armed with pronounced gnostic doctrines—surely not a product of the new creed. One is content with the hasty assertion that pre-Christian gnosticism was exceedingly primitive, a statement the naïveté of which is obvious when one thinks of the high standard attained by the Alexandrian gnosis in the time of Jesus.

Such assertions are the necessary outcome of a reluctance to acknowledge the influence exercised by the Jewish Diaspora directly and immediately upon the development of its daughter-faith. For, after all, the first Christian community sprang from the Synagogue of the Dispersion, which counted among its adherents the Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, and the Cilicians—Asiatics among whom Stephen developed, though at first cautiously, those antinomian teachings which found a sympathetic hearing with many, but were condemned by others as blasphemies against Moses and God.

Here, then, we have two parties, the Conservative and Radical. According to the Apostle Paul's opinion, as given in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, heresy was, from the first, an inevitable element in Christianity. The following remarkable words are put into the apostle's mouth: "When you come together, I hear, there be divisions among you, and I partly believe it, for there must be also heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you" (1 Cor. xi. 18, 19). Here, then, is an authorita-
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1 Ketzergesch., p. 2.
2 Acts vi. 9 sq.
3 συνεχομένων άθυμων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἰδοὺν σχίσματα ἐν άθύμων ὑπάρχειν, καὶ μέρος των πιστών, οἵς γὰρ καὶ αἱρέσεις ἐν άθύμω εἶναι, ἔνα αὐτὸν δόξαν φανερὸν γίνονται ἐν άθύμῳ.
tive pronouncement concerning the existence of heresy in the early Church, and its necessity in order that orthodoxy should be clearly distinguished from it.

In opposition to this view, Hegesippus—who, as before mentioned, regarded Christian heresy as a continuation of Jewish heresy—pretends that, till Trajan’s time, Christianity, where it was still untainted by futile controversies, enjoyed uninterrupted peace, and that during the lifetime of the apostles, heresy, if it at all existed, had not yet dared to raise its head. Only after their death had the reptile crept forth from its dim obscurity.

"The Church," so Eusebius reports Hegesippus¹, "was, up to this time, an undefiled virgin; they that sought to falsify the pure teaching of the Gospel, if indeed there were such, still kept in the background. But after the holy apostolic choir had been hushed, and the generation that had heard the divine wisdom had died out, there began the conspiracy of a God-forsaken heresy fomented by false teachers. When the apostles were no longer living, heresy was brazen-fronted enough to dare to pit the Gnosis—incorrectly so styled—against the Gospel of truth."

This account embodies much truth and affords us a glimpse into the controversies which produced Christianity. It must, in the first place, be borne in mind that Hegesippus speaks not merely of heretics but also of heterodox gnosticism, which had raised its head after the Apostles’ death. The false gnosis was thus, already in the Apostles’ time, perniciously active, and it was only their strenuous opposition which violently thrust it back into the darkness, from which it again impetuously burst

¹ Eccl. Hist., III, 30. 7, 8 ὅς ἔρα μίχρα τῶν τότε χρόνων παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφορος ἦς καὶ ἐκκλησία, ἐν ἀδήλῳ τοῦ σκότους φωλικὴν εἰσῆλθεν τότε τῶν, εἰ καὶ τινὲς ὑπήρχον, παραφθείρεις ἐπιχειροῦσαν τὸν ὑγίη κανώνα τοῦ εὐθείου θεογόματος. ὃς δὲ οἰεῖ τῶν ἀποστόλων χορὸς ἀδιάφορον ἔληφε τοῦ βίου τέλος . . . τηροῦντα τῆς ἁθίου πλάνης ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ συνάσκη διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐπαγαθίων ἀποστόλων ἱερατείας ἀποκάλυφεν τῇ αἰετίας ἐπιγράμματι τῷ ψευδόνυμως γνώσεως ἀντικράτεις ἐπιχειρήσεως.
forth after their decease. But it had been in existence from the beginning. Gnostic teachings clearly did not spring up in a night, but had passed through a long course of evolution. What, however, was the origin of this gnosticism, which notwithstanding the Apostles' antagonism, exercised a mighty influence upon the formation of the new creed? Hegesippus furnishes a reply. It came from pre-Christian Judaism; and, one may add, from the Judaism of the dispersion, which before the advent of Christianity already possessed a fully developed gnosis based on allegory; and this was afterwards transferred into the Christian Church.

Of immense value also is Origen's remark concerning the schisms in the early Christian community. "At first," he says, "the believers cherished a diversity of views concerning the meaning of the Holy Scriptures; and this was the case at the time when the Apostles preached and men who with their own eyes had seen Jesus proclaimed his teaching."

In the epistles of St. Paul, who lived in the days of eye-witnesses of Jesus, there are passages which indicate that some doubted the resurrection and asked whether it had already taken place. And the same apostle's admonition, "Beware of profane debates and of the disputes of a spurious gnosis," shows that at the period when, according to Celsus, the number of believers was but small, there were some who misconstrued religious doctrines.

At the dawn of the third century gnosticism had made so many conquests on Christian soil, the adherents of "the spurious gnosis" had grown so numerous and invested with so much authority, that they posed as masters of the situation and played the rôle of teachers of true Christianity, which they shook to its very foundations. Then commenced a severe struggle, in the course of which the

1 Compare my essay, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christentums, Wien, 1894, p. 8 ff.
2 Contra Celsum, III, 11.
memory of the pre-Christian heretics of the Jewish Diaspora was thrust into oblivion—an oblivion encouraged by the parties interested, who were thus enabled to represent all heresy as an offshoot of Christianity. This attitude was also forced upon them by learned heathen antagonists like Celsus, who reproached the Christians with being split up into so many sects that their religion itself was hidden from view, or appeared nothing else than one of the innumerable heresies which had grown up contemporaneously or at an earlier period.

It was therefore the Church's business to prove that it was the mother of all heresies—new or old—which could by any stretch be brought into relation with itself.

Christianity was the source, and all schisms were the impure rivulets flowing from it. Tertullian strikingly proves the success of this method in repelling the attacks of heathens and heretics. "Surely it is unnatural," he says, "to suppose that the true doctrine was an innovation preceded by heresy, for did not the true creed foretell the advent of heretics?" The tares clearly sprang up after the good ears. Under these circumstances it is conceivable that pre-Christian Jewish sects which stood as sponsors at the cradle of Christianity, though they had till the end of the first century remained purely Jewish sects which had made no concessions to the new faith, were nevertheless stamped as Christian heresies by a Church engaged in a vital struggle with external and internal foes.

And even to-day, when the traces that guide one's footsteps from Christian gnosticism to its pre-Christian Jewish predecessor have become almost obliterated, we can,

2 The Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians, often mentioned in Josephus and the New Testament, form an exception; they stood quite outside the pale of Christianity. Concerning the relation of the Essenes to that creed, the reader is referred to my work, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums, 98–142.
amongst the innumerable Christian heresies reported by
the Church, distinguish those which sprang from Jewish
Alexandrianism. These heretics reveal themselves as the
children of the antinomian radicals of the Jewish Diaspora,
upon whom Philo passes such severe strictures. We need
only describe the Ophites, Cainites, Sethites, and Melchize-
dekites. The earliest history of heretics already mentions
the first three sects as belonging to the same category.
The common character of their teaching can be inferred
from the fact that the Ophites were often confounded with
the Sethites—some even maintaining that the Ophites were
called Sethites.

These sects were eminently antinomian. This is proved
not only from the position which they traditionally
assumed towards the Mosaic Law and from the Old
Testament figures selected by them as representatives of
their “spiritual Dynamis,” but also from express testi-
mony to the same effect.

The earliest accounts of the Ophites can, as regards
essentials, be easily compressed into the statement that
this sect worshipped the serpent which secured for man-
kind the gift of knowledge of good and evil. Moses
showed his reverence for its power by making a brazen
serpent. As it opened up to man the perception of the
true and august God, the serpent is a divine force worthy
of adoration, an incarnation of the divine Sophia.

Here we have the Alexandrian doctrine of the Dynamis.
The serpent is Sophia incarnate. The Jewish Alexandrian
School, as we read in Philo, and its predecessors regarded

1 Theodoret, I, 14 Ἡθιανοῖ, οὐ διανοῦντές διάφθαρα δομάζουσιν.
2 Blasphemant legem deum iegisauctorem, is said of the Cainites in
Augustine, Haer., XVIII.
3 Iren., Haer. I, 30; Pseudo-Tertull., c. 6; Philaster, 1; Epiphan.,
XXXVI.
4 Philaster, Haer., 1 et velut aliquam dei virtutem esse eundem aesti-
mant, atque eum adnuntiant adorandum.
5 Irenaeus, Haer., XXX. 15 Quidam enim ipsam Sophiam serpentem
factam dicunt.
the Sophia as the power which preceded the world and created it. This idea was founded upon the much-discussed passage in Proverbs, in which Wisdom declares, "God created me, the first of all his works, and before the ages he formed me." The Cainites adored the divine Dynamis in Cain. This force, manifested in him in great strength, overpowered the weaker Dynamis in Abel, whom it destroyed. The Cainites permitted and indulged in all sensual excesses, teaching that none can attain to bliss who had not indulged the bodily appetites to the full. All should endeavour to choose a Dynamis stronger than that weak one that created the world. The Cainites blasphemed the Law and God its author, and denied the resurrection of the body.

Could this sect have sprung from Christianity? What is there Christian about it except perhaps its later gnostic additions absorbed under the influence of the Christian gnosis? All else points to the Alexandrian school, of which it represents the extreme left section. Moreover we find this sect clearly sketched by Philo. Cain he conceived as the incarnation of foolish arrogance and self-conceit, which claims everything as its own. The very name Cain, meaning possession, describes the character. There are, says Philo in another passage, two opposing views, the one ascribing everything to individual mind, guide of all thought, feeling and desires, the other leaves everything to God. The one is represented by Cain, the other by Abel. Cain's challenge was only intended to provoke

---

1 Cf. M. Friedländer, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums, pp. 8-36.
2 Iren., Haer., I, 31.2; Pseudo-Tert., 7; Philaster, 2; Epiph., XXXVII; Theodor., I, 15.
3 Augustine, c. 18 Cainani propterea sic appellati, quoniam Cain hono-rant, dicentes *cum fortissimae esse virtutis.*
4 Philaster, 2 et virtutem maiorem, quae erat in ipso Cain, invaluisse ut suum interficeret fratrem.
5 Augustine, 18 *Blasphemant legem, et deum legis auctorem, carnisque resurrectionem negant.*
6 Philo, *De Cherub., I, 150 f.*
his brother Abel to a discussion and to vanquish him by sophistries that had the appearance of truth, and when, at the present time, Philo continues, the egoists discuss with the moralists, they do not stop until they have subdued and wholly destroyed them. The evolution of their principles runs on the following lines: Is not the body the habitation of the soul? Must we not therefore take exceeding care of this habitation? Are not the eyes, the ears, and other senses the constant companions and friends of the soul, and, as such, do they not deserve due honour?

Has nature created sensuality, delights, and all the pleasures of life for the dead and yet unborn, or rather for the living? Why shall we not strive for riches, honours, power, and other similar advantages which secure a safe and happy life? Proofs of the justice of these sentiments are the lives¹ of these so-called moralists, who are nearly all obscure, despised, wretched, and in indigent circumstances. With such sophistries they seem to have vanquished those unaccustomed to casuistry. But Abel, whose spirit was all goodness, and who had not attained to the specious arts of the rhetorician, ought to have refused Cain's challenges². More important still for our purpose is the following passage. Philo says: What is the view of the ungodly? It is that the human intellect is the measure of everything; a theory said to have been promulgated by an old sophist Protagoras, an expounder and champion of Cain's perversities³. How could you (philosophers) dare to pronounce or to listen to sublime phrases concerning holiness and divine worship when you attributed all good and evil entirely or partially to mortals? And if anybody charges you with impiety, you boldly defend yourselves with the statement that you have been educated in it by the excellent example and precept of Cain, who

---

¹ μᾶρος ὅδε διὸς τοῦ βραβίου.
² Philo, Quod det. pot. insid. solet, I, 191, 197 ff.
³ De Posterit. 232 τῆς Καίρου ἀριστογένους.
⁴ εἰ δὲ έχετε ψυχ' λαυτόις τὸν άριστερὸν νόμι.
taught men to honour the nearer rather than the remoter cause? Apart from all reasons it is right to follow him, as he irrefutably demonstrated the force of his teaching by vanquishing Abel, the champion of the opposite view.

Most striking of all is the following allegory, which shows that Philo not only knew but combated the anti-nomian sect of the Cainites. This remarkable passage reads as follows: As every town consists of houses and inhabitants, so Cain regarded his proofs as structures, from which he repulses the attack of his adversaries, devising fictions instead of truth. The inhabitants are accomplices in the crime of godlessness, self-love, arrogance, and falsehood; they imagine themselves wise without knowing true wisdom, they heap up foolishness, stupidity, ignorance, and other kindred plagues. Their laws are lawlessness, injustice, unfairness, licentiousness, impudence, audacity, lustful intemperance, and indulgence in innumerable unnatural desires. Such impious men form, in their depravity, communities, until God, incensed at their sophistries, suddenly and violently overthrows them, even though they have built not only a town, but also a town with a tower reaching up to heaven.

---

1 De Posterit., I, 223 καὶ ἡ ἡμῶν ἦν τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τῇ ὦμον, ἀπολογούμενοι θαρρείτε, φάσκοντες παρ' ἄρρητη καὶ ἀδιασκάλη πάντα καλῶς πεπαιδεύοντες. Καί, ὥς τὸ πλήρειον τοῦ μακράν αἰτίου παρθένωμεν, ἂν δίκαιον ἔργον τῆς δύναμιος λόγων ἐνδείξατο, μετὰ τὴν τῆς ἰναντίας δόξης εἰσογητήν Ἀβελ, καὶ ἂν αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν ἐκπονῶν ἀνελείν.

2 De Posterit., I, 225 Ἑσειδή τοῖς πόλεσιν πάσας ἔστω ἐξ ὀρθοδοξίας καὶ . . . συνελθήσει τὰ μὲν ὀρθοδοξίας ἐστιν αὐτῶν λόγων οἱ ἀποδεικτικοὶ οὐ, καθάπερ ἄνδρες τεῖχισαν, πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἰναντίων ἀπομάχεσθαι προσβολάς τιθαίς εὐφρενίς κατὰ τῆς ἀδελφίας μεταπλαστῶν. οἰκήτορες δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοί, ἀδεμίας, φιλανθίας, μεγαλαχίας, φευγόν, δόξας ἱσταίρον, δοκιμασθεὶσορο, τὸ πρὸς ἄλλησθαι σοφόν σύν εἰδότες, ἄγνωστοι καὶ ἀπαιδευωμένοι καὶ ἀμάθαι καὶ τὰς ἀλλὰς ἀδελφὰς καὶ συγγενεῖς ἑρᾶς συγκεκρισμένοι. τόποι δὲ ἀνομίας, ἀδύνατον, τὸ ἄνισον, τὸ ἀκελαστόν, ἡθῶν, ἄθορπες ἁμαρτίας, τῶν περί φύσεως ἀληθῶς ἔνθειμαι. Ταῦτα ἄτοις ἔκαστοι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ τῇ παναθείᾳ ψυχῇ δημοσίως εὐφραίνοντα, μέχρις ἐν τῷ θεῷ θυσίας ἐν τῷ σοφιστικώς αὐτῶν τῆς πρόοδος ἀδέλφων καὶ μεγάλης ἐνεργητάτες ἑκάστας. Τοῦτο δὲ ἢ γίνεται, ὡς μὴ μόνον πόλεις, καὶ πῦρον ὀρθοδοξίας, οὐ ἡ κεφαλὴ εἰς ὀφραγ να ἄφεται . . .
we find then a sect described as the philosophizing sect, who chose the self-worshiping Cain as the guide of their lives, their teacher and master, a sect which, in accordance with the sophist Protagoras' axiom, "The human intellect is the measure of all things," revered in Cain the supreme force. The theories of this party are based on a web of sophistry. Instead of law they proclaimed lawlessness. Orthodoxy personified in Abel was combated and defeated by the superiority of the higher Dynamis incorporated in Cain. The body, the mortal frame of the soul, is not only permitted but also enjoined to taste sensual pleasures. This is precisely Cainitism, as depicted in the earliest heresiology.

This sect, as we read in Philo, was particularly dangerous on account of the rhetorical skill possessed by its representatives, and seemed to have produced a mental ferment of an extensive and perilous character. For Philo warns all virtuous people unskilled in sophistry not to enter into disputations with them. Only those should oppose them who have mastered every device in the art of controversy. Then the pious would no longer be vanquished by their weakness in dialectics, but would easily avoid the sophist's traps. Properly grappled these sectaries would prove unsubstantial opponents. Successful in detached argument, earnest and organized controversy would discomfit them.

Next we come to the Sethites. These are reported to have shared the chief errors of the Ophites and the Cainites. According to them, everything was created by the angels and not by the Higher Dynamis. The Superior Power which they term Mother became all-powerful, and after Abel's death gave life to Seth and bestowed upon him that heavenly spark by which the force of the creative angels was shattered.

1 De Propert., I, 225.
2 Philaster, 3; Epiph., Haer., XXXIX; Pseudo-Tert., c. 8.
3 Philaster, 3 Quod providens, inquinunt, mater, quia occisus est Abel
The Sethites call Seth the Messiah. The three sects here named, the Ophites, Cainites, and Sethites, undoubtedly belong to the pre-Christian Jewish Diaspora; their disciples were recruited from the Radicals. Just as the Synagogue generally everywhere counted among its adherents numerous sympathizers among Greek heathendom, so the Radical section was also joined by philosophizing heathens whom Philo dubs "the echoes of Cain's perverse theories." If an investigation had been instituted—as strangely enough has not yet been done—into the measure of influence which these proselytes—many of them adherents from the various philosophical schools—exercised upon the religious evolution of Judaism in the Diaspora, quite different views would have been accepted as to the origin and development of Christianity.

The paths trodden by Judaism in the Greek world, which have not yet been sufficiently explored, would become clear. The supreme importance of Christianity—the ripest fruit of this evolution—would remain undiminished. Even the Talmud, notwithstanding its dark presentiments, lauded as an ideal of the future the union between the Jephetic and Semitic spirits. Unhealthy symptoms undoubtedly preceded and succeeded the birth of a child, whose parents, notwithstanding the diversity of their characters, external circumstances had forced into an unnatural union; but it must be remembered that both father and mother were of originally healthy stock. The innumerable Jewish sects, from whose midst Christianity stepped to the front and by which it was accompanied like a shadow on its world-conquering path, afford evidence of the vigour of religion in the Jewish Diaspora. The principal excrescences were the sects of the Ophites, Cainites, and Sethites.

1 Justus, cogitavit ut pararet iustum Seth in quem et collocavit magnas virtutis spiritum, ut possint destrui virtutes inimicas.

1 Ibid., Quidam autem ex eis non solum genus de eo deducere, sed etiam ipsum Christum esse asserunt atque opinantur.
Of the Melchizedekians I will speak later on. Even these spirits of infidelity, who consistently pursued evil, nevertheless worked unconsciously for good by the prominence into which they forced Judaism and Christianity, whose orthodox followers repelled those sects. They were repudiated by Philo and also by Christianity as soon as it had become conscious of its mission.

Philaster enumerates the Ophites, Cainites, and Sethites among the sects flourishing among the Jews before the advent of Jesus. Origen repeatedly and emphatically protests against the notion that the Ophites, Cainites, and similar sects belonged to Christianity. Thus he says: "Celsus may possibly have heard of some sects which do not even share the knowledge of Jesus with us. He may have heard of the so-called Ophites, Cainites, and other sects who entirely renounced Christ. But this does not justify him in the reproach which he levels against Christianity." In another place he replies to Celsus' stricture: "That the Christians imprecated the Creator for cursing the serpent which brought the knowledge of good and evil to our first parents. Celsus ought to have known," he says, "that the Ophites, so-called on account of their adoration of the serpent for its good counsel to the first authors of the human race, by which they overcame the Titans and giants of the fable, are so little in sympathy with Christianity that they hurl against Jesus the same abominable charges as Celsus himself does, and refuse to admit any one to their society who has not first pronounced imprecations against the Saviour. It should be noted that Celsus puts his case in his polemic against Christianity so clumsily that he even recognizes as Christians those who would not hear the name of Jesus and denied that he was a virtuous man. Can any one be conceived more perverse than these Ophites, to whom the serpent was the source and instrument of all goodness, unless it be Celsus himself, who says that the charges

1 Orig., c. Cels., III, c. 13.
against the Ophites were also justified against the Christians? The Greek philosopher who lived in poverty, and who sought to prove by his personal example that happiness is possible without wealth, styled himself a cynic. But these godless people act as though they were not human beings, to whom the serpent is an enemy, but rather serpents themselves. They glory in tracing their name Ophite to the reptile which is dreaded and loathed as the deadliest foe of the human race.

The above three sects are not therefore in any way the offspring of Christianity. This, even apart from Philaster's and Origen's evidence, is, in our opinion, beyond question. The circumstances that they sought their Dynamis in the Old and not in the New Testament sufficiently indicates their Jewish origin. They are undoubtedly children of the Diaspora, and, to speak more definitely, they formed the extreme left wing of the allegorical school of Alexandria. They stood in sharp opposition to the Conservatives of this school. Here, heterodox Cain; there, orthodox Abel! The allegorizing Conservatives wished the Law to be scrupulously observed, although it had been disintegrated by their peculiar system of hermeneutics. They were actuated by reverence for the lofty-minded teachers who had created it. They also had regard to the sentiments of the large multitude of believers in literal inspiration. The Radicals, on the other hand, had thrown the Law completely overboard. For in their estimation it was already a thing of shreds and tatters. In the work of destruction they proceeded methodically, employing weapons with which the Law itself had furnished them. Their conception of the divine Dynamis—the instrument used by them for the process of disintegration—they borrowed from the Old Testament. From the same source was derived the idea of the serpent which endowed man with the gnosis, as well as the biblical figures of Cain and Abel, to whom the Law was yet unknown. They continued to cling to

1 Orig., c. Cel., VI, c. 28.
their scriptural ideas even after they had joined the ranks of Christianity—a further proof that that religion had not given them birth. Let us now consider the Melchizedekians, who, I am firmly convinced, were also a pre-Christian sect of the Jewish Diaspora, and the Sethites, with whom by all accounts the former were closely connected.

The Melchizedekians, as they are termed in patristic literature¹, regarded the Melchizedek of the Bible as a mighty force (μεγάλην δύναμιν); they place him upon an inaccessible pinnacle of greatness, contending that he is not only a Dynamis, but even higher than the Messiah. "He was without father, without mother, without descent, the real mediator between God and man, through whose intercession alone forgiveness can be obtained from God²." He was a Prince of justice and therefore was raised by the Almighty to the condition of a spirit and Son of God. This is essentially the creed of the Melchizedekians.

We may now ask, how did the assumption arise that this sect was the offspring of Christianity. Nothing indicates a Christian origin, while everything points to the Old Testament as expounded by the Alexandrian school of Exegesis as the source of inspiration. Just as the Ophites looked upon Ophis as the first teacher of the gnostics, while the Cainites regarded Cain and the Sethites Seth in the same light, so the Melchizedekians adored the mystical Melchizedek as the representative of their Dynamis. The object in all cases was to break down the trammels of the Law which retarded and hindered the spread of Judaism in the Diaspora. Their great Dynamis, Melchizedek, did not recognize circumcision or the obligatory character of any other rite. Why, therefore, should his reverers be bound by the external

¹ Epiphan., Haer., LV, c. 1-9; Pseudo-Tert., c. XLVIII; Theodor., II, 6; Augustine, 34; Philaster, 52 and 148.
² Epiphan., c. 8 Ὄν ἄρχω ἵστη δικαίωσίνην. Ibid. ἐν' αὐτῷ τοὺς κατα-
σταθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὄραμὶ πνευματικῷ τις ἐν καὶ ὄλης θεοῦ τεσσαμένος.
Law, especially as they were fully penetrated by its spirit.

When, accordingly, the time arrived for the Melchizedekians to come to an understanding with Christianity, whose conception of the Law was entirely to their own taste, they made certain concessions, without, however, in the least giving up their own peculiar notion of the great Dynamis. Melchizedek continued to be the great Dynamis par excellence. Jesus was subordinated to him. As the Sethites had asserted that the founder of Christianity was not naturally but miraculously a child of Seth, or Seth himself sent down on earth for the second time, so the Melchizedekians, by their firm adhesion to their own doctrine, sought to bridge the gulf between it and the new creed. Jesus, they said, had certainly been entrusted with a mission, but only "after the order of Melchizedek," to whom he is subordinate and upon whom he is entirely dependent. The Old Testament furnished them proofs for this theory, for the Psalmist explicitly said of the Messiah, "Thou art a priest of the order of Melchizedek"—which clearly shows Jesus' inferiority to the ancient King of Salem. Jesus, accordingly, was appointed in the order of Melchizedek and charged with the mission of guiding mankind out of their manifold errors and leading them to the only right path, that of the gnosis, marked out by Melchizedek.

Of some importance for our inquiry is the Melchize-

1 Epiphan., XXXIX, 4 ἀνδὶ δὲ τοῦ Σῆθ κατὰ σφίρμα καὶ κατὰ δαδοχὴν γένους ὁ Χριστὸς ἦλθεν, αὐτὸς ἤρειν οὐχὶ κατὰ γένει ἄλλα θαυμαστῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ πεφησαίν, ὥστιν αὐτὸς ὁ Σῆθ ὁ τότε, καὶ Χριστὸς τὸν ἐπιφοίτησαν τῷ γένει τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἀνή τῷ μαθητῷ ἀνωθέν ἀνεσταλμένος. Cf. Philaster, Haer., 3 De Seth autem ipso Christum dominum genus deducere aiunt. Quidam autem ex eius non solum genus de eo deducere, sed etiam ipsum Christum esse asserunt atque opinantur.

2 Epiphan., LV, c. 8 καὶ δὲ ἡμᾶς αὐτῷ (οἱ Μελχισεδέκ) προσφέρειν φασίν, ἵνα δὲ αὐτῷ προσενεχθῇ ὑπ' ἑαυτῷ ἡμῶν καὶ εὑρομεν δι' αὐτοῦ ζωήν. Καὶ Χριστὸς μὲν φασιν ἐκλείξαν ἡμᾶς καλεῖ ἐκ πολλῶν ὀδών εἰς μίαν ταύτην γνώσιν, ὡς θεῷ εὐχρησάμον καὶ ἑκκλησίᾳ γενόμενον ἵππῳ ἐκστρεφέν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ἅδωλον καὶ ἐνίδιον ἡμῶν τὴν ὀδών.
dekians' traditional conception of Jesus' mission after the order of Melchizedek. It runs in the ecclesiastical chronicler's report as follows: "Jesus is inferior to Melchizedek, because of the former it is said, 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.' Whilst Jesus is mediator for mankind only, Melchizedek, being a higher and divine Dynamis, intercedes also for the angels and heavenly hosts. He is superior to Jesus, 'being without father, without mother, without descent, without beginning or end.'" This conception of Melchizedek explains the text—otherwise scarcely intelligible—in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 16: "For verily he (Jesus) took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham."

But before we consider the Epistle to the Hebrews, which exhibits the cult of Melchizedek in the period of its ripest fruition, and clearly demonstrates how this scriptural hero had, in early times, already become transformed into a dark mystical figure, let us search the literature of the Alexandrian school for traces of this cult, and thus support our view that, like Ophitianism, Cainism, Sethianism, this cult too was a child of the pre-Christian Jewish Diaspora. We find, in fact, that Philo not only deified Melchizedek, but actually identified him with the Logos. The passage is so important that we venture to transcribe it in extenso: "If any one inquires concerning the origin of the universe, we are justified in replying that it was due to the mercy, loving-kindness, and grace, exhibited by God to the human race. Everything in this world and the world itself are gifts, favours, boons from God. Thus God appointed

1 Pseudo-Tert., XLVIII sed hunc (sc. Iesum) inferiorem esse quam Melchisedech, eo quod dictum sit de Christo: Tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech. Nam illum Melchisedech praeipueae gratiae caelestem esse virtutem, eo quod agat Christus pro hominibus deprecator et advocatus ipsorum factus; Melchisedech facere pro caelestibus angelis aequus virtutibus. Nam essse illum usque adeo Christo meliorem, ut διώκω sit, διώκω sit, διηνεκέληγγειον sit, cuius neque initium neque finis comprehensus sit aut comprehendi possit.

2 Heb. v. 11.
Melchizedek King of Salem, i.e. King of Peace, to be his own priest. This king's virtues are not named, because without preceding merits he was appointed a Prince of Peace and deemed worthy of the priesthood. He is styled king in contrast to the term tyrant; for a king rules according to law, a tyrant according to his arbitrary will. The tyrannical spirit imposes upon body and soul violent and unjust orders which bring pain and sorrow and encourage sensuality. The king does not command, but convinces. His orders guide the soul to virtue as a ship is wafted by a favourable breeze into a haven of safety. This king is the true Logos. The tyrant may be called Prince of War; the king—Prince of Peace—Salem. He ought to provide for the soul this ambrosia of delight and gladness, for Melchizedek it is said, He offered wine and bread—gifts denied by the inhospitable Ammonites and Moabites, who were therefore excluded from the congregation of the Lord. The Ammonites (children of sensuality) and the Moabites (children of intellect) are types of those who strive to explain all things by the senses or the intellect, and account God as nought. Of them Moses therefore said, they shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord, because they did not present bread and water when we came out of Egypt. Melchizedek, however, might offer wine instead of water to quench the thirst of the Lord, strengthen it and elevate it to that state of divine exaltation which passeth all understanding. For he is the priest—Logos—whose inheritance is the Lord. And of the Lord he cherishes sublime and exalted conceptions, therefore is he called priest of the most high God, not as if there could be another and less high God, for God is one in the heavens above and on the earth beneath, and there is none beside him, but because, to think of God is an exceedingly lofty and exalted occupation. Hence Melchizedek is styled priest of the most high God.

1 Philo, Leg. Alleg., I, 102. . . . . ἵππος τήρης τοῦ λόγου, εἰχεν τὸν ἔστι καὶ ὑφιλός ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἥπερον καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὸς λογιζόμενος.
We thus find that the same mystery had gathered around Melchizedek's name and personality as had enveloped the sect called after him. Melchizedek is priest by the grace of God; and without this grace he would not have obtained the priesthood. But though Philo conceived this priest as a symbol of the highest Logos, he shrinks from representing him as a second God: "For there is but one God in the heavens above, and on the earth beneath; and there is none beside him." Here, too, there are not lacking unmistakable allusions to the extreme antinomian sects. There are the Ammonites, who abandon the ways of God to wallow in sensuality; there are also the Moabites—children of intellect who interpret all things rationalistically, seeking to supersede the Almighty, and who were therefore excluded from the congregation of the Lord. Here we have the various types of schismatics, as Philo describes them; the votaries of sensuality on the one hand, the devotees of intellect on the other. Between the two Philo places Melchizedek—the Logos—as the exalted symbol of orthodoxy. Melchizedek, who harmonizes the earthly and the divine, embodies the true apprehension of God and the right worship of him. And what was the real character of moderate Alexandrian Judaism as formed on this basis? Philo, its noblest representative and exponent, has discovered its secret. He says, "However deeply we may have penetrated into the allegorical meaning of the Law; however clearly we may have grasped its higher sense, we are not justified in exclusively fixing our attention upon this higher meaning and rejecting the literal interpretation. We are not absolved from the practice of the prescribed religious ceremonies. The literal sense is like the body; the occult meaning like the soul. As we take thought for the earthly tabernacle which enshrines the spirit, so must we respect the literal meaning of the Law."

Only a short step brings us to the Alexandrian author of the Epistle to the Hebrews who stands so near to Melchizedekianism, and gives the following sketch of the
spirit of the Alexandrian school. "The law is a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of those things" (Heb. x. 1) 1. From the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews we learn that the mystery of Melchizedek, as taught by the professors of his cult, was not of recent growth. For he hurls the reproach at his readers that the mission after the order of Melchizedek, which should have long ago been familiar to them, had to be taught them from the beginning. Alluding to the text in the Psalms he says, "Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec. Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing. For when for the time ye ought to be teachers 2, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil" (Heb. v. 10-14). Here it is clearly shown that the cult of Melchizedek, concerning which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews might have said much, and whose teaching he terms the mystery of the "word of righteousness," flourished before the epistle was written, and traced its origin to a period anterior to the advent of Christianity. As if to leave no doubt as to the intimate connexion between the mystery of Melchizedek and the cult called after his name, the author of the epistle, after prolix statements and homilies, returns to the priest-king and expatiates on the mission entrusted to him by God in the following characteristic fashion: "For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth

1 Heb. x. 1 μετὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐκείνου τῶν μελλόντων ἄγαθῶν, σὺν αὐτῷ τὴν εἰλικρίνεια τῶν πραγμάτων.

2 Heb. v. 12 καὶ γὰρ δειλινοὶ εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τῶν χρόνων.
part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually” (Heb. vii. 1-3). Each of these words proclaims the Melchizedekian. One cannot but feel amazement at the boundless eulogy bestowed upon this cult; and the question is forced upon one—What place does the author of this epistle assign to Jesus if it be not that accorded him by the favour of this cult, namely, after the order of Melchizedek, below that occupied by the priest-king, and nearer that of ordinary men? Still, at the decisive moment when a return to Jesus seems almost impossible, the writer surprisingly swings round in the brief words, “made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually” (Heb. vii. 3). Here Melchizedek is degraded to the secondary position of a mere copy. Notwithstanding his greatness he is but a shadow of the true Christ, his incomparably greater successor, whose advent had been predicted in the Psalmist’s prophecy which had been fulfilled in the person of Jesus.

With this sudden volte-face, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews saves his Christianity, raises the divine Dynamis of the New Testament high above that of the Old, and boldly continues his eulogy of Melchizedek in the following instructive manner (Heb. vii. 3-12): “Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils. And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham; but he whose descent is not counted from them received
tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better. And here men that die receive tithes; but there he receiveth them, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him. If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?" Here the author reaches a decisive point, and at last discovers the supreme secret of the transcendent Melchizedek; the abrogation of the ancient Law, the proclamation of a new and incomparably superior revelation; the vanishing of the obsolete and decaying legislation which is but the foreshadowing of good things to come, but not their essence.

Let the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speak for himself (Heb. vii. 12-23): "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. . . . And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. For he testifieth, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God. And inasmuch as not without an oath he was made priest: (for those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, the Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:) by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament."
All these expressions point to the dogma that the Law had, in consequence of Melchizedek's mission, ceased to exist. Their importance lies in the fact that they elucidate the relation of the Melchizedekian sect to the Law, and authoritatively confirm what we already otherwise knew, namely, that the cult of Melchizedek was founded upon antinomian tendencies. For the author of the epistle no more owes his doctrine of Melchizedek's antinomian mission to Christianity than he derived from that creed his Alexandrian exegeses which he treats in so masterly a manner. Thus, too, the author of the Epistle to Barnabas was indebted for his artistic allegories by which he endeavours to crush Mosaism as a carnal system, not to Christianity but to the radical school of the Jewish Diaspora from which they were imported into the faith. The same remark applies to the Alexandrian Jew, Apollos, a missionary to the Greek world, and later on a coadjutor of St. Paul the Apostle (Acts xviii. 24): "An eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures... instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue," i.e. his antinomian Alexandrian Judaism. When Aquila and Priscilla, who had been converted to the Pauline Christianity had heard him, "they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly"; that is, impressed upon him that the Messianic expectations had been fulfilled in the person of Jesus, "he helped them much which had believed through grace: and mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the scriptures that Jesus was

---

1 Acts xviii. 24 ff. Σπουδάζων δὲ τις, 'Απόλλων δυνάμει, 'Αλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος... δυσκόλον ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς... κατηχημένος τῇ ὠδῇ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ γλώσσῃ πνεύματι, ἱλαρεὶ καὶ ἴδιὰς κυρίες λειψάνῳ τῇ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου. οὕτως τε ἔρεσαν παρρησίασθαι ἐν τῷ συναγωγῷ.
Christ. A striking example of the popularity achieved by the Alexandrian exegeses among the philosophizing heathens is furnished by Justin the Martyr, who handles this system like a master. This facility, and his general knowledge of the Old Testament, he distinctly does not owe to Christianity. He himself tells us that, before his conversion, an old man referred him to the writings of the Jewish prophets, which he studied closely and for which he conceived a great attachment. Thus, after long and futile philosophical labours those gates of light opened to him which are visible to them alone who have received from God and his Christ the gracious gifts of insight and discernment. It is noteworthy that the Melchizedekians did not exhibit so aggressive an hostility to the Law as did the Ophites and Cainites. Melchizedek, the prince of peace, asks that the carnal Law should be gently laid aside, and the spiritual Law be taken up in its place; and this view is held forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Pauline letter and the Epistle to Barnabas are more embittered in their tone. They make a fierce onslaught on Mosaism, demand that the tablets of the Law shall be shattered, and the very fragments ground into dust. This attitude recalls the virulence of Cainite antinomism. Paulinism continually pushes into the foreground the antagonisms between the Old and the New Testament, labours to cut asunder the last links of historic continuity which the Epistle to the Hebrews tries to keep intact.

Just as the conservative wing of the Alexandrian school—that represented by Philo—struggled against the radical tendency, and sought to retain the ceremonial element in the Law, although it had been reduced to a shadow by the discovery of its inner meaning and spirit, so the Epistle to the Hebrews tries to rescue the old tablets from destruction.

---

1 Acts xviii. 28. . . . ἐπείρασεν διὰ τῶν γραφῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς Ἰουδαίας. This passage of Acts xviii. 24-28, so much treated of and commented on, appears to be, looked at in this light, clear and transparent.

2 Justin, Dial. c. Tr., c. 8.
tion, though these were already shattered. To the author of the Epistle, the Law is a shadow, but "a shadow of good things to come." It should not be allowed to disappear even when it had achieved its purpose, but should always follow in the wake of the spiritual child it had long borne in its bosom, and of whose divine origin and truth its existence was to be a continual evidence.

The notion of a religion freed from the trammels of ceremonial Law had thus already arisen in the pre-Christian Diaspora, but it needed an authoritative faith based on revelation. Certainly in limited philosophizing circles like the Radicals mentioned in Philo, there existed even a revelation—that of the divine Dynamis, as enunciated by the Ophites, Cainites, Sethites, Melchizedekites, and others. But this revelation had made no headway among the masses. At last even this was brought about in the course of time. The divine Dynamis was incarnated. And the blessed message of a bodily resurrection, sealed by the supreme exemplar, made the doctrine welcome to the sorrow-laden.

Such a message was impossible to the antinomistic Judaism of the Diaspora which taught the immortality of the soul, but denied the resurrection of the body. This, too, explains the failure of the Melchizedekians to popularize their doctrine of the divine Dynamis. Melchizedek was too remote from the masses. Without mother, without father, without descent, without beginning or end, free from human temptations, assuming a human form for a time, enthroned above the angels and heavenly hierarchy, for whom he acts as intercessor with the most high God, Melchizedek was a mediator for philosophers, not for the common herd who clamoured impetuously for salvation. And this explains the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews which defines the essence and mission of Jesus the true Christ (Heb. ii. 14-17): "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power
of death, that is, the devil. . . . For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest.” And again (Heb. iv. 15): “For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.”

I conclude this research with the expression of my firm conviction that sooner or later the dogma that Christianity is founded upon Pharisaism will be abandoned; New Testament criticism will then no longer speak of a Jewish Christianity and a “Gentile Christianity founded by Paul,” but rather of a conservative Jewish Christianity and a radical Jewish Christianity. That this period is not far off is shown in Schürer’s notable essay published in 1897, entitled “The Jews in the Empire of the Bosphorus,” and dealing with the inscriptions of the first Christian century, found in Pantikapaean (Kertch) on the Cimmerian Bosphorus, Gorgipia (Anapa), east of the Cimmerian Bosphorus, and in Tanais on the extreme frontier of Greek culture, in the north-east corner of the Palus Maeotis. That Judaism had, at the latest in the first century, and probably earlier, taken root here is proved by these inscriptions. “The Jews of the Diaspora,” Schürer says in his introduction, “and the Gentile world in which they lived influenced each other in spite of the Hebrew aloofness. The Jews assimilated the Greek language and civilization, and adopted many heathen habits and customs. But they, in their turn, exercised a mighty influence on their Gentile neighbours. Many Jewish communities had a following of σεβόμενοι τοῦ θεοῦ who worshipped the true God, rejected idolatry, and in

part accepted the Jewish Law. Interesting illustrations are furnished by the Greek inscriptions from the Bosphorus, of which Lasyscher has published the completed edition. They show, on the one hand, that the Jews even imitated some of the Greek legal institutions; and on the other, that there were certain religious communities who cannot be regarded as Jewish, but nevertheless betray a distinctly Jewish influence by the manner in which they speak of themselves and of the God they worship."

After treating of other inscriptions Schürer continues: "These inscriptions prove the existence and influence of Jewish communities in the Byzantine Empire during the first centuries after Christ. Such an influence can most probably be traced in the religious community mentioned in the following inscription: Worshippers of the most high God who have now been received in the communion." They honour the Deity by erecting a stone tablet on which their names were inscribed.

Schürer thus sums up his conclusion: "The peculiar religious bodies in Tanais are the fruit of a Jewish propaganda in that remote region. The founders of these communities derived from their Jewish teachers the knowledge of the most high God, whose name is ineffable, and beside whom there are no other gods. But they mingled with this Hebrew Monotheism elements of the Greek Zeus idea which in its way also pointed to Monotheism. This conclusion is completely confirmed by our knowledge of similar organizations of later date, namely, the Hypsistarians and kindred communities mentioned in the Patristic literature of the fourth and fifth centuries. The Hypsistarians lived in Cappadocia, in the fourth century; they worshipped the Almighty, rejecting images and sacrifices, but nevertheless paid some reverence to Fire and Light. They rejected circumcision, but observed the Jewish Sabbath and certain Dietary Laws."

Adducing further proofs for his theory, Schürer continues: "These hypotheses enable us to understand how religious
communities who exclusively worshipped θεὸς ὑπηκοός could grow up in Tanais under Jewish influence. The religion of this brotherhood was neither Judaism nor Paganism, but a combination of both. From their Jewish teachers they learned σέβεσθαι θεὸν ὑπηκοόν. But maintaining a separate organization rather than joining the Jewish community in a secondary rank, as other adherents had done, they admitted or retained Greek elements.” The utmost interest attaches to Schürer's final conclusion which shatters the view, hitherto in vogue, that Paul was the author of Gentile Christianity emancipated from the Law; for the existence is admitted of antinomian Judaizing communities in the pre-Christian Greek era.

Schürer's conclusion is as follows: “Certain indications point to the fact that the formation of antinomian Gentile-Christian communities was not exclusively due to Paul. The process in many places, i.e. at Rome, seems to have been favoured by the sympathy with which the Sermon on the Mount was received amongst the σεβόμενοι τοῦ θεοῦ. As those who had accepted only certain elements of Judaism severed their connexion with Jewish communities and formed independent organizations, it was easy for them entirely to repudiate the Law. And this is exactly the history of the Greek religious communities in Tanais. Just as these sprang from the σεβόμενοι τοῦ θεοῦ and became something distinct, so, by an analogous process, they in their turn gave birth to Christian communities.”

I welcome with much satisfaction this long expelled but at length dawning recognition of the truth. It is of great promise for the elucidation of the history of the pre-Christian Jewish Diaspora and the rise of Christianity. A few more such valuable excavations and the light of the noon day will have arrived: Saxa loquuntur!

Vienna.

M. FRIEDLÄNDER.

Stimulated by Schürer's essay, Cumont published a pamphlet on the same subject, entitled "Hypsistos" (Supplément à la Revue de l'instruction
Cumont not only unconditionally accepts Schürer's theory, but goes beyond him in asserting the Jewish influence upon Asia Minor which notoriously had, at the time of Jesus, a numerous Jewish population. He quotes several votive inscriptions, unnoticed by Schürer; and all referring to the θεὸς ὡμιγίας; and adds: "... combien ces milieux, tout pénétrés d'idées bibliques sans être étroitement attachés à la loi judaïque, constituaient un terrain fécond pour la prédication chrétienne, et l'on s'explique mieux, en tenant compte de cette situation, que la foi nouvelle ait opéré plus de conversions en Asie Mineure que dans toute autre région" (p. 8).
SOME BRITISH MUSEUM GENIZAH TEXTS.

In the present paper I will, without any further preface, give an account of four short texts contained in the collection of fragments from Cairo now preserved at the British Museum.

I. ON THE EXILARCH BUSTĀNĪ.

A fragment, consisting of two consecutive paper leaves, each measuring about 5½ in. by 3½, with eight or nine lines to a page, Arabic in Hebrew character. Oriental Rabbinic writing of probably the twelfth century.

The contents may at once be described as an interesting and welcome addition to the partly legendary history of the "Rēsh-Galutha," or exilarch Bustānī, whose rise was contemporaneous with the establishment of the Muhammadan power in Mesopotamia. A detailed account of the story and its critical difficulties is given in Graetz, Geschichte, vol. V, pp. 118–122, 413–416. But the Museum Genizah text differs from all previously known versions in one very important detail. Instead of leaving children of Jewish wives, who after his death contested the legitimacy of the son of his Persian wife, Bustānī is here emphatically declared to have married no other woman except the Persian captive given him by the then reigning Sultan. The fragment agrees, however, with the usual tradition that the exilarch had omitted to give his slave-consort her

1 On the legend of Omar's "garden-dream," which is said to be the origin of the name Bustānī ("Bustan" in Persian meaning "garden"), see Graetz, Gesch., vol. V, pp. 119, 120. The spelling "Bustanāt" must give way to the correct "Bustānī," as generally in the present fragment.
freedom. This circumstance is here dwelt on with special emphasis as calculated to discredit the family of Bustānī and to destroy the claim of his descendants to be the genuine heirs of the Davidic line. It is in keeping with this tendency of the fragment that a rival Davidic family, residing in a district called "Nams," is brought to the reader's notice. It appears clear that the account preserved in the present fragment was written in the interests of a party that was extremely hostile to the headship of Bustānī's descendants, and historical investigators will in all probability attach no weight to the new version of Bustānī's married life given in the text. Another point to be noticed is the confirmation of the now generally accepted view that it was Omar, the second successor of Muhammad, and not Ali, the fourth Khalifah, who bestowed so much favour on Bustānī. The fragment also contains an account of the special occasion at which the incident of the "fly" occurred, but Bustānī's history is so much mixed with legend that great critical caution has to be exercised in either the acceptance or rejection of any definite statement.

The Arabic Text (part of Or. 5552).

1 This word is repeated in the MS., being written at the end of a line and also at the beginning of the next.
... his privilege. And he remained in this condition until Bustānī was sixteen years of age, when he was fit to assume the chieftaincy. And the people desired the Sheik, who acted as regent, to relinquish the rule he had exercised. But he did not do so, for there was a certain guilty cause preventing him. The matter was then brought before the Khalifah. The Sultan of that time was ‘Umar ben al-Khaṭṭāb, and the Sheik and Bustānī stood together before him, and they argued the matter at length. And whilst they were arguing, there settled upon the face of Bustānī an insect, which did not depart until blood issued. But

1 See note on the translation.
2 No doubt miswritten for لاملاك; the scribe has, in fact, attempted to correct the word, but only succeeded in blotting it.
3 I.e. the Sheik who had acted as regent.
4 Apparently a wasp. In e.g. Graetz, a fly.
he did not drive it off whilst standing before the Khalifah, who was much pleased with the incident. It is on this account that the Davidic family impress upon their seal the form of an insect. The Sultan accorded to him the chieftaincy, and delivered it to him, and granted him permission to be present at his Divan. He also gave him a daughter of Caesar, for 'Umar ben al-Khaṭṭāb had sacked a city of the Caesar and killed him. And Bustānī the Davidite married the girl given to him by 'Umar ben al-Khaṭṭāb, and there were children of the marriage. But he had not given her her freedom either through neglect or pride. And all Bustānī's children were of this woman, for he married none other, and had no other children. Amongst his descendants are Anan, and besides, Boaz, the sons of Zakkai, the chief of the captivity in Bagdad, and some few persons in Andalusia. All these trace their descent from Bustānī. And it is said that there are Davidites in the localities of Nams, persons who are known as Bēnē Mārāwāthā, who are not of the family of Bustānī; and no one else in that part derives his descent from the family of David. They are called Bēnē Mārāwāthā on account of the purity of their descent, and the freedom of their family from that blemish, their name signifying that they are princes descended from David. They are in those parts beloved, whereas the people of Bagdad strongly hate the family of Bustānī, because they had con-

1 The name of the Persian king was Chosru or Kesra. The Hebrew שֶׁבֶר may, therefore, be only a transcription of this name. Graetz gives the date A. D. 642 as the time of this event. The princess's name is said to have been Dara.

2 The orthodox writer appears to mention the fact of the heresiarch's descent from Bustānī, in order to add discredit to the family in general.

3 The text is obscure (שנים תבנר), we may assume Sa'adyah Gaon's antagonist, the heresiarch David ben Zakkai, to be included. If so, a terminus a quo for the composition of the text can easily be fixed.

4 Is this the same as ʿAnṣaṭ in Isakhri's Index Geographicus, Part IV, (edit. De Goeje)? I have, if I remember right, seen ʿAnṣaṭ on the title-page of printed Syriac books used in the sense of "Saxony."

5 Descendants of lords or princes.
tracted this blemish which vitiated the family. And may God send his people the expected One who is free from such a blemish, and who proceeds from a pure descent, not having contracted a stain: the expected One who existed before the destruction of the second temple, as our early teachers—may their memory be blessed—said that God did not destroy his sanctuary until he had created One who should build it up, as he had promised his people that he would create the remedy before the hurt, as he had said: “When I heal Israel” (Hos. vii. 1).

And there is a record regarding the presence of the expected One that he existed before the destruction of the temple in the saying “The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundations of this house, and his hand will finish it” (Zech. iv. 9). May God bring near the solace of his people, and may not be far off . . . .

II. A Fragment relating to the Ge'onîm Sharîra and Hai.

A single leaf, measuring about 5½ in. by 3½, with nineteen lines on the recto and eighteen on the verso. Apparently eleventh century.

This fragment seems to possess genuine historical value. It has been known hitherto that the latter years of Sharîra’s life were embittered and even endangered by a quarrel with some powerful enemies, but the cause of the quarrel has so far remained a mystery. This small Genizah leaf appears now to provide a clue. The impression one gains from it is that the management of the finances was at the bottom of the mischief. The writer of the communication given in the text at any rate states that before Sharîra’s death “perfect peace” was made between the Gaon and

1 Dr. S. A. Hirsch has kindly drawn my attention to a work entitled *tnioHinnrvn*, which is being published at Pressburg at the expense of the “Alliance Israélite Universelle”; but I have not yet been able to study the discussion of the Sharîra controversy contained in that work.
himself, and that a certain definite arrangement was then arrived at with regard to the ownership of the offerings sent either for the private use of the heads of the academy or for the support of the scholars generally. Another very interesting fact is the intermarriage of Hai with the family of his father's former enemy. It almost appears as if there had been a rivalry in the rule of the academy between Sharira and the writer of the present document, and that the opposing interests were united by the marriage here mentioned. The financial difficulties, however, cropped up again. Hence this epistle addressed by Hai's father-in-law to some community or communities who were in the habit of sending offerings to the academy of Pumbeditha.

The Hebrew Text (another part of Or. 5552).

I (recto).

The Hebrew Text (another part of Or. 5552).

II (verso).

Or, perhaps, 

...
... in these ways; and lest they should err and turn aside, and lest we should turn aside. For we are the great one of the academy, and its elder. There is none who is greater than ourselves in wisdom and in years. The elders of the academy and its wise men are with us and sit before us. Moreover, perfect peace was made between ourselves and between the party of Sharira Gaon—may the spirit of the Lord give him peace—before he was gathered in (full of) years, and with the Gaon his son—may his Shield strengthen him. For he has allied himself with us and taken our daughter in marriage. And stipulations were written out between us in our joint names, one of these stipulations being that all the offerings which come in the name of either of us shall be for himself alone, no other having a share in it; and that that which comes without an express name on it, or in the names of the doctors of the academy shall be divided, a half belonging to us and a half to our son-in-law.

And now have we written with authority and faithfulness... to the intelligent and wise and prominent Rabbi Joseph, administrator of the academy—may the Lord preserve him—the son of Rabbi Berakhya—his soul be in Eden—(having written both to him and to the people to number

Translation.

I.

\[1\text{ MS. not clear.}\]

\[2\text{ MS. apparently רכזס.}\]

VOL. XIV.
him amongst the wise men of the people and amongst those who enforce the alms): Speak, I pray thee, in his ears that he should not turn aside to be a cause of trouble, and that he should not be misled, but act in accordance with the stipulations which we have indicated; for as the Lord liveth, we have spoken righteously and written the truth.

II.

For if any one sends offerings for the academy and for the benefit of learning in a name other than his own, he points to himself and appropriates them. And do ye neither hear nor give heed to any one who may write to you: “Send the offerings in my name.” For he does so in order to take them for himself. And we have not written so; but that if any one should make an offering to either of us personally, he should send it in our name; and that that which is meant for the doctors of the academy should be sent without a name, so long as ye apportion and divide it between us, giving to each a half, so as to remove quarrels from us. It has also been reported to us that the Rabbi who has been gathered into Eden had sent in a name other than our own a hundred and fifty Darkemonim, and he without doubt had sent them for the doctors of the academy that they might live on it and have sufficient. But if ye neglect the matter, he in whose name they were sent will take them for himself. And to the Lord do we cry and to you that this is a great sum. It may make one wealthy and a hundred will suffer.

1 ἥδη is repeated in the text.
2 Is it Ἡλ himself who was to be admonished?
3 If ἰδη be the right reading: “in the name of one of us.”
4 This refers to a person who must have been named in an early portion of the epistle.
5 On the value of the ἰδη in Biblical times see Hastings’s Bible Dictionary, III, p. 481. On the ḫr of Moslem times see Matériaux pour servir à l’histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie musulmanes, par M. H. Sauvain, p. 13 passim.
far be it from you to incur guilt, and to engage in a false transaction. Therefore write quickly to our beloved Joseph, the son of the honoured Jacob—may the Lord raise him up—who is in Egypt, to whom were sent . . .

III. A Fihrist of Works by the Gaon

Samuel b. Hofni.

Two leaves, each about 4½ in. by 3½, containing eighteen lines on the one entire page of Hebrew writing. The language is Arabic. Probably eleventh century.

A list of books (or rather, probably, divisions of one large work) composed by the Gaon on subjects mainly falling within the range of Judaism. The various titles bear a close resemblance to the headings of the chapters in Muhammadan law-books of the same nature. The lower margin is very closely cut, and it is therefore impossible to say whether the "fihrist" is complete.

The Arabic Text (also a part of Or. 5552).

1 The word ns is written over several of the titles and also at the end. On the subject of the titles compare Poznański, J. Q. R. for Jan. 1901, pp. 326, 327, 328, 330, where also the reference to Mr. E. A. Adler's "An Ancient Bookseller's Catalogue" in the J. Q. R. for Oct. 1900 will be found.

2 Apparently for ḫ'ndw, "rivers."

3 Apparently for ḥm'hw, "oaths."
IV. An Early Grammatical Fragment.

Four paper leaves, the full dimensions of a leaf being about 9½ in. by 6. One folio is, however, very badly mutilated, and the other three are also slightly damaged. The number of lines to a page varies from twenty-five to thirty-two. Hispano-oriental writing, an autograph apparently belonging to the second half of the eleventh century. The language is Arabic, but the character Hebrew.

Fragments of a grammatical treatise dealing, so far as the contents of the leaves go, with the rules regarding gender, with special reference to the relation existing between Hebrew and Arabic and to the correct method of translating from one of these languages into the other.

There can be no doubt as to the fragments being in autograph. They appear to belong to the first rough draught of the work. The numerous corrections by the original writer are all in a form which at once suggests the author's hand. The paper used had previously contained on one side Arabic writing of the tenth or eleventh century. The Hebrew writer has erased the Arabic on one page and written his text over the erasures, but in the case of nearly all the rest he wrote the Hebrew in the wide blank spaces between the Arabic, the latter being, however, for the most part crossed through and thus rendered almost illegible.

The impression one gains of the contents is that they form part of Moses b. Gikatilla's וְנָסָה בָּלָקָנָא אֲשֶׁר הָיָה. If so, it seems to belong to the introduction of that work, for the fragments found by Dr. Harkavy at St. Petersburg are in the form of a dictionary (see Revue des Études Juives, XL and XLI).

1 The priority of the Arabic writing was pointed out to me by Dr. H. Hirschfeld, who at once detected this feature of the MS.

2 According to an epistolary communication made by Dr. Harkavy to Dr. Poznański, his fragments contain נְפִּיָה and הָרָעָשׁ. The article נְפִּיָה has been given by Dr. Poznański in his paper on Tanhum Yerushalmi (Revue des Ét. Juives, XL and XLI).
A clear demonstration of Gikatilla's authorship cannot at present be given, as none of the quotations from his grammatical work found in later writers (see Poznański, *Mose b. Samuel ibn Chiquitilla*, pp. 118-120) are contained in the present fragment. The identification is, in fact, based on indirect inference rather than direct proof. It is a kind of inference, however, which seems to carry a very strong probability with it.

The points to be considered are the following:

1. It is not known that any other writer of an early period devoted a monograph to the study of gender in the Hebrew language. This consideration alone would at once suggest that the present treatise is a part of Gikatilla's work. The weak point in this argument is the possibility that these four leaves are part of a general grammatical work and only accidentally contain the portion treating on gender. But it is, on the other hand, hardly likely that such detailed treatment would have been given to gender in a work of a more comprehensive character. Moreover, if it is a part of a more extensive grammatical treatise, the question would still remain whose work it might be.

2. The manner of treatment given to the subject is exactly what one might expect from Gikatilla, who is known to have made a special study of Arabic in its relation to Hebrew, and who was besides the first translator from Arabic into Hebrew. One can see at a glance that in the present fragments Hebrew is constantly compared with Arabic, and that special regard is paid to the proper method of rendering from one language into the other.

3. The style of writing is in accord with the supposition that we have before us an autograph of Moses b. Gikatilla. If one had no other means of judging, one would probably

---

1 On treatises on "gender" by Arab grammarians, see Pozn., op. cit., p. 22.

2 On Gikatilla's Hebrew translation of Ḥajjug's works, see Pozn., op. cit., ch. VI.
assign the fragments to the eleventh or twelfth century. The Arabic which had been written on the paper before is very early, and the paper also belongs to early times. If the Hebrew writing is Gikatilla's, it must be assigned to the second half of the eleventh century (see Pozn., op. cit., p. 9), thus placing it quite within the period to which the general aspect of the leaves appears to point.

4. The only authority quoted in the extant portions is apparently Sa'adyah Gaon under the title ṬṬn!>N antra1, one of the authorities to whom Gikatilla was in the habit of referring (see Pozn., op. cit., p. 45). The absence of reference to other authorities is properly accounted for by the smallness of the portions preserved. There is at any rate no reason to suppose that a complete list of authorities cited in the work would be found to oppose the theory of Gikatilla's authorship.

The Arabic Text.

Or. 5553 A (1st leaf, recto)².

---

Sa'adyah was known as ṬṬn!>N antra1, and ṬṬn!>N antra1, though — so far as I know — not found elsewhere, is a suitable designation of the first great commentator of the Bible.

² The arrangement of the leaves followed here is partly tentative. With regard to orthography and peculiar forms, the plan followed is simply to reproduce the readings of the MS. The difficulty of representing a very irregularly written MS. like this is, however, very considerable, and the present writer hopes that an improved text will some day appear.

³ These two words are written over.

⁴ The underlined words are written over.

⁵ In margin: ṬṬn!>N antra1.
some british museum genizah texts

1. The order of these two words is doubtful.
2. The underlined words are irregularly written in blacker ink, and represent a correction.
3. Written over the line.
4. Over the line.
5. Last three words written over the line.
6. Written three times in the MS.
7. *TVm is written in the margin, and is apparently meant as an alternative reading for :הש"מ.
Or. 5553 B (1st leaf, recto).

... through花纹 number 1 of the 4th column. 

The last two words written both over the line and in the margin.

The following words written over.

In the margin: "written over: apparently for מַשָּׂאָה 으ְשָׂא אֵוְ שָׂא אֵוְ שָׂא אֵוְ שָׂא אֵוְ שָׂא אֵוְ שָׂא אֵוְ Sh.
For הוי!?
The alternative יבר is written over.
The alternative יברשא is written over יברשא.
A word erased.
Written above an erased word.
So apparently meant to be read; but a number of words erased, of whichJakarim כמות נכתבה כמות נכתבה are clear.
It appears, however, to have been erased.
A line to indicate its omission.
The underlined words are in the margin, but a number of words have been crossed out in the text after סרב, which latter word is both in text and margin.
This is not written over.
The last two words written over.
SOME BRITISH MUSEUM GENIZAH TEXTS

(2nd leaf, recto.)

The last two words written over.

The last twowords written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

Added in small writing.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.

The last two words written over.

Written over.
George Margoliouth.
RECENT CRITICISM OF THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS

The newer criticism of the Letter of Aristeas dates from 1869. In that year Moritz Schmidt re-edited the Greek text in vol. I of Merx' Archiv für wissensch. Erforschung des AT (Halle). He relied on two Paris MSS. (Græc. 129 and 5), and on the citations in Eusebius. He cannot be blamed for neglecting Josephus. As Fabricius had already remarked, Josephus is of very little value for the textual criticism of Aristeas. Though he paraphrases about two-fifths of the Letter (omitting the visit to Palestine, the discourse of Eleazar, and the seventy-two questions and answers), Josephus re-wrote almost every sentence, retaining, however, "many of the characteristic words of Aristeas" (but contrast Swete, Introduction, p. 12, with Thackeray, ib., p. 517). As moreover Josephus entirely misunderstood Aristeas in several passages, it is obvious that we can derive slight assistance from him in the difficult task of reconstructing the original. Still, sometimes Eusebius is confirmed by Josephus, and when the two agree their readings are perhaps to be preferred to the MSS. On the other hand, Josephus is "often useful to detect the alterations which have been introduced into the Text by Eusebius or the B group" (Thackeray, Introduction, p. 517; cf. Wendland, Preface to his edition of Aristeas, p. xxii). Schmidt's edition was based on this very B group, and is thus entirely superseded by the later editions of Thackeray and Wendland, which, as will be seen, rely on another and superior group of MSS. Yet Schmidt deserves credit for perceiving that it was no longer possible to regard Aristeas through Hody's spectacles (p. 244). He adds a very strong expression of belief in the genuineness of Aristeas' description of Jerusalem, and of his account of the costly presents bestowed by Philadelphus on the Temple, and he even goes so far as to assert that he can see no ground why the King of Egypt should not have wished to acquire and translate the Hebrew scriptures, nor why the monarch should not have entertained the translators at a banquet, even as Aristeas describes (p. 252).

1 Read before the Jews' College Literary Society, London, Dec. 16, 1901.
In several particulars Schmidt was right. But the strongest evidence of his accuracy was unknown to him. Hence, the rehabilitation of Aristeas originates not so much with Schmidt as with his critic Lumbroso. In the *Atti della R. Accademia di Torino*, vol. IV (1868–9), there is a paper by Lumbroso entitled "Dell' uso delle iscrizioni e dei papiiri per la critica del testo di Aristeas," à propos of Schmidt's edition. Here for the first time, Lumbroso showed that the papyri threw considerable light on Aristeas, and that the text of the Letter cannot be accurately edited without constant reference to this source of information. As we now know, the same is true of the study of the Septuagint, for as Deissmann has shown (Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 297), "Many well-known Septuagintal words find a place in the Greek papyri of the Ptolemaic period." Both Wendland and Thackeray have rightly availed themselves of Lumbroso's suggestions, and their editions are all the better for it. Lumbroso, however, was not content with merely asserting the importance of the papyri in establishing true readings in Aristeas. In a slightly later work, *Recherches sur l'Économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides* (Torino, 1870), Lumbroso maintained that the papyri confirm the substantial accuracy of Aristeas in many points. Mr. Thackeray cites a part of the Introduction of Lumbroso, but no apology is necessary for citing it again at somewhat greater length. Lumbroso, describing the materials available for his Researches into the life of Ptolemaic Egypt, refers to the Letter of Aristeas in these terms (p. xii seq.):—

Un seul ouvrage contenant la narrative suivie d'un épisode de l'histoire des Ptolemées nous est parvenu dans son intégrité, mais il est fort court; on ne sait précisément qui en est l'auteur, ni l'époque à laquelle il a été écrit; on conteste de tous côtés la sincérité du récit; et jusqu'à présent quelque savant le retient tout entier pour une pure fable. Je veux parler de la lettre d'Aristée à Philocratus sur la version de la Bible par les 72 interprètes, demandées à Jérusalem, sous le règne de Ptolémée Philadelphie. Cependant la critique basée uniquement sur la collation des manuscrits et l'étude exclusive du texte n'est plus suffisante pour cette lettre si méprisée. Depuis quarante ans un rayon de lumière inattendu a jailli des inscriptions et des papiirus, qui jette sur elle un jour nouveau; chose frappante: il n'est pas un titre de cour, une institution, une loi, une magistrature, une charge, un terme technique, une formule, un tour de langue remarquable dans cette lettre, il n'est pas un témoignage d'Aristée concernant l'histoire civile de l'époque, qui ne se trouve enregistré dans les papiirus ou les inscriptions et confirmé par eux.

"A close examination of the larger evidence from the papyri now available," adds Mr. Thackeray (p. 502), "will probably corroborate
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the opinion, to which other evidence seems to point, that the letter was written under one of the later Ptolemies." This is to leave a wide margin, for the Ptolemaic dynasty does not end till the overthrow of Antony at Actium. Graetz placed Aristeas even later—in the reign of Tiberius. This, however, is far too late, and I may say at once that I entirely agree with Schrtrr that the Letter is at least as early as 200 B.C. But Wendland, who holds the Letter as post-Maccabean, thinks (Preface, p. xxvii) that the evidence of the papyri is in his favour, for in Aristeas we have a reference to the king's φίλοι, and also to the officers described as τῶν ἄρχομενον ἀμφιλακτών. Now, according to Strack, the earliest use of the technical term "friends" of the king in the papyri dates from 191 B.C. (Rhein. Museum, LV, p. 168 seq.). Mahaffy, however, though thinking it "tolerably certain" that the title τῶν φίλων is only as old as Epiphanes, is constrained to admit that "it is nevertheless possible that both Strack's 60, and another from Thera, which H. von Gärtringen has sent me, attest the origin of the titles in the earlier reign [that of Philometor]" (History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, p. 161). According to Strabo, the title "Friend of the King" was current under Ptolemy II (Lumbroso, Egitto, p. 118 seq.; Mahaffy, op. cit. 101). At all events, as Philometor succeeded in 222 B.C., Wendland's argument from the use of the phrase τῶν φίλων by Aristeas is ineffective. Equally indecisive is the argument from the term τῶν ἄρχομενον ἀμφιλακτών. Strack (ibid., p. 187) maintains (from the evidence of the papyri) that while the singular is found as early as 264 or 227 B.C., the plural is a later introduction, and does not occur before 145 B.C. But it is surely a curious fact that in one of the two passages (Wendland, § 40; Thackeray, p. 527, l. 1) in which Aristeas uses this characteristic Ptolemaic title the text is uncertain. The reading in Wendland's LM, Thackeray's BTZ and Josephus, is τῶν ἄρχομενον ἀμφιλακτών, and the variation cannot be with rejected (as Thackeray does, p. 515) on the ground that the singular removes "an idiomatic use of the genitive, frequently attested by the papyri." In the other passage (Wendland, § 12; Thackeray, p. 521, l. 5) the plural τῶν ἄρχομενον ἀμφιλακτών may easily have arisen in error owing to the juxtaposition of two names. Nor is it clear that Aristeas means us to infer that Sosibius and Andreas held the office simultaneously (cf. τολεία). Moreover, the plural, as a mere designation, is as old as Alexander the Great (Strack, ibid., p. 169).

Thus, while the evidence of the papyri adds a strong testimony to the familiarity of Aristeas with Ptolemaic life, there is nothing so far discovered that militates against a pre-Maccabean date for the Letter. As to the other grounds on which a post-Maccabean date
is maintained by recent critics more will be said shortly. In the meantime, as repeated references have been and must be made to the editions of Thackeray and Wendland, it is advisable to postpone further considerations as to the date and authenticity of Aristeas, and to undertake at once the duty of describing these two editions. Thackeray and Wendland worked independently, and the editions were published almost simultaneously. The former, however, was able to prefix, in a page of Addenda, some "noteworthy emendations and readings adopted in the edition of Wendland and Mendelssohn, which appeared too late for any use to be made of it in constructing the present text." Wendland chronicles emendations far more frequently than does Thackeray, and though the former is laudably judicious in introducing these into the text, he does so, on the whole, the less sparingly of the two. Wendland's edition forms a volume in Teubner's well-known series; it is admirably printed and is convenient in size. The exact title is: "Aristeas ad Philocratem Epistula, cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum Testimonii. LUDOVICI MENDELSJOHN schedis usus edidit PAULUS WENDLAND" (Leipzig, Teubner, 1900). Thus Wendland is the editor of Mendelssohn as well as of Aristeas, and in the opening pages of his Preface the former offers generous praise to Mendelssohn, whose intention of editing Aristeas was only interrupted by death. To Mendelssohn is due the collation of the MSS., and from his accumulated notes Wendland derived much help. Mendelssohn had designed a commentary as well as a critical edition of the text, and his work on about a fifth of the letter was printed in Vol. V of the Acta of the University of Dorpat in 1897: ("Aristeas quae fertur ad Philocratem epistulæ initium apparatu critico et commentario instructum edidit L. Mendelssohn"). Though, however, Wendland has provided no formal commentary, his accessory matter is so helpful and complete that he might claim that the commentary is not after all wanting in his edition. His "Index Verborum" (pp. 171-220) is more than a vocabulary, for its frequent references to the LXX (Hatch and Redpath's Concordance), and to many works on the Papyri and Inscriptions, when added to the admirable citations in the notes of critical essays often scattered in remote periodicals, place the student in a very advantageous position for the fullest understanding of the text. (Readers will not need reminding that Liddell and Scott is also serviceable for the study of Aristeas. Some interesting grammatical notes will also be found in L. Radermacher's Demetrii Phalaris qui dicitur de elocutione libellus, Leipzig, Teubner, 1901. See ibid., Index Auctorum, s.v. Aristeas.) Rarely has a scholar conveyed so much help in so brief a space, and Wendland's splendid reputation
will be further enhanced by this work. Another important feature of Wendland's edition is the displayed list of "Testimonia," which occupy pp. 87-166. All the Greek and Latin texts in which Aristeas is directly cited or his narrative alluded to are here printed in full, with all requisite critical aids. One can hardly express in adequate terms one's gratitude for this valuable collection of Testimonia.

It is a little strange that Wendland did not complete his list by citing the Rabbinic passages bearing on Aristeas. These are given in part by Swete (p. 14), and by Schürer (III, 471). Cf. also Friedmann, Onkelos und Akylas, p. 5 seq. (esp. pp. 16, 19, 20). These Testimonia are of supreme importance, especially notable being the statement in Tract. Soferim that the translators sent from Palestine were only five in number. Again, from Philo (Vit. Mos. ii, 5) we learn that an annual festival, in which Greeks and Jews participated, was held at the Pharos in memory of the completion of the LXX, and this points to a genuine popular tradition which included at all events some of the elements of Aristeas' story. If, again, the fragment from Aristobulus contained in Eusebius, Praep. Ev. xiii, 12, 2 be genuine (Wendland, p. 124, and Cohn do not accept it; Swete, p. 13, though expressing a doubt, seems more inclined to believe in it, as does of course Schürer, III, 384), then his words "establish the fact that the main features of the story were believed by the literary Jews of Alexandria, and even at the Court, more than a century and a half before the Christian era, and within a century of the date assigned by Aristeas to the translation of the Law" (Swete, ibid.). On the other hand the Christian fathers (Irenæus, III, 21, 2, Wendland, p. 123; Clement of Alexandria, Strom. I, § 148, Wend. p. 124; Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. IV, 34, Wend. p. 138; Augustine, De civ. dei, XVIII, 42, Wend. p. 163) as well as the Rabbinic Sages (Megillah, 9 a: which goes back as early as any of the Christian references, Soferim, i. 6-8) add legends such as that of the separate cells occupied by the seventy-two translators which throw undeserved suspicion on Aristeas.

Jerome (Praef. in Pent., Wendland, p. 162) stands alone in disputing this particular legend, as well as in strenuously maintaining that Aristeas refers only to the Pentateuch, and to no other part of the Alexandrian Bible (Swete, p. 23). Epiphanius (De mensuris et ponderibus, 3, p. 155 Lag. Wendl. p. 139) places the seventy-two in pairs in thirty-six cells, and even "apportions the books of the Hebrew canon among thirty-six pairs of translators" (ibid.). Another favourite attack on Aristeas seems to me to owe its point to an unauthorized embellishment of Epiphanius. Scarcely a modern writer but attributes to Aristeas the blunder of imagining that the twelve tribes still preserved their distinctive identity in the 3rd cent. B.C. Willrich with his...
usual lack of generosity employs very strong language on this point; he calls the writer of Aristeas "erstaunlich gedankenlos," but all that Aristeas tells us is that six representatives were chosen from each tribe. I see nothing in Aristeas' language to imply that the tribes still retained their identity (cf. Whiston, *Literal Accomplishment*, &c., 1724, p. 132), and as de Rossi acutely points out (in the *Meor Enayim*), Aristeas attributes to Ptolemy and not to Eleazar the suggestion as to appointing delegates from the twelve tribes. The case as it really stands is well illustrated by placing side by side the original statement of Aristeas and the additions of Epiphanius:

**Aristeas** (Wendland, p. 16, Thackeray, p. 528).

**Epiphanius** (Wendland, p. 142).

Mr. H. St. J. Thackeray's admirable edition of the Letter of Aristeas forms an Appendix to Swete's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge University Press, 1900). The inclusion of it in the Introduction is a notable sign of its continued, or rather revived, importance for the history of the LXX. It is a little inconvenient, for the purpose of reference, that Mr. Thackeray and Prof. Wendland have not divided the text into the same paragraphs. As Prof. Wendland's paragraphic division had already been used by him in his excellent German translation (Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A. T.*, vol. II, p. 1 seq.), Mr. Thackeray might with advantage have placed Wendland's numbers in his margin. Wendland's arbitrary division, however, is not without objection. Why should the twelve series of names be divided into four distinct paragraphs? Why should the letters that passed between Egypt and Palestine be divided up? No doubt, the shorter the paragraph the easier is the
reference, but an excessive subdivision interrupts the reader's attention, and this is the more felt as Wendland has a threefold numbering; pages, paragraphs, and lines. Mr. Thackeray of course divides the Letter into paragraphs, but without numbering them, and much more sparingly (Wendland has 322 paragraphs, Thackeray 129). The variations in this respect between the two editions are frequent, and sometimes startling. Thus Wendland's § 2 begins in the middle of one of Thackeray's sentences; and Thackeray begins a new paragraph in the middle of the last sentence of Wendland's § 4. Altogether, the variations between the two texts are chiefly variations in punctuation, for except that Wendland, rather more often, adopts Eusebius' readings, and other emendations, the two texts agree very closely.

This is not surprising, for both editions are based on the same group of MSS. Mr. Thackeray's grouping of the MSS. is more easily followed by the student than Prof. Wendland's, but as they cite several of the same MSS. with different designations, I have thought it useful to make out the following table:

A Group (Thackeray), b¹ and b² Group (Wendland).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS.</th>
<th>Thackeray</th>
<th>Wendland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vat. 747</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C (b²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 128</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(b²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 130</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(b²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit. Mus., Burney 34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(b²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat. 746</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>[C (b³)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat. 383</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>A (b³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basle O.IV. 10 (Omont 21)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice 534</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>V (b¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palat. 203</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P (b¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottobon. 32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 950</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B Group (Thackeray), a Group (Wendland).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS.</th>
<th>Thackeray</th>
<th>Wendland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florence Laur. Acquis. 44</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>L Par.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 129</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(Included by Wendland in his b¹ group.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barberini IV. 56</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat. 1668</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Vat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich, Bibl. de la Ville</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Turicencis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 11 (Omont 169)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The descriptions of the MSS. are very full in both editions; but the account given by Mr. Thackeray is much the clearer and more informing. Here I will only indicate the relations between groups A and B. Following Mr. Thackeray (p. 504) one may assert that "the B group, which was followed by Schmidt, while presenting a specious text, is in reality based on a recension, although in a few passages it has kept the original readings; in the A group no correction has taken place, and though the text which has here been handed down is not altogether free from corruption, yet the true reading is in most cases rather to be looked for here than in the revised B text." Mr. Thackeray explains subsequently (p. 511) that the corrections in B rarely have the support of Eusebius, and moreover "we find that in places the reading of the HKA and GI groups, which the B text has rejected, is corroborated by the usage of Alexandrian papyri which are contemporary or nearly contemporary with the pseudo-Aristeas." It should be noted that T (=Wendland L) is a far older member of the B group than is the MS. on which Schmidt relied. While, however, it is safe to assert with Thackeray (p. 514) that the "singular" readings of B are in nearly all cases due to a correction of the text, it is open in crucial cases to use B's "singular" if other grounds support it. B in some cases is undoubtedly less corrupt (p. 515). Eusebius, on the other hand, only rarely corroborates B, and Eusebius' importance for the text of Aristeas is as both Thackeray and Wendland rightly hold very great.

"On the whole," says Mr. Thackeray, "the Eusebian evidence is of the greatest importance; it tends to show that the GI group, especially if supported by any member of the B group, is nearest to the primitive text." Among the MSS. referred to, but not collated by Thackeray, is Codex Monacensis 9. This is fully described by Wendland (p. xiv); he terms it M, and shows that his MLB form one group, though M has some relations with (Wendland's) b group. Wendland identifies M with the particular MS. used by Simon Schard for the editio princeps of the Greek in 1561. The MSS. which Wendland most frequently cites in his footnotes are M, LB, VPAC. Thackeray's collations are thus the fuller, and the omission of M is of the less moment, as the printed edition of Schard was available.

The enormous labour expended by both editors (and more particularly by Mr. Thackeray) on the collation of MSS. forms a striking contrast to the calm refusal of Hody to take the trouble of examining a single MS. "Until 1870," says Mr. Thackeray (p. 501), "the latest edition of the text was that which Hody prefixed to his work, De Bibliorum Textibus, published at Oxford in 1705. This was merely a reprint of Schard, Hody naively confessing in his preface
that he did not consider the work of collating MSS. of a work of such doubtful authenticity to be worth the trouble. "Non me fugit servari in Bibliotheca Regia Parisina, aliiisque quibusdam, exemplaria istius MSS. Sed de tali opusculo, quod tanquam foetum supposititiun penitus rejicio, Amicos solicitare, et in Partes longinquas mittere, vix operae pretium existimavi. Eas curas relinquo illis, quibus tanti esse res videbitur."

After two centuries, the collation which Hody thought worthless has been undertaken by two scholars, one of Cambridge, and the other of Wilmersdorf, and the result is before us in the two editions of which the foregoing remarks are meant as a grateful recognition. It is interesting to note the exceptional interest that has at various times been taken by Englishmen in Aristeas. Hody takes a front rank in the history of Aristeas, and his Oxford edition contains many of the Testimonia. His attack on the authenticity of the Letter, which held the field until the present generation, was answered by Whiston in The Literal accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies (1724, p. 121 seq.). Many of Whiston's arguments are thoroughly sound. So, too, there are good points in Hayes' Vindication of the History of the Septuagint (1736). Of English translators (not over accurate) there were several; Done, 1633 and 1685; Lewis, 1715, Whiston (Authentic Records, I, 423-584), 1727. A new English translation is now a desideratum.

It now remains to approach a little closer to the subject-matter of the Letter of Aristeas, and to exhibit, in the light of recent research, the case as it stands for and against its credibility. I trust that my own position will not be misunderstood. I think that the accuracy of Aristeas may now be vindicated in so many points, that it is unjust to reject his statements where no positive evidence against them is forthcoming. Because the work is pseudepigraphic, it is not therefore just to regard its assertions with suspicion. On the face of it, the Letter is undoubtedly a "forgery." It emanates not from a heathen, but from a Jew, for its easily detected motive, the glorification of Israel and of Israel's Law, betrays the Jewish hand. Where I think thenewer facts, as well as the newer psychology, entitle us to reverse the old verdict, appears just in this: a work written with a tendency, with a romantic colouring, may nevertheless be thoroughly trustworthy, not only in its details but in its main outlines. The tendency lies on the surface; the truth rests deep in the body of the work. To me it seems that the Letter is the work of a Jew who lived about half a century after the events recited, but who relied almost exclusively on heathen and contemporary sources of information, the authenticity of which is coming more and more to be probable
or even demonstrable. Even the pseudepigraphic theory must be based on general rather than specific grounds. Wendland cites two specific cases in which he thinks that Aristeas momentarily forgets his rôle and discriminates his own later age from the age of Philadelphia (§§ 28, 182 Wendland; Thackeray, p. 524, l. 18 seq., and p. 550, l. 16). These passages are inconclusive. The phrase ἄνωτε καὶ κάτωτε (like the Hebrew יָנוּר יָנוּר יָנוּר) does not necessarily imply any long interval, while in the earlier passage Josephus is supported by a small amount of MS. authority in using the present tense.

At all events, the compiler of the Letter, though a Jew, relies entirely on non-Jewish sources of information. This is clearly shown by two large incidental sections of the Letter, the Table-discourses and the description of Palestine. As Wendland himself points out (Pseudep. II, p. 3) in the Table incident the writer utilizes only Greek materials, and the “Jewish Gnomic wisdom seems scarcely used at all.” So, too, with regard to the description of Palestine; the Jewish Scriptures are not used at all, and the heathen standpoint is so well mentioned that “Aristeas” if a forger was a most artistic one. Sir Charles Wilson’s remark on the description of Palestine is worth citing (see Preface to vol. XI of Publications of the Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Society):

Aristeas and Hecataeus visited the Holy City before any change had been made in the walls and other fortifications erected by Nehemiah. The truthfulness of the description of Jerusalem attributed to Aristeas is not affected by the question of its authorship. There is evidence, internal and external, that it was written by some one who actually visited the Jewish capital during the time of the Ptolemies (circa B.C. 250). Special interest attaches to the description of the citadel, which is said to have stood high, and to have protected the precincts of the temple. It apparently occupied the ground upon which the Macedonian Akra and the Herodian Antonia were afterwards built.

Yet the reference in Aristeas to the Akra is one of the chief grounds on which Wendland, Willrich, and Wellhausen in his third edition (Isr. u. jüd. Geschichte, ed. 3, 1897, p. 232) base their theory that the Letter cannot be earlier than the first century B.C. In his fourth edition (1901, p. 236) Wellhausen, while retaining his theory as to the date, omits the argument from the Akra. That a citadel existed in pre-Maccabean times is strongly and I think successfully argued by Schürer (III, 469), who is convinced that Aristeas belongs to the period c. 200 B.C. One may say in general that the whole letter makes the impression that it was written before the Syrian domination over Judea (198 B.C.). There are certainly no indications of post-Maccabean conditions.
It is incredible that an Alexandrian should have introduced a Ptolemy so prominently into the story, if, when he wrote, Judaea had been wrested from Egyptian rule. So, too, Aristeas's conceptions of the position of the High Priest is completely pre-Maccabean. A strong point made by those who discredit the pre-Maccabean origin of Aristeas, viz. the reference to the harbours, is again a confirmation of the pre-Maccabean date. This argument originates, in its modern form, with Mendelssohn, but Schürer (III, p. 470) effectively disposes of it. The argument that the Judean possession of the harbours of Ascalon, Joppa, Gaza and Ptolemais (Aristeas, W., §§ 107, 115, Th., pp. 538, 9) points to the time of Alexander Jannæus is untenable, for Ascalon and Ptolemais never belonged to the Judean government. The writer of Aristeas makes no claim that those harbours belonged politically to Judaea, but had he written when certain of these were politically in Jewish hands, he would hardly have added those which were not. Schlatter, who also holds with a post-Maccabean date, nevertheless admits that the geographical data are pre-Maccabean (Zur Topographie u.s.w. Palæstina's, p. 332). The other considerations on which a late date are defended are equally insecure. The most important of these, the date of the Hekataeus cited by Aristeas, (W., § 31, Th., p. 525), is certainly feeble. Willrich (Juden und Griechen, p. 21) maintains that this Hekataeus is a pseudo-Hekataeus who wrote "frühestens um 100 vor Christ." Here again, Wellhausen apparently withdraws the argument, for while it is present in the third edition it is absent in the fourth. Schürer (III, 461 seq.) has a brilliant vindication of both Aristeas and Josephus in this matter, and there is no reasonable ground for doubting that the Hekataeus quoted is the Greek writer of the third century B.C. Willrich argues that this pseudo-Hekataeus (as cited by Josephus, Ant. Apion, I, 22) must have written after the Maccabean age because he (Hekataeus) asserts that the Jews bravely bore torment and death rather than renounce their ancestral religion. Prof. Schürer replies: "We know too little of the history to be able to say that such circumstances never arose before the Maccabean times." But surely we can go further, for Josephus proceeds to cite, from Hekataeus, similar martyrdoms and acts of Jewish fidelity in the age of Alexander the Great! How critics argue in a circle is well illustrated in this connexion. Willrich places Aristeas late because he cites Hekataeus; Schürer places Hekataeus early because he is cited by Aristeas. Prof. Büchler (who treats the Letter as composite, and attributes, Omniaden und Tobiaden, p. 225, the passages referring to the freeing of the Egyptian Jewish slaves to the Roman period after 63 B.C.) maintains (p. 228) with Schürer that Aristeas cites the genuine Hekataeus; so also does Wendland.
(Apokryphen und Pseudepigr., II, 1), whose remarks on the relations between Aristeas and Hekataeaus must be given in full:—


All the other arguments for a post-Maccabean date are insignificant compared to the foregoing. The papyri attest that Egyptian Jews Hellenized their names in the third century, and further, that an important Jewish diaspora was established there under the early Ptolemies. "In the time of Philadelphus," says Willrich (p. 36), "there was possibly no Diaspora at all in Egypt, anyhow, it was very unimportant." This assertion is untenable in face of the evidence which has accumulated of recent years. It is very pleasing to note that English scholars have been well to the fore in providing and utilizing this evidence. Prof. Swete (Introduction, p. 3 seq.) proves the antiquity of the Jewish settlement in Egypt. "Long before the time of Alexander, Egypt possessed the nucleus of a
Jewish colony.” And further: “When Alexandria was founded in 332 B.C., although the design of the conqueror (Alexander) was to erect a monument to himself which should be essentially Greek, he not only assigned a place in his new city to Jewish colonists, but admitted them to full citizenship. Mommsen indeed expresses a doubt whether the grant of citizenship was made before the time of Ptolemy I, but in the absence of any direct evidence to the contrary the repeated statement of Josephus justifies the belief that it originated with Alexander.” This is an attitude which does honour to English scholarship, and Prof. Driver’s position (Daniel, Cambridge Bible for Schools, p. xxxiv seq.) is identical. It is, however, to Prof. Mahaffy that we owe our latest knowledge regarding Ptolemaic Egypt, and hence I cite his most recent utterances on the Diaspora as against Willrich (whose Juden und Griechen Mahaffy rightly terms a “very unconvincing tract”). “The existence at this time of settlements of Jews in Egypt, and even in Upper Egypt, is quite proven by the existence of the village in the nome called Samareia (its Egyptian name was Kerkesphis, at least in later days), which is mentioned more than once in the Petrie Papyri. We even know of two inhabitants who were retailers of oil—Pyrrias and Theophilos, which are probably Greek translations of Esau and Eldad.” Prof. Mahaffy adds in a footnote: “This evidence is by no means solitary. There was a Jewish section of the people of Psenuris, concerning whom I found the following (P.P., I, 43): εν τω πυρηνει πιντο | εις τα σποδοχια της κωμης | παρα των Ιουδαιων και των Ελληνων εκαστου σωματος | και τουτο λογευει δια | Δι[...] που του επιστεγου. I commend,” continues Prof. Mahaffy, “this fragment to Willrich, who has only quoted the evidence of the P.P. at second hand, and has missed this passage (Juden und Griechen, p. 151). Here is a tax of half a drachma set upon every slave belonging to any Jew or Greek in Psenuris. In one of the wills, dated 237 B.C., a man, whose name is Συρμη Ιωναθας, appears as owing the testator 150 (silver) drachmae. We have also on the back of a λογος χρωμων with assessments of value, dated in the thirty-seventh year of Philadelphus, της παρα Σιμωνος ουν σοι αν(τιγραφον) επιστολης αποσταλα (P.P., II, p. 18). Hence Simon was an official in the Fayyum in 248–7 B.C. These sporadic, but perfectly unsuspicious, bits of evidence are quite conclusive” (A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, pp. 92–3).

Wendland makes an ingenious and acute point when he tries to show that Aristeas was acquainted with the Prologue of the Greek translation of Sirach (“written about 130”). Here are his parallels (Preface to his Greek Aristeas, p. xxvii):—
Prologue to Sirach.

But is not the inference just the reverse of Wendland's? The kind of literature referred to by the translator of Sirach is precisely of the Aristeas type. Of the verbal identities, two out of three are common usages of Aristeas. It is also argued that had the Siracid known of the glories attaching to the suggested initiation of the LXX he must have alluded to them. On the contrary, he can hardly be expected to so depreciate his own private work as to draw a contrast between it and the public fame of the LXX. He particularly brings into prominence the fact that his translation was made on his own personal initiative. On the other side, not only is Aristeas illustrated (Thackeray, p. 502) by 3 Macc. (which I hold to be contemporary, see J. Q. R., X, 39), but I think that there are some slight confirmations of Aristeas's story in 1 and 2 Macc.

In 2 Macc. v. 16, among the spoils taken by Antiochus IV are τα υπὸ πολλὰν βασιλέων ἀνασταθήνα πρὸς άθέσαν καὶ δόσαν τοῦ τίτου καὶ τιμήν. This is illustrated by the gifts of Ptolemy II described by Aristeas. Cf. his phrase: ἄπαστα φιλομηβίνετε εἰς ἵπποχὴν δόχησα τοῦ βασιλέως ποιήσα (W., § 79, Th., p. 533). Even more clear seems to me to be the reference in 1 Macc. i. 22, a passage which has given very much trouble to commentators, but seems to me explained by Aristeas. Cf. in the former καὶ τὰ φύλακα ... τὰ χρυσά ... καὶ τούς στεφάνους with Aristeas (ibid. and often) καὶ δι χρυσά φύλακα ... στεφάνους. The whole description of the table in Aristeas is important. Prof. Büchler holds its triangular design and its emblems as Dionysian (Omiaden, &c., p. 198) and thus appropriate to Ptolemy II. Prof. Mahaffy has a very interesting note on another aspect of this splendid work of art: "While the ornaments (of the shew-bread table), all worked in gold and precious stones, contained both Greek and Egyptian patterns—the egg and dart along the edge, the lily or lotus for the legs—there was a careful avoidance of any human or animal forms in all the design. This, which Josephus (=Aristeas) does not specially note, seems to imply that the design was really intended for its peculiar place in the Jewish temple" (Greek Life and Thought, p. 509). Side-lights of this kind, in favour of Aristeas, are numerous. Willrich audaciously says (p. 35): "Von einem Raffinement in der Reproduction
ptolemaischer Zustände ist also nichts vorhanden, dagegen fehlt es nicht an groben Schnitzern." Contrast with this Nestle's remark: "Dass der Aristeasbrief in vielen Einzelheiten genaueste Kenntnisse der Verhältnisse der Ptolemäerzeit beweist, bestätigen die Papyrusfunde mehr und mehr" (Hauck-Herzog, s.v. Bibelübersetzungen, pp. 3-4).

Even more emphatic is Ulrich Wilcken, who produces the minutest confirmation of the reference in Aristeas (§ 298, Th., p. 570) to the daily records kept by Ptolemy's officials; a cross between the business gazette and the Court Journal. Wilcken conceives that the narrative of Aristeas is a fiction, but that the writer placed it in an accurate setting. But is this true of an ancient writer? Rather, the genuineness of the frame proves the genuineness of the picture. But here are Wilcken's own words, worthy of being specially brought into contrast with Willrich's error: "Ich erinnere daran, dass wenn auch der Hauptgedanke dieser Schrift auf einer Fiction beruht, doch die Einzelheiten, die der Verfasser über die aegyptischen Verhältnisse nebenbei einfiessen lässt, durch die Urkunden in erstaunlicher Weise ihre Bestätigung finden (wie Lumbroso zuerst nachwies) und überhaupt so vortrefflich sind, dass man ihnen mit dem allergrösssten Vertrauen begegnen muss" (Philologus, LIII, 1894, p. 111). The complete confirmation respecting the written Journals (nára ἄνωρφεσθαι) also removes suspicion from another incident mentioned by Aristeas. It is, to my mind, no longer improbable that the king would communicate in writing with his librarian as Aristeas asserts, though Hody directs his satire against this very point.

So many of Aristeas' allusions have now been confirmed, that where there is no direct evidence against him his assertions can no longer be treated with contempt. But Aristeas is not to be relied on with regard to the names of his dramatis personae. Thus, there is no sufficient ground for accepting the existence of a high priest Eleazar, but though the correspondence between Jerusalem and Alexandria in Aristeas bears all the marks of artistic elaboration, such an embassy may well have taken place. There is no point in Jewish history more obscure than the order of the High Priests, and it is inevitable rather than disappointing that Schürer in his new edition (I, 182) has little if anything to add. Willrich's remarks (Juden und Griechen, p. 107 sq.) certainly indicate some of the difficulties, but the author, as Schürer rightly says: "zwar über das Ziel hinaus schiesst." (The Simon of 3 Macc. is certainly not Simon the Just as Willrich assumes, p. 111.) Cheyne in 1891 (Origin of Psalter) held (p. 144) that under Ptolemy Philadelphus "it is in a high degree credible that the captives were released [as Aristeas asserts], and that on hearing of the glad news and receiving the rich presents intended for the temple, the Jews at
once offered sacrifices and public prayer for the gracious monarch."

Hitzig sees in Ps. lxxii a reference to this, and Cheyne (though he does not adopt this view) thinks the theory plausible enough.

May he give doom to thy people in righteousness,
And to thine afflicted ones according to right.
Before him let foemen bow,
And let his enemies lick the dust...

*Because* he delivers the needy when he cries,
The afflicted also who has no helper.—Psalm lxxii. 4, 12.

So, too, Mahaffy (*Greek Life and Thought*, p. 508) says of the release of the captives: "There seems to be some basis for this story." It is not easy to speak confidently, but the view of Dr. Büchler (p. 225) that the release points to the Roman period does not seem probable. It is clearly not unlikely that Philadelphus desired to make Judaea his basis for an attack on Syria. Hence he would use every means to win the affection of the Jews. As to Eleazar, Cheyne conjectures (ibid. p. 170) that this High Priest was the author of Psalm xlv, written upon the marriage of Philadelphus to Arsinoe daughter of the Thracian king Lysimachus. The Arsinoe, however, of the letter of Eleazar in Aristeas is the *second* Arsinoe, the king's sister. Aristeas has been accused of ignorance regarding Arsinoe on very inadequate grounds. Wendland (in *Pseudepigr.* p. 1) says that while the author of Aristeas knew that the second Arsinoe was Philadelphus' sister-wife, he did not know that she was childless. Is this so?

Aristeas simply makes Eleazar refer to ἡ βασιλείασα 'Αρσινόη, ἡ ἄδελφη, καὶ τὰ τίκνα (§§ 41 and 185; Thackeray, pp. 527, 551). Now Ptolemy had children by the first Arsinoe, and when the second Arsinoe found herself childless, she "advised or acquiesced in the adoption of her step-children, of whom the eldest was therefore declared crown prince." (Mahaffy, *History of Egypt*, p. 76). The phrase καὶ τὰ τίκνα seems specially chosen in Aristeas as avoiding the suggestion that the children are Arsinoe's own offspring. Again, Wendland thinks that Aristeas (§ 180, Th., p. 550) transforms Philadelphus' defeat at Cos into a brilliant victory. But (a) would Philadelphus admit himself defeated at Cos? True, Antigonus won a victory, but not over the Egyptian fleet. It is by no means certain that Theocritus wrote his Idyll xvii before Antigonus' victory. (b) Cos is not named, why may not Aristeas refer to Philadelphus' sea-victory at Andros in 247? (Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 490). True this brings us very near Philadelphus' death, but if the compiler of the Letter of Aristeas lived under the fourth Ptolemy, this would still leave ample time for the reference. With regard
to Aristeas's references to Theopompos (§ 314, Th., p. 572), Theodektes (§ 315, Th., p. 573), and Menedemos (§ 201, Th., p. 554), Wendland seems right in accusing Aristeas of inaccuracy. The case with regard to Menedemos is not so certain, for even Willrich (p. 35) admits that "die Einführung des Philosophen Menedemos nach dem Seesieg des Philadelphos über Antigonos mag noch hingenommen." Wendland rightly suspects the list of names of the seventy-two given by Aristeas, but he quite fails to make out his case that the Letter was written between 96 and 63 B.C. Every requirement is met by assuming a date about 200 B.C. at latest. And, as regards the authenticity and credibility of the story, the evidence that has accumulated is all so favourable to Aristeas, that the attempt to discredit him by criticism of details can no longer be made with effect. Aristeas must stand or fall by our verdict as to his general and central statements.

We may now proceed to face the main question, and to consider the credibility of Aristeas in regard to the principal outlines of his story (cf. on this Swete, Introduction, pp. 16–22, a work which places all students of the LXX under the deepest obligations). These outlines are (1) that the translation of the Pentateuch was made in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus; (2) that the version was instigated by Demetrius of Phalerum and the king; (3) that the Hebrew Scrolls and the translators were imported from Jerusalem; and (4) that the translation, when finished, was welcomed alike by Jews and Greeks. The full consideration of (1) would carry us too deep into the history of the LXX, but it is now very generally held that Aristeas' assertion as to the date or the Greek version of the Pentateuch is absolutely accurate. Graetz stands almost alone in placing this part of the LXX so late as Philometor, but Swete's reply that the rendering of מְדַדְרָת הַשָּׁמַע (Lev. xxiii. 11) by γὰς ἵππαρχον τῆς πρῶτης betrays the hand, not of a Pharisaic translator, but of a Pharisaic corrector, is perhaps met by Graetz's note in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III, p. 154. As regards (2) Aristeas cannot be so easily justified. It is now held that the LXX grew out of the needs of the Alexandrian Jews themselves, and that Aristeas is romancing when he ascribes the work to royal initiative. Many moderns go so far as to modify this condemnation by admitting that "it is not improbable that the king encouraged the work of translation with the view of promoting the use of the Greek language by the settlers (cf. Mommsen, PROVINCES, II, p. 164), as well for the purpose of gratifying his own curiosity" (Swete, p. 20). It would serve little to cite the numerous writers who see no improbability in the part assigned by Aristeas to Ptolemy II (cf. Mahaffy, Greek Life and Thought, p. 508, and Empire of Ptolemies, p. 180, but contrast his later view in Hist. of Egypt,
The real ground for disbelieving Aristeas’s statement is his introduction of Demetrius of Phalerum, though it must be remembered that Aristobulus (if Eusebius’ citation be genuine), not only names Philadelphia and Demetrius, but also does this in an address to Philometor. Hence this part of the story was current at the Ptolemaic court in the middle of the second century B.C. Now Aristeas seems to make Demetrius royal librarian (κατασκευὴς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ βιβλιοθήκῃ), which he never was. Zenodotus and Eratosthenes were Philadelphia’s librarians. But K. Kuiper (who almost stands alone in making the fair and obvious suggestion that Aristeas, if he erred, may have done so from error and not from fraud), suggests that Aristeas does not call Demetrius προστάτην τῆς βιβλιοθήκης, and that the Letter might be true if Demetrius was librarian of the private royal collection (Mnemosyne, XX, 1892, pp. 250–272). This suggestion is not plausible, for Aristeas conveys the clear impression that he is referring to the museum and its annexes. Again, a fragment of Hermippus Callimachius (Müller, Frag. Hist. Graec., III, p. 47, frag. 50) informs us that Demetrius stood in ill favour with Philadelphus, and was banished by him. Hermippus is not to be quite so readily accepted against Aristeas as many critics do (e.g. Susemihl, II, p. 606; I, p. 138). As Müller says of him, and is quite certain (p. 36): “Multa enim in fragmentis occurrunt, quae aperte falsa sunt.” Still the facts about Demetrius are, in our present state of knowledge, a serious difficulty in the way of believing Aristeas. Dr. Swete, to a certain extent, saves the situation by his clever suggestion (p. 19) that “if Demetrius took part in the inception of the LXX, he must have done so during the reign of Soter. This is not in itself improbable. He had taken refuge in Egypt as early as B.C. 307, and for many years had been a trusted adviser of the first Ptolemy; and it is not unlikely that the project of translating the Jewish law was discussed between him and the royal founder of the Alexandrian library, and that the work was really due to his suggestion, though his words did not bear fruit till after his death.” Cf. Plutarch, Apophthegm. viii Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς Πτολεμαῖρ τῷ βασιλείᾳ παρῆνε τὰ περὶ βασιλείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας βιβλία κτάσιν καὶ διαγγελεσθέναι. Hence Aristeas may have followed a genuine tradition in associating Demetrius with the work, though his exact statements cannot be reconciled with the counter-statement of Hermippus. Before leaving this point, it must be said that several Jewish critics refuse to believe that the Alexandrian Jews themselves took the initiative in the matter of the Greek version. Friedmann
RECENT CRITICISM OF THE LETTER OF ARisteas

(Onkelos und Akylas, 1896, p. 5 seq.) stoutly maintains the theory of a royal intervention in the matter. Graetz (in the article apparently overlooked by Swete, but cited above) thinks that "positive proof exists that the translator avoided the plain rendering, and substituted another less likely to excite prejudice—out of deference to a Greek ruler" (J. Q. R., III, p. 152). In Deut. xvii. 14–19, which deals with the election of a ruler, the word יִבְעֵץ occurs three times, and in each case the LXX renders, not βασιλεύς, but ἀρχων (Aq., Theod., and Symm. all have βασιλεύς). Now let us look at the passage in Deuteronomy: "When thou... shalt say, I will set over me a king, thou shalt set a king over thee: one from amongst thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee. Thou mayest not put a foreigner over thee who is not thy brother." Graetz argues on this as follows: "A delicacy of feeling prevented him rendering the sentence, Thou shalt not appoint a stranger king over thee, literally, or mentioning the throne of his fatherland. How shall we account for this variation if we do not assume that the translator's respect for the foreign ruler to whose government the Jews were at the time subject, restrained him from letting the king read that, according to their Scriptures, the Jews were to select their ruler (rather king) from their own body? And this is equivalent to the admission that the translation was prepared with special reference to a sovereign of Alexandria. It was assumed that he would glance at the version of Deuteronomy, as of the rest of the Pentateuch, and care was therefore taken to omit phrases that might give umbrage. The pith of Aristeas's letter would thus be confirmed, viz. that an Alexandrian king gave his countenance to a translation of the Pentateuch." As an interesting curiosity one may here refer to Prof. D. S. Margoliouth's suggestion (Lines of Defence, ch. I) that the Greek version of the Song of Solomon was much liked by Ptolemy Philadelphus because the royal lover and his bride frequently call each other brother and sister.

Closely connected, though certainly not identical with the strong doubts as to the royal initiative, there arise serious difficulties against accepting Aristeas's statements with regard to the nationality of the translators. Prof. Swete is very emphatic on this point, and leaves no loophole for escape from the conviction that Aristeas conveyed a falsehood when he reported that the translators of the Pentateuch were Palestinians. "The Greek of the Alexandrian Pentateuch is Egyptian, and, as far as we can judge, not such as Palestinian translators would have written" (p. 20). He contrasts the Greek of the Palestinian translator of Sirach, the clumsy Greek of the prologue, the stiff artificiality of the book, with the simple style of the Pentateuch. (Yet Wendland, as we have seen above, thinks the style
of Aristeas, undoubtedly an Alexandrian, similar to the prologue of the Palestinian Siracid.)

That the latter [the LXX Pentateuch] is mainly the work of Alexandrian Jews appears from more than one consideration. An older generation of Biblical scholars pointed to the occurrence in the LXX, and especially in the Pentateuch, of such words of Egyptian origin as δύναμις (Gen. xlii. 2), κόσμος (Gen. xliiv. 2), Ἰσραήλ (Lev. xi. 17; Deut. xiv. 16), βύσως (Exod. xxv-xxxix passim), and such characteristically Egyptian terms as διδοξος, διδοξος (ἴδιος), ἰδιοτικὸς, ἰδιοτικὸς, and the like. The argument is not conclusive, since after the time of Alexander the LXX contained elements drawn from different localities. But recent discoveries in Egypt have yielded a criterion of Egyptian Greek which has been applied to the LXX with definite results. In 1892 Professor Mahaffy was able to write: "in the vocabulary of the papyri we find a closer likeness to the Greek of the LXX than to any other book I could name." This statement has been abundantly justified by the publication of Deissmann's Bibelstudien (Marburg, 1895), and Neue Bibelstudien (1897), where a number of the peculiar or characteristic words and forms of the LXX are shown to have been in common use among Egyptian Greeks of the third and second centuries B.C. The vocabulary and style of the LXX will be treated in a later chapter; for the present it is enough to say that they are such as to discredit the attribution of the Greek Pentateuch to a company consisting exclusively or chiefly of Palestinian Jews. The LXX as a whole, at any rate the earlier part of the collection, is a monument of Alexandrian Greek as it was spoken, by the Jewish colony in the Delta under the rule of the Ptolemies.

The force of this contention is almost irresistible: almost, but not quite. Aristeas tells a story of rolls written in letters of gold and sent to the king by the High Priest. "This story," says Dr. Swete, "may be dismissed at once, it belongs to the picturesque setting of the romance." But there is some Rabbinic confirmation that the χρυσογραφία (Ar., § 176, Th., p. 549) was associated with scrolls of the law used in Alexandria. The statement in Aristeas confuses the whole MS. with the divine name. The name of God (according to Tract. Soferim, I, 10) was so written in an Alexandrian codex, and from Josephus' remark as to the "name of God inscribed in sacred characters" on the High Priest's forehead (Antiq., III, vii, 6), added to Aquila's custom of writing the Tetragrammaton in the ancient Hebrew script, we may infer that the name of God was often specially distinguished. Evidently Josephus found nothing incredible in the story, and L. Löw (Graphische Requisiten bei den Juden, 1870, p. 162) holds the incident as accurate, "Sie ist ein glaubwürdiges Zeugniss, dass man sich gegen Ende der Periode des zweiten
Tempels der Goldschrift bediente." He even thinks that the use of gold-illumination was an original Jewish invention (p. 161). The passage in *Tract. Soferim* runs thus: אֵין מָצוּתָה בַּת הָעִבְרִית מְזוֹעֶה אֲלֵם כֹּל אֱלֹהִים שלומְּלֹת. וַיְהִי לוֹ אֵין מָצוּתָה בַּת הָעִבְרִית (MSS. שְׁחֵי לֶלֶךָ אֱלֹהִים חֶבְּרוֹת). Meller (in his edition, note 54) thinks that this is a direct reference to Aristeas, but Friedmann (*Onkelos und Akylas*, p. 24) thinks that the phrase הוא מָצוּתָה אֲלֵם כֹּל אֱלֹהִים חֶבְּרוֹת implies an accidental case and not an historical instance. It may be hazardous to suggest that there is in 1 Macc. iii. 48 an underlying attack on such illumination of Bible scrolls, but the passage seems to me to bear that meaning.

Though, however, Dr. Swete dismisses the gold-written scroll as a romantic invention, he thinks that "there is nothing improbable in the statement that the Hebrew rolls were freshly brought from Jerusalem, for communication between Jerusalem and Alexandria was frequent during the reigns of the earlier Ptolemies." If this be so, and we know that it was, why should not the Greek of Palestinian Jews be strongly Alexandrian in vocabulary? The contrast with the Siracide does not weaken this supposition. He translated a full century after the LXX Pentateuch, and in the meantime Judaea had passed from Egyptian into Syrian hands, and a temporary reaction had occurred against the familiar use of Greek in Jerusalem. Lumbroso, who also holds with Swete that the translators of the Pentateuch were Alexandrians, nevertheless thinks (*Recherches*, p. xxxi) that it is to the last immigrants rather than to the old settlers that the translation was due. The LXX is Alexandrian in vocabulary, but Hebraic in syntax. "The manner of the LXX," says Dr. Swete (p. 299), "is not Greek, and does not even aim at being so. It is that of a book written by men of Semitic descent, who have carried their habits of thought into their adopted tongue. The translators write Greek largely as they doubtless spoke it; they possess a plentiful vocabulary and are at no loss for a word, but they are almost indifferent to idiom, and seem to have no sense of rhythm. Hebrew constructions and Semitic arrangements of the words are at times employed, even when not directly suggested by the original." If we suppose a body of Palestinian translators at work in Alexandria, with local Alexandrian Jews to help them, is not this precisely what would result? The vocabulary of the translation would be Alexandrian, the style and idioms Palestinian; and this is what the LXX is. If it be true that (as the final note to the LXX Esther asserts) the Greek translation of Esther was the work of a Palestinian, then the case for a Palestinian influence on the LXX Pentateuch is much strengthened. For the LXX Esther is thoroughly Alexandrian in vocabulary, and
in its use of technical terms (Jacob, _ZATW_, 1890, p. 280), but, adds Jacob, p. 290 (and most must agree with him): "Die Uebersetzung (of Esther) ist in Aegypten verfasst." Still the fact remains, as Cornill, _Einleitung in das AT_, p. 297 (ed. 1891), points out, that "an allen Stellen, wo von den Uebersetzern etwas Nâheres angegeben wird, Palästinenser als solche erscheinen," and he cites with apparent approval Buhl’s conclusion (_Kanon und Text des AT_, p. 124): "Wirklich werden wohl in den meisten Fällen die Palästinenser besser Griechisch verstanden haben, als die eingeborenen ägyptischen Juden Hebräisch." The evidence of the papyri must clearly weaken our belief in Palestinian influence on the LXX Pentateuch, but it does not seem to me to justify us in pronouncing this part of the story of Aristeas a fiction. He wrote a full half century after the event, and his information may have been defective. He does not emphasize sufficiently perhaps the part played in the LXX version by local Jews, though his remark (§ 302, Th., p. 571) ῥῶ δὲ ἐκ τῆς συμφωνίας γνωμενον πρεπόντως ἀναγραφῆς αὐτῶς Εὐγέχας παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου hints at local intervention in producing the final result. As to (4), the welcome accorded to the rendering by Greeks and Jews, Dr. Swete sees no ground for doubting Aristeas. "The welcome accorded to the Greek version by the Jews of Alexandria," he says (p. 22), "was doubtless as Aristeas represents, both cordial and permanent; nor need we doubt that Philadelphus and his scholars approved what had been done." The subsequent feelings in Jewish circles regarding the LXX have no bearing on the Letter of Aristeas.

I. ABRAHAMS.
THE GENEALOGIES OF BENJAMIN

(NUM. xxvi. 38-40, 1 Chron. vii. 6 ff., viii. i ff.).

1. The Genealogy in Numbers and Genesis.— Num. xxvi. 38-40 gives the following genealogy of Benjamin.

Benjamin

i. Bela
ii. Ashbel
iii. Ahiram
iv. Shephupham
v. Hupham

Ard
Naaman

In Gen. xlvi. 21 the list is somewhat fuller and differently arranged. In the fuller text of the LXX it stands thus:

Benjamin

i. Bela
ii. Becher
iii. Ashbel

Gera
Naaman
Ahiram
Shephupham
Huppm
Ard

In 1 Chron. vii. 6 ff.—A very divergent list is to be found in 1 Chron. vii. 6 ff. It agrees with the list just given in ascribing to Benjamin only three sons, and deriving from these the individual branches. The last of the three, however, is not Ashbel (better Ishbel = Ishba'el, "Man of Baal"), but Jediasel (יְדֵיָשֶל), which is therefore apparently a kind of translation of Ishbel in which is sub-
stituted for the divine name Baal, one that was less objectionable. The verbal adjective בָּאָל does not occur in the Old Testament, but must have meant "intimate friend." Jediael accordingly is practically equivalent to the Arabic תַּאֲלִיָּה (l-lat), the common designation of Abraham.

The text reads in general smoothly. In verse 10 the words, “and the sons of Bilhan; Jeish and Benjamin” (בִּלְחָן יְהִיַּשׁ וּבֵית), are to be taken as a parenthesis. The names that follow are still sons of Jedial. Verse 12 is a kind of appendix: “Shuppim” and “Huppim” are here sons of Ir (יִרָה; in ver. 7 יִרְיָה, שֵׁם esp. = יִרְיָה), the youngest son of Bela. The next words, אָבִית בִּנְי איַד, EV “Hushim, the sons of Aher,” are corrupt. There can be no doubt that Hushim in turn is to be assigned to the youngest son of Jedial, whose name in ver. 10 is given as Ahishahar. We may conjecture, however, that Ahishahar (אִישָּׁחַær) is a modification of Ahihor (אִישָּׁחוֹר, “my brother is Horus”) made for the purpose of eliminating the name of the foreign god. We should therefore read “Hushim, son of Ahihor” (אִשָּׁחַær, בֶּן). Thus we can easily account for the meaningless “Aher” in ver. 12 (אֶר) for (אֶר). It should be noted also that the remarkable name Tarshish (תָּרָשֶׁשׁ) in ver. 10 becomes in יִבְּרָשֶׁשׁ—i.e., in Hebrew (תָּרָשֶׁשׁ) a thoroughly Egyptian name. Besides some post-exilic names of persons (Uzzi, יֶשֶׁל; Eliezer, אֵלְיֶזֶר; Eleoenai, אֵלְיוֹנָא; and the enigmatical “Jeremoth,” יַרְמוֹת), the list of “sons” contains two names of places: Anathoth, עֲנָתֹת, and Alemeth, עַלְמָת (1 Chron. vi. 45); but the text is probably corrupt: for “and Jeremoth and Abiahs,” אַרְמֶתָּח, and Anathoth and Alamoth,” read, “And Jarmuth (he built Anathoth and Alemeth, or he was the father of Anathoth and Alemeth)” 1.

The whole list, 1 Chron. vii. 6-12, will therefore stand as on opposite page.

1 Compare “Jehiel, son of . . . .” (יַהֲלֶל), 1 Chron. xxvii. 3a, with the parallel “Ishbaal of Beth Camon” (יִשְׁבַּאל בֵּית קָמָן) in 2 Sam. xxiii. 8: for the emendation see the present writer’s Fundamente israelitischen u. jüdischer Geschichte, p. 15 f), where Jehiel (יַךְיֶל) is a translation of Ishbaal (יִשְׁבַּאל read as כֶּלֶל).
3. **The genealogy in 1 Chron. viii. 1-40.**—Greater importance attaches to the list in 1 Chron. viii. This has been treated already by H. W. Hogg in so admirable a manner that I can for the most part adopt his results in their entirety. Of the greatest importance is his acute discovery that verses 30-40 contain the genealogy of the b’në Becher, the Benjamite clan to which, as the present writer had sought to show, Saul belonged. Hogg maintains with justice against an assertion of Eduard Meyer’s, that this passage, which

---

1. See note 1, p. 344.
2. Compare the name of one of the “Judges,” Ibzan, בֶּן זִיַּן (מל הָאָב), of Bethlehem (Judges xii. 8, 10).
3. MT יִרְשָׁד. Compare the south Arabian זִירִשְׁדָּא, and the Canaanite Zimrida (Tell Amarna tablets) — זִירְשָׁדָא.
4. Identical with the Horite clan Bilhan (Gen. xxxvi. 27).
5. Compare the Edomite clan in Gen. xxxvi. 5, 14, 18.
6. A variant of the preceding name.
7. MT יַרְשַׁד. Compare the south Arabian זַירְשַׁדָא, and the Canaanite Zimrida (Tell Amarna tablets) — זַירְשַׁדָא.
8. MT יַרְשַׁד. Compare the south Arabian זִירְשָׁדָא, and the Canaanite Zimrida (Tell Amarna tablets) — זִירְשָׁדָא.
9. MT יַרְשַׁד. Compare the south Arabian זִירְשָׁדָא, and the Canaanite Zimrida (Tell Amarna tablets) — זִירְשָׁדָא.
11. According to Hogg, 30-38.
recurs in ix. 36-44, is in its proper place in chap. viii; only, verses 28 and 29 have been imported from ix. 34, 35. The present position of verses 30-40 in chap. 8, however, is probably not original. Becher is, according to Gen. xlii. 21, 1 Chron. vii. 6, and the original text of 1 Chron. viii. 1, the second son of Benjamin. Accordingly we should look for his descendants immediately after the sons of Bela enumerated in verses 3 and 5 (see below), and there is where they probably in fact originally stood. Thence they were inserted in chap. ix (36 ff.), the last two verses (viii. 39, 40) being omitted by a mistake. Hogg has allowed himself to be misled by an assertion of Eduard Meyer's¹ (that verse 39 is the direct continuation of verse 27) into disconnecting verses 39 and 40 from the genealogy of Saul, and finds in the “sons of Eshek” (יְשֵׂע), by a hazardous conjecture, the descendants of Shua (יוֹשֵׁע), a son of Gera, whose name he happily restores in verse 4. The LXX *, however, shows that Shua is an inferior reading for Shema (יהָנָה), which is identical with “Shimei, son of Gera” (שֵׁמנָה בְּנֵגֶר) in 2 Sam. xvi. 5 ff., xix. 17 ff., 1 Kings ii. 36 ff., who would scarcely be still directly represented in post-exilic times. It is therefore quite accidental that verses 39 and 40 are not repeated with the rest in chap. ix. The whole passage viii. 30-40 was later transferred to the end of the chapter (viii) on account of its length, verses 28 and 29 being inserted from chap. ix.

To convey a clearer idea of the structure of the chapter, we give an attempted restoration of it based on Hogg's work. Its simplicity is in its favour. We shall give, A the English, B the Hebrew, C Notes on the Text.

A.

1 And Benjamin begat Bela, Becher, and Ishbel, and Ahiram, 2 and Naamah, and Gera. 3 And Bela had sons: Addar and Shephuphan and Hupham. 30 And the sons of Becher: [Abdon and] Zur and Baal and Ner and Kish 31 [and Gedor] and his brothers Zechariah and Mikloth. 32 And Mikloth begat Shimeah. 33 And Ner begat Kish, and Kish begat Saul, and Saul begat Jonathan (and Malchi-shua and Abinadab and Ishbaal). 34 And the son of Jonathan was Meribah, and Meribaal begat Micah. 35 And the sons of Micah were Pithon and Melek and Tahrea and Ahaz. 36 And Ahaz begat Jehoaddah, and Jehoaddah begat Alemeth and Azmaveth and Zimri. And Zimri begat Moza. 37 And Moza begat Baana: Raphaeliah his son, Eleasah his son, Ezel his son. 38 And Ezel had six sons, and these are their names: Azrikam his firstborn, and Ishmael and Sheariah, and Obadiah, and Hanan. All these were the sons of Ezel. 39 And the

¹ Die Entstehung des Judentums, 161, n. 2. * Die Αβέσιώμας (Δαλι Αβεσιώνε)
sons of Eshek his brother: Ulam his firstborn, Jeush the second, and Eliphelet the third. 40 And the sons of Ulam were mighty men of valour, archers, and had many sons and sons' sons, an hundred and fifty.

3 And Gera was the father of Ehud and the father of Shimei. 6 And these are the sons of Ehud; these are heads of clans of the inhabitants of Geba and Jiglom unto Manahath (?). 7 And he begat Uzza and Ahihor. 8 And Ahihor begat in the plateau of Moab of his concubine, whose name was Baara, Hushim. 9 And he begat of Hodesh his wife Jobab and Zibia and Measha, and Milcom and Jeuz and Sachiah and Mirmah. These are his sons, heads of their clans.

11 And Hushim begat Abitub and Elpaal 13 and Beriah and Shimei—these were heads of clans of the inhabitants of Aijalon; they put to flight the inhabitants of Gath—and their brothers (were) Shishak and Jeremoth.

12, 17, 18 And the sons of Elpaal: Eber, and Meshullam and Hizki [and Heber] and Jishmerai, (he built Ono and Lud and its daughters). And Jigaliah and Jobab, 15 and Zebadiah and Arad [and Eder], 16 and Michael and Ishpah and Joha (were) the sons of Beraiah.

19 And Jakim and Zichri [and Zabdi] 20 and Elioenai and Zillethai and Eliel 21 and Adaiah and Beraiah and Shimrath, the sons of Shimei.

22 And Ishpan and Ebed and Eliel 23 and Abdon and Zichri and Hanan 24 [and Hananiah] and Elam and Anthothijah (?) 25 and Iphdeiah and Peniel, the sons of Shashak.

26 And Jishmerai, and Shehariah and Athaliah 27 and Jareshiah and Eliah and Zichri, the sons of Shimshai.

40 All these were of the sons of Benjamin.
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MT adds ₩ (see Hogg, J. Q. R., XI, 109 with note 4).

* So Hogg, § 8; MT ס fica l. ₩ = רכבר, where א has taken the place of an objectionable divine name (ל or ו?).

Gen. xli. 21, Num. xxvi. 38 מיאה. MT adds רכבר.

* So Hogg, § 8; MT ס fica l, = דעומ, = דעומ; cp. ₩ ס fica l = דעומ; ₩ ס fica l = דעומ. Gen. xli. 21, Num. xxvi. 38 מeah. MT as usual adds רכבר.
MT אֲבִיאֵל (אַבִּיאֵל) for אֵלֶּה (אֵלֶּה) (Hogg, § 8). MT adds כֹּל חוֹזֵה (cp. 1). The corrupt group כֹּל חוֹזֵה was emended on the margin thus: זוֹר (זֹּר) (Hogg, § 8), which made its way into the text in ver. 4, 5 and again, as אַבִּיאֵל, in ver. 7 (cp. Hogg, § 8). Here the divine name אֵל is displaced by לוֹ.

So Hogg, § 8; MT דֵּד, לֵוָה, טִּשְׁוָא = טִּשְׁוָא; Num. xxvi. 39 לוֹוָה, Gen. xlvii. 21 לוֹו.

So Hogg, § 11; MT בּוֹנֵי הָעֱבָד (Verses 30–38 are repeated in ix. 36–44.) Before these words are inserted from ix. 34 f. the following sentences:

And the divine name אֵל is displaced by לוֹ.

So Hogg, § 8; MT דֵּד, לֵוָה, טִּשְׁוָא = טִּשְׁוָא. This has made its way into the text at ver. 31.

MT אֲבִיאֵל לֵוָה, אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל בּוֹנֵי הָעֱבָד (Aba kai Kais kai Baalakaym) kai Abiel (Nada®). In ix. 36 MT has לֵוָה, kais kai Baalakaym, where the place of Kish's father אביאל of 1 Sam. ix. 1. לוֹ is a correction of לוֹ and corresponds to the לו of ver. 33. The persons here named were originally connected genealogically and are here made brothers wrongly. An indication of their real relation is preserved in לוֹוָה—i.e. לוֹוָה—in ver. 32, which can refer only to Kish. The original text probably read: לוֹוָה כֹּל חוֹזֵה (עֶבֶד) אֲבִיאֵל לֵוָה בּוֹנֵי הָעֱבָד; so also לוֹוָה נֵר (Aba kai Kais kai Baalakaym) kai Abiel (Nada®). The statement (ver. 33) that Ner was the father of Kish, and therefore the grandfather of Saul, rests on a misunderstanding of 1 Sam. xiv. 50: אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל אֲבִיאֵל (father's brother) was referred to Abner instead of Abner's father Ner, and then according to the present text of Samuel, Abiel was made father of Ner alone: thus—

Abiel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

instead of

Abiel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

viii. 31 MT אֲבִיאֵל, סֵלָלָה, סֵלָלָה, סֵלָלָה, סֵלָלָה.

MT omits סֵלָלָה in ver. 31. There is a סֵלָלָה among David's heroes (1 Chron. xxvii. 4).
In ix. 38 MT has סַמּוֹא, whose form is peculiar. MT adds שְׁמֹאָה. It would seem that the sixth should be Eshek, in which case we should read, in ver. 39, "their brother," instead of וּשְׁמֹא "his brother."

Only five are mentioned. It would seem that the sixth should be Eshek, in which case we should read, in ver. 39, "their brother," instead of וּשְׁמֹא "his brother."

The true pronunciation of the name שְׁמֹא in Judges iii. 15 ff. (מַשְׁמֹא) is וּשְׁמֹא, an abbreviation of שְׁמֹא, an abbreviation of נַשָּׁמָא; cp. מַשְׁמֹא, ii. 15, 15, see Marquart, Fundamental israelitischer u. jüdischer Geschichte, 24).

The reference is to מַשְׁמֹא בֶּן נָו (2 Sam. xvi. 5).

MT has שְׁמֹא. MT has שְׁמֹא. MT has שְׁמֹא. MT has שְׁמֹא. MT has שְׁמֹא. MT has שְׁמֹא. MT has שְׁמֹא. MT has שְׁמֹא.
The genealogy is therefore as shown in the accompanying table.

J. Marquart.
NOTE ON J. Q. R., XIV, PAGES 26 SQQ.

MAY I offer a few remarks on Dr. Skinner’s interesting and careful description of a newly acquired Samaritan MS.? There is nothing of importance to add to what he has said, but after working at this literature for many years, perhaps I may be able to throw light on a few minor points.

In explaining the later colophon, on pp. 27, 28, it is important to remember that the author is thinking in Arabic, is trying to write in Hebrew and often slips into Aramaic. In יַּעַרְבָּה (line 2) therefore he probably has in mind the Arabic עזרה, but the meaning is no doubt “restoration” as Dr. Skinner translates. In 1.6 “speedily” is quite right: כיָרָב or כיָרוּב is often used in this sense. יַעַרְבָּה is the Aramaic emphatic form (which always ends in מ not א) and is the Arabic 적용 (not “his servant”), an ordinary general way for a writer to describe himself. L. 9,نشر יֲנַחֲבַת יִסְדֵר is not “Shammash of the sacred school,” but “servant of the holy law.” מכבר אַבּוֹ is the ordinary phrase for the famous roll of the law supposed to have been written by Abisha, which is almost personified, so that it is sometimes even called אָבִישָה. He therefore naturally calls himself the servant of our master the law. Used alone, צַר טוֹרָה = macro. “The great name” is of course the Tetragrammaton. L. 10, יָעַר מ I think means “by order of.” L. 11, יְסֶר is rare as a name, but common otherwise. It is used of God in the phrase יַצְרֵי צְרוֹי (in early MSS. more correctly יַצְרֵי צְרוֹי) adapted from the Targum on Exod. xv. 3 where פִּקְדַת כֶּרֶב should probably be emended to פיקד כֶּרֶב. The termination is participial: ואַשְּרֵי יְסֶר יִסְדַר, פִּקְדַת כֶּרֶב. Thus יָכַר is the Samaritan translation of the Arabic name אַשְּרֵי. L. 12, בַּעַמַּה might be a mistake for בַּעַמְּהָ, but בַּעַמְּהָ has become a sort of compound phrase for the holy law, and the writer probably means בַּעַמְּהָ קרָשַת והוֹרָה בַּעַמְּהָ in allusion to בַּעַמְּהָ (שמותי) (שם) (who) the name by which the Samaritans call themselves. L. 13, והוֹרָה is simply the Arabic חַלָּף אלְּהוֹנָּל, “may God make it up to him.” L. 17, Dr. Skinner points בַּעַמְּהָ, and this is no doubt the simplest way of taking it. I think, however, that the writer meant בַּעַמְּהָ and that the whole line is an expansion of the common phrase בַּעַמְּהָ קרָשַת והוֹרָה; “peace ... to the number of all that God created,” i.e. unbounded peace. In the acrostic on p. 31 can hardly be right, as that term is never applied to Moses. It probably should be (א) בַּעַמְּהָ.
The family of the writer will be best shown by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shlomoh (1783–1857)</th>
<th>Aaron</th>
<th>Amram (1809–circ. 1870)</th>
<th>Isaac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob (b. 1841)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHLOMOH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aaron was the eldest son of Shlomoh, but for some reason did not succeed his father, probably owing to mental disqualifications. The second son Amram became second priest with his father in 1827, a common practice in recent years. On the death of Shlomoh in 1857, Amram became head priest, and, since the succession properly belongs to the elder branch, he very rightly appointed his nephew Jacob second priest in the same year. On Amram’s death (I have not the date, but it was between 1861 and 1876) Jacob became head priest and made his cousin Isaac second priest—an arrangement which still continues. In 1894 Jacob had three sons, of whom the eldest, Joseph, then about 17 years of age, was mentally weak and was not to succeed to the priesthood.

The family of Seth-Aaron (Arab. מַחְרִיגָא נָאָסָר נַאָסָר) is well known from the colophons of MSS. The man נַאָסָר was the son of Isaac son of Joseph son of Joshua. His uncle, Joshua b. Joseph, copied the Bodleian MS. Samar. e. 5 in A.H. 1261.

In the colophon on pp. 30, 31, Abraham is the same person who twenty years later sold a MS. now in St. Petersburg, see Harkavy’s catalogue, p. 181. He is called there Abr. b. Seth, but signs his name Abr. b. Seth Aaron. He was only second priest, since the transaction took place (in A.H. 929) before Pinhas b. Eleazar, head priest at Damascus from 915 till 945, when he removed to Nablus where he died in 956. A son of this Abraham, named Abdallah, who was נמי or minister (Harkavy, ibid.), accompanied Pinhas in 945 as his secretary. They were a literary family. Seth-Aaron b. Isaac (it does not appear which of the two) wrote a hymn for Succoth (in the British Museum MS. Add. 19008, fol. 77); Abraham is probably the author of a few compositions and his son Abdallah wrote several pieces. With regard to the family of Abraham b. Sa’adah, my information is uncertain.

I hope the details of these obscure people are not too petty for consideration. They are difficult to collect, but perhaps the trouble is not altogether wasted if a little consecutive history is gained by it.

A. Cowley.
TWO JEWS BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL AND AN ENGLISH LAW COURT IN 1614–15.

In Mr. Lucien Wolf's essay on the Middle Age of Anglo-Jewish History enumerating the Jews who are known to have been in England between the Expulsion in 1290 and the Resettlement under Cromwell, there is a passing mention of a Jewish pirate, said to have been a servant of the king of Morocco, who was arrested at Plymouth in 1614. Mr. Wolf derives his information from a letter sent by Mr. John Chamberlain (the Horace Walpole of his day, as he is described by his biographer in the Dictionary of National Biography) to Sir Dudley Carleton, the British Ambassador at Venice. The Jewish "pirate" in question was Samuel Palache, a distinguished member of the Jewish community of Amsterdam, in which city he resided for many years as Envoy of the Sultan of Morocco to the States General. His arrest in England must have called forth considerable interest at the time: otherwise Mr. Chamberlain would not have written about it to his friend the ambassador. But the records relating to the case do not end with the arrest. There are printed below extracts from the manuscript volumes of Acts of the Privy Council showing that the Spanish Ambassador at the English Court tried hard to secure the punishment of Palache, and that the Lords of the Privy Council and the Judges defended him with spirit against the ambassador's demands.

The records here printed also mention the unsuccessful attempt of the Spanish Ambassador to secure the assistance of the Privy Council in a suit relating to a cargo of sugar which had been brought to England by another Jew.

The fact that two Jews received the protection of the Privy Council and the Law Courts in England in the reign of James I is of some importance in its bearing on the difficult question of the legal status of the Jews in England before the period of the Commonwealth.

1 Papers read at the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, p. 76.
2 For Mr. Chamberlain's letter, see p. 358 below.
3 Menasseh ben Israel (Hope of Israel, sect. 32) mentions that in 1609 Palache was "sent Ambassadour to the States by Mulai Zidan, the King of Maracco." For information as to Palache's position at Amsterdam, see D. Henriques de Castro, Auswahl von Grabsteinen auf dem Niederl.-Portug.-Israel.-Begräbnisplatz zu Ouderkerk.
TWO JEWS BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL IN 1614-15

ACTS OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

20th November, 1614.
To Sir William Craven, Alderman.

Whereas there is cause to make stay of Samuel Palachie who shall be herewith sent unto you, these shall be therefore to will and require you to receive him into your charge and custody, and to keep him safe until you shall receive further order from us, for which this shall be your warrant: and so, &c.

23rd December, 1614.

Whereas upon complaint heretofore made unto this Board by the Lord Ambassador of Spain now resident here that one Samuel Palache, a Jew, lately arrived at Plymouth had committed piracy and outrage upon the subjects of the King, his Master, for the which he required justice and satisfaction to be made, it was then thought fitting by their Lordships to give order for the restraint and safe keeping of the said Jew, and accordingly committed unto the custody of Sir William Craven, Knight, Alderman of the City of London, there to be detained until further examination of the said complaint, together with the quality of his offence. And, forasmuch as the said Palache hath since pretended and alleged that he is a servant unto the King of Barbary, and by him employed as his agent unto the States United, and that from the said King his Master he had received commission for the arming and setting forth of ships of war, by virtue of which commission (together with licence of the States United) he pretends the fact to be justifiable and no way within the compass of piracy. Whereupon it being conceived that the accusation and his justification must necessarily depend on matter of proof and points in law, Their Lordships for the more due proceeding therein and that justice may be uprightly and precisely administered on both sides, have thought fitting to remit the whole proceeding thereof unto the Court of the Admiralty, there to be prosecuted and determined according to law, whereof the Judge of the said Court of Admiralty is to take notice and give such due expedition therein, as shall be requisite. And to that end it is also ordered that a copy hereof be delivered unto the said Judge.

27th December.
A Letter to Sir Wm. Craven, Kt, Alderman of the City of London.

Whereas upon a complaint heretofore made unto us by the Spanish Ambassador against one Samuel Palache a Jew, it was thought fitting by this Board to commit him unto your charge and safe custody until further order should be given on that behalf,
and forasmuch as it is now ordered that the said Ambassador do prosecute his complaint by the due and ordinary course of law, these are to let you understand that from henceforth you are no further charged with the custody or safekeeping of the said Jew: and so, &c.

29 December, 1614.

To Sir Wm. Craven, Kt, Alderman of the City of London.

Whereas by letters from this Board bearing date the 27th of this month you received a discharge of the service lately imposed on you for the custody and safe keeping of one Samuel Palache, a Jew, and have nevertheless detained him in your house, by reason of an arrest immediately laid on him by process out of the Admiralty until you should receive further directions therein, these are to let you know that we do well approve of the stay you have so made of him, and do hereby require you to keep him in your custody until further order shall be given you in that behalf: and so, &c.

20th January, 1615.

Whereas by an order of this honourable Board bearing date the 23 of December last it was appointed that the cause concerning Samuel Palache the Jew accused of piracy by the Lord Ambassador of Spain should be referred wholly unto the Court of Admiralty, there to be prosecuted and determined according to law, for reasons in the said order expressed, which nevertheless had not yet his effect in respect of some doubts and difficulties intervening, which since are accommodated. It is therefore now again ordered that the said order of the 23 of December shall stand and be of force, whereof the Judge of the Admiralty is to take notice and give all expedition that conveniently may be unto the cause and that at the hearing thereof the Lord Chief Justice of England and Master of the Rolls are to be present. In the meantime until the matter be legally decided, the said Palache to remain with Sir Wm. Craven, Kt, aut libera custodiis, as now he doth.

20 March, 1615.

Upon complaint heretofore made unto this Board by the Spanish Ambassador now resident here that one Samuel Palache a Jew, being apprehended and brought unto the City of London had lately committed piracy, spoil and outrage at sea upon the subjects of the King his Master, wherein he desired justice and satisfaction, their Lordships were pleased to refer the consideration and hearing thereof unto Sir Edward Cooke Knight, Lord Chief Justice of England, Sir Julius Caesar, Knight, Master of the Rolls, and Sir Daniel Dunn, Knight, Judge of the Admiralty, who having heard the said accusation on the behalf of the said Spanish Ambassador, by his counsel learned in the law, together with the answer of the said Palache and
his counsel, have made report unto their Lordships that, forasmuch as it hath appeared unto them that Samuel Palache is born the subject of the King of Morrococos (between whom and the King of Spain, as is conceived, there is actual war) and hath from him an especial commission to take the subjects of the said King of Spain, they are of opinion that by the laws of the kingdom he is not subject unto any criminal demand or action for the said spoil or outrage, but that the said Spanish Ambassador is to be left to seek his remedy or restitution by way of a civil process or action. Whereupon the Lords were pleased to order by general consent of the Board that according to the opinion and report of the said Judges Palache should be freed from any criminal action commenced against him in name of the said Spanish Ambassador, but to be left to a civil prosecution or action upon point of restitution (if the said Lord Ambassador of Spain or his counsel shall resolve on that course), and that the said Palache, putting in good security before the Judge of the Admiralty to answer unto such civil action or actions as are or shall be commenced and prosecuted against him by the said Spanish Ambassador, for the said seizure or spoil committed by him on the persons and goods of the subjects of the King of Spain, forthwith to be released from his restraint and also his servants that be imprisoned upon this occasion.

October, 1615.

Answers made by the Lid* of His Mates Priuie Councell to the Memoriall exhibited vnto their Lid* the 17. days of Octob. by the Lo. Embassador of Spaigne.

1. First whereas ye sayd Lo. Embassadordesireth that ye Lid* Commiss* formerlie appointed by his Mates order for examining the matters concerning the Iewe Palache, and the dependances thereupon, would be pleased according to his Mates order, with as muche expedicion as their other affayres will give them leuse, to meete together and resolve vpon such points as were represented vnto them by the sayd Lo. Embassador, whereof some toucheth reputacion, &c.

Forasmuch as it seemed good vnto his Mates to referr the examination of that Cause vnto spetiall Commissioners persons of honor and greate integritie; It may please the sayd Lo. Embassador to receive his answer from themselves, who haue not yet made anie report thereof to this Boorde, but wilbe readie at anie time to give him all iust and honb*e satisfaccion and to Cause their orders and Comandm* to be putt in speedie execucion if hetherto they haue bene neglected, wherein they shall never want ye* assistance of this Table.

2. Secondly whereas his Lp mooved that the newe Cause of the other Iewe now latelie arrived wth Sugars may be remitted eyther to
the Censure of the foresayd Li's Commission, or suche other of the Councell as the Boord shall appoint; It may please him to vnderstand that it is a Cause of Civile Iustice and appertayning to the Court of Admiraltie and that of suche Causes this Boorde takes no Cognizance of their owne authoritie, otherwise then to Comaund that Iustice be donne wth expedicion, wth they have alreadie recommended vnto y* Judge of the Admiraltie, wth so strict a Charge and Commaund, as they doubt not but his L* shall finde y* effects of it to his contentment.

3. Thirdly whereas the sayd Lo. Embassador hath also mooved, that y* Sugars now in question be sequestred, into some Convenient warehouse vnder two keys, the one to be in y* Custody of some person to be appointed by the Councell, and the other to be in y* keeping of his L*, vntillye y* Cause be determined to ye ende that y* goods may be safe, &c.

Their Li's being very desirous to giue as muche satisfaction to his L* in this point, as Conveniently they may, have accorded that for the matter itself, that is the sequestration of the goods it shalbe presently performed, although in the manner propounded they are forced a litl to dissent; It being Contrarie to order and Custome (as they are Certainelie informed) that pendente lite a key should be deliered to eyther partie; But y* Sugars shalbe presently landed and an Inventorie made thereof in y* presence of suche persons as shalbe appointed by the sayd Lo. Embassador on the one side, and of the Iewehimself on the other side; of wth Inventoryes two Coppies indented shalbe made, the same to be subscribed by the persons so assigned for the sayd Lo. Embassador, and by the Iewehimself and to be deliered to eyther of them a Coppie reciprocally, wth being donne, the sayd goods to be in their presence deposited in some safe warehouse vnder two lockes wth seuerall keyes, the one key to be kept by the Judge of the Admiralitie, and the other by the officers and termo* of His Ma* Customes, vntill the matter be adjudged.

LIONEL ABRAMS.

Extract from Mr. Chamberlain's letter mentioned on page 354.

"Here is a Jew Pirat arrested that brought three prises of Spaniards into Plimmouth, he was set out by the King of Maroco, and useth Hollanders ships and for the most part theyre mariners, but yt is like he shall passe yt ouer well inough, for he pretendeth to haue leave and licence vnder the k's hand for his free egressse and regresse which was not beleued vpon the first sight, till he made profe of yt."

John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton, dated London. 4 Nov. 1614.

Diese Namen liegen vor in dem Satze⁵, aus welchen Buttenwieser die Namen Quietus der Sohn ⁶ des Macrinus und Kallistos machen möchte, das ist: Quietus der Sohn des Macrinus und Kallistos. Nun führt aber Aureolus, einer der sogenannten

---

1 Die hebräische Elia-Apokalypse, Leipzig, 1897.
2 P. 18, ed. Buttenwieser; p. 66 bei Jellinek, Beth-kamidrasch, III.
4 Graetz, Geschichte der Juden, IV, 3. Ausgabe, p. 455.
5 Warum der Sohn? Das ist ja nicht historisch!

B b 2
dreissig Tyrannen, gegen den jüngeren Macrianus¹ auch Krieg, und
dieser Aureolus und sein Gefährte Domitianus sollen mit den obigen
Namens gemeint sein; das ist Αὐρεόλος = Domitianus, 
Μακριάνος = Aureolus. Es leuchtet ein, dass die hebräischen Namen durchaus
nicht das besagen, was Buttenwieser aus ihnen herausliest. Dabei
macht er nicht einmal den Versuch, auch das Μακριάνος und
Μακρίνος des Textes zu erklären. Im Laufe unserer Untersuchung werden wir
noch Gelegenheit haben Einiges zu berühren, was nach Buttenwieser's
Hypothese unüberwindlich schwierig ist.

Nun liegt aber wenigstens in dem einen Namen Αὐρεόλος ganz
deutlich der Name Philippus vor. Durch einen glücklichen Zufall
hat sich uns derselbe Name mit der gleichen Prothese des A-Lautes
in dem kurzen, aus dem Mittelalter stammenden, Verzeichnisa der
römischen Kaiser erhalten, welches vor einigen Jahren von A. Neubauer
veröffentlicht wurde². Hier heisst er Λούκια νόμος, das ist italienisch
Gordiano = Gordianus, regierte 3 Jahre³; 
υπερβλέπων Φίλιππος 17 Jahre. Es kann nämlich nur Philippus gemeint sein, da
vorher Gordian, nachher aber Decius (Δέκιος) genannt ist; zwischen
Beide fällt die Regierung des Philippus. Es fragt sich nun, ob
αὐρεόλος Φίλιππος zwei Namen sind, oder nur ein Name. In demselben
Verzeichnisse steht vor Gordian, Ποπιένος, das ist Pupienus und
Βαλβίνος. Pupienus und Balbinus waren bekanntlich Mitkaiser und
die jüdische Kaiserliste fasz sie zusammen. Dasselbe müsste auch
mit Philippus der Fall sein; nur kennen wir einen Mit- oder Gegen-
kaiser des Philippus nicht, der Φίλιππος oder Φίλιππου geheissen hätte⁴.
Ich glaube daher den Passus so erklären zu müssen, dass damit
immer der eine und derselbe Philippus gemeint ist, nur einmal als
Mitkaiser Gordians III., einmal als selbständiger Kaiser. Der Autor
der jüdischen Kaiserliste kann eine Quelle benutzt haben in welcher
dieser Irrthum vorlag, oder aber hat er selber den Irrthum zu
Schulden kommen lassen. Freilich ist die Jahreszahl 17 jedenfalls
falsch, da die Praefectur und Kaiserwürde des Philippus zusammen-
genommen nicht länger als 6 Jahre dauerte; ich möchte also statt
οκόλος nur '7 oder '1 lesen. Vergleichle Lampridius c. 64 über die kurze
Dauer der Regierungsjahre dieser Kaiser: sie regierten höchstens

¹ Hermann Peter, der Herausgeber der Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Lips.
1884, Teubner, bemerkt im Index: Macrianus, sic pluribus locis dictus,
paucis Macrinus. CL. a. v. Marius.
² Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles (I), Oxford, 1887, p. 185.
³ Gemeint ist Gordianus III (240-243); zusammen nur 3 Jahre.
⁴ Doch ist es möglich, dass der Vater des Kaisers gemeint ist, der
ebenfalls Philippus heiss. Ueber Julius Priscus, Bruder des Philippus
Arabs, s. Rheinisches Museum, LIV, 159.
drei Jahre und erst Aurelian hatte eine längere Regierungsdauer; wie der aber auch sei, soviel geht aus dieser Kaiserliste mit Bestimmtheit hervor, dass der Name Philippus im Jüdischen auch σάλας geschrieben wurde; demnach halte ich das σάλας in der Elia-Apocalypse ebenfalls für Philippus, nur ist nach Art vieler aramäischer Vocabeln vor 'ד noch ein 'ז eingeschoben; vgl. יֶשׁ על bei Levy, Targumisches Wörterbuch, I, 42.


1 Der Name ist aus Romulus entstanden; s. mein oben angeführtes Werk, L, S. 242.
2 Buttenwieser (p. 78) möchte וּרְאוֹזֶה lesen, das wäre Hormizd I.; für möchte er keine Erklärung.
4 Vgl. פְּאָפָס, papyrapá, פְּאָפֶּס, pessis (Lehnwörter, § 347).
5 So ed. Jellinek, was an شَرْف noch mehr angelehnt ist; ed. Buttenwieser nach der Aussprache מַנָּו תִּdeny.

Der nächstfolgende Satz der Apocalypselautet wie folgt: der letzte König von Persien wird drei Jahre nacheinander gegen Rom ziehen. Der letzte Krieg zwischen dem neupersischen Reich und den Römern fand im Jahre 628 statt, in welchem Chosroes Parvez von Heraclius auf's Haupt geschlagen wurde; bald nachher wurde das ganze persische Reich vom Islam verschlungen. Dieser Krieg kann in unserer Apocalypse nicht gemeint sein, denn nach der Apocalypse werden die Römer geschlagen, was doch nicht der Fall war. Es muss also ein Krieg gemeint sein, in welchem die Perser Sieger blieben. Wir kommen auch dadurch in die Zeit der Gründung des neupersischen Reiches zurück. Artaxerxes hatte in seinem Hochmut erklärt, dass die Römer in Asien nichts zu suchen hätten und sich auf Europa beschränken müssten. Gegen diese Forderung ist vielleicht der in unserer Apocalypse zweimal hervorgehobene Umstand gerichtet, dass die Römer vom Meere her kommen, was doch sonst ganz unnöthig wäre. Die stolze Sprache des Persers musste

1 Dies behauptet auch Buttenwieser (p. 68); seine Gründe sind jedoch anderer Art.

2 Herodian, VI, 1; Gibbon, l.c. Auf Herodian beruft sich auch Ael. Lampridius in Alex. Sever. c. 57, doch ist die Stelle wahrscheinlich interpolirt. Auf die Sache selbst, dass nämlich nicht die Römer, sondern die Perser siegten, kommen wir weiter unten zurück.

3 Nach Buttenwieser (p. 74) ist die "wörtliche Interpretation (von ... ) sicher ausgeschlossen." Natürlich, denn der von ihm
von Rom geahndet werden; es entstand eine Reihe von Kriegen, der Zahl nach drei (טבַּחַת סלַעַת, סלַעַת שְׁנֵא). Wir versuchen diese Kriege einzeln darzustellen.


1 Vielleicht wegen Gen. xiv. a.
3 Vgl. Lampridius, Alex. Sever., a. 57, Ende: puellas et pueros... Mammaenas et Mammaeas et Mammaenae instituit. (Im Index findet sich merkwürdigerweise der Fehler Mammaeas für Mammaenas.)


1 Jellinek in Beth-hamidrasch, III, p. xviii, Note 1.
2 Der Ausdruck gründet sich auf Dan. xi. 41. Buxtorf bemerkt mit Recht (p. 75, Note 1), dass damit irgend eine Metropole der babylonischen Judenheit gemeint sein kann. Chosroes hatte in der That Nisibis (7722) genommen und geplündert. Dass die Juden an dem Kriege mit beteiligt waren, geht aus der interessanten Notiz (Gord. tres, c. 34) hervor, dass das Grab Gordians III. in Circesium an der Grenze Persiens auch jüdisch (Judaisca litteris) bezeichnet war.
3 Dan. vii. 8.
drei Kriegshelden ziehen gegen ihn, das ist gegen den König von Persien. Der ganze Passus ist also entweder eine Doublette, oder der passende zusammenfassende Schluss der Erzählung vom ersten Kriege, das ist vom Kriege des Artaxerxes mit Alexander Severus.


2 Ich lese Μisintheus statt Μisintheus, da diese Zahl zu den früheren in keinem Verhältniss steht. Vielleicht ist Μisintheus statt Μisintheus zu lesen; vgl. weiter unten Μisintheus.
3 Amm. Marc. XXIII. 2, 1, 6: Euphrate navale ponte transmissa. Eine weitere Analogie zwischen den beiden Kriegen liegt auch darin, dass

sowohl unter Gordian III. (Gord. tres, c. 56) als auch unter Julian (Amm. Marc. XXXIII, i, 4) die sibyllinischen Bücher befragt wurden.

1 Vgl. Buttenwieser, p. 76.
2 Vgl. περασ = exercitus.
3 Man denke nur an die verschiedenen Kaiser namens Antoninus; auch Diadumenus nannte sich Antoninus.— Ich bemerke, dass auch nach Jul. Capit. unter Gordian III. ein neuer persischer Krieg anfing (Gord. tres, c. 4: bellum Persicum natum est).

Aufrichtige Gefühle und Dankbarkeit.
soebene seinen tausendjährigen Bestand feierte; es wäre genug,
meinten die Juden, jetzt müsse etwas Anderes kommen.
Die gewaltigen Perserkriege, der Sturm der barbarischen Völker, der Sieg
der Gothen, die grosse Pest, die Christenverfolgung—all dies vereint
weckte in den Juden neue Hoffnungen und liess die Zeit des Messias
als nahe bevorstehend erscheinen.

Noch müssen wir über die Heimath des Autors eine Muthmassung
aussprechen. Dass die Apocalypse von einem römisch-persischen
Kriege spricht, steht ja auch ohne unsere Interpretation fest, da das
ausdrücklich im Texte steht. Es fragt sich nun, welchen Stand-
punkt hierbei der Autor einnimmt, ob er sich als Römer oder als
Perser fühlt? Eigentlich ist die Frage müsig, da die Juden mit
gleicher Angst sowohl vor der persischen als auch vor der römischen
Macht zitterten. Doch glaube ich annehmen zu dürfen, dass der
Apocalyptiker mehr Sympathie für die Perser hat, als für die Römer.
Er lässt die Römer in die Hände der Perser fallen. Er schimpft
nur römische Kaiser (νέων τοῦ ρωμαίου θρόνου), während er
für die persischen Herrscher kein Wort des Tadels hat. Vielleicht
kommt das daher, weil die Persönlichkeit des Artaxerxes in der That
eine ehrtwürdige war; seine Regierung bedeutet, wie Gibbon sagt,
eine grosse Epoche in der Geschichte des Orients, und das von ihm
eingeführte Gesetzbuch blieb Jahrhunderte lang in voller Kraft.
Darum spricht auch der Verfasser nicht vom Ende des persischen,
sondern vom Ende des römischen Reichs. Auch die Provinzen
oder Städte, die im Kriege verwüstet werden, sind ausschliesslich
römische. Da wir uns hierbei, wie es scheint, auf historischem Boden
befinden, müssen wir dem Schauplatz des Krieges eine eingehendere
Erörterung widmen.

Nach Jornandes (Res gestae Goth. c. 16) verheerte der Gothenkönig
Ostrogotha die Provinzen Mösien und Thracien; wir haben jedoch
Nachrichten, dass die Gothen auch nach Asien drangen. Auch unter
Gordian III. wachte sich ein Scythenkönig, namens Arvaitus, hervor.

Nach unserer Annahme ist hier vom Feldzuge des
Alexander Severus die Rede, von welchem nur die Perser behaupteten, er
sei zu ihren Gunsten ausgefallen. Vgl. den auf Grund von christlichen
Quellen schreibenden David Gans in Hanover zu dem Jahre 230, der die Römer
siegen lässt. — Infolge des Satzes εἰς τὴν ἐλπίδα &c. bemerkten wir schon oben, dass
der Verfasser sich zum Hause der Arsacidern bekannte.

Rom ist bekanntlich das vierte Weltreich. Ganz
Rom ist gleich am Anfang nur
mehr Rezit.
Provinzen oder Städte; in der Liste sind sowohl Provinzen als
Städte aufgeführt.
Beim dritten Krieg findet sich die Angabe, dass mit den Römern halten "alle Provinzen, von der grossen Ebene an bis Jaffa und Askalon\(^1\)." Nach Buttenwieser handelt es sich "jedenfalls" um die schlachtenberühmte Ebene Jesreel (p. 30). Aber was bedeutet der kleine Landstrich von Jesreel bis Askalon, wenn von dem römischen Weltreich die Rede ist? Vielmehr scheint unter "grosse Ebene" die Ebene zwischen Euphrat und Tigris gemeint zu sein\(^2\), also Mesopotamien. Dies ist ja die am meisten vorgerückte römische Provinz und beim ganzen Kriege handelte es sich eigentlich um deren Besitz. Die Perser nahmen während der Regierung des Gordian Mesopotamien in Besitz und bedrohten von hier aus die Hauptstadt des Orients, Antiochien\(^3\). Zwei Provinzen waren in Gefahr, Mesopotamien und Syrien, oder, wie es in unserer Quelle heisst, von der grossen Ebene an bis Jaffa und Askalon, das ist bis an's Ende von Syrien nach Süden hin; die hier stationirten Legionen mussten sich also zur Wehr setzen.

Noch instructiver ist die Liste der zerstörten Städte. Artaxerxes hatte, wie schon bemerkt, durch eine feierliche Gesandtschaft die unerhörte Forderung aufgestellt, dass ganz Asien ihm zu überlassen sei; er betrachtete sich als den Nachfolger des Cyrus und wollte dessen Reich wieder herstellen. Er hielt ein Anrecht selbst auf die jüdischen Städte und sogar auf Egypten, denn all' das war einst den Persern unterworfen. Er fügt sich also ganz gut, dass in der Liste der verwüsteten Städte auch Antiochia und Alexandria genannt sind. Der letzte Name ist Edom, was in diesem Zusammenhange nicht das ganze römische Reich bedeuten kann. Es ist vielmehr Edom im eigentlichen Sinne gemeint, das ist die römische Provinz Idumaea. Der eine der kriegführenden Römer, Philippus, stammte ja aus Bostra in Idumaea, Grund genug, auch Idumaea in die Zerstörung hineinzuziehen! Als bedeutende Stadt muss noch Tyrus (תירון) hervorgehoben werden. Ausserdem sind zumeist nur jüdische Städte genannt, und zwar, wie Buttenwieser richtig gesehen, solche, welche, obzwar in Palaestina gelegen, dennoch heidnisch waren und eine römische Besetzung hatten. Dagegen heisst es von den rein jüdischen Städten, dass sie durch göttliche Fürsorge intact bleiben werden (ברקע העירות של ארץ ישראל); dies letztere Datum wird aber mehr ein Wunsch, als ein Factum gewesen sein. Die Aufzählung der palästinischen Städte ist kein stringenter Beweis für die palästinische Herkunft der Apocalypse, denn jeder Jude, auch wenn er in Babylonien lebte, konnte und musste soviel Interesse für Palaestina haben, dass er

\(^1\) Vgl. Gen. xi. 2.
\(^2\) Gibbon, loc. cit.


Zum Schlusse lasse ich noch die paar Sätze, welche ein Historicum zu enthalten scheinen, im Zusammenhange hier folgen:—


Der letzte König von Persien wird gegen Rom ziehnach einander, so dass er sich zwölf Monate empören wird. Drei Kriegshelden werden vom Meere her gegen ihn heraufziehen, sie

1 Buttenwieser, p. 69. Sein Hauptbeweis ist die Parallelstelle in Genes. rabb. e. 76; dort sind aber ganz andere Namen genannt.

2 S. auch Monatschrift für Gesch. u. Wissensch. des Judenthums, XLII, 480.
werden aber in seine Hände gegeben. Ein geringer König unter den König, der Sohn der Magd Gigit, [zieht] gegen ihn vom Meere her. Das sind aber die Merkmale, die Daniel an ihm gesehen: sein Gesicht lang, zwischen den Augen eine Erhöhung (Auswuchs), seine Statur sehr hoch, die Fusssohlen sind hoch und die Schenkel dünn .... Am zwanzigsten in Nisan zieht [dieser] König vom Meere herauf, verwüstet und erschüttert die Welt, rückt an den heiligen Berg und verbrennt ihn. Eine Verfluchte unter den Weibern hatte ihn geboren; das ist das Horn, welches Daniel gesehen, und an nem Tage war Noth und Krieg gegen Israel ....

Den zweiten Krieg führen Misitheus der Praefect und Philippus der Praefect; mit ihnen sind 100,000 Reiter, 100,000 Fussvolk, und auf den Schiffen halten sich verborgen 300,000 (lies 30,000) ....

Den dritten Krieg führen [Decius] Messius und Carinus, und mit ihnen sind alle Provinzen, ein gar großes Volk, von der grossen Ebene an bis Jaffa und Askalon ... In derselben Stunde spricht Gott zu den Völkern der Welt: "Wehe euch, Ruchlose, denn am Ende der vier Weltriche werdet ihr alle aus der Welt geschafft werden" .... Hernach führt Gott Gog und Magog her und all dessen Dependenzen ....

Und das sind die Provinzen (oder Städte), welche zerstört werden: Jericho, Beeroth, Bet-Choron, Susin, Malka, Dora,

Samuel Krauss.

Budapest.


1 Wahrscheinlich = קִיפֶּר שָׁלָם = Kefarsalama, s. Buttenwieser, p. 46.
7 ובו רָם. Da es mehrere Ortschaften namens רָם gab, so halte ich das daneben befindliche רָם nicht für einen besonderen Ort, sondern für nähere Bestimmung zu Chamat. Buttenwieser hält רָם für Emmaus, רָם für Kirjat-Sefer.
8 Ed. Jellinek רָם, richtiger ed. Buttenwieser רָם, das ist Adasa, ein Ort, der durch die Schlacht zwischen Juda Makkabi und Nicanor bekannt ist.
THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA.

The first volume of The Jewish Encyclopedia lies before us. The outcome of an age of systematization and co-operation, its appearance is a distinct event in the history of letters. One regards its publication with feelings of gratitude and admiration. Gratitude towards the publishers whose public-spiritedness made the issuing of the work possible; admiration for the manner in which it has been produced under the direction of the able projector, Dr. Isidore Singer, and his band of four hundred scholars and specialists.

The magnificence of the complete structure can easily be gauged by the excellence of the portion now in our possession. It will be a worthy Temple set up to the genius of Jewish Science and Jewish Thought, into whose courts, far from the coarse clamour of the market-place, all may come, and, conning the rich page of Israel's history, may get for themselves knowledge unbiased and broad sympathy. We have everything to gain and nothing to lose by this new "Revelation." Or rather it might be as true to say that we have everything to lose—our unequal share of the world's misjudgment; and others have everything to gain—true insight, a larger knowledge, liberal-mindedness. But then such loss being another's gain, is, ethically, a gain too—so we can well afford it.

The work—need it be said?—comes from that land of big enterprises and big successes, America. Right royally is the New World repaying the Old for discovering it. And for this last guerdon it holds the world its debtor indeed.

The scope of the work can be outlined by a brief statement of the departments in its purview. The subject-matter falls into three main divisions, which again branch out into subdivisions. They are (1) History, Biography, Sociology, and Folk-lore; (2) Literature—Biblical, Hellenistic, Talmudical, Rabbinical, Mediaeval, and Neo-Hebraic; (3) Theology and Philosophy; each department being...
under the control of an editor responsible for the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the articles in his province.

The prospectus of the Historical and Biographical division promises much in the way of detail, and in the way of rescuing from oblivion those worthies who have, by word or deed, contributed to the general commonweal; and in this, the first volume, these promises have begun to be redeemed right honourably. Jews by race, Jews by conviction, Jews by predilection—all will be included, and rightly so, if we really desire to get a true conspectus of Israel's ramifications.

Obviously, *The Jewish Encyclopedia* is a dictionary of the Bible, but it is something more than this, inasmuch as it deals not with a part of Jewish History, but with the whole. In the domain of Literature no attempt has been made to compete with the Bible Dictionaries of Hastings and Cheyne; but these, in many ways and many places, by sudden side-lights, are supplemented by such a work as this, even in their own special departments, for it is the superior vantage-point that gives a wider outlook. The plan has been adopted of treating the more important Biblical articles under three heads, under the first of which are arranged the Biblical data, giving the plain statement of the text; under the second, we have the Rabbinical interpretation, including that of the Talmud and Midrash; the third division presents the critical view. Thus the Encyclopedia strives to keep abreast of the latest explorations in the fields of Assyriology, Egyptology, and in general, archaeological investigation.

The Talmud, of course, will receive treatment commensurate with its importance, and the Rabbis of the Talmud, the Tannaim and Amoraim, many of them epoch-making in virtue of their work or personality, will each have a niche in this Temple of Fame. In connexion too with this subject the course of later Rabbinical Literature will be traced for the fourteen hundred years (500–1900) of its run. And lastly, the History of the Jewish Literature will be set forth in all its multifariousness.

The third division of Theology and Philosophy will include a systematic presentation of Rabbinical Judaism in regard to Jewish beliefs and doctrine.

And, finally, the Encyclopedia will deal in an exhaustive manner with the subject of Anthropology, under which section will fall the evidence relating to purity of race, special aptitudes, susceptibility to disease, &c., &c.

This in short is a summary, and summary at that, of the task the Editors have set before themselves. High as the ideal is, this first volume makes us confident that it will be successfully attained.
It is not surprising that an undertaking of this kind should prove so fascinating both to the professed student, or professional, and to the general reader. The Jew stands as a link between the ancient world and the modern. Present at the launching of the oldest civilizations he voyaged with them for many a weary year, if not actually as pilot, often as one of the crew; and he has lived to see them swept away on the floods of time. If the knowledge of the centuries points to any one truth, it points to the transitoriness of all things, the ebb and flow in the affairs of mankind.

And throughout all these vicissitudes, the Jew, while not unresponsive to the influences that pulsed about him, has preserved the continuity of his traditions, and the purity of his ideals. It is a strange history that is here unfolded, now rolling majestic under Babylonian or Egyptian skies; now sunning itself gloriously as it winds through the fields of Old Castile; now wasted and scanty as it spreads itself over the sandy soil of oppression and repression. Such story as this must grip one strongly; and as one reads, mind and soul yield unreservedly to the all-compelling charm. It will give the reader a heart of understanding, enabling him to grasp aright something of the significance of Israel's wanderings; to rub off the grime and unlovely lettering of this human palimpsest, and to read beneath all of it the majestic drama of a nation's history. We shall see how the Jew has pushed onward the vehicle of the world's progress; how the light of his genius has played upon the fields of Art, and Science, and Literature, in many and many a land. With this work as our spell, Israel the Sphinx will be made to speak some of its most precious secrets.

And now to examine our treasure a little more closely. It is a handsome volume, its print clear and pleasant, and its illustrations numerous and really elucidatory of the text. And more; we shall find, if we test it, that the work exactly fits that empty space which somehow gapes from the shelves of every library however well furnished—the vacant chair, so to say, at the Symposium of Letters!

Let us turn, say, to the article "Adam." Under this heading we have, first of all, a statement of all the Biblical data. Then follows an account of the name in Apocryphal and Rabbinical Literature, comprising a most interesting survey of the sources of the Midrashic conception, by Dr. Kohler; Prof. Gottheil then takes up the story and discourses pleasantly of Adam in Mohammedan Literature. Lastly, we have a summary of the critical view, in which the generic use of the word in contradistinction to the use of it as the name of an individual is well brought out. Then succeed articles on the Book of Adam, and Adam Kadmon or Kadmoni, both of them...
crammed with information. It should be added that a Bibliography is appended to each article—a very valuable consideration.

The same care characterizes the subject "Akiba b. Joseph": Palestinian Tanna. His parentage and youth are lucidly narrated, his remarkable life is then set forth, bringing out his relation with Bar Cochba in the sad times in which his lot was cast. Akiba as Systematizer, his Halacha, his Hermeneutic System, his Religious Philosophy—these are but headings, but they show sufficiently the trend of the rest of the article. To round off the whole we have, lastly, an account of the various legends that have clustered round the Martyr's memory.

The important subject of Angelology is especially well treated. The Biblical conception of these celestial beings is traced step by step; their denomination, their appearance, their function—all are here set forth. The second part of the article occupies itself with Angels in Talmudic and Midrashic Literature. We have a succinct account of the development of the angel-idea, of the angelic embellishment of the Bible story, and of the nomenclature and variety of angelic forms. "Angels and the Cabala" and "Angels and Mysticism" conclude this division of the subject. At this point Dr. Kohler continues the task. He outlines for us the general historical development of this subject of Angelology, and shows us how the circumstances of Israel's environment in Persia and Babylonia combined to make complex and cumbersome the simple conception of the Divine Messenger found in earlier Biblical writings. Thus Angelology tended towards systematization, and so we find that it is in the Book of Daniel that a systematic classification of angels is first presented. And Daniel led the way for the establishment of a hierarchy of vast proportions. Then follows a mass of information in regard to some of these hierarchical systems, with an account of the powers of individual angels, as instructors, as mediators between God and man, as guardians of the nations. Finally, we are presented with the views of Philo on Angels, of Saadya Gaon, of Judah Ha'Levi, of Ibn Daud and Maimonides. A brief statement of the Mohammedan position, which seems to trench both on Jewish and Gnostic ground, brings us to the end of this engrossing subject.

But let this suffice. The more the work is examined the indispensableness of it becomes more and more evident, and the wonder grows that its success should have ever been questioned. It is just the work required for the completion of every library and the equipment of every student. Such a bringing together the latest results of Jewish scholarship in the domain of Jewish lore is a notable achievement indeed. The effect of it—who shall deny?—will be as im-
portant as widespread, culminating in a real revival of Jewish learning.

It is ungracious to find fault with the well from which we have just slaked our thirst, but it is impossible to resist expressing the regret that in a work presenting the imperial proportions, as it were, we have endeavoured to draw, there should have been included names of those whose work lies rather before them than after. We have said the worst; and it may be that this little spot but serves, after all, to bring out the extreme fairness of the rest of the page.

Concluding, we can but re-echo the words of the writer who has said: "Christianity will learn from it to understand Judaism and to respect Jews. Jews will learn from it to understand and respect themselves."

H. Snowman.

MACLEAN’S “VERNACULAR SYRIAC.”


More than thirty years ago Prof. Noeldeke expressed the hope that a dictionary of modern Syriac dialects would be compiled from materials gathered among the Nestorian population east of the Tigris without regard to the classical language, and that in so doing special attention might be paid to the vernacular of the Jews living in the district. Since then much valuable linguistic research has been accomplished in this field, both in the publication of texts and their utilization for grammatical purposes. The great vitality of this group of dialects is illustrated by the fact, that amidst a population of different creed and languages it not only held its own but penetrated further east, supplanting a tongue spoken of old in these territories. Geographically speaking, the dialects in question form the vernacular of many villages situated in a large triangle, comprising the Plain of Mosul, Lake Van and the Urmiah lake. Even a comparatively short examination will reveal the fact that these dialects are distinctly different from classical Syriac, and the appellation _Fellühi_, selected by Prof. Sachau (Skizze des Felluchi-Dialekts von Mosul, Berlin, 1895), has therefore much in its favour. It is but
natural that it is largely influenced by the Turkish dialects spoken in Kurdistan by Persian, and particularly by Arabic, since this language forms the vernacular of the town of Mosul. Through the translation of the Bible also many Hebrew words have crept in. In presenting his book Mr. Maclean has given a supplement not only to his own grammatical work on the subject published five years ago, but has furnished most valuable aid to the study of the large literature of the dialects now available. Till lately our information as to the existence and importance of this branch of Semitic philology was very scant. The merit of this work cannot, therefore, be easily overrated, and he may rest assured of the sincere thanks of Semitic students.

In an appendix to his Grammar Mr. Maclean has given a few specimens of a translation of some Psalms by an Azerbaijan Jew. In so doing he has only whetted our appetite for more. It would be desirable to obtain larger pieces of translation or of original compositions either liturgical or secular. It is more than probable that such exist. Mr. Maclean gives instances showing that the Jewish pronunciation of certain words varies slightly from that of their compatriots. Moreover, the nearer relation of the eastern dialects to that of the Babylonian Talmud justifies the expectation that linguistic research in these provinces would prove advantageous for the lexicography as well as for the phonology of the Talmud.

Mr. Maclean is undoubtedly right in emphasizing the fact that translators are apt to err on the side of literalness, and often employ words not used colloquially; but in spite of this the style remains homely, as the standard of education of the Jews in East Syrian countries is not very high. We may safely presume that the peculiarities of their language will, on the whole, run parallel with those of the Jews living in Arabic-speaking countries and in Persia, and that they are possessed of original compositions, however modest. It is of no small interest to observe that the language of the Talmud may still be considered a living one, and capable of being preserved and cultivated.

The addition of cross-references to Western Syriac dialects and the language of the Pehittā, as also the transliteration of all words and phrases in Roman characters in Mr. Maclean's book, greatly assists the student. Although his works signify a great advance in the study of the Eastern Aramaic dialects, we may hope that further investigation on the spot will be fruitful also in a direction which runs beside the main road.

H. HIRSCHFELD.
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II (continued).


Owners: Isaac Rafael Finzi, Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi, S. D. Luzatto.

German Rabb. char., nearly vocalized throughout, fol., 2 cols., ff. 181 [H. No. 115].

185. אֵינֶשֶׁר תַּחֲרוּת, n by Isaac [b. Meir] of Dueren on תֵּבַע זִנַּה, with Glosses (printed); b. Fol. 23. ננָחִים; ibid. v. ננָחִים; c. Fol. 24. סְסִים הַיֶּפֶה יְהִי יִרְאָה, but hardly legible and unfinished.

Vellum, German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 24 [H. No. 182].

186. a. מְסָר תָּמִית Compilation of ritual rules in 526 paragraphs. The beginning is missing as far as par. 16. At the top of fol. 1, written by a later hand, the words מְסַר אֵינֶשֶׁר תַּחֲרוּת וּזְמָה are found, but they are apparently copied from fol. 73. The compiler, Moses hal-Levi (fol. 11v), frequently styles himself a pupil of R. Jehiel [of Paris?], to whom he alludes in the terms מְסָר אֵינֶשֶׁר תַּחֲרוּת וּזְמָה. He quotes, besides, the following authorities: Amräm, Asher of Lunel, Bäruch [b. Isaac of Regensburg], Ḥayyim hak-Kohn, Elḥanān, Eliezer b. Joel [hal-Levi יִרְעָה וּזְמָה], Eliezer of Metz, Eliezer b. Nathān, Gershom [Meʿor Hag-Gōlāh], Hai Gaōn, Isaac al-Fasi, Isaac b. Judah, Isaac b. Moses [of Vienna?], Josef Gaōn, Josef Tob Elem, Judah b. Nathān, Meir of Rothenburg [זְמָה וּיִרְעָה], Menahem of Joigny, [Moses of Coucy] author of מְסָר
of Chinon mentioned. The frequent references to ‘my teacher R. Isaac’ in b–f prove that all these sections were compiled by the same person. This was probably the above-mentioned Moses hal-Levi, who, after the departure of R. Jehiel to Palestine (1259), continued his studies in South Germany ( ниже הָלֵּי, fol. 77v, col. 2) under the said Isaac. The MS. is written throughout in the same hand, and is, to all appearance, the compiler’s autograph. A later owner added marginal notes.

Owners: Samuel ...; Zunz (No. 28).

Vellum, Franco-German Rabb. char. French and German words vocalized, occasional pen and ink drawings on the margin; 2 coll., 4to, ff. 81 [No. 427].

137. אַלְמָא הָיִרָא, by R. Susman (cf. NCat., No. 2073a). Copied from a volume belonging to R. בְּנֵי by Abraham b. Hezekiah hal-Levi, and finished Wednesday, דו (12 Iyyar), 5195 (May 11, 1435).

Vellum, German curs. char., 4to, ff. 12 [H. No. 309].

138. 1. דִּתְנָי הָשָׁרְּרוּת הָוָדֵק, by Joshua Segre on פָּסָר שֶׁלֶׁכְבֵּרָה, beginning with a sonnet. Fol. 22, Admonition addressed to Shōḥēṭim, reminding them to be careful, and recommending the practice of R. Isaac בְּנֵי (who died in Sefāth), who, when living at Casale, only licensed Shōḥēṭim under the most stringent conditions. Fol. 23v, Shōḥēṭ’s certificate given to Elḥānān b. Gamaliel Foa.
2. Fol. 24. שְׁיִיטֶה, by Jacob Weil.
3. Fol. 34. Shōḥēṭ’s certificate given to Michael Foa by Isaac Rafael b. Elisa Michael Finzi.

Owner: Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi.

No. 1 copied by Elḥānān Foa, who studied Sheḥiṭa under the author (fol. 23).

Ital. curs. char., 8vo, ff. 34 [H. No. 270].

139. 1. דִּתְנָי הָשָׁרְּרוּת הָוָדֵק, by El’azar of Worms on פָּסָר שֶׁלֶךְ הָרָאָה, in thirty-six chapters.
2. Fol. 20v. A treatise on the same subject, in which are quoted Abraham וּרְדֵי, Eliezer of Bohemia, Eliezer of Metz, R. Gersḥōm, Hananēl b. Ḥūshiēl, Isaac hal-Lāḇān, Jacob b. Shēsheth, Samuel b. Ḥofni, Samuel han-Nāgīd, Solomon b. Isaac (Rashi), and the Rabbis of Narbonne. The end is defective.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 39 [H. No. 173].

140. לֶבֶן שֶׁחוֹטָלוֹת בִּכְיָת הָאָדָם.

Owner: Bendix Marcus in Hornburg.

German curs. char., 8vo, ff. 31 [H. No. 518].

141. 1. Fragment of a work containing religious aphorisms, probably by the author of No. 2.
2. Fol. 27. כמות דיני סחיטה וברית, by Rafael Birdogo. The end is missing.

Maghribine Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 8 [No. 521].

142. 1. קורות הלכות מחתרת, by Efraim Joshua Luzatto. The headings of the chapters are accompanied by the Italian translation.

2. Fol. 71. ינשד ויבחר בלאו על, by Efraim Joshua Luzatto. The headings of the chapters are accompanied by the Italian translation.

3. Fol. 71. שמרה וורה שמוך שלום, by Efraim Joshua Luzatto. The headings of the chapters are accompanied by the Italian translation.


5. Fol. 76. מימי אין ויבחר בלאו על, by Efraim Joshua Luzatto. The headings of the chapters are accompanied by the Italian translation.

 Owners: Angelo Salvador Rafael Luzatti; Isach Florenzo di Benedetti; Lazzaro Lanzon Bachi.

Ital. curs. char., small 4to, ff. 78 [H. No. 95].


Magrib. curs. char., 8vo, ff. 19, last leaf slightly damaged [No. 492].

145. Collection of Minhagim [by Seligmann Bing Oppenheimer, pupil of Jacob Levi of Moellin מַזוּל]. The MS. is, according to Steinschneider’s suggestion (see Berliner in HB., IX, p. 81 sqq.),
the compiler's autograph. A former owner has marked the leaves from left to right, but in the following summary the proper order is observed. a. fol. 8, some titles of books (in the compiler's possession?); c. fol. 9, Homily with reference to Passover (Sabbath haggadah sermon); d. fol. 10, employment of the Vowels; e. fol. 23, "...the leaf of the book..."; f. fol. 25, names of books; g. fol. 40, "...some titles of books in the compiler's possession?"; h. fol. 44, Isaac; i. fol. 49, "...the leaf of the book..."; j. fol. 50, of R. Gershon (printed), ends poem; k. fol. 52, the compiler's autograph; l. fol. 63, "...the leaf of the book..."; m. fol. 66, "...the leaf of the book..."; n. fol. 67, "...the leaf of the book..."; o. fol. 68, "...the leaf of the book..."; p. fol. 75, another poem on the same subject, with the acrostic beginning of the last six lines being destroyed; q. fol. 75, a Commentary with marginal notes; r. fol. 84, headed "...the leaf of the book..."; s. fol. 109, containing the agenda of the Seder nights in an acrostic on the name Sabbath, but the last three lines are incomplete. Underneath the name of the author... is to be seen; ibid., another poem on the same subject, with the acrostic beginning of the last six lines being destroyed; t. fol. 111, Commentaries on the preceding poem, beginning with "...the leaf of the book..."; u. fol. 138, "...the leaf of the book..."; v. fol. 146, "...the leaf of the book..."; w. fol. 151, "...the leaf of the book..."; x. fol. 152, "...the leaf of the book..."; y. fol. 153, "...the leaf of the book..."; z. fol. 154, "...the leaf of the book...";
w. fol. 150, Responsum by Salman Kitzinger; y. a quite illegible document concerning הצלמליל רבי סאול (Gutlein), the widow of a certain R. Hayyim.


The work is rich in German words.

Vellum, German Rabb. char., fol. and 4to, 3, 2, and 4 cols., ff. 155, of which many are injured, particularly after fol. 80 [H. No. 175].

144. by Azariah b. Efraim Figo (printed), the author's autograph, written in Piza, commenced Monday (r. Tuesday), 1 Tammuz, 5570 (1610).

Span. curs. char., 4to, ff. 75 [H. No. 254].

148. Collection of ritual rules, Minhagim, and extracts from printed works and letters; a. fol. 97, Responsum by Moses Sofer of Frankfort [on the Main], dated 5 Tebah, 5518 (Dec. 16, 1758), and witnessed by Uri Phoebus (ספיבס) Kohen; b. fol. 99v, Responsum by David of the 四年 'N' חן in Melville, dated 1 Tammuz, 5522; c. fol. 183, Letter by Samuel שלום of Genoa, messenger from Tiberias to Carpentras, addressed to the community of Lille (לילות), and dated 14 Ab, 5517; d. fol. 185, Letter by David אספלי in Tunis to David of Melville (see above); e. fol. 199, Letter by Benjamin b. Isaiah Bassano (זאמס) ; f. fol. 202, by Asher Selig of יראל; g. fol. 205, Letter to Samuel Heilmann (היללמ) in Metz, dated 5 Ab, 5517, Monday, last day of Passover 1, 5518 (May, 1758); h. fol. 208, Document appointing Elhanan Jesse to be Shohet in לילות, dated 25 Adar II, 5518, and signed Daniel, Moses, Josef, Michael, Israel, Judah of Beaucaire (יבכתבא), Moses Kohen, Elhanan Jesse, Isaac Moses, David and Jacob of שליבאץ, שמא Astruc, Abraham מוסא, Gad of ידראדיס, ממולא, מושל קדוש, Gad of ידראדיס, ממולא, מושל קדוש.

French Rabb. char., 24mo, ff. 1-17 missing, some other leaves are out of their places, ff. 270 [H. No. 265].

149. Minhagim for the year, according to German rite, with calendar rules, in 141 paragraphs. At the end, table of contents. On the margin, coloured pen and ink drawings.

Owner: שמאלי שלום (!), rest of colophon illegible.

Vellum, German curs. char., 4to, ff. 54 [H. No. 144].

150. 1. Ritual rules and regulations, beginning מ"ע וֹנֵי וַיְהִי אֵלֶּה הָיוֹת אֶחְיָא לְאִית אַלְכִּי הָיוֹת אֶחְיָא לְאִית אַלְכִּי הָיוֹת אֶחְיָא לְאִית אַלְכִּי הָיוֹת אֶחְיָא לְאִית אַלְכִּי הָיוֹת אֶחְיָא לְאִית אַלְכִּי הָיוֹת אֶחְיָא לְאִית אַלְכִּי הָיוֹת אֶחְיָא לְאִית אַלְכִּי הָיוֹת אֶחְיָא לְאִית אַלְכִּי 하ָיוֹת [Samson b. Szadok], Mahzor Vitri, and Maimoni. Others are

1 Read 'one day after Passover,' as the last day fell on a Sunday.
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signed מנהיג אשכנז מדוכים. Fol. 13r, Bāruch, precentor in מדרש.

2. Fol. 17. על לטל, Ritual rules by Moses b. Senior [of Evreux].

3. Fol. 31r. Gloss on ציון סמואל.


5. Fol. 47. Discourse beginning מורה יפים迷你 ו '<?' in מדרש. ר"ו אימר וה.scope נמבט.

German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 47 [H. No. 366].

151. מערד תעב, Regulations concerning circumcision and the prayers connected therewith, compiled on behalf of Simmel [שלמה] Wolf in ... ישיש. At the end several medical instructions in [Jewish] German.

Written in Lieben (= ליבנה), and finished 24 Tebeth (Jan. 3), 1769.

Vellum, sq. char., 8vo, ff. 41 [H. No. 248].

152. 1. a. Fragment of a discourse on נֹּ֠עַ; b. fol. 2, Notes on the same subject according to Solomon b. Addereth and R. Peres.

2. Fol. 3. Isaac of Düren's ... ירח, with Glosses after each chapter.

3. a. Fol. 41, דִּיג הַלְוַת מְפַרְזָה לְמִנְה גוֹרָה, תָּמוּנָת של יומא תַּחְפְּאָה (printed); d. fol. 54v, דִּיג וַתַּמְתַּמָה, תָּמוּנָת בְּלַמְתָה כְּלָמָה. This is followed by other ritual topics, in which the following authorities are quoted: Isaiah, Jonathan, Qalonymos, Isaac hal-Labân, Samuel b. Hofni; Hanan's, Samuel Şarîthi, Moses of Dîrin (fol. 44v), al-Fâsi; Samuel b. Natronai, Efraim, Maimuni, Isaac [of Düren?], Menahem Recanati, Hayyim Kohên [maternal grandfather of the compiler], Judah b. Benjamin Harôfè, Eliezer hal-Lévi, Abigédor, Abraham b. Solomon [author of], אשבל בן הלכך, Abraham Abigédor, Josef, Meir [teacher of the compiler]. Fol. 96v illegible, end wanting.

Written by the compiler, Jehiel Ashkenazi (ff. 2 and 87). Owner's notice not legible.

Vellum, Franco-German curs. char., small 4to, ff. 96 [H. No. 332].

153. Compendium of Glosses, Novellae, Sermons, and Talmudical Discourses by the following: Abraham Broda, fol. 39v; Abraham Fassel of Prague, fol. 35v; Bezalèl, fol. 60; El'azar of Colin, fol. 29; Elijah Kohên of אין הידק [Hochheim i see SCat., col. 928], fol. 49v; Ezekiel Landau of Prague, ff. 25v, 37, 40, 56; Fishel of רבי יהושע, fol. 38; Jonathan Eibenschütz, ff. 44, 55v; Josef Liberles, fol. 3; Kaufmann Metz, fol. 55; Lammel Eisenstadt, fol.
45. Meir Aryeh [Horzitz], ff. 41, 67; Meir Barbari [Scat., col. 1694 Barbe] of Presburg, ff. 32, 34, 38, 47; Moses Meir [Bunzlau], ff. 17v, 25, 30, 34v, 48v; Moses Rapp of Wi (I), fol. 42v; Naftali, fol. 1; Salman [lots], fol. 39; Sandor Nemetz, Dayyan in Furth, fol. 24; Samson of Ostropole, fol. 31v; Weil [na] of Karlsruhe, fol. 15; Wolf Austerlitz, fol. 29v.

The compiler lived in Horzitz towards the end of the eighteenth century.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 70 [H. No. 168].


2. Fol. 12. n SD, by the same [when living in Finale de Modena], on the same subject, directed against "VYp'Haa ni SDVI, by Phineas Hayy Anaw, pupil of Isaac Lampronti, dated 22 Tammuz, 5475 (1715).

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 43 [H. No. 349].

155. WV forthey year, according to Rashi’s Siddur, with many Responsa by him, or with reference to the table of contents at beginning. The compiler quotes n Sl n SD and rv 'D, the Minhagim of Mayence and Lorraine (fol. 41v), besides many other authorities.

Franco-German Rabb. char., fol. The leaves are much stained by water; ff. 79 [H. No. 190].

156. 1. Drafts of legal documents compiled by Josef Gaon b. Abraham Gaon [explained HC., p. 40, as initials of "ai", numbering sixty-six. Table of contents at beginning. No. 3, numbered according to the rite of Toledo; No. 64 incomplete; No. 65 missing. At the end by m mo bj yhr b rev DS1C, according to R. Peres, dated Famagusta in Cyprus [with the year 5092 (1332) on the margin].

2. Fol. 49v. Alphabetical Index rerum to Books XII–XIV of Maimuni's " " .

3. Fol. 54v. Rules for writing a letter of divorce, in 174 paragraphs, with a copy of one (fol. 66), dated Regensburg, Tuesday, 10 Sivan, 5195 (June 7, 1435); fol. 69v, razaiy hem sheva b, mor, fol. 70v, Letter of divorce, according to Josef Kolon, dated Mestre (Miszchov), Wednesday, 13 Tebeth, 5229 (Dec. 28, 1469); ibid., n, sent by Zakariah Koh in the Rhine province, dated Nurnberg, Sunday, 4 (read 5) Tebeth, 5185 (Nov. 26, 1425), ends n, fol. 71, Remark by
Isaac of Ingelheim (אנסלדער) on behalf of his master Josef (Kolon) in Mestre; ibid., Text of Ḥabaseth, dated 31 Sivan, 5173 (May 21, 1413), sent by Manasse b. Moshe to Ḥava, daughter of Dan, and signed by the Dayyanim Jom Tob b. Solomon, called Lipman, Menahem b. Jacob Shalem, Abigedor b. Isaac Caro; fol. 72 sqq., other documents communicated by Isaac Ingelheim, who comments on the custom of writing letters of divorce in Candia; fol. 80, חוגת הלוי, by the same.

4. Fol. 87'. ידיעות הבנויות, by Simon b. Semah, headed:—

ואני_sem תחתם את שמות_names ותקנים
ל التابועות ומסמכים...
ends:—
ואני שמות הנשיםeker־ם
ואני השמות...

5. Fol. 107. פי solicitud.


Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 120 [H. No. 223].


Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 61 [H. No. 101].


2. Fol. 37. ספר תורה (printed with שניים ממציא, Constantinople, 1519). At the end the following verses, which are not to be found in the edition:—

משררנו והברבח עיניים בברכה וברכה בברכה וברכה
ברכות ידינהו לזרב בזרב בזרב
ברכות ידינהו לזרב בזרב בזרב
הברוך עיניים בברכה בברכה בברכה
Orient. Rabb. char., 8vo, (ff. 2-5 inverted), ff. 48 [H. No. 342].

Modern Span. Rabb. char., fol. 21 [H. No. 100].

**Autograph Works by Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi.**

160. 1. כלל חומרי הכסות, being the result of his study of Jacob Algazi's הכסות...

8vo, ff. 28, many blank pages [H. No. 297].

161. כות ponieważ ב. Correspondence on ritual subjects with other Rabbis. Vol. I begins with כלל כות, by David Hayyim b. Abraham Samuel כות, dated 13 Marhesh., 5592 (1838); Josef Isserles אפרשת כות, (Ben Şion Aryeh Ghirondi) the father of the author; Abraham Reggio in Gorizia (Georz); Nathan מטיב כות of Sefath; fol. 9, Josef Zamiro of Jerusalem; fol. 17, Menahem Azariah Meir of Castelnuovo; fol. 18, Letters to and from Shem Tob Amarillo in Corfu, Abraham Reggio; David Zakkuth; Mazzal Tób of Modena; Abraham Jonas of Venice; Elias Aaron Lattes; Abraham of Cologne; Mordecai מטיב כות of Sefath; Isaia מקסב; Elhanan Hananyah Hayy Kohen of Reggio; David Yequthiel Kohen of Jerusalem; fol. 130, Letters to and from in Triest, signed Abraham Hayy of Cologne, Abraham Reggio, Solomon Nissim of Mantua.

Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 132 [H. No. 271].

162. Vol. II of the same work, beginning with כלל כות, by Hayyim Samuel Kohen of Tiberias, Hayyim מטיב כות of Smyrna; Josef Motro of Hebron, Eliezer Abulafia of Tiberias, the diploma of מטיב כות by Josef Ashkenazi of Jerusalem; fol. 5'; and כלל כות, by the author's father, Ben Şion Aryeh, and Abraham Salomo Salmon of Jerusalem. The work itself begins, fol. 9, with the correspondence with Elias Aaron Lattes, Jacob Cazes of Mantua, Abraham Reggio, David Zakkuth, Nathan מטיב כות, Josef Motro. Ff. 155 sqq., an address in Italian.

4to, ff. 158 [H. No. 273].

163. Another copy of the same work, but ending § 416 (fol. 123 of preceding No.).

4to, ff. 157 [H. No. 272].

164. Vol. III of the same work begins with copies of כלל כות, by Ezekiel Eliezer Abulafia of Tiberias, Samuel Kohen of Tiberias,
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4to, ff. 233 [H. No. 274].


4to, ff. 90 [H. No. 275].

166. The same, vol. II. Nos. 92-309.

4to, ff. 197 [H. No. 276].


4to, ff. 125 [H. No. 277].


4to, ff. 197 [H. No. 278].


4to, ff. 117 [H. No. 279].

170. The same, vol. VI. Nos. 943-1339.

4to, ff. 197 [H. No. 280].


4to, ff. 56 [H. No. 281].


4to, ff. 67 [H. No. 282].

173. The same, vol. IX. Letter by Ezekiel Eliezer Abulafia of Tiberias; fol. 8, Correspondence with Abraham Reggio; fol. 18, Letter by Isaac Luzatto of Padua; fol. 20, Correspondence with...
Abraham Reggio; fol. 21, Letter by Saul Formigini of Triest; fol. 24, Letter by Nathan, written in Triest (written in Triest).

4to, ff. 34 [H. No. 283].

174. The same, vol. X. Penitential prayer; fol. 2, Correspondence with Jacob of Lemberg; fol. 5, Correspondence with Jacob Reifmann in Schebryn (Poland); fol. 8, Correspondence with Samuel Leb Goldenberg; fol. 20, Correspondence with Hirsch Chais (written in Zolkiew); fol. 23, Letter to Rafael Segre in Triest.

4to, ff. 89 [H. No. 284].

175. The same, vol. XI. Pasted on to the right-hand cover a letter by Jacob Cazes; fol. 2, Reply by Gedalyah Cazes.

4to, ff. 45 [H. No. 285].

176. The same, vol. XII. Letter by Samuel Pardo in Verona and Aryeh Ascoli in Reggio; fol. 2, Letter to Jacob Cazes in Mantua; ibid., Letter to Hanael Nepi in Cinto; fol. 3, Letter to Elias Aaron Lattes in Venice; ibid., Reply by Abraham Reggio in Gorizia; fol. 4, Reply by Elias Aaron Lattes of Venice, dated eve of New Year, 5594 (1834); Letter by the author's uncle, Isaac Ghirondi in Triest, dated 7 Marhash., 5594, followed by reply; fol. 8, Letter to Josef in Gorizia, 6 Kislev; ibid., Letter to Phineas; ibid., Letter to Isaac Reggio in Gorizia; fol. 10, Letter by Abraham Reggio to Ghirondi's wife on the occasion of the birth of a son; fol. 12, Reply by Phineas and Josef; ibid., Reply by Solomon Rappoport of Lemberg; fol. 50, Tombstone inscription for Solomon David of Lugo.

4to, ff. 50 [H. No. 286].

177. Index to the preceding work.

4to, ff. 44 [H. No. 412].

178. Responsa, decisions, &c.; fol. 17, Letter by Issia Romanin in Pesaro to the brothers Mordecai and Isaac Ghirondi, dated middle days of Sukkoth, 5520 (1759); fol. 30, Hisborts Shnuchat Urib Ram 412; fol. 50, Tombstone, dated Tuesday, Perik. 5598 (March 9, 1838).

4to, ff. 69 [H. No. 287].

179. a. Supplement to the same author's Responsa; b. fol. 47, Letter by Joshua b. Si'en Segre to Azriel Joel; c. fol. 48, Responsa; d. fol. 62, Queries sent to Ghirondi by a certain Samuel, and dated Tuesday, 2 Adar II, 5584 (1824); c. fol. 71, Prayer for the soul of Meir, son of Shmuel, and pupil of Jacob; f. fol. 73, Homily in Italian on Esther ix. 4; g. fol. 75, Note on Ps. xxii; a. fol. 76, Chips from the Agada; i. fol. 81,
Note on Midrash B'reshith Rabbâ on Gen. xviii. 5 (רשביעי, סעיף א'); k. fol. 93, Minhagim, copy of a letter, prayer for Ghirondi's mother-in-law and several aphorisms by R. Abraham of Padua.

A leaf pasted on the left-hand cover bears the date 3 Tishri, 5580 (1819); underneath are the dates of the death of Moses Hayyim Luzatto, 26 Iyyâr; of Shabbathai Aaron Hayyim, 3 Adar; of Isaac Finzi, who was twenty-seven years Rabbi of Padua, 19 Tishri.

Various Ital. squ. and cura. charr., 4to, several fasciculi in 8vo and 16mo; ff. 100 [H. No. 289].

180./ms לוחמי שישנה, containing Responsa, poems, abstracts, notes, and comments.

4to, ff. 196 [H. No. 292].

181. לעל ח'ישנה, vol. II. Fol. 24, Abstract from D'JWB, by Menahem Azaryah of Fano (printed); fol. 32v, Quotation from Josef b. Joshua's Chronicles; fol. 51, Autograph letter by David of Modena (Hebrew and Italian); fol. 66v (towards the end of the volume), Italian sonnet; fol. 67v, Pen and ink sketch of the Temple in Jerusalem; at the end a small fascicule of Italian.

Author's pedigree at the beginning.

Ital. Rabb. charr., fol., ff. 72 [H. No. 293].

182. על ח'ישנה, Supplement to the same author's D'JWB, with abstracts from the writings of Samuel Archevolti, Abraham and Leon of Modena; fol. 22v, Poem by Samuel Archevolti on Josef Karo; fol. 34, Poem in eight strophes by Isaac Hayyim in praise of the Talmud (printed in Hebrew) by Abraham Bäruch Piperno, Leghorn, 1846; fol. 51; fol. 41, Abstracts from Hayyim Kohen's ספר פ実際に לשון הרע (printed Leghorn, 1655); fol. 51, Samuel b. Moses Dlugotsch's preface to his ספר אני הנה שמע (printed); fol. 53, Rhymed riddle; fol. 51v, Hebrew translation of Sûra I of the Qoran; fol. 57v, Preface of Don Josef Nasî's (read David) על ח'ישנה.

Ital. char., 4to, ff. 62 [H. No. 294].

183. מרי home לעי ישנה, Proceedings of divorce, as arranged by Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi, Padua, 12 Kislev, 1836; fol. 32, Letters by Abraham Reggio of Gorizia, Moses b. Samhûn of Sefath and Samuel Rava Majâr; fol. 34, Italian letter by S. Nessim. Another letter in Italian is pasted on the left-hand cover (dated May 24, 1837).

4to, ff. 46 [H. No. 295].

184. 1. Another copy of the same.
2. Fol. 35, מרי home לעי, by the same author.

4to, ff. 53 [H. No. 296].
185. דיני שמחה, begins with copies of סדר הלכות מסכתות על כל ראות, by Menahem Azariah of Castelnuovo, dated Padua, 13 Adar, 5581 (1821), and David Hayyim, 1822. Shohet's prayer, by Moses Hayyim Luzatto.

Ital. Rabb. char., 8vo, ff. 40 [H. No. 269].

186. הלכות מסכתות, another copy of the preceding No.

Ital. squ. char., 12mo, ff. 31 [H. No. 300].

187. דֶּהָנָּוָּדָה, Sayings and sentences collected from the Talmud of Jerusalem by Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi.

Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 25 [H. No. 125].

188. Rabbinical diplomas during the years 1816, 1826, 1828.

Ital. squ. char., 12mo, ff. 34 [H. No. 298].

QARAITE.

189. 1. מִלִּים מֵאָסְרִיָּה, by Solomon Jedidjah Troki, in two parts. The introductory poem is printed in Kraft and Deutsch's Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. of the Vienna Library.

2. Fol. 50. רֶבֶנֶּבֶּרֶכֶת, by the same author, being a controversy between a Qaraite and a Rabbanite.

The writing of this MS. was finished Friday, 25 Tammuz, 5570 (1810), by Joshua b. Josef b. David in Troki.

Cursive char., 4to, ff. 8a [No. 437].

III.

LITURGY.

190. Mahzor, rite of Algiers.

A. New Year: a. First day, Shaharith, 1. מָתֵא הַיֶּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאת; 2. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 3. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות (Sa'adyah); 4. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 5. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות (Moses al-Ashqar); 6. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 7. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 8. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 9. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 10. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 11. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 12. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 13. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 14. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 15. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 16. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 17. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 18. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 19. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 20. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות; 21. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות (recension of the Spanish rite); 22. מָתֵא הַיָּהָן לָךְ נָבִי מַרְחַּכְּלֹת נְבֵאֵי הַלּוֹאות (with a Commentary on the Thirteen Articles of the Creed);
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23. (fol. 34) אַלְּלָה; 24. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ; 25. סֶמֶר נַב; 26. אַלְּלָה; 27. מְדוֹם נַב; 28. מְדוֹם נַב; 29. כַּעַר בִּשְׁבַּכֶּם; 30. דֵּּרֶם; 31. לָּהּ; 32. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ; 33. מְדוֹם נַב; 34. מְדוֹם נַב; 35. מְדוֹם נַב; 36. מְדוֹם נַב; 37. מְדוֹם נַב; 38. לָּהּ; 39. לָּהּ; 40. לָּהּ; 41. לָּהּ; 42. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ. 39. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ; 40. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ; 41. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ; 42. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ. 39. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ; 40. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ; 41. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ; 42. מַעַּשֶׁה לָּהּ.

B. (fol. 84) Fast of Gedalyah: 1. יַּחַּשְׁוֹן יַּחַּשְׁוֹן; 2. יַּחַּשְׁוֹן יַּחַּשְׁוֹן; 3. יַּחַּשְׁוֹן יַּחַּשְׁוֹן.

C. (fol. 88) Day of Atonement: a. Night, 1. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 2. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 3. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 4. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 5. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 6. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 7. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 8. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 9. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 10. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 11. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 12. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 13. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 14. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 15. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 16. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 17. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 18. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 19. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 20. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 21. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 22. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 23. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 24. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 25. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 26. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 27. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 28. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 29. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 30. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 31. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 32. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 33. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 34. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 35. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 36. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 37. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 38. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 39. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 40. נַחַּת נַחַּת. 39. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 40. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 41. נַחַּת נַחַּת; 42. נַחַּת נַחַּת.
7. Akedah (Mel); 8. She'eva Ratzon (Mel); 9. Musaf, an additional service (different from the Spanish rite); 10. Shemuel, three and a half strophes (Mel).

6. Pentecost. 1. Lam Adar; 2. Shavuot (Gabirol); 3. Shavuot (Mel); 4. Fol. 307. Azharoth by Isaac b. Mordecai, called Maestre Peti of Nimes (Nimes, see Neub., Cat., No. 1142, II. ψ). They are preceded by two introductory poems, a. Shirah (Lévi b. Gershom); b. Shirah (Lévi b. Gershom).

Owner: Zunz (No. 36).

Large Maghribine Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 186 [No. 447].

191. Mahzor, rite of Algiers, New Year and Day of Atonement. It begins fol. 7, whilst the first six leaves are covered with additional Piyutim, the prayer for the Day of Atonement, and some directions for the service of the Day of Atonement. Written by Jacob Hajjaj, and finished Sunday, 22 Ellul, 5501 (1741).

Large Maghribine aqu. and Rabb. char., ff. 1-6 by a later hand, 4to, ff. 93 [H. No. 385].

192. Mahzor, rite of Algiers: 1. Ye'ihu Be'alma (Isaac hal-Lévi); 2. Ye'ihu Be'alma (Isaac); fol. 64, Haftaroth for Passover with Aramaic Targum; fol. 64v, Arabic Midrash on the Decalogue, pseudonymously attributed to Sa'adyah (printed); fol. 157, Habdalah in Hebrew and Arabic (see J. Q. VII, p. 418 sqq.).

Large Maghribine Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 182 [H. No. 379].

193. Amorot, Mahzor, rite of Algiers and Tunis, for New Year and the Day of Atonement, arranged by Judah Aryeh Peres (printed Amsterdam, 1738). The preface is preceded by two introductory poems, signed by Abraham Tayyib, Moses Najjar, Isaac b. Samuel hak-Kohën, Abraham b. Nahman, Mordecai b. Nissim Najjar, Isaac b. Judah Hajjaj. Fol. 273, a list of the compiler's works (some of which exist in print) with the date Amsterdam, 1745. The last leaf contains the prayer for the prescentor.


Large Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 274 [No. 430].

194. Mahzor, rite of Avignon, for the three Festivals. a. Passover, 1. Shirah (see Zunz, Lit., p. 500); 2. Shirah (Gabirol); 3. Shirah (Mel); 4. Fol. 307. Azharoth by Isaac b. Mordecai, called Maestre Peti of Nimes (Nimes, see Neub., Cat., No. 1142, II. ψ). They are preceded by two introductory poems, a. Shirah (Lévi b. Gershom); b. Shirah (Lévi b. Gershom).
begin nniD'n i>3TID'; fol. 38. Another introductory poem by Levi b. Gershôm, beginning (see Halb., Cat., p. 49).

c. Tabernacles, 1. Ani ma-amin (Jos. b. Abi Thaur, as also the following); 2. Ani ma-amin (sic); 3. Ani ma-amin (Meir Crescas of Zunz, Lit., p. 504); 4. Ani ma-amin (Zunz, Lit., p. 576); 5. Ani ma-amin (Meir Crescas of Zunz, Lit., p. 504); 6. Ani ma-amin (Meir Crescas of Zunz, Lit., p. 576); 7. Ani ma-amin (Meir Crescas of Zunz, Lit., p. 504); 8. Ani ma-amin (Meir Crescas of Zunz, Lit., p. 576); 9. Ani ma-amin (Meir Crescas of Zunz, Lit., p. 504);


Fol. 134v, Written by a later hand, Piyut in ten lines, all ending with "ma-amin, otherwise mostly illegible.

Censor: Antonio Franc Enrique, 1687.

 Owners: Hirsch Leib, Moses Meir Drucker.


Fol. 134v, Written by a later hand, Piyut in ten lines, all ending with "ma-amin, otherwise mostly illegible.

Censor: Antonio Franc Enrique, 1687.

 Owners: Hirsch Leib, Moses Meir Drucker.

197. Mahžôr, rite of Corfu, New Year.
Owners: S. D. Luzatto, Zunz (No. 34).
Squ. char., vowel-points, 8vo, ff. 86 [No. 444].

Ff. 143 [No. 445].

199. The same, Vol. III, Three Festivals. a. Pentecost, Shaḥarit,
Franco-German rite, beginning missing.

200. Mahžôr, rite of Corfu, New Year and Day of Atonement.
Owner: Zunz (No. 35).
Squ. char., with vowel-points, 8vo, ff. 201 [H. No. 186].

201. Mahžôr, Franco-German rite, beginning missing.

A. I. New Year, fol. 84*. 1. מ לפני תשרי; 2. מלכסי סוסים
בימי יד בעמא
3. After fol. 86 lacuna. Fol. 87v. Index of
Piyûṭim.

II. Day of Atonement, Musăf, (Fol. 147) 1. במאי אמור
אמית ומיומ; 2. Fol. 155. 1. לפני באה; 3. אוסף סוסים
בימי יד בעמא; 4. Fol. 168v. הסתולה
וחזק ובזוג;
5. Abôdâh.
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B was probably an independent volume. Piyyutim numbered by a later hand.

Vellum, the leaves after fol. 235 are more or less damaged. Franco-German squ. char., 4to, ff. 334 [H. No. 67].

202. Mahzor, Franco-German rite, begins with the evening service of the Day of Atonement; fol. 114, Ḥanukkah I; fol. 115, Ḥanukkah II, belonging to a different volume and incomplete; fol. 118, Ḥanukkah I; fol. 214, beginning of Part II, but missing as far as the end of Sukkoth; fol. 227, Sukkoth, the end is wanting. On the lower margin (fol. 114 sqq.) Ecclesiastes iii. 13—vii. 14, as well as additions and notes by a later writer.

Vellum, fol. 115, paper, large squ. char., vowel-points, custodes only at the end of each quire, and ornamented with pen and ink drawings; ff. 9-13 in a wrong place, 4to, ff. 242 [H. No. 359].

I. Sabbath of Hanukkah, 1. (J. Hall.) (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
2. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
3. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
4. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
5. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
6. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
7. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
8. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
9. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
10. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
11. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
12. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)

II. Fol.7r. (Isaac), (Isaac)
1. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
2. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
3. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
4. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
5. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
6. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
7. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
8. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
9. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
10. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
11. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
12. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)

III. Fol. 33v. (Isaac), (Isaac)
1. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
2. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
3. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
4. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
5. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
6. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
7. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
8. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
9. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
10. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
11. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
12. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
13. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
14. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
15. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
16. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
17. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
18. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
19. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
20. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
21. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
22. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
23. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
24. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)

IV. Fol. 28v. (Isaac), (Isaac)
1. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
2. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
3. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
4. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
5. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
6. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
7. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
8. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
9. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
10. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)

V. Fol. 33r. (Isaac), (Isaac)
1. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
2. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
3. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
4. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
5. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
6. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
7. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
8. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
9. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
10. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
11. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
12. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
13. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)

VI. Fol. 39r. a. (Isaac), (Isaac)
1. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
2. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
3. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
4. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
5. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
6. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
7. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
8. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
9. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
10. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
11. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
12. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
13. (zohar) (Jehuda) (Isaac)
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(Isaac) ; S. D'D^ epDSK (Abraham) ; 6. $>13T 'Wj ; 7.
fry
(Isaac) ; 8. -piipD 1X3 ; 9. m~l bw (Solomon b. Gabirol) ; 10. UW
"UDJ 1Bt< (Solomonb. Gabirol); 11. *B" 133 Bne> (Solomon b. Gabirol);
12. r6' m»3 ("priD) Isaac b. G.; 13. WB "VDI; 14. TOCJn i>3 ;
15. TOy bx-its" (row); 16. nivnn :n vm; 17. foie* py;
18. nrmb ow; 19. Drfosj dtt; 20. cot? nave'; 2i.(K«np)
enirp w ; 22. Hsu nyc ; 23.
nrae> btt ; 24. fen »m (nxe) ;
25. nun ny»3K ; 26. Dy ^npa Toonx ; 27. 11133 n» tvo (jbin)
30. royo nx nay; 31. nw TW»; 32. Trow n«; 33. (mixo)
ix^a nap ; 34. tin nrne nx ; 35. mxn w ; 36. 'an* 'D (ronx) ;
37. »33i> peri ; 38. Q'brpob rr> ; 39. qvd rvoi ; 40. t\u nc ; 41. (mw)
"intaro vx ; 42. ttbfiJ dt ; 43. myDD nsyy "inx ; 44. »nns DV ;
45. nny pD' (r6ixa) ; 46. tt 'Dm ; 47. nea'!> dv ; 48. Dip n> ;
yp-i.
d. Musaf(i>tD), i.ew naiic; 2. inn n^ty (rvno) ; 3. taa
-nitK ; 4. 'norm ^an dv (pora) ; 5. miyao pcx (dhbdh xwrb).
VII. Fol. 68. niyi3tri> mtn Isaac b. Gayath : First day, 1. DV
•J'D TOyo ; 2. *iy 13S |B» ; 3. <33i> T.V ; 4. i^x dvi^x m ("priD) ;
5. mown rw (toeo) ; 6. rnnwn ruv ; 7. ixd ni>na 'rr?x « (cnp) ;
8. i>3V U3; 9. niK3Xn i>X DB> (1313); 10. imnh 31t5» (iSV) ;
11. owip nux (faix); 12. mm 5>3bti (rntXD); 13. vu\ t\io D';
1 4. pon i>33 yiu (ronx) ; 15. wik n{>r bx ; 16. va> »yiv (ni>n) ;
Second day, 17. 131Ty (ni85n); 18. 'JflK y*lT Ijnw (nOt»); 19. P"1W
H'od ; 20. bvb mix (trnp) ; 21. iry3 pnx (jaix) ; 22. ixxox n:x >t ;
23. nixtan pnx -ip» ; 24. rbo "no py mv (n-nxx) ; 25. dx (D3nx)
3nxn; 26. 'jnn no n:v; 27. am 3nr; 28. m dv pox (n5>ixj);
29. rrwnrw rroiw (ncy nnmx!> men); 30. royo «3^ not?
(Sol. b. Gab.). 31. ww dv (potfl); 32. .Tsnn mmx (n"i» nie'n)
Abraham b. Ezra (Zunz, L c, p. 208) ; 33. nom Ht? !>V3 ; 34. (potc)
vbtu ny jsitf ; 35. v6n nsw (dhbd nNsin5») ; 36. (min jno^ di^c)
jaw tit; 37. Torn 5>nN (nnBDn nNxir6).
VIII. Fol. 96T. o. ri3W K«n OD^C n3t?i» niinW, Phineas Hallevi :
1. btt my3 3V3 D'ni'N (Zunz, I. c, p. 492) ; 2. nipn TDX (pota).
6. New Year's eve before Arblth, 1. nop mm (nrr^D) Abraham
Hazan Girondi, Zunz, I.e., p. 410.
c. First day, 1. n^y (niBH)
K31, JudahHallevi; 2. D1HB flip' Dynt23tr3nyn(nnno)Moseb.Ezra;
5. D'B>n t (law) J. H.; 6. D'Ni»B3 to vt^yo Mi>N (nSr) J. H.;
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Censor: Fra Luigi da Bologna, 1599.

Vellum and paper, large Franco-German Rabbinical char., vowel-points, 4to, ff. 233 [H. No. 68].

204. Mahzor, Franco-German rite with a Commentary: a. Daily Prayers; fol. 77, אֶּלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 77v, אֶּלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 79, בֹּקֵץ מִמֶּלֶךְ עַל הַכֹּל; fol. 79v, בֹּקֵץ מִמֶּלֶךְ עַל הַכֹּל; fol. 80, הַרְכָּזֶה עַל תּוֹלֵדֶת הַגְּדוֹל; fol. 80v, הַרְכָּזֶה עַל תּוֹלֵדֶת הַגְּדוֹל; fol. 81, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 81v, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 82, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 82v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 83, בֹּקֵץ מִמֶּלֶךְ עַל הַכֹּל; fol. 83v, בֹּקֵץ מִמֶּלֶךְ עַל הַכֹּל; fol. 84, הַגִּקְנֵה תֹּלֵדֶת הַגְּדוֹל; fol. 85, הַגִּקְנֵה תֹּלֵדֶת הַגְּדוֹל; fol. 85v, הַגִּקְנֵה תֹּלֵדֶת הַגְּדוֹל; fol. 86, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 86v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 87, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 87v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 88, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 88v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 89, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 89v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 90, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 90v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 91, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 91v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 92, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 92v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 93, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 93v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 94, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 94v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 95, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 95v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 96, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 96v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 97, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 97v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 98, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 98v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 99, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 99v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 100, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 100v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 101, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 101v, אֵלֶּחֶנֵי בֵּית בָּאתֵךְ; fol. 102, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ (Silluq); fol. 102v, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ (Silluq); fol. 103, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 103v, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 104, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 104v, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 105, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 105v, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 106, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 106v, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 107, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 107v, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 108, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 108v, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ; fol. 109, מַעֲקֵדָתָהּ.

[Owner: S. D. Luzatto.]

Vellum, German Rabbi char., 16mo, ff. 197 [H. No. 357].

205. Siddûr, German rite. After fol. 57 lacuna; fol. 122, Piyûtim for the Three Festivals; fol. 157v, Sabbath Rosh Hôdesh  הללו ימים של שבועות וימים (Ofan, not mentioned by Zunz); fol. 173v, First Sabbath after Passover (Zulath, not mentioned by Zunz). Fol. 206v, Family memoranda by a former owner: his son Mattathias, born in Venice, 17 Tisîri [5254] (Sept. 28, 1493); other sons Moses, Qalonymos, Naftali, Judah, and several other children whose names are illegible. Fol. 207, Sundry private prayers.

Owners: Bœruch (fol. 194v); Joel Pan.

Vellum, German square char., with vowel-points; fol. 154, many lines blotted out, 4to, ff. 207 [H. No. 260].

206. Mahzôr, German rite, beginning missing. The volume commences Sabbath הילפנ, and ends with the morning service of the second day of Pentecost. It is richly illuminated both by coloured and pen and ink sketches, but greatly damaged by damp. Many leaves are entirely or in part cut out.

Vellum, large German square char. in black and red ink, and vowel-points, fifteenth cent., large fol., ff. 297 [H. No. 298].

207. Mahzôr, German rite, beginning with the Amidâh of the Day of Atonement. After fol. 27 lacuna. Marginal notes, one of which (fol. 27v) ends מְסַפֶּר הַיּוֹרֵב אַבְנִוֹר, and pen and ink sketches.

Vellum, German square char., with vowel-points, large 4to, ff. 304 [H. No. 64].

208. Mahzôr, German rite, for distinguished Sabbaths, Passover, and Pentecost. The beginning is missing. Fol. 180, Memoranda by the copyist about the birth of his sons: Qalonymos, Sabbath, 29 Ab, 5260 (July 25, 1500) inシュטד (sic); Simon, 9 Ellul, 5266 (1506) inシュטד (sic); Jacob, 1513, likewise inシュטד (sic).

Colophon: ושלע היהות ארץ יש עגוory, כי שלחך יכין אינא בות ארם מות וה鞠ר יצירא שלחך ילך החומר יש עגוory, בעלי שולימונימ ברי משכ.

Vellum, German square char., with vowel-points, custodes at the ends of sheets, 4to, ff. 262 [H. No. 50].
209. Mahzor, German rite, beginning and end missing.

Vellum, German char., vowel-points, fol., ff. 228 [H. No. 70].

210. Selihoth, German-Polish rite, beginning with the penitential days, and divided into two parts. Part I (ff. 1-136) contains the ordinary Selihoth in 164 Nos. Part II (fol. 137 sqq.) ָשָׁחָחְתָּא; fol. 146, קֶשֶׁת; fol. 161, והנה, of which No. 42 is identical with No. 55; fol. 176, וְיָד; fol. 180, פְּלִיוֹת; fol. 206, אָנָא בָּאָרָה; fol. 209, אָנָא בָּאָרָה. The fly-leaves are covered with lists of Selihoth to be read on certain days. Many marginal notes.

Owners: Luzatto (No. 102), Zunz.

Vellum, large German squ. char., but more slender towards the end of the vol., large fol., ff. 216 [No. 414].

211. Siddur, Italian rite; fol. 8V, כְּדֵי בָּרָה of Elijah Hazzan; fol. 26V, Selihoth, of which the following are not mentioned by Zunz: fol. 52, מֵלֶל מִי מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; fol. 67V, קֶשֶׁת אֲלָרָה; fol. 72, מִלֶּל מִי מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; fol. 76, והנה; fol. 97, מִלֶּל מִי מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; fol. 101, יָד נַח הָעֲבַד; fol. 103, מִלֶּל מִי מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; fol. 106, מִלֶּל מִי מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת. Many marginal notes.

Indexes on fly-leaves.

Vellum, German Rabb. char., 12mo, ff. 131 [H. No. 142].

212. Siddur, Roman rite, for the whole year.

Vellum, small German Rabb. char., vowel-points, ff. 1-3 and 240; Italian Rabb. char., by a later hand, 16mo, ff. 244 [H. No. 155].

213. I. Siddur, Roman rite (see the edition, Venice, 1772):

1. לִיַּחַד מִי מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 2. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 3. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 4. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 5. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת.

c. Fol. 60. Sabbath and New Moon. 1. וְיָד נַח הָעֲבַד; 2. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת.

d. Fol. 61V. Hanukkah. 1. יָד נַח הָעֲבַד; 2. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת.

e. Fol. 66. Fast of Tebeth. 1. מִלֶּל מִי מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 2. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 3. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 4. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 5. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת.

f. Fol. 69. Sheqalim, זָקְרוֹנִי, זָקְרוֹנִי, זָקְרוֹנִי, זָקְרוֹנִי, זָקְרוֹנִי. 1. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 2. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 3. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 4. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 5. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת.

g. Fol. 74V. Fast of Esther. 1. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 2. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 3. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 4. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 5. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת.

h. Fol. 78. Parah. 1. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 2. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 3. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 4. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 5. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 6. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת.

i. Fol. 82. Passover night. 1. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 2. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 3. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 4. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 5. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת; 6. מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת מַעַלֶת.
The following Piyyütim are given in an appendix: 1. Ḥayyāth Ḥayyāth; 2. Ḥayyāth Ḥayyāth; 3. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 4. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 5. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 6. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 7. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 8. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 9. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 10. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 11. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 12. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 13. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 14. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 15. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 16. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 17. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 18. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 19. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 20. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 21. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 22. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 23. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 24. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 25. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 26. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 27. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 28. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 29. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 30. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 31. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 32. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 33. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 34. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 35. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 36. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib; 37. S. Naḥamu Ṣāḥib; 38. Ṣāḥib Ṣāḥib.

II. Fol. 231v. Samuel b. Tabbūn’s translation of Maimūnī’s Commentary on Abūth (‘Eight Chapters’) as far as the middle of ch. v.
III. Fol. 237. 1. Prayer when entering a cemetery; 2. At the end; 3. At beginning various prayers and Psalms.

Written by Isaac b. Eliezer hak-Kohen on behalf of R. Joab in Rome, and finished 2 Marheshvan, 5192 (Oct. 9, 1431), fol. 227.

Owners: Moses b. Nahman (fol. 1), Shabbethai b. Mahla'el (fol. 9).

Vellum, German script and Rabb. char., vowel-points, 4to, ff. 238 [H. No. 61].

214. Mahzor, Roman rite in two parts, Vol. I.

A. Of R. Elijah Hazzan, and the daily hymns of Nathanael of Chinon (ḥiṭḥoth, fol. 3v, cf. Zunz, Sym., p. 363); fol. 29, beginning by Moses b. Judah Benjamin has-Sefaradi (Zunz, ibid., p. 517); fol. 31v, Headed (so) 'n3 n^D 'n3 n^D 'n3 n^D bnx; fol. 49v, Headed (so) 'n3 n^D 'n3 n^D 'n3 n^D bnx; fol. 59, ascribed to Eleazar of Worms (but cf. Zunz, ibid., p. 300); ibid., Another prayer attributed to Nahmani; fol. 73, Ani qravet, with variations in the refrain.


E E 2

As to the writer see next No.

Censor: Marchion (ff. 78, 95, 97), who signed his name opposite the erasures on the margin.

Owners: El'azar, who notifies (fol. 1) the birth of his son Jacob, 1531; Jacob Rimini, whose name is impressed in gold on the outside cover, and who is probably the writer of the notice (fol. 1) concerning the death of David of Rimini (Nov. 1672). The name Jacob is also affixed to an Italian document on the fly-leaf.

Vellum, splendid German sq. char., fifteenth century, with vowel-points. The leaves are numbered with Hebrew letters, beginning with א; 40. [H. No. 224].
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65. תחא כותב; 66. חמה; 67. חברת; 68. אזרוח; 69. חרבה; 70. רוח; 71. ארור; 72. מקוה; 73. חיות; 74. נאום; 75. דומש; 76. אליהו; 77. (Abodah) מִשְׁפָּרְךָ; 78. אסר תינוקות; 79. סופר; 80. אֶמֶרֶב; 81. צוותא; 82. תינוקות; 83. עפר; 84. מקוה (Abraham b. Ezra, not mentioned by Zunz); 85. אַמּוּת בְּלָבָב: (Second Abodah, by the same); 86. מִנְחָה בָּאָדָם בְּכַל עֵבֶת; 87. אֵזֶר בַּחַר אֵזֶר בַּחַר בָּאָדָם; 88. 입 ספוקה; 89. אֲבָנָה; 90. אָנָד; 91. נְאַו; 92. נְאַו; 93. אָבָנָה; 94. אָבָנָה; 95. אָבָנָה; 96. אָבָנָה; 97. נְאַו (Abraham b. Ezra, not mentioned by Zunz); 98. אֵזֶר בַּחַר אֵזֶר בַּחַר בָּאָדָם; 99. מִנְחָה בָּאָדָם; 100. נְאַו; 101. נְאַו; 102. נְאַו; 103. אָבָנָה; 104. נְאַו; 105. נְאַו (Raphael b. Isaac of Faenza); 106. אָבָנָה תּוֹכַל.

Fol. 1. Note of sale by Rafael Yi b. Isaac of Faenza (probably the author of Pijjut, 105, and Zunz, Syn., p. 385), who sold all three volumes to Emmanuel b. Uziel of Camerino, at that time living in Florence. The document is dated Florence, Monday, 7th Tammuz, 5218 (June 19, 1458). Witnesses: Abraham, Menahem b. Isaac of Vienna. A second note mentions as owners the brothers Solomon and Elhanan, sons of Abraham of Vienna (?), who received the volumes when the books of Emmanuel Hai of Camerino were distributed among his heirs. A third document testifies to the sale of the same volumes by Abraham b. Joab of Vienna (1) to Jacob b. Elazar of Modena for sixteen florins (florins, cf. Zunz, Zwr Gesch., p. 563). A title-page written on paper by a later hand ascribes the writing erroneously to Jacob b. Daniel Rimini. Censor marks ff. 49, 121v.

Fol. 217 [H. No. 225].

216. Mahzor, Roman rite, Part II (Vol. III) of the preceding volume.

I. a. Tabernacles, 1. (Evening) בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 2. (Sha'arir) רָחִיל; 3. חַסְרֵךְ רַבֶּה; 4. אֶשֶּׁר נָתַן צָהָרָה; 5. טַלָּה שֵׁרַיִם; 6. מִשְׁפָּרְךָ; 7. (Sabbath) בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 8. (Abodah) בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 9. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 10. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 11. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 12. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 13. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 14. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 15. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 16. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 17. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 18. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 19. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם; 20. בְּכֵרָת שֵׁרַיִם.
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have been re-written by a later hand; Fra Luigi da Bologna, 1599;
Camillo Jagel, 1613; Frater Renatus da Modena, 1636.

Owners: Samuel F. . . ., S. D. Luzatto.

Vellum, Franco-German squ. char., vowel-points, fourteenth century,
occasional pen and ink sketches, small fol., ff. 339 [H. No. 69].

218. Mahzor, Roman rite, corresponding to the preceding,
though not quite so full; yet it contains several Piyutim not to
be found in the former.

d. Simh. Tôrâh; e. Hatan.


Written by Jacob b. Gershôn hak-KohSn Ashkenazi of
Neustadt, and finished Monday, 13 Kislev, 5171 (Nov. 10, 1410),
on behalf of Solomon b. Daniel of Ashkenazi (fol. 237v).

Censors: Alessandro Scipione, 1593; Domenico Ierosolimitano, 1597; Clemente Canetto, 1617.

Vellum, German squ. char., ff. 438 sqq., later and more cursive char.,
vowel-points, 4to, ff. 516 [No. 514].

219. Mahzor, ed. Sabbionetta, 1560, with MS. notes at the
beginning, in the middle, and at the end. The last two portions
contain Selihôth.

German. cursive char., 4to, ff. 42 [No. 501].

220. Mahzor, Romanian rite, for the Three Festivals and
prominent Sabbaths. The following Piyutim are not mentioned
by Zunz:

15. Rosh Hashana 16. Shemaryah, with cabbalistic glosses on the


37. v. 38. First day; 39. Haggadah with Commentary; 40. Hol Ham. 41. Shem Asereth; 42. Seventh day; 43. Azharoth; 44. Pentecost; 45. Hol Ham.

38. Second day; 46. Haggadah with Commentary; 47. Hol Ham. 48. Shem Asereth; 49. Seventh day; 50. Azharoth; 51. Pentecost; 52. Hol Ham.
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Westminster Gazette.—"His method and conclusions generally will, if we
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shall endeavour to show. But we cannot refrain from saying that this book
is the despair of a reviewer. One cannot hope to do justice to such a work
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ISRAEL AND TOTEMISM.

The whole question of Semitic totemism is inseparably associated with the name of the late Professor W. Robertson Smith, whose brilliant studies upon the early religion of the Semites inaugurated a new method by the systematic introduction of anthropological evidence. It is now more than thirty years since Mr. J. F. McLennan laid it down as a working hypothesis that the ancient nations of the world had passed through a peculiar kind of fetichism or animism which finds its typical representation in the totem-tribes of Australia and America. Ten years later, Professor Robertson Smith contributed an epoch-making paper to the Journal of Philology on "Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Ancient Arabs, and in the Old Testament," in the course of which he put forth in a tentative way certain points of evidence which, in his opinion, were "remarkably confirmatory of McLennan's theory." Next, the systems of social organization which were taken to belong to totemism received his closer attention, and in 1885 he produced an elaborate investigation of the

1 The present writer desires to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. J. G. Frazer, who read this article in proof and favoured him with valuable observations, especially on the present position of totemism, which he has been permitted to quote.
principles underlying kinship and marriage in early Arabia. In this work Robertson Smith formally laid down the theory that the Arabs passed through the totem stage, and that "they entered it before they were differentiated from their brethren who, in historical times, lived outside the peninsula." All the Semites, therefore, had passed through the totem stage, but since the Northern Semites "advanced in social and political life so much more rapidly than Arabia... we cannot look for more than very fragmentary relics of the primitive system." A considerable advance was made in 1886 when, in the article "Sacrifice" in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, the theory was proposed that sacrifice was a ceremonial meal of a totem-clan, and this was fully worked out in the Religion of the Semites, where a whole mass of evidence was collected and brought to bear upon the ritual of Semitic sacrifice and its original meaning.

Our knowledge of totemism and totem-tribes, however, has been greatly enlarged since McLennan's time, and recent studies have made it very evident that the utmost caution must be observed before we can safely derive survivals of animism or of exogamy from an earlier stage of totemism. Reserving further observations for the present, we need only mention that the members of a clan do not always consider themselves to be descended from the totem whose name they bear, that exogamy can and does exist without totemism, and that forbidden foods are not always associated with totemic animals and plants. The origin and meaning of totemism are not yet quite clear, and in spite of the relatively large amount of evidence it still remains a matter of some doubt whether even the Aryans had totemism.

To what extent the lamented Robertson Smith would have recast his views had he lived, it is of course impossible to say. Certain it is that he was ever prepared to accept

1 A new edition of Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia will shortly be published by Messrs. A. & C. Black.
fresh evidence, to weigh all arguments and criticisms, to reconsider and reject any statement of his which might appear unfounded. Meanwhile, Professor Zapletal has opened up afresh the question of totemism and the religion of Israel\(^1\), and, by making a thorough onslaught upon Robertson Smith’s arguments, has endeavoured to demolish the structure which that scholar had so carefully raised. Zapletal’s victory is apparently so easy, and his refutations are superficially so overwhelming, that, although it may be admitted that he has done good service in pointing out some of the weak spots in Robertson Smith’s armour, it is to be feared unwary readers will too hastily conclude that the theory of Semitic totemism is to be cast upon one side for the future, and that evidences of animism among the Israelites are almost wholly wanting.

In an introductory chapter Professor Zapletal has briefly outlined the views of later writers on the subject of totemism. He does not fail to recognize that totemism has entered upon a new stage, but, instead of examining the theory of Semitic totemism in the light of recent discoveries—as subsequent writers necessarily must—he has preferred to base his criticisms upon the arguments of the founder.

Professor Zapletal has with great skill and ability collected, on the one side, the arguments of Robertson Smith and his school in favour of Semitic totemism. On the other side, he has with equal care brought together the criticisms of Nöldeke, Wellhausen, Mr. Joseph Jacobs, and others, who have directly handled Robertson Smith’s theory. To every argument he has a reply, for every “survival” an explanation.

The evidence in favour of Semitic totemism has been grouped under seven heads—animal names, nature-worship, unclean animals (and forbidden foods), sacrifice,

---

1 *Der Totemismus und die Religion Israels. Ein Beitrag zur Religionswissenschaft und zur Erklärung des Alten Testaments* (Freiburg, Switzerland; 1901), pp. x + 176.
tattooing, the *jinn*, and matriarchy. Little attention is paid to *piacula*, and the question of blood-feud is scarcely mentioned. Without examining Professor Zapletal's criticisms in detail, I propose here to touch briefly upon some of his conclusions as he traverses Robertson Smith's evidence under the above heads. In the great majority of cases it is a question of points of evidence which Robertson Smith explained on the theory that they were survivals of totemism, the only legitimate alternative being whether they admit of any other explanation in harmony with the ideas of the time to which they belong. Without passing any judgment upon the totem-theory as a whole, it must be confessed that in the main Zapletal's explanations are inadequate. As the introducer of a new hypothesis Robertson Smith may have pushed the evidence too far, but we seriously doubt whether Zapletal has not endeavoured to disprove too much.

Zapletal very rightly urges that in the case of stone-worship the stone is not in itself a god, but simply an abode of the god (p. 56), in harmony with Robertson Smith¹; he rightly denies—also in company with Robertson Smith²—that names compounded with *sūr* (rock) have anything to do with fetichism. His refutation of the hazardous suggestion that David belonged to a totemic serpent-clan (pp. 68 sq.) is by no means uncalled for. There are serious text-critical difficulties in the way, and it is significant that Robertson Smith nowhere seems to have countenanced his early suggestion³.

That the evidence from animal-names alone is a precarious support for the totem-theory is now clearly recognized⁴, and perhaps the

³ *Journ. of Phil.*, IX, pp. 99 sq. Zapetal adopts the explanation suggested by Mr. Joseph Jacobs (*Archaeological Review*, May, 1889; see *Studies in Biblical Archaeology*, p. 82; London, 1894). But the friendship between David and Nahash would hardly survive the Ammonite war (2 Sam. ix), and a different theory, which takes this into account, has been proposed by the present writer in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, April, 1900, p. 164.
⁴ Cp. e.g. Jacobs, op. cit., pp. 64–103, especially pp. 68–74, and
safest conclusion at which we can arrive is that the totem-theory explains the animal-names, and holds good in default of any better explanation. Now Zapletal notes (pp. 29 sq.), with Nöldeke, that the meanings of the animal-names are sometimes uncertain; sometimes they are names of individuals and not clans, and the clan-names may have arisen from individuals with animal-names which are not of totemic origin but may be described as "characteristic." Some of the names, too, are place-names, and may have arisen from the fact that the animal in question frequented the spot. A few of the animals were introduced at a later age. He observes, with Mr. Jacobs, that the preponderating proportion of animal-names is considerably less than is found in England or Western Europe at the present day, and urges, therefore, that the argument from such names has little weight. Finally, Zapletal argues that the famous "Jaazaniah ben Shaphan" (Ezek. viii. 11), whether the "coney" be a real or a fictitious designation, is devoid of totemic associations. If Shaphan is a real name, he points to Shaphan the courtier of king Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 3) "who was certainly no totem-worshipper." If an invented name, it was chosen as a piece of irony; Jaazaniah, in spite of his name ("Yah hears") was an animal-worshipper, and is called a "ben Shaphan," i.e. "son (follower, worshipper) of a coney".

Now all this seems to be rather artificial. To take the case of "ben Shaphan," surely it is one thing to say that the giving of animal-names arose in a totemistic stage, it is quite different to argue that all animal-names of whatever age are evidences of an existing totemism. This is not the doctrine of "survivals." It is at least interesting to find the other animal-names Huldah (mole) and Achar (mouse) among the court of Josiah (2 Kings xxii), and surely Achbor (mouse) ben Micaiah (son of "Who is like Yah") is not ironical! The bearers of animal-names are not necessarily totemists, although, until a stronger case can be made out for the


---

2 Mayer Lambert, *Rev. de l'Hist. des Religions*, XXXVI, 420 (1897), suggests that such geographical names may be derived from the shape of a rock in the neighbourhood, and conjectures that the localities 'Raven's Rock' and 'Wolf's Vat' (Judges vii. 25) may have given birth to aetiological legends of the princes of Midian.
3 The horse is especially mentioned (p. 29); but cp. Robertson Smith's remarks, *Kinship*, pp. 208 sqq.; *RS.*, p. 469.
4 On English animal-names cp. Lang, *Custom and Myth* (1898), pp. 265 sq.
"natural poetry" theory of their origin\(^1\), it remains extremely probable that such names take their rise in animal-worshipping communities.

In another chapter Zapletal discusses nature-worship, and concludes that living animals were not worshipped by Israel, and that the existence of animal-images admits of a better explanation than that suggested by the totem-theory. He allows that star-worship prevailed in Israel during the wanderings in the wilderness (Amos v. 25 sq.), but ascribes it partly to foreign influence and partly to an innate love of nature. In support of this aesthetic admiration for the beauty of the heavens he cites Job xxxi. 27 sq., where, in fact, the kissing of the hand corresponds to the kissing of a sacred image (1 Kings xix. 18, Hos. xiii. 2). Organized and specific astral cults are no doubt foreign to the original religion of Israel, but star-worship itself was only natural among nomad and pastoral tribes, particularly as certain stars were supposed to bring rain\(^2\). The mas**e*bôth, &c., are explained as external signs of veneration (pp. 56 sq.), as symbols of the presence of the deity. Well-worship, he apparently considers, was borrowed from the Canaanites, to whom the chosen people adapted themselves in many external particulars (pp. 59 sq.). In regard to tree-worship he justly points out that in many cases the sacred trees are pre-Israelite, but observes that we have no sure evidence that the chosen people worshipped them after the settlement, he adds, they allowed themselves to be seduced to the worship more than once (pp. 62 sq.).

That totems are occasionally represented upon flags or ensigns appears to be an indubitable fact\(^3\), and McLennan’s theory that the ensigns of the children of Israel bore totemic clan-crests is not refuted by the objection that the detailed Rabbinical accounts are late, or that the animal metaphors in the blessings of Jacob and of Moses differ\(^4\). The encamping of the Israelites according to the 'ôthôth of the fathers’ houses (Num. ii. 2), compared with


\(^3\) EBi. (= *Encyclopaedia Biblica*), col. 1299, n. 6; see J. F. McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, 2nd ser. (London, 1896), pp. 301, 408 (pp. 380). Schwally, *Semitische Kriegsfeiertäume* (Leipzig, 1901), pp. 16 sq., suggests that the Israelite ensigns (’ôth and dépêl) have arisen from war-idioms.

\(^4\) Jacobs, pp. 91 sq.; Zapletal, pp. 114 sq.
the use of 'oth in Gen. iv. 15, suggests separate group-
marks¹: whether these were flags or ensigns (cp. E.V.), or
body-marks, need not be discussed here. It is known, too,
that the members of a totem-group will mark their totem,
or a distinctive part of the same, upon their bodies or upon
their property, and Robertson Smith thought it not un-
likely that the Arab tribal-marks, branded upon cattle or
scratched upon rocks, might be pictorial, and ultimately
totemic, in their origin. But the evidence does not appear
to be conclusive. Some of the marks are derived from
natural objects², though it would be unsafe to assume
that the present interpretation set upon them is always
correct, others are obviously borrowed from a South
Semitic script, and are thus used analogously to the Greek
κοππαρας and σαμφέρας, and the Arabic tīwā. At all events,
the evidence goes to show that the common clan- or family-
mark—this, by the way, is said to be the primary meaning
of the word "totem³"—exactly corresponds to the old land-
and clan-marks of Northern Europe. Now, just as the
cattle or property of the group could be marked with a
common wāsm, so it is not unlikely that the group itself
could be tattooed or otherwise marked to indicate their
relationship one to another and their intimate connexion
with their deity. Examples and parallels from the Semitic
world are not wanting (EBi., col. 974). In Arabia, the
tradition ran that the wāṣirat, the woman who serrated her

¹ The 'ōth would indicate the group or moiety to which the individual
belonged. In the later religion of Israel the 'ōth is a sign that the
individual belongs to Yahwē (cp. Frey, Tod, Seelenglaube, und Seelenkult in
alten Israel, p. 135; Leipzig, 1898). There is an interesting parallel to Num.
ii. in the customs of the N. American Indian tribes on the march: the
members of each totem-clan encamp separately according to a specified
arrangement (Frazer, Totemism, 81; London, 1887).

² It is to be observed that the Ass. simtu "image, figure," and asumatu
"mark, sign," like the Palmyrene κττος[ι] (= κττος), are probably
connected with wāsm (Jensen, Die Kosmologie der Babylonier, p. 349, n. 1;
Strassburg, 1890).

³ It is certainly unfortunate that a better term than "totemism" cannot be found to designate the theory which is implied.
teeth, was accursed of Allah, apparently a reference to some heathenish cult. The object of this practice, which originally would hardly be confined to women alone, may find its explanation in a desire to imitate a god. For this parallels might be cited; it may suffice to refer to the peculiar tonsure adopted by the Arabs in honour of their god Orotal, who was supposed to wear his hair in the same way (Herod. iii. 8)\(^1\). The practice of making apparently unmeaning cuts survives in Arabia to the present day. The child’s face is gashed shortly after birth, and Burton mentions, as one of the current explanations of this custom, that the child so scarred was thus shown to be “a servant of Allah’s house\(^2\).”

That similar practices were in use among the Hebrews seems almost certain in spite of Zapletal’s criticisms. Occasional ceremonial cuttings, whether to attract the attention of a god or on behalf of the dead, are not viewed as directly connected with totemism, and do not come under consideration here. Zapletal’s contention that the kēthōbeth ka’āka’ of Lev. xix. 28 (γραφματα στικτα) refers to an incision or cutting of written characters, which, as they were not animal-representations, could not be regarded as a trace of totemism, seems to be untenable. The term properly denotes a “writing of scratching,” and we may be sure that הָעַ ה here retains the primary meaning (which is found in “write,” scribo, and γράφω) of “to score or engrave.” That the mark of Cain was evidently some external cutting, probably a tribal-mark, seems to have been proved by Stade, and his conjecture that the prophets of Ahab’s

\(^1\) Prof. Haddon (Head-hunters, p. 133; London, 1909) observes that the Snake men in Mabuiag had “two small holes in the tip of their noses which were evidently meant to represent the nostrils of the snake.” For other imitations see Frazer, Totemism, pp. 26 sqq. With regard to the practice of grinding the front teeth, a fairly common custom, Mr. Frazer writes that there is no evidence that this and other mutilations of the teeth are connected with totemism (private communication).

time bore some outward mark that made them recognizable
(1 Kings xx. 38, 41) has been endorsed by Kittel, Benzinger, Holzinger (Genesis, p. 51), A. R. S. Kennedy (Hastings, BD, III, 871), and others. Finally, there are some grounds for the supposition that the "frontlets" (τοῖσὶ φόθοι) were primarily marks or cuts¹. This finds further support in the Syriac τεπεθα (pl. τεπη), "point," and it may be conjectured that the Assyrian τατάπυ, "encircle," and ταππάτυ, "protection,"² are not unconnected with τοῖσί φόθοι, since, as it has been seen, the use of the mark or waim contains the idea of tutelage or possession. There seems to be no grounds, therefore, for denying to the Hebrews the practice of making cicatrices and the like in the flesh. It is necessary, however, to observe that it can exist where totemism is unknown, it is no independent proof of the system, and it was not recognized as such by Robertson Smith in his latest utterance (RS, 334). The custom appears to indicate simply that the worshipper stood under the direct protection of the god, whether the latter has sprung from a totem would everywhere depend upon the tendency of other evidence.

Forbidden foods have often been held to be a survival of totemism, and since prominence is given in the Old Testament law-books to prohibitions of this nature, it is evident that the subject played no small part in early Israelite religion. Zapletal finds five reasons sufficient to account for the origin of the laws in Lev. xi and Deut. xiv: (1) the fact that the flesh of certain animals

¹ Frey, op. cit., pp. 135 sqq.; Holzinger, Gen. p. 51; Baentsch, Exodus, pp. 113 sqq.; C. J. Ball, art. "Cuttings," and Prof. Cheyne, art. "Prayer," in EBi. It may also be conjectured (though with less confidence) that the πακούμα or distinguished (lit. "pierced" or "bored") men (Amos vi. 1) were primarily those marked with tattooings. Parallel customs, where only the upper-classes bear tattoo marks, are not wanting (e.g. the Thracians, Herod. v. 6).
² The derivation suggested by Fr. Delitzsch. Mention should also be made of Knobel's view, that the word is from an (assumed) root πομ "to tap," on the analogy of σπίγμα from στίξω.
is deleterious; (2) the belief that the flesh of certain animals is harmful to a man's soul; (3) the pedagogic and allegorical explanations as proposed in the first instance by the early fathers; (4) the fact that certain animals would not naturally be eaten; and (5) general feelings of decency and cleanliness which would lead men to refrain from animals which devoured putrid flesh, and so forth. These explanations, it must be admitted, are insufficient, and take no account of the abrogation of the laws in Acts x. 12 sqq. We are bound to infer that there must have been good reason for the prohibitions, consequently certain of the above explanations are futile, as there would be no object in prohibiting an animal which nobody would think of eating. Moreover, when Clement of Alexandria observes that the Egyptians do not touch fish "on account of certain fables, but especially on account of such food making the flesh flabby," we have no difficulty in ascribing the priority to the first-named reason; and, similarly, when in speaking of the Jewish use of goat's flesh he notes that "it is said that the eating of goat's flesh contributes to epilepsy," we may surmise that had we only one of the "fables" of the Israelites a more plausible explanation would be at hand. But it is impossible to restrict the subject of forbidden foods to Israel alone. No doubt good reasons may be found for considering the flesh of the pig to be injurious. But the pig was not unknown in Palestine (Prov. xi. 22; Matt. viii. 30); it is figured on the sculptures of Egypt and Assyria, in the former country, though an "unclean" animal, it was an annual sacrifice, and in Assyria its flesh was forbidden (only?) on rare occasions. It was, perhaps, sacred to Bel of Nippur.

1 More weighty is the view supported by S. Many (art. "Animaux Impurs" in Vigouroux's Dict. de la Bible) that the laws have originated from the desire to sever Israel from the surrounding nations.


3 Jastrow, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (Boston, 1896), p. 381—in one case the penalty is disease of the joints.

and the sweeping statement has even been made that it was venerated wherever the Adonis cult flourished. Zapletal lays stress, also, upon the absence of forbidden plants (p. 91). But taboos in the vegetable kingdom are everywhere rarer. Examples are found in ancient Egypt and among the Yezidis, the latter being prohibited the use of lettuces, beans, cabbages, and cucumbers¹; even in Israel itself there was a myth of a forbidden tree in the Garden of Eden², and a curious Rabbinical tradition speaks of sacred trees under which priests sit but may not eat of its fruit³.

An adequate discussion of similar taboos among other peoples⁴, though it would lead to interesting results, would obviously be out of place here. It may suffice to mention that among the forbidden foods are found horses, oxen, antelopes, gazelles, and fowls, not to mention less attractive foods, as cats, dogs, moles, rattlesnakes, and vampire-bats. In the case of certain natives of the Zambesi, the hippopotamus is a taboo and the tribesmen enjoy the flesh of the foul-feeding marabou. The taboos are, as a rule, local, tribal, or national. The vampire-bat is venerated and therefore not eaten in Samoa, whilst the Savage Islanders, not far distant, consider them a delicacy. The reasons which are put forward to explain such taboos are various. The animal is sometimes supposed to be the descendant of a god, or to contain the soul of an ancestor, or the clan affected by the taboo will even regard itself as the descendants of the animal in question. Where the clan is named after an animal it will not only view that animal with a certain superstition and dread, but will refrain from eating it. Finally, it is important to observe that occasionally the tabooed food may only be eaten after a small portion has been given to the gods.

There is reason to believe that a food is forbidden on account of its being associated with some cult or belief⁵.

¹ Parry, *Six Months in a Syrian Monastery*, pp. 371 sqq., 379. According to a native view the lettuce (khass) is forbidden on account of the resemblance of the name to that of the prophetess (Khasca).
² Compare the Babylonian magic plant that restores old age to youth (*Zeit.für Assyr. u. u. v.* XIII, p. 389; Haupt in the *Journ. Amer. Or. Soc.*, XXII, I [1901]).
³ Gemara on *Abodah zarah*, III, 11.
⁴ The following notes are taken from McLenman's *Studies*, and ser.
⁵ So, in the Koran, forbidden food is that over which the name of
and in support of this Bertholet (Comm. on Lev. xi) has collected an imposing number of evidences to show that the animals forbidden to the Israelites played a prominent part in some Semitic rite, or were in one way or another the object of superstitious regard. The gazelle, though not mentioned as a forbidden food in Israel, was tabooed to the Yezidis; it was connected with the worship of the Phoenician Ashtoreth and the corresponding Arabian goddess al-'Uzza, and it is curious to find that the Banû Hârith of South Arabia, on finding the dead body of a gazelle, would bury it like a man, and mourn for it as a kinsman. "Simeon Stylites forbade his Saracen converts to eat the flesh of the camel, which was the chief element in the sacrificial meals of the Arabs, and our own prejudice against the use of horse flesh is [probably] a relic of an old ecclesiastical prohibition framed at the time when the eating of such food was an act of worship to Odin.

Among the Syrians fish were sacred to Atargatis (Derceto), and it was believed that if they ate a sprat or an anchovy they would be visited with a wasting disease. That a penalty is attached to prohibitions of this nature is important. Similarly, Dr. Frazer cites a New Guinea belief that if any one tried to lay hands upon a refugee in the dubu or temple, which serves as an asylum, his legs and arms would shrivel up. To a certain extent it may be said that the refugee is the possession of the numen, who thus avenges himself for an affront upon his property. It is on the same analogy that in Palestine a god other than Allah has been invoked (Sûr. V, 4, XVI, 116, &c.). S. Reinâch (Revue Scientifique, Oct. 13, 1900, p. 451, col. 1, n. 1) observes that the Russian peasant of to-day will not kill the dove on account of its association with the Holy Spirit.

1. Robertson Smith, The Old Test. in the Jewish Church, and ed., p. 367.
2. For a series of similar penalties cp. Frazer, Totemism, pp. 16 sqq.
3. Fortnightly Review, April, 1899, p. 651.
4. The abode of the god constitutes the sanctuary; thus in Persia (where the horse is a sacred animal) the stable is an asylum (Folk-Lore, XII, p. 269 [1901]).
the guardian saint is supposed to punish the man who removes a piece of wood from the forest or bushes around his abode, or attacks the man or animal that trespasses or feeds upon his grounds; and it is for this reason that the modern bedouin will still store his food or fuel near a holy grave, confident that it will be untouched. The thing is sacrosanct because it is "holy." But it is very important to bear in mind that mere ideas of property do not cover the whole ground. Taboos exist where there is no clearly defined god, and it is quite as likely that a tomb should be placed in a sacred locality as that a spot should have the reputation of sanctity through the presence of a tomb. Taboos may arise from the most varied circumstances, but no discussion of Semitic taboos is possible without a consideration of the conceptions underlying the use of the terms "clean" and "unclean," and it is Zapletal's failure to realize this that weakens his attempt to explain the laws of forbidden food. Among the many survivals of the idea in Talmudic times we may probably include the circumstance that the later Rabbis disapproved of the barber's trade on account of his association with ceremonial tonsures; such a person may well have been deemed "unclean." Similarly, drivers of asses and camels may have been abominated because the latter was an unclean animal (note its occurrence in the list of forbidden foods), and on account of the probable connexion of the former with Jewish heathenism (though absolute proof is wanting, RS., p. 468). Possibly, too, the

1 PEFQ. (= Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statements), 1893, pp. 216, 219; cp. 1873, p. 86; 1875, p. 210; 1877, p. 91; 1879, pp. 46 sq. It is pertinent to observe that the use of a church as a storehouse has often been noted in North Syria and elsewhere.

2 Thus Zapletal's view (pp. 127 sq.) that the animals in a sacred tract—the ḥima—were dedicated to a deity, and therefore the property of a deity, misses the point, and fails to take account of the argument in RS., pp. 142 sq., 145 sq., 153 sq., 288, n. 1.

3 See, fully, Mr. G. A. Simcox's article in EBii, col. 836 sqq.

4 EBii, col. 507, n. 5.
tanner was obliged to carry on his evil-smelling craft outside the precincts of the city because of his dealings with the skins of sacrificial beasts, and an analogy for this is found in the Hill Tribes of Central India, where the Chamar, primarily a tanner or currier, from his association with hides, in particular those of the sacred ox, is detested by orthodox Hindus. The most reasonable conclusion we may draw is that there are sure and certain survivals of animal-worship among the Hebrews, and, since they appear in the guise of forbidden foods, it is probable that the animals were at some time regarded as closely allied to clans or communities of men. To what extent the ideas of incarnation-animals and the transmigration of souls may lie at the bottom of this it is hard to say. At all events the principle belongs, as does also the doctrine of totem-animals, to the same general theory of animal-worship, but the identification of the two does not hold good without independent support in other directions.

Robertson Smith's important theory of the totem-sacrifice, a fuller consideration of which in the light of the present evidence was to be expected, is unfortunately handled with disproportionate briefness (pp. 92-105), and Zapletal's criticisms in the main only affect points of detail. His conclusion that sacrifice is a recognition that God is the highest ruler and that man owes Him his life is of course true for Israel. It was the ideal conception, but it is scarcely primitive. The claim of divine ancestry, he states, is due to a desire for flattery, or to a high grade of veneration. This, again, is partly true, but does not appear to go deep enough. "To claim divine descent and an especial sacredness for the ruling house is no peculiarity of the East, or any other part of the world," and the evidence for cults in the Hellenic world has been collected by Mr. E. R. Bevan. It is noteworthy that the divine official

---

3 English Historical Review, Oct. 1901, pp. 625-639.
surnames are not *claimed* by the holder, but *conferred* by the people¹, and the evidence clearly shows how easily the king and god could be identified one with the other. In this connexion it may be added that Zapletal (pp. 132 sqq.) finds no survival of heathen mythology in the ancient fragment Gen. vi. 2-4. His view that the bêne Elohim are mere ordinary men seems improbable; the mythological interpretation is the more natural, and is as early as the Septuagint translation and the Book of Enoch ². Further, he holds to the opinion that the proper names consisting of the divine name compounded with a term of relationship do not imply a physical tie—a view more easily asserted than proved. Mr. G. B. Gray, in fact, has shown that such names go back to early times, and were not confined to Israel alone. Strangely enough, they commence to fall into disuse “just when the deeper ideas of the fatherhood of God were developing,” and the existence of parallel compounds of aḥ (e.g. Ahijah, “brother is Yah”) forbid our interpreting them in a spiritual sense³. Whether the veneration of domestic animals is an important item in the theory of totemism or not, Zapletal’s opinion, that it has arisen from the desire of the whole tribe to control the killing of beasts which provide them with food and clothing (pp. 98 sq., cp. 74) is hardly convincing. It does not explain the dedication of the cow among the Todas, or the fact that the butcher among the Troglodyte nomads of East Africa was unclean, or even the opprobrious reproach, “you kill your cattle,” hurled at the heads of the men of Jōbar*. In his chapter on the jinn Zapletal criticizes the evidence for the totemic origin of a belief in demons. The

⁴ J. G. Wetzstein in *Zeit. d. Morgenländ. Gesell.*, XI [1857], p. 468. Even Kremer (*Studien*, ii. pp. 86 sq.) observes that the fact remains that there is a decided reluctance to kill and eat cattle except on special occasions.
nature of the Arabic *jinn* has been recently handled by Westermarck 1, whose criticisms are well worthy of serious consideration. This writer clearly shows that the *jinn* are not necessarily the denizens of places frequented by wild beasts, that they are commonly man's enemies, and that they are, broadly speaking, beings "invented to explain what seems to fall outside the pale of nature." Their general resemblance to the fairies, trolls, and goblins of Europe has been noted by Mr. Lang 2, and like these, it may be added, they sometimes appear in a more friendly or, sometimes even, a mischievous guise. In modern Lebanon the *jinn* will "sometimes perform kindnesses to the poor and distressed by multiplying their meal, or causing mills to grind extra-quickly. In these cases they manifest themselves as old men of the mountains" 3. That the Israelites shared with the Arabs a belief in the *jinn* seems certain from the numerous survivals of demonism in later times. Zapletal, however, holds that it is by no means certain that the *šērīm* of Isa. xiii. 21 are demons, they are more probably wild-goats (p. 123). Elsewhere (pp. 74 sq.) he observes that living animals were not worshipped by the Hebrews, and that in Lev. xvii. 7, 2 Chron. xi. 15, the term is an opprobrious epithet for demons which were supposed to have the form of goats. No notice is taken of the *šēdim* to whom sacrifices were offered (Deut. xxxii. 17), or of the story of Hiel (1 Kings xvi. 34), where comparative anthropology teaches us to recognize a special kind of sacrifice to supernatural powers 4.

3 *Folk-Lore,* IX (1898), p. 19. Cp. also ib., XI (1900), 390, and *PEFQ,* 1893, pp. 215 sq. Modern Palestinian folk-lore, too, has its stories of people who dance and sing at night-time, and suddenly disappear when the name of God is mentioned.
4 For parallels see *EBi.,* col. 2063; Schwally, op. cit., pp. 92 sq.; *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.,* XXIX (1899), p. 262, and *Folk-Lore,* IX (1898), p. 16, where mention is made of sacrifices of sheep or oxen in Lebanon at the finishing
In the concluding chapter Zapletal turns to the vexed question of exogamy and matriarchy. He finds no traces of promiscuity; female infanticide may have arisen through poverty, and polygamy, which plays an important part among the Semites, points to patriarchy. The alleged evidences in favour of matriarchy in the Old Testament he explains as due to the well-known psychological fact that a more tender relation always exists between mother and child. Exogamy, as a custom, may have arisen elsewhere from a lack of women, or, more especially in the case of the rich and noble, from a desire to enter into alliance with reputable families. He holds that the mention of a man’s mother, and not father, in magical ceremonies admits of an explanation other than matriarchy (p. 159, n. 2), thus differing from Nöldeke, who on the same grounds suspected a survival of matriarchy among the Mandeans (p. 139, n. 3). Opinion will probably be divided as to the weight to be attached to Gen. ii. 24. That in the mind of the narrator the words had a psychological meaning (Holzinger, Genesis, p. 30) may well be granted, the question whether they originally indicated matriarchy (Gunkel, ad loc.) depends upon the view taken of the other evidences of the custom in the Old Testament. Zapletal’s discussion of marriage with half-sisters is meagre, and the existence of prohibitory laws in Deut. xxvii. 22; Lev. xviii. 9, 11; xx. 17 (cp. Ezek. xxii. 11), carries more weight than his explanation of 2 Sam. xiii (p. 166). In regard to the marriage of son and step-mother no point is made by the remark that in the case of Reuben and Bilhah the present conclusion of the narrative (Gen. xxxv. 22) is abrupt, and that doubtless a word of blame originally followed. Nor is it helpful to insist that in 2 Sam. xvi. 22 concubines and not wives are mentioned, the tone of the narrative here, as also in iii. 7 and 1 Kings ii. 13-25, suggests that we have to do with an act of presumption rather than an unheard-of crime.

Zapletal’s main thesis is the denial that the Israelites—of a house, also at the opening of the Beirūt-Damascus railway. The animal has here taken the place of a human victim; cp. J. G. Frazer, Journal of Philology, XIV (1885), p. 156. The whole subject is voluminously treated by Paul Sartori, “Ueber das Bauopfer,” in the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, 1898, Jan., pp. 1 sqq.

The argument is unsound, endogamy would be equally natural among rich families. It may be noticed that, according to Prof. Tylor (Nineteenth Century, July, 1896, p. 92), whereas maternal peoples are endogamous, exogamous peoples do not necessarily retain matriarchy, but may be either maternal or paternal, clanship being reckoned on the mother’s or father’s side accordingly.
incidentally, also, as we gather, that the Semites—were
totemists. If I am not mistaken, he would go further
and deny all traces of fetichism or animism in general.
Now, it is to be remembered that Robertson Smith
himself does not go so far as to lay down any formulated
account of the totemism of Israel. In 1880 he
concluded that “the superstitions with which the spiritual
religion had to contend were not one whit less degrading
than those of the most savage nations. . . . It does
not appear that Israel was, by its own wisdom, more
fit than any other nation to rise above the lowest
level of heathenism.” In 1894 his opinion of Semitic
totemism may, I think, be conveniently summarized in
these words: “At the stage which even the rudest Semitic
peoples had reached when they first become known
to us, it would be absurd to expect to find examples of
totemism pure and simple. What we may expect to find
is the fragmentary survival of totem ideas, in the shape of
special associations between certain kinds of animals on
the one hand, and certain tribes or religious communities
and their gods on the other hand.” Considering the mono-
theistic ideals of the prophets and teachers in Israel, the
incessant war against heathenism, and the redaction that
the books of the Old Testament have undergone, it is
not to be expected that survivals should be numerous.
It is to the people not to the prophets, to the lore and not
to the literature, that we must look for further evidence.
“Neglected by sacred poets, it will linger among the
superstitions of the rustics.” Experience shows that
primitive superstitions and beliefs are almost ineradicable.
Wave after wave of foreign population may flood a country

1 Journal of Philology, IX (1880), p. 100.
“Among the Semites, as amongst the Aryans, we nowhere find totemism
a living organism, though we find all the disjecta membra.”
3 Similarly, traces of fetichism in the oldest Aryan literature are found
only in the relics of popular poetry connected with charms, imprecations
and other superstitious usages (Lang, Custom and Myth, p. 241).
without destroying the germs of its early rites and cults, and, as is often the case, the conquerors may be physically conquered by the people they have beaten. That this is true of the Semitic world is abundantly proved by the presence of the same physical types that were in existence nearly three thousand years ago, and by the survival of rites and beliefs closely parallel with, if not identical to, those of the earliest times. It is no great matter for surprise—though the evidence is none the less acceptable—that a complete pillar-cult should have survived to the present day in Upper Macedonia; the suppliant kisses and embraces the sacred stone and drinks thrice from the water of an adjacent holy spring mingled with earth from a sacred grave at the head of which grows a thorn-tree hung with rags. There is still room for a collection of the evidences of Semitic heathenism past and present. "Much of Talmudic ritual carries on the face of it evidence of more archaic ritual than the more ideal codes of Ezekiel and the Pentateuch," and the prevalence of genuine Semitic heathen beliefs under a veneer of Mohammedanism is abundantly vouched for among the modern fellahin and bedouin.

There seems to be a tendency in Zapletal's book to sever the early religion of Israel from that of the surrounding Semites in a manner hardly warranted by the evidence. He is at pains to show that we know too little of the early home of the Semites to infer that Israelite beliefs are to be explained in the same manner as Arabian parallels (p. 25), although there is no sound reason why Israel should not have possessed the same ideas and superstitions as other nomadic Semites. This, the most natural view, is held

---

1 A. J. Evans, *The Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult* (London, 1901), pp. 102-106. With the meal referred to, we may compare, inter alia, the Yazidi custom of eating of the dust from the tomb of the patron Sheikh Adi on the occasion of a marriage ceremony. The mere possession of the sacred earth is viewed as a blessing (*Journal Asiatique*, 9th ser., t. 7 [1895], pp. 111, 126, and 115, 130).

2 Jacobs, op. cit., p. 31.
by the great majority of critics of the Old Testament. As Prof. Driver has said:—

"The general result of the archaeological and anthropological researches of the past half-century has been to take the Hebrews out of the isolated position which, as a nation, they seemed previously to hold.... Their beliefs... their social usages... their religious institutions, can no longer be viewed, as was once possible, as differing in kind from those of other nations, and determined in every feature by a direct revelation from Heaven; all, it is now known, have substantial analogies among other peoples."

The curious rite of the Ordeal of Jealousy, the superstitious fear of iron in holy places, ritual dances, scapegoats, speaking trees, and stars imbued with life, are among the indications that Israel was no different to other primitive peoples. Israel came out of the desert, the home of infantile beliefs and ideas. Yahwism was hostile to Israel's older beliefs, and in spite of the polemics of prophets and the prohibitions of priestly schools did not succeed in eradicating its early inheritance of heathenism and superstition. Polytheism (or, better, polydemonism) prevailed in Israel, as among her neighbours, although the plural form

1 Authority and Archaeology (London, 1899), pp. 6 sq.
2 Exod. xx. 25; Deut. xxvii. 5; Joshua viii. 31; 1 Kings vi. 7. Aben Ezra's conjecture that the fear is connected with some abomination ('עון), and that the touch of iron would profane ('נדו) the stone, is singularly luminous. This conservatism is easily paralleled. Going back a stage in human culture, we find the savages of Central Australia retaining the fire-stick (a piece of bark) on the occasion of initiatory ceremonies and the like, long after they have become acquainted with the use of implements of stone (Spencer and Gillen, Indian Tribes of Central Australia, p. 401).
3 Dances round trees are still kept up in Lebanon (Folk-Lore, IX, pp. 8 sq., 15 sq.); also elsewhere on the occasion of vows and sacrifices, though the practice is considered sinful (PEFQ., 1893, p. 208).
4 Its partial success is seen in the almost entire absence of dolmens within the borders of Israel, and in the small number of rock-carvings and pottery-figures among the finds of recent explorers (cp. C. R. Conder, Palestine, pp. 110, 115 sq., 155 sq.). On the other hand, it is remarkable to find animals portrayed upon Galilean synagogues, particularly when the animals in question include the "unclean" hare (ibid., pp. 90 sq.).
As Zapletal and Nöldeke agree, is no proof for the same. There is not the slightest doubt that many of the later cults and beliefs in Israel were derived from the settled Canaanite inhabitants of the land, and a distinction can often be drawn between the religious and social practices of a nomad pastoral folk, and those of settled agriculturists open to the civilization of neighbouring powers. It may be questioned, however, whether any system of "ethnology in folk-lore" would allow us to do this thoroughly. There are, perhaps, too many factors to be taken into consideration. In addition to the specifically Canaanite cults (forms of nature-worship connected with agriculture), the rites and practices directly or indirectly borrowed from Babylonia (astral cults, sexual licence, &c.) and the importations of Aramaean origin (Gad and Meni, Tophet) — the evidence for so-called Turanian or Accadian survivals is of the slightest — we have now to face the possibility of traces of Mycenaean culture and beliefs in Canaan, and (may we add?) in Israel. At all events it is worth noting that the Mycenaean sacred animals include the ass, lion, bull, stag, horse, goat and pig, though it would be unsafe...

1 Nöldeke, ZDMG., XLII, p. 476; Zapletal, pp. 129 sq. The latter, however, does not admit that polytheism has been proved for Israel (Revue Biblique, Oct. 1901, p. 651).

2 The very presence of the civilizations of Assyria and Egypt is sometimes taken to support the view that Israel was scarcely deficient in culture previous to the settlement in Canaan. So, for example, Hommel (Ancient Hebrew Tradition, pp. 239 sq.). But a definite impulse led the Hebrews to Canaan, had it not been for which they would assuredly have remained a nomadic people like the Arameans, who, as Hommel himself justly observes (p. 208), "would seem to have offered the same resistance to Babylonian civilization as was always displayed by the Beduin Arab tribes in Palestine."

3 Cp. EBi., col. 1965.

4 The name Tophet, at least, may be Aramaean (RS., p. 377).

to base any theories upon this list alone. Horse-worship for the Semites and Mycenaeans would find a common starting-point in Persia or Armenia, but it would be unwise to treat every parallel as due to a common source.

Thus the suggestion that the tree- and pillar-cults of the Semites and Mycenaeans have been borrowed from a common source in the form of a pre-Aryan, pre-Semitic race of Asia Minor goes much too far. So widespread a custom cannot have been derived from one fountain-head. To assume too hastily that the existence of a similar cult or custom among peoples is due to borrowing is as rash as for the philologist to endeavour to trace a historical connexion between the languages of the agglutinative group. That the greatest caution is required is naturally obvious, a foreign cult may be so grafted upon a religion that it can become regarded as part of the original stock; an illustrative example of this is to be seen in the sporadic traces of a Tammuz-Adonis cult in the Mohammedan festival of Hosein.

Enough has been said, perhaps, to illustrate the lines upon which the latest opponent of Robertson Smith's theory has worked, and to indicate our opinion of the general inadequacy of Professor Zapletal's criticisms. Notwithstanding this, let it be remembered that his book has undoubtedly the merit of pointing out the weak places in the totem-theory. It is possible that retrenchment may be found necessary in certain side-issues, but the question of Semitic totemism must still be confessed to be sub judice until the whole of the available evidence from the entire Semitic field has been studied in the light of

1 A. B. Cook, "Animal Worship in the Mycenaean Age" in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, XIV (1894), pp. 81 sqq.; see especially pp. 157 sqq. Mr. Cook, who suggests that the Mycenaeans were not totemists pure and simple, observes that the indications point to their worship having been developed out of an earlier totemism.
2 Cp. d'Alviella, Rev. de l' Histoire des Religions, XLIV (1901), pp. 1-15, who shows that analogies may spring from (1) a common heritage, (2) intentional or accidental borrowing, and (3) parallel formation.
our growing knowledge of totemism in other parts of the world. To a brief consideration of this we now turn.

Totemism, it may be said, is essentially a product of the English school. English writers have familiarized the study, and it is due to English research that it may now be said to have entered upon a new stage. The admirable labours of Messrs. Spencer and Gillen among the tribes of Central Australia have brought to light a system of totemism differing in essential particulars from the systems already known to us; and although their discoveries have necessitated a reconsideration of the whole theory, they have this unique value that "they seem to point to a solution more complete and satisfactory than any that has hitherto been offered." The facts are these: among the Arunta, a representative tribe, the belief prevails that the members of the totem-group are the descendants of semi-human ancestors intimately associated, if not actually identical, with the animals (or plants) after which they are named. These ancestors roamed over the country in totem-groups, carrying sacred stones called Churinga, which, as Dr. Frazer has pointed out, seem to represent the external soul of folk-lore. At certain well-known spots a number of ancestors went into the ground carrying the Churinga with them. Their spirits continue to haunt these places, and, entering into women, become reincarnated. Whatever be the totem of the mother or the father, that of the child rests upon the locality where the mother believes that she


2 Mr. R. H. Mathews (Queensland Geographical Journal, new ser., XVI, p. 85) has recorded a somewhat similar idea: infants live in rocky hills and forest trees before birth. It is worth noticing that the Arunta happen to be the only recorded tribe who have a belief in an immaculate conception. Natural death is an unknown idea among them, and every death is supposed to be due to the magic influence of some malevolent person, and steps are taken to avenge it.
has conceived. The totems, therefore, are strictly local, though what may be called local centres of any one totem may be found in various districts of the area occupied by the tribe.

In addition to the Churinga, the ancestors carried about with them a Nurtunja, or sacred pole, emblematic of the totem. They were, too, the originators of certain ceremonies, of the nature of sympathetic magic, called Intichiuma, whereby each totem-group endeavoured to gain control over the object after which it is named. Thus, the men of the kangaroo, emu, and other groups respectively, perform magical rites to secure an increase of the article of food in question, the men of the Hakea Flower totem or of the mulga tree each multiply their totem, the Rain men secure due measure of rain, and so the whole of nature is partitioned out among the tribe. "In the case of many of the totems, it is just when there is promise of the approach of a good season that it is customary to hold the ceremonies." These magical ceremonies, therefore, would find their analogy in the well-known spring or midsummer festivals of Europe, and, needless to say, predominate wherever the supply of food and water is uncertain owing to the climate and other considerations.

Now it is remarkable that, although the rule that the totem-animal or plant must not be killed or eaten by the totem-group is very generally observed at the present day, the traditions unambiguously point to a time when the ancestors both killed and ate their totem, not occasionally, but regularly. But, on the occasion of these Intichiuma ceremonies the leading members of the totem-group have the first right to the animal or plant whose increase they endeavour to procure, and not only this, it is absolutely necessary for them, and especially for the head man, to eat a little of it. To eat none on these occasions would be as dangerous as to eat too freely of it at other times:

1 Spencer and Gillen, op. cit., pp. 169 sq.
it is essential to the success of the ceremony. Not only
does each totem-group work for the benefit of the others,
but a man will sometimes actually take a very active
part in helping others to charm and kill his own totem.
If, on the other hand, the totem is dangerous, it would
be the aim of the group to curb, control, or nullify its
propensities. Hence, as Dr. Frazer suggests, from the Arab
belief that the blood of men of noble rank is a cure
for hydrophobia, we may conjecture that the men were
descendants of a dog totem-group.1

From a consideration of the Central Australian data
Dr. Frazer and Prof. Baldwin Spencer independently
reached an explanation of the meaning of totemism which,
if correct, completely revolutionizes our conceptions of the
system. "It is not so much a religious as an economic
system," writes Dr. Frazer; "it is not a worship of
nature, but a mode of exploiting nature by means of magic
for the common good. It is especially (but by no means
only) a system of providing, by means which seem to the
savage natural and reasonable (not supernatural and
mysterious), for the food supply. It is the business of a
man whose totem is an edible animal, to multiply animals
of that sort in order that they may be killed and eaten.
It is the business of a man whose totem is an edible plant,
to multiply plants of that sort in order that they may
be gathered and eaten. The functions of the two corre-
pond to those of the grazier, the farmer, and (to some
extent apparently) the butcher with us. They breed
animals for eating (and seem sometimes to kill or help
others to kill them), and they grow roots and plants
also for eating. The means they employ are, indeed,
irrational and absurd (for they are magical), but the

1 RS., pp. 368 sq. The belief was fairly prevalent, cp. Wellhausen, Reste
arabischen Heidentums, 1st ed., p. 142, 2nd ed., p. 162. Marillier would
associate the belief with the magical properties ascribed generally to royal
2 In a private communication.
intentions of the men answer exactly to those of our graziers and farmers."

Ceremonies more or less analogous to the *Intichiuma* are not wanting1, and Dr. Frazer writes that the drift of the latest evidence seems to confirm the above explanation of the meaning of totemism. Messrs. Spencer and Gillen "have during the last year been exploring the tribes to the north of those formerly examined by them, and one of the results of the new information (communicated to him in letters by Prof. Baldwin Spencer) is to prove the correctness, for the Central Australians at least, of the more or less hypothetical explanation of totemism put forward on the basis of the previously ascertained facts. According to Prof. Haddon, there are some grounds, also, for thinking that the same explanation will apply to the totemism of the Papuan peoples*. Further, certain indications lead us to anticipate that the same thing will prove to be true of the well-developed totemic system of the Baganda in Central Africa, though as yet it would be premature to speak with confidence on the subject. The matter is receiving careful attention. Should it turn out, however, that what we may call the economic theory of totemism explains the system as we find it in Central Australia, the Papuan area, and Central Africa, we might almost conclude, with a fair degree of probability, that the same explanation would hold good of totemism everywhere, if only the facts were sufficiently ascertained, which, unfortunately, they seldom are."

The immense importance of this evidence is clear. Hitherto only a very limited number of cases was known where an animal, apparently sacred, and *ex hyp. a totem*, was solemnly killed, but in no instance was there a clear proof of the eating of the animal by the group, the essential part of Robertson Smith's theory of the totem-sacrifice (*RS.*, pp. 294 sq.). Now, at last, in the *Intichiuma* ceremonies we have authenticated cases of a practice which he had conjectured though without any certain example. It is to be noted, however, that there is nothing abstract or mysterious about the rite. No theologically abstract idea

---


3 Even the *Intichiuma* rites escaped the notice of Europeans until quite recently.
of communion underlies it. It is a piece of practical co-operative magic, and is based upon a utilitarian motive.  

Herein lies the great distinction between the "totem sacrament" of Robertson Smith's theory and the actual evidence of the Central Australian rites. Robertson Smith's theory inferred, to quote Dr. Frazer again, "a totem community united in reverence, awe, and love of the totem animal, solemnly and sorrowfully killing it once a year, and partaking of its flesh, not as common food to fill their stomachs, but as a means of entering into a mystic communion with the divine animal. What are the facts? We find a community of which the greater part regularly kills and eats the animal in question whenever they can lay hands on it, whilst the remaining section (which has the animal for its totem) does its best to multiply the creature in order that all the rest of the people may devour it. And since, in order to breed the animal for eating, they think it necessary to have part of its substance in their bodies, they do ceremonially partake of its flesh, not in order to acquire certain mysterious divine qualities, but ultimately in order that the majority of their fellows may feed on roast kangaroo, roast emu, or whatever it may be. Instead of a mystic religious rite like the Christian sacrament of the Eucharist (which was clearly in Robertson Smith's mind), we see a magical ceremony of the most practical and business-like intention. The difference is that between the spiritual religion of a highly cultured European and the crude, grossly materialistic magic of the  

1 With this compare Mr. Jacobs' remarkably acute criticism of Robertson Smith's theory (Studies, pp. 33 sq.): "The whole idea of communion seems to me too theologically abstract to be at the basis of savage rites of sacrifice. For these we must look to some utilitarian motive, based, it may be, on some savage and seemingly absurd idea, but logically deduced from it." The author of the too little known Studies in Biblical Archaeology has exactly hit the mark in these words, which were written at least twelve years ago.  

2 Cp. also Frazer, "On some Ceremonies of the Central Australian Tribes," a paper read before the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, 1900, pp. 315 sq.
primitive Australian savage. Further, the relation of the group to the totem cannot properly, it seems to me, be described as worship. In worship the worshipper confesses his inferiority to the being worshipped. In the Central Australian ceremonies for the multiplication of plants and animals the man no more confesses his inferiority to his totem than (to recur to the simile employed above) a cattle-breeder confesses his inferiority to his cow, or a farmer to his wheat. Quite apart from this, it is a mistake to speak of a totem as a god. A totem may have often developed into a god (though this is not certain), but it is hardly any more a god than a seed is a tree because it may grow into one... On the whole, the thing that seems to come out most strongly in the relation of a man to his totem is his identification with it; he becomes, as far as may be, a creature of the same sort as his totem. If his totem is a kangaroo, then his creed is, not that the kangaroo is his god, but that he himself is a kangaroo as near as may be."

I have gladly availed myself of Dr. Frazer's permission to quote his statement of the difference between the theoretical "totem sacrament" and the actual evidence of the Intichiuma ceremonies, since it is not unlikely that the divergence between the two may not have been fully realized. At the same time it is necessary to estimate the bearing of the new evidence upon Robertson Smith's theory at its proper worth. There is no one, I imagine, who, because Robertson Smith's explanation of certain Semitic sacrificial phenomena, which had never before been fairly studied in the light of comparative anthropology, proves to be without probability, will appreciate his unequalled wealth of resource or critical insight the less. Few Orientalists are anthropologists, and the happy combina-

1 The principle was stated long ago (Frazer, Totemism, p. 3), though it was not clear why the man should have identified himself with his totem. The new evidence now makes it abundantly plain that by this means he is able to control and direct the species for the common good—multiplying it if edible, controlling or propitiating it if dangerous or destructive. That little distinction is made between the man and his totem appears, for example, in two aboriginal drawings cited by Mr. R. H. Mathews (Queensland Geogr. Journ., XIV, pp. 10 sq. [1898-9]), where an emu and a kangaroo are depicted with a shield.
tion in the person of Robertson Smith will doubtless long remain unparalleled 1.

Further important discoveries were made by Messrs. Spencer and Gillen regarding the social organization of the Central Australian tribes. It was found that one set of tribes strictly observed the familiar rule that a man must not marry a woman of his totem, whilst in another, of which the Arunta may be regarded as representative, totemism has no effect upon either marriage or descent. In addition to this, the traditions of the Arunta clearly point to a time when men and women of one totem lived together, and a man never married a woman who was not of his totem. This novel though not illogical idea further complicates the problem of the origin of exogamy.

It is very important to notice—what has been often observed—that climatic and other considerations have some bearing on the problem. In studying the structure of the South Australian tribes, Mr. Howitt 2 found that the most backward types of social organization, with descent through the mother, and an archaic form of communal marriage, existed in the dry and desert country. In the more genial districts descent through the mother still survived, but of the communal or group-marriage only relics remained. Finally, in fertile districts where food abounded, descent was counted through the father, and individual marriage prevailed. The last-mentioned stage is that now reached

1 I venture in this connexion to quote from a letter from Dr. Frazer:
"If you cite my reasons for questioning the correctness of Robertson Smith's theory of the 'totem sacrament,' I hope you will make it clear that I continue, as ever, to hold in high respect and admiration the work of a very dear friend, whose vast superiority both in learning and in intellect I have always been proud and happy to recognize. He was a tower of strength in whose shadow his friends rested and felt safe... It is the reverse of pleasant to me to express dissent from him. But no man, however great his genius, could see to the bottom of a subject in which the data are so imperfect as they were in regard to totemism in Robertson Smith's lifetime. The wonder is not that he did not see further, but that he saw so far."

2 See Mr. E. S. Hartland in Folk-Lore, XI (1900), pp. 71 sq.
by the Arunta tribe, whence it would appear that their
totem-system has already undergone some development.
Already we find the germs of a priesthood, and of cities
of asylum; the totem-system is plainly territorial, and,
as Mr. Hartland conjectures, is gradually developing into
something similar to the societies of British Columbia.

Space forbids a fuller discussion of these and of the
numerous other points of interest which Messrs. Spencer
and Gillen's work has raised. In spite of the very meagre
account we have given of the totemism of the Arunta
enough has perhaps been said to indicate its importance
for the totem-theory, though it is well to keep before
us always the possibility that the traditions of a primitive
endogamy and of a time when the clan killed and ate its
totem-animal area etiological.

With reference to the foregoing evidence from Central Australia
it is necessary to guard against viewing all analogies elsewhere as
actual evidences of an original totemism. Neither the European
festivals which Mannhardt and Frazer have interpreted as originally
charms for the revival of vegetation, nor any other examples of
sympathetic magic are, taken by themselves, evidences of totemism.
But they are analogies, and it is one of the many valuable features
of the Australian evidence that it reveals a people who do still take
part and believe in ceremonies which are almost extinct in Europe,
the meaning of which has for long been forgotten by the participants
themselves.

We still know too little to lay it down that the system of economics
revealed in the *Inихима* is an essential of totemism, and con-

---

1 With this qualification, however, that the child belongs to the same
exogamous moiety of the tribe as his father.

2 See Mr. E. S. Hartland in *Folk-Lore*, XI (1900), pp. 74 sq. These
societies are comparatively modern, and are quite independent of the
totem-system there in vogue; each group is under the special protection
of a single spirit.

3 See, for the former, Mr. Hartland, *Folk-Lore*, XI (1900), p. 76, for the
to have preceded exogamy among the Yakuts, so according to Sieroshevski

4 Similarly, the *tamu* (taboo) has frequently a very practical and intel-
ligible purpose—that of enforcing a 'close' period (op. Lang, *Magic and
sequently it is not easy to determine the evolution which such ceremonies could undergo. We can scarcely go so far as to suggest that the co-operative method of procuring food would lead to the institution of hereditary trades and professions, or of organized guilds, although Prof. Haddon tells us that "though rain is not a totem the office of 'rain-maker' was hereditary in Mabuiag, and consequently rain-making would be the function of a particular family." But the evidence for "departmental totemism"—if we may so call it—is as present of the slightest.

It is particularly interesting to find that among the tribes of the Northern Territory of South Australia "some of the old men, the shamans of the tribe, profess to have the power of causing the supply of animals, fruit, vegetables, roots, and other sources of food to increase." If wild-ducks are desired a man of the wild-duck totem officiates, and so on. In time the importance attached to the aid of such men might lead to their attaining the position of priests or chiefs. Already we find them wizards, and doubtless ere long they would be credited with more extensive powers. It is impossible here, however, to pursue this subject further. At all events let us note that the savage who goes to a man of the emu totem when he requires emu, finds an analogy in Aelian's statement (NA. XI, 9, cp. RS., p. 160, n. 1) that in the sacred island of Icarus in the Persian Gulf the wild-goats and gazelles could not be successfully and safely hunted until permission had been obtained from the resident goddess (Artemis). It is true that the gap between the two seems wide, but some recently published evidence seems to suggest the manner in which it could be bridged. The Churinga, which plays an important part in the Intichiuma ceremonies, finds its fellow in the Madubu (bull-roarer) of New Guinea, one of the functions of which is to secure good crops, whilst the Madub, a wooden image, a kind of "garden charm," would "turn devil" at night-time and go round the

Religion, pp. 257-69 [London, 1901]), but could it be said that this was its original meaning and aim?

1 Head-hunters, p. 134.
3 Maqrizi, in his account of Ḥadhramaut (ed. Noskowij, pp. 24 sqq.; Bonn, 1866), mentions a tribe called 'Omar ibn 'Išā, all the men of which possessed the power of curing snake-bite, also a bedouin tribe, the Ḥamar, in the mountains of Ṣafār (Ḍofār), any member of which was supposed to be able to control the rain. Whether these tribes were pure Arabian or not, it is at all events plausible to suggest that they once belonged to snake and rain totems respectively. For an interesting rain-charm practised by the Ḥamar, see Frazer, Golden Bough, and ed., I, p. 84.
gardens swinging the bull-roarer to make the yams grow. Finally, mention is made of a wooden image, sometimes called Orooadubu (usually translated “god”), which makes everything grow, and before which presents of food are placed when the planting season commences—thus reminding us of the meal indulged in by the participants of the Intichiuma (see above, p. 436). The gradual deification is interesting.

We can scarcely expect to find evidence for the existence of such a totem-system among the Semites. In Australia itself we find a very considerable diversity of usages, and Prof. A. C. Haddon has warned us of the possibility of a “differential evolution” in the history of totemism. “There may be a lagging behind or an acceleration or an entire omission of certain customs and beliefs in even allied tribes which belong to the same general level of culture.” This is more to the point than the view of the late Marillier that totemism is a rare form of cult incapable both of evolution and of transformation, a view which would imply that survivals of animal-worship, ancestor-worship, and the like, are to be regarded as of other than totemic origin. We may only expect to find totemism flourishing where culture is rudimentary, and where the domestication of animals has made no, or at least little, progress. Thus it is that in North America and Australia totemism has lasted until the advent of European man. But how striking are the divergences! The Arunta eat the totem as a solemn rite, among the tribes of North West Canada—to take a recently investigated case—this nowhere happens. The former believe that they are descended from the totem-species, among the latter this belief does not prevail. In both, however, there is the vague bond uniting man and beast, that concomitant of totemism which, it has been conjectured, ultimately leads to the domestication of those animals that have “the instinct of domestication.”

In view of the above differences it may be premature to seek analogies, developments, or survivals of totemism among the Semites before the forms and phenomena of savage belief have been more strictly classified. As this has yet to be accomplished it may be useful to present in a condensed and paraphrased form the provisional "code of totemism" which M. Reinach has drawn up, solely as regards the relation between man and animal:—Totem-animals are venerated and are often believed to be of the same descent with the totem-group; they are usually neither killed nor eaten, but sometimes the prohibition extends only to a part of the animal. If its death is required, apologies are made, or means taken to mollify or remove the penalty of its "murder." After it has been ritually sacrificed, it is mourned; if its dead body is found, it is bewailed and reverently buried. The totem-animal helps and protects the totem-group, it acts as a guide, an augury and fortune-teller. If of a wild or dangerous kind, it spares the members of the group. Finally, where men (1) clothe themselves in the skin of an animal, particularly on the occasion of religious ceremonies, or (2) call themselves by its name, or (3) figure it upon their ensigns, property, or bodies, the animal is a totem provided other evidences for totemism exist. Parallels from the Semitic field will readily occur to every one, though it would be unwise to lay undue stress upon them before we know more precisely what the totem-theory involves. Totemism, in the accepted use of the term, is only a form of animism, and "it is extremely probable," as Prof. Haddon has well said, that "it is only one of several cults of animals."

In conclusion, passing over the question of the survivals

Rev. Scientifique, Oct. 13, 1900, p. 450. On the other hand, as Mr. Frazer points out (in a private communication), in point of fact neither the North American Indians nor the Australians have domesticated any animal with the exception of the dog.

2 Rev. Scientifique, loc. cit.
3 Head-hunters, p. 393.
of totemism in the social organization of a folk—perhaps the most complicated of all inquiries—let us remind ourselves of that widespread belief in the transference of a man's spirit or soul into some external receptacle, which, Mr. Frazer suggests, is the essence of totemism. In the case of the Arunta tribes the man transfers his soul to the totem for his own and the common good (viz. the multiplying of food); elsewhere it is rather due to man's desire to put his mortal part out of the reach of harm. It conveys the general idea of an asylum, and is on a level with the belief in the transmission of souls. It takes its rise in that stage of animism where man fails to find any real difference between himself and the rest of nature, animate and inanimate, and finds its expression in the legends and folk-lore stories of metamorphosis and metempsychosis.

Although Semitic examples of the belief of the external soul in its crude form appear to be exceedingly rare, the conception that a man's life can be wrapped up in some external object on the safety of which his immunity depends, is one that readily lends itself to development and refinement. Thus David's soul is bound up with (i.e. in the care and custody of) Yahwe (1 Sam. xxv. 29), and, according to 2 Sam. xxi. 17, the life of the nation is wrapped

\[1\] Fortnightly Review, 1899, pp. 844 sq.; Golden Bough, and ed., III, p. 418; and for Semitic and Egyptian examples, see ib., pp. 331 sqq.

\[2\] This is actually effected by clasping or embracing the Nurunja on the occasion of a painful initiation ceremony. Some of the ancestors are traditionally said to have hung their Churinga (soul) on the Nurunja (totem) before going out hunting.

\[3\] Frazer, Golden Bough, and ed., III, p. 178; Kremer, Studien, I, p. 58. To this we may perhaps add the following from the Kitāb al-Adam, quoted by Landberg, Arabic, V, pp. 143 sq. (Leiden, 1896). It would appear that every house in Mecca had an idol, and it was the custom of a man to pass his hand over the idol and over himself (the tamassuḥ), the last thing before a journey, and the first on his return. The suggestion is that the man transfers his soul to the idol for the sake of security during his absence from home. Cp. Wellhausen, Heid., and ed., p. 109.

\[4\] For the translation of 'r̄q cp. Isa. xlix. 4, and Driver's note (Sam., p. 156).
up in David, since the extinction of the "lamp of Israel" seems to entail that of the people. Similarly, the loss of the ark (practically identified with Yahwè) is almost regarded as involving the destruction of Israel. To put one's trust in any one may have originally meant to put one's life in the safe-keeping of another. "If ye take not hold (of God), ye shall not keep hold (of life)," says the prophet (Isa. vii. 9), and the thought is paralleled by the words of the Chronicler, where the "taking hold" of Yahwè and his prophets is rewarded by preservation and prosperity (2 Chron. xx. 20). Primarily, the idea of taking hold, of actual contact, may be part of the grosser conception of the transmission of the soul. Thus, when the worshipper embraces the sacred stone at the Ka'aba, he not only comes into immediate contact with the god, but would seem to place his soul under its protection, and we appear to have an analogous idea of transmission in 1 Kings xvii. 21, 2 Kings iv. 34, where the man of God by throwing himself upon the dead child restores it to life. Finally, the common Hebrew word for "to trust" (bāṭuh) seems to have meant primarily "to throw one's self upon some one," and tikwah, "confidence," &c., if connected with kaw, "line, cord," suggests the idea of binding. May we therefore infer that the ideas of confidence, trust, and the like, arose from the fact that a man had placed his life or soul in safe-keeping elsewhere? This is not to be taken as an assertion that these modes of thought are actual survivals of totemism in Israel, though, if the above evidence from the Old Testament has been correctly interpreted, it would

1 It is unfortunate that the continuation of the particular narrative to which 1 Sam. iv belongs is wanting.


3 We may perhaps compare the words of the thorn-bush, "put your trust in my shadow" (Judges ix. 15, נconciliation to. The shadow is often practically identified with the object itself (a good Arabian example is cited by Frazer, Golden Bough, and ed., I, p. 287), and the loss of the shadow is regarded as the loss of life itself, op. Num. xiv. 9 (for parallels see Frazer, loc. cit.).
seem to represent a development of a belief which on good authority is considered to be the essence of totemism.

It has not been my intention to attempt either to prove or to disprove Robertson Smith's theory of Semitic totemism. It is now almost unanimously agreed that he proved beyond doubt that the Semites had passed through phases no less degraded than those of other savage nations, and every one will agree with Dr. Frazer that "whether the Semites had or had not the particular institution of savagery which we call totemism, is a comparatively unimportant matter." It remains for the anthropologists to determine the laws and canons of totemism, and for the Semitists to continue collecting and classifying the phenomena of Semitic heathenism. It should be the aim of the latter, especially, to follow the evidence whither it may lead them, and not to seek to adapt it to, or to interpret it after, preconceived ideas or prejudices. To approach the subject without an acquaintance with and a certain sympathy for primitive modes of thought would be futile: the spirit of the inquiry is aptly and concisely set forth in the words of Littré: "Il faut que le cœur devienne ancien parmi les anciennes choses, et la plénitude de l'histoire ne se dévoile qu'à celui qui descend, ainsi disposé, dans le passé. Mais il faut que l'esprit demeure moderne, et n'oublie jamais qu'il n'y a pour lui d'autre foi que la foi scientifique."

Stanley A. Cook.
Fragment T-S. 10 K 71, paper, five leaves, size 20.5 x 15.5 cm., is written in a late cursive hand, of the fourteenth century or even later. The letters run into each other, which circumstance makes the reading very difficult, whilst the MS. has also suffered badly from dampness, which has so faded many words and lines as to render them almost illegible. Besides this, it would seem that the copyist was not always able to read the MS. at his disposal, which fact will account for certain gaps in the contents, as well as for several words that give no sense, and where it is clear that the scribe was only guessing.

But though our actual MS. is of comparatively late date, it represents a copy of a document composed some centuries before. The title of this composition is נלעלאה ("roll"), a branch of literature in which Egypt seems to have been particularly rich. But whilst as a rule the actors in the

---

1 See e.g. p. a, l. 1 (יומם); ibid., l. 39; p. 6, l. 10, and note 1, &c.
3 This Abiathar is undoubtedly identical with the one mentioned in the crusade document published by Dr. Neubauer in the J. Q. R., IX, p. 28, where he is called יבשא גלעניר ויצリア, who sent an open letter from טנמאס or Tripoly of the East (cf. Benjamin of Tudela's Itinerary (ed. Asher), I, p. 27, and notes to it). See also Bacher in the J. Q. R.,
various Megilloth are represented by a Jew and a Gentile, the latter playing the oppressor, the *Dramatis Personae* in our story are a Jewish priest, and a Jewish noble. The object of contention was, as it seems, the religious jurisdiction over the Jews in Egypt and Palestine which Abiathar, the author of this document, and his ancestors, a representative priestly family of Palestine, claimed for themselves, whilst David b. Daniel the descendant of the House of David tried to bring them under his own authority. The struggle was one of long standing, having already commenced somewhere before 1054 when the two litigant

ibid., p. 358, and *Revue des Études Juives*, XXX, p. 225. I note also that MS. T-S. 24. 49 is signed by a Jew and a Gentile.

1 In a document belonging to Mr. E. N. Adler dated 1056 and written in Jerusalem occurs a Jew who probably belonged to the same family; whilst in a letter (T-S. 24. 96) addressed to a certain Abraham, dated 1131, from a certain Abiel, I find the following pedigree:

See J.Q.R., XIII, p. 221, where this David figures as bridegroom in a marriage deed of 1082. In another document again he is called David b. Israel. The following *Testatum*, copied from Document T-S. 30. 31 dated 1093, will not be uninteresting in this connexion:
parties were represented by Joseph and Elijah the priests, who also wore the title of Gaon (the latter was the father of Abiathar), on the one side, and by the Nasi, Daniel ben Azariah (the father of David) on the other side. Joseph, who was bitterly persecuted by Daniel, who apparently was supported by the government, died 1054, whereupon the latter exercised his functions as Nasi for eight years without any further opposition. But after his death (1062) the priestly family came again into power, Elijah holding the office of Gaon for some twenty-three years. But two years before his death, which occurred in 1084, Elijah "gathered all Israel of the land of Tyros and of the Galil where"—probably with the purpose of forestalling any action which might be taken by his antagonists—"he ordained, with the permission of all Israel, his son Abiathar as Gaon, his son Solomon as the Father of the Court of Justice, whilst Zadok, the son of Josiah, was invested with the office of Father (א"א)." This precaution, however, proved of no avail. For about 1081 David b. Daniel wended his way to Egypt where he soon found support.

1 P. 2, ll. 9 and 10.  
2 Ibid., l. 12.  
3 Ibid., l. 15.  
4 Ibid., l. 16, including the year 1062 in which he was installed.  
5 Ibid., l. 23.  
6 See the שָׁעִי in the Kaufmann-Gedenkbuch (Hebrew Section, p. 57), where we again meet with this triad, but where the Solomon bears the title of א"א. Cf. J. Q. R., XIV, p. 228, and Teshuboth Haggemonim, ed. Harkavy, p. 359, with regard to the title of א"א. In connexion with the title question I may be permitted to give here the following names copied from a fragment written in an ancient hand (T-S...):—

7 Ibid., l. 37, et seq.  
8 Ibid., l. 29, I cannot find a place. Perhaps we should read.
in certain Jewish notables as well as in the government. The Nagid Meborach and the head of the school Josiah Azariah the priest also befriended him, but he soon resumed the old feud and the hostilities began again in which both Egyptian and Palestine communities were implicated. This state of things, with possible short intervals of truce, seems to have lasted till about 1093, in which year David—probably as a counterblast to the claims of Abiathar—tried to have himself ordained in Fostat as the Head of the Dispersion. In this place our MS. drops the thread of the story and suddenly drifts into a Halachic discussion as to the rights and prerogatives of the Palestine authorities. But just as unexpectedly the story is resumed about the end of our document, where the writer, after abusing his antagonist and enlarging on the suffering of his own party, and paying a compliment to Meborach for his good offices on his behalf, breaks out in a triumphal song in which some phrases even of the blessing said after the reading of the Roll of Esther on Purim are inserted; which shows that the struggle was at an end when our Megilla was written, which was the year 1084.

Divested of all personal recrimination and petty scandals usually attendant upon such controversies, the most of the contents of this Megilla may be described as a plea for...
the superiority of Palestine and its prerogatives over all other countries, and as thus forming in part a continuation of the old feud between R. Saadyah and Ben Meir. As Ben Meir, more than a century ago, Abiathar claims the privilege of fixing the calendar for the *Nasi* of the Holy Land, who in ancient times was alone in the possession of the calculation secret. It was only in the days of R. Juda the Saint, as he proceeds to argue, when schisms increased and striplings without the fear of God multiplied, that this Rabbi found it advisable to make all the sages and the Sanhedrin the depositaries of the Secret, which they teach to the whole of Israel according to the fixed rules of the *Four Gates* (א.MiddleLeft ושם) from which they may not turn to the right or to the left. But the important point is that the head of the Sanhedrin, who is the head of the *Yeshiba*, should sanctify the new moon in accordance with the calculation.

1. P. 4, l. 21, p. 5, l. 22.
2. P. 5, l. 23, and p. 9, ll. 6–9.
3. P. 9, l. 11. In this connexion the following lines taken from a very ancient and faded fragment (T-S. 12, 726) representing the remainder of an Ordination Form will not be uninteresting:

The use of the formula *aw b* (usually altered on the occasion see *Rosh Hashanah*, 24 a) is significant.
hand, his laying so much stress upon the antiquity of the calculation, and his statement that the discussion about the coming of witnesses for the appearance of the new moon (ררי) is only dating back from the times of Antigones of Soko, when the schism of Zadok and Baithas took place, greatly recall some of R. Saadya's stock arguments in his polemics against the Kara'ites.

Quite peculiar to this controversy is the antagonism manifested between the two lineages, the priestly and the kingly or the Aaronite and the Davidic. It is the covenant with the seed of Aaron, says Abiathar, which is everlasting, never to cease, whilst the one with the House of David is conditionally depending on the obedience to God. By such a succession, however, of such wicked kings as Ahaz, Manasseh, Amon, &c., they proved themselves unworthy of the confidence of God, "the oath (to David) was desecrated," God's promise confined to the Messiah. David, the descendant of all those evil doers of kings, is thus only a pretender, whilst he (Abiathar) derives his pedigree from R. Eliezer b. Azariah, Ezra, and Phineas.

The style of Abiathar is plain prose with occasional lapses into Piyut. Less satisfactory than his diction is his reasoning which is never convincing, whilst quotations are inaccurate and his interpretation of them faulty. But

---

1 See p. 6, ll. 24 and 25, and J. Q. R., October number 1892, p. 204, text and notes.
2 P. 1, l. 12 sq.
3 Ibid., p. 2, l. 2 sq., and p. 1, l. 28 והיוו באתם לתקיים. L. 29 is unfortunately very much faded, but the general drift of thought seems to be that given in the text. Perhaps we should read after the word יהוהו which L. 29 commences ד ל. 39.
4 P. 2, l. 27, and p. 4, l. a. In the latter the text seems to be corrupt.
5 P. 2, l. 25, and p. 10, ll. 13 and a.
6 See p. 3, l. 16 sq. and l. 28; p. 4, l. 1 sq.; p. 9, l. 26 sq.; p. 10, l. 4 sq.
the fierce struggle under which the removal of the seats of authority is taking place, is not, as a rule, particularly favourable to calm thinking and sound philology. But it is just this contest between the past and the future, or between sentiment and aspiration, which is of paramount interest to the historian, the one supplying him with facts, the other with ideas.
See Isa. xxix. 23.  
9 Jos. xiv. 10.  
6 Ps. ciii. 19.  
7 Isa. xliii. 8.  
3 See Berachoth, 6 b. The words from ירמיה do not occur in the Talmud, and sound rather strange.  
8 Num. iv. 17 and 20.  
10 Num. xv. 31.  
11 Jer. x. 10.  
2 Deut. xxxiii. 4.  
12 See Siphra, 39 b, 48 b.  
14 Cf. Exod. Rabba, 6, § 4 and parallels given there.  
9 See Mechilla, 60 b, and Midrash Tillim, ch. 132.  
15 Jer. xxii. 24.  
16 Jer. xxii. 30.
ג"א התשע"א, ביוםחדש ב' של חנוכה, אם בר חיות שאו חיות לא תACHED מזון של תחת ⟨1⟩ כי הוא אсал נמצאים שהם מזונים ויוכלו ודמידה שאור וחיות Leben של תחיית וכמרחצן התשע"א, לא זיהו ידיעות ושינה את העדר השון של דבר. רצון לשון של דבר עליון ונющей אבל שינה ולא制品 של תᆡול לחופש מהרומマン של התשע"א, היותו ידיעות אם עליון ונ酐א גם עליון ונויית את העדר השון של דבר.}

2. התשע"א, ביוםחדש ב' של חנוכה, אם בר חיות שאו חיות לא תACHED מזון של תחת ⟨1⟩ כי הוא אsaldo נמצאים שהם מזונים ויוכלו ודמידה שאור וחיות Leben של תחיית וכמרחצן התשע"א, לא זיהו ידיעות ושינה את העדר השון של דבר. רצון לשון של דבר עליון ונージה אבל שינה ולא制品 של ת�回 לחוף השון של דבר. היותו ידיעות אם עליון וניזיה גם עליון ונויית של העדר השון של דבר.}
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See Jer. xxxviii. 28, after which we should read יִלּוֹדָה for יָלִידָה.

1 See Genesis Rabba, 42, § 3, and Pesikta Rabbathi, ed. Friedmann, 19 b, after which the blank in our text may easily be supplied; though the quotation does not agree in all details with the cited Midrashim and the parallels given there by the commentators. Cf. also Lev. Rabba, 10, § 5, with regard to the ייָשֵׁי. See 2 Kings xxvi. 16. 2 Isa. viii. 16. See Gen. Rabba, ibid. 3 See 1 Kings xv. 13, according to which we should read מְנִי for בְּנֵי. See Aboda Zara, 44 a. 4 Jer. xxxvi. 23. Cf. Moed Katon, 25 a. See also Sanhedrin, 103 ב, and Tanachuma, ed. Buber, I, 77 a b, regarding the kings of Judah; but none of these passages form an exact parallel. 5 See 2 Sam. xxii. 14, but more likely it is a corruption of Castellum. Cf. however J. Q. R., XIII, p. 358, I, 19, and p. 364, I, 21 (צְנַחֲדָה), from which it would seem that the epithet "lame" was applied to antagonistic sects. 6 See Exod. v. 21. 7 See Lam. i. 18. 8 So in the MS. Perhaps it is a corruption of some such words as תִּכְתָּב. 9 See Benjamin's Itinerary, I, 45. Our text agrees more with the Yichus Hazzaddikin and other authorities mentioned in the notes to the Itinerary, II, p. 110, and in the Seder Haddoroth under the names given here. 10 See Jer. xliii. 10. 11 See Jer. xliii. 10. Frag. T-S. 20. 104, in which it is mentioned, finishes המ יִתְנַשֶּׁד ויִתְנַשֶּׁד rather than המ יִתְנַשֶּׁד ויִתְנַשֶּׁד. 12 Probably a corruption of המ יִתְנַשֶּׁד ויִתְנַשֶּׁד. 13 Read המ יִתְנַשֶּׁד.
מתלעך בן ישת בן וובש שוחיה מרונים זועם על כיושב על לשון עמו מוכה הגזר ויהיווה אלכס
ב(?) מַנְהָא שָׁר עַל מַלְאַר מַנְהָא והוֹחַת (?) אֵבַּרְדַּמְּחַר הָזִּית לְאַלְמָדוּ לְאַלְמָduto非常に難しいです。
The final "ם" of ב is not clear. Perhaps it is a corruption of תרנשדר or תרנשדר. Perhaps it should read תרנשדר.

Perhaps a corruption of תרנשדר. In a document belonging to Mr. E. N. Adler, dated 1106, I find the words: בם יתנשדר ותנשדר יתנשדר יתנשדר יתנשדר יתנשדר יתנשדר יתנשדר איה יתנשדר, see also above, p. 2, l. 18. Perhaps a corruption of יתנשדר.

Read שאר with Daleth.
ד"ח ר"ע, לא ייעלם שימן או חרב בהترة כיון ביבים על שם הגדרות נטועות. 37
ובכדיף ישuko אחר בן בסיס משלב כיום مضוקן הים ואسودון תפוקיו
ביד רפה את הים ובו שופטים כל מבנה כשמת עדה במים.

5 ואומר את הדור כי ייילוד שימן או חרב בהترة כיון ביבים על שם הגדרות
בגידה משלב, כיו עדה במיםonen בהymphו
ובכדיף ישuko אחר בן בסיס משלב כיום مضוקן הים ואسودון תפוקיו
ביד רפה את הים ובו שופטים כל מבנה כשמת עדה במים.

שכבת א"ו, אומלץ כי רע כי השמם המפרスタート מגביר למינים ויביים במים
ופקודת יאני בהית ממעית, כי עליהן ייילוד שימן או חרב בהترة כיון ביבים
בגידה משלב, כיו עדה במיםonen בהymphו
ביד רפה את הים ובו שופטים כל מבנה כשמת עדה במים.

שכל, צו מתחילה מפרスタート במלאו תלמידי התנאים והמצעים על יישום
א新业态, כיו עילוי מנהל חרב בהترة כיון ביבים על שם הגדרות
בגידה משלב, כיו עדה במיםonen בהymphו
ביד רפה את הים ובו שופטים כל מבנה כשמת עדה במים.
See Isa. lvii. 3.
See Baba Bathra, the phrase 8 a JTOV to 9 Dn 1!, meaning that he will tax them heavily.
See, for all these passages, Sanhedrin, ibid.; but it can hardly be doubted that the writer misunderstood the real sense of the cited passage. See Commentaries to the Gemara.
Page 5.

מנין לדנה ביליה וlea ישובות אלה_INCLUDEDות שלמה. זוה מדרס ולא מניבים עמי בום ו土耳其ו
תעובר את השכון וקראה כהן עלל שם שבמען הלא נהנה והיה כלל ווהל עם טוסים ושטים ולמר
הנהוב נספה Bản שול רפייה פלמי אחד ואתה מסור לעזיר בן תיבון עמי בום וט琇ו
תעובר את השכון לאקר מתקרב שבルー וראה את אזור זה עלי ישוב ובומר העובר בבר
5ackets עלפי הנהנה ב決 עלكيف נסכי ונכון עמי בום וט琇ו עמי בום וט琇ו העובר עמי בום וט琇ו
לאמר הבוס עלבר את השכון אם ולפי העבר את שיכת עלבר את השכון בהצה לבאר ורי י睫 אנק אנק
באמר עבור את השכון שבשו אירל אם עלكيف יצאר לא קמח בנש ראותו של עלי ומך שמה
כאמר נספי עומר בברת עולג ונקב מסור לעזיר עלבר עמי בום וט琇ו
שנכנך בום וט琇ו עומר בברת עולג ונקב מסור לעזיר עלבר עמי בום וט琇ו
10 כשפיידיו לטריס תנומץ וברי העובר עם שינון משב עואר וקר וקנסו מצרה קמח ולא
משה ולאירה ביאיר שלףلاح וס使って והיה עזיר וייאיר רבי לאיר אפי לאיםifestyle מאים ויהי
мор וט琇ו מסוי אוכל אחד והיה עלבר 1 הנשנו העובר עם שינון לא את החצר והיה
בון ימים ומעון שיר ויקיר לא הביאו אפי סים ולא עשו כי הראה לכל המילים והיה
מור וט琇ו עלבר (1) והיה שאמר את המשיות לא מיADR ורי הקמודה מקדרת
15 ויהיו כלगים וקניאים לעתוניאו ובו מתקנה למדתים ומכים עלגלת עליי למשים שמודא לא י än ויהי
Sack Hashana, a.

See Chapters of R. Eliezer, ch. 8.

* Read.xxx.

See for this and the following passage (I. 11 of p. 6)

Rosh Hashana, 25a.
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אף עלへר חכם לא ירא ל://ןיער כדי מים שלמרותם אם /ל /ו של /ים א/ו של /ים פ/ים 
והם כפי ש/ומינה /ים א/ו מ/ים מ/ים (1) לכל /ים כ/ כי /ים /ים /ים ע/ו /ים núי מ/ים א/ו 
רבוותי לשעון תנכָּההל הנכָּהל
ותוחב למאה, ובי ראיות וילא את ראיותיה שלמה, כיון שעלה מהתערבות אשר לתחא לכותב.

ורבעו היא ידית ידית ורדיה ורדיה, ולא נ произведен הפרשיהjom לעלה שלמה, כיון שעלה מהתערבות אשר לתחא לכותב.

נשלחו לי, כוהן שחלแตกת בבל, Исוישית מז chim, ויקקלות בעלה שלמה, כיון שעלה מהתערבות אשר לתחא לכותב.

רכס ואחרים וдачиי וديثי בבית אדברי, ולא נ произведен הפרשיהjom לעלה שלמה, כיון שעלה מהתערבות אשר לתחא לכותב.

עשית את זה, אשת חכמה, כיון שעלה שלמה, כיון שעלה מהתערבות אשר לתחא לכותב.

כ_palette[30,32,31]יון שעלה מהתערבות אשר לתחא לכותב.

-

1 Rosh Hashana, 20 b.
2 Ibid., 19 b.
3 Sanhedrin, 11 b.
4 Ibid., 11 a.
15. Chapters of R. Eliezer, ch. 8.  
2. Sanhedrin, 10 b.  
3. Ibid., 11 a.  
"1. Perhaps as elsewhere, &c., cf. Ps. vii. 15.
2. See Job xii. 19.
3. See Ps. lxxv. 8.
5. See Prov. ii. 17.
6. See Jer. ii. 5.
7. See Prov. xxii. 29.
8. See Ps. xlii. 13.
10. See Job xxi. 19.
11. Perhaps as elsewhere, &c., cf. Ps. vii. 15.
12. See Isa. xi. 10.
13. See Job xiv. 31.
14. See Prov. ii. 17.
15. See 1 Sam. 2, 117.
16. See Ps. xlv. 13.
17. See Ps. xxxvi. 10.
19. See Prov. ii. 17.
20. See Jer. ii. 5.
21. See Prov. xxii. 29.
22. See Ps. lxxv. 8.
שלש עשרה חובה בcommerce גזירי סק וצקועו לא אלים בוחת מרזוי ומקל לו通りי 참 ו régime אחד והם היום ישם.
בכְּבַדְּשָׁהְוּ בְּמָדְשָׁה יְזִירָה בֵּשָׁלֶשׁ אֶבְּאָהְוּ תְּזִירָה יְזִירָהְוּ נְעַמְּתָהְוּ חַקֶּם וְנָמְתָּתוּ חַקֶּם אֵשֶׁרְוָה גּוֹשְׁתִּי לְכַלְכָּל בְּגִין דְּעָלְמָה.
יְזִירָה יְזִירָה הַשָּׁבַע כְּמָשָׁרְי שֵׁשִי יְזִירָה אֵשֶׁר מַשַּׁרְיָהוּ יְזִירָה יְזִירָה הָנִים הָנִים מַשֵּׁר הָנִים שָׁרְיָהוּ שָׁרְיָהוּ אֵשֶׁר אֵשֶׁר אֵשֶׁר.
אֶחָד עָשָׁה לְבָלֹב אֲלֵי מַעָּשִיָּתְוָהוּ זָה אֱגוֹן הַשָּׁבַע בְּזָה אֱגוֹן.
בּוּלָּה אֱלֵא עָשָׁה הָאָכָה אֲלֵי מַעָּשִיָּתְוָהוּ זָה הָאָכָה הָאָכָה הָאָכָה הָאָכָה הָאָכָה בְּזָה הָאָכָה הָאָכָה בְּזָה הָאָכָה.
סָנִיְתוּ הָנִים הָn

1 See Ps. vii. 7.
2 Ps. lxxxiii. 19.
3 Ezek. xiii. 15.
4 Job xiii. 4.
5 Nahum ii. 11.
Fragment T-S. 12. 729, paper, two leaves of a quire of which the middle pages are missing, size 23 × 13 cm., written in square characters with a turn to cursive, but of a much earlier date than Fragment XL. The first leaf represents a portion of the Abiathar Megillah, and corresponds with the first nineteen lines of the preceding fragment. The varying readings of this fragment, of which there are many, are in all cases the more correct ones. The second leaf reproduces a few passages from the minor tractate Derech Erez Zuta.

(recto)

בר המנוח על מנשה שמך: איום.
 amat המינה אسرائيل אברים אחרון הכמה נסך
 נטש נר מאום על חמש נשמה על הלשון
 האים הקדשカラ אניר שוח אתך. המנהל מת
 נשמה על אנימל צבועה עמו ב(Transaction כימי צמחו
 מ lorem נאלהות. כי התוועידעül
 התלאות נגלות על כלן כל החものが נכל בנשים.

10 וברוח נבואר בה.

15 אני כי אם רב ובו שהمقا
jsonp הסמלה . אברחת יא ו המרה.
を得ת מהן הפרוש בינא כן לא אם מתבשיט.

שהמה והרננים מה חבר ו הלכלולו. ליבו רשמ.

יחלשת cél מותת בלגרי אמרו לי רבן
לברュ ברי אבריס לי בר ברי לבר חולם.

רביע הכתובים ברמות פלטוניות כי
בשם הנוחות בה נוה בسعادة ע

20 כה עמוד נ쉬ה כי ביסמה ובר.
Fragment T-S. 8 J 2, paper, four leaves, size 17 × 13 cm., written in a rather late (thirteenth or fourteenth century) cursive hand, and representing the remainder of a letter pleading on behalf of the jurisdiction of the Head of the Dispersion, who was a descendant of the House of David, for whom authority is apparently claimed over Babylon, Palestine, and Egypt. Probably the document was composed by David the son of Daniel, mentioned above, and was directed against the pretensions of Abiathar. To this point his

1 Leaf 2 verso, 1. 9 sq.
2 See above, Frag. XL, and cf. this fragment, leaf 3 recto, 1. 1 sq. But it must be pointed out that Daniel is not mentioned as his father.
complaint that he was in money difficulties, as well as his statement that he found support in the government \(^1\), whilst his address to the Daughters of Zoa (= Fostat) “to come and behold” the beauty put upon them and the might and glory fixed among them, contains apparently an allusion to his being ordained as Rosh Gola in this Egyptian city \(^2\).

\(^{1}\) See this fragment, leaf 1 verso, l. 2 and l. 11 sq.

\(^{2}\) See this fragment, leaf 3 recto, l. 17 sq. The פְּלַי נַעֲנָה are of course a pun on the פְּלַי נַעֲנָה (Song of Songs, iii. 11).

\(^{3}\) See Chaggigah, 15 b.


\(^{5}\) Read nw^nn.

1 See this fragment, leaf 1 verso, l. 2 and l. 11 sq.

2 See this fragment, leaf 3 recto, l. 17 sq. The פְּלַי נַעֲנָה are of course a pun on the פְּלַי נַעֲנָה (Song of Songs, iii. 11).

3 See Chaggigah, 15 b.


5 Read nw^nn.
THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

5 5 ויסכמ המבר את בנינו ולא נשא
ל אל ישראל וברחו את את א FileReader
לא פלמים אליהם ושם עד סמך
מצאו רד למדר תרב חס %+
ועדנו ווהל הער נכם והעלו החזק.
או וה עשה בוטויני בלאה.
עלים הזה אלהים עלון תחל ברי
לאמשה קלח תמרנה (1) אתליזי אלאמסיויה
שהנהיה אלהים... אלו מנהיגה
(Leaf a recto)
בלﻸליהם ימיים משמתיה ומושתיה וינויה על
כל בנים תלדה המשרה עד שמה
מעלぽת להלא אין בון אומץ
בל מנטמת ממלכתיה אל נת לום ראי
ב şiirה והנהגה עליון עלכל ביראל
להתריע המשאלת והויעור בעד פלמחה
לא אליהם השמים והא (1) יוני באת ממלכתה
עד שעה. שהמל מית שית לחהא במנחת
ילבון על שיאנין המנהות שלל הרוחות
לא🦫י נחש תחרון תחילה מסלום
עתרון להתייך מצפי על טמה
בודוה שלישב המשעה אשטר מפגן
Ъספר נורה עללאהแสงה אלוהים נכמה
ואזם ויתנו רפיעים סלמה ואשר
(Leaf a verso)
והול שלהשל אתה יזא מצימו ננגלת
барד יי יבון הכל כי סילーム שוסף
באייר תלאה ואתו תוספת ייחם חזר
עינו ואתו שחית יצור אתליץ
ורח יי מתסה ובו אינס לב(1
סגן פורא שלשה י poate עד את יחללה
והול רבמבא אתיש ואיש לא את נחל yt מחק

1 Job xxxiv. 24.
See Sanhedrin, 5a, where it is proved from this verse (Gen. xlix. 10) that the authority of the Head of the Dispersion extends in certain respects also to Palestine. Cf. the Letter of R. Sherira Gaon, p. 27.
המשביח תלבש ונתתוקה בזרע עמו
וכלל לאיזו דעה ותומח והם זנוק
חכמה למשרור את סקל נפשו הגר השי
ה équipים הספרים שאחדו קץ ויווד
ובן ישראלי חתושב על מתוכה המש {{$}}
הארשים בוחן או יושב או יושבbazש
בוחן יושביו והרי קלק bestehtו
ולאzzle מרחיק כרור לכל עמו יי

(Leaf 4 recto)
כמל אזור וולושי היה כנראה לכל אזור והוד
וית ובלבל לא צוות לצל סמלכלות
ון הלומדtraîי נראתי ישועה ליישאר
חכם משארות וחיי
יאסמניה פאריר עוזני תורו תומך וואור
מתניה והארת השלחוןراق(wxוה והזזת
ולעשת בכרוים שלום ישאם ממלכני
לשם בינה ובנות השלחן שמי רותים
ולא יموا כני ישוע הלעותבנ הלוחכת
כפררשיך ומ야ו שאר ישוב עמו יי:טע
כפריש כראותיו שאר ישוב עמו יי:טע
שימע עיפק אול עומר במשמר הצלקת
כי מתמשח צדקת שלום עםברת השמק
בכשת לעל בוחה ויהי ער יר עיד בישלם
שלום ה�ור חליפִי ברומא מתים
ול.Bitmap דיבר מסך נומר כניב

(Leaf 4 verso)
הלא אחר יכוסים חותא לארם ושם נויר כנימי
שכימי יותר זני בה יואר ידוע ליין לא פנים
בכ נוד הולילה זות ראשתו הזה בה
לאחריוו שאר ואבכרה וфессионаו
כפררשיך משועי כו חקוף הספרים מ학생 סכות
ובשבם בוחה כי לא עשו מימי ישועת בן נון ובני
ישראלי על היה חתהו וקאריש בור לא

Digitized by Google
MS. T-S. 20. 102, paper, one long strip of paper, 47 x 18.5 cm., written in a semi-cursive hand and representing an autograph by R. Solomon, the head of the school, addressed to Ephraim b. Nathan. No date is given in this letter, but it is safe to assume that this Solomon is identical with Solomon the son of Elijah and the brother of Abiathar², ordained by the former as Father of the Court of Justice. Probably he succeeded his brother in the dignity of the Gaon, carrying on at the same time the feud of his predecessor for the supremacy in Egypt, as Elijah and Abiathar before him³.

See Arachon, 33 b.  
² See above, Frag. XI, p. 2, l. 18.  
³ Ibid.
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Fragment Adler, paper, one leaf, size 15 x 19 cm., written in a square hand and dated from Jerusalem in the year 1058. It represents a document in which a certain Joseph b. Shemariah, of Beroka (?), takes upon himself, on oath, not to speak disrespectfully either of the friends of the Nasi Daniel or those of the priest Elijah, officiating at that time as the Father of the Court of Justice. This would point to a sort of compromise between the two parties, probably imposed upon them by their followers for the benefit of the “holy Yeshiba,” which could only have suffered by these schisms. The leaders themselves, however, had not their hearts in this peace; for, as is clear from Abiathar’s Megilla, there never took place a reconciliation between Daniel and Elijah.
Fragment T-S. 8 K 11, paper, two leaves, 18 x 11 cm., written in a square hand and representing the remainder of the MS by A. Samuel Ben Chofni, which has quite disappeared since the days of R. Moses Al-Ashkar in the fifteenth century. The matter reproduced here forms the contents of the first leaf; the second leaf contains an index of the said work on civil law (יִדְרֵי סְעָרְו) which was divided into “gates” (פשייר). There are as many as twenty-three “gates” before the MS. breaks off. One of its owners was Solomon, the priest, a grandson of Solomon the priest, styled Gaon. This colophon was covered over by another reading.

1 Perhaps a corruption of סְעָרְו. This document is altogether carelessly written, having mistakes even in spelling.

2 A corruption of יִדְרֵי.


4 This grandfather Solomon the Priest Gaon is probably identical with
Solomon the son of Elijah the priest. Cf. above, Frag. XL, p. 2, l. 8, and introduction to it, p. 450, note 1. Mazliach the Priest is also mentioned in the colophon to Frag. LIII, dating from about 1111. Our Solomon here (the grandson), the contemporary of Mazliach's granddaughter, must accordingly have flourished in the third or fourth decade of the first half of the twelfth century.
Fragment T-S. 8 F 1, parchment, two leaves, size 20 x 14 cm., written in an ancient square hand, and representing the remainder of a commentary to the tractate Yoma, by R. Chananel b. Chushiel, of which the first page is here reproduced. Among the various owners which the codex had is also Elijah the priest, probably a grandson of the Elijah mentioned on Fragment XL¹. He bought the MS. in 1111.

(verso)

רמיה ומכהה סיסט והר ירבח ויהן
תרכו במשמך חזוק וחסונא חורב והובר
על התוח וחסונא אלי להניא והבר
כט עלי המבר וחסונא אלי להניא
ובו חיח ואסמס סיסטות אלי לירבח
כן
לארוחת מלאה היה בן טאות
וכathed שאולח יליא
בוי שערית יליא נתי
אנתקול בהבכ אלי אריא
לוחנאל בר טמטאל
כן

¹ See also note a to Frag. XLIII.
Fragment T-S. 10 J 1, paper, two leaves of a quire, of which the middle pages are missing, size 21 x 14 cm., written in a square hand with a turn to cursive of the thirteenth century (?), and representing the remainder of a letter by R. Sherira Gaon, the father of R. Hai Gaon. In its present defective state it is impossible to say with full certainty what the burden of the letter was, but as it would seem it formed a plea for the support of the Babylonian schools, which at that time of decentralization did not any longer receive

1 See leaf 1 recto, l. 8.
the pecuniary assistance to which they were accustomed. He tells them that to be sure he was himself helpful in the “setting up of places” (that is establishing schools) in Israel of the West, but if the decay is once allowed to set in in the head (which is probably Pumbeditha) the rest of the body is not less sure to degenerate. We have thus in this document another instance of the struggle for authority which took place at the removing of the old centres. The next document is of the same nature, and it is this fact which suggested their insertion in this place, as an illustration of an historical phase already made manifest to us by the contents of fragment XL.

(Leaf 1 recto)

מש... associative
והי ויתר להלן קורשיני כי מחזק ודק תוער
אותו אוספני את האלומימ ואת התحمام בבט
כל אלה דケース הם מסシーン רבים אלה ומגילת פור
5 מסכת אוחרת חכמים פרקים אוחרת את
הטור של איל יוסי בתקין בושה אלחנן טוביאן
את הללירימ ל tanı מידי שע秉 הכת ליאת cambio
שים ומעם ממבחמ ואשר ייסך נכת בכבוד
מאשרת יושב להוריהו הא מי ידיא בוחר
8 שוקל לאמיתו אלוש בימת ישר ואל יד עציאל
ילרורי רד' הקשתיא יוחב את הרדר בוניני
טרמינט טחלקן (1)ßיך עולימלא אנטני
מותעומד הנותין בהם לחר את החבר הזה
הלחן את מכם והונים ואשר הוא חלקרי אב钌
15 ומכ אוליגו בהמה שראני תעשמ אתו ללא
וכיו שמש שמש וא新た בין מעלבים את החבר
לאת לא שנון הוריהו המרוב החורק וה슧
עלין מתור ורבעי תחת משאותוاطא לא
יינן את בונ בולת

1 Leaf a recto, ll. 15-19.
2 See leaf i verso, l. 16, and leaf a verso, ll. 3-7.
(Leaf i verso)

וחוּדֵיךְ עִלָּא כְּכֹל חָבִיא עַלּוֹן; והָא שָׁמַעְתָּו שָׁאֲרָהְנָה
ומִקְוָנֵיִים וּנְהָלָנֵיִים וּרְנוּ. עֶלְבֶם שָׁאָלָנְיָנָה
בָּשַׁר וְמִימָר דַּקְתּוּ עַצָּרְבָּן עֲלָבָם וּרְבָיו
אֶלֶף וּמִרְבָּא שָׁוֵהוּ שְׁמֵסֵנָה וּרְבַּיָּנָה בָּרָבָיו
5 עַמְּכֶם חַכִּים וּרְשֵׁי עֲבָדָי דִּיקָם וּרְשִׁים
והָקָה הָאֱלֹהִים עַצָּרְבָּן וְיַמְשֹׁק (1) בַּמַּלְאַכְוּת
בָּטַח אוֹרָהֶם עִמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, וּלְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב
לַהוֹרִים עַמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, לְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב.
בָּטָא צָאֶרֶת הָאֱלֹהִים עִמָּם דֻּבָּא שָׁאֲרָה הָהוֹרָב
50 בָּטָא צָאֶרֶת הָאֱלֹהִים עִמָּם דֻּבָּא שָׁאֲרָה הָהוֹרָב
בָּטַח אוֹרָהֶם עִמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, וּלְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב.
בָּטַח אוֹרָהֶם עִמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, וּלְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב.
בָּטַח אוֹרָהֶם עִמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, וּלְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב.
בָּטַח אוֹרָהֶם עִמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, וּלְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב.
בָּטַח אוֹרָהֶם עִמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, וּלְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב.
בָּטַח אוֹרָהֶם עִמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, וּלְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב.
בָּטַח אוֹרָהֶם עִמָּם יַמְשֹׁק הַיָּמִים, וּלְכָה הָכָת הָוָרָב.
(Leaf a recto)

... מִסְתַּלֵּק הָאתָךְ, והָא שָׁמַעְתָּו שָׁאֲרָהְנָה
5 מַיּוּ שֵׂא אֲלֵיכַם לַמַּלַּכַּה, אֶבֶן בֵּי יְדֵי אָתָּן
לֹא זָרֲזָה בְּעַדָּן אָם לָשֶׁתֵּא רוּפָא לְוָדָי
וּסְמַנְתָּו אֶבֶן בֵּי יְדֵי וְהָיְתָה צוֹפָרָן
5 תְּחִיהֵבָן, וְנָא צוֹמָרָנְיָנָה בְּתַךְ. וּכָשָׁמָרְיָנָה ר. וּכָשָׁמָרְיָנ
מִלָּךְ 6. שַׁכָּבְנָה צוֹפָרָן. וְצָוָהָנְיָנָה 6. וּכָשָׁמָרְיָנ
וּתַקְשַׁט בְּאֲלֵיכַם חַמִּית וְזָזְבַּרְיָנ בֵּלַי בֵּדָרָן שֶא
אֲשֶׁר לְתוֹבֲרֵי הָאֱלֹהִים וְנֵחַ לְי הָיְשָׁתֵא רוּפָא שְׁמוּ
1 Neh. xiii. 10. 2 Ibid. xiii. 11. 3 Ibid. xiii. 13. 4 See Solah, 49 b. 5 The source for the last four lines is unknown to me.
See Koheleth Rabba, I, 8 (§ 4), Jer. Nedarim, 40 a, Sanhedrin, 32 b; see also the Letter of R. Sherira, p. 16. Cf. Bacher, Agada der Tannaim, I, 389 sq. text and notes.


2 See Gen. xix. 13. 1 Haggai i. 9.
Fragment T-S. 28. 24, one long strip of parchment, size 59 x 16 cm., written in a square hand but with a strong turn to cursive. It is defective at the beginning and the end, whilst the right margin has also suffered badly. The fragment represents a responsum (probably autograph) of some great Rabbinical authority addressed to R. Shemariah b. Elchanan (of Alexandria), who flourished about the end of the tenth century. In its present condition it is impossible to say who the writer was, but I may state that the Geniza possess various documents from which it is evident that Shemariah was the correspondent of the Gaon R. Samuel b. Chofni. We may thus attribute our fragment to this last Gaon of Sura. The Halachic contents of this responsum are of the usual kind addressed to and answered by the Geonim; but they are prefaced by an appeal for the support of the שuyện and a dissertation proving the authority of the Babylonian schools, even after the establishing of new centres of learning in the west, which, like the preceding document, gives evidence of the strained efforts made by the last great representatives of the Babylonian schools to maintain the ancient seats of authority.

Dan. xi. 35.
See Berachoth, 27 b and 28 a.
See Chaggigah, 3 b sq.

1 Dan. xi. 35.
2 Isa. i. 18.
4 See Berachoth, 27 b and 28 a.
5 See Chaggigah, 3 b sq.
1 See Chul. 50 a.
2 See Megillah, 25 a. Cf. also Kethuboth, 111 a.
3 See Benjamin's Itinerary, pp. 67, 69, 73, and 74. See also Pethachia's Travels, p. 50 sq.
4 See Berachoth, 35 b.

See also Pethachia's Travels, p. 50 sq.

VOL. XIV.
The quotation is not verbal.

1 Chulin, 54 b.
2 See Gen. Rabba, ch. 72, § 5. The quotation is not verbal.
3 See a Chron. xxxi. 8.
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(בשון)

• 30 התשונ

• 2 בן

• 1 ב א

5 לא שאר

• 156 ב א

2 ב א

10 asia roam

15nasroa roam

20ז"תアン

30ז"תアン

1 35 יבאמות, 49 א.

2 35 יבאמות, 14 א.

3 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

4 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

5 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

6 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

7 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

8 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

9 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

10 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

11 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

12 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

13 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

14 מיקוד بلשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

15 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

16 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

17 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

18 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

19 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

20 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

21 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

22 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

23 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

24 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

25 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

26 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

27 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

28 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

29 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

30 מיקוד בלשנה בץ יוסי דאורייתא בץ יוסי דאורייתא

לוב: סמלול בפסכין קדוש ההוא הגדת והאמה והאמה הבכראות והא דברי רשאך.
Psalms in the Talmud: A New Perspective

In the study of Psalms, the Talmudic context offers a unique insight into the historical and theological significance of the text. This paper explores how the Talmudic interpretation of Psalms can shed light on the socio-religious life of ancient Jewish society.

The Talmudic references to Psalms are numerous and varied, reflecting the centrality of the text in Jewish culture. Psalms are quoted and analyzed in various Talmudic tractates, each providing a unique perspective on the textual and theological dimensions of the Psalter.

One key aspect of Talmudic study of Psalms is the emphasis on the role of music and song in Jewish worship. Psalms are not only sung in public assemblies but also in private devotions, reflecting the centrality of worship in Jewish life.

Another important dimension of Talmudic analysis of Psalms is the interpretation of the textual content. The Talmudic scholars often engage in exegesis, seeking deeper meanings behind the surface textual readings. This exegesis is guided by the principles of midrash, which seeks to understand the deeper significance of texts.

Moreover, the Talmudic study of Psalms is imbued with ethical and moral teachings. The Psalms are not merely poetic expressions but are imbued with lessons on conduct, virtues, and the nature of God. The Talmudic scholars often extract these ethical lessons from the Psalms, providing guidance for daily life.

In conclusion, the Talmudic study of Psalms offers a rich and nuanced perspective on the text. By engaging with the Talmudic analysis, we gain a deeper appreciation of the Psalms as a foundational component of Jewish culture and religious experience.
LATEST ADDITIONS.

MS. Adler, paper, one leaf, size 20.5 × 16.5 cm., written in an early cursive hand and representing, as far as I can judge, another fresh fragment of R. Saadyah's controversial letters against Ben Meir. The text seems to be corrupt in places. The following lines were supplied to me by Mr. E. N. Adler, which he copied from an ancient list of books in his possession:

Possibly the is identical with the attributed to the Gaon (see Weiss, Zur Geschichte der Tradition, IV, p. 156). About the cf. above, Fragment XXVII.

Very faded, and might also read סדר ו. The Lamed is doubtful. It may also be a Kaph.
ההיסטוריה של היהודים

1. הefore, מונח גזע
2. כך, מונח גזע
3. כך, מונח גזע
4. כך, מונח גזע
5. כך, מונח גזע

1. Writing faded; but it looks as if a line was drawn through the word as a sign that it has to be cancelled.
2. Perhaps it reads מְרֵי.
Very faded; perhaps it reads הורן, cf. Isa. ix. 23.
2 No dots on the Kaph and the Waw. The Kaph is altogether doubtful, and may perhaps be taken for Teth (ת).  
3 The Nun is doubtful. It may also read Pe (פ).  
4 Read שרה.
5 See Roeh Hashana, 20 b, and cf. the commentary of R. Channahel on the margin (of the Wilna edition). See also Revue des Études Juives, XLII, p. 194 sq.
Fragment T-S. 12. 731, paper, one leaf, size 21 x 14 cm., written in Arabic characters, except the few words forming the title and written in square. It represents the remainder of a treatise by R. Saadya Gaon, on the laws of ٤٦١٥٥. To this fragment Dr. Hirschfeld drew my attention. I am also indebted to him for the collation with the MSS. of all the Arabic pieces contained in this article.

(recto)

الله المحبة للمرأة الماردة التي للحي
فقد أحسننا بها، عن طلب
ما في قول للله... و... و... وهذا
حضر في الاملاء [؟]. قال وبعد تدريج
الله. ٥٥٥٥٥. أوصي رحمته تدريج عبد في الزيادة
الله فيها وتعلتها ولونها ودورها
فالله أنها فان عددهم الطبيعية حمص
بهد من اللسان النسر واس من اللسان الإسر
فان بعض اللسان النسر وتائت الزيادة، منها
حسنتها كانت دولا والل روا

(verso)

في صف الادان، فيه حلال... ...
وان كانت الزيادة حلف الادان مهل حرام
وان وحننا ابد منقيسه في المنفر
كانتها واحدة الاص مشا... في منفر
بالانقسام و فتحنا الرئة، فان حرم الزيادة

1 See above, Fragment XXVII, text, l. 10, text recto, ll. 5-10.
2 Writing at end of line faded away.
Fragment T-S. 12. 730, paper, two leaves, size 15 x 12 cm., and written in an old square hand. It represents a sort of diary of a Rabbi travelling to Babylon. It is not impossible that we have in it the remainder of a work by R. Saadyah, who is known to have visited the Holy Land whence he probably emigrated to Babylon; whilst the imitating of the Biblical style and the providing of the texts with vowel-points and accents was a favourite way of composition with the Gaon. Such evidence, however, is too slight to be decisive.

(1 recto)


See Harkavy, Sepher Haggalui, pp. 150 and 162.
לְאִּישׁ הַיָּדָּוָּא בְּלַזָּחֵּלֹּם רְב֖וּ ְלִבְּבָּּא תְּפַלֶּּֽתָּּמָּה.

וְלָּא יֶנְּחַֽתְּנֵּֽהֶנְּ ְלֵֽבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא רָאִֽי הַיָּדָּוָּּא בְּלַזָּחֵּלֹּם.

וְלָּא רְבּוּ ְלִבְּבָּּא תְּפַלֶּּֽתָּּמָּה.

וְלָּא יֶנְּחַֽתְּנֵּֽהֶנְּ ְלֵֽבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא בְּלַזָּחֵּלֹּם אֵלַי הַיָּדָּוָּּא.

וְלָּא שַׁחַיֵּֽה ְלִבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא רְבּוּ ְלִבְּבָּּא תְּפַלֶּּֽתָּּמָּה.

וְלָּא יֶנְּחַֽתְּנֵּֽהֶנְּ ְלֵֽבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא בְּלַזָּחֵּלֹּם אֵלַי הַיָּדָּוָּּא.

וְלָּא שַׁחַיֵּֽה ְלִבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא רְבּוּ ְלִבְּבָּּא תְּפַלֶּּֽתָּּמָּה.

וְלָּא יֶנְּחַֽתְּנֵּֽהֶנְּ ְלֵֽבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא בְּלַזָּחֵּלֹּם אֵלַי הַיָּדָּוָּּא.

וְלָּא שַׁחַיֵּֽה ְלִבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא רְבּוּ ְלִבְּבָּּא תְּפַלֶּּֽתָּּמָּה.

וְלָּא יֶנְּחַֽתְּנֵּֽהֶנְּ ְלֵֽבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא בְּלַזָּחֵּלֹּם אֵלַי הַיָּדָּוָּּא.

וְלָּא שַׁחַיֵּֽה ְלִבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.

וְלָּא רְבּוּ ְלִבְּבָּּא תְּפַלֶּּֽתָּּמָּה.

וְלָּא יֶנְּחַֽתְּנֵּֽהֶנְּ ְלֵֽבְּבָּּא שַׁפָּּחֵּת.
Fragment T-S. 8 K 12, paper, one leaf, size 18 x 12.5 cm., written in square letters with a strong turn to cursive, and representing what may perhaps be described as a sort of history of post-Biblical literature. The authorities mentioned in it are Jose b. Jose of blessed memory, Yanai, Eleazar (Kalir), the Head of the School (R. Saadyah), and Ben Sira and Ben Irai. Professor Bacher, of Budapest, who kindly supplied me with a rendering of this piece, also drew my attention to the Agron (ed. Harkavy), p. 56, where R. Saadyah gives a somewhat similar list of Paitanim. I hope that this great scholar will give us soon a translation of this important document and accompany it with the necessary comments. For the

1 Cf. Teshboth Haggeonim, ed. Harkavy, p. 176 sq.
3 Verso, l. 4.
4 Ibid., l. 7.
5 Ibid., l. 17.
services already done I express to him herewith my very best thanks.

(recto)

(verso)
Fragment T-S. 8 G 2, paper, quire of two leaves of which the middle pages are missing, size 18 x 13 cm. The contents of the first leaf agree more or less with a portion of responsum No. 1 of the n^ixannmrn (ed. Lyck), attributed to R. Hai Gaon, and refuting certain opinions of R. Saadyah with regard to the calendar. The contents of the second leaf seem to bear on the same subject, but I am unable to express any opinion with regard to the authorship.

(Leaf 1 recto)

וירש ונוצרו כי הוא המשך באתר
ויאר והיא הראשונה סופתב נק
וטאחו שליש ואתגרה כי זה
ם poate כי כל זה למעון שיאמר
בכל מענים בשני ימים פסכים הרבח
וספכות עלים בחמ שיזימ כ           נורא מאורワイ שיאמר כי אחרון שיתפיש
במה כומ חמריו ב הולדתו בשובות
הצקהות חומר החואנות ברבריו

10Ribh an safeh 'la עך בפירוש כמא
מסיקflammatory על 해פגג דאז את
НЫ5 מסיערב און אלשיראל ובשויות
באנר היה leased ואחר הבחרה לאניר
שנין יים ובו היה מועלם כל ישראל תעוף
באלמס על הנערע על השפת דע
5שץאתה המים בו יסחו החומיה לחראת
י5י רראית הוריה החוסכאנ ארור זני וישק
כל וחא ורביד עשים רב גמלאל

(Leaf 1 verso)

בצבצל עמים שלחיהם וכל לאומין כך חורי
לפעור על עיקרם קר varargin הקבה עלשה
שיות באנר יומ הבחרה לאניר שיני יים
6אומר אריתני בשימושו המאבדות
לארשי קאמביכ נודה המسئل המבישי
היראתנים יך הנינו הנכיאים הראשנים
את ישראל מתחל naגלת ששיש ישימ
מוכים בהרצת שיני יומ הכהרורים והם
אואר חסם שאוי על המCarthy נאמר צורה
10יהואן הוא מנזה בתשפת על מי
שכותם בחורין כי בחותם שבינה יים
תאכל משותם בסיכת תשובה
 ישים יינו בחנה חא ומ즈יאן
כי לא היין חור נצפתה על חהת
יכול לא שלמרור חכם אוזן על רזר חוזק
15יאמר מרא מרבדן אלבל במעドイ
شبهו כל שומ יאמר החות בשמיה
יאמר מך אכי במצחט שמם צור יומ

...
(Leaf a recto)
ואתהא על אלעטמ בוי מיבית אלעטנוקים
אשר יקריה החם 메וראי חירש וחירש
יורדה בכנא ומענה מפייה והנה עליי
כמה פאמה אלעטנוק כנא נמי מקלה
ימאים מנכי זיווד ילך לחוה
אשר נשא חמה חוה זומ בוי תער
שרואל חנק עלית אינן אלה בנלאב
אלעטנוק הלאל פאמה אלעטנוק הכמה
ל𝑐ייתイメージ עלית נלאצלה שמה פה 56
המשמעת יז פלטנה בעל ילך
הטנה יאנתור אחר כלו לнем
השמהמה נעה על עופי ומפעת
נא לאלאב הלאל נעלית אלעטנוק
נלאבאלב ערביה ינבי רעבי ינבי
אלפרה התמקח באלו אלעטנוק
נא חאלות לא ינביי ימקול יינילי
יהכלי ינבליא אל רודומ לא עסומי המובני
יאור בלו חובל יז עופת נוה לאיעה
(Leaf a verso)
אלפוקלא פוחית חוסクリーム עליי,עלית להוביה
השתחנין על אול ניווה צוחקה
לא הלודר לשם שונים לא חסדק
אשמן מתהים עם תגרי אלפוקלא תหมלת
אלפרהוב נוגרא משה אלפרהוב להקה
סמביהנה בכס עצל יתקי נג ז אתה
בחיותנו נג יורה בלאה לב,יון
אגשים לחריפה וחקי אسا משעה עם
ילך בלאהי כי שמחת אלפוקלא הששב
אתם יסייעו עלית אנא יאמכו
בראתם ו気軽に לעי,אני יعقل בוי
שידי פאמה אלפוקלא מראוו
עלית על שם המווח והאלרי.
Fragment T-S. 8 H 8, paper, two leaves, size 18 x 13 cm., written in a square hand with a turn to cursive, and representing the remainder of a Hymnology to the jms. The author is a certain Moses Hakkohen, and his emphasizing the prerogative of Palestine in fixing the calendar and the part the Kohen takes in it, makes it probable that he belonged to the party of Abiathar and his successors.

(Leaf 1 recto)

The author is certain Moses Hakkohen, and his emphasizing the prerogative of Palestine in fixing the calendar and the part the Kohen takes in it, makes it probable that he belonged to the party of Abiathar and his successors.

1 Leaf a recto, l. ro, and verso, l. 1. In connexion with the reference to the study of the Tosephta in the text the following lines reproduced from a Sulzberger fragment collection will not be out of place:

On the other side:

VOL. XIV.
Does this apply to Alfasi’s Code?
SAADYANA

5

םנוסב. התוחזת את הכאב

'ספורים אלה בנו רבך. מ進一步יהו

ותוחזת את הכאב

דוד ותורות בו אירוסיכה

אוביבים. לא חרטות מחל הדיכס. ראת אל הטמ על התוגה

'םפורים את הלבטחלק. ראשת את הלט לוחש הלעבה:

המחנה והשעון והריק והאשה עמה

סמיבין. אחרון על עין חכם. ספורת ההליס האבר:

'םפורים את הלבטחלק ויר פרודרה. אשתה יעד

מותוס לפנייה: עליהם המיפה וה據דית:

15

הסערת את התוקחת את הל pérdה:

'נוארת עלילת כלול מもち מוסמיס. צוות מצות לעמ

הקודש. המתייהים ילעアジים: הנחה

אשר התקרא אחרון מקרין קדר

(Leaf a verso)

סמוסים ישוב אריר מהויה. הוא חיור ו.IDENTITY

ףקות של הנהירות. חישבי גילה לא יורי בו

נייה. כי מציחו חוה:

'עלמים להחייה קרוסים ש.Promise. חכמת מביכים

כ.getChildAtים אספסים. להן חורה זבר תורום

5

אם הם מכונים. וייב ני צוריך שומר אספים

'סימוש בצורתקרבונין לא יורי לחישה הש公益性.

סпромышлен לא יוהנה עד אברון. תועדו נכרה

'עתון קפלאת המניה. אוועדה לא עד当たり

10 'זוז תלשית עליה מועדת למאכלם. עם כל לארו

'lemma קעל. האלקינייאוף רבה לפי שאול

לברוח מכל ירואאים על עמל:

'קרוא כל་ตาย מקרן זה. אהיו כי כשיו קדרות:

ואם ואת לא ראית. כי קדרות זה.

15 'ראו עדים התוחזת ללבם. תלולים שבת או רכיב רוחק

M M 2
Fragment T-S. 16. 316, paper, a quire of two leaves, of which the middle sheets have gone, size 27 x 16 cm., and written in an ancient square hand. It represents the remainder of a commentary to Leviticus (I, 1 seq. and VII, 21 seq.) by Daniel b. Moses. It is inserted here on the assumption that this Daniel may be identical with the Daniel b. Moses Al Kumsi against whom R. Saadyah wrote a treatise, who is also known to have written a commentary to certain portions of the Bible.

(Leaf 1 recto)

מתרחхотמשויקראאוחרי
שומרהריבלאנמשחרוח
וניגון
ועריהל

(Leaf 1 verso)

... קחיאלאמשהאושיכידיב:עדיכלתעשלבהבעכהואתמהבה... סמהמקשהשקלאמעדידייעלוותאההMethodName:תעדלאתעשלבר... עלעלונהתוככים:הוא уровнеולממהכללאוללתעשלחרואשר... קרשאתأملמעדאתהמשמשאתהאוריתאתהדבריהםאתהיהוה

ןןעהשלתואשרחקירובעלווהבערהלאנמש_unset(Yiiולאיכולא
כלוימפרסתאתהלולישים:הלוהחרוהנתברحماוזאותאורית:וזクラブאןאוריןבטיבتسمשתאתבארכםמפרסותבתישתהיתקמששה
וחתו
אתהדוהאתהמהנה:אוחרייתיקיטאהלברעלויה:אך人死亡המשה
מרמקידחותהמהנה:באותהוחדעיכהלליעלעליכובמכקרום meticםיקים

לא נמצאו נושאים מיוחדים ו天上 העתים הוא המנסח לכל הימים: ימי הקרוב.removeAll

השלמים הם ברך בכם כב בונים רבים: כי בהלתו יאלד על (1) ההלתו הנפש.

אם וجمال הוא סמח שבכר всем קרובני יאלד:

ול=my מילה: על כל זה לא הוזן של בך: כי��ברק לא נמסר

אם הלילה נפרבות איך על כל זה מגמור יבר pcs: והם

כל dere החופשים עם ברך צי ברך: על י딜 ודבר חכם וקורבי.

(Leaf 0 verso)

אלאבל 'בום יאלד יאלד משמר זה שלמד יItemClick ויבלי הלילה א"ר.

 giờא כי בשון חוץ עזר קרונ יאלד: אזה יאלד כלל שני.ImageIconי

قبل ולמסיםحوا בכל אלה הוזן צי בך: כי מרי ונהב יאלד

מסمحا ההלילה שליש ברך אלה הוזן צי בך זי שליש: יוז

ייאלד יר_rooms יאשר ברך אלה הוזן צי בך: אبذل יד שיא הובחר יאשר

ינן גבל מסה לא יאלד: כי gehören לכל מסה לא על tobim

וכל סריה יסורים קסומים אך כי לא ישוע עולם של מסה גל護a

רק אם יאלבלו והאלבלו可根据 שיקוף לא בכל מסה: נגור כי יאת

יאש יין גבל מסה ממעונה בכל מסמה: יאנון והר כיון כל הלא את

והנה בה מיס_ann והנה בה מיס_ann ואתנה מיס_ann והנה בה מיס_ann

וה הזרעה כי man הם מענה-loader מסמה עדני

המסמה עשתה להיל שירנים לא המתים של מסמה

וה: אלה חזק כי yênה ואכלת חום מסמה ונעלת המסמה

והא מסמה יעזר: לא אחר לא כל בן זוג ונעלת המסמה

מסמה: כי אם אחר הזוון בשיר מסמה ונעלת מסמה היא מסמה

אשמם: כי ההנה הזוור א어서 יין גבל מסמה ונחרז לכל מסמה

והזוור כי לעמה תשה כי יין לכל מסמה וחרז לכל

מסמה: כי לכל שוק מסמה היא שיר מסמה: האלה אמר אל

אמר לכל גלים בן... זה יאלד מעשה השילום. milhões צים.
Fragment T-S. 8 J 3, paper, one leaf, size 17 x 13 cm.,
written in a square hand with a turn to cursive, and repre-
senting the remainder of a letter written by a Gaon.
Among others it contains also a reference to
Aḇerāhām bēṭaḥlāleh
ishaḥ; probably identical with Abraham, who plays such
a part in document XXXV.¹

(recto)

1 See introduction to Fragment XXXV, and below, verso, L 17.
The Jewish Quarterly Review

(verso)

1 See Arachin, 17a, Shabbath, 54b, and Tamid, 28a. Cf. also Alfas, Baba Mezia, chap. II, 17a, ed. Wilna.

S. Schechter.
WHAT JEWS MAY LEARN FROM HARNACK.

For the last century, many of the best Jewish thinkers have been endeavouring to discover an effective remedy against apostasy from Judaism, which is assuming threatening aspects in many circles. The reason for the increase in the number of Jews who receive baptism is often alleged to lie in their ignorance of their own religion. They are said never to have learned what Judaism really is; they have neither love nor respect for it; and do not, therefore, realize what they renounce when they turn their backs upon the faith of their fathers. But it may be maintained that ignorance of the Jewish religion is not the only factor. An equal and perhaps stronger motive lies in ignorance of the new religion. The converts to Christianity do not, in most cases, know what they adopt when making their profession of the Christian faith, and they would be greatly embarrassed by an examination in the doctrine uttered by their lips. For this reason Jews, in order to remain faithful to their own religion, should not only study Judaism, but should also make themselves acquainted with the Christian religion, at least in its outlines.

It must be admitted that the ordinary manuals of the Jewish religion and Jewish history supply pupils or readers with a very insufficient idea, if with any at all, of Christianity. From an exaggerated timidity, or a fear of using some word liable to be misunderstood, the authors prefer to omit the subject altogether, even where it may
demand a thorough elucidation. Such a game of hide-and-seek, which on other occasions also is a feature of modern Judaism and has done much harm, is particularly inappropriate in this case. Only recently Professor Hermann Cohen pointed out\(^1\) that a careful treatment of the differences between Judaism and Christianity ought to be one of the principal subjects of instruction in religion. What injury can possibly arise to Jews from a calm and intelligent discussion of the Christian religion among whose followers they live? The polemic against Judaism occupies a considerable portion of Christian religious instruction; and although Jews, from their side, never will undertake such polemic, and as hitherto will be at pains to banish from their schools every offensive and uncharitable expression against other religions, it would, nevertheless, be foolish and dishonest to conceal the differences in the principles of Judaism and Christianity. It is in consequence of an incredible shortsightedness that many Jews are reluctant to examine more closely the nature of the Christian religion. It seems as if they were afraid that, in doing so, harm would accrue to their own faith. But Judaism need not fear a comparison with its daughter-religion; it can only gain by it. And as Maimonides narrates that he read all works on the heathen religions that were accessible to him, Jews have all the more reason for making themselves acquainted with the Christian religion, for—to use a well-known expression in a somewhat modified form—he who does not know other religions does not know his own. Every well-educated and thinking Jew will gain a profounder conception of the value and weight of the Jewish teaching, if he be able to compare the latter with some other religion, and particularly with Christianity, which exhibits, on the one hand, so many points of affinity, and, on the other hand, such far-reaching differences. He will then consider Judaism from quite a new point of view; fresh elements of superiority will disclose themselves; he

\(^1\) Zeitung des Judenthums, 1901, No. XXII, p. 256 b.
will even be enabled to regard in a more favourable light certain deficiencies and weaknesses of which he formerly disapproved. His range of vision in respect to religion will be enlarged; his judgment about his own and about the other religion will become more unprejudiced and just after knowing both, in the same way as one only obtains a complete knowledge and appreciation of one's own country, after having travelled in foreign lands.

But how is a Jew to study the Christian religion? Is he to make a study of the New Testament, and, thereupon, go through a catechism? This would as little answer the desired purpose as it would serve a Christian who sought to acquire an idea of the Jewish religion of the present day to study the Pentateuch and Maimonides' articles of faith. A work was wanting to elucidate the substance of the Christian religion on a scientific basis, and, at the same time, in language intelligible to the public, and in a terse and clear style. Such a book has now appeared, and from the pen of a man who appears to be capable above all others for such a task.

Adolf Harnack, professor at the university of Berlin, is undoubtedly not less famous among English scholars than among those in his own country. He occupies in the learned world the position he deserves from his profound erudition, his critical powers, and not less from the moral earnestness which is displayed in all his works. He may, without exaggeration, be called one of the greatest Christian theologians of the present day. This would be sufficient to secure him sincere appreciation of Jews; but he has, besides, some special claims to their sympathy. He has publicly and boldly defended his religious standpoint against a world of enemies, and has, in consequence, become a very martyr for his convictions. It is especially the Jewish community, which has suffered so much, and partly suffers

1 Das Wesen des Christentums. The work has since been translated into English by T. Bailey Saunders, with the title What is Christianity? (London, Williams & Norgate, 1901.)
still, for its convictions, that must feel sympathetically
drawn towards him, and we can in all sincerity apply to
him the beautiful words of the poet:—

"Durchbrechen seh' ich euch mit fester Faust
Die mörderischen Stricke der Bestallung,
Dem Menschendienst entfliehn, um Gott zu suchen."

(Gerhart Hauptmann, Die versunkene Glocke III.)

Most of his writings, which deal with ecclesiastical
history in its widest range, are of a strictly learned
character, and are, therefore, unknown to the public at
large. But last year, Harnack summarized his inquiries
into the essential characteristics of Christianity in a series
of lectures held before students of all faculties, and he
subsequently placed them before the public in book form.
With a precision only attainable by a scholar who draws
upon the fullness of his learning, he presents in 189 pages\textsuperscript{1}
a vivid picture of the rise and development of Christianity
down to our own time. He delineates the figure of Jesus
Christ and his teaching with great religious ardour and
the greatest possible objectivity, and sketches the characters
of the Apostles as well as of Martin Luther. He tries to
point out the peculiarities, the merits, and the faults of
Catholic, Greek, and Evangelical Christianity, and formu-
lates his own standpoint, from which he never deviates
throughout the work.

As a matter of course, Harnack addresses in the first
instance only Christian readers, but every educated Jew
will enjoy the reading of the book, and will derive very
much information from it in many directions, and, as we
pointed out before, without injury to his own religion.
Indeed Harnack's work is, without the author's desire or
intention, the most brilliant justification of Judaism that
could be possibly desired. This we propose to show in the
following remarks.

Harnack's Christianity differs fundamentally from the

\textsuperscript{1} The quotations are all translated from the second German edition.
official Christianity, taught and professed by the churches of the various denominations, and solely approved by the State. On the basis of historical data, and of his own reflections, he constructs quite a new Christianity, which, in his opinion, represents the gospels, if rightly understood. For this purpose he must, of course, eliminate from the Christianity of the present day everything which cannot stand the test of reason and of critical research, though the discarded elements be that which is posited by the Church as the most essential part of the faith. The Christology, the whole doctrine of the trinity, hereditary sin, the bodily resurrection of Christ, the so-called truths of salvation, which one must believe in to be saved, all this is expunged from his Christianity. We almost feel constrained to ask: what remains of all that has hitherto been considered as specifically Christian? And indeed the representatives of ecclesiastical orthodoxy, who attacked Harnack at the beginning of the nineties on account of the dispute about the Apostolic Creed, could not refrain from unanimously adopting, at their pastoral conference at Berlin, the following declaration: "The Pastoral Conference, whilst recognizing in Professor Harnack's lectures on the essence of Christianity the intention to impress again upon our generation, which is anti-Christian in so many ways, the blessings of Christianity, expresses its conviction that the contents of these lectures, on account of a falling back upon the superficial standpoint of an already refuted rationalism, and of the rejection of that which is the essence of Christianity according to Scripture and history, do not accord satisfactorily with historical insight, with the true gospel, nor with human needs". This narrow declaration on the part of the authorized representatives of a religion, which, in contrast to Catholicism, holds up the banner of freedom of research, appears, indeed, quite unintelligible to us, but teaches us at the same time, that the evangelical clergy understand under Christianity something quite different from what Harnack understands by it. Jews,
as outsiders that have no part in that religious controversy, need not be intolerant, and admit that Harnack has a right to designate his religion as Christianity. It is true Christianity has never anywhere assumed a form at all similar to the one offered here, nor does there even in our days exist any community that flocks round Harnack and shares his standpoint. Nevertheless, the name of Christianity is applicable to the religious view he has of the world, for he acknowledges, if not the divine character of Christ, yet his person as the highest moral and ethical ideal. Besides, who could blame Harnack if he designates his own religion by a name under which he had been wont, ever since his infancy, to comprehend that which is most beautiful and good? All great religious thinkers who break through the bonds of tradition, and evolve a new religious system out of their own cogitations and sentiments, apply to their new teachings the name of the religion in which they were born. They do this in consequence of their filial piety, and of a very intelligible self-deception; they all profess to teach the old religion in its purity, freed from all that tended to deface it. Thus Tolstoi calls his view of the world a Christian view, notwithstanding that he was excommunicated for it by the orthodox Church; Döllinger considered himself to be a good Catholic, although Rome repudiated him in no very gentle manner; and, as Joel rightly points out, even Spinoza is at pains to exhibit, in his Theologico-political Treatise, a harmony with traditional religion, although it is a harmony in words and phrases only, and not in substance.

1 On pp. 172, 173, Harnack, when formulating his views and demands, uses all along the expression “we.” He can only denote thus such as agree with him, but not a denomination in whose name he speaks. It is true, immediately preceding, we find the phrases “a really spiritual community of evangelical Christians, a common conviction in the most important, and its application to the variegated life, has arisen and is in force”; but, unfortunately, he does not make it clear to us, by whom this spiritual community is constituted and in which way it finds its expression.
Harnack's standpoint is for us of particular interest, because he excludes from Christianity those very elements which always appeared to the Jews impossible to adopt. He performs a radical operation on the body of the traditional form of religion; he first removes small excrescences and disfigurements, and then proceeds to extirpate some most important organs. However much it grieves him to the very soul, he resolutely makes the sharp incision, in order to save the threatened gospel. When we look upon this great and religious thinker, and perceive the critical reductions he is obliged to make from the Christian doctrine; when we see what a sacrifice it is to him to break with venerable and beloved notions, the tenderness with which he approaches the diseases of official Christianity, what desperate efforts he is forced to make in order to find a justification for certain details; when we see how the man, whose object it is "to prevent Protestantism from becoming a pitiable double of Catholicism," almost goes himself to Canossa, the words of our morning prayer involuntarily rise up before us: "Happy are we, how goodly is our portion, how pleasant our lot, how beautiful our inheritance. Happy are we, who early and late, in the morning and in the evening, pronounce twice every day, 'Hear, O Israel, the Eternal is our God, the Eternal is One.'" The Jew, especially the Jewish theologian, is happy indeed; he is spared many a mental struggle, his mind is not enslaved by dogmas that run counter to reason; he need not first conquer freedom of thought by a violent rupture; he need not defend numberless things that in reality do not bear defence; he does not require special apologetics; and he has never cultivated that latter discipline, which plays such an important part in several Christian denominations.

1 On p. 154 he makes use of the following words in regard to the Catholic religion: "Compared with the mistakes and rashness in the progress of the Moderns, its checking influence is not always detrimental."
If Harnack meets with disapproval from his strictly orthodox judges, he, nevertheless, and perhaps for this very reason, approaches Judaism. For, once the dogmas are eliminated from Christianity, not much more than Judaism remains. And indeed, on considering his doctrine point by point, we find a surprising concord in the main questions. I believe we may say that Harnack might have found, and might still find more sympathy, not only from some few free-thinking Jews of great eminence, but also from most of the official representatives of traditional Judaism—from most Rabbis of all times and countries—than from those who stand within his own Church.

But how does the matter stand? Is it Judaism that approaches more and more to "Christianity in its pure form" as taught by Harnack, or does Harnack gradually approach Judaism? Men like Benedictus Levita, who know little or nothing of Judaism, and would like to sever themselves from it "in a decent manner," of course believe and proclaim the former. Harnack's Christianity comes very opportunely to them, for it soothes their critical consciences, and makes the leap from Judaism easier for them. They naturally overlook the circumstance that baptism does not constitute a profession of Harnack's creed, but of that very official Christianity which is controverted by Harnack. It is, after all, Harnack that approaches Judaism. But is he conscious of it, does he admit it expressly? Professor Harnack would probably be startled, or would perhaps smile, were he to read how he is stamped here as

---

1 Judaism has always acknowledged and appreciated morality and religious sentiment in non-Jewish circles. Cf. for ample proofs of this, Chwolson, *Die Blutanklage und sonstige mittelalterliche Beschuldigungen der Juden*, p. 63 sqq.

2 Harnack calls it thus himself in his address as Rector, just published: *Die Aufgabe der theologischen Facultäten und die allgemeine Religionsgeschichte*, p. 16.

3 See his article "Die Erlösung des Judentums," in the October part, 1900, of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*. Levita counsels Jews to baptize their children.
a Jew, and would perhaps say to himself: "How have I deserved this? How do I come by this unexpected and unwished-for honour? Does not my work contain many a passage which abrogates ancient Judaism in unmistakably plain terms?"

An ignorant or careless reader might indeed allow himself to be misled by that abrogation, and think that Judaism was here once more victoriously refuted. But further reflection shows that the abrogation in words lacks refutation by argument, that Harnack pronounces indeed his antipathy to Judaism, but that he does not put anything else in its place, and ultimately almost avows it. The very abrogation looks like a convulsive effort to repress the dawning consciousness of the harmony of Judaism with his own view; for however free and unprejudiced his mind is on other occasions, he forsakes his objectivity on this point. Here he stands, sentimentally at least, upon the standpoint of orthodox Christianity, and is unable to emancipate himself from his traditional notions; here he stands on common ground with the most diverse manifestations of Christianity, as if the highest and holiest dogma of Christianity were to deny the existence of a sound spot on Judaism, as if Christianity could only be saved by belittling Judaism.

It is highly interesting, from a psychological point of view, to analyse more minutely Harnack's attitude towards Judaism. Although the author's love of truth induces him to say many things about Judaism which we gladly adopt, and although he proclaims as Christianity a doctrine which comes very near to Judaism, and is almost identical with it, he underrates the significance of the Old Testament, he indulges in most violent attacks upon the Jewish religion at the time of Christ, and wraps himself in eloquent silence in regard to the Judaism of the last 1800 years.

First of all he belittles the Old Testament. On the one hand, he admits of the Old Testament (p. 30) that "Monotheism had been established long before, and the few
possible types of monotheistic piety had already long come to the light, here and there, in whole schools, in a people. Is it possible to surpass the vigorous and deeply religious individualism of the Psalmist who confessed: "O Lord, if I have only thee, I do not ask for heaven and earth"? Can Micah's words be excelled: "Thou wert told, O Man, what is good, and what the Lord requires of thee; to do what is right, to practise love, and to walk humbly before thy God." A few lines after this he says in reference to the Gospels: "Search the whole history of the religion of the people of Israel, look into history at large, for a message from God and the Good so pure and earnest—for purity and earnestness belong together—as we hear and read here." It seems almost as if Harnack were blind to the contradiction between the two sentences quoted here. Or does he really believe that those biblical verses which he himself designated as unsurpassable, to which, of course, might be added innumerable verses more—and even whole books, like Job, and, above all, Deutero-Isaiah—stand really below the Gospels for purity and earnestness? Or, to give another instance, he mentions (p. 85) that during the last two centuries B.C., through the broadening of the historical horizon, the interest of the Jews in the other nations was roused more and more, that the idea of universal humanity sprang up. As if that idea had not been forcibly and unmistakably expressed four centuries earlier in Deutero-Isaiah and in many psalms. We are still more surprised on reading (p. 140): "Thus arose the aggressive and absorbing orthodoxy of the State and the Church, or rather of the State Church; examples from the Old Testament, which are always at hand, completed the process and made it sacred." With regard to so much that is great and beautiful in Christianity, the influence of the Old Testament is undervalued or entirely ignored; but when

1 Harnack translates here and p. 90 erroneously: "to keep God's word" instead of "to do what is right."
it is a question of the "State Church" to which Harnack is so greatly opposed, the Old Testament must play the part of scapegoat, as if quite different factors had not co-operated in the institution of the State Church, as though there were any necessity for searching for examples from the Old Testament.

But the following passage on the Old Testament (pp. 116, 117) sounds stranger and more contradictory than any:

"How great is the blessing which this book has brought to the Church! As a book of edification, as a book of comfort, as a book of wisdom, and of counsel, as a book of history it has an incomparable significance for life and for Apologetics. And yet its possession was not salutary to the Church in every sense; for, firstly, another religion and another morality than the Christian was written on many pages of that book. Spiritualize their significance ever so resolutely, it will be impossible completely to remove the original meaning by these means. There was a danger, and it came really to pass, that an inferior, discarded element would invade Christianity from the Old Testament." Is it really Harnack who speaks, he whose religion is so entirely imbued with the spirit of the Old Testament? Does he not feel that in saying this he abuses the mother from whose breast he had drawn his best faculties? Does he believe that it is his duty to keep the Old Testament the farther from him, the more he removes himself from orthodox Protestantism, in order to escape from the peril of landing in the neighbourhood of Judaism? It almost looks like it; for we observe the same in other free-minded theologians, their retreat from official Christianity holds equal pace with their depreciation of the Old Testament. Thus Kautzsch, the learned and eminent editor of the new scientific translation of the Old Testament, gives expression to the following sentiments¹: "No scholar will deny to the Old Testament rudiments of the highest and purest conception of God,

¹ Bibelwissenschaft und Religionsunterricht, Halle, 1900, p. 46.
and of a truly evangelical morality (compare, for instance, apart from numerous passages in the Prophets, the 31st chapter of the book of Job); nor will any deny the great significance of the Messianic expectation. But it is nevertheless of the highest importance to make the student plainly aware of the boundaries that separate even the most purified Old Testament conception of God, and the highest degree of Old Testament morality, from their perfection in the New Testament.” On reading this, especially the few examples from Old Testament morality graciously conceded in a note under the text, and the phrase “apart from numerous passages in the Prophets,” one cannot help thinking of an anecdote of a Frenchman, who declared that the Germans were as poets absolutely without any gifts; they had not produced a single great poet except Goethe. As if this would not be enough: ἐνα ἀλλὰ λέγεται. Nobody will assert that everything in the Old Testament stands on the same level; this cannot be expected in a book that combines such diverse degrees of religious development. Is, then, everything in the New Testament of the same grain? Is not Harnack under the necessity of weakening, modifying, and trimming for his own use many sayings of Christ, although he never repudiates them entirely? On perusing the passage quoted above, in which he has not a word to say about the morally beneficial influence of the Old Testament upon Christianity, and on comparing therewith what he himself says elsewhere about the unsurpassable moral character of certain Old Testament sayings, one feels constrained to assume that two souls dwell in his breast, one of which recognizes and acknowledges the truth, and the other follows unconsciously some dark impulse, and excludes the truth. How refreshing as against this are the fervour and

1 The words in brackets appear in Kautzsch as notes under the text.
2 To give an example. On p. 60 he reproduces the well-known saying of Christ in the following form: “A rich man will hardly come into the kingdom of heaven.” Cf. to this p. 55.
enthusiasm with which Cornill\textsuperscript{1} sets forth the Old Testament morality, because sentiment does not draw him into another groove than the one into which he is directed by his intellect.

A still greater want of clear-sightedness can be observed in Harnack when he comes to speak of Judaism at the time of Christ. Here the contradictions and unjust judgments accumulate; here lies indeed the principal difficulty for Harnack; here are the most numerous rocks which he tries very carefully to clear, but against which he ultimately strikes in spite of all his art. He tries to understand Christ as \textit{man}, and he thinks that the ugliest possible picture of the Judaism of the time would serve best as a background for setting off Christ's greatness. He falls into the same error as most historiographers of that period, an error which cannot be better described than in Chwolson's striking words\textsuperscript{2}: "With a rude house-painter's brush, dipped in pitch-black paint and mire, he daubs on an unsightly black background, and writes under: 'This is Judaism at the time of Christ'; then he takes another, finer brush, dips it in gilt, and paints on the background the picture of Jesus. The picture is finished with two, sometimes with three brushes, and he names it by a respectable and learned name. I would allow myself to suggest another method, a rational and historically correct one, instead of this. Let them paint as a background the \textit{paganism} of that time, with its criminal, licentious, and frequently insane rites, with its cruel assassinations in the contests of gladiators and fights with beasts, its promiscuous domestic and social life, its harshness and cruelty, &c.; then let Christ's splendid form appear, and let it be shown how through him and through his personal activity the whole criminal, decayed, antique world, which was devoid of God and salvation, falls to pieces and is annihi-

\textsuperscript{1} Especially in his lectures, \textit{Die Psalmen und die Weltliteratur, Das alte Testament und die Humanitaet}.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Das letzte Passamahl Christi}, pp. 81, 82.
lated; and in its stead a new world was constructed, with
grand and sublime teachings of a kind, omniscient, and
holy God, with teachings of true humanity, chastity, piety,
devotion to, and confidence in God, and a doctrine of com-
fort hereafter, &c. Such a picture will be as great as it will
be true, and in it Jesus Christ will appear in his great and
incomparable splendour." Most Christians believe even to
the present day that the significance of Christ and Chris-
tianity consists in the internal victory over Judaism, and
rather acknowledge the heathen, i.e. the Greek elements
of the new religion, than such as were taken over from
the Jews, as if Christianity marked a greater advance upon
Judaism than upon paganism. Harnack himself is much
milder and flattering towards Hellenism than towards
Judaism, and is much more ready to do justice to the high
ethics of the Greek thinkers than to Jewish ethics. On
one hand he places Jewish ethics very high indeed (p. 45):
"Jesus found with his own people a rich and profound
ethical system. It is incorrect to judge of the morality of
Pharisaism merely by the casuistic and trivial phenomena
which it exhibits." But immediately after, as if he re-
gretted this admission, he proceeds: "Intertwined with
worship and the petrified in the ritual, the morality of hol-
ness had certainly been turned into the exact opposite; but
everything had not yet become hard and dead, there was
still something alive in the depth of the system. Jesus
could reply to the questioners: You have the Law, keep
it; you know yourselves best what you have to do; the
sum total of the Law is, as you say yourselves, Love to
God and to your neighbour." Again on page 66 he says:
"The priests and Pharisees kept the people in bond and
murdered their souls." On p. 120 we read: "The Christian
religion originally developed its strength amid the wreck
of the Jewish religion." Any child can perceive the
unsolved contradictions between the sentences quoted. If
there existed in the Jewish people a rich and profound
ethical system; if it is incorrect to judge of pharisaic
morality merely from casuistic and trivial phenomena, how is it then possible to say that the Pharisees murdered the souls of the people? We know that there were among the Pharisees some abject people and wretched hypocrites; we know this not only from the Gospels, which have a pronounced antipathic tendency, and are in this respect biassed, although Harnack will not admit it (p. 14), but we know it from a source which lies under no suspicion, and yet of which, strange to say, Harnack makes no use, namely, from the Talmud, which is altogether pervaded with the spirit of pharisaism. Nevertheless, the Talmud in several passages brands such impure types that were found in the midst of the Pharisees. Where has there ever been, and where is there a religious community, in the midst of which such elements cannot be found? The bad and the hypocrite are international and interconfessional; in their own camp they are better known and recognized, and more abhorred by the better and nobler men within than without. It is therefore very wrong to make a whole religious community answerable for its objectionable members, who defile and abuse religion, and make use of the latter as a mask and label to cover meanness, deceit, and crime. Harnack also commits this injustice when he sweepingly identifies the Pharisees with those abject fellows, who indeed borrowed their name, but who were repudiated and energetically discarded by the former.

Harnack commits another error in asserting that the morality of holiness was turned into its exact opposite by its intertwining with worship and the petrification in the Ritual. This assertion cannot be better refuted than by another utterance of Harnack's (p. 109): “Even the innermost feature, religion itself, does not manifest itself free and isolated, but grows, so to say, within a bark, of which it stands in need.” If Harnack thinks himself able

to excuse with these words certain Christological notions, which, however, he himself does not share, he must, in his capacity as a great historiographer of religion, also know the value of worship and rites, and acknowledge their worth for the very raising of religious and moral life. Worship and Ritual in Judaism have succeeded in preserving pure monotheism. They have kept it free from that turbidity and those obscurations which it received at the hands of Christianity, and which Harnack is at such pains to remove. Worship and Ritual were consciously set up in Judaism as "a fence round the Law," and they loyally fulfilled their task. At various times and with many individuals, this fence, instead of forming a protection for the religion, became a massive wall, which obstructed air and light. But such were always abnormal cases, and are not decisive of the whole question. I will be silent about the inner impulse which many ceremonies gave to the Jewish religion, of the educational value in disciplining the will which the numerous precepts of the Ritual, often seemingly so devoid of meaning, possess. I would only ask whether Harnack knows the ethics of the mediaeval Jewish philosophers, especially the ethics of Maimonides, who kept steadfast to worship and Ritual, and whether in presence of such facts he still believes that the morality of holiness was petrified in Ritualism. Harnack's aversion to the Rites goes so far, that he judges of the official leaders of the Jewish people at the time of Christ in this manner (p. 33): "They conceive God as the Despot, who watches over the ceremonial of his domestic arrangement . . . They saw him only in his Law, which they had made into a labyrinth of passes, byways, and secret exits. . . . They possessed a thousand commandments from him, and therefore thought they knew him. . . . They had made of religion a worldly profession, there was nothing more abominable."

1 On the other hand, Harnack, p. 174, with striking tolerance, excuses Protestantism for having retained so many forms from aesthetic and pedagogic motives.
The whole context shows that Harnack understands under the official leaders the Pharisaic teachers of the Law, the disciples of Hillel. In that case his words are a misrepresentation and a libel, which cannot be excused by anything except by a complete ignorance of Pharisaic Judaism. Even a superficial acquaintance with Talmud and Midrash would have taught him better, and given him a different notion about Pharisaic Judaism. He would look there in vain for corroboration of this monstrous charge, and if he derives the justification of his verdict from Matthew, ch. xxiii, it would be only necessary for him to peruse, for instance, a few pages in the above-cited work of Chwolson, to learn several truths which may appear to him perhaps painful and new, but which are nevertheless irrefragable, and which I do not repeat here out of respect for Harnack.

Such ignorance of the Rabbinical writings from which alone a picture of the Judaism of that period can be obtained, explains also how Harnack can say quite seriously (p. 58): "The social conditions which obtained in Palestine at the time of Jesus, and long after, are not sufficiently known to us." They are very well known to every Talmudist, although it must be admitted that the scattered and colossal material has not as yet been systematically worked. Only an entire ignorance of Jewish jurisprudence, both in theory and practice, makes it possible for Harnack to say: "Jesus was in a nation, the greater half of which had, throughout generations, demanded its right in vain, and which knew right only as force"; and the following sentence can only have been written in complete ignorance of the real social conditions (p. 58): "The ruling classes, to which above all the priests and Pharisees belonged—these, partly in conjunction with the secular authorities, possessed little heart for the wants of the poor people." Generally it is assumed that the Sadducees belonged to the ruling classes, and that the Pharisees were pre-eminently recruited from the lower

1 *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, pp. 77-81.
classes, and therefore belonged to the oppressed and not to the oppressors. But, apart from this, the whole Rabbinical, i.e. Pharisaic literature, breathes so much love for the poor, and developed so perfect a system of charitable organization, admirable even at the present day, and still so efficacious in instilling into the Jews a sense of charity, that the grounds on which Harnack bases his judgment are quite incomprehensible.

When we collect all these utterances together, we involuntarily gain the impression that, to speak with Chwolson, “the mother of the brilliant child must by all means be represented as a monster.” That impression will be strongest where Harnack is at pains to fix exactly the advance effected by Christ. He admits on pages 30, 31 that Christ’s teaching contains nothing new, that even the Pharisees possessed it; but directly afterwards he cites a passage from Wellhausen, which is a worthy counterpart of the above-quoted passages, in which the Pharisees are also roughly handled. We read on the same page that “the pure source of the Holy had been disclosed long before, but sand and rubbish had accumulated over it, and its water was polluted. The case is not altered, when Rabbis and theologians subsequently distilled it, even if they were successful.” Harnack chose this metaphor of distillation rather uncautiously, for his Wesen des Christentums is the product of a thorough distillation such as was never attempted, nor was ever necessary to be attempted, by any Rabbi in regard to Judaism. Not only the official Christianity of the present day has to endure this distillation of his, but also the Gospel, which, as was already pointed out, has acquired under his hands a quite new complexion. Harnack evidently claims for himself alone the right to distil the water of his religion, and he would then throw the turbid parts removed by him into some other source, the purity of which is inopportune to him. Thus he says immediately after: “Pharisaic teachers had announced that everything was comprehended in the
command to love God and one's neighbour; they had spoken glorious words, which might have gone forth from the mouth of Jesus. But what have they effected therewith? That the people, that their own disciples rejected him who took these words seriously. Everything had remained weak, and therefore injurious. Words cannot effect anything; the effective force is the personality that stands behind them." Strange if every influence was weakened, that it was still possible for the pharisaic religion to survive the downfall of the Jewish State that immediately followed. How could it weave a common bond that encircled the Jews that were scattered in all directions? How could it kindle such heroism in the Bar Cochba revolt? How could it stir up its followers to such unparalleled fidelity to their faith that they joyfully accepted an uninterrupted martyrdom of almost two thousand years, so that they endured in spite of all persecutions, and do not perish even now? The Christian theologians will not and cannot acknowledge the spiritual and moral force of Judaism. By doing this they would lose the ground under their feet, for such acknowledgment would involve the most crushing charge against their mode of construing history. The disciples of the Pharisees rejected Jesus certainly, but did they do so because he took the love of God and men seriously? Did they reject the historical Jesus, as depicted by Harnack, of whose activity they knew little or nothing, who offered them neither what was new to them, nor what was assailable by them? They rejected Jesus only in the aspect under which he was represented by his followers; they would know nothing of the deification of man, which ran counter to their religion; they would not acknowledge his resurrection; they would and could not consider him as a "saviour," and in this they were in perfect harmony with that which Harnack teaches to-day.

But we still do not know in which points the Gospel marks in Harnack's opinion an advance beyond Judaism. Is it the severance of religion from the Jewish national
existence? But this was completed only by Paul, and Harnack admits himself (p. 109) that the characteristic elements that were of most importance to the first Christians can, if necessary, be carried out also within the confines of Judaism and in connexion with the synagogue. If, therefore, according to Harnack, Christ did not teach anything that was peculiar, but was only the noblest representative imaginable, and the highest living embodiment of the Jewish teaching, how can he be designated as the father of a new religion? However great the number of people may have been that were made acquainted by him with the Jewish teaching, to which they were converted by his example, he cannot for all that be designated as the founder of a religion, as little as Hillel, nor did he claim to be such, as his famous saying proves:

"Think not that I come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

Or does the chief significance of Jesus lie in the sacrifice of his death? Harnack nowhere says so directly, but he seems to possess a particularly high notion of its effectiveness. He says (p. 99) that "there can be no doubt that the death of Christ made an end to the sacrifices of blood in the history of religion," and he puts it as certain that "the inclination which led to such mode of sacrificing had found its satisfaction and therefore its termination in the death of Christ." But surely the Jews were not really induced to abstain from animal sacrifices by the death of Christ, of which they scarcely took any notice. They did not stand in need of such external motive, for ever since the days of the Prophets their best men had opposed the sacerdotal service. The sense of the religious worthlessness, even of the harm, of this service had gained such mastery, that Rabbi Eliezer

1 Matt. v. 17, 18.
could use the great words 1: "From the day that the temple was destroyed an iron wall fell down between Israel and their Father in heaven." Therefore the great national calamity, the destruction of the state and the temple, appeared to a pharisaic teacher of the law, from a religious point of view, as a blessing, because it was the external motive for the abolition of sacrifices. And again, R. Jochanan ben Zakkai, who witnessed the destruction of the temple, comforted his disciple R. Joshua, who on seeing the ruins of the temple lamented the cessation of sacrifices as atonement 2: "Do not be griev ed. We have an atonement left, which is of equal value, namely, the practice of benevolence (Gemiluth Hassadim); for it is said: I desire love, not sacrifice." It was, therefore, not the death of Christ, but the utterances of the prophet Hosea, which enlightened the notions of the Jews of the time on the subject of sacrifices.

The significance of the death of Christ is depicted by Harnack (pp. 99, 100) in beautiful and eloquent words. But he should apply the same measure to the whole of Judaism. Jewish history since the rise of Christianity has been one great sacrifice, the sacrifice of a whole people, which cheerfully offered itself up for one great idea; for which it has accepted on thousands of occasions death and martyrdom, hatred and persecution, scorn and degradation; which has resisted, and does resist, all allurements; which, in spite of all temptations, does not show a desire to become unfaithful to its God and to disappear from history.

The following words of Harnack (p. 102) show to what a degree he is inclined to consider the Judaism of the last 1800 years as a negligeable quantity. He says that "the indelible belief in the victory over death and in eternal life has taken its rise from that grave. Do not let people point to Plato, to the Persian religion, and the later Jewish thoughts and writings, all that would have perished and

1 Bab. Berachot, 32b.
2 Aboth de R. Nathan, ch. iv (ed. Schechter, fo. 11*).
has perished.” No, Judaism does not do Professor Harnack the favour of having perished, even though he may ever so many times draw up its certificate of death. It is alive, and that which Harnack says of Christianity applies with greater force to Judaism (p. 187): “It has outlived the changes in the views on life; it has stripped off like a garment all those thoughts and forms which once were holy; it participated in the collective progress of the Cultur; it has spiritualized itself, and has learned, in the course of history, to apply ethical principles more firmly.” It is highly characteristic that he does not once, in his book, mention the Judaism of the last 1800 years; he thinks that he is allowed simply to eliminate it from history. Were it not for one passage (p. 38), in which he speaks of the Jewish scholars who deny Christus's originality, one would not learn from Harnack that there was a Judaism after the spread of Christianity, or that a Judaism still exists. Some centuries hence Harnack's book may perhaps be used to prove that at his time there were no longer any Jews in Europe, and especially in Germany; for, otherwise, he could not possibly have been silent about it, considering that he occasionally speaks of Islam and Buddhism. His silence will be invoked as evidence against the statements in statistical works, according to which almost 100,000 Jews were living in the place where he worked. And how can this silence be explained? Is it from a wish to spare Judaism and to evade an unpleasant discussion? Harnack, who does not shrink from a struggle with any power, can hardly have been so considerate and tenderhearted towards the modern Jews. The cause is quite different; it lies in this, that if he had taken notice of the existence of the Judaism of to-day, he would have been compelled to admit that everything which for him constitutes religion is to be found in that Judaism in a much purer and less turbid condition than in any of the official churches. The same remarkable circumstance is exhibited in his
inaugural address as Rector, already quoted; we cannot learn therefrom that there ever was, or that there is yet, a Jewish religion. In his consideration of the universal history of religion he does not once mention the name of Judaism, and since he is obliged to speak, either well or evil, of the religion of the Old Testament, he reclams it for the Christian religion, calling it "the primitive history of Christianity." On the other hand, we read in the Rectorial address the following interesting passage (p. ii): "The history of that religion which possesses the Bible comprises a clearly recognizable and uninterrupted period of almost three thousand years, and can even at the present day be studied as the living religion. It rises in these three characteristics so prominently above all other kindred manifestations, that we may safely say that he who does not know that religion knows none, and he who knows it and its history knows all." Every impartial reader, be he Jew or Christian, will say on reading these words that they cannot mean any other religion except Judaism, for it is only to Judaism that they are all applicable. Yet Harnack says all this of Christianity, though the remark is in strange contradiction with what he elsewhere says\(^1\) of the *history of the Jewish religion*, that it was "the profoundest and richest that any nation ever had, and indeed, as the future was to prove, in reality the religious history of the human race."

It is astonishing how a man who taught at a University together with Steinthal can bring himself so entirely to ignore Judaism. I feel inclined to think that Harnack can scarcely have approached those Jews who were qualified mentally and morally to give him a correct notion of Judaism. Had he done this his acumen and his love of truth would have induced him somewhat to modify his conceptions. He himself observes very strikingly in the same Address (p. 15): "Absolutely correct notions can only be gathered from the living

\(^1\) *Wesen des Christentums*, p. 89.
religion, from the contemplation of piety." Unfortunately, he does not put that maxim into practice in regard to Judaism. Otherwise he would not have failed to allow a modest place to Judaism in the history of religion, and in the present time, by the side of Islam and Buddhism; if he had made a somewhat closer acquaintance with the various types of Jewish piety in Eastern and Western Europe, he might even have discovered types the counterpart of which cannot be found in Christianity, as, for instance, the Lamdan 1, the Chasid, the Maskil, but that, on the other hand, most of the types found in Christianity exist here also.

On summing up all that has been said here I arrive at the following result: Harnack strips from official Christianity, as the Church teaches it and the State propagates it, all those elements which Jews also refuse to acknowledge. He arrives in this way at a form of religion which approaches very near to Judaism, he tries to blind himself against such approach by rejecting the old Judaism on account of some specific excrescences, and by ignoring altogether the present Judaism. It is true that such a method is simple, but it is, as we have seen, best refuted by that which Harnack himself says. Thus Harnack has, against his will, succeeded in justifying Judaism, and he confirms Jews in their loyalty and attachment to their religion, in the place of which he can put nothing newer or better. It is a particular joy and satisfaction for Jews to know that they are spiritually so near akin to a man of the mind, the learning, and the religious earnestness of Harnack, and they will not be misled when he is often unjust to Judaism, for they have to deal with a man who does not offend them willingly and intentionally, but who is ruled by a deep-rooted sentiment of which he cannot entirely free himself.

I do not know whether Harnack will ever become

---

1 Cf. the beautiful description of the Lamdan in Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl*, pp. 73, 74 n.
cognizant of these lines; if so, I do not believe that I shall have converted him to another conception, for, as he says himself at the end of his book (p. 188) on this subject, our proofs are only variations of our convictions.

On the other hand, Jewish readers, to whom I cannot sufficiently recommend the study of Harnack's work, will receive from it much instruction in points other than those mentioned above. They will gain from it much religious suggestion, they will consider many religious questions in a new light, they will understand better many sore spots in the present Judaism, and comprehend more earnestly many dangers that threaten it. For the same grave struggles that are being carried on in Christianity have their play in Judaism, and what Harnack says on the last four pages of his work about the contemporary condition of the evangelical Church applies, mutatis mutandis, for the most part to Judaism also. We see there how equal causes have equal effects. Sometimes indeed the causes are different with us, but the effects are much the same. If, e.g., in Christianity the protection by the State acts as a check upon the development of religion, with us, where that factor does not exist, it is, on the one hand, hostility without, and, on the other hand, a desire to imitate within, which call forth similar results. An abundance of sound observations and subtle remarks, which can be unconditionally applied to the Jewish religion also, are scattered all over the book. This is, for instance, the case with the conception of Reformation which is clearly expounded on p. 168, further that which is said on pp. 4, 5 about apologetics, also that which is said on pp. 114 and 123–125 about the dangers that lie in religious forms, and what he says on p. 41 about prayer: "The prayers are the decisive factors of the higher religions." In this sentence Jews can very well acquiesce, both in respect to their own prayers and in respect to the fact that the Christian prayers, from the "Our Father" to the Church hymns, are only an echo of the Jewish prayers. But more than all will every
reader derive satisfaction from what he says on p. 62 of those curates of souls who indulge in good living: there Harnack's moral nature shows itself in the most beautiful light, and compensates for many points with which we are unable to agree. The candour also with which he discloses and discusses the sore spots of the old and the new Christianity (e.g. pp. 79, 115-116, 121, 130, 131-132, 140, 146-148, 150, 159, 163-166, 179 sqq., 184), the impartiality which impels him, notwithstanding his high appreciation of Luther's significance, to ascribe to him many grave faults and errors, must please every friend of historical truth.

It is true we find also in the book many general statements which will meet with just objections. Thus on p. 155 he says that "No church can have so much self-deception as to disregard essential conditions when receiving new members, especially from other confessions." Daily experience teaches the opposite. The method practised on the reception of Jews into Christianity contradicts that assertion very completely, and has therefore often been rejected by earnest members of the Church, who have considered proselyte hunting as something unworthy.

But enough of fault-finding. Harnack quotes at the beginning of his book a passage from Goethe in order to refute the view that Christianity has outlived itself. I will therefore conclude my remarks also with a citation from Goethe, by which Jews can confirm their conviction that neither has Judaism outlived itself: "The people of Israel is the most tenacious people on earth; it is, it was, it will be, in order to glorify the name of Jehovah throughout all times."

FELIX PERLES.

Konigsberg i/Pr., 12 Sept. 1901.

1 Does not Harnack feel that he is unjust towards the Judaism at the time of Christ when he places it, on p. 148, on the same level as the Greek Orthodox Church?

2 Wanderjahre, bk. II, ch. ii.
POSTSCRIPT.

After the conclusion of this article I received the latest number of the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, in which Leo Bäck discusses at length Harnack's lectures (pp. 97-120). As a matter of course his views resemble in many points that which is said here, especially in the refutation of the wrong judgments upon Judaism in the time of Jesus. I saw no reason, notwithstanding, to alter anything in my article, because I look upon this harmony between two critics, who wrote quite independently of one another, the most satisfactory confirmation of the correctness of their strictures; and because, on the other hand, the two articles show deep differences in tenor and contents.

F. P.

23 Oct. 1901.
THE GOLDEN KEY.

Once, upon a time far distant,
Lived, they say, an ancient monarch.
Wonderful beyond all telling
Were the riches he possessed.

There were mounds of gold and silver,
Heaps of diamonds and pearls.
Guarded had they lain for ages,
Hid within the mighty palace.

And the palace door was closed,
Fastened, with a lock tremendous;
But the key that turned the lock
Was a little, tiny key!

Of the finest gold, the purest,
Fashioned only was the little,
Little key, and very easy,
See you, had it been to lose it.

So the king, to make his riches
Safer yet, he took the key,
And securely he attached it
To a great and heavy chain.
Lo, the key art thou, my people,
To the old king's palace door!

Art the key to all those wondrous,
All those dear and priceless treasures:
Torah, charity and faith!—
Only, so that never, never,

Thee in all this world, my people,
Should he lose, has thy Creator
Fastened thee beyond escaping
To a great and heavy chain.

To a heavy chain of sorrows
God has made thee fast, and said:
Go, my people! tho' the stormwind
And the tempest rage around thee,

Thou endurest—thou endurest!

A FANTASY.

Each man is a trader,
The world is a fair:
They boil and they fry,
And they chatter and stare;
They chaffer and haggle,
And each one is keen
On making a bargain,
And profit, and profit—
For me there's no profit!
I beg, I implore:
The money I ventured
 Restore me, restore!

For oh, in the business
I ventured my best:
My youth and my childhood,
And all I possessed
Most precious, invested and sold.
For riches and honour
I hunted untiring,
For joy and contentment to be.
Oh, let me relinquish—
Too narrow, dear brothers,
Too hard is the bargain for me!

Too great is the venture,
Too small is the profit.
Take, take altogether,
And yours shall remain,
The honour, the riches,
The power and learning,
And give me my youth
And my childhood again!
Give back, oh, give back
The lovely, the vanished,
The years that so quickly
Have slipt from my hold!
The gateway of faith,
Once more fling it open—
Of hope and of gladness
The portals of gold!

You look on me, brothers,
You sigh, and you pity.
My life, my misfortune,
My lack of good sense.
Oh, short-sighted creatures,
Oh, poor, foolish creatures,
You feel not,
You know not,
How happy am I!
How happy am I,
When, free as an eagle,
My spirit her pinions
Hath spread, and is flown
To other dominions,
The home of the stars,
Where youth's fadeless flowers
Still perfume the shore,
Where this world's false treasures,
Her tears and her pleasures,
Are heard of no more!...

MY EPITAPH.

Yes, many songs of bitterness and tears
I've sung for you, my friends, in bygone years,
And, with my last remaining tooth outworn,
The hapless jargon have I bit and torn,
And chewed the dear, old speech that was our mother's
Some parts with rhyme I salted, peppered others
With verse, and tried to make it soft and nice,
Essayed to smother something of the spice
That now and then too vividly recalls
The Düneburg and Wilna market stalls,
The flavour spreading ten miles round a place
Where once the jargon left, if but a trace...
Yes, eight long years, dear brothers, have I sung
And much devised in this pleasing tongue.
Some praised, and others blamed me (not a few),
I heard—and took my fiddle up anew!...

But Israel is a very stiff-necked nation,
A bitter folk, peculiar, separate.
From Egypt's sea to Horeb's desolation,
And from Mount Horeb to the present date,
God knows, he knows! you tear yourself in pieces,
You stroke, bless, praise them, flatter all you can,
In vain you reckon on their next caprices!
God knows, I say!—then what is one poor man
To make of them—a jargon writer too?

You mean to write then, neighbour? (says a Jew)
Well, write by all means, only—have a care,
And recollect with whom you have to do:
That we are Jews, and so—no vulgar fare!
Write—how shall I explain? why, you can tell
How best to please them all, you know quite well,
You understand! . . .

Dear friends, you are too good!
Alas, but one thing have I understood!
In pity, tell me, is it this you ask,
Is this, and this alone, the writer's task:
To make the people laugh?

—That's it! That's right!

You see, you are too serious by half,
Dear Mr. Frug!—do be amusing, bright!
We only ask of you to make us laugh.

Write stories, anecdotes, things wise yet witty,
With verses and with rhymes to make them pretty!

—I cannot do it, cannot—woe is me!
I cannot leap and caper, cannot make
Strange antics, cannot laugh! for pity's sake—
I cannot laugh, I tell you—let me be!

And some day your revenge you all may take,
(But I shall absent be, I shall not know it),
And write upon my tomb for all to see:

Here lies a strange, wild thing, a crazy poet.
His name ran thus—so many were his years—
He spent them ev'ry one in tears! . . .
THE GRAVE OF MOSES OUR TEACHER.

Oh, at times, when I've thought on it early and late,
    Till exhausted and sick is my brain,
How that life is so hard, the misfortune so great,
    And the remedies fashioned in vain.

Oh, then hence, where there's no one to lead us or guide,
   To make our sore burden seem light,
Unto Moses the god-like, our hero, our pride,
   My thoughts and my longings take flight.

Oh, how sweet would it be, in our terror and grief,
   At thy grave could we gather and kneel,
And, bitterly weeping, a moment's relief,
   At the heart all disconsolate feel!

But alas! of our prophet and crown we're bereft,
   He is deaf to our tears and our cries;
No refuge or comfort to us now is left,
   For concealed is the grave where he lies! . . .

And a voice, a voice from Heaven,
    Hark, is sounding clear and sweet:
Jews, no grave to you is given,
    Dust and ashes at your feet!

But a crystal fount, a river
    Springing day and night anew,
Thro' the desert flowing ever,
    He has left behind for you.

Flowers on its bank are growing,
    Trees their verdant branches wave.
See, beside the fountain's flowing,
    Small and mighty, king and knave.
In the workman’s narrow dwelling,  
    In the spacious, gilded hall,  
See the limpid waters welling!  
    “Bible” we this wonder call.

Fear and grief and desolation  
    Washed away on sunlit waves—  
Go, my child, thy consolation  
    Flows from out our fathers’ graves. . . .

A LEAFLET OF CONFESSIONS.

How slowly, how lazily passes each day,  
And the years, oh how swift are the years!  
Far, far is it yet to the end of my way,  
And yet, brothers, see, I am bent, I am grey,  
My cheeks they are sunken, my hands are a-cold,  
My forehead is wrinkled with many a fold—  
O brothers, I am not yet thirty years old!

“At thirty years: strength,” runs the saying—What then?  
The words in the Talmud you see.  
O take, I beseech you, take paper and pen,  
And reckon how many must be  
The strong ones in Israel . . . with joy and with trembling  
I picture their host in its might,  
In Luzin, in Pinsk, in Berdichef assembling,  
A nation of strong ones, a shield, a delight!

A nation of strong ones, and then, Jew by Jew,  
Goliath the Philistine, Samson in pride.  
The kettle o’er-boils with the powerful brew,  
The earth, as tho’ feverstruck, quakes at their stride.  
We labour, we eat and we drink of the best,  
We revel in riches—each alley, each house,  
Each place where is food for ten men and one mouse,  
A lair is of lions, of eagles a nest!
O lions and eagles! time was, when I too,
I too was an eagle with eyes wildly gleaming,
High, high o'er the hills and the valleys I flew,
And high o'er the lakes and the rivers far-streaming.
The clouds were below me, the stars gave me greeting,
The woods and the forests beneath me that lay,
They rustled and sang, and the streams in their fleeting,
They sang too, and shone, and rejoiced on their way.

The vales and the dales, and the wide-stretching plain,
The clouds and the stars, and the wind and the river,
The green little leaflets that glisten and shiver,
That glance in the sun, and are wet with the rain,
The snow-wreath of silver, the gold of the fall,
The heaven above, and the earth at my feet,
Of hope and of gladness they sang, one and all,
And oh, but their singing, their singing was sweet!

My Rabbi was Nature—she set me to learn,
She taught me to sing, and she taught me to play,
And all that is beautiful swift to discern.
"The heart must be fresh, and the brain clear and steady,
The measure and scales still be waiting and ready"—
And I, after all, have become—why, you know it!
A poet, my brothers, a poor Jewish poet!

You know what that means, have considered it well,
And this which I tell you, O friends, is no news:
Unhappy the man to whose portion it fell
A poet to be among Jews!
A jester, a fiddler at feast and at fair,
A creature of jingle and jangle and verse,
He leaps, and turns head over heels in the air—
The crowd stand round laughing, and laughing disperse.

And woe to him, woe! if there beat in his breast
A heart full of love and of passion unsleeping,
That will not allow him to turn into jest
The harp that was given awhile to his keeping.
His task is to play on it, firm and unshaken,
Of love, hope, and gladness, the thrice holy song,
The feelings the purest and best to awaken
Of truth and of friendship, the faithful and strong.

And who takes his part? in the wind and the sun,
A voice unto bones in the wilderness crying
Is he, to the rocks and the hills round him lying.
They list, but alas! of his brothers, not one.

A Jew with one hand strokes his grey little beard,
He bends down his head, to one side lets it fall.
You think he has seen, and you think he has heard....
Well, yes, he has heard you—and so has the wall!

I can't understand it—I try all in vain!
Are Jews then bewitched? oh, in pity explain!
Such anguish and terror endured in past years,
Such woe, such outpouring of blood and of tears,
And a Jew—requires a jester with horns and with claws!

The jesters with jingles and verses, of these
A critic is he, and as wise as you please.
His heart, when he sees one, is widened with pleasure,
Supreme his delight, and his joy without measure.
A catchword, a proverb, a squib somewhat caustic,
A legend, a riddle, a rhyme, an acrostic...

The daughter of Zion in misery lay,
Long since, where the waters of Babylon flow,
In fetters of iron:
Now sing to us, lo,
A song of your Zion!
Thus cried in that day,
Triumphant and laughing, the foe.

I see them in Rome, they are rent there and torn
By tiger and bear, they're a byword of scorn.
In Spain too I see them, thrown over to shame,
Bereft of their riches, their honour, their name.
I see how they wander alone in the woods,
I see how they toss on the desolate floods,
And still, oh how clearly, I hear thro' it all
The voice of my nation, her watchword, her call:
My children, my children, whose love I rely on,
Oh remember the name that thro' ages untold,
Before angels and men you were wont to uphold,
Defend still the treasured, the dear name of Zion!
And this, do you see,
Mr. Jew, is for me
The one only song, which from life's early dawn
My heart to itself, by my heart's love, has drawn.

ONE OF THE BEST.

I.

(On the grave of Michel Gordon.)

One more gravestone! one more heart,
Cold and still, has found relief
From the joy as from the smart,
From the wrath for other's grief.

Where the ash is strewn about,
Lies the dear old fiddle, lone;
And the crazy song rang out
With a sudden sound of moan.

Strong and earnest, unafraid,
Rose the song, and clear and high.
Ring the bell—the piece is played!
Hushed the laughter, hushed the cry!

In the land where, free from pain,
Thou, dear soul, art gone to live,
One assurance still retain,
All the comfort we can give.
This: while still there lives a Jew,
   And for many, many years,
Shall thy songs be sung anew,
   Some with laughter, some with tears.

Sleep, thou spirit sweet and rare,
   Where the leaves of life are shed!
Thine own songs shall be the Pray'r
   Spoke in blessing o'er the Dead . . . . .

II.

What see I, what hear I? O say, if you know!
The dovelet is cooing, the linnet is singing,
The little, the silvery bells all are ringing,
The little straw cradle, it rocks to and fro.

The cradle is rocking, the lamplight is lighted,
   Beside me once more is my Grandmother sitting;
With small, bony fingers a sock she is knitting,
   She bends o'er my cradle with dark eyes dim-sighted.

She sits and she knits, and she sings thro' her musing:
   "You've been to Poltava, of course, Mr. Jew?"
My very best thanks, Michel Gordon, to you!
   Your booklet of verse I just now was perusing.

Of those who awoke in the night you were one,
   Who woke while the Jews all about them were sleeping,
And round to the doors and the windowpanes creeping,
   You tapped, and you called them all forth to the sun.

I see her, your Muse, she is Jewishly dressed
   In garments old-fashioned and plain, but the cotton
With which they were sewn is not worthless or rotten—
   'Tis fine and 'tis costly, 'tis thread of the best.

Her garments are long, without flounces or laces,
   That free and unchecked she may wander about
In alley and court, where the school-children shout,
   And where the dogs yelp in the old market-places.
The poor Jewish Muse! she must roam o'er the earth 
Amid Jewish refuse, and rubbish, and ashes,
And slippers, and old hooded mantles and sashes,
And things that had never a halfpenny's worth.

Where people have prospered, and hard are the heads,
The hearts too, in danger of blows and of curses,
Deserted and nameless still onward she treads,
And bears on her shoulder a bundle of verses.

SIMCHAS-TORAH.

(The Rejoicing of the Law.)

"Simchas-Torah! skip and hop
On your feet till down you drop!
In your mouth a merry jest—
And a burden in your breast!"

(Old song.)

So frisky and fit,
At table we sit,
We eat what we choose,
We drink and are gay.
Sing, brother Jews,
Be merry to-day!
Cup after cup,
Drink it all up!
No need to fear,
Lift up your voice,
To-day we rejoice—
Sing, brothers dear!

Alas, Jewish singing!
And alas, Jewish gladness!
What means it, O tell me,
And whence is the sadness
That weighs on my heart when I hear?
I hang down my head
Like a child that is chidden,
And oft, ere I know it,
Uncalled for, unbidden,
Falls, bitter and burning,
A tear!
Not always with sorrow
Our hopes were requited,
And often the sunshine
Has brightened our way:
We once were a nation
Both strong and united,
And yet, O my brothers,
And yet to this day,
We keep not one feast-day,
But still doth remind us
Of swords that lie shivered
And broken behind us,
And old, tattered banners,
Now useless and furled;
Of all our dead heroes,
Our great ones who perished,
The altars forgotten,
The ruins uncherished
And scattered abroad o'er the world.
No song that contains but
Two words of rejoicing,
In which we discern not,
The jesting below,
An echo of laughter,
Of false, bitter laughter,
A cry half-despairing
Of shame and of woe!

O great and happy feast-day, Simchas-Torah!
High above our head still your bright star flashes.
To win such a feast-day, one such feast-day,
Ten spend we fasting in sackcloth and ashes!
TWO PICTURES.

"Other seasons, other song-birds: Other song-birds, other songs."

Friends, the legend you remember, How of old, in days departed, Wont were we to keep the fast-day Called among us "of Atonement" . . . .

In the green and shady gardens Round the city named "of palm-trees" Stir of harp-strings, sound of trumpets, Flow of sweet and youthful voices.

Girlish voices sweet are mingling, Girlish voices flowing gaily, Like the sound of silv'ry joy-bells O'er the dewy flowers floating.

"Come, young men, come hither, hither! (Hark the soft, caressing voices) For the fairest are assembled Here, of Jericho's fair daughters.

Slender as the waving palm-trees, Fresh and scented as the roses, All the sweetest, all the fairest Of the city's virgin daughters.

Hither come, young men, come hither! Come and choose your bride, but look not On our youth and freshness only, Rather seek more lasting beauty!

Youth must fade and charms will vanish, Passing like the summer roses, Goodness shall endure for ever, Virtue nevermore shall perish.
Virtue, purity, affection,
Feelings delicate and noble,
These are still our best adorning,
These are still our richest dower."

Raven locks and snow-white dresses
Shine and flutter in the distance,
Now between the waving palm-fronds,
Now between the wreathed flowers.

All are dressed alike, in simple
Linen robes, by one agreement,
And their dresses oft the maidens
Used to borrow one from other.

So that neither rich nor needy
There might be, no pride, no blushes—
Ancient days and ancient pictures,
Ah, already they have vanished! . . .

Other times and other people:
Other people, other pictures . . .
Brightly lighted is the spacious
Dancing-hall at the "Assembly."

In the bright and lofty ball-room
Gather, gather, for the "evening,"
All the fairest and the finest
Of the city's lovely daughters.

All the finest and the fairest
Of the city's youthful daughters,
Maids of Jericho and Hebron—
Of Berdichef and of Kovno.

Pretty Marya Pessachovitch,
Nastya Kaphon, Phrosia Lamech;
And the brilliant Isabella,
Isabella Lokschen-Zimmes.
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Each and all are dressed and fitted
In the very latest fashion;
And the little song they're singing,
Is another altogether.

—Come, O bridegrooms, hither, hither,
(Thus sing Marya, Nastya, Phrosia,
And the brilliant Isabella,
Isabella Lokschen-Zimmes.)

Come, come hither, hither, doctors,
Advocates and engineers too,
With cockades and with distinctions,
Medals, ribbons, attestations!

Take, oh, take us all, have pity!
Take us, snap us up! for ready
Are we each and all to follow—
Up to Heav'n or down to Hades!

Take us, snap us up, and wrap us,
Fold us up in silk and velvet,
Buy us opera-stalls and boxes,
Take, oh, take us masquerading!

Buy us hats that shall resemble
Beds of flowers, shine and dazzle;
Geese and hens, in beak and feathers
All complete, shall sit upon them!

Let our dresses be the smartest,
Smarter than the other people's,
Let our trains be still the longest,
Our "tournures" of all the biggest.

And our ornaments and trimmings,
Like the stars shall glance and sparkle,
All our friends and our relations
Shall be jealous when they see us . . . .

P P 2
And—and so on, O my brothers,
Runs the little song—you know it!
Other times and other people:
Other people, other pictures.

Other names, and other hearts too,
All is changed and new, and diff'rent.
All? not all! one link is left us
With the days so long departed:

’Tis a detail! see, the dresses,
O my friend, the lovely dresses,
With the ornaments and flowers—
Hist! they’re very often borrowed!

HOT AND COLD.

Good luck to you, Rachel! we all wish you joy:
The babe’s a delight to behold!
He screams—(may God bless him, the beautiful boy!)
The first taste of life does not seem to enjoy.
Ah me, up in Heaven, poor child, it was light,
And warm and delightful and cheerful and bright,
And now—do you hear?
The wee thing is talking and whimpering, hark!
“O Mother, how cold is it here, and how dark ...
I shiver and fear!”

The wheel goes on spinning,
It hums and it sings.
A day passes creeping,
A year, as on wings.

—Good day to you, Rabbi!
—Good day! and now look,
Your place is there waiting—sit down in it quick,
And give yourself body and soul to your book,
Or else—why, a taste of the stick!
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Repeat now—no answer? lie down then—lie—so!
One, two—come, lie down, I say!—oh, Rabbi, oh!
—Lie down, you—you rascal! I toil, I perspire,
And he, he does nothing—you felt that one, what?
'Tis warm, is it? answer!—oh hot, Rabbi, hot,
It burns me like fire!

The days pass so slowly,
The years fly so fast,
And that which began,
Why, it ends too, at last.

And once more: good luck to you! play, fiddler, play,
On wings now of melody rise!
The bridegroom is handsome and clever; the bride,
A jewel, a mirror, a prize.
Play on! if the jewel has nails, time will tell—
The mirror, a tongue, alas!—well, bridegroom, well,
You glow not, possessed of this treasure?
O friends, O companions, I beg of you, hold!
As one in a wood, in the night, all a-cold,
I shiver and shake—as one palsied and old,
I freeze—but with pleasure!

The world is a class-room
For small and for great.
We're crowded and squeezed,
And we learn, soon or late.

A trader, a pedlar—there's no time to waste:
In Klotz is a fair, and in Hotz—O make haste!
A market they hold, and, wherever you go,
It roars like a furnace—they hurry, they fly,
They speed as on wheels, as on wings they were borne.
Salt, furs, flax and leather and cattle and corn...
They charter and barter and bargain and buy.
The trader, the fledgeling, he runs to and fro,
He trembles, gesticulates, damp is his brow.
O friends, brother dealers, how flames it! just now,
What ardour, what glow!

The world is a market,
The wheel, the wheel turns.
The life flames and flickers,
It crackles and burns.

Burn, burn! you will cool before long, Mr. Jew!
Of wood and of iron you seek to make sure,
Of silk and of velvet and wares not a few.
Nor would I neglect, O my friend, were I you,
A piece of white linen ere long to secure.
The hammer is sounding, the saw gives a drone,
Four boards—and inside them he's shut in, alone.
And now from the fair he drives home—a last time!
Come quickly, shamashim, and heap on the mould . . .
O Jews, it is cold there, I tell you, 'tis cold!
How like you my rhyme?

SAND AND STARS.

Shines the moon, the stars are glowing,
The night sweeps on o'er hill and plain.
In the tattered book before me,
I read, and read them o'er again,

Ancient words of promise holy,
And loud, at last, they speak to me:
"As the stars of heav'n—my people—
And as the sand beside the sea!"

Lord Almighty, thou hast spoken,
Unchanging is thy holy will,
Ev'rything as thou commandest
His own appointed place shall fill.
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Yes, dear Lord, we're sand and pebbles,
We're scattered, underfoot are trod;
But the stars, the bright, the sparkling,
The stars, the stars—where are they, God?...

THE FIDDLE.

Good morrow, my masters, my fiddle and I
   Before you make bold to appear.
   (Come, fiddle-strings, children, be merry, I pray!)
   A song will it please you to hear?

May-be, sirs, you know that a bantling to-day
   Was born to Salomith, the wife
Of Veitel the fiddler—the stars have foretold
   A long and a prosperous life.

He's swaddled and dandled and fed and caressed,
   They kiss his wee hands and his feet.
The fiddler-chick grows, why, an inch to a day!
   (Sing, fiddle-strings, gaily and sweet!)

And out of his cradle the fiddler-chick creeps,
   He walks and he talks, and to-day
He toddles to school, to the Rabbi he goes.
   (Oh, hark how I merrily play!)

He learns aleph—beth, and the Pentateuch reads,
   The Talmud—in study is wrapt;
And now he's "bar-mitzvah," he's twelve years old—
   (twang!
   What was it? a fiddle-string snapt!)

And day follows day still, and week follows week,
   The months and the years, how they flee!
The fiddler-chick, praised be the name of the Lord!
   A man and a bridegroom is he.
The fiddler-chick now is a bridegroom, a man,
A father—misdoubt me who will!
(No matter! the fiddle plays merrily yet:
He boards with her family still!)

Out, out of the nest now, and look to thyself,
And thine be the loss and the gain,
Oh, fiddler-chick! (see the string leaping and—snap!
Another one broken in twain!)

And year follows year, and old age comes at last.
Cough, hobble, and groan, and drag on
A little while longer, a few more days yet—
(Another, the third one, has gone!)

And now the old fiddler lies stretched on his bed,
(One string still is left to me—one!)
He feels for his fiddle, he longs for it—nay!
His playing is over and done.

The fiddle-string shudders, it shivers and sighs,
It moans—you would think it had spoken!
The string, how it stretches and strains itself—ah,
'Tis broken, the last one is broken!

'Tis broken—and useless and mute on the ground
The fiddle, it lies where it fell.
Both fiddle and fiddler have come to an end,
The song, too, is finished—farewell!

STOLEN.

Once upon a time a lovely,
Black-eyed, little Roman matron,
With a sage and ancient teacher
Reasoned of the Jew's religion.
Tell me, Rabbi (thus demanded,
Wondering, the youthful lady),
In the Bible it is written
That, when our great-grand-dame Eva

God Almighty fashioned, Adam
Caused he first to fall on slumber.
Then, from out the helpless creature,
Quietly, a rib was taken.

Taken—nay, I say 'twas stolen!
See you, Rabbi, it was taken
From the sleeping!—is it meet now,
That a God should stoop to thieving?

And is this the great and mighty
God, the love and awe-inspiring,
This the God, whose name so proudly
You uphold before the nations?

Lady, (this is now the answer
Of the teacher sage and ancient),
You will graciously allow me
To repeat a little story!

'Tis a true one, and moreover,
Lady, mine own self concerning;
Very lately too it happened—
That by night came one and robbed me.

In the dawning, when from slumber
I arose, intending straightway
To betake myself to study,
Lo, my little lamp was missing!

Mine own lamp, so old and battered,
Black with smoke, that cost my father,
Thirty years ago, it may be,
Seven coins in honest copper.
Well, the lamp was gone—for ever!
But—now listen, dearest lady!
In the corner, where aforetime
Stood the lamp so old and dingy,

I beheld a lamp, a new one,
Broad and high, of precious metal,
Little figures fine were graven
On the sides and round the border;

On the top there shone and sparkled
Here, and there again, a brilliant,
Brightly as the stars at midnight
Sparkle in the deep blue heaven.

Now, what say you, madam, tell me,
To such dear and kindly robber?
Once again, I pray, with patience
Take our Bible, turn the pages,

Read a little, and consider,
Honoured lady mine, of Adam
And of Eve the ancient story...
Madam, do you call it stealing?

SPRING SONGS.

The wild-dove is cooing,
She calls from the tree:
Come, children, the breezes
Are lightsome and free!

The long threads of sunlight
From heaven now issue,
As some one sat weaving
A shimmering tissue:
The hive-bees are humming,
   They take as they pass
The sweet of the roses,
   The dew off the grass:

The garden is blooming,
   The hill and the hollow,
The spring-time is here,
   And the summer will follow!

Come, children, the breezes
   Are lightsome and free!
The wild-dove is cooing,
   She calls from the tree.

The dovelet is cooing,
   She calls from the bough:
Come, children, the breezes
   Are sweet to the brow:

The leaves are a-flutter
   On hill and in hollow,
The spring-time is here, and
   The summer to follow!

The wild birds are singing
   In garden and dale,
And sweet is their music
   In valley and vale:

The fishes are swimming,
   Where ripples are glancing,
And gliding and sliding
   And leaping and dancing:

The flowers, the flowers
   Are blossoming now!
The wild-dove is cooing,
   She calls from the bough.
SUMMER SONGS.

1.

Clear and sunny are the heavens,
And the wind blows fresh and free:
Sing, oh, sing a song of summer!
Begs the pale-faced child of me.

Take me out into the garden,
To the valley, there to pull,
For my wreath, the valley flowers
That are large and beautiful!

Child, my harp-strings all are broken,
So the harp was put away,
And my hand has quite forgotten
How to play!

And my heart has quite forgotten
How to waken and be glad:
Autumn, winter, spring and summer,
-It is sad!

2.

In the fields and in the gardens
Merry voices, hark, are singing,
And the wavelets blue and sparkling
To the breeze their foam are flinging.

O'er the gardens, o'er the meadows,
In a wreath of tender oats,
Knowing not of care and sorrow,
See, the golden summer floats!

Summer birds from out the gardens,
Honey bees for treasure prying,
On his raven locks are settling,
Round him chirping, buzzing, flying.
From the fanning, from the beating
Of his great brown wings there flow
Warm, sweet airs, that fly and flutter
O'er the limpid waters low,

Where the green and leafy garlands,
Rustling, all the trees adorn,
And across the open meadows,
And the waving ears of corn:

Golden heads together laying,
Hark, they whisper and they hum:
When, oh, when (the corn is saying)
Think you, will the reapers come?

And the reapers, see, they hasten:
Sickles ring and flash and glisten—
To the sound of merry voices
Once again I stand and listen.

Down the valleys they are singing,
They are singing o'er the plain,
And the old, unconquered sadness
Rises in my heart again.

AUTUMN SONGS.

I.

How wet and gloomy lies the wood,
Of all its flow'rs how stript and shorn!
One scanty handful, see, I bring,
Tho' I have wandered there since morn.

Poor, dwindled things, some dark with frost,
And others drenched and spoilt with showers.
Beside whose grave-stone shall I lay
The last remaining wreath of flowers?
This little wreath alone have I,  
Of pinched and melancholy blooms,  
And oh, at ev'ry step I take,  
So many, many are the tombs!

For with a hundred snatching hands  
Has death made desolate my way . . .  
Oh, then, beside whose resting-place  
The wreath, the last one, shall I lay?

My song, my melancholy song,  
The little wreath of blooms art thou—  
Too long I spent upon the road,  
Too late, too late, I bring thee now!

My head is bent, my hair is grey already,  
Dim-sighted, too, and weary, are mine eyes,  
And drop by drop upon my heart is falling  
The chilly dew of evening, stolenwise.

The last remaining summer flow'rs have faded,  
The last dead leaves have fallen from the tree—  
Oh, let me for one moment rest beside thee,  
And lay my tired head upon thy knee!

'Tis time, 'tis time that I should cease from toiling!
The way was long, and heavy was my load:
In cold and heat, in tempest and in darkness,
I followed still the never-ending road.

I think my heart is dead, for where aforetime
There sprang and blossomed flowers wild and sweet,
And where the grasses rustled in the sunshine,
Are pebbles now, and thorns, that wound the feet.

And where the waters once ran swift and sparkling,
Lies, bare and dry, the stony river-bed,
My harp is broken, and my song is silent,
My tears are shed.
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Ah me, those tears, what time that I was singing,
How bitter and how hot they used to fall!
And what, I ask myself, have I accomplished?
And what has been the ending of it all?

The Jews my brothers, will they understand me?
And all that stirs within a poet's heart?
Will they believe how deep can be his sadness,
How burning and incurable the smart?

A Jew has learned to think of other matters,
Since first from out the mud his head he raised,
And stood upon his feet, and managed shortly
To look like other people, God be praised!

From all eternity he had a teacher,
On Sabbath days the Scripture to explain,
And as he listened, full of deep contrition
He sighed and sobbed, his tears fell down like rain.

And then he had a crazy thing, a jester—
A man of brains, a youth sharpwitted, quick,
And in his verses he would find refreshment,
And with his tongue would click.

And then, sometimes, he bought him of a pedlar,
Or else at fairs, a tale—upon my word,
It is the very drollest thing that ever
Was seen or heard!

One reads and laughs, and then a little farther
One reads, and laughs till one is like to split.
One laughs, because to that intent and purpose
The thing was writ!

What then? is Jewish life so very cheerful?
Contains it then so much at which to smile?
Are there so many things away from sadness
The stricken heart one moment to beguile?
And do we then lament so very seldom?
   Let's reckon now, and see if we can tell!
We weep throughout the fast-day of Atonement,
   The rich and poor, the young and old as well.

We weep o'er Lamentations and Confession,
   We weep the daylight and the darkness through,
And are we not to laugh a little ever?
   Go, let us be! why, that would never do!

They've laughed in years gone by, and in the future
   To laugh they will continue, just so long
As there shall live a Jew—then hush, be silent,
   My song, my melancholy song!

"FOR THE SIN OF . . . GRANT US
FORGIVENESS!"

Once again, in spirit,
Living o'er my childhood,
On the solemn fast-day
By the wall I stand,
Dressed in snow-white linen,
Hungry, aye, and thirsty,
With the old, the heavy
Prayer-book in my hand.

And with tears and fervour:
"For the sin" repeating,
Missing nothing, from the
First word to the last,
All the while, tho', feeling
Most as I were dreaming,
Most, as I were lying
Bound in slumber fast.
"For the sin"... come, quicker!
'Tis my father speaking,
And I lift the prayer-book,
Read them one by one,
Sins, by tens I count them,
And misdeeds so many,
Wicked things I never,
Nevermore have done!

God of mine almighty!
I, a child in Israel,
I, a little, sickly
Jewish boy, oh, say:
How can I be guilty
Of such dark misdoings,
Who misdeeds so dreadful
To my charge can lay?

Usury, extortion—
Three misdeeds and forty—
I, a little Jew! well,
Rattle it along!
Ah, too big and heavy
Is for me the Pray'r book,
And the fast-day portion,
"For the sin..." too long!

Days, and months, and seasons
Since have come and vanished,
I have altered with them,
I am bent and old,
And my head is sprinkled
With the snows of winter,
On my heart's faint beating
Fall the night-dews cold.

Yes, the little school-boy
To a Jew has changed—
In my lonely chamber
Pensively I lie,
Thoughts of gloom and sadness
Gathering within me,
Like the clouds at evening
In a stormy sky.

I, dear people Israel,
Will thy life consider,
Prying into corners,
Searching, thinking o'er
All our deep and tender
Brotherly affection,
Year by year increasing,
Strengthened more and more:

All our benefactors,
And our wealthy leaders,
In whose flood of riches
We are more than blest;
All our learned Rabbis,
Counsellors and judges,
Schools and Talmud-Torahs,
Temples, and the rest:

Our untarnished honour,
Our sincere attachment
To the name we're called by,
And which we have borne,
Cherished years three thousand,
Deeming it a treasure
To be saved and sheltered
From the breath of scorn;

Lest it should be injured,
Spoken of with slighting—
And I take the pray'r-book,
Heavy, worn with age,
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"Tis the same—and open
At the fast-day portion:
"For the sin . . ." is written
On the yellowed page . . .

How is this, my brothers?
Oh, this topsy-turvy
World!—in truth I know not
If to cry or laugh!
Tell me, what has happened
To the list, the long one?
This one—why, God help us!
'Tis too short by half!

THREE FRIENDS.

Three neighbours were we, three companions, I ween
That nowadays rarely our like may be seen—
The red-haired Eliakim, Nachman, and I,
The poet who humbly to please you will try.

We grew up together, we learned side by side
The law that is Israel's comfort and guide,
Together we sported, we prayed all together,
Alike for all three were the wind and the weather.

Together we settled to live evermore,
Till we met beyond parting on Eden's glad shore.

And now will I tell you what happened one day,
When down to the wood we had taken our way.

We brandished three pointed and glittering knives,
As long as the Angel's who gathers our lives.

To murder, to rob? why, good friend, how you shiver!
To cut willow-branches alongside the river.

The rays from the West, growing long now and cold,
Illumined a willow-tree crooked and old.
And thereby beheld we, at rest on a stone,
Elijah the Prophet, alone . . .

And with a voice that kindly, was and low,
He said, Dear children, I will tell you all,
That shall, God willing, be your lot below,
To each one on his way thro' life befall:

Eliakim's shall be a voice resembling
The storm-wind when the sky is overcast,
Men, women, children, at the sound assembling,
Shall bend like flowers in the Autumn blast.

Thou, Nachman, shalt have gladness for thy part,
And who, pausing, listens to thy voice,
Shall feel the burden lighten at his heart,
And shall, forgetting, for a while rejoice.

And I?—and thou shalt have both joy and sorrow,
Both happiness and grief are given thee,
From each of their two lives in turn shalt borrow—
Thus spake Elijah unto me.

And days and weeks and months since then have flown,
Eliakim in Poland many years
The ram's-horn in the synagogue has blown,
And moved all hearts to terror and to tears.

And Nachman is a wandering musician,
He plays at weddings—journeys, takes his chance,
And they that hear him, of whate'er condition,
Feel young at heart again and join the dance.

And I, my masters, I, woe worth the day!
A poet have become, altho' a Jew,
And what's a poet among Jews to-day?
The Prophet truly spake of that he knew!

A ram's-horn man, and then again musician,
I blow and blow—then on my fiddle play
Till wearied out—then call men to contrition
Upon the shofar till my strength give way.
NATURE.

Clearly shine the skies of evening,
    Shadows long and longer grow,
Cool and humid airs are stealing
    From the woods and valleys low.

And the tall, old trees around me,
    Hark, they rustle with delight,
Shake their leaves and sigh: how pleasant
    And how fresh it is to-night!

Drops of dew like pearls are shining
    In the level sunset beams,
And along the little valleys
    Rush the icy, bubbling streams.

Come, oh, come and walk among us,
    Where the wood her coolness spreads!
We will spin a net around thee—
    Soft and green the silken threads.

We will fan away the sorrow
    From thy forehead, from thy mind,
Visions sweet of consolation
    In our shadow thou shalt find.

From the woodland, coolness breathing,
    And delight, on either hand,
Forth I wander, by the margin
    Of the mighty deep I stand.

On the surface of the waters
    Purple sun-rays lightly dwell,
Touch with gold the waves of azure—
    'Tis the dying day's farewell!
And across the waves of azure,
Softly as they shine and sing,
Glides a sail that floats and flutters,
Flutters like a great, white wing.

O'er the quiet waves of azure
Swims a little, tiny boat;
O'er the quiet waves of azure,
Sweet and pure, young voices float.

Voices young and clear are singing
Of the fisher in his bark,
With the angry billows fighting,
In the tempest, in the dark:

Of the seaman sailing, sailing,
Sailing o'er the waters blue
To the land for ever sunlit,
Dwelling of the good and true.

Free and happy and united,
One great family are they:
Ties of love and bands of friendship
Growing stronger day by day.

"Cheer, boys, cheer! the sail is swelling
In the breezes fresh and free,
And our little ship is floating
Like a feather o'er the sea!"

"Clouds are low, and with the tempest
And the billows we must cope . . ." And themselves the sweet young voices
Answer: Forward still—with hope!

Young, sweet voices, I am list'ning,
Voices, I am singing too!
Deep within my heart awaken
Strength and joy and ardours new.
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Sweet as water to the fevered,
On my heart refreshing fall
Hope's cool drops—O songs and waters,
Winds and trees, I thank you all!

Bees and flow'rs and waving grasses,
Take my thanks, I pray you, take!
For my heart, since you have soothed it,
For a while has ceased to ache.

THE JEWISH CHILD¹.

In the airless gloom and darkness,
Where no sunlight falls,
Dost thou mark the blind-worm yonder
Where he crawls?

In the earth the worm in darkness
Had his birth,
And his lot: to crawl for ever
In the earth.

Worm-like, in the dark and helpless,
All the undefiled
Years of childhood thou art passing,
Jewish child!

By the cradle-side, thy mother,
Rocking thee,
Sings no song of peace, of gladsome
Liberty;

Of the gardens, of the valleys,
Where, the livelong day,
Free as air, the rosy children
Laugh and play.

¹ The original was taken from the History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century, by L. Wiener.
Nay, a bursting tide of anguish
   Flows along,
Ever welling—oh, the bitter
   Cradle-song!

Deep-drawn sighs and tear-drops scalding,
   In a rushing stream,
Night and day are sounding ever
   Thro' thy dream;

Deep-drawn sighs and tear-drops scalding,
   Cold and pain,
Drag their weary length, like spectres,
   In thy train.

And from cot to grave, unbroken,
   All the long, long way,
Stretch whole forest-leagues of trouble—
   Grim and grey! . .

HELENA FRANK.
DER SÜDARABISCHE SIDDUR UND JAHJÁ ŞALIH'S COMMENTAR ZU DEMSELBEN.


freuliche Thatsache zu verzeichnen, dass derselbe nunmehr auch in
gedruckter Form zugänglich ist. In Jerusalem, das in den letzten
Jahren sowohl die Juden Südarabiens als die Bochára's mit liturgischen
und sonstigen Druckwerken versieht, ist in den Jahren 1894 und
1898 in zwei Bänden zum ersten Male das Gebetbuch der Juden
Jemens gedruckt worden, und zwar in einer gewissermaassen offiziellen
Gestalt. Denn der Ausgabe liegt zu Grunde die Handschrift eines
der gelehrten Koryphäen der Juden Südarabiens aus der zweiten
Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts, dessen Commentar unter dem Titel

\[ \text{alsdruck} \]

dem Gebetbuch beigefügt ist. Und die gegenwärtigen
geistigen Führer der Hauptgemeinde Jemens, Sán'a, gaben der Ausgabe
in ihren vom Nissan 5654 (1894) datirten Approbationen ihre Zu-
stimmung; es sind der Gemeinde-Rabbiner Salomo b. Schalom Šáliḥ,
der Dajján Abraham b. Šáliḥ, der den Verfasser des Commentars
seinen Grossvater nennt, ferner die Haupter des Lehrhauses von Sán'a
(Lasch, Šáliḥ, und Šálím Šámim Schamane). Als Correctoren (מ"ס"ה דק) der Ausgabe
nennen sich auf dem Titelblatte unter einer beiden Bänden vorge-
Chajjim Schalom al-Naddāf ( pObj yb'haw), aber Schalom b. Šálím Schamane
(נ'ל), Schalom b. Joseph 'Omar, Joseph b. Schalom Dār,
Schalom und Chajjim, die Söhne Joseph Tōbi's, Schalom b. David
Gamāl. Diese Mitglieder der in Jerusalem ansässigen südarabischen
jüdischen Colonie geben in einer an der Spitze des ersten Bandes
stehenden kurzen Vorrede die Beweggründe der Drucklegung des
Werkes an; vor Allem seien sie dazu durch das Beispiel zweier Lands-
leute angeregt worden, des Abraham b. Joseph Halevi, genannt
Al-Scheich (ם"ל), und des Moses Chanoch Halevi, die den
ersten und zweiten Theil des Werkes Ḥaláfil zum Drucke befördert
hatten. Dieses Werk wird einmal auch in dem Commentare unseres
Gebetbuches (Bd. II, S. 22 b) angeführt. Jakob Saphir sah das
Manuscript des Werkes in Sán'a im Jahre 1859 und giebt einige
Notizen über dasselbe. Der Titel des bei S. Zuckermann in Jerusalem
in recht stattlicher
Form gedruckten Gebetbuche lautet:

\[ \text{asdruck} \]

1 Einen erwähnt Jakob Saphir im Jahre 1859 (I. 108 b).
3 Einen erwähnt Jakob Saphir, a. a. O., 76 b.

Was über den Verfasser des Siddur-Commentars gesagt ist, soll weiter unten noch ergänzt werden. Hier sei nur darauf hingewiesen, dass J. Saphir eine ziemlich richtige Beschreibung des Werkes liefert, aber als dessen Namen statt des den Commentar bezeichnenden Titels den Namen des Gebetbuches angiebt. Er schreibt ihn "יְיִישׁוּב", woraus zu schliessen ist, dass er ihn nicht dem Manuscrypte


1. Das Gebetbuch.

Die Überschrift des Gebetbuches lautet: נָּהַ לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָנָּה לְאָn l ā n hায় একটি চিত্র দিয়ে তো কিছু তালিকা ভালুক এরা প্রথমের খুব কম কাজ করবেনোনে।
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1 Hebr. Bibliogr., XII, 55: "ז"ה gar nicht zu finden." Hingegen berichtet Saphir (1, 57a): "וד א_ws בקע שלום.
und wiederholt das Gebet mit lauter Stimme, damit er denjenigen, der nicht gut zu beten weise, seiner Pflicht Genüge thun lasse. Alle hören stehend zu und antworten nach jeder Benediktion mit Amen, sowohl die Kundigen, als die nicht Kundigen. " Arabische Vorschriften finden sich auch bei dem zu jedem Morgengottesdienst gehörenden Priestersegen (52 a, 52 b), wobei die Richtung der Segnenden mit dem Worte Kibla (אלה קבלת) bezeichnet wird. Dem aus Maimuni übernommenen Gebete (הפיות אל בורא) (überschrieben דאשא, entsprechend unserm ‛חנן’) geht in arabischer Sprache eine genaue Angabe über die Art der Körperbewegung voraus (54 b). Für Montag und Donnerstag ist vor den Aser Hurban (אלא מן הבעון) - Abschnitten eine Reihe anderer Gebete vorgeschrieben, anfangend - wie im spanischen Ritus - mit dem קַלֶּל יִשְׂרָאֵל des Selichoth-Rituales und auch das Sündenbekenntnis desselben enthaltend. Ausserdem ist (ebenfalls wie im spanischen Siddur) für Montag und Donnerstag je eine kurze Techinna gegeben, deren eine (אלא הוא ארמי ואשימי) das Akrostich בורא (ם) darbietet. Während der Vorbetor vor der Herolektion die Rolle emporhebt und mit langsamer Modulierung (Deut. iv. 44 und Ps. xviii. 31) recitirt, spricht die Gemeinde, sich vor der Thora neigend, folgende Bibelverse: Ps. xcv. 6, Deut. iv. 44, Ps. xix. 8-15.


Dem 145. Psalm wird (Ps. lxxviii. 38) vorausgeschickt. "Jetzt sagt man, wenn Zeit dazu ist," vorher den 84. Psalm und auch die Abschnitte vom täglichen Opfer und Räucherwerk, am Schlusse Ps. cxli. und cxlii.

Am Schlusse "sagt man jetzt" Ps. viii. und Ps. cxxi.

1 Vgl. Saphir, I, 57 a: "wise thon we ein שפוקים את שפוקים המַגִּלָּה und nach אֶזְרוֹן אֶזְרוֹן המַגִּלָּה."

Digitized by Google
In einer kurzen arabischen Vorschrift wird noch angegeben, was Jemand, der nicht mit der Gemeinde betet, zu beten hat (WittnvK), und das UJ'an- Gebet mit dazu gehörenden—arabischen—Vorschriften (93 b). Eine (arab.) Regel über schliesst den die Wochentage betreffenden Theil des Siddur ab (94 a b).

Das Sabbath-Ritual (95 a—152 b) beginnt—wie im sefardischen Gebetbuche—mit dem Hohenliede. Diesem folgen die Psalmen xcv-xcix. 29, das sogenannte “Gebet Nechunja b. Hakana's,” das aber hier nicht mit diesem Namen bezeichnet ist. Dann mit folgender Einführung: 


Vor J1DEO fehlen die poetischen Introductionen (רשות), die z. B. der Siddur N. 2498 der Bodleyana enthält; der Commentator erklärt ausdrücklich, dass das Gebet durch dieselben hier nicht unterbrochen werden dürfe. In der Name des gegenwärtigen Sultans so angegeben: DMn TDnfl "bdtt STOP !K3TDNI^K lay |KDi>VOT. Nach Beendigung der Haphtara liest der Vorbeter etwa eine halbe Seite aus irgend einem die Sittenlehre behandelnden Werke vor (offenbar an Stelle der Predigt): "Name des gegenwärtigen Sultans so angegeben.

Im Mussafgebete beginnt die mittlere Benediktions mit dem aus Maimuni’s Gebetordnung genommenen "Dhata"; der Absatz "Dhata" fehlt. Vor "Dhata" ist es Brauch, ein Capitel aus Isaak Aboab’s Sittenbuche zu lesen (offenbar an Stelle der Predigt): "Name des gegenwärtigen Sultans so angegeben.

Im Mussafgebete beginnt die mittlere Benediktins mit dem aus Maimuni’s Gebetordnung genommenen "Dhata"; der Absatz "Dhata" fehlt. Vor "Dhata" ist es Brauch, ein Capitel aus Isaak Aboab’s Sittenbuche zu lesen (offenbar an Stelle der Predigt): "Name des gegenwärtigen Sultans so angegeben.

Im Mussafgebete beginnt die mittlere Benediktions mit dem aus Maimuni’s Gebetordnung genommenen "Dhata"; der Absatz "Dhata" fehlt. Vor "Dhata" ist es Brauch, ein Capitel aus Isaak Aboab’s Sittenbuche zu lesen (offenbar an Stelle der Predigt): "Name des gegenwärtigen Sultans so angegeben.

Im Mussafgebete beginnt die mittlere Benediktions mit dem aus Maimuni’s Gebetordnung genommenen "Dhata"; der Absatz "Dhata" fehlt. Vor "Dhata" ist es Brauch, ein Capitel aus Isaak Aboab’s Sittenbuche zu lesen (offenbar an Stelle der Predigt): "Name des gegenwärtigen Sultans so angegeben.

Im Mussafgebete beginnt die mittlere Benediktions mit dem aus Maimuni’s Gebetordnung genommenen "Dhata"; der Absatz "Dhata" fehlt. Vor "Dhata" ist es Brauch, ein Capitel aus Isaak Aboab’s Sittenbuche zu lesen (offenbar an Stelle der Predigt): "Name des gegenwärtigen Sultans so angegeben.

Im Mussafgebete beginnt die mittlere Benediktions mit dem aus Maimuni’s Gebetordnung genommenen "Dhata"; der Absatz "Dhata" fehlt. Vor "Dhata" ist es Brauch, ein Capitel aus Isaak Aboab’s Sittenbuche zu lesen (offenbar an Stelle der Predigt): "Name des gegenwärtigen Sultans so angegeben.

Die Trauungsformel, die der Bräutigam mit Übergabe einer Silbermünze an die Braut richtet, lautet:  

Von einem Ringe ist überhaupt nicht die Rede. Eine andere Formel, die über einem Becher Wein gesprochen wird, lautet: (182 a):  

An einigen Orten werden nach den Bräutigam und Braut aus dem Becher trinken, verschiedene Sprüche und Bibelabschnitte recitirt, darunter Ps. iii, Ruth iv. 11-17, Prov. xxxi. 10-31. Dann wird ein besonderer Becher für den Bräutigam eingeschenkt und dieser mit Segensworten (darunter der grösse Theil der Königspsalmen xxi und xiv) begrüsdt, die er am Schlusse, bevor er trinkt, mit den Worten beantwortet:  

Dieser Theil unseres Gebetbuches schliesst mit sehr ausführlichen Vorschriften in arabischer Sprache über Tephillin, Schaufäden, Sabbathlicht, Erub, Erstgebornenlösung. Einige Blätter füllen Kalenderregeln aus (190 b-193 b), denen (aus Dn 13 K}3 D, Cap. 428) vorausgeschickt ist:  

Eine andere Seite des Kalendermachens behandeln mehrere Capitel, die überschrieben sind (194 a-195 b):  

Einige der Capitel beginnt mit den Worten:  

Ein Capitel ist eingeleitet mit  

Das ist Isachar b. Mordechai Ibn Susan (Steinschneider, Catal. Bodl., Col. 1061 f); unsere Capitels sind seinem im Commentare Jahja Sálih’s oft citirten Werke (erschien Salonich 1564) entnommen. Dann folgen noch zwei Tabellen, und zwar:  

1 Der Anfang lautet:  

Der Schluss lautet:  

Vgl. J. Saphir, I, 6a b.
Vor OTI DHay steht auch hier wie bei Greenburg: (Und dies ist die Antwort). Sonst sind die eingestreuten liturgischen Regeln hebräisch. Der auch bei Jakob Saphir (I, 89 b) gedruckte Einschub im vor-


Die Pesach-Liturgie (32 b-40 b) enthält gar keinen Pijjut; nur vor dem Mussafgebete ist (vorher die Angabe: ) eingefügt, bestehend aus: . Nach der Haphtarawiird die Azharot Salomo Ibn Gabirols gesagt (47 a-56 b) und zwar die erste Hälfte am ersten, die zweite (nach der Übersetzung) am zweiten Tage . Am ersten Tage wird ein Pijjut David Ibn Bekdás

1 Auch Salomo b. Samuel hat in seinem hebräisch-persischen Wörterbuch einen Artikel (Schätze), S. meine Schrift über dieses Wörterbuch, hebr. Theil, S. 64, und die Bemerkung von Horovitz, Monatschrift, 1901, S. 87.

2 S. J. Saphir, I, 89 b.

3 S. J. Saphir, I, 104 a.
Das Ritual des Hüttenfestes leitet der Festpsalm (Ps. xlii nebst xliii) ein. Die Vorschriften über den Festtraum werden arabisch gegeben, zum Theile wörtliche Auszüge aus Saadja Gaon's Siddur (60a). In Bezug auf die Hoschanoth heisst es, dass sie nach dem Hallel und vor der Thoralektion gesagt werden, und dass sie Saadja zum Verfasser haben (Saadja's Hoschanoth, die unser Gebetbuch bietet (63 b–74 a), sind bereits durch Kohut veröffentlicht worden (Monatsschrift, 37. Jahrgang, S. 512–517, 556–565). Für den sechsten und siebenten Tag verfasste Saadja keine Hoschanoth, nach folgender Bemerkung, die S. 73 a zu lesen ist:


1 Wo das nicht angegeben ist, findet sich das betreffende liturgische Gedicht bei Zunz nicht verzeichnet, was mit Hilfe von Ad. Gestetner's Maftach ha-Pijjutim (Berlin, 1889) nicht schwer festzustellen war.

Nach der Thoraalektion werden ausser den alten Simchath-Thora-Gesängen (Zunz, *L. d. P.* 74) ein alphabetisches Lied, Reain: (Yehi ruach ha-od ha-ot, mit dem Reain: ...)

Ausserdem ein alph. Lied, ... mit dem Reain: (Refrain: ...)

Ein doppelt alphabetisches Lied, Reain: (Refrain: ...)

Die Strophen von einander nur durch die Epitheta Gottes unterscheiden, die eine alphabetische Reihe bilden; dann das vierfach alphabetische Lied, dessen jede Strophe je ein Epitheton Gottes, des Sohnes Amrams, der Thora und Israels bietet, mit dem Reain: (Refrain: ...)


Zum 2. Capitel: (Refrain: ...)

Zum 3. und 5. Capitel fehlt die Introduction; die zum 4. lautet: (Refrain: ...)

Nach den Klageliedern wird am Abend des 9. Ab der 137. Psalm angestimmt. Dann folgt eine grosse Anzahl Kinoth, und zwar die auch im deutschen Ritus an der Spitze stehenden: ... die weiteren Kinoth des Abendgottesdienstes haben folgende Anfänge: ...
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(von der ganzen Gemeinde gesprochen). Dann ein aus Bibelstellen bestehendes Stück und zwar: Hiob xxxiv. 10; Joel i. 13, 14; ib. ii. 17; Jes. lxiii. 9, 10; ib. V. 15; Jes. lxiv. 11; Echa v. 21. Hierauf wird in einem gereimten Sündenbekenntnisse verkündet, wie lange seit der Zerstörung des ersten und seit der des zweiten Tempels verflossen ist; unser Gebetbuch gibt anstatt des in der Handschrift stehenden das Jahr, in dem es gedruckt wurde (1897): 1829 seit der Zerstörung des zweiten und 2319 seit der des ersten Tempels.


1 Vgl. den Bericht bei J. Saphir, I, 65 a.
Berliner Hschr. N. 5 im deutschen Rituale nebst unserer N. 18 unmittelbar den Zioniden vorausgehend; 21. (vom Martyrium der Mutter und ihrer sieben Söhne, s. Zunz, 725) 22. (identisch mit der im deutschen Rituale mit (vom Martyrium der Mutter und ihrer sieben Söhne, 7 Str.); 24. (6 Str.); 25. (6 Str.); 27. (6 Str.); 28. (identisch mit der im deutschen Rituale mit der Überschrift: ül, in der Berliner Hschr. 103 die 2. Kina; statt der Überschrift: אֲבָרָם (Akrostopaprām, in der Berliner Hschr. die 8. Kina); 34. (Akrostopaprām, in der Berliner Hschr. die 9. Kina); 36. (Akrostopaprām, in der Berliner Hschr. die 10. Kina); 37. (in der Berliner Hschr. die 6. Kina); 39. (8 Str.); 40. (4 Str.); 41. (4 Str.); 42. (4 Str.); 43. מפורש אמור בפרリスト (Str. 40, Dialog zwischen Zion und Gott). Die letzte Gruppe wird mit der Weisung eingeleitet: (s. Zunz, S. 393, N. 3); 40. (s. Zunz, S. 393, N. 3); 41. מפורש ויוליлиц (4 Str.); 42. (4 Str.); 43. (4 Str.); 44. (4 Str.)

1 Diese Elegie hat H. Brody nach einer Oxford Handwritten (N. 1146, Neubauer) herausgegeben im Sammelband, Jahrg. XI (1895) der Akkerei Nerdamin, S. 30-33. Der Text unseres Gebetbuches weicht von dem bei Brody in vielen Einzelheiten ab. Nur einige Varianten hebe ich hervor: Str. 1, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות) ; Str. 3, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); Str. 4, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); Str. 5, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); Str. 6, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּieties); Str. 7, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); Str. 8, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); Str. 9, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); Str. 10, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); Str. 11, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); Str. 12, (Brody: מַשְׁפַּיות מַשְׁפַּיות); ib. nach noch die Reihe: מפורש אמור בפרليس. In meiner Vorlesung: "Jüdische Märtyrer im christlichen Kalender," Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur, Vierter Band (Berlin, 1901), S. 70-85, ist auf S. 82 die Erwähnung unserer Kina nachzutragen; ferner Hirschfeld's Aufsatz in der Jewish Quarterly Review, VI, 123-135, "The Tale of Hannah and her Sons.


Dem Rituale der Selichoth des Monates vor dem Neujahrsfeste geht eine Einleitung voran mit der Überschrift: י"ע מם נס לארש מ"ס יסא. Die Bussgebetes selbst (33 a-54 b) haben die Überschrift הא נס מ"ס יסא. 1. Jehuda Halevi's ס"ש מ"ס יסא (s. Zunz, 414); 2. עם נומ נס שיר (Akrostich mit T, Refrain: מ"ס יסא); 3. עם נומ נס שיר (Akrostich mit T, Refrain: מ"ס יסא); 4. עם נומ נס שיר (Akrostich mit T, Refrain: מ"ס יסא); 5. עם נומ נס שיר (Akrostich mit T, Refrain: מ"ס יסא); 6. Bibelverse und Bussgebetstücke: מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 7. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 8. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 9. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 10. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 11. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 12. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 13. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 14. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch); 15. מ"ס יסא (alphabetisch). Dann folgen verschiedene Litaneien, Sündenbekennnisse, Gebete, unterbrochen durch die Akeda 14. מ"ס יסא (s. Zunz, S. 278, N. 20). Am Schlusse (54 a) Moses b. Esra's מ"ס יסא (s. Zunz, S. 413).


Jahja Salih citirt im Namen seines Grossvaters (s. unten) Folgendes:

Es folgt ein anderer Pison:


Esra (s. Zunz, 413); 4. (Strophen mit dem Refrain: (Zunz, 677); 5. (Johann Baptist von David e.Bekoda (Zunz, 677); 6. (Str., mit dem Refrain: (von Abbas (Zunz, 343); 7. (Str., mit dem Refrain: (von Jehuda Halevi (Zunz, 413); 8. (Vorbemerkung: (s. Zunz, 582, N. 15).

Refrain: "|V3DNlT3, von Isaak Gajjat (Zunz, 412); 47. *mijn WvW (Akrost. TOW, Refrain: 'n WW unw nN); 48. TnnBl 'mm, von Chisdai (Zunz, 345); 49. VBH 2TJT STU (s. Zunz, 222); 50. 131JJD3"]bo (Akrost. "11*30, Refrain: 'flNUn J>NT3B^; über den Dichter Mansur s. Zunz, 579); 51. nyE>i> 710n (Akrost. L3N, Refrain: 1N13'IBO 5>3"pV n^Bn JJOIC); 52. •31J>HB3 DV K133C"in!?-|Wjn (viell. identisch mit Zunz, S. 224, N. 28); 53. "pay bttW (5 Str., Refrain: D,E&n!'IDn "WOn i>N. 1); 54. U»3B^B3 iai» (Zunz, 477, N. 8); 55. niK31mirW (Zunz, 590, N. 33); 56. 133UJT"HUiy DK (4 Str., Refrain: JTP Kin '3 T3rT3NIBy '3mr 13nV); 57. bit'TrU (Refrain: '3 -ITODV3 Tjbt**W by SUn, 7 lange Strophen); 58. "JODnN -|t3B>iT, von Jehuda Halevi (Zunz, 413). Vor 64 steht die Überschrift D'Dmi>N(?)"1X3tnm Bibelverse mit dem in N. 74 als Refrain benützten Bibelverse beginnend, als Einführung des Sündenbekennnisses und der dazu gehörigen Litaneien. Am Schlusse die mit pD beginnenden Gebete, mit der Vorbemerkung: 66. nyai 'X^iniN"?ND ni31"lD ("Dann sagter Maran's nach Belieben, und zwar die folgenden"). Es sind aramäische Stücke, im Ganzen 18 Nummern, an deren Schlusse die Gemeinde sagt: 'ir ym.
findet sich in der des Jemen-Siddur von J. 1598 (Bodleiana, N. 2498, Catal. Newbauer, Col. 890) fast die Hälfte. Die Sammlung beginnt hier mit denselben drei Selichoth (N. 1, 2, 3) wie die unseres Gebetbuchs und schliesst ebenfalls mit derselben Nummer (דְּרוֹנֵיכֵיֶלֶת), wie diese. Im Ganzen hat der Siddur vom J. 1598 76 Nummern, unter diesen — in anderer Reihenfolge und durch andere Stücke unterbrochen — die folgenden Nummern der obigen Liste: 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 43, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 74. Auch von der oben gegebenen Liste der 15 Elul-Selichoth (הבריאות) enthält der Siddur vom J. 1598 den grössten Theil: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15.

2. Jahja Sāliḥ's Commentar zum Gebetbuche.


theilung seines Commentars ersichtlich. Bei Gelegenheit des wochentägigen Abendgebetes erörtert er ausführlich die Berechtigung der vor dem Achtzehngebete recitirten Benedictionen und erwähnt, er habe sich mit einer Anfrage darüber an die Rabbiner Aegyptens gewendet (Bd. I, 92 a: Ḥayyim Averbach und andere). Die zustimmende Antwort der befragten Rabbiner Aegyptens (Kairo's) wird dann im Wortlaute mitgetheilt. Unterschrieben sind: Ḥayyim Averbach und andere. Offenbar hat Ch. J. D. Asulai, als Jahjä's Anfrage nach Kairo kam, dort die Rabbinerwürde bekleidet, eine bisher unbekannte Einzelheit seines Lebens (zum Namen Surnaga s. Steinschneider, Catal. Bodl., Col. 834: Chajjim S.). Asulai war zuerst im Jahre 1753 in Aegypten (Bd. I, 163), später aber, zwischen seiner ersten und zweiten grossen Reise (s. ib., I, p. x), kam er wieder nach Aegypten (vor 1770), und damals wird er wohl eine Zeit lang als Rabbiner in Kairo fungirt haben. Jahjä Šāliḥ wirkte also in Saul'd in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts. Seinen Vater Joseph erwähnt er öfters im Commentare. Er citirte eine von ihm vernommene Deutung zu Ps. cxiv. 1 (I, 18 a); eine ihm vom Vater im Namen des Grossvaters, Šāliḥ, berichtete Ansicht (I, 33 a); eine Frage des Vaters, die er ihm beantwortete (I, 45 a, b); eine Mittheilung des Vaters im Namen von dessen Schwiegervater, Jahjä's mütterlichem Grossvater, David Ḥašmi (I, 54 b); eine Bemerkung zu Ps. xci (I, 148 a); eine Mittheilung aus R. Bechais, Ḥayyim Averbach, nicht nur, wie bereits erwähnt, in der Vorrede, sondern auch im Commentare selbst, so I, 85 a: Ḥayyim Averbach und andere. 

1 Gemeint ist wohl Bachja Ibn Pakuda, dessen "Herzenspfichten" in unserem Siddur-Commentar nie citirt sind.
602 THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

... ...

Siddur-Commentare zu nennen: 1. ד"ת מ"ט הדוקרי, ein massoretischer Commentar zur heiligen Schrift. Ginsburg hat denselben als הפסוקים (Massora aus Jemen) im III. Bande seines Massora-Werkes abgedruckt (Col. 53 a–105 b). Aus den in ihm citirten neueren Werken hat S. Baer (Z. d. D. M. G., XL (1886), 758) richtig geschlossen, dass die Schrift "höchstens 120 Jahre alt" sei. Unten wird auf die in


Unter den Quellen, welche Jahjä Šāliḥ bei der Zusammenstellung seines Gebetbuches und bei der Abfassung seines Commentars benutzte, stehen oben die in Jemen gebräuchlichen Gebetbücher, deren gewöhnliche Benennung, wie wir oben aus J.’s Commentar ersahen, Plural תַּקַּלָּלוֹת (Tiklāl, Takālīl) war. Zumeist giebt der Comm. an, dass die תַּכַּלוֹת (תַּכַּלְלָה) oder תַּכָּלָל in Einzelheiten des Gebettextes mit der Gebeteordnung Maimūni’s (am Ende des II. Buches seines Mischeh-Thora: סדר התַּכְלָל) übereinstimmen. S. I, 12a, 13a, 27 a, 28 b, 29 b, 30 b, 32 b, 48 a, 54 a, 69 a, 70 b, 71 b, 82 a, 91 a, 92 a, 111 b, 131 b, 142 b, 153 b, 168 b, 174 a, 177 a, 199 a; II a, 40 b; II b, 2 a, 34 b, 60 b, 61 a, 64 a, 80 a, 84 a, 86 a, 87 a. Aber auch verschiedene andere Angaben über diese specifisch jemenesischen Ritualbücher enthält Jahjä’s Commentar. J. muss sehr viele Exemplare des Tiklāl zu Rathe gezogen und verglichen haben, besonders solche, die durch ihr Alter bedeutsam waren. Zu einer auch in seinem Siddur aufgenommenen—arabischen—Regel über die mit dem Lulab vorzunehmenden Schwingungen bemerkt er, in allen alten Tiklāl’s sei ausdrücklich bemerkt, dass diese Regel vom Gaon Saadja herstamme (II a, 60 a: כדי הלשון המבואר כל התכֳּלָלִים האקרמשים). Sonst

1 Aus einem alten Tiklāl (הכְּרֵם הסֶפֶרָיוֹת תַּכְלָל) citirt Jahjä Šāliḥ in der Einleitung (I, III b) folgende hebr.-arabische Vorbemerkung eines alten Siddur-Redactors, deren Anfang auch Gunzburg aus seiner Abschrift mittheilt (R. d. E. J., XVII, 47). Sie lautet: "בשתך אתך אתך אתך אתך אתך אתך אתך אתך אתך אתך אתך אתך.At this point, the text continues in a similar manner, discussing the significance and use of the Tiklāl in the context of Jewish liturgicalCustoms and commentaries. The text highlights the importance of these ancient sources, particularly those attributed to the Gaon Saadja, in the formation of the ritual practices as well as in the commentary texts of authors like Jahjā Šāliḥ. The commentary not only references specific texts and commentaries but also acknowledges the blending of Hebrew and Arabic elements in these rituals and their significance in the liturgical practices of the Yemenite community.
sei es nicht Art der T.'s, die Namen der Autoren zu nennen; hier sei es ausnahmsweise geschehen, um anzudeuten, dass die genannte Regel auf Jemen keine Anwendung habe, wegen der abweichenden Orientierung dieses Landes zu Palästina. — Die klimatischen Verhältnisse Jemens nennt J. als Ursache einer anderen, allen T.'s gemeinsamen Einzelheit, dass sie nämlich die Dankbenediktion über den Regen an keine Bedingung knüpfen, abweichend von der im Schulchan Aruch (Orach Chajjim, Cap. 221) gegebenen Regel (I, 173 b unt.: "...אֶלָּכֶל בְּעַד אֶתָּשָׁם יִשָּׁמֶר בִּטְחֹנָה יִלָּעָה נְעֵרֵר עָשָׁה קִים")... Einmal beruft er sich nicht auf selbst gesehene Exemplare des T., sondern auf Kunde über solche (I, 132 b: "...משתמשÏת יֶבֶרֶכֶת הָכֹל רְאוּנּוּ בָּא אַל מָשָׁה בְּבִּית הָמְשָׁא יִבְרֵיהֶם לָהֶם יִשָּׁמֶר לֵיהֶם..."

Andere Anführungen der alten Tiklids's, s. I, 148 b, 190 b, 191 a, II a, 70 a und sonst. Trotzdem dass in der Regel die T.'s mit der Gebetserzählung Maimūni's übereinstimmen, haben sie dem von diesem nicht aufgenommenen Kol-Nidre am Vorabend des Versöhnungstages eine Stelle gewährt, darin Saadja folgend, der für Jemen ebenfalls eine maßgebende Autorität sei (II b, 83 b; "...ומֶכֶבֶּל יְבָרֵכֶת אֲךֵא מָשָּׁה כָּל בִּרְאֵם יִבְרֵיהֶם יִשָּׁמֶר..."

Zuweilen verweist J. auf die Übereinstimmung des lebenden Brauches mit, was die Tiklids's vorschreiben, s. I, 31 b: "...ךְָּכֵי בְּתוֹנָה יִבְּרֵי יִשָּׁמֶר יִבְרֵי יִשָּׁמֶר יִבְּרֵי יִשָּׁמֶר..."

Aber auch solche Fälle erwähnt er, in denen zu seiner Zeit gültige Brauch von dem in den T.'s enthaltenen abweicht. S. I, 89 a (in Bezug auf den im Maaribgebet nach Ps. lxxviii. 38 gesprochenen Psalmsvers 10): "...בְּכֶל יְבָרֵכֶת אֲךֵא מָשָּׁה כָּל בִּרְאֵם יִבְרֵי יִשָּׁמֶר..."

Zum Pesachabend-Rituale sagt er in der Einleitung zur Haggada (II b, 8 a): "...בְּכֶל יְבָרֵכֶת אֲךֵא מָשָּׁה כָּל בִּרְאֵם יִבְרֵי יִשָּׁמֶר..."

In Bezug auf die Lesung einzelner Worte des Gebettextes beruft sich J. auf die Punktion der T.'s; s. I, 100 a ("...תְּכַפְּרַת הַבָּטַלְּל..."), 121 a, 142 a, 161 b, 176 a, 179 a, d. h. "...תְּכַפְּרַת הַבָּטַלְּל..."..." (zu Ritus von Hoschana Rabbah). Anstatt des Ausdruckes Tiklid bedient sich J. zuweilen des hebr. Ausdrucks סְיָמִים, seltener סְיָמִים. Einmal erwähnt er ein 250 Jahre altes — also um 1500 geschriebenes — Siddur, I, 112 b: "...סְיָמִים..."

Zum Pesachabend-Rituale sagt er in der Einleitung zur Haggada (II a, 8 a): "...בְּכֶל יְבָרֵכֶת אֲךֵא מָשָּׁה כָּל בִּרְאֵם יִבְּרֵי יִשָּׁמֶר..."

VOL. XIV. S. S
Einige Tiklāf's citirt Jahjā mit Angabe ihres Verfassers oder richtiger Ordners und Redaktors.

I. [Texte aus verschiedenen Quellennachweisen referiert.

Das Responsum betrifft dieselbe Frage, wie oben (S. 601) berichtet war, Jahjā Šāliḥ selbst an die Rabbiner von Kairo gewendet hat. Der Verfasser des Responsums erwähnt Moses Maimūnī als Lebenden (ill. 113 b: nnnn friU) und citirt dessen Gebetebuch (nämlich im Nischmath-Gebete: nnnn friU); er spricht auch von seiner eigenen Gebeteordnung: Knmmi T1^Bni>N'inD WB^KTI 13
die Benediktion zur Thora: nnnn friU; es ist N. 97 in der hebr. Sammlung der Responsum Maimūnī's, Kobez 1, 19.) — II b, 17 a wird in der Überschrift zu einer Elegie Jehuda Halevi's der Inhalt derselben in arabischer Sprache aus dem Siddur J. Baschiri's angegeben (s. oben, S. 594, N. 14). — II b, 52 a: "כメール" כメール (Punkta

1 S. oben, S. 594: סרח לבר כメール.
die von J. Baschiri vertretene Lesung statt; zu Num. v. 23 ein längeres arabisches Citat.

II. Von J. Baschiri vertretene Lesung statt; zu Num. v. 23 ein längeres arabisches Citat. So citirt eine dem Commentare zur Aboda (IIa, 101 b) eingefügte Glosse, die mit ḤaMi der angeleitet ist und wohl von einem der Correctoren, Abraham b. Chajjim, herrührt. Jahja Ǧaširi selbst citirt seinen Vorgänger R. Isaak Wana (wohl ein Ortsname) sehr häufig und meint jedenfalls dessen Tikdal. I, 48 b: ḤaMi demet; 56 b: ḤaMim ḪaMi ḤaMi; 77 b: ḤaMi demet; 81 b: ḤaMi ḤaMi; 88 b: ḤaMi ḤaMi. Im Commentare zu den Hoschanoth und zu den Selichoth wird er sehr häufig angeführt, meist mit der Abkürzung ḤaMi oder ḤaMi. S. noch IIa, 63 b: ḤaMi demet; IIb, 66 a: ḤaMi ḤaMi. Jahja Wanas Glosse, die mit der Abkürzung ḤaMi eingeleitet ist und wohl von einem der Correctoren, Abraham b. Chajjim, herrührt. Jahja Salihs selbst citirt sein Vorgänger R. Isaak Wana (wohl ein Ortsname) sehr häufig und meint jedenfalls dessen Tikdal. I, 48 b: ḤaMi demet; 56 b: ḤaMi demet; 77 b: ḤaMi demet; 81 b: ḤaMi demet. Im Commentare zu den Hoschanoth und zu den Selichoth wird er sehr häufig angeführt, meist mit der Abkürzung ḤaMi oder ḤaMi. S. noch IIa, 63 b: ḤaMi demet; IIb, 66 a: ḤaMi ḤaMi. Jahja Wana's Commentar zu Pentateuch und Propheten citirt (s. unten). — Einmal (IIb, 144 a, zu 1 Kön. viii. 13) wird Isaak Wana's Commentar zu Pentateuch und Propheten citirt (s. unten). — Neubauer (J. Q. R., III, 616) erwähnt eine Schrift über Schechita und Bedika von Isaak b. Abraham Ǧaširi.

III. In Bezug auf ein Wort in den Hoschanoth, zugleich mit dem Tikdal J. Baschiris angeführt. Im Commentare zu den Hoschanoth (IIa, 77 b): ḤaMi ḤaMi ḤaMi ḤaMi. Damit ist der Commentar Jahja Ǧaširis zum Pentateuch gemeint (s. unten). Sein Pijjut zu Simchath Thora ist in unser Gebetbuch aufgenommen (s. oben, S. 592). Innerhalb des Gebets wird eine Glosse von Gabirol eingefügt (II b, 109 a–110 b), mit der Überschrift: ḤaMi ḤaMi ḤaMi ḤaMi. Sein hebräischer Name lautet Zacharia b. Saadjia b. Jakob, wie er sich in seinem Makamenwerke ḤaMi nennt, das um 1569 geschrieben ist. Näheres über dieses Werk ist in der Bodleyana (Cat. Neubauer, 2397) befandliche Arbeit s. bei Brody, ḤaMi, S. 9 ff., im Sammelbande des IX. Jahrganges der Mekize Nirdamim (1893). S. auch Neubauer im J. Q. R., III, 617 f. In der 45. Makame (bei Brody, S. 23) nennt er seinen Pentateuchcommentar: ḤaMi ḤaMi ḤaMi ḤaMi.

IV. Neben Jahja Baschiri citirt unser Commentator ḤaMi für die Punktation eines Wortes in den Hoschanoth (II a, 63 b) und für die eines andern Wortes im Gebetrutuale (I. 131 b: ḤaMi ḤaMi ḤaMi ḤaMi).
Den Siddur Salomo Mansili's citirt er I. 113 b mit folgenden Worten: "... den Schluß mit folgenden Worten: "..."


Sonst ist J. q. R. ein Commentator des Gebetbuches, der sehr oft citirt wird, und der wohl mit dem in der nächsten Nummer zu besprechenden Ibn Shi'ah identisch ist. Am
Anfänge unseres Commentares (I, 1 a) steht ein längeres mit Pb 6 eingeleitetes Citat über die Unantastbarkeit der überlieferten Gebettexte. Am Schlusse wird dem Citate folgende Bemerkung hinzugefügt: Da diese Bemerkung mit dem übereinstimmt, was in der Uberschrift zu der Einleitung Jehuda Sa'di's gesagt ist, da andererseits Citate aus "..." oder "..." sich im ganzen Commentare finden, so darf man schliessen, dass jenes an die Spitze des Commentars gestellte Citat ebenfalls aus Jehuda Sa'di's begonnenem Siddur-Commentare genommen ist.


Auseinander genannten jemenensischen Ordnern und Commentatoren des Siddur werden in Jahjá Sálib's Siddur-Commentar noch folgende Autoritäten seiner Heimat angeführt.

mentatoren, erwähnt dieser an der Spitze eines Werkes unmittelbar
nach der Einleitung Jehuda Sa’di’s (I. Bd., III b: "Dan
gehen Schrift und Tradition einander
opportruim, so dass der Exzerpt aus der vorliegenden
Handschrift ebenfalls als eine der grossen Synagogen
Jemens erachtet wird.

Saadja Omar Halevi. S. I, 856: "Y’sehinabn
Dann t navigino an tinvdc no
DINO a TWIN3. Die Synagoge Jahja Halevi’s (Alscheich)
... Saadja Keti. S. I, 26 b: "Y’sehinabn
DINOB a TWIN3. Den Namen Keti verzeichnet
Steinschneider nicht.

Sehalomal-Sadvi. I, 64 b: "ITO CT1NO
ont taga 3lE>. Auch im massoretischen Commentar zur Bibel citirt
ihn unser Autor in Bezug auf die Lesung VITI in Gen. ix. 29 (a. oben,
S.606, N. L. Ende); jedoch ist der Name sowohl bei Ginsburg, als in
der jeruslaimischen Ausgabe des Tanak mit "b g" geschrieben.
Die interessante Anführung lautet:

Sehalom al-Schebzi. II, 74 b,
... Salomo der Schreiber. I, 65 b: "Salomo
den Namen Maimuni's: "GMDNCT1NO
3?131133K "m" 331331133K. Der
Zacharia (Jahja) ibn Suleiman der Arzt,
... Zacharia der Arzt, 1, oder abgekürzt "Znit. Öfters werden seine Erläu-
terungen zu Maimuni’s Mische Thora citirt; a. I, 6 a: "Znit. 20 a:
313131133K: 41 b: "Ortina 20 arnota; 44 a:
313131133K: 46 a: "Znit. 313131133K:
170 b: "Znit. 313131133K: 170 b: "Znit.
Der Titel zu "Znit. 313131133K: 170 a: "Znit. 313131133K.
S. auch die Fussnote, II a, 25 a.
Zacharia (Jahja) ibn Suleiman der Arzt schrieb im Jahre 1430 den
Mishne Thora (a. Steinschneider, Catal. Berl., I. Abth., S. 71); er
commentierte auch andere Schriften Maimuni’s (a. ib., S. 66 und 78).
S. auch Neubauer, J. Q. R., III, 615; Cat. der MSS. des British Museum,
Or. 2746.

Im massor. Commentar unseres Autors zur Bibel sind noch folgende
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zwei heimische Autoritäten angeführt: B. Abraham aus Şan'a. Zu Ezech. xlvi. 10. Alle jemenenischen Bibelhandschriften lesen ordentlich (entsprechend dem B. Abraham aus Şan'a)


Den Midrasch Haggadot citirt J. b. Salih zweimal, beidemal als Werk Abraham Maimûni's (a. dazu Jakob Saphir, I, 76 b). I, 178 b:

Die alten Bibelhandschriften seiner Heimat citirt er einige Male in seinem Siddur-Commentar als Schriften (Plur. von אֱלֹהִים), s. I, 138 b (EB mit וֹאֵלֶּמֶל); II a, 28 b, 29 a; II b, 79 b. Im mass. Bibelcommentar beruht er sich fortwährend auf dieselben (zu Gen. xxix. 13; מִשְׁכַּבְרָתָה חֲזֶון). Die jenen Bibelhandschriften vorausgehende grammatische Schrift (in arabischer Sprache) — s. R. d. É. J., XXIII, 238 — citirt er als שְׁמַהְרָת הָיוֹנָה, I, 121 a, 162 b (im mass. Commentar zu Gen. xlix. 26, Deut. ix. 4, Job. xiii. 22; מִשְׁכַּבְרָת הָדוֹר; zu Num. xxxi. 8, Deut. xviii. 13: מִשְׁכַּבְרָת הָדוֹר; zu Deut. xxii. 25: מִשְׁכַּבְרָת אַשְׁרִים; zu Gen. xix. 4: מִשְׁכַּבְרָת הָדוֹר; s. auch zu Gen. I. 5: מִשְׁכַּבְרָת הָדוֹר).


Die bisher angegebenen jemenenischen Quellen und Autoren bilden nur einen geringen Theil der in Jahjä Şalih's Siddur-Commentare benutzten und angeführten Litteratur. Es hat kulturgeschichtliches Interesse zu beobachten, welche Erzeugnisse der jüdischen Litteratur sowohl Europas als des Morgenlandes und welche Druckwerke im fernen Şan'a dem gelehrten Commentator in der zweiten Hälfte

Die Stelle lautet: אַשְׁרִים לְאָרָאשֵׁהוֹנָה קְסוּל וּלְאָרָאשֵׁהוֹנָה קְסִיוּל בָּהַר רַעַב.

Zunächst sei bemerkt, dass außer den Gebetbüchern seiner Heimat (den Tik'at's) Jahja Saliḥ auch andere Gebetbücher, sowohl handschriftliche als gedruckte, verglichen und deren Lesarten und sonstige Einzelheiten erörtert hat. Er erwähnt oft die im Druck ihm vorliegenden Gebetbücher mit allgemeinen Bezeichnungen: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buchtitel</th>
<th>Seitenzahl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 135a</td>
<td>60b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 102a</td>
<td>10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 47b</td>
<td>52b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 63a</td>
<td>71b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 141a</td>
<td>46a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 56a</td>
<td>47b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 59a</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 10b</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 62a</td>
<td>9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 131b</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 73a</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 53b</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 114b</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 134b</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 63b</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Er erwähnt oft die spanischen Gebetbücher, I, 112b: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buchtitel</th>
<th>Seitenzahl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 112b</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 51b</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 55a</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 108a</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. handschriftliche Siddurim, werden I, 177a citirt. — Unter den italienischen Siddurim, werden I, 33 b (s. auch I, 201a) citirt: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buchtitel</th>
<th>Seitenzahl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 63d</td>
<td>71b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 114a</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 134b</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 63b</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oft wird das Werk citirt: I, 16a (neben nicht 'I); 32 b, 47 b, 91a; II, 8a, 9ab (in der Mitte des Textes der Pesach-Haggada: הֶנְחָה תְנָא מִנְחָה וּמִנְחָה הַחֲוָה), 23b, 64a, 71a, 88b (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen); II, 83a (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen). In diesen Citaten handelt es sich stets um Lesungen des Gebettextes; und aus zwei der Citate geht hervor, dass ein gedruckter Siddur gemeint ist.

Oft wird das Werk citirt: I, 16a (neben nicht 'I); 32 b, 47 b, 91a; II, 8a, 9ab (in der Mitte des Textes der Pesach-Haggada: הֶנְחָה תְנָא מִנְחָה וּמִנְחָה הַחֲוָה), 23b, 64a, 71a, 88b (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen); II, 83a (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen). In diesen Citaten handelt es sich stets um Lesungen des Gebettextes; und aus zwei der Citate geht hervor, dass ein gedruckter Siddur gemeint ist.

D. handschriftliche Siddurim, werden I, 177a citirt. — Unter den italienischen Siddurim, werden I, 33 b (s. auch I, 201a) citirt: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buchtitel</th>
<th>Seitenzahl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 63d</td>
<td>71b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 114a</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 134b</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 63b</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oft wird das Werk citirt: I, 16a (neben nicht 'I); 32 b, 47 b, 91a; II, 8a, 9ab (in der Mitte des Textes der Pesach-Haggada: הֶנְחָה תְנָא מִנְחָה וּמִנְחָה הַחֲוָה), 23b, 64a, 71a, 88b (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen); II, 83a (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen). In diesen Citaten handelt es sich stets um Lesungen des Gebettextes; und aus zwei der Citate geht hervor, dass ein gedruckter Siddur gemeint ist.

Oft wird das Werk citirt: I, 16a (neben nicht 'I); 32 b, 47 b, 91a; II, 8a, 9ab (in der Mitte des Textes der Pesach-Haggada: הֶנְחָה תְנָא מִנְחָה וּמִנְחָה הַחֲוָה), 23b, 64a, 71a, 88b (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen); II, 83a (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen). In diesen Citaten handelt es sich stets um Lesungen des Gebettextes; und aus zwei der Citate geht hervor, dass ein gedruckter Siddur gemeint ist.

D. handschriftliche Siddurim, werden I, 177a citirt. — Unter den italienischen Siddurim, werden I, 33 b (s. auch I, 201a) citirt: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buchtitel</th>
<th>Seitenzahl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 63d</td>
<td>71b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 114a</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 134b</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 63b</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oft wird das Werk citirt: I, 16a (neben nicht 'I); 32 b, 47 b, 91a; II, 8a, 9ab (in der Mitte des Textes der Pesach-Haggada: הֶנְחָה תְנָא מִנְחָה וּמִנְחָה הַחֲוָה), 23b, 64a, 71a, 88b (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen); II, 83a (in der Mitte des Textes, nur hier mit den Strichelchen). In diesen Citaten handelt es sich stets um Lesungen des Gebettextes; und aus zwei der Citate geht hervor, dass ein gedruckter Siddur gemeint ist.

**Gebetbücher, Commentare zum Siddur, und sonstige liturgische Schriften.**


Gebetbücher, Commentare zum Siddur, und sonstige liturgische Schriften.


"c", II b, 88 b; "c", II a, 82 a und 95 b; oft bloss "c" (I, 8 a, 16 a, 38 a, 48 a, 82 a, 135 a) oder auch "c" (I, 8 b, 40 a, 55 a, 57 a, 149 a, II a, 60 b, an der letzten Stelle als "c" bezeichnet).


Eine fortwährend citirte und stark excerpirte Quelle unseres Siddur-Commentars ist David Abudraham, in der Regel als ב"ר angeführt.

Von den Werken der halachischen Litteratur, die Jahja Ibn Šalih anführt, steht obenam Maimunis Mischne Thora, von dem er auch alte Handschriften benützte; s. I, 142 a (ב"א בִּכְתָּב הַמְּטִיל יָד בֵּיהוּ), 179 b (ב"א בֵּית מִדְרָשׁ יָד יִשְׂרָאֵל; ב"א בֵּית מִדְרָשׁ יָד יִשְׂרָאֵל), II a, 84 b (ב"א בֵּית מִדְרָשׁ יָד יִשְׂרָאֵל). Aber auch Jakob b. Ascher's und Joseph Karo's Codices werden fortwährend angeführt, sowie die Commentare zu letzteren. Andere hierher gehörige Werke: Abraham Jarchi, רביעית (sehr oft).— Abraham Oppenheim, אלף תשחי תקנין (I, 91 b).— Arje Finzi, כַּל זַעֲרוּת שְׁלֹשָׁה (I, 112 a).— Chajjim Algazi, רביעית (I, 172 a).— Chajjim Bochner, רביעית, s. Benj., S. 24, N. 487 (II a, 6 b; II b, 84 b) 1. Chajjim Benvenisti, רביעית, נבולות וגרילה (I, 46 b, 54 a, 62 b).— Ders., רביעית, שTreeView (I, 43 a, und oft, stets:طب).— Chajjim Abulafia, רביעית, כדי (I, 174 b).— Chajjim Kohen, רביעית (I, 148 a; רביעית (I, 145 b) ist wohlsein Autor, der erste Theil des Werkes, zum I. Theile des Schulchan Aruch; s. Steinschneider, Catal. Bodl., Col. 829, Benj., S. 205, N. 45 (I,

1 S. auch den Massoretischen Commentar (in den folgenden Anmerkungen als M. C. citirt) unseres Verfassers zu Num. xi. 17.
Die gaonitische Literatur ist durch die Halachoth Gedoloth (oft) vertreten. Auch Hai Gaon wird citirt: I, 57 a (än Imeschah Besa's) und I, 117 b.

Die gaonitische Literatur ist durch die Halachoth Gedoloth (oft) vertreten. Auch Hai Gaon wird citirt: I, 57 a (än Imeschah Besa's) und I, 117 b. Jedoch findet sich auch Aus seiner Handschrift, der Sonne, nicht vorkommendes. - Von Ha'i, der in aram. Sprache angeführt (II b, 60 b), mit dem eine Lesart zum Neujahrgebete rechtsfertigt wird. - Von Saaidja wird aus der Hoschanoth (s. oben, S. 592) und bibelausgetischen Einzelheiten (s. unten) das citirt (I, 61 a:)]

Folgende Response werken werden von Jabjā Jailih angeführt:


Der Kabbala ist in unserem Siddurcommentar eine bedeutende, aber nicht so sehr hervortretende Stelle eingeräumt. Immerhin sind die Hinweise auf die kabbalistische Literatur zahlreich genug. Der Sohar wird sehr oft citirt (s. I, 24 a: "m"r'ib d'sh'rah knoros); auch der in Salonik 1597 zuerst erschienene (I, 93 a, 111 a; II a, 24 b. Einem anonymen handschriftlichen Commentar zu einem Hauptbestandtheil des Sohar (ם"ש"ית ה'דתות) citirt der Verfasser II a, 79 a: "מ"ש"ית ה'דות המ"ש"ית H"

1 Salomo Ibn Adret's Responser, N. 164, M. C. zu Gen. xxv. 27.
angeführt: Abraham Asulai, Com. zum Sohar (I, 56 a, 59 b).
— Derselbe, Abraham Galanti, als möglicherweise (I, 44 b).
— Abraham Sason (I, 186 a: „ ohne Nennung des Werkes).— Benjamin b. Mattatia, (I, 7 a, 7 a, und oft).
— Jakob Zemasch, (I, 81 a, 114 b; Ii, 56 b).
— Jehuda Chajjat, d. i. der Commentar zu Perez b. Isaak's Werke (I, 27 a).— Jehuda Lob b. Simon, d. i. der Commentar zu Perez b. Isaak's Werke (I, 27 a).
— Jesaja Horwitz, (I, 85 a).
— Immanuel Ricchi, (I, 112 a, 168 a).
— Joseph Kardo, (I, 29 a, 29 a) und sonst).— Isaak Luria, (I, 42 b, 134 a), der Commentar zu Perez b. Isaak's Werke (I, 160 a; Ii, 60 b, 14 b), der Commentar zu Perez b. Isaak's Werke (I, 160 a; Ii, 60 b, 14 b).
— Derselbe, (I, 138 a).
— Moses Chalaz, (I, 30 a).


1 M. C. zu Deut. xxxii. 6.


1 M. C. zu Num. xii. 1. 2 M. C. zu Exod. xxxi. 2. 
3 M. C. zu Gen. xi. 3a. 
4 M. C. zu Kön. viii. 31; Ps. xlviii. 14; Dan. xii. 7.
DER SÜDARABISCHE SIDDUR 619


Von Saadja's exegetischen Schriften citirt unser Autor den Commentar zu Daniel (II b, 144a: 'יכל יהוה יכלה); die Übersetzung der Psalmen (II b, 83b, zu Ps. lxxx. 13): die Erklärung zu Ps. lv. 9 (I, 101a), die zu Ps. xlvi. 5 (I, 121b: 'יכל יהוה יכלה); die Erklärung zu Ps. xlv. 9 mit arabischem Text (I, 77b).

Aus der sprachwissenschaftlichen Literatur werden folgende Autoren citirt: Abraham Ibn Esra's 'יכל יהוה יכלה (I, 70a) 3, in der Sammlung der Psalters (Venedig, 1546), aus welcher auch im mass. Comm. zur Bibel (I, 3) die Grammatik 'יכל יהוה יכלה citirt wird. — David Kimchi's Wörterbuch (öfters).— Elija Levita (I, 146a) 4.— Abr. Balmes (IIa, 70a).— Immanuel Benevento's Worterbuch (I, 146a).— Samuel Archevolti's Dictionnaire (I, 162a; IIa, 22a: 'יכל יהוה יכלה).— Salomo Hanau's Worterbuch (I, 127a).— Übersicht der Aussprache von 'יכל יהוה יכלה, Ps. cxvi. 16, wird IIa, 27a eine Ansicht von M. Cases (I, 77b) citirt; das Werk ist nicht genannt. Der Vater

1 M. C. zu Exod. xxviii. 20; xxxii. 2; i Kön. xi. 2; Ps. xlv. 10.


2 M. C. zu Gen. xxxi. 27.


8 M. C. zu Gen. xiv. 6 (א"כיהם ה"כיהם ג"כיהם), nämlich in der Sammlung der Psalters (1546).

5 M. C. zu Jona i. 14.

7 M. C. zu Exod. ii. 3.

8 M. C. zu Gen. xxxi. 27; Deut. xxviii. 29; Richter ix. 35.
Aruch wird öfters citirt (2. B., I, 115 b) 1, ebenso Menachem Lonsano's

Wörterbuch wird an folgenden Stellen angeführt: I, 6 a (zur Erkl. von
vom ':
mena' der worter der menachem bessern tone) lere, fürt almena
(Art. 78 b; (besonders) 79 a; (besonders) 7a b (Art. 79 a; (besonders)
citieren. In der他是一个 ist die hebr. Wiedergabe von 'menachem'.

Von religionsphilosophischen Werken ist Maimuni's More angeführt
(I, 41 b; II, 52 b), ferner Joseph Albo's MocNI (II, 52 b). —

Werk zur Ethik, die unser Autor anführt, sind folgende: Bachja
b. Ascher, nre (I, 50 a). — Das Sefer Ha-Chinnuch (oft). —

Das Sefer Chasidim (oft). — Elia b. Abram Salomo Kohen aus
Smyrna, nx (I, 55 a, 58 a; II, 65 a, 112 a). — Elija Vidas,

in der hebr. (sehr oft). — Elieser Askari, nI Nun (II, 48 b, 52 a). —

Elieser b. Samuel aus Metz, n (I, 77 b). — Jechiel Epstein,

her. (I, 55 a). — Menachem Lonsano, n (oft). — Moses

Negrin, Bemerkungen zu Jona Gerondi's n (I, 112 b). — Zacharia
Plongian, n (I, 55 a). — Zebi Hirsch Kaidanower,

n (I, 47 a). — Hierher gehören auch die Commentare zum Traktate
Aboth: Isaak Abrabanel, ni (I, 70 b); Samuel Uceda,

n (I, 43 b, 66 a). —

Die Traditionsliteratur ist im Verhältnisse nicht zu häufig angeführt.

Jedoch oft genug wird auf den jüdischen Talmud verwiesen 4.

1 M. C. zu Gen. xxxiv. 15; Num. xvi. 29.
2 R. Jona (Abulwalid) ist in M. C. einige Male aus zweiter Hand citirt.
3 Jedoch zu Prov. xvii. 20 citirt er hebräisch den Artikel zv, mit der
Einführung: st. M. C. zu Deut. xxviii. 39: z.` z`s z`r, d. i. die Grammatik von Jehuda Neumark.
4 M. C. zu Num. xvi. 15.

4 Aus dem jüdischen Talmud (Erubin 24 c, 24) citirt J. Sali (I, 55 a) die
bekannte Botschaft des Amora Jose an die Diaspora (s. Die Agada der palaest.
Amorder, III, 235) in folgender Version: st. Auch zu
Beginn der Einleitung Jehuda Sa'di's zu seinem Siddurkommentar (s. oben,
S. 608) ist der Satz so citirt, nur die 'z' statt 'v' (II a); aber in der-
selben Einleitung (II b) lautet das Citat so: st. Aus dieser letzter Anführung ist ersichtlich, dass man

n im Sinne von "Gebete" (festgesetzte, bestimmte Gebetsformeln)
nahm (wohl durch das v vorverleitet) und dann einfach nx an die Stelle
von nx setzte.
Hauptquelle für den Midrasch ist der Jalkut Schimeoni. Was unter dem (I, 46 a) gemeint ist, weiss ich nicht. — Von Historikern wird ausser dem (I, 161 b) mehrere Male David Gans, angeführt (II b, 3 a, 16 a, 24 a).


W. BACHER.

Budapest.


WHILST reading Prof. Schechter's article “Saadyana” in the Jewish Quarterly Review for January, I was led to think that the "Fragment relating to the Gēonim Sharira and Hai" contained in the above-mentioned pages may have been written, or dictated, by the Gaon Samuel b. Hofni. If so, Samuel b. Hofni had been an antagonist of Sharira. The historical value of the fragment would thus be enhanced.

GEORGE MARGOLIOUTH.
DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE OF HEBREW MSS. OF THE MONTEFIORE LIBRARY.

III (continued).

SPANISH-ORIENTAL RITE.

221. A. Common prayers, Spanish-Oriental rite, compiled by Hayyim Kōhēn of Aleppo, beginning with the compiler's introduction, and accompanied by ritual regulations, and a cabballistic Commentary.

B. Fol. 124. Morning service for the New Moon.
C. Fol. 143. Evening prayers.

222. Siddur, Sephardic rite of Ferrara, compiled by Phineas Ashkenazi for a certain Benjamin Solomon. At the end a short PIYYUT of six strophes, beginning [transcription].

Modern squ. char., 8vo, ff. 55 [H. No. 151].

223. Grace after meals, benedictions and night prayers, according to the Spanish rite. The title-page is also in Italian translation. The volume is richly illuminated with miniatures in water colours.

Vellum, splendid small squ. char., 3mo, ff. 22 [No. 466].

Rite of Yemen.

224. Siddur, according to the rite of Yemen, beginning [transcription]. Many headings and directions are written in Arabic. A short cabballistic note on the fly-leaf is signed Hayyim b. David al-Abrash.

Orient. squ. (Yemenian) char., with vowel-points, 4to, ff. 83 [H. No. 380].

225. Fragment of a Siddur, according to the rite of Yemen.

The introduction beginning [transcription]. The introduction beginning is written in alphabetical order, but is evidently of much later date. The Abōdāh itself begins (see No. 129, 7).

Orient. squ. (Yemen.) char., fol., ff. 5 [No. 581].
Passover Haggadah.

226. 1. Passover Haggadah, Spanish rite, with Commentary, ends (printed).
3. Fol. 57. ינואר וינואר, Calendar rules by Isachar b. Mordecai Ber Miklosh in Prague; colophon, Wednesday (read Tuesday), 17 Tebeth, 5458 (Dec. 31, 1698).
4. Fol. 71. Prayer before the blowing of the Shofar.
5. Fol. 72. חָשָׁבַת הָעָמִיד, by the author of No. 3. The end is missing.

German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 103 [No. 449].


The following notices are to be found on fol. 166: וְהָיוּ עַדְלוּת בּוּת הָלֹא כְּמוֹשֶׁת שֵׁלֶד מֵאָנָשׁ וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נסי (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּתוֹל (1640) ד' נسى (sic) הנן בֵּית הָאָדוֹן וְהָרֵי חָלָם שֵּׁמְתָּ הָאָדוֹן בְּת
Piyuṭlūm and Selīrūth.

229. Collection of Piyuṭlūm by the following poets: Aaron, Aaron Elijah, Abbās, Abraham, Abraham b. Abjalon, David Abbās, Elijah, Elijah Walid, Hayyim, Isaac Amigo, Israel, Jacob Abbās, Mordecai, Moses Abbās, Qaifu (Rizqī), Shabbethai, Shammāsh, Solomon, Toledo, Zeraḥyāh hal-Levi. Beginning and end are missing. Fol. 101, Piyuṭ in Turkish, but in Hebrew characters.

Owner: Hayyim Pardo (fol. 12).

Modern Orient. cura. char., various hands, 8vo, ff. 182 [H. No. 215].

230. Piyuṭlūm, many by unknown poets, beginning and end wanting.

A. 1. מָדָה מִדְרָה יְהוָה (Moses b. Ezra); 2. מַכִּים (Moses); 3. יִתְנָה וּתְנָה (Izraïel); 4. מְבֻּדָה יִתְנָה (Israel); 5. מְבֻּדָה (Samson b. Labi); 6. מְבֻּדָה (Moses Sultān); 7. מְבֻּדָה (Moses); 8. מְבֻּדָה (Maimūn); 9. מְבֻּדָה (Moses b. Jacob); 10. מְבֻּד (Maimūn); 11. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Moses Sultān); 12. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Sa'dyāh Barā'isṭāhī); 13. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Issa); 14. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Moses); 15. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Moses Sultān); 16. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Farajī); 17. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Farajī); 18. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Abraham); 19. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Eliezer); 20. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Eliezer); 21. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Isaac); 22. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Mordecai); 23. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Moses); 24. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Moses); 25. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Moses); 26. שְׁמוּר שְׁמָה (Moses).

B. Fol. 15. Pizmōnim for the Ḥatān: 1. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Qalonymos); 2. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Josef); 3. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Moses); 4. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Eliezer); 5. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Judah); 6. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Eliezer); 7. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 8. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 9. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 10. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 11. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 12. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 13. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 14. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 15. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 16. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 17. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 18. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 19. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham); 20. מְצִיבָת אַלְנַא (Abraham).

C. Fol. 33. 1. מִדְרָה יְהוָה (Judah); 2. מִדְרָה יְהוָה (Moses);
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3. במבת חטף (Israel Levi); 4.ATALOG גם (Judah Hall.); 5. גָּלְבָּן (Abraham); 6. ipairs גֶּרֶשׁ (Judah); 7. גִּתְּנִי (Levi); 8. טוּרֵם (Abraham); 9. גִּתְנִי (Judah Hall.); 10. גִּתְנִי (Josef Isaac); 11. גִּתְנִי (Abraham Isaac); 12. גִּתְנִי (the same); 13. גִּתְנִי (Abraham); 14. גִּתְנִי (Isaac Gayath); 15. גִּתְנִי (Abraham); 16. גִּתְנִי (the same); 17. גִּתְנִי (Isaac Hallivi); 18. גִּתְנִי (the same).

Maghribine curs. char., 8vo, ff. 55 [H. No. 103].

231. 1. a. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); Fragmentary glosses on the Pentateuch, beginning missing; b. Fol. 6. Some short glosses on Esther.

2. Fol. 7. En Bonet Abram (Judaja Hap-Pennini), תָּנִיט (printed in the Responsa of Solomon b. Addereeth), end wanting.


4. Fol. 14. Piyyütim: a. Purim, 1. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 2. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 3. שִׁנְבָּל גּוֹרֵנִי בָּה יָם לֹאטָב (Abraham); 4. שִׁנְבָּל גּוֹרֵנִי בָּה יָם לֹאטָב; 5. חֲטַף (Abraham); 6. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 7. (Sabb. Zakhor) יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 8. (Parah) יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 9. (Sheqalim) יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 10. (Hahodesh) יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 11. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 12. Sab. and New Moon יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 13. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 14. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 15. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 16. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 17. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham); 18. יְרוּשָׁמ (Abraham).

5. Passover, 1. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 2. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 3. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 4. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 5. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 6. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 7. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 8. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 9. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 10. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 11. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 12. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 13. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 14. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 15. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 16. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 17. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham); 18. שְׁוָיִד (Abraham).

6. מִשְׁתָּב a. Pentecost, 1. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 2. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 3. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 4. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 5. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 6. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 7. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 8. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 9. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 10. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 11. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 12. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 13. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 14. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 15. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 16. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 17. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham).

7. מִשְׁתָּב b. Hanukkah, 1. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 2. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 3. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 4. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 5. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 6. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 7. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 8. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 9. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 10. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 11. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 12. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 13. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 14. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 15. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 16. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 17. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham).

8. מִשְׁתָּב c. Sabbath, 1. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 2. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 3. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 4. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 5. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 6. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 7. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 8. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 9. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 10. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 11. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 12. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 13. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 14. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 15. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 16. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 17. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 18. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham).

9. מִשְׁתָּב d. Pentecost, 1. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 2. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 3. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 4. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 5. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 6. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 7. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 8. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 9. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 10. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 11. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 12. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 13. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 14. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 15. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 16. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 17. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham); 18. מִשְׁתָּב (Abraham).
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Owner: Zunz (37).

Nos. 1 and 3, Franco-German Rabb. char.; No. 2, Ital. curs. char.; No. 4 (originally separate volume), squ. headings, Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 70 [No. 441].
232. Piyyütim and Selihoth, rite of Saxony, preceded by an (incomplete) index.


c. Selihoth begin; d. Second Sabb. and Hanukkah, 1. selihoth begin; 2. shemah begin; 3. hashanah ha'zvah begin.


c. Selihoth begin; d. Second Sabb. and Hanukkah, 1. selihoth begin; 2. shemah begin; 3. hashanah ha'zvah begin.

II. a. Fol. 218. The Book of Job; b. Jer. ii. 29—x. 14 (train)

At the end various prayers for the Precentor on New Year and the Day of Atonement.


German Rabb. char., 18mo, ff. 275 [No. 443].

Emanuel Lattes in Piedmont; i. Fol. 17. Dirge on the death of Isaac Lattes, born in Nizza, died in Provence in the month of Kislev, 5409 (1648). The poem is signed דוד, and was written in Turin; j. Fol. 18. Two dirges on the death of Jacob Sinai in Turin, 1659; k. Fol. 18*. Poem by מֶנֶהָם, by Menahem Azaryah of Fano; l. Fol. 19. Poem by מֶנֶהָם, by Menahem Azaryah of Fano, on the 14th Marheshvan, 5417 (1656); m. Fol. 21v. Poem sent to Jacob Joshua of the family Barukh, on the day of his marriage with Malkah, the daughter of Emanuel Montalzino, on the 14th Marheshvan, 5417 (1656); n. Fol. 22. Wedding song in honour of Mattathias Segre and Rebecca, the daughter of Gershon Segre; o. Ibid. Wedding song in honour of Reuben Israel b. Nathan Samuel and Vittoria, daughter of Gabriel Rumilian.

Owner: Jacob Joshua Barukh in Nizza.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 22 [H. No. 368].

234. a. Collection of Piyyutim, most of which are unknown; fol. 7, Aramaic Piyyut, beg. ילל אלוהי בר כוכב עוז; fol. 14, Spanish Piyyut, beg. מוכי.support alumno אל שלוש אל♂.fol. 16, headed שיר הווה לאל נקודות הלשון, beg. שיר הווה לאל נקודות הלשון.

c. Fol. 92. Kind of syllabus for the study of Bible and Mishnah.

Owners: Stella Dafano, Abrom Maestro in Venice.

Orient. Rabb. char., seventeenth cent., many pages elaborately ornamented with pen and ink sketches, 8vo, ff. 97 [H. No. 355].

235. Piyyutim for various occasions; fol. 11 sq., by Moses Zakkuth; fol. 17v, Spanish Piyyut.

Owner: Moise Baruk Caranaglio.

Squ. char., ff. 18-21, Span. curs. char.; many leaves seem to have originally belonged to a different volume, and are numbered; ff. 4 and 5 should be placed after 13; ff. 57-60, inverted; ramos, ff. 63 [H. No. 267].

236. Hymns: a. Weddings, rite of Corfu; fol. 29, Meir b. Isaac Rothenburg (Wednesday, 4 Tebeth, 5466 (1706). b. Fol. 30. 1. יְשֻׁבָה מַעְלֶה (Isaac); 2. יְשֻׁבָה מַעְלֶה (Abraham); 3. אלפים תַּמְשֵׁךְ (Abraham); 4. אלפים תַּמְשֵׁךְ (Eliezer); 5. עַלְוֵי חַיִּים (Eliezer).
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287. 1. Hymns, many of which are not known; fol. 35, Acrostic; Reuben Modena.

2. Fol. 52. Glosses on various passages of Talmud and Bible, beginning with Ḥagigah, fol. 27-1. The author quotes several times the אדס ולמה ישנים (by Meir Levi), and Elijah Mizrahi's Supercommentary to Rashi.

Owner: Moses (fol. 10).

238. a. מ הדבר תמך. Three hundred and fifty hymns for various occasions, collected by David Silva b. Abraham Haróf in Venice, 1650. Many pieces are not known; fol. 73, Hebrew and Italian; Fol. 207. Synopsis of the tunes for various prayers and hymns, followed by an index. Compiler's autograph.

Small squ. char., ff. 138-207 blanks; 8vo, ff. 237 [H. No. 358].

239. 1. מ זמר, numbering one hundred and five pieces.

2. Fol. 20. Other liturgical compositions.


4. Fol. 27. Various accounts in Italian, signed E. de Paz.

5. Fol. 76. Index to No. 1.

Squ. and Ital. curs. char., many blanks, 8vo, ff. 78 [H. No. 395].


Large squ. char., 4to, ff. 39 [H. No. 363].
241. a. Selihoth, German rite, consisting of two hundred and twelve pieces, but Nos. 1–61 are missing; No. 62 does not exist in print; b. Fol. 115–126, 16 Nos. The end is wanting. An additional leaf contains lists of Selihoth to be recited on certain days.

Vellum, large German squ. char., vowel-points and Rashi; many leaves damaged by cuts; catch-words at end of quires ornamented with pen and ink sketches, beginnings in red ink; fol., ff. 126 [H. No. 392].

242. Selihoth, appended to a printed edition of Venice 1600 fol., and comprising twenty-six pieces.


Germ. Rabb. char., fol., ff. 10 [No. 422].

243. Selihoth, appended to a printed edition of Cracow 1584, and comprising sixty-four pieces. Index at end.


Germ curs. char., fol., ff. 32 [No. 423].

244. Selihoth: a. Before morning prayers, Spanish rite with variations (fol. 11). b. Fol. 17v. Day of Atonement, 1. • 2. • 3. • 4. • 5. • 6. • 7. • 8. • 9. • 10. • 11. • 12. • 13. • 14. • 15. • 16. (On Sabbath) • 17. • 18. • 19. • 20. • 21. (sic) • 22. • 23. • 24. • 25. • 26. • 27. • 28. • 29. • 30. • 31. • 32. • 33. • 34. • 35. • 36. • 37. • 38. • 39. • 40. • 41. • 42. • 43. • 44. • 45. c. Arbith, 1. • 2. • 3. • 4. • 5. • 6. • 7. • 8. • 9. • 10. • 11. • 12. • 13. • 14. • 15. • 16. • 17. • 18. • 19. • 20. • 21. • 22. • 23. • 24. • 25. • 26. • 27. • 28. • 29. • 30. • 31. • 32. • 33. • 34. • 35. • 36. • 37. • 38. • 39. • 40. • 41. • 42. • 43. • 44. • 45. d. Minhah, 1. • 2. • 3. • 4. • 5. • 6. • 7. • 8. • 9. • 10. • 11. • 12. • 13. • 14. • 15. • 16. • 17. • 18. • 19. • 20. • 21. • 22. • 23. • 24. • 25. • 26. • 27. • 28. • 29. • 30. • 31. • 32. • 33. • 34. • 35. • 36. • 37. • 38. • 39. • 40. • 41. • 42. • 43. • 44. • 45. e. Ne'ilah, 1. • 2. • 3.
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4. On le "m'morim"; 5. On "m'morim"; 6. On "m'morim"; 7. On "m'morim"; 8. On "m'morim".

f. 1. Fol. 50. R. Bahya's
2. R. Nissim's
3. R. for Minḥah,
beg. of
4. Prayer for the eve of New Year and Day of Atonement, beg. of

Owner: Josef M. K.

Papal Ital. curs. char., small 8vo, ff. 59 [H. No. 370].

245. Esther translation.

with Italian translation; fol. 7, Italian translation of

Illuminated and arranged for home use.

Squ. char., 4to, ff. 8 [H. No. 365].

246. Selihāth, rite of Ṣan'a.

1. R. Nissim's :
2. R. Nissim's :
3. R. Nissim's :

with Italian translation; fol. 7, Italian translation of

Illuminated and arranged for home use.

Squ. char., 8vo, ff. 11 [H. No. 384].

2. a. Fol. 13. Chapter IV of Jacob Tam's
3. Fol. 20. a. A Maqama in Al Ḥarizi's style, beginning

and wanting.

2. a. Fol. 13. Chapter IV of Jacob Tam's
3. Fol. 20. a. A Maqama in Al Ḥarizi's style, beginning

and wanting.

4. a. Fol. 21. Rhymed prayer by Josef b. Nahmias, beg. of
5. Fol. 27. Rhymed prayer by Josef b. Nahmias, beg. of

and wanting.

6. Fol. 33. A Maqama in Al Ḥarizi's style, beginning

and wanting.

7. Fol. 34. a. A Maqama in Al Ḥarizi's style, beginning

and wanting.
abridged; c. Fol. 37v. The first Ghazel of Maq. xlii, one of Maq. i, and the following two lines which are not to be found in the editions:

גחצנ הינו טע כמל חול לא
אכ דבר כל חוכל רט רת חול

8. a. Fol. 41. ט"ז קרב השם קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב השם קרב קרב קרב קרב Kabbalistic prayers; b. Fol. 43v. קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב Kabbalistic prayers and other prayers; c. Fol. 48v. קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב קרב Kabbalistic prayers.

9. Fol. 49v. ט"ז קרב השם מנהיג השם קרב השם מנהיג השם Hygienic advice relating to the diet suitable for each month, attributed to Abraham b. Ezra.


11. a. Fol. 57. ט"ז קרב השם ונהיג השם; b. Another, attributed to Moses Nahmâni; c. Fol. 59. ט"ז קרב השם ונהיג השם Prayer, attributed to Saadyâh; d. Fol. 62. Ps. cxix-cxxxiv, followed by more prayers.

248. Various Prayers, headed ונהיג השם מנהיג השם.

a. Fol. 2. ט"ז קרב השם ונהיג השם Prayer by Menahem Azariah of Fano.

b. Fol. 12v. ט"ז קרב השם ונהיג השם, attributed to Saadyâh.

c. Fol. 45v. ט"ז קרב השם ונהיג השם by Nahum Foa.

Owners: Jehiel Josef, Isaiah Leon Jona (Jorea !).

Ital. curs. char., 3amo, ff. 133 [H. No. 57].

249. 1. ט"ז קраб השם ונהיג השם.


b. Fol. 12. ט"ז קраб השם ונהיג השםDraft of document of sale, to which is attached a hymn, acrost. El'azar.


5. Fol. 25v. ט"ז קраб השם ונהיג השם; b. Fol. 35v. ט"ז קраб השם ונהיג השם; c. Fol. 38. ט"ז קраб השם ונהיג השם.

6. Fol. 40v. ט"ז קраб השם ונהיג השם (printed).

Vellum, Nos. 1-6, German Rabb.; No. 7, squ. char.; ff. 11v and 12r, coloured illustrations of bride and bridegroom in the costumes of the time, 16mo., ff. 61[r.H. No. 333].


2. Fol. 17. Sundry prayers.


The volume ends נבאתה, and is probably the author's autograph; see also title-page.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 19[H. No. 8a].

251. Prayers and hymns by Abraham b. Daniel, many of them bearing upon events in the author's life. In one prayer, fol. 61v, he mentions the following places: Mantua, Forlì, Rivaroli, Modena, Scandiano, Bologna, Forli, Modena, Scandiano, Buttiro; fol. 80. Hymn giving a kind of autobiography, and ending with the statement, that the author was in his sixty-first year in 1571; fol. 101. שמע עיניו in rhymed verse; fol. 112. Prayer with reference to a false accusation of the Jews in Rome, which, however, ended favourably in Iyyar, 1555 (see חכם האשכנזי, ed. Letteris, p. 115); fol. 132v. The author's wife Virtuosa mentioned; fol. 141r. A series of vows, among which one of writing of scroll of the Law. According to a later notice, written between the lines, this was finished 17 Tammuz, 1573, in the presence of Judah Kohen b. Eliāqim; fol. 152. Prayer for the Jews of Bologna; fol. 392. The author nominated Rabbi and preacher; fol. 394v. Prayer for his elder brother Nāhum in Mantua and his daughters; fol. 418. Death of his wife, 25 Iyyar, 1574; fol. 424. Author states having written his prayers in two volumes, and composed a מדרש על התורה; fol. 456v. Began to write a prayer, each word of which begins with מ (Tuesday, 7 Schebat, 1575). According to a remark on fol. 223, the author composed altogether five thousand prayers.

Ital. curs. char., 16mo, after fol. 277, one leaf missing; ff. 467[H. No. 360].


B. Fol. 85. Short prayer by Nahmān, with cabbalistic Commentary.

Owner: Reuben Josef Mezorot.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 92 [H. No. 29].


Owners: Samuel Hayyim Cohen Belinfante, Elijah Utop; Benjamin Consolo; Barukh of DTD; Moses of HDTB; Judah NDIplNp; Josef Hayy IB^TUID; Moses Cohen Belinfante, Meir Cohen Belinfante.

Ital. curs. char., small 4to, ff. 28 [H. No. 208].


German squ. char., 8vo, ff. 3 [H. No. 381].


Vellum, Span. Rabb. char., ff. 18 [H. No. 146].

257. Mordecai Isbān's penitential prayer (תבנית), printed.

Ital. curs. char., 8vo, ff. 42 [H. No. 33].

258. 1. Menahem b. Solomon Meiri's treatise on repentance during the penitential season, on fast days, and on days of mourning. It is divided into two parts: a. סט ורצועה יט with two sections with twelve and thirteen chapters; b. científico with seven and twelve chapters.

2. Fol. 230. Fragment of a work containing glosses on Maimūnī's Morēh (see Shem Tob Palqēra's Morēh, p. 159 sqq.).
Writer: Abner ..., who finished this copy, 20 Adar, 5231 [Feb. 11, 1471].

Owner: Eliezer.

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, after fol. 200 lacuna; fol. 215 misplaced and should be read after fol. 226, several leaves missing, ff. 231 [H. No. 231].

259. 1. מִשְׁרַ הַמַּעֲצָא, Hebrew translation of R. Israel's Commentary on the Prayer-book.
2. Fol. 8. סעדה לְחָשָׁב for the Great Sabbath by Judah Hallevi, beginning הרבעצ יִסְמָך אַפֶּלֶךָ וְרָאָת.
5. Fol. 25. Two short Italian addresses, headed בֵּית מְרוֹי מַנְתָּה.
6. Fol. 27. Extracts from Ben Sirah, copied from the Hebrew translation of Ismael Menahem.
8. Fol. 44. List of sermons with their dates, beginning with the funeral sermons on Moses Hefer, 11 Sivan, 1798.
   No. 1 copied for Mordecai Samuel Ghirondi from a MS. belonging to Abraham Reggio of Gorizia.

Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 44 [H. No. 263].

260. I. 'וֹרַוְחַ בִּתָּ הָא, Cabbalistic commentary of the Abodah, beginning missing.
II. אַנֵחַ אֲתָה; 1. בַּרְעַק יִשָּׁב בָּהָר; 2. זֵעָה נָאָר חָוָשָׁה; 3. סְלִיתַּוא; 4. אַנֵרִיָּא אֲמוֹרִי; 5. אַלְנוֹבָא אֶאֶרְקַזָא אֵמוֹנִי; 6. בַּרְעַק אֶשֶּׁר שֵׁסָה; 7. יִרוֹא אֵירוֹב יִשָּׁמָה; 8. טּוֹלְאָ הָוָּא שְׁמָאָל עֲלֵיהָ; 9. מַכָּנָה בֵּנוֹלַי יִשָּׁב מָדָא. "וּרְחָא לְכֵנָשָׁה לְפַלָּמָא, beg. יֵרִוא אַנְוָא לְכֵנָשָׁה לְפַלָּמָא.


Maghribine curs. char., 8vo, ff. 67 [H. No. 259].
Commentaries.

261. Eliezer b. Nathan’s ("עזרא, twelfth century) Commentary on the German Mahzor for New Year, Day of Atonement, Sukkoth, Shem. Asreth, Simhath Torah; Sabbath before Sukkoth, Hoshanoth; fol. 1, missing. The following names are mentioned: Aaron Kohen ("אברהם", fol. 37), perhaps R. Eliezer b. Isaac, quoted by Rashi on Ps. Ixxvi. 11 (cf. Zunz, Zur Gesch., p. 63); Azriel b. Nathan, Elazar Qalir, Elazar of Worms, Gershom, Isaac, and Jacob ("יהודה", and not identical with the one mentioned by Zunz, ibid., p. 50); Jacob b. Judah hal-Levi; Jacob Nazer, Judah b. Moses Haddarshah; fol. 41, marg. יוחנן, Jonathan, Meir, the Precentor (Zunz, ibid., p. 47); Menahem of Helbo; Menahem b. Saruq; Meshullam; Solomon b. Isaac (Rashi); Samuel b. Isaac hal-Levi; Simon b. Isaac; Solomon hab-Babli. Of older authorities are quoted Josippon, and Jotad: fol. 53, "שמעון ויהו". Fol. 46, against the word עלת (Isa. xxxviii. 14), marg. ילל אל "Kranich"; fol. 53, against ייירי, marg. מצה וברכה ("wird gefingert").

Passages struck out by censor, ff. 16, 20v, 28, 31v, 37, but without signatures.

Vellum, Franco-German Rabb. char., 2 cols., large fol., ff. 89 [H. No. 71].


Modern copy, 4to, ff. 10 [H. No. 147].


German curs. char., 8vo, ff. 54 [H. No. 121].

IV.

PHILOSOPHY.

264. a. קצירת הזחבת הלילנות ("שומרי הנbrit") begins with ch. iv; b. Fol. 96. Poem on the contents of the tenth chapter of the same work; c. Fol. 97. Bahyah’s query addressed to the human soul.

Owner: Isaac of Modena.

Vellum, small squ. char., 3amo, ff. 100 [H. No. 138].
265. Solomon b. Gabirol's Sefer Mafeh ha-Mevorim, with the (printed) Commentary. The work is preceded by a preface and two poems by the抄写者 Solomon b. Isaac b. Moses. Fol. 43, Letter of dedication to Isaac ibid. Arabic poems headed _rs_r, accompanied by a Hebrew paraphrase in verse, and other poems by the copyist; fol. 46v, Poem of three lines with reference to Samuel Hagiz.

Finished in Algiers, Friday, 9 Tamuz, 5353 (July 9, 1593).
Maghribine char., 4to, ff. 46 [H. No. 408].

266. 1. Sefer Mafeh ha-Mevorim, with the Commentary on the margins, and preceded by a Table of Contents.

2. Fol. 27v. Sefer Ul'aloth be-Ravim, with the Commentary of Josefb. Meshullam, without the poem which precedes the printed edition of the halo'ot IV, p. 179 sqq. (see also HB., VII, 26, and X, p. 160). From the words (fol. 39v) דקינכ התויה ל'יהקה 'יהש (ed. Ibn Ezra) we can gather that the work was written in 1468 (see also the colophon).

Finished Tuesday, 13 Nisan, 5228 (April 5, 1468). Are the author and commentator one and the same person?


5. Fol. 62v. Metaphysical definitions in the style of the Moreh. At the end the words: יכדר המילה ושלום השם ויהי טוב ויהי יתיר. שמחת ירח משכון שמחת שמחה שמחת ירח משכון שמחת ירח משכון שמחת ירח משכון. Written probably by the commentator (and author?) of No. 2.

Owners: Marco di Dona Luzza[tto?]; Samuel.

German Rabb. char., various sizes, 4to, ff. 63 [H. No. 117].

267. Judah b. Tabbôn's Hebrew translation of Judah hal-Levi's Kitāb al-Khazari. At the beginning the following rhymes:

The MS. is incomplete and ends III, § 63 (see Das Buch al-Chazari, ed. Hirschfeld, p. vii).

Writer: Elazar (see the poem).

Ff. 10, 24, 25, 36, 37, 42, 48, 49 vellum, Span. squ. char., 4to, ff. 54 [H. No. 139].
268. Jacob b. Hayyim Farissol's Commentary on the Kitab al-Khazari, written 1422. The author frequently quotes explanations of his teacher Frat. Maimon. At the end the following rhymes:

«השמל את סלמ הלם בור חור בור
כעל המסומ קרש שועלימ להוב
לום חוים והשומת עבר
לרמז וריכי בית יעקב להוב

Span. Rabb. char., large 8vo, ff. 179 [H. No. 214].

269. Nathanael Kaspi's Commentary on the Kitab al-Khazari.

Written by Menahem b. Elijah de Rossi (מ' אָּלֵיֵי), and finished Thursday, 12 Tammuz, 5240 (July 1, 1480). See HB., XVI, p. 127.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 84 [H. No. 1].


Modern copy, 4to, ff. 5 [No. 413].

271. Abba Mári's Commentary, with variations from and additions to the printed edition (see Neubauer, Rabbins français, p. 655 sqq.). The beginning is missing.

Written by Mordecai b. Abigéдор, and finished in 6 Tammuz, 5128 (June 8, 1458).

Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 162 [H. No. 194].

272. Shem Tob Paíqera's Treatise in three sections. It begins with a poem, headed

אל מעלה נפש אשר תcoma
אם מעלה נפש אשר תcoma
והנה נפש האשראי מרי תcoma

The introduction ends: תורורי מים (בימה) (read תורורי המים)

At the end the writer added the poem introducing the המים המ reliant והיבר בبعثו התולה אל תוך ראה כדי لتحقيق יכלו י FAILURE

Owner: Zunz (No. 12).

German curs. char., modern copy from an original which had been finished June 22, 155a, fol., ff. 56 [No. 420].

273. Shem Tob b. Josef b. Paíqera's, in twenty chapters, to which is added, as ch. xxii,
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2. Fol. 28. Commentary on the first four chapters of Maimuni’s Mishneh Torah, beginning "מדעך ינ牢固树立 הוהי רוח הוהי"; fol. 34, "_udg", beginning "שלא ינ牢固树立 סדרי שמחה לבר קמח סדרי שמחה לבר קמח"; fol. 35, "_udg", with a space left (fol. 35*) for an astronomical figure. Attached are some short poems, published by Dukes, Orient., 1847, p. 405.

3. Fol. 38. Queries and answers on medical topics, headed "שאולא ובגין תחכומת"; fol. 43, headed "שאולא ובגין תחכומת".

Owners: Heidenheim (ר"שמה הספרים, p. 41, No. 42); Zunz (No. 6).

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 43 [No. 442].

274. 1. _משר האמונת הרוחם_. Philosophical treatise by Abraham ha-Levi b. Dawud (אברהם הלוי) in three sections, translated by Solomon b. Labi. The translation is headed by a poem of eight lines. Colophon (fol. 68) like _NCat._, No. 1227 (minus the last four words). The work ends after ch. i of section 3. Fol. 69 gives a table of contents, which ends as follows: ת"מ ל"מ ziv "םלמה ינ"ל ינ_GLOBAL_ שולחא ינ"ל גל ינא אלא ינ תחכומת ינאמירה ינמנה בuncture ת"מ ינيران יגלה משמיע תחכומת ינמנה היינש ינ"ל ינגי שולחא משמיע קוח דיש ינ"ל ינ_ "לא שמעחנא הסמר חנ인데זכר ינ"ה יראשא יגלה התויס מ"ל יגלה ינ3"ק ינ3 יגלה ת"מ ל"מ ziv יגלה ת"מ ל"מ ziv ي
275. 1. פסח ירח, by Isaac b. al-Latif (printed in vol. XXV).

2. Fol. 6. פסח ירח, by the same (printed, cf. פסח ירח, ed. Warnheim).

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 26 [H. No. 161].

276. Isaac b. al-Latif's פסח ירח, without the table of contents (see NCat., No. 1277d).

Written by Hezekiah Rafael b. Hayyim.

Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 98 [H. No. 167].

277. פסח ירח, translated by Abraham hal-Levi b. Hisdai; fol. 93 rewritten by a later hand.

Written, Mantua, 1548 (same hand as 522).

Span. Rabb. char., verses vocalized, 8vo, ff. 98 [No. 523].

278. 1. Translations by Judah b. Moses b. Daniel Romano;


Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 42 [H. No. 409].

279. 1. מדרשים על החיבור, by Samuel b. Motti; מדרשים על החיבור (partly printed). According to a note at the end, the work was written in Wadi-l-Hijara in 1370. The text of the מדרשים is annexed (see HB., XV, p. 15).

2. Fol. 20. מדרשים על החיבור, Commentary on Esther, by Anselmo Astruc (see Mag., VII, p. 115).


4. a. Fol. 27.Twenty-four מדרשים; b. Fol. 32. מדרשים; c. Ibid. מדרשים, in six chapters (the end wanting) with introductory rhymes by Todros hal-Levi (printed).
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7. Fol. 44. Agadā, beginning "ח' ר כנבו בתכ"ה או היכלנה ונא ז' נביהו ז"כ.

8. a. Fol. 45. The Book of Judith; b. Fol. 47. Megillath Antiochus in Aramaic; d. Fol. 51. חתני שארית ו התורה על ראשי ; e. Fol. 52. Short tales, some of which are taken from ת"ש וירשא. At the end, two short poems; fol. 67, Pseudo-Ben Sirah (printed).

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 71 [H. No. 289].

280. מין ומעי, Theological treatise by Aaron b. Elijah, the Qaraite (printed).

Owner: Zunz (No. 24).

Late German curs. char., 4to, ff. 118 [No. 439].

281. 'ת אר, by Hisdai Crescas b. Judah (fol. 5), beginning with table of contents (ff. 1-2). According to a note on fol. 159, the author finished the work in Saragossa in 1410 (year of his death). It is therefore probable that the MS. is the autograph of the author. Many variations from the printed editions.

Span. Rabb. char., ff. 48 and 72 written by a later hand; 4to, ff. 159 [H. No. 4].

282. Samuel Sarshā's מ"כל וית. The beginning is missing (see NCat., Nos. 1296 and 1297).

Censor: Camillo Jaghel, 1611.

Span. Rabb. char., after ff. 3a and 4a lacunae; fol., ff. 218 [H. No. 411].

283. 1. סכ"ר וית (מו וית in the colophon), by Moses Köhen Tordesillas, written in 5139 (1379), as stated in the heading of fol. 1. The work was translated from the author's original (בליון ים) into Hebrew by Meir b. Jacob, and contains seven chapters (see NCat., No. 1796).

2. Fol. 10. מ"כ尔 וית, a polemical treatise by the same author, written 5135. The MS. only contains the preface and part of the table of contents.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 11 [H. No. 187].

284. Another (complete) copy of the מ"כר וית (םורא וית).

Ital. squ. char., 4to, ff. 76 [H. No. 191].


Span. Rabb. char., ff. 30 and 31 misplaced, 8vo, ff. 91 [H. No. 94].

286. Shem Tob b. Isaac Shafrūt's ספ, a polemical treatise against Christianity; slightly defective at the end.


Modern copy (by B. Goldberg†).

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 8 [H. No. 361].

288. *סֶסֶר מַיְאֹבִי הָתֹבְכְּמִי* (see *HB.* VI, p. 2 sq.). The last leaves are slightly damaged.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 21 [H. No. 193].

289. *סֶסֶר רַד אֶמְטָה* by Abraham Bibago, beginning "כְּבָּרְנֵנִי נִמְכָּר נִמְכָּר יִמְּכָּר נִמְכָּר" אָמָה לָא לָא קְבוּרָה.

Underneath is written

וכָּרָה בָּמָוָה
כָּרָה, —— תַּכָּר
אָמָה לָא לָא קְבוּרָה.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 3 [H. No. 3].

290. *סֶסֶר זָר* by David b. Judah Messer Leon (printed), a cabbalistic philosophical treatise.

Owners: Amrām, David Meldola, Moses Judah b. Israel (foll. 5); David b. Rafael Meldola, who received it from Safed in the year 1836.

Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 178 [No. 465].

291. *נַנְגֶרֶר הָשְּׁמִי* by Abraham b. Meir de Balmes, metaphysical treatise based on the number Ten, as conceived in the *סֶסֶר זָר*, and conceived *פְּרִיכִי וּרְבַי עַלְיוֹן*. At the beginning stands the following poem:

בָּשַׁל כְּבָּרְנֵנִי נִמְכָּר
וכָּרָה בָּמָוָה
מֵלָבָּה שְׁוֵאַל מִשֶּׁחָה
שִׁבְּרוּ מִי הַסֶּפּוֹר
עַל תַּכָּר מַשְׁפּוֹר
כָּל שְׁמַעְתֵּנִי שְׁמַעְתֵּנִי
אֵלָה אַל תְּשַׁמְּעֵנִי לְעַלְיוֹן
בָּגַל עַל בָּגַל עַשְׁרִי

The date given at the end, 26 Nissan, 5269 (April 16, 1509), implies that the MS. is in autograph.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 113 [H. No. 105].
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2. Fol. 47. Al-Ghazālī's treatise on logic, The translator's preface is missing. The work begins at the colophon.

Owner of No. 1: Josef b. Halfon.
The copy was finished 5 Tebeth, 1320, by Moses of Tortosa in Venice.


IDDLE. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 25 [H. No. 207].

2. Fol. 167. Some observations on the constellations and the number of stars belonging to each.
3. Fol. 197. Some observations on the constellations.
4. Fol. 237. Some observations on the constellations and the number of stars belonging to each.
5. Fol. 237. Some observations on the constellations and the number of stars belonging to each.

Span. curs. char., 8vo, ff. 56 [H. No. 133].


Germ. curs. char., 4to, ff. 108 [No. 438].


The preface was edited by S. Sachs, Ker. Chem., VIII, 110–11.

Finished 22 Shebat, 5251 (Feb. 2, 1491).

Writer of the preface.

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 303 [No. 431].


3. Fol. 557. Solomon b. Immanuel da Fiesira's treatise...


6. Fol. 121. Al-Ḥarīzī’s translation of Maimūni’s Commentary on Ḥakam (see HCat., p. 31).

298. Prevenciones divinas contra la van idolatria de las gentes, by Ishac Orobio de Castro, libro primero. The author lived in the seventeenth century.

4to, ff. 453 [No. 525].

299. Spanish translation by Christoval de la Torre of Ishac Orobio de Castro’s Certamen philosophicum...adv. J. Bredenburgii principia (Amsterdam, 1684). The translation is dated April 8, 1721.

8vo, pp. 144 [No. 53a].

300. D’Dn ana, by Moses Taquī. The inverted part of the MS. begins p. 70, l. 2 from the bottom of the printed text (Kirchheim in TDrO, III, pp. 58–99).


German curs. char., 4to, ff. 24 [H. No. 20].

301. 1. Dvot Aḥim, Theological treatise by David of Rocca Martino (printed).

2. Fol. 27. Joshua al-Lorqi’s polemical letter to Don Solomon hal-Lewi (with variations from and additions to the printed edition).

3. Fol. 35. Letter, headed UV bn"k bn (see) pirmiprtm rtm minm pirm (sic) (with variations, beginning of printed edition).


Span. curs. char., 4to, ff. 50 [H. No. 143].

302. 1. Philosophical treatise consisting of four sections (see), but only an epitome and part of the introduction are given.
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2. a. Fol. 77. שֶׁנִּיחַ שׁוֹבָה by Jônâh of Gerona (printed), epitome only;
b. Ibid. Poem, beginning אָזִית עַלָּלָה אֵשָּׁר בַּיָּרָה בָּרֹךְ הָלֵב שֵׁבֶת (42 ll.).

Written by Isaac b. Samuel Hezekiah.
Censor: Giovanni Dominico Carretto, 1607.
Ital. cura. char., 4to, ff. 7 [H. No. 377].

303. Compilation by a certain Eliezer b. Abraham, whose name appears in an acrostic at the beginning of the MS. Then follows an introduction with a second, and longer poem, after which the MS. contains, without revealing the title or the author's name:—
a. Samuel מְנָה גְּרוֹנָה's, Book I, and beginning of Book II (see No. 279).
b. Fol. 11. סֵפֶר דּוֹר, Introduction to Maimuni's Moreh, with a Commentary, with notes by Seligmann Bing (Oppenheim).
Style and writing are exactly the same as No. 146, so that also this MS. appears to be in autograph.
German Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 26 [H. No. 300].

304. סֵפֶר הָמוֹר, by Esraim of Modena, with variations from the printed edition (Lyck, 1871).
Vellum, German Rabb. char., 4to, richly illuminated with pen and ink caricatures and arabesques, ff. 16 [H. No. 304].

305. 1. Shemaryâh of Negroponte's letter to King Robert of Anjou in defence of the belief in the creation of the world as taught in the Bible, against Aristotelian materialism. It begins והם המסכים קא"ס שלח חסדו והנה ד"ג ממארה פּוּם וּלְךָ (1320) והד כותב עליאי הכתוב המְנָה בִּמְסַמְרָה הָכְהָכֶה הָמוֹרִי מְאוֹדָה מְרָבָא הָאָרָי בְּרֵכִי כַּכֶּלָּה מַכָּה הָכְהָכֶה הָשַׁרוּאָה הָשַׁרוּאֶת נֹשֶׁה. 2. Fol. 9. a. Short Commentary on the Thirteen divine attributes; b. On the word דְּשֵׁר according to Simhâ b. Solomon of Germany; c. מְסַמְרָה דְּשֵׁר וּדְמַעִים; d. On the word דְּשֵׁר in the fourth of the eighteen Benedictions; e. אֲלֵי דְשֵׁר אֵין בַּיָּרָה (Abôth, III, 17); f. On I Chron. xxxix. 11; g. On דְּשֵׁר (Abôth, II, 14); h. אֲלֵי דְשֵׁר מִלְּיָה הָרֹידהֹתָה הָשָׁה הָנָחֵי בַּיָּרָה.
5. Fol. 29. תורת העם והכרח מראים, Treatise on logic (see NCat., No. 1318).

6. Petrus Hispanus' Summula, beginning תורת הצל הצל, The translation is by Abraham Abigedor (see SU., p. 471).

7. Fol. 66. Philosophical figures called 'Trees.'

Vellum and paper, Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 72 [H. No. 361].

306. Naftali Hirsch Goslar's אֵין מְשָׁרָה, a philosophical treatise in the form of a dialogue with commentary at the end.

Owner: Carmoly (No. 245).

German curs. char., after fol. 49 lacuna; 8vo, ff. 90 [H. No. 320].

307. The three last dialogues of David Nieto's מִשְׁמַר, translated into English by E. H. Lindo (the translation of Dialogues I and II, by Dr. L. Loewe, was published in 1853). Appended are:
1. A table showing the differences between Passover and Easter Sunday of the Latin and Greek Churches up till 1900; 2. A dedicatory poem to Sir Moses Montefiore, dated April 20, 5616 (1856).

4to, pp. 257 [No. 527].

308. Hirz Ullmann's work on Psychology (chaps. 451 to 711).

Large German curs. char., 4to, ff. 240 [H. No. 85].

309. מְשָׁרָה, by Tobias Isaac Baruch of Nizza-Monferrato, discussed between the good and evil imaginations.

Author's autograph, dated 1783.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 53 [H. No. 398].

310. מְשָׁרָה. Hebrew translation of Moses Mendelssohn's Morgenstunden, by Josef Herzberg of Mohilew, with dedicatory letter to Sir Moses Montefiore, dated February 25, 1843. The translation ends (fol. 119) with a poem and an appendix (fol. 131) by the translator.

8vo, ff. 6 and 144 [No. 464].

311. מְשָׁרָה. Moral teachings, chiefly with regard to sexual intercourse. The work is appended to a printed copy of עֵינְי הַבְּנֵי, Amsterdam, 1650.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 9 [No. 455].
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V.

QABBALAH.

312. Commentary on מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא, by Judah b. Barzillai of Barcelona (ed. Halberstam, Berlin, 1885). Appended are many loose sheets, containing the editor’s annotations.

Modern copy from Cod. Padua.

4to, ff. 168 [H. No. 305].

313. Commentary on the מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא, attributed to Isaac b. Abraham of Pozquières, surnamed the Blind.

Modern copy by Benjamin Wolf Schoenblum, finished Friday, 9 Nisan, 5614 (1854), in Lemberg.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 25 [H. No. 174].

314. Commentary on מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא, attributed to Isaac the Blind, but not identical with the preceding work.

Span. Rabb. char., ff. 21 sqq.; Ital. curs. char.; many diagrams, 4to, ff. 23 [H. No. 54].

315. a. Commentary on the מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא, by Samuel Portaleone (שלש אַלְשֶׁשׁת), styled אַלְשֶׁשׁת (after the author’s father); b. Fol. 17. Another Commentary by נְנָן לָךְ, styled לָךְ (after the author’s mother); c. Fol. 34. A third Commentary by נְנָן לָךְ, styled לָךְ.

Owner: Menahem Sinai.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 48 [H. No. 165].

316. 1. מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא, by Abraham Abulafia.

2. Fol. 25. מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא, attributed to R. Ḥammām Gāon.

3. Fol. 29. מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא, attributed to R. Ismael b. Eliashā.

4. Fol. 30. Fragment of מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא (ch. i, 1–6).

5. Fol. 31. Commentary on מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא.

Written by Ezrā b. Isaac b. Ezrā b. Isaac of Fano, called Gajoḥ, and finished 1555.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 154 [H. No. 8].

317. מַסֵּר צִיּוֹרָא, by Todros hal-Lēvi [Abulafia], Cabbalistic Commentary on Ps. xix, beginning with a poem of six lines. The two end rhymes, giving the name of the author, are reproduced in Benjacob’s יַסְרֵי תַּבּוֹל.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 29 [H. No. 123].
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Owners: Levi (1); Abraham (1); Hayyim (2).

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 88 [H. No. 75].

319. 1. תבנית הצבר, Cabbalistic treatise by Josef Chiqatilla on the Seferot, beg. fol. 4, beginning with six lines of poetry. The work itself is addressed to a friend (יידעי נפשי), and treats on the same subject as No. 1, but more in detail. An epilogue (fol. 97v) ends with seven lines of poetry (fol. 98v), beginning שיטו יסוד עולם, which is followed by a kind of homily on the Tetragram. The margins are covered with notes in Latin.

No. 1, written by Shabbethai Kohen of כפאתל מונופראפא; No. 2 is written in the same hand.

Ital. Rabb. char., 12mo, ff. 14–18 blank (the leaves of No. 2 are independently marked, but both treatises originally belonged to a larger volume, since fol. 1 is marked 373), ff. 106 [H. No. 120].

320. 1. ש"ע, by Josef Chiqatilla (printed).

2. Fol. 149. ש"ע, by the same (printed).

Censors: Bernard Huescas; Fra Luigi da Bologna, 1599; Hippolite of Ferrara.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 235 [H. No. 335].

321. Commentary onピン"ל (identical withピン"ל) of Josef Chiqatilla, beg. fol. 8, beginning with six lines of poetry. The work itself is addressed to a friend (יודא מוצאים), and concludes with a kind of homily on the Tetragram. The margins are covered with notes in Latin.

Written by ש"ע, and finished Iyyar, 5300 (1540).


Span. Rabb. char., after fol. 16 lacuna, 4to, ff. 44 [H. No. 25].

1 Popper, The Censorship of Hebrew Books, p. 143, reads his name Heuesas (†).

2. Fol. 49. Of three parchment fly-leaves, the first gives the name of Mordecai, probably owner of a MS. other than the above. The second gives the dates of the birth of eight children of a certain Jehiel b. Moses: 1. n^WT*pi, born on the eve of Passover, 5092 (1332), died 14 Kislev, 5162 (1402, addition by a later hand); 2. Mattathias, born 18 Shebat, 5093; 3. Dulcinea, born 11 Ab, 5094 (died last Ellul, 5108); 4. Solomon, born 2 Marheshwān, 5097; 5. Šoshannā, born in the same town, 19 Marheshwān, 5099; 6. Nathan, born Wednesday night, Rosh Hōdešh Kislev, 5101, in the same town, but died at the age of 62 days; 7. *...* , called Shemarētor, born in the same town, 3 Tebēth, 5102 (Dec. 13, 1342); 8. Shabbethai, born 1st day of Pentecost, 5105. The last fly-leaf gives the birthdays of four children of Solomon Jedīyāh, probably a lineal descendant of the above:

1. Yehiel, born Molad Ab, 5238 (died August 15, 5241); 2. , born Tuesday, 5242 (month omitted); 3. Nārādā, born Thursday, Jan. 15, 5244; 4. Lūcīnā, Sabbath Hanukkah night (28 Kislev), 5206. A note on the verso gives the name of a later owner, Aaron Benjamin Ibn Nehemiah * elevate,* 1640.


323. 1. Introduction to Isaac b. Samuel's treatise. The author mentions Abraham b. Daud, Solomon b. Addereth, Nahmanides, and gives a quotation from the writings of the last named, made by b. Todros. He also mentions R. Mordecai Ashkenazi (fol. 7v, col. 1), and R. Azriel (fol. 7v, col. 2).

2. Fol. 10. (see *NCat.*, No. 1925v).

3. Fol. 12v.

4. Fol. 12v. Agadic Commentary on the Pentateuch by Efraim b. Samson (see *NCat.*, No. 2105v), as stated on the margin by a reader of the name of Samuel. Elāzar of Worms, on whose teaching the work is based, is mentioned fol. 96v.


Colophon: תחנה שם יית בוחת לע ייתה
שムשת כספתנה יורה
Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 162 [H. No. 83].

324. 1. Moses Corduero's סמר מראות אלתרים (printed).
2. Fol. 31. סמר מרואת אלתרים by Hanokh b. Solomon al-
Quastantini. The introductory distich, incompletely reproduced
by Steinschneider, HB., XII, p. 108, runs thus:—

בכפשיטי מעלה היוי הנבואה יהי שופים ובחי ממבקים

3. Fol. 3. סמר מרואת אלתרים by Hanokh b. Solomon al-
Quastantini.
4. Fol. 52. סמר מרואת אלתרים incomplete.

325. 1. Fol. 3. ספרTREE יז ת"כ נ." by a certain Semah.
2. Fol. 15. ספרTREE יז ת"כ נ." by Hayyim Vital.
3. Fol. 52. הספר TREE יז ת"כ נ." by Zechariah Plongian (printed).
4. Fol. 96. ספר TREE יז ת"כ נ." Letter written by the physician Abraham
Zakkuto to הסאה.
5. Fol. 99. ספר TREE יז ת"כ נ." Abbreviations and initials, alphabetically
arranged by Joshua b. Baruch.
Venice (1654).
7. Fol. 145. הספר TREE יז ת"כ נ." Cabbalistic treatise; fol. 166v, the
ספר TREE יז ת"כ נ." quoted.
Venice (1654). b. Fol. 168. הספר TREE יז ת"כ נ." by Josef Karo,
copyrighted 1715.
10. Fol. 183. ספר TREE יז ת"כ נ." Introduction to the Index, copied from
ed. Offenbach (1715).

Written by Joshua Baruch Isaiah Aryeh b. Jehiel Joseph Jonah of
אפריא, and finished 7 Y'vir, 5551 (1791). On the fly-leaves
(ff. 1-2) several incidents of the copyist's life.

Ital. curs. char., fol. ff. 190 [H. No. 131].

326. ספר TREE יז ת"כ נ." according to the teachings of Isaac Loria, by
Hayyim Vital (cf. fol. 17). Several portions are not to be found in the printed edition.

Orient. Rabh. char., fol., ff. 258 [No. 425].

327. 1. סמר הכנלטלם, by Isaac Loria.
2. Fol. 117. מנהטםazariah of Fano's ספר הכנלטלם.
4. Fol. 189. דר תורנלא, by Isaac Loria.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 210 [H. No. 12].

328. 1. שער וּשְׁמֹר וְכָלָה סְפִּי, by Isaac Loria, a fragment.

Written by Isaac b. Josefb. Hayyim in Morocco, and finished Thursday (read Tuesday), 24 Tammuz (July 19), 1740.

Span. Rabh. char., 4to, ff. 218, much dilapidated at the end [No. 499].

329. ספר א葖 לא ידועתי (attributed to the Patriarch Jacob), with Isaac Loria's Commentary (printed); the beginning is missing, and the last two leaves are damaged.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 28 [H. No. 251].


German Rabh. char., fol., ff. 116 [H. No. 405].

331. a. מַמְאוּרַות לְנַחַת, Glosses on the letters of Isaac Loria, by Nathan Spiro of Jerusalem; b. Fol. 54. Abstracts from the Novellae of Hayyim Vital (with diagrams of phylacteries); c. Fol. 183. Abstracts from the writings of Menahem di Lonzano on liturgical matters.

Owner: Isach Solomon Segre di Vercelli.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 311 [H. No. 24].

332. 1. בְּשֹׁר הַשֶּׁבָּה. Second part of מַמְאוּרַות לְנַחַת of Nathan Spiro.
3. Fol. 108._RESPA RAVיח FALF.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 159 [H. No. 41].

333. 1. Meir Poppers' (Meir Poppers' Commentary on Isaac Loria's ספר הכנלטלם on the Pentateuch; abstracts from the work of R. Judah מַמְאוּר (1), and especially from Hayyim Vital's writings.
2. Fol. 128. ספר נְנָן עַל חַיּוֹת by the same author, containing Glosses on the writings of Isaac Loria in 132 chapters.

[Autograph ?]

Owner: Zunz (No. 8).

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 315 [H. No. 433].
   2. Fol. 27. לְקַוֹמֵי הַקְּדָמוֹת לְחַמְּרָה חַמְּרָה attributed to the same.
   3. Fol. 57. הַמִּלְּיָה אֶלֶּה בַּעֲשֵׂי חֲאָבָא (Gen. xxxv. 28).
      Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 70 [H. No. 13].

335. 1. סֵפֶר אָרָא, by Judah b. Jacob Honein, Cabbalistic treatise on the consonants, vowel-signs, accents, and Taggin. The work is divided into four chapters. The introduction ends with the following rhymes:

       בחותילה לבות החשה
       וידמה אל כל חול לשבר
       כל שלמה טבר ורומ חורה
       ידככיה אל ברכ ולב流れ

2. Fol. 43. סֵפֶר אָרָא, Cabbalistic treatise on the consonants, by Moses b. Maimūn b. al-Bāz, beg. עַנִּי אֵלֶּה חֲמָרָה חֲמָרָה חֲמָרָה
      הָאֶלֶּה יְלֵא אֵלֶּה חֲמָרָה חֲמָרָה חֲמָרָה
      Written by Josef b. Solomon Musā.
      Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 56 [H. No. 339].

336. סֵפֶר תָּעִיר, Menahem b. Jacob Lonzano's Commentary on the נַתַּנְי.ITAL. curs. char., fol., ff. 55 [H. No. 21].

337. Queries by Benjamin Kohen, addressed to R. Moses Zaccuth.
      Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 9 [H. No. 42].

338. Several treatises by Menahem Azariah of Fano.
      1. a. סֵפֶר בטַוָּר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר, beginning טִפְּלָר חֲמָרָה חֲמָרָה חֲמָרָה חֲמָרָה; b. Fol. 6. סֵפֶר בטַוָּר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר; c. Fol. 15. סֵפֶר בטַוָּר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר; d. Fol. 22. סֵפֶר בטַוָּר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר; e. Fol. 27. סֵפֶר בטַוָּר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר תַּעִיר. breaks off before the end.
   2. Fol. 29. Cabbalistic observations on the Tetragram in connexion with Abōth, IV, 1, by a pupil of Menahem Azariah.
      Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 42 [No. 37].
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THE JEWS AND THE ENGLISH LAW.

IV.

Having already passed in review the law in its bearing on the Jewish religion and endowments founded for the purpose of propagating that religion, as well as the conditions under which Jews are entitled to a share of general endowments and charities, the laws concerning the civil and political status of the Jews next claim attention. For a period of more than three and a half centuries Jews were not permitted to live in England, nor is the date when they were first allowed to settle here by any means certain. However, in considering the course of legislation, so far as it concerns the Jews, the time of their legal recognition of their resettlement is of great importance, and was much discussed in the recent case of Dr. Wilton v. Montefiore, where Mr. Justice, now Lord Justice Stirling, decided it to be November 13, 1685. The words of the learned judge are: "The history of the Jews in this country, so far as it is material to the present question, is given in a note to the report of Lindo v. Belisario\(^1\). After stating that the Jews appeared to have been brought here in considerable numbers by

\(^1\) Hag. Cons. 216.
William I from Rouen in 1070, and that they lived as bondsmen of the kings, and under special protection, regulations, and exemptions, till they were banished in 1290, the note proceeds as follows: 'They did not appear again in this kingdom as a distinct body till the time of Charles II. They had petitioned in 1648 to be allowed to return and enjoy their religion, and the question was much agitated but nothing was done. On the Restoration, Charles II promised them protection and the use of their religion, and an order of Council issued to that effect.' The order is given in the Appendix, p. 3. It is dated November 13, 1685, and it provides as follows: 'Upon reading this day at the board the petition of Joseph Henriques, Abraham Delivera, and Aaron Pacheco, overseers of the Jewish synagogue, and the rest of the Jewish nation, setting forth that his late Majesty, of blessed memory, having found the petitioners and their nation ever faithful to the government, and ready to serve him on all occasions, was pleased in February, 1673, to signify his royal pleasure, that whilst they continued quiet, true, and faithful to the government, they should enjoy the liberty and profession of their religion, which they accordingly peaceably exercised till Michaelmas Term last; that several writs out of the King's Bench, on the statute made in the twenty-third year of Queen Elizabeth, had been taken out against forty-eight of the Jewish nation by one Thomas Beaumont, and thirty-seven of them arrested thereupon, as they were following their occasions on the Royal Exchange, to the great prejudice of their reputation both here and abroad; and therefore praying his Majesty to permit and suffer them, as heretofore, to have the benefit and free exercise of their religion during their good behaviour towards his Majesty's government. His Majesty having taken this matter into his royal consideration, was pleased to order, and it is hereby accordingly ordered, that

1 By these words Dr. Haggard probably means having a synagogue and communal organization and openly practising their religion.
his Majesty's Attorney-General do stop all the said proceedings at law against the petitioners; his Majesty's intention being that they should not be troubled upon this account, but quietly enjoy the free exercise of their religion, whilst they behave themselves dutifully and obediently to his government.' From that time forward the Jews appear to have been permitted to reside in England and to practise the rites of their religion."

This date, November 13, 1685, in the reign of James II, is inconsistent with the popular theory that the Jews came over during the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell in the wake of their great Rabbi, Menasseh Ben Israel, in the year 1655, and have been legally settled here ever since, nor is it much less at variance with the view of the historians, that the Jews obtained a legal settlement in England sometime during the reign of Charles II, though the precise date is not given. The true date is of some importance when the course of subsequent legislation as it affects the Jews is placed under review; and as much may be said on behalf of either theory, and as the legal theory is not necessarily correct, it will not be out of place to summarize the evidence upon which the rival theories are based, so that the reader may be enabled to form an impartial judgment on the subject under discussion. Here it will be necessary to travel outside the contents of the statute book and the law reports, and to extract, though it is to be hoped not at undue length, certain entries in the public records. It must not of course be forgotten that an actual settlement is one thing, and the legal recognition of it another. The former must necessarily precede the latter. The date adopted in Mr. Justice Stirling's judgment is therefore a late one, and in reality marks the last occasion on which a serious attempt was made in due form of law to prevent the Jews who had already an organized community from continuing their residence in the country.

1 Law Reports [1900], 2 Ch. 489.
In order to understand the conditions for the solution of this problem, it is necessary to glance at the previous history of the Jews in this country. There can be little doubt that from the earliest times, that is, ever since England may be said to have come within the pale of civilization, Jews, prompted by that commercial instinct which has always been their characteristic, came here for the purposes of trade, and reaped the profits to be derived from it, and even settled here, though probably not in such considerable numbers as to establish distinct communities of their own until the connexion between England and the continent of Europe became closer by reason of the Norman Conquest and the events immediately preceding it. Therefore though there are at the present day few or no traces remaining of any Jewish settlements in England prior to the time of the Norman kings, it is a mistake, founded upon a passage in Prynne's *Demurrer*, to assert that the residence of Jews in England was illegal before that time. Prynne's words are: "I have deduced their introduction into England only from William surnamed the Conqueror, because I finde not the least mention of them in any of our British or Saxon Histories, Councils, Synods, Canons, which doubtlesse would have mentioned them, and made some strict Laws or Canons, against their Jewish as well as against Pagan Superstitions, had they exercised them here, as they would have done as well as in Spain, and other places, had they resided here." But apart from Edward the Confessor's law, the authenticity of which Prynne disputes, there are contained in the *Liber Poenitentialis* of Theodore, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 668 to 690 A.D., and the *Excptiones* of Ecbert, who was Archbishop of York from 735 to 766 A.D., a not inconsiderable number of canons and regulations relating to the Jews: e.g. it was provided that a Christian woman committing fornication with a Jew should undergo severer penalties than if guilty of the same offence with a Christian;*}

1 Prynne's *Demurrer*, part I, p. 5.
and that if any celebrated the feast of Passover with the Jews, he should be expelled from every church; and that if any Christian received unleavened bread or any food or drink from the Jews, he should do penance on bread and water for forty days; and that if a Christian were to sell another Christian, although his own slave, to Jews, he was to suffer severe penalties until he redeemed him. Again, mass was not to be celebrated in any place where the bodies of Jews or infidels were buried, and no Christian was to turn Jew or take part in Jewish feasts.

However this may be, there can be no doubt that after the Norman Conquest separate Jewish communities were to be found in many of the more important towns. The Jews, or "Iudaei," as they were called, living in these communities, possessed a separate and distinct legal status. This status was very similar to that of the villein, with this distinction, that the Jew was not a scriptus glebae, and was in every case subject to the king, and not to the lord of the manor, as the villein was. It is well described in the twenty-fifth law of Edward the Confessor, which may be translated as follows: "All Jews, in whatever part of the kingdom they may be, are under the liege protection and guardianship of the king; nor can any of them attach himself to any rich man without the king's licence, because the Jews themselves and all their chattels are the king's. But if any one detains them or their chattels, the king may claim them as his own." Such a status was consistent

2 Ibid., § 4; Ecb. Ex. 150.  
4 Ecb. Ex. 147.  
5 As to this law Prynne says: "I cannot but reject it as counterfeit, and esteem it rather a Declaration of the Jews' condition in England in Hoveden's time (inserted by him, as well as some other things of punier date, amongst these Laws) rather than any Law of, or in the Confessor's days, wherein I can find no evidence of any Jews' residence here, but only this interpolation and forged Law, which Mr. Selden wholly omits in his Collection of his Laws." Hoveden lived in the reign of Henry II, and probably died in 1201 A.D.; and though Prynne thinks the law
with a large amount of freedom: as against all the king's subjects they were free and possessed of all the rights of freemen, but their persons and property were under the absolute control and disposition of the king, whose exactions were only restricted by that prudence which warns the owner not to slay the goose that lays the golden eggs. So important a source of revenue did the Jews become that a special court, the Exchequer of the Jews, was established in the reign of Richard I; this court had jurisdiction in all causes whether civil or criminal in which Jews were implicated; though purely civil cases in which both parties were Jews were frequently, if not generally, remitted to a purely Jewish tribunal, to be decided by Jewish and not by English law. The Jews were not popular; they were the licensed money-lenders of the land—in this trade they had an absolute monopoly—and the creditor is rarely beloved by his debtor. The barons looked with jealous eyes on the Jews' wide privileges in relation to their fellow men; but it was not till towards the close of Henry III's long reign that their civil rights were materially abridged by statute, though they were always subject to such restrictions as the king in his discretion might think fit to impose. In the year 1271 a statute was enacted prohibiting Jews from holding lands in fee (the houses they then possessed being expressly excepted), and also from having Christian servants, while about the year 1275 the famous statute de la Jeuerie or de Judaismo was passed, which forbade usury to the Jews, and enjoined that every Jew should wear a yellow badge on his outer garment and pay a yearly tax of threepence to

spurious, he admits that it correctly represents the legal status of the Jews in the latter part of the twelfth century. See Bracton, f. 385 b. The law is now accepted as genuine, and is included in the Ancient Laws and Institutes of England printed under the direction of the Commissioners on the Public Records of the Kingdom in 1840.

1 Usury was most strictly forbidden to Christians as being contrary to the law of God and of the land. See Co. 3 Inst., p. 251.

2 Rymer's Foedera, I, 489.
the king; on the other hand, the Jews were to be under
the king's protection, and might gain their living by
lawful merchandise and labour, and might buy houses
in the cities where they lived and hold them in chief
of the king, and might take farms or land for the term
of ten years or less. But the licence to take lands to
farm was to endure for only fifteen years. Such was
the position of the Jews before their final departure from
the country in 1290. This event is accurately described
in Stubbs's *Constitutional History*: "At the same time (as
the July Parliament) by an act done by himself in his
private council" ("per regem et secretum concilium,"
Hemingb. II, 20) "he banished the Jews from England:
the safe-conduct granted them on their departure is dated
on the 27th of July." These safe-conducts are the most
important documents still in existence relating to this
event. The one referred to by Bishop Stubbs is addressed
to all the bailiffs, barons, and shipowners of the Cinque
Ports, commanding them that, inasmuch as a certain time
has been fixed for all the Jews to quit the realm, to give
them a safe passage for themselves, their wives, children,
and chattels, and to charge them no more than the ordinary
and accustomed freight, and enjoining them under pain of
severe forfeiture from injuring or, so far as in them lay,
allowing others to injure or molest any of the Jews in
property or person.

---

1 Statutes of the Realm, I, 221.
2 For further detail the reader is referred to Pollock and Maitland's
*History of English Law before the time of Edward I*, vol. I, pp. 451-459, and
Gneist's *Constitutional History*, p. 228 note, and also *The Expulsion of the Jews
from England* in 1290, by B. L. Abrahams, and the *Introduction to the
Jewish Historical and Selden Societies* edition of *Select Pleas*, Starrs, &c., by
J. M. Rigg, which has appeared while these pages were in the press.
3 Stubbs, Const. Hist., II, 126.
a similar writ addressed to the sheriff of G. and dated July 18, 1290. *Inst.,
II, p. 597, and see Tovey's *Ang. Judaica*, p. 241, and at p. 232 the entry in
the Red Book of the Exchequer is given.
The decree of banishment itself is no longer extant, but Dr. C. Gross has discovered a document which throws much light upon it. This document is in the form of a writ issued from King's Clipstone on November 5, 1290, and addressed to the Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer. It recites that though by the statute passed at Westminster (the statute de Judaismo) the Jews had been forbidden to take usury of any Christian, nevertheless they still exacted interest under the name of "courtesy," and thereby oppressed the people; wherefore on account of their crimes and in honour of Christ, the king had compelled them to quit the realm as being perjured, and proceeds to order that no penalty or interest should be exacted in respect of debts due to the Jews, and that the debtors should pay only the principal moneys they had actually received from the Jews. The exile of the Jews did not annul debts due to them, but such debts became payable to the king, whose bondmen the Jews had been. They had been ordered to leave the kingdom before a fixed time, which is not stated in any of the documents, but is generally believed to be the first of November; the writ in question was therefore issued immediately after their final departure.

In consideration of having issued this decree of banishment, the Parliament which was then sitting, composed as it was in a great measure of landowners to whom Jewish usury had been a heavy burden, granted the king a fifteenth "pro expulsione Iudaeorum." But the transaction was not a very profitable one to the crown, for by it a plenteous

1 The original word is curialitas, which is quite distinct from the "curialitas Angliae" or interest which the husband has in his wife's freehold land. It probably does not occur elsewhere in this sense in mediaeval jurisprudence, and is not to be found among the terms explained in "Termes de la ley." It is used in the Corpus Iuris, but with a very different meaning. Novell, Valentinian, tit. 3, § 3.


3 Mathew of Westminster, a contemporary chronicler, says the king had allowed them to stay till the Feast of All Saints (Tovey, p. 233).
source of the revenue was for ever cut off, and that at a time when the king was expected to defray the ordinary expenses of the state out of his hereditary revenues, and subsidies were only voted by the Parliament on special and extraordinary occasions. Yet in the year 1290 this source could not be expected to yield as rich a harvest as it had done in former days. The prohibition of usury in the third year of Edward I, even if occasionally evaded, had greatly diminished the resources of the Jews, and the licence to take lands to farm, which was to endure for only fifteen years, was now about to expire, and thus another road to the acquisition of wealth was closed to them. Had they been allowed to remain, the Jews hampered by these restrictions imposed by Act of Parliament, and therefore removable only by Act of Parliament, would no longer have been as profitable to the king as they had been in former times, when, in the words of Lord Coke, "a great revenue by reason of the usury of the Jews came to the crown; for between the fiftieth year of Henry III and the second year of Edward I, which was not above seven years complete, there was paid into the king's coffers four hundred and twenty thousand pounds of and for the usury of the Jews!" This is a truly enormous sum, having regard to the value of money and the total wealth of the country in the thirteenth century. But after the statute de Iudaiismo such rich harvests were no longer to be reaped, and in all probability this knowledge had considerable influence on the king's mind, in addition to the proffered gift of a fifteenth by the Parliament and the knowledge that a great part of the property still remaining to the Jews would come to him by way of escheats.

1 3 Inst., 151.
Looking back over the gulf of centuries, this event can be descried with sufficient clearness, but the loss of the proclamation of banishment has left it wrapped in some obscurity that has given rise to several erroneous theories that should here be mentioned. Lord Coke says that there was no banishment of the Jews, but only a voluntary exodus in consequence of the suppression of usury. "Our noble King Edward I and his father Henry III before him sought by divers Acts and Ordinances to use some mean and moderation herein, but in the end it was found that there was no mean in mischief, and as Seneca saith, 'Res profecto stulta est nequitiae modus.' And therefore King Edward I, as this Act" (the statute de Judaismo) "saith, in the honour of God, and for the common profit of his people, without all respect (in respect of these) of the filling of his own coffers, did ordain, that no Jew from henceforth should make any bargain or contract for usury, nor upon any former contract should take any usury, from the Feast of Saint Edward then last past; so in effect all Jewish usury was forbidden."

"This Law struck at the root of this pestilent weed, for hereby usury itself was forbidden; and thereupon the cruel Jews thirsting after wicked gain, to the number of relating to Law-proceedings, by Amerciaments imposed on them for Misdemeanour, and by the Fines, Ransoms and Compositions, which they were forced to pay, for having the King's Benevolence, for Protection, for Licence to trade and negotiate, for Discharges from Imprisonment, and the like. He would tallage the whole Community or Body of them at Pleasure; and make them answer the Tallages for one another. If they made Default at the Atterminations or Days of Payment prefixed to them, they were charged with great Fines or Compositions for it. In Sum, the King seemed to be absolute Lord of their Estates and Effects, and of the Persons of them, their Wives and Children. 'Tis true, he let them enjoy their Trade and bequests; but they seemed to trade and acquire for his Profit as well as their own: for at one Time or other, their Fortunes or great part of them came into his Coffers. They were a numerous Body (being settled in many, especially the great Towns of the Realm): and by Traffic and taking of usuries and mortgages of the King's subjects, they became very wealthy both in Money and Land. But as they fleeced the subjects of the Realm, so the King fleeced them."
15,060 departed out of this Realm into foreign parts, where they might use their Jewish trade of usury, and from that time that Nation never returned again into this Realm. Some are of opinion (and so it is said in some of our Histories) that it was decreed by authority of Parliament, That the usurious Jews should be banished out of the Realm; but the truth is, that their Usury was banished by this Act of Parliament, and that was the cause that they banished themselves into foreign Countries, where they might live by their Usury; and for that they were odious both to God and man, that they might passe out of the Realm in safety, they made Petition to the King, that a certain day might be prefixed to them to depart the Realm, to the end that they might have the King's Writ to his Sherifes for their safe conduct, and that no injury, molestation, damage or grievance be offered to them in the mean time."

Coke's error is due to his post-dating the statute de Judaismo, and attributing it to the Parliament of 1290. It is still placed among the statutes of uncertain date by the commissioners responsible for the statutes of the realm. In the Harleian MS. it immediately succeeds the Statute of Westminster I, passed in the third year of Edward I, and in the document discovered by Dr. Gross at the British Museum it is stated to have been enacted "in quindena Sancti Michaelis anno regni nostri tertio"; so that the date is now placed beyond all doubt. The basis of Coke's theory is thus destroyed.

Prynne, on the other hand, is very positive that the banishment was effected by Act of Parliament; his words are: "This their banishment was by the unanimous desire, Judgment, Edict, and Decree both of the King and his Parliament; and not by the King alone: and this Banishment, total, of them all, and likewise final, never to return

1 a Inst., 507.
into England. Which Edict and Decree not now extant in our Parliament Rolls (many of which are lost) nor printed Statutes; yet it is mentioned by all these Authorities. Prynne here alludes to different chroniclers, extracts from whose works he had already given; but these extracts when carefully examined do not bear out his assertion.

This view held by Prynne was undoubtedly very widely spread, and at one time held by both the supporters and opponents of the Jews' readmission; for the first petition presented on behalf of the Jews to the Council of War on Jan. 5, 1645, some seven years before Prynne wrote his Demurrer, is entitled, "The petition of the Jews for the repealing of the Act of Parliament for their Banishment out of England," and speaks of the instrument of expulsion as "the inhumane, cruel statute of banishment." But those responsible for this petition seem to have been ill acquainted with English history and jurisprudence, for the banishment is said to have taken place in the reign of Richard II. Prynne has the candour and honesty to admit that the alleged statute was no longer in existence, but "B.B.," the anonymous author of A Historical and Law Treatise against the Jews and Judaism, a virulent diatribe against the Jews, published in 1703, which was so popular with the anti-Semites here that it was reprinted in 1721 and again in 1753 as the second edition—perceiving the weakness of this theory on account of the total disappearance of the alleged statute, unblushingly asserts that it is to be seen on the Roll of Parliament in the Tower. From internal evidence it is clear that this writer had carefully studied Prynne's Demurrer, and it is impossible to escape the conclusion that his statement is a wilful falsehood, made in reliance on the improbability of any of his readers taking the pains to verify it. Prynne was above such a statement as this, but feeling that the authorities he had cited were not conclusive, and fearing

1 Demurrer, p. 49.  
that the term "groundless conceit," which he had applied to Sir Edward Coke's theory, might with equal justice be applied to his own, he concludes his argument with the statement that by the fundamental laws of England, "No Freemen and Natives of England can be justly banished or exiled out of it but by special judgment of Parliament, or by Act of Parliament," as authority for which he cites Magna Charta, c. 29, and a large number of Acts of Parliament banishing individuals at various times. Therefore, he says, the Jews being banished by Act of Parliament "(never since repealed or reversed) neither may nor can by Law be readmitted, reduced into England again, but by common consent and Act of Parliament: which I conceive they will never be able to obtain." It can hardly be denied that Prynne was carried away with excessive zeal to make good the proposition, to prove which he had sat down to write his Demurrer. He had, as he says in his "Preface to the Christian Reader," been asked by Mr. Nye, the minister, "whether there were any law of England against bringing in the Jews amongst us? for the Lawyers had newly delivered their opinions, there was no law against it." To which he had answered "That the Jews were in the year 1290 all banished out of England, by Judgment and Edict of the King and Parliament, as a great Grievance, never to return again: for which the Commons gave the King the fifteenth part of their Moveables: and therefore being thus banished by Parliament, they could not now by the Laws of England, be brought in again, without a special Act of Parliament, which I would make good for Law." The conference to consider the demands of Menasseh ben Israel was still sitting at Whitehall, and party feeling ran high; otherwise so sound a lawyer as Prynne would not have overlooked the fact that the famous clause of Magna Charta applies only to freemen, and that in the year 1290 no Jew could claim to be a liber homo. As has been already shown, the Jews

1 Demurrer, p. 50.
were serfs or villeins, and by the statute de Judaismo passed only fifteen years before, the privilege had been granted to them of not being challenged or troubled in any court, except in the court of the King, "whose Bondmen they are" ("ky serfs yl sunt"). The Jews consequently had no right to the benefit of Magna Charta or any other fundamental law of the land that applied to freemen only, and could accordingly be banished, as in fact they were, by decree of the King alone. There is yet a third theory of the expulsion which need be but briefly mentioned here. It is that sentence of exile was passed upon the Jews by a synod held in London. This does not rest on very strong authority, and it is certain that the clergy, whatever their wishes might have been, had no legal power to effect the expulsion of the Jews.

It has been lately suggested that in spite of the decree of banishment and the severe penalties which disobedience to that decree would undoubtedly have entailed, some Jews still remained in this country. The suggestion is based upon little trustworthy evidence, and does not call for any comment here; for if any did remain they were very soon amalgamated with and became indistinguishable from the general mass of the population. Then, again, as the centuries rolled on individual Jews from time to time can be proved to have landed on our shores, but they never attempted to establish a Jewish community here or to celebrate their worship publicly in this country; they were treated as other foreigners and subject to the laws which governed aliens. It is therefore true to say that for a period of more than three centuries English history is a blank so far as the Jews are concerned; but in that long interval occurred two events of great importance in relation to the return of the Jews here. Those events

were the extinction of villenage and the reformation of the English Church.

The disappearance of villenage is one of those great changes which has been brought about without the intervention of the legislature. To a great extent this result was effected by the attitude of the courts of common law, which admitted every presumption in favour of liberty, and in practice made it difficult and finally impossible to sustain a claim to a villein, if it was seriously contested. The last reported case in which villenage was pleaded was tried in Hilary Term, 1617 (15 Ja. I), and, as in numerous other instances, the claim was not upheld. From the 15th of James I, says Mr. Hargrave in his learned argument in Sommersett's case, "the claim of villenage has not been heard of in our courts of justice; and nothing can be more notorious, than that the race of persons, who were once the objects of it, was about that time completely worn out by the continual and united operation of deaths and manumissions." Had the case of the Jews occurred to him, he might have added banishment also. Villenage had thus become obsolete, but the laws and rules relating to villenage had never been repealed, and by these laws the sovereign as much as the private citizen was bound; therefore if Queen Elizabeth had laid claim to Rodrigo Lopez as her villein, it would have been necessary for her to prove either that Lopez had made confession that he was her villein in a court of record, or that he and his ancestors had been villeins to herself and her predecessors time out of memory—that is to say, for a period of sixty years, as limited by 32 Hen. VIII, cap. 2. Such proof would obviously not have been forthcoming, and no such claim was ever made by any of our sovereigns against those Jews who from time to time landed on our shores. But if they were not villeins then the disabling statutes enacted before

1 Pigg v. Caley, Noy 27.
2 J. O. Howell's State Trials, p. 41.
the expulsion did not apply to those Jews who might return and reside here. The disabling acts no doubt applied to "Iudaei" or Jews, nor were any exceptions made in the statutes, but the Jews who came back to England in the seventeenth century were free men; they were no longer villeins or quasi-villeins, and were not "Iudaei" within the meaning of the Acts. This principle of interpretation is well known to English law, and after much discussion and considerable disagreement among our greatest judges as to its application, was acted on in a recent case in which it was held that the enclosure at Kempton Park was not a place within the meaning of the Betting Act. In that case reliance had to be placed on the preamble of the Act, and also upon extrinsic evidence of the circumstances existing at the time when the Act was passed, and it was the necessity of going outside the words of the statute itself which occasioned the difference of opinion among the judges; but in the very body of the statute de Iudaismo, the Jews, as has been already pointed out, are repeatedly called the King's bondmen, and therefore this difficulty would not arise. Certain it is that many generations of Jews lived in this country in open and flagrant violation of these obsolete statutes. They did not wear yellow badges on their outer garments; they employed Christian servants, and in some cases they did put out money to usury and held lands and houses; and yet no attempt was ever made to enforce the laws prohibiting such things, and that though, as contemporary pamphlets prove, there were undoubtedly many persons willing, nay eager, to annoy and injure the Jews had it been in their power. And yet in the year 1846 it was thought advisable to solemnly repeal by Act of Parliament "the Statute or Ordinance of the fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth years of the reign of King Henry the Third, and the Statute or Ordinance commonly called Statutum

de Iudaismo 1." If the view here stated is correct this was a work of supererogation, but in any case if there ever existed any doubt after the resettlement as to the absolute freedom and equality of the Jews with their fellow citizens before the law, it has now been removed.

Much as the decay of villenage might have facilitated the return of the Jews by rendering the former disabling enactments no longer applicable to them, the various laws passed in consequence of the Reformation of the English Church and the events which immediately preceded and led up to it were no less effective in retarding a resettlement. These laws may be classified under two heads: (1) those constituting the proclamation, teaching, or propagation of doctrines at variance or inconsistent with the tenets held for the time being by the Church as by law established, a criminal offence—the law of heresy; (2) those making criminal, failure to attend the service of the Church as by law established, and also the attendance at services other than those of the Established Church—the law of uniformity, to a great extent embodied in the statutes known as the laws against recusants.

At the time of the expulsion of the Jews, and indeed until the days of Wycliffe and the rise of the Lollards nearly a century afterwards, heresy was almost unknown in England; and if there was any legal machinery other than excommunication and ecclesiastical censure, by which such a crime could be punished, there were but few occasions when it was brought into operation, and the fact that Wycliffe and his earlier disciples escaped all temporal penalties goes far to show that though heresy even in those times was regarded as a heinous crime, there was no regular procedure by which those tainted with it could be brought to justice and punished. In any case the Jews, who had lived here as the King's villeins and under the special protection of the King, had not been liable to be charged with heresy; but if they converted a Christian

1 9 & 10 Vict. cap. 59.
to their religion, the apostate would have been treated with extreme rigour. Perhaps the best-authenticated case of capital punishment for heresy before the year 1400 A.D. is that of a deacon who in the year 1222, because he had become a Jew for the love of a Jewess ("pro quadam Iudaea"), was degraded by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, at a provincial council held at Oxford, and then delivered over to the sheriff as representing the civil power and forthwith burned. There is grave doubt as to the legality of the latter part of this punishment; there seems to have been no sort of judicial proceeding of any kind when once the unfortunate cleric was handed over to the civil power; nor can it be determined under what precise enactment the capital punishment was ordered, and the sheriff who carried it out was Fawkes of Breauté, a man notorious for high-handed and lawless acts of violence. The infliction of the death penalty for heresy was, however, common on the continent, and this particular case (the offence being a flagrant one), though viewed with surprise by contemporaries, seems to have met with general approval. It cannot, however, be taken as an authority that heresy would in ordinary cases be visited with severe temporal punishment. The impotence of the law is made manifest by the complete failure of the measures taken against Wycliffe and his followers, and in May of the year 1382, when the Wycliffe controversy was at its height, the clergy actually managed to fraudulently introduce into the statute book an ordinance enabling the arrest and imprisonment of heretics; but in October of the same year the Commons represented to the King that the pretended statute had never received their assent and it was accordingly repealed. Wycliffe, the arch-heretic,

---


was allowed to die a natural death, and it was not until the beginning of the reign of Henry IV that a thoroughly reliable weapon for the suppression of heresy was placed in the hands of the Church. In the year 1401 the famous statute de Haeretico was passed; it enacted that no one should preach or write contrary to the Catholic faith or determination of holy church, or hold any conventicles or schools for teaching such doctrines, or favour or maintain any such teacher, and it empowered the diocesan to cause any one "defamed or evidently suspected" of being guilty of any of the offences enumerated in the statute to be arrested and detained in prison until he should canonically purge himself and abjure his heretical and erroneous opinions. The diocesan was to openly and judicially proceed against him according to the canonical decrees within three months of the arrest, and if he were convicted he was to be imprisoned and fined after the "manner and quality of the offence" at the discretion of the diocesan, but if he should refuse to abjure or after abjuration should relapse, so that according to the holy canons he ought to be left to the secular court, then he is to be handed over to the sheriff or other proper officer who shall receive him and "before the People in a high place do to be burnt." Before the statute was promulgated, and while the Parliament which passed it was still sitting, William Sawtre was pronounced by Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the provincial council, a relapsed heretic, degraded and committed to the secular court. A writ was accordingly issued by the King in Parliament ordering the heretic to be burned, and the sentence was

The Act declaring 5 Rich. II, stat. 2, cap. 5 void was omitted (it is said through the craft of the clergy) from the published editions of the statutes; therefore in the days of the Reformation 5 Rich. II, stat. 2, cap. 5 was treated as still subsisting, but it could hardly have been acted upon until the action of the House of Commons had been forgotten. It was finally repealed by the Statute Law Revision Act, 1863.

\[1\] Henry IV, c. 15. Statutes of the Realm, II, p. 125.

\[2\] A copy of the writ is to be found in Rot. Parl. III, 459.
carried out. The writ is dated February 25, though the Parliament which passed the statute de Haeretico did not break up until March 10, and this fact is the main basis of the argument that after the statute de Haeretico had been formally repealed, heretics might still be committed to the flames because the writ de Haeretico comburendo could issue at common law independently of the statute. Fourteen years later it was thought right to still further increase the severity of the law. 2 Hen. V, stat. 1, cap. 7 provides that the chancellor, justices, and magistrates shall make an oath to use all diligence in destroying all manner of heresies and errors, commonly called Lollardries, and that all persons convict of heresy and left to the secular power according to the laws of holy church shall forfeit their lands and tenements as in the case of attainder for felony, and that their goods and chattels shall also be forfeited to the King. These acts remained in full force till the year 1533, and were frequently resorted to. They placed almost unlimited power in the hands of the Church. There was no definition of heresy, and the bishops were thus empowered to punish any views which were at variance with their own. The procedure was also most drastic; a person once pronounced to be an obstinate or relapsed heretic was handed over to the civil power, which had no alternative but to execute the utmost rigour of the law. We can thus explain the total absence of any effort to establish a Jewish colony in England after the banishment from Spain in 1492. The knowledge of the severity of the English law combined with the memory of the cruelties that accompanied the expulsion two hundred years before would effectually discountenance any such attempt.

Under Henry VIII and Edward VI the law as to heresy was considerably altered, but it was not varied in such a way as to give any sort of toleration to those who held principles in conflict with the doctrines proclaimed by the sovereign as supreme head of the Church as binding on all its members. Many heretics were put to death in the
reign of Henry VIII, and in the short reign of Edward VI at least two persons were burned for heresy. Mary, shortly after her accession, procured the passing of an "Acte for the renewing of three Estatutes made for the punishment of Heresies," providing that the three statutes enacted in the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V, already mentioned, should "from the xxiith day of January next coming be revived and be in full force strengthe and effecto to all Intentes construcions and purposes for ever." The fierce and merciless persecution that ensued has caused a horrible but not undeserved epithet to be added to the name of the first Queen regnant of England, and though the number of the victims may have been exaggerated in after years, hundreds were brought to the stake within the short period of less than four years that elapsed before the Queen's death.

When Elizabeth came to the throne, the law was again recast. The first Act of Parliament passed in her reign, commonly called the Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. cap. 1, sect. 15) expressly repealed the Act of Philip and Mary under which the persecutions had taken place, as also the former statutes for the punishment of heresies revived by that Act; but it was by no means intended to allow heresy and error to go unpunished, and therefore by sect. 17 jurisdiction for the visitation "of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities" was annexed to the crown, and by the following section the Queen was empowered to appoint commissioners to exercise her ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to visit, reform, and correct

1 The principal statutes are 25 Hen. VIII, cap. 14, and 31 Hen. VIII, cap. 14 (the Act of the Six Articles), 1 Edw. VI, cap. 12, 1 Edw. VI, cap. 1, and 2 & 3 Edw. VI, cap. 1 (see sect. 3). The last two, though obsolete, are still technically in force. For the whole subject see Stephen's History of Criminal Law, vol. II, pp. 453-460.

2 1 & 2 Phil. and Mary, cap. 6.

3 The exact number is given as 377. For the persecution see Dodd's Church History, vol. II, pp. 101-109; Pike's History of Crime, vol. II, pp. 57-60, and 613.
all errors, heresies, &c., "to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue, and the conservation of the peace and unity of this realm"; but a later section (sect. 36) limited the power of the commissioners so appointed, by declaring that nothing should be adjudged heresy unless determined to be heresy by the authority of the canonical scriptures, or by certain general councils, or by the high court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in their convocation. This restriction was no doubt intended, and did in fact operate, to exempt Roman Catholics from prosecution for heresy—Papists obnoxious to the government were proceeded against for other crimes—but it could not in any way relieve or exempt Jews, or any one who impugned the sacred doctrine of the Trinity. Although the procedure established by the statutes passed under the Lancastrian kings was abolished, it seems to have been assumed that a culprit in the case of contumacy could be burned, and that the writ de Haereticocomburendo would issue at common law. There are several instances of this having taken place. Two Anabaptists were burned in the year 1575, and two Arians as late as 1612. One of these last, Bartholomew Legatt, was charged with holding thirteen damnable tenets, most or all of which are held by every believing Jew; the last two are short and are here inserted from the collection of state trials: "12. That Christ by his Godhead wrought no miracle. 13. That Christ is not to be prayed unto." There has been considerable discussion among lawyers as to the legality of the punishment in these latter cases; into this discussion it is not our purpose to enter; it is enough to state the fact that the convictions took place and that the extreme penalty was enforced, to show what might have been the position of professing Jews openly living and practising their religion in this country.

Since the year 1612 no execution for heresy has taken place in England, nor were offenders, if it was intended to
deal severely with them, brought before the ecclesiastical courts. They were, however, dealt with by the Court of High Commission, which had been constituted in its ultimate form in the year 1583 under the powers supposed to be conferred on the crown by the eighteenth section of the Act of Supremacy, the substance of which has already been given. The commissioners had no power to order capital punishment, but they were authorized to award "such punishment by fine, imprisonment, censure of the church or otherwise, or by all or any of the said ways, and to take such order for the redress of the same, as by their wisdom and discretions should be thought meet and convenient"; and these penalties were unsparingly inflicted. Their mode of procedure was most arbitrary, and by contemporaries not inaptly compared to that of the Inquisition. There was as a rule no jury, though the court could if it wished summon a jury; arrests were made without any legal warrant; the accused were punished, though there was no evidence against them, except such as was wrung out of their own mouths by means of the ex officio oath. "In two points alone it was distinguished from the Inquisition of Southern Europe. It was incompetent to inflict the punishment of death, and it was not permitted to extract confessions by means of physical torture." Such a court could be made a terrible engine of oppression by a zealous persecutor, for it assumed authority not merely to try but to seek out offenders; for example, on April 1, 1634, when Laud had held the primacy but a few months, a circular letter was sent by the commissioners to all officers of the peace in the kingdom, of the following tenor: "There remain in divers parts of the kingdom sundry sort of separatists, moralists, and sectaries, as namely—Brownists, Anabaptists, Arians, Traskites, Familists, and some other sorts, who, upon Sundays and other festival days, under pretence of repetition of sermons, ordinarily use to meet together in great numbers in private houses and other obscure places, and there keep
private conventicles and exercises of religion by law prohibited, to the corrupting of sundry his Majesty's good subjects, manifest contempt of his Highness's laws and disturbance of the Church. For reformation whereof the persons addressed are to enter any house where they shall have intelligence that such conventicles are held, and in every room thereof search for persons assembled and for all unlicensed books, and bring all such persons and books found before the Ecclesiastical Commission as shall be thought meet. The circular makes no mention of Jews; had Laud and his associates known that they were at this very time beginning to creep secretly into the kingdom, this omission would hardly have been made.

The court had always been unpopular, and the oppressive use made of it by Laud caused its abolition by the Long Parliament in 1640 by a statute (16 Car. I, cap. 11). After reciting, "Whereas by colour of some words... in the Act (of Supremacy)... commissioners have to the great and insufferable wrong and oppression of the King's subjects, used to fine and imprison them, and to exercise other authority not belonging to ecclesiastical jurisdiction... and divers other great mischiefs and inconveniences have also ensued to the King's subjects," section 18 of the Act of Supremacy, under which the letters patent constituting the High Commission were issued, was repealed. A further section dealt with the other ecclesiastical courts, depriving them of all power to inflict "any pain, penalty, fine, amercement, imprisonment, or other corporal punishment upon any of the King's subjects," or to administer the ex officio oath. Thus after 1640, though heresy was not removed from the list of crimes, there was no court which could inflict any higher punishment than a purely ecclesiastical penalty. After the Restoration all the provisions of this statute, excepting those abolishing the Court of High Commission and the ex officio oath, were repealed (13 Car. II, stat. 1, cap. 12), and the power of inflicting physical punishment

---

1 Cal. S. P. Domestic, 1633-4, p. 538.
was thus restored to the ecclesiastical courts, but some years afterwards, in 1679, it was further abridged by 29 Car. II, cap. 9, which abolished the writ de Haeretico comburendo, and all punishment by death in pursuance of ecclesiastical censures," reserving to the ecclesiastical courts only the power to punish atheism, blasphemy, heresy, &c., "by excommunication, deprivation, degradation, and other ecclesiastical censures not extending to death." This is still the law, but there is no record of any prosecution for heresy ever having taken place since the ecclesiastical courts were shorn of their power of inflicting corporal punishment by the Long Parliament in 1640.

Such was in outline the law of heresy; it remains now to consider the second impediment to a Jewish resettlement, the Law of Uniformity. The expression Church and State is a common, almost a hackneyed one, and we are apt to forget that there was once a time when no one, who was not an adherent of the Church, could be a citizen of the State; and when severe pains and penalties were incurred by non-attendance at church or by attendance at any religious meeting not sanctioned by the ecclesiastical authorities. Prior to the Reformation the Church had been content with punishing under the name of heretics those who ventured to proclaim doctrines inconsistent with her creed; the zeal engendered by the movement for reform prompted the punishment, though with somewhat milder penalties, of those who neglected or refused to take part in public worship as by law established. The first statutory provision was a very mild one. The Act of Uniformity (1 Eliz. cap. 2) after enacting that the Book of Common Prayer should be used in all churches and ordaining penalties for those who depraved it, provides (sect. 14) that "all and every person inhabiting within this realm, or any other the Queen's Majesty's dominions, shall diligently and faithfully, having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent, endeavour themselves to resort to their parish church or chapel accustomed, or upon reasonable let thereof,
to some usual place where common prayer and such service of God shall be used in such time of let, upon every Sunday, and other days ordained and used to be kept as holy days, and then and there to abide orderly and soberly during the time of the common prayer, preaching, or other service of God there to be used and ministered," upon pain of punishment by the censures of the Church and of forfeiting for every offence twelve pence to the use of the poor of the parish. The penalty was only small, but sufficient to cause all except the very wealthy to conform, especially as the law was strictly interpreted. Serjeant Hawkins\(^1\) says of it: "he who misbehaves himself in the church, or misses either morning or evening prayer, or goes away before the whole service is over, is as much within the statute as he who is wholly absent; and he who is absent from his own parish church shall be put to prove where he went to church." It was, however, thought too lenient and was supplemented by an Act to retain the Queen's Majesty's subjects in their due obedience (23 Eliz. cap. 1), sect. 5 of which ordains that every person above the age of sixteen years who does not attend church shall forfeit to the Queen's Majesty twenty pounds for every month's absence. This penalty was in addition to the forfeiture of twelve pence imposed by the Act of Uniformity, and a month was interpreted as a lunar month, so that thirteen penalties might be imposed every year. If the penalty was not paid, the offender was liable under a later statute (29 Eliz. cap. 6, sect. 4) to have all his goods and two-thirds of his lands seized to the use of the crown; one-third of his lands (if he was fortunate enough to be a landowner or a leaseholder) being left him for the maintenance and relief of his family. But even this was not enough. Twelve years later a still more stringent Act (35 Eliz. cap. 1) bearing the same title was passed. Any one who obstinately refused to come to church without any lawful cause, and in addition (1) persuaded any other person to

\(^1\) *Pleas of the Crown, Bk. I, cap. 10, sect. 4,*
abstain from going to church or receiving the communion administered according to the rites of the Church, or to be present at any unlawful assemblies, conventicles, or meetings, or (2) "either of himself or by the persuasion of any other" willingly joined in or was present at any such assemblies, conventicles, or meetings under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion contrary to that prescribed by the Act of Uniformity, was to be committed to prison until he should conform and make open submission and declaration of his conformity. If he did not conform within three months he was to abjure the realm of England and all the Queen's dominions for ever. If he refused to abjure or after abjuration did not depart out of the realm, he was to be adjudged a felon and suffer as in the case of felony (i.e. death and forfeiture of lands, goods, and chattels), without benefit of clergy.

Persons neglecting to come to church were called Recusants; and if they absented themselves because they were Papists, Popish Recusants. This latter class was subject to still further disabilities. In Elizabeth's reign they were not allowed to remove more than five miles from home without licence (35 Eliz. cap. 2). The alarm which succeeded the discovery of Gunpowder Plot—an event making so great an impression on the popular mind that its anniversary is still celebrated with more public enthusiasm than any other event in our history, not excepting the destruction of the Spanish Armada or the battle of Waterloo—caused the enactment of still more stringent measures. These were the Act for the better discovering and repressing of popish recusants (3 Jac. I, cap. 4) and the Act to prevent and avoid dangers which grow by popish recusants (3 Jac. I, cap. 5). As many of the provisions of these Acts might not have applied to Jews, it is unnecessary to enter into them here. One provision, however, which was undoubtedly not confined to Papists, cannot be passed over. By sect. 13 of the former Act "for the better trial how his Majesty's subjects stand affected in point of their loyalty
and due obedience," all persons over the age of eighteen who had been convicted or even merely indicted of any recusancy for not attending divine service, or who had not received the sacrament twice within the year might be compelled to take an oath, afterwards known as the oath of allegiance, the terms of which are set out in sect. 15. They are framed with the intention of being obnoxious to Papists, and expressly renounce and deny any authority to the Pope, so that many Roman Catholics who were ready to take the oath prescribed by the Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. cap. 1, sect. 19) found themselves unable to take the new oath, the last clause of which must have been unacceptable to a religious Jew. It reads as follows: "And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words without any equivocation or mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever: and I do make this recognition and acknowledgment heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian, So help me God." The oath itself was abolished in 1688 by the Bill of Rights (1 W. & M., sess. 2, cap. 1, sect. 3); but the final words, now for the first time introduced, were retained in other forms of oaths and declarations and, as will be hereafter shown, for a long time proved an insurmountable obstacle to the Jews in their struggle for the acquisition of political rights. The Acts contain other sections also which were not confined to Popish recusants; e.g., sects. 8 and 11 of the former enable the crown to refuse the penalty of twenty pounds a month for not attending church imposed by the statute of Elizabeth, and to seize and retain two-thirds of all the lands belonging to the offender, even although no default had been made in the payment of the penalty or the amount had been

1 Four years afterwards provision was made for more effectually administering this oath to persons neither indicted nor convicted of recusancy. See 7 Jac. I, cap. 6.
actually tendered. And by sects. 3 to 5 of the latter all persons with certain exceptions, who had not repaired to church for the space of three months, were ordered to depart from the city of London and ten miles compass of the same; and by sect. 8 of the same Act convicted recusants were disabled from holding legal, military, or naval offices, and from practising the professions of the law and medicine. Moreover, to prevent evasion of these penalties and disabilities by merely formal attendance at church, it was enacted that a recusant who conformed and repaired to church should also be required to take the sacrament of the Lord's Supper once at least every year.

Such was the legislation against recusants, which was not finally repealed until the middle of the last century. We are now able to sum up the legal position in which Jews, in the early years of Charles I's reign, when they undoubtedly began to settle here, would find themselves. There was no law to prevent their coming here. If the banishment in 1290 had been effected by royal proclamation, the force of that proclamation had long been spent; if on the other hand it had been by Act of Parliament, as many persons at that time believed, the Act itself had long been lost, and any Jew for whose expulsion legal process might be brought could challenge his adversary to produce the Act. If this initial difficulty had been got over and the court had been induced by reasoning similar to Prynne's that there must have been such an Act of Parliament and that it was lost, then it would remain to consider what effect that would have upon Jews coming to England in the reign of King Charles. The first precedent cited by Prynne is the Act banishing the Despensers, and it would have been necessary to assume, as Prynne does, that the Act banishing the Jews was in similar terms. The enacting words of that statute are as follows:

1 7 & 8 Vict. cap. 102 repealed most of the penal enactments so far as Roman Catholics were concerned; 9 & 10 Vict. cap. 59 repealed the remaining penal enactments, including those against Jews.
“Wherefore we Peers of the Land . . . do award that Sir Hugh le Despenser the Son and Sir Hugh le Despenser the Father, be disherited for ever . . . and that they be utterly exiled out of the land of England, without returning at any time, unless it be by the Assent of our Lord the King and by the Assent of the Prelates, Earls and Barons, and that in Parliament duly summoned . . . and if they do return, then be it done unto them, as enemies of the King and of the Kingdom.” Substitute the words “Jews in England” for the words “Sir Hugh le Despenser the Son and Sir Hugh le Despenser the Father” and it is seen at once that the Act would apply only to the persons actually banished, for there are no words to include heirs, issue, or children; but even if such words were embodied in the Act, it would have been quite impossible to prove that a Spanish Jew living in the seventeenth century was an heir, descendant, or in any wise connected with the English Jews, all of them of German origin, of the thirteenth century. The residence of Jews in England was therefore lawful, but they would of course be subject to all the laws which bound aliens living here; though they would not be liable to the disabilities imposed on the Judaei by the legislation of Henry III and Edward I, because the special status of serfdom or villenage to which those disabilities had been attached, though not legally abolished, had practically become obsolete. On the other hand, if they attempted to practise their religion they were liable to be charged with heresy in the ecclesiastical courts or to be summoned and persecuted by the Court of High Commission; in any case the common law would compel them to regularly take part in the services of a church, which they believed to be idolatrous. If they neglected to attend they were subject to severe penalties, and if in addition they took part in a Jewish service they could be made to abjure the realm, and should they still remain here they were guilty of felony and denied all benefit of clergy. Thus the

real impediments to a Jewish settlement were the impossibility of setting up a Jewish synagogue and the necessity of taking part in the religion of the established church. The first of these obstacles was not removed until the reign of Charles II; we will now explain how the second was obviated in the time of that king's father.

Before the commencement of the seventeenth century, it had become customary for the monarchs of Europe to maintain legations in each other's capitals, and these legations were, by the principles of international law, which were even at this time beginning to be recognized, regarded as extraterritorial—i.e. as not subject to the ordinary law of the land. Accordingly the law of heresy and the statutes against recusants would not apply to persons attached to any foreign embassy, but they would apply to all other foreigners coming to this country. Therefore on the marriage of Charles I with Henrietta Maria elaborate provision was made by treaty for the religion of the queen and her suite. However, in the treaty made with Spain in the year 1630 a clause was inserted which was interpreted as entitling all Spanish subjects, though not belonging to the embassy, to exemption from the penal laws against recusants. In express words the King of Spain undertook that subjects of the King of England who might be in his dominions for the purposes of commerce should not suffer any molestation or disturbance on account of their religion, provided that they gave no occasion for scandal. No similar promise was made by the King of England in respect of Spanish merchants, but the reason for this was that there were very few likely to remain here for more than one month and so render themselves liable to the laws against recusants, and it was well understood that the promise was reciprocal and that it would not be fulfilled unless a like measure of toleration was extended to Spanish subjects in England. It was

1 The treaty is printed in Rymer's Foedera. The words of clause 19 are:

"Et quia iura commercii quae ex pace consequuntur infrauctae reddi
shortly after the signature of this treaty that a few Jews ventured to permanently settle in England, but they came not as Jews but as Spaniards, and sheltering themselves under the protection of the treaty were able to avoid taking part in the services of the English church. They were crypto-Jews and thought by all their neighbours to be Catholics, and no doubt occasionally attended mass at the ambassador’s chapel, in order to ingratiate themselves with the embassy. Some had fled from Spain through fear of the Inquisition, but there is no evidence of any kind that they ever attempted to practise the Jewish religion here, and as it was necessary to keep on friendly terms with the representative of the Catholic king they were not likely to do anything to forfeit his protection. Among the earliest of these new comers was Antonio Fernandez Carvajal; he must have arrived here in or before the year 1635, long before the Great Rebellion commenced, for in the letters of denization which were granted to him by Cromwell on Aug. 17, 1655, he is described as having “for the space of twenty yeares and upwards been an Inhabitant in this nation.” When he had been here for some years he with other merchant strangers was prosecuted as a recusant, but the English merchants who had factors in Spain petitioned the House of Lords to stay the proceedings on the ground that the result of a convic-

non debent, prout redderentur si subditis Serenissimi Regis Angliæ dum eunt et redeunt ad Regna et Dominia dicti Serenissimi Regis Hispaniærum, et ibi ex causa commercii, vel negotii moram trahunt, eis molestia inferatur ex causa conscientiae, Ideo ut commercium sit tutum et securum tam in terra quam in mari, dictus Serenissimus Rex Hispaniarum curabit et providet, ne ex prædistrib causa conscientiae contra iura commercii molestentur et inquietentur, ubi scandalum alii non dederint.” Foedera, vol. VIII, pt. 3, p. 143 (edition of 1742). In the treaty of 1667, which was renewed by the treaty of Versailles in 1783, the same clause occurs, but the reciprocal clause is expressed, “and the said King of Great Britain shall likewise provide, for the same reasons, that the subjects of the King of Spain shall not be molested or disturbed for their conscience against the laws of commerce, so long as they give no public scandal or offence.” Hertslet’s Collection of Treaties, vol. II, p. 152.
tion would be that their own factors would be similarly treated in Spain and thereby be compelled either to forsake their religion or abandon the country, which would be a matter of great concernment, as there were above one hundred English subjects resident in Spain for every Spaniard resident here. The petition appears to have been granted and the proceedings stayed. Whether the other merchants attacked at the same time as Carvajal were also Jews we do not know, but we do know from the depositions in the Robles' case that there were at this time several other Jews in London who were or professed to be Spaniards and therefore obtained immunity from the penalties imposed upon recusants. It is important not to exaggerate this indulgence; it did not extend to the toleration of any sort of Jewish worship and it was itself withdrawn by the outbreak of the war with Spain in 1656.

This position could not have been satisfactory to the Jewish communities abroad. If they knew of the existence of and held communication with the crypto-Jews here, they must have seen that the situation of their brethren in England was little if at all better than that of the Marranos in Spain; they were bound to take part week by week in the idolatrous worship of the Protestant church or else to obtain the protection of the Spanish embassy, as the price of which they would have to be occasionally present at the no less objectionable Catholic mass, and furthermore to completely disguise their Jewish faith even to the extent of refraining from entering into the covenant of Abraham. In neither case could they meet for worship according to Jewish rites. The establishment of a synagogue or the organization of a community was impossible, and even private prayers could only be indulged in under the cover of the strictest secrecy.

At length a brighter prospect seemed to open out; the Great Rebellion had broken out and proved successful, and the Protestant Dissenters who had formerly inveighed against the persecution of the church and advocated universal toleration were invested with the powers of government. And yet in the moment of their triumph they forgot or repudiated the precepts and maxims which had been so dear to them in the hour of persecution. True it is that the law against heresy was practically repealed by the abolition of the Court of High Commission and the power of temporal punishment formerly exercised by the ecclesiastical courts, but the Parliament claimed the right to itself take cognizance of offences against religion, and in the assertion of this claim, which was not abandoned until the Restoration, inflicted penalties even more severe than those formerly imposed by the Court of High Commission. It was only with exceptional cases that it could itself deal, and accordingly in May, 1648, it made an Ordinance for punishing Blasphemies and Heresies. The ordinance enumerates eight distinct heresies or errors (including, for example, maintaining that Jesus Christ is not the Son of God and that the New Testament is not the word of God), and provides that persons found guilty of any of them, unless they recant and abjure their errors, shall suffer the pains of death as in case of felony, without benefit of clergy; if they recant they are to be imprisoned until they find sureties against a repetition of the offence, but if they repeat the offence after having recanted they are to suffer death as in case of felony without benefit of clergy. The ordinance also enumerates other errors, which are to be visited with less severe penalties. The laws against recusants were not interfered with, but the church services at which attendance was compulsory were to be

1 See the case of Paul Best, who had asserted that Christ was merely and properly a man (Goodwin, II, pp. 252 seq.), and James Nayler (5 State Trials, 801).

2 Scobell, part I, p. 149.
conducted in accordance with the new Service-book, called the Directory, which had recently been framed by the Westminster Divines; and two ordinances were passed, one in March, 1645, providing that "the Book of Common Prayer shall not be henceforth used, but the Directory for Publique Worship," and the other on the 23rd of August of the same year ordering "the Directorie to be put in execution with penalties for using the book of Common Prayer." The penalties were five pounds for the first offence, ten pounds for the second offence, and for the third offence "one whole year's imprisonment without bail or mainprize." These ordinances gave great satisfaction to the Presbyterians who possessed a majority in the Long Parliament, and who, having destroyed the power of the church were eager to establish their own form of worship and invest themselves with all the powers of the church they had supplanted, including the right to persecute all who held religious opinions different from their own. But this the Independents, who besides having a strong minority in the House, had the preponderating voice in the council of the army, which in those troublous times really governed the land, were bound to dispute. After a prolonged struggle the Independents gained the upper hand, and on December 6, 1648, succeeded with the help of the army in excluding their Presbyterian opponents from all share in the deliberations of the Parliament and the government of the nation. Again the party which had stood for toleration was successful, and the Jews who had long cast anxious eyes upon the growing commerce of England and desired to share it, were not slow to take advantage of so favourable an opportunity. The Council of Mechanics at Whitehall had at the end of December voted a toleration of all religions whatsoever, "not excepting Turkes nor Papists nor Jews." A petition on their behalf was prepared by the Jews of Amsterdam; it was in the name of Johanna

1 Scobell, part 2, pp. 75 and 97.
2 Pragmaticus, Dec. 19–26. The Council of War had also on Christmas
Cartwright a widow, and Ebenezer her son, freeborn of England, and resident in the city of Amsterdam, and prayed that the Statute of Banishment made against the Jews might be repealed and that they under the Christian banner of charity and brotherly love, might "be again received and permitted to trade and dwell in this Land as now they do in the Netherlands." The petition was presented to the General Council of the Officers of the Army, under the command of Lord Fairfax, at Whitehall on January 5, 1648, and favourably received with a promise to take it into speedy consideration "when the present more public affairs" were dispatched. The present more public affairs were the trial and execution of the king and the settlement of the government, and proved to be of such momentous concern that the petition of the Jews was completely overlooked; at least nothing was done upon it nor was the law altered or relaxed in their favour. And yet a belief was spread abroad that the petition had been granted. A circular was published by the disappointed and defeated Presbyterians entitled "the last damnable Designe of Cromwell and Ireton and their Junto or Caball," in which it is stated that "their real designe is to plunder and disarme the City of London and all the country round about . . . and so sell it (the plunder) in bulk to the Jews, whom they have lately admitted to set up their banks and magazines of Trade amongst us contrary to an Act of Parliament for their banishment." Nor was this belief confined to the political opponents of the dominant faction.


1 The petition was printed and there is a copy of it in the British Museum, King's Pamphlets, E 557, Art. 17, and is reprinted in Hag., Cons. Cases, vol. I, Ap. No. 1. For the whole transaction see the Clarke Papers, vol. II, p. 172; History of the Independence, part 2, pp. 60 and 63; and "A Perfect Diurnall of some passages in Parliament and the daily proceedings of the Army under His Excellency the Lord Fairfax, from Munday the 1 of Janu. till Munday the 8 of Janu. 1648."

2 History of the Independence [4to, 1649], at p. 61.
here, for in the collection of original letters found among the
Duke of Ormonde's papers is to be found the following:—

"Rouen, March 4th, 1649.

"This morning I happened to have some discourse with
a Jew that spake English, and asking him how he liked
the Parliament and Army of England, now they had
revoked the Laws that were made against the Jews; he
told me, that nevertheless he thought that there were no
such villains in the world as they are, and believed that
none of his Religion would ever adventure themselves
among such bloody traitors as had murdered their own
King.""

But yet no one at the present time would seriously
argue that the readmission of the Jews into England dates
from January, 1649, nor should we give more weight to
similar expressions which seem to indicate a successful
issue to the negotiations conducted by Menasseh Ben Israel
some six or seven years later, which in the end proved
equally abortive. The ascendency of the Independents
lasted till the death of Cromwell in 1658, but during the
whole of it, the law was in no way altered to the advantage
of the Jews. True, a milder ordinance was passed for
the punishment of atheistical, blasphemous and execrable
opinions; as for instance maintaining that there is neither
heaven nor hell, neither salvation nor damnation, the
penalty being six months imprisonment for the first offence
and banishment for the second, and if any one returned after
being banished he was to suffer as in case of felony without
benefit of clergy. This ordinance, cruel as it is, is milder
than the one passed by the Presbyterians in May, 1648,
for the extreme penalty could only be inflicted in the case
of a second offence, but the earlier ordinance was not
repealed, and as the offences enumerated by the two enact-
ments were different, both were technically in force at

the same time. The advocates of toleration throughout the period of their power showed no disposition to abandon the weapons of persecution:

*Et qui nolunt occidere quenquam
Posse volunt.*

It may be said on their behalf that the earlier and more cruel ordinance was never put into execution by them, but on the other hand there is no record of its having been enforced by the Presbyterians either, and the later ordinance was undoubtedly acted upon; the proceedings against George Fox, the Quaker, being a well-known instance.

Though the Independents did not repeal the law relating to blasphemy, they found it necessary to materially amend the laws against recusants. In spite of having obtained the supreme power, they formed, if numbers only were counted, a small if not insignificant minority of the general population. They had as strong objections to the new Directory as to the old Book of Common Prayer, nor could they hope to establish any form of worship which should be both consonant to their own religious ideas and acquiesced in by the other rival sects. Accordingly, shortly after the victory of Dunbar the Parliament passed an Act for the repeal of several clauses in Statutes imposing penalties for not coming to church. It recites that "divers religious and peaceable people, well-affected to the prosperity of the Commonwealth, have not only been molested and imprisoned, but also brought into danger of abjuring their country, or in case of return to suffer death as felons, to the great disquiet and utter ruin of such good and godly people, and to the detriment of the Commonwealth," and repeals all clauses of the Act of Uniformity (1 Eliz. cap. 2), and the Acts for retaining the Queen's subjects in their due obedience (35 Eliz. cap. 1, and 23 Eliz. cap. 1), and all clauses in any other Act whereby any penalty is imposed on any person whatsoever, for not repairing to their

1 Goodwin, vol. IV, p. 309.
respective parish churches. But the exemption from penalties was subject to this proviso, that “to the end that no profane or licentious persons may take occasion . . . to neglect the performance of religious duties . . . all and every person and persons within this Commonwealth . . . shall (having no reasonable excuse for their absence) upon every Lord’s day . . . diligently resort to some public place where the service and worship of God is exercised, or shall be present at some other place in the practice of some religious duty, either of prayer, preaching, reading, or expounding the scriptures or conferring upon the same.” Every person not so attending was to be deemed to be an offender against the law and proceeded against accordingly. This proviso would prevent any real measure of relief to the Jews, for attendance at a synagogue, if there had been one in existence, would assuredly not have been held to be a compliance with the Act. Should there be any doubt upon this point, it is cleared away by the religious clauses of the Instrument of Government; the document under which Oliver claimed to exercise his power as Lord Protector. The terms of the Instrument were finally settled before December 16, 1653, on which date it came into force. The clauses relating to religion are Articles 35, 36, and 37, and provide that the Christian religion shall be publicly professed, but that to this public profession none shall be compelled by penalties or otherwise, and all who professed faith in God by Jesus Christ (though differing from the doctrine publicly held forth) should be protected in the profession and exercise of their religion “so as they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts, provided this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as under the profession of Christ, hold forth and practise licentiousness.”

If one thing is certain among the doubts occasioned by

---

1 Ordinance of Sept. 27, 1650; Scobell, II, p. 131.
2 Gardiner’s Constitutional Documents, p. 324.
the hasty and manifold changes of law which took place during this revolutionary period, it is that freedom of worship was not extended even to all Christian sects; indeed, the majority, as events afterwards proved, were expressly excluded from protection by the last recited article, and no form of worship not in accordance with Christian dogma was at any time legal or authorized throughout the whole period.

Nevertheless, the Jews, encouraged by the reception their overtures had met with in the early part of 1649, had not given up their hopes. The Navigation Act which became law on October 9, 1651, caused such friction between England and the Dutch against whose carrying trade it was principally directed, that war between the two nations became almost inevitable, and actually broke out. While the war lasted the negotiations which had been carried on from Amsterdam were naturally suspended. In the month of April, 1654, peace was again proclaimed, and the negotiations were almost immediately resumed. Manuel Martinez Dormido, a member of the well-known family of the Abarbanel family, arrived in London early in September, and presented to the Protector two petitions for the readmission of the Jews. These were in due course recommended to the speedy consideration of the Council, but they met with the reception which throughout the interregnum was accorded to all attempts to relax the law in favour of the Jews; the Council did not see its way to make any order in the matter. But the cause was not yet hopeless; in the October of the year following, Menasseh ben Israel, brother-in-law to Dormido, and a learned Rabbi, came from Amsterdam to London, and was hospitably received by the Protector; who was willing to admit the Jews and even tolerate their worship, if conducted privately and without

1 Scobell, II, p. 176.
scandal, but who was at the same time determined not to risk a popular tumult which might not improbably break out if protection was extended to a strange religion without the previous sanction and approbation of the leaders of the people. It was with this view that a conference was summoned to meet at Whitehall to discuss the question. So much has recently been written about the conference and the events which led to it, that it will be sufficient here to extract from the old Parliamentary History the Narrative published by order of Cromwell and his Council 1.

"Whitehall, December 4.

"Divers eminent Ministers of the Nation, having been called hither by Letter from the Lord Protector, were present with his Highness and the Council in the Council-Chamber; when the following Proposals, made by certain Jews, of whom Rabbi Menasseh Ben Israel, of Amsterdam, was the Chief, were read to them.

"These are the Graces and Favours which, in the Name of my Hebrew Nation, I Menasseh Ben Israel do request of your Most Serene Highness, whom God make prosperous, and give happy Success to, in all your Enterprises, as your humble Servant doth wish and desire.

"1. The first Thing I desire of your Highness is, That our Hebrew Nation may be received and admitted into this puissant Commonwealth, under the Protection and Safe-guard of your Highness even as the Natives themselves. And, for greater Security in Time to come, I do supplicate your Highness to cause an Oath to be given (if you shall think it fit) to all the Heads and Generals of Arms to defend us upon all Occasions.

"2. That it will please your Highness to allow us public Synagogues, not only in England, but also in all other Places under the Power of your Highness; and to observe in all Things our Religion, as we ought.

3. That we may have a Place or Cemetery, out of the Town, to bury our Dead, without being troubled by any.

4. That we may be permitted to traffic freely in all Sorts of Merchandise, as others.

5. That (to the end those who shall come may be for the utility of the People of this Nation, and may live without bringing Prejudice to any, and not give Offence) your Most Serene Highness will make Choice of a Person of Quality, to inform himself of and receive the Passports of those who shall come in; who, upon their Arrival, shall certify him thereof, and oblige themselves, by Oath, to maintain Fealty to your Highness in this Land.

6. And (to the Intent they may not be troublesome to the Judges of the Land, touching the Contests and Differences that may arise betwixt those of our Nation) that your Most Serene Highness will give License to the Head of the Synagogue, to take with him two Almoners of his Nation to accord and determine all the Differences and Process, conformable to the Mosaic Law; with Liberty, nevertheless, to appeal from their Sentence to the Civil Judges; the Sum wherein the Parties shall be condemned being first deposited.

7. That in case there have been any Laws against our Jewish Nation, they may, in the first Place and before all Things, be revoked; to the end that, by this Means, we may remain with the greater Security under the Safeguard and Protection of your Most Serene Highness.

Which things your Most Serene Highness granting to us, we shall always remain most affectionately obliged to pray to God for the Prosperity of your Highness, and of your illustrious and sage Council, that it will please him to give happy Success to all the undertakings of your Most Serene Highness. Amen.'

"The Ministers having heard these Proposals read, desired Time to consider of them, and the next Day was spent in Prayer and Fasting."
"Dec. 7. This Day, in the Afternoon, a Conference was held with the Ministers about these Proposals, in the Presence of his Highness the Lord Protector, the Lord President Lawrence, Lord Lambert, Lord Fiennes, and divers more of the Council, with the Lord Chief Justice Glynn, and the Lord Chief Baron Steel. Of the Ministers there were Dr. Thomas Goodwin, Dr. Wilkinson, Dr. Tuckney, Mr. Manton, Mr. Nye, Mr. Bridge, and many others; but nothing being concluded on, another Conference was appointed to be held on the next Wednesday. Accordingly,

"Dec. 12. The Conference was renewed in a Withdrawing Room in the Presence of the Lord Protector, where a Committee of the Council were met by the greatest Part of the Ministers and other Persons, approved by his Highness to take the said Proposals into Consideration; but nothing then resolved upon.

"Dec. 14. There was another Conference on the same Subject. And,

"Dec. 18. The Committee broke up without coming to any Resolution or even a further Adjournment.'

"The Narrative concludes with this Remark, 'That his Highness, at these several Meetings, fully heard the Opinions of the Ministers touching the said Proposals; expressing himself thereupon with Indifference and Moderation, as one that desired only to obtain Satisfaction in a Matter of so high and religious a Concernment; there being many glorious Promises recorded in Holy Scripture, concerning the Calling and Convention of the Jews to the Faith of Christ. But the Reason why nothing was concluded upon was, because his Highness proceeded in this, as in all other Affairs, with good Advice and mature Deliberation.'"

Thus the famous Conference resulted, like all the attempts made during the interregnum, in nothing being done and no alteration in the law being made; Cromwell's
good-will was not proof against the prejudice which was displayed at the Conference and which was rampant among the mob outside. Nor did the Lord Protector, actuated as he was at this time by the motives of the astute politician rather than by the feelings of the religious enthusiast, care to press the cause of religious toleration in the teeth of popular opposition; and yet he did not give the petitioners a formal dismissal. And so Rabbi Menasseh remained in London, but with far different hopes to those he cherished on his first arrival. On March 24 of the following year he again took part with six other Jews in presenting a petition to the Protector. The boons prayed for by the petitioners were now very small; they were two only, (1) protection in writing for meeting privately in their own houses for purposes of devotion; (2) a license to bury their dead in a convenient place without the city. But even this petition was not granted. It was referred to the consideration of the Council and no answer was ever returned to it. A few days later, on April 10, Menasseh published his *Vindiciae Iudaeorum*, his last effort to gain the cause he had come to plead. Speaking of the Conference he says: "Mens judgements and sentences were different. Insomuch, that as yet, we have had no finall determination from his Serene Highnesse. Wherefore those few Jewes that were here, despairing of our expected successe, departed hence. And others who desired to come hither, have quitted their hopes, and betaken themselves some to Italy, some to Geneva, where that Commonwealth hath at this time most freely granted them many and great priviledges." But Menasseh, though his *Vindiciae* effected nothing, though no response came to his second petition with its very humble prayer, still stayed behind at his post, hoping against hope. In September, 1657, his son Samuel died in his house, and the pious father having solemnly promised to take his

---

1 *Vindiciae Iudaeorum*, the seventh section.
mortal remains to Holland and lay them to rest in consecrated soil there, "at length with his heart ever broken with griefe on losing heer his only sonne and his presious time with all his hopes in this iland he got away with so much breath as lasted, till he came to Midleburg and then he dyed." His mission had proved an utter failure.

H. S. Q. Henriques.

1 Petition of John Sadler to Richard Cromwell (S. P. Dom. Inter., cc. 8), and Petition from Menasseh to Olivar, Sept. 17, 1657 (S. P. Dom. Inter., clvi. 89), both printed in Wolf's Menasseh Ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell, p. lxxxvii.
AUTO DE FÉ AND JEW.

VI.

TUDOR ENGLAND, SPAIN, AND THE JEWS.

Englishmen must regard with interest the part played by Jews in the royal divorce which convulsed Europe, offended Spain, and led to the establishment of the English Church by Henry VIII. Jews in Venice, Bologna, and Rome were consulted on the divorce case by Stokesley, the king's solicitor, during the year 1530. Chapuys writes\(^1\) to Charles V to tell how King Henry had sent a dispatch to Rome, "to bring over an old Jew, now here, who says he can prove incontrovertibly that the king's marriage (to Katharine of Arragon, the betrothed of his deceased brother) was unlawful," and Chapuys goes on to say that he has "advised Messire Mai of this, so that should the Jew be a man of such learning and parts as to inspire confidence, he (Mai) may prevail on the Pope to stop his coming (to England), at least until his arguments have been heard," so that Bishop Gardiner might be instructed how to reply to them.

A little later on Messire Mai writes\(^2\) to the Emperor that "Your Majesty will be glad to hear that this very year one among the Roman Jews has been compelled to marry his brother's widow—not only not prohibited, but actually enjoined by Jewish law,"—a curious instance of the irony of fate—a Spanish king, grandson of Ferdinand and

---

\(^1\) Calendar of State Papers (Spanish), 1531-33, 61, 558, 869.

\(^2\) Ibid., 739; and see Lucien Wolf's paper on "Anglo-Jewish History, 1390-1656" in the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition Papers, and the authorities there cited, including an entry how Henry "swore to persecute without mercy any cursed Jew in his dominions."
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Isabella, trying to save his sister from divorce by appeal to the Jewish law of גומא as practised in the ghetto.

Later on the "Jew in Rome is to be brought over to England." Then Charles the Fifth's faithful servant promptly reports that, "the king takes with him to Calais a legion of doctors and priests who hold for the divorce, and likewise the Jew who came from Venice at his bidding."

The British Museum has a note on the subject, by one of the Rabbis whom the king consulted, which has been published by Kaufmann. The Rev. Michael Adler, in his history of the "Domus Conversorum," gives several instances of references to Jews in England during the Tudor period. Between 1492 and 1581 two Jews and five Jewesses were admitted to the Domus as converts—all of them seem to have come from the Peninsula. Elizabeth Portingale (i.e. of Portugal) was the first, and reached London in the very year of the expulsion from Spain, Menda (Mendes?) and Massa were the last.

Shortly after the divorce had been settled in a manner unsatisfactory to Spain, trouble began with the ill-treatment of English subjects by the Inquisition. These were mostly seamen adventuring on the Spanish Main. In 1534 we read of two Englishmen imprisoned for having heretical books in their possession, and throughout the remainder of Henry's reign, and the whole of Elizabeth's, there are constant references and protests to such violation of the Law of Nations, and as Foxe's Book of Martyrs testifies, many Lutherans were burnt at the stake. Thus we read of Englishmen who go to Spain to trade, and English prisoners of the Inquisition at Seville, and Queen Elizabeth sending Sir John Smith to Spain on a mission respecting

---

1 Cal. of State Papers, ibid., p. 761, and ibid., p. 535.
2 Ar. Or. 151, quoted in Revue des Études Juives, XXX, 309.
3 Exchequer Accounts, Bundles 253, Nos. 8, 17, and 15; 254, No. 3; 255, Nos. 10 and 11, and Foreign and Domestic Papers, 24 Henry VIII.
4 State Papers (Spanish), 1534, pp. 164, 296, 412.
them, and English merchants trafficking with Spain presenting a petition concerning the Inquisition in 1576. Throughout this period Jews, mostly from Spain and Portugal, seem to have come to England for the purposes of commerce, and some to have settled here. Theoretically any Jew's property was forfeit to the Crown, in practice he was left alone, and the police and the neighbours seem to have connived at his presence. Nathaniel Menda, the convert above referred to, was six years in London before his conversion, poor but unmolested. Lee has shown how a Spanish Jew, Lopes, practised here as Elizabeth's physician. Even a cursory investigation of our official records shows other instances. Thus in the Acts of the Privy Council we read of a "Dispute between the King and certeyne marchawntes strawngers probably suspected to be Juis." These are later on described as "Portugalles suspected of Judaisme," and were ultimately, in 1542, declared to be Christian men. In 1543 we read of Portuguese Jews imprisoned in London and released by special request of the King and Queen of Portugal! Again one Henry Alveros or Alvaros (Alvarez?) is in 1546 able to disprove a similar charge, and at a council holden at Hampton Court a man was purged of the charge of "defrauding the King's Majesty of his interest in the goods of Alveros in case he had been proved a Jewe."

Alvarez was more fortunate than "Doctour Armande" (Fernandez?) who in 1562 was tried by the Privy Council, "esteemed to be a Jewe and judged to ryde through the streetes in a carte" by way of punishment and disgrace.

The troublous and anxious time prior to the defeat of the Spanish Armada was occupied by England in various negotiations with the enemies of Spain. Then, as now,
Constantinople was a hotbed of intrigue, but the Turk was a strong man then and in the refugees from the Peninsula he had shrewd and trusty advisers. It is not generally known that Rabbi Solomon, the Portuguese Jew, was the honest broker of the first Anglo-Turkish Alliance in 1587. The Venetian delegate at Constantinople writes to the Doge and Senate: "Since the news of the defeat of the English . . . the English Ambassador frequents the houses of the Pashas . . . and of the Jew, Salamon the Portuguese, who is well acquainted with Indian affairs. Sultan promises fleet to annoy the King of Spain and give satisfaction to the English."

Next year saw the defeat of the Spanish Armada, and England could do without Turkish help, but even in 1599 Elizabeth corresponds with another Turkish official, also a refugee from Spain, but this time a Jewess—Esperanza Malchi, the Sultana's secretary. A year or two previously, as Graetz recounts, the lovely Maria Nunez and a whole shipload of fugitive Marranos were captured by the English, and received so graciously by the Queen that Maria Nunez had the refusal of the hand of an English duke!

VII.

THE STORY OF JOSÉ DIAZ PIMIENTA.

(From the Spanish of J. M. M. de Espinosa.)

FRAJ OSE DIAZ PIMIENTA was born in the island of Havana. His father was a Spaniard, and his mother a Creole. Both were nobles and "Cristianos viejos," that is to say, there was no admixture of Jewish blood in their veins. At the age of ten years he is said to have attempted suicide by taking poison. At fifteen he was a novice at

1 Col. of State Papers (Venetian), 1581-91, p. 324.
a convent in the island of Cartagena, where he seems to have displayed artistic rather than religious tastes, so much so that, hearing that the Spanish Vicar-General was about to visit Cartagena, he fled to the island of Curacao, in "Holland where the heretics and Jews live," and joined them. Denying the faith of Jesus Christ, he became an apostate and heretic, and followed the law of Moses, which he held in great love. He had himself circumcised with all due rites and ceremonies, and took as his name Abraham Diaz Pimienta, and then afterwards he married a Jewess. The Spanish account says that he became a pirate, and on one occasion received a wound with a cutlass. On his recovery he was appointed by the Jews schoolmaster to teach the law of Moses to their sons. He spent some time in this employment, but was ultimately apprehended in the street, when they slit his nose with a knife without otherwise injuring him. Handed over to the Inquisition of Cartagena, he confessed his crimes and begged for mercy. Eventually he had to march out in procession as a penitent wearing the sombenito in the public Auto de Fé held in the convent of San Domingo in Cartagena, and was condemned to be exiled from America, and taken to Spain, where he was to remain a recluse in a convent of his Order for the rest of his life. He was placed on a ship of the Miflona (with the protocol of his case), and guarded with other prisoners, but he endured the voyage so impatiently, and his imprecations and blasphemies were such, that the sailors determined to throw him into the sea if they had to suffer any more trouble with him. As soon as the boat arrived at Cadiz, the captain handed over the prisoner to the Bishop and to the Commissary of the city. They put him in the ecclesiastical prison, and there he remained for three months. He begged the Commissary to remove his chains and alleviate his imprisonment, but when he saw that this was refused he broke the outer wall of the prison and escaped with another prisoner, leaving a paper writing to say that he escaped because
of the ill-treatment he had received, and that if any one
was sick of his life he might go and look out for him.
He made for the city of Jerez, and betook himself to his
convent, where he was held for some days and treated
without harshness, being permitted to go to the choir and
to confess every four days, but not to administer the
sacrament, as he had no licence from the Tribunal to do
this. But notwithstanding this liberty he took every
opportunity to speak badly of the said Tribunal, saying
that they were more cruel than pirates. He took advantage
of his cunning and sagacity to write a letter to a rich
Jew of the city of Jerez, telling him his troubles, and
begging him to come to the convent to see him, as he
wished to talk with him; and, in order that there might
be no doubt that he was a Jew, he wrote down some words
which the Jews of Curacao spoke during the ceremony
of circumcision. The Jew was much vexed to receive the
letter, and said that he did not understand Latin, and that
he was unable to come to the convent. So he wrote a
second letter to another Jew of Jerez, saying how that he
was a Jew and wished to speak to him in the convent,
where he expected him, and, in order to be recognized
without asking questions, he was to wear a green ribbon
on his left wrist, adding that the said Jew would
recognize him by his slit nose. There was no answer to
this letter, nor did the Jew go to see him, and so he wrote
a third time to a Jew of the city of Cadiz, begging of him
twenty-five doubloons; but his letters remained un-
answered. All of which the said Fray Jose confessed he
had done in order to trick the Jews, for he was not con-
verted in his heart, but had only pretended conversion in
order to get money to go back to Curacao, and to avenge
himself, and kill all the Jews who had circumcised him
and were the cause of his destruction. For this purpose
he wrote a letter to the King, and another to the Duke
of Verugoas, seeking to obtain permission from his
Majesty to go to conquer the island of Curacao, offering
to pay for the permission 6,000 dollars. But when he saw his hopes frustrated he wrote commentaries on chapters li and lii of Isaiah, giving the explanations thereto given by the Jews. He wrote this for transmission to the Jew of Jerez, begging him to give the signal of the ribbon, but could not send it off because he had no safe messenger, and judging that he was punished by God, and that no Jew would help him after he had given up the law of Moses, he wrote a letter to the Commissary of Jerez to the following effect:

Though for a time I held it my highest happiness to have deserted the law of Moses for that of Jesus Christ, now I hold it for my highest happiness to have arrived at the knowledge that the law of Moses is the most certain and sure. I would live and die therein, and would give a thousand lives for it in cruel martyrdom, and now sign myself Abraham Diaz Pimienta.

And the postscript added: Although I must die by burning and am near thereto, I am surprised that they have not yet taken me to the Tribunal of the Inquisition, in order that I may gain a thousand lives in its fire.

This letter he sent to the Commissary of Jerez, but on the same day took flight and escaped from the convent by the garden. When he arrived at that city he freighted a ship for Cadiz, and when he reached Puebla de Coria he found an English boat and asked the captain to take him to London, and related to him all his troubles. But the captain excused himself and said that if he took Pimienta he would lose his ship, his fortune, and his life, but Pimienta could easily follow on to Lisbon. He obeyed this advice, and by way of Seville proceeded to Lisbon, where he found an English ship laid up three days for repairs, and asked the captain to take him to Amsterdam or Jamaica. The captain refused, as he was a Spaniard, but suggested that he could go to Jamaica in another Dutch ship which was there. When all was ready he went
on shore one day, and recognizing the evil of his ways refused to re-embark, but changed his clothes in a wood and went to the city of Seville. The same day he presented himself at the College of S. Laureano, which was of his Order, and confessed his sins to the Father Rector, asking to be handed over to the Inquisition, and craved forgiveness.

Two days he stayed in the City College, whence he was taken to the Convent of Our Lady of Mercy, a great building of that city, and afterwards brought to the Inquisition.

He was charged with being a heretic, apostate, and Jew, but was defended by his advocate with great sagacity and vivacity, saying that his conversion was true and that he had written the letters with the intention of extracting money from the Jews and avenging himself on them for his circumcision; and that the letter to the Commissary was with the intention of flight, in order that if they should catch him they should not place him in the convent and that the Jews should favour him, substantiating these arguments by the fact that when he had reached Cadiz he could have gone to Gibraltar and thence to wherever he pleased, but instead thereof he presented himself at the convent of Jerez. So also he could have betaken himself at Lisbon to the Dutch ship, but did not do so, but on the contrary came to Seville and presented himself at S. Laureano, but did not go direct to the Tribunal because he was indecently clad, as he wanted both frock and "cerquillo." By these and other arguments he defended himself against the Fiscal's charges, and sought to prove that his conversion was genuine.

The Tribunal placed him in strict confinement, where he remained some time, but this was afterwards relaxed. One night the Alcaide entering his cell to put a light in the pumpkin, he became greatly excited and begged and prayed, saying, "Let the Tribunal understand that it is no good forcing me; they are making a mistake. I will not obey, for that I am a Jew and mean to live and die in the
law of Moses,” quoting as his authority the Apostle St. Paul in Gal. v, “Every man that receiveth circumcision is a debtor to do the whole law.” On the following day he was taken to the hearing of his case, and when asked whether he wished to alter or change his pleas, he answered “Yes,” stating that all his life he had been an enemy of deceit, but what he had said was false, and the truth was that he was a Jew in his heart and regarded the law of Moses as the true and sure path to salvation, and not that of Jesus Christ, and that he wished to be burned and to give his life for it a thousand times, that he knew well that theologians would come and argue with him, but that none would be able to convince him. When he was asked what he thought of the mystery of the Most Sacred Trinity, he replied that he had always believed in one God only, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, according to chapter xxxii of Deuteronomy; and when he was asked what he thought of the maternity and purity of the Most Holy Mary, he replied that she had never existed, inasmuch as the Messiah could have neither father nor mother, according to the prophecy of Isaiah, “Who shall tell his birth?” and that he knew not what to say; and when he was asked what he thought of the person of Jesus Christ, he replied that he was not the promised Messiah, for whom he was still waiting, and that Jesus was only a son of God in the same way as are all men, though he had always regarded him as a holy and lofty counsellor; and that as for the observance of the law of Moses which he kept, he had in prison observed the fasts from sunset to sunset, and recited the Psalms of Degrees, the Benedicte and Cantemus domino gloriose, all without the Gloria Patri, that he had always covered his head with a cap and would show courtesy to no judge while thus charged with religious crime. Then he was taken to the Fiscal, who asked him to appoint an advocate to defend him, and he replied that it was not necessary, for he had no advocate but God. His advocate being unable to
A Jew because of his obstinacy, warned him that he would be burnt without fail. He replied that this was what he wished, he would give his life for the law of Moses, and thereby assure his salvation. The hearing was three times adjourned, then he confessed and ratified all that he had said. He said that he could not help but be a Jew for the sake of the Holy God of Israel, and that the sooner they burnt him, the sooner he would die for his faith. The Court found him an impenitent, and ended the case by pronouncing him an "escomulgado," a heretic, an apostate Jew, a Judaizer fallen from the faith and impenitent. The proceedings and his statement and confession were read over, and he was asked to sign the same, but he replied that he could not sign that day as it was the Sabbath, a holy day among the Jews, and that another should sign it. When the Tribunal saw that the prisoner was incorrigible, it adjudged that he should be publicly degraded from all his Orders and should be handed over to the Secular Arm in order to be burnt alive, and before his execution it ordered that, for the space of three months, men of great learning and recognized virtue of the city should preach to him and convert him.

It were useless to describe how these theologians, critics, and men of singular virtue laboured to convert him because of the scandal which he had given to his religion and the Church, inasmuch as he was a priest. He maintained that one could find salvation as well in the law of Moses as in that of Jesus Christ, but was ultimately corrected of this error and convinced that only in Jesus Christ and not otherwise could he find salvation.

On the eve of the Auto de Fé he lay down a little after dinner, and when he rose he said, "Is there no remedy; must I burn alive?" They sent for the Master of the Capuchin novices, whom he did not know and had never seen, for the P. Rector of S. Laureano, and for the P. Regent of San Tomas. To them he made confession and appealed for clemency. On the following day, the 25th
of July, 1720, at dawn he was absolved from excommunica-
tion and communicated with much unction. At six in
the morning, with five other prisoners, he left the Court,
carrying a crucifix in his hands and dressed as a "Mer-
cenario," with two priests supporting him. Holy men of
all Orders, and especially his own, accompanied him. The
crowd was very great. He reached the convent of St. Paul,
where the Auto was to take place, mounted the platform
without the least fear, and holding the crucifix in his
hands he said in a loud voice these solemn words. "The
errors of my youth caused me to follow the law of Moses, by
aid of which I explained sundry texts of Scripture. For
this reason I am thus disgraced, but by the grace of God
I am now convinced, and the wounds of our Lord have con-
verted me," whereon he kissed the feet of the crucifix and
wept. "Would that I were in the land of the Moors or in
Mequinez, to give my life for the Catholic faith." He said
no more, sentence was pronounced, and accompanied by the
judges he went from the convent of St. Paul to the Plaza de
San Francisco, where a sumptuous theatre and magnificent
throne had been erected. Here sat Jose de Esquibel, Bishop
of Licopoli, of the Order of San Domingo, in his pontifical
robes, and many clergy of all Orders, and all the nobles
of Seville. The prisoner mounted the platform, and in the
presence of that huge crowd clothed himself with all his
sacred vestments, from the amice to the chasuble and
chalice. Then he knelt down and the ceremony of degra-
dation began. The Bishop divested him of his sacred
garments, and appeared much moved, and could not restrain
his tears. When his religious garb had been quitted,
P. M. Mendoza, critic of the Holy Office, also of his Order,
handed him over to the Secular Arm, begging on the part
of the Inquisition that they should treat the prisoner with
pity. They took him to another majestic theatre, where
beneath a canopy stood the Lieutenant Mayor, don Alonso
de los Rios, who having regard to the circumstances con-
demned him to be garrotted and then burnt.
A learned and Christian statement was read and listened to by the prisoner, who without making any disturbance signed the same with his hand, after which, because of the great heat, the garrotting was postponed till six in the evening. He was taken to the Royal Prison and entered the chapel, where he ate with good appetite and lay down awhile. Between five and six they roused him to go to the "Quemadero," and on the road he showed his true repentance. He reached the place of punishment and was then embraced tenderly by all the priests who accompanied him. In a loud voice he begged pardon of all for the bad example which he had given, and especially of his Order for that he had disgraced his sacred garb, and loudly declared and confessed to all the public that he died in the faith of Jesus Christ, which was the true one, and that he believed and confessed all that Mother Church believed and confessed, and that he died therein, and he besought all to follow the Church and never betray her. He himself having fallen away from the faith for a time had, through his youthful vices, come to that situation, and he begged that they might now burn him alive and treat him with no compassion, for that his crimes required the greatest punishment. Finally the sentence was executed, and he died with a great show of repentance. Then they placed a coroza¹ on him and a gown of "llamas," and his body was burned to ashes.

This was one of the greatest days ever seen in the city of Seville, not only because of the great crowd which was twelve leagues in circumference, but because such a case had never been seen before. The whole city and nobility of Seville assisted, and in their Christian piety ordered an infinite number of masses to be said for his soul, and all the religious Orders, nuns as well as monks, kept great days of penitence, fasting, and discipline. The prisoner was 32 years of age when he died.

¹ A coronet of strong paper worn as a mark of infamy.
### VIII.

**Supplementary Table of Autos de Fé celebrated in Spain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 1459</td>
<td>?Barcelona</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>1 victim burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 1481</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Kateylerling</td>
<td>Between these dates there were 3, 4 or more autos celebrated each year in Saragossa, the capital of Arragon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4, 1481</td>
<td>Saragossa</td>
<td>Kayserling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 13, 1486</td>
<td>?Monçon</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 17, 1487</td>
<td>?Barcelona</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 24, 1487</td>
<td>?Saragossa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14, 1487</td>
<td>Lerida</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 18, 1488</td>
<td>Monçon</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 1488</td>
<td>Huesca</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 1489</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 11, 1490</td>
<td>Saragossa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 1491</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 1491</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 8, 1495</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kayserling, Gottheil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 28, 1505</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>Kayserling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 17, 1505</td>
<td>Saragossa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 5, 1506</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 1506</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 1511</td>
<td>Saragossa</td>
<td>Kayserling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This list is mainly compiled from additional information supplied by Dr. Kayserling of Buda-Pesth and Professor Richard Gottheil of New York in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for October, 1901, XIV, 136-140 and 80-87. Their articles are here cited as "Kayserling" and "Gottheil" respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 18, 1523</td>
<td>Saragossa</td>
<td>Kayserling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23, 1524</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 28, 1528</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 28, 1539</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 1559</td>
<td>Valladolid</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>29 Jews killed&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 13, 1560</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Calendar of State Papers, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 25, 1567</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>2 burnt, 55 reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 29, 1571</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4 burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 18, 1571</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>James Bolen (Bullen or Boleyn) of Scotland burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 30, 1596</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 1600</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2, 1604</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 6, 1604</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Manuel de Almeyda, a victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15, 1619</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1624</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Kayserling</td>
<td>50 prisoners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 28, 1627</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Tiepolo, Ambassador with King Philip, writes to the Doge concerning this Auto as follows:—"A fortnight ago last Sunday an act was performed at Murcia which is called at Toledo an Act of Inquisition, whereat 29 individuals were burnt as Jews and amongst them some chief personages (uomeni principali), so that the confiscating their property will yield the king upwards of 400,000 ducats. I have already informed your Serenity that a Jew whilst a prisoner in that city corrupted a great part of the population, and how the plot was discovered, so punishment of the culprits has not yet ended. The 29 persons who were burnt lately were all impenitent, but if they had recanted and demanded mercy even at the last their lives would have been spared, though with loss of their property and freedom, by virtue of a privilege to this effect which is enjoyed by the kingdoms of Murcia, Granada, Aragon, Catalonia and Valencia, but which is not conceded to those of Castile, where, unless recantation be made within a certain period, the individual who omits to make it is necessarily put to death." Calendar of State Papers (Venetian).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 21, 1627</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>57 Jewish victims. Dr. Vas da Silba a victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 22, 1628</td>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Don Lope de Piera burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 1630</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Schwab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1634</td>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>Gotthiel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 1644</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Menasseh ben Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Valladolid</td>
<td>&quot;Mikveh Israel&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 12, 1654</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>Schwab</td>
<td>12 Jewish victims. Ishack de Almeida Bernal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 1655</td>
<td>Compostella</td>
<td>Elogios que</td>
<td>martyrred &quot;sobrino del otro Martir.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galicia</td>
<td>zelosos os</td>
<td>My copy contains a MS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dedicaron a la</td>
<td>&quot;soneto&quot; of 14 lines,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>felice</td>
<td>dedicated to this young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>memoria</td>
<td>Isaac Bernal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18, 1655</td>
<td>Compostella</td>
<td>Steinschneider,</td>
<td>Abraham, father of Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Galicia</td>
<td>Bodleian</td>
<td>Athias, the printer of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalogue, p.176</td>
<td>&quot;זאצני ורמאנה&quot; burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 30, 1661</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>8 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 1663</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24 &quot;reos.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 1664</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>22 &quot;reos.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6 and 9,</td>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>23 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13, 1675</td>
<td>Mallorca</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>50, 52, and 62 victims,分别.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6, 23,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>46 and 13 victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 30, 1679</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3 and 28,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Kohut in Am.</td>
<td>Manoel Delgado reconciled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procs. IV, 108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 7, 1691</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>3 burned, 34 strangled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1 and 6,</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>25 victims at each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 1691</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>At this auto perished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 30, 1693</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>José Díaz Pimientos, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25, 1720</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Jud.&quot;Sev.</td>
<td>adventurer. Vide ante VII.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Autos Celebrated in Portugal and its Colonies

(Mostly from MSS. A 4, 34–37 (Inventario 166–169) in the Bibliotheca Nacional de Lisboa.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15, 1721</td>
<td>Mallorca</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>Dec. 16, 1725</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Gottheil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 1722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 1723</td>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18, 1726</td>
<td>Llerena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1776</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 7, 1781</td>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Haydn’s Dictionary of Dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Juan Rodriguez, a Bayonne condemned. Louis Castellane, a physician, the victim. A witch burnt.

---

1 These particulars were extracted by the kindness of the Librarian, Sr. D. Alberto Carlos da Silva, and their source is here cited as “MSS. Lisb.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>Menasseh b. Israel 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574(3)</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1605(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582(2)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1609(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588(2)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1615(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1618(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1618(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1619(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1619(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599(3)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1621(3)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1621(4)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Quoted in Zedner's *Auswahl Historischer Stücke*, p. 144. At this auto Pater Diego de Assunca was burnt for refusing to inform against judaizing Marranos.

2 Quoted in Zedner's *Auswahl Historischer Stücke*, p. 144.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 29,</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>April 2,</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>Silva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silva.</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>Silva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1645 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 2,</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1645 (3)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Silva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630 (2)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1647</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2. MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1647 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1648 (2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1650 (2)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1650 (4)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td></td>
<td>1653 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geddes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 20,</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1654 (3)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>Silva.</td>
<td>1656 (3)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1656 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1657 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1658</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kayserling and Gott-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640 (2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>Silva.</td>
<td>1658 (2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>heil, J. Q. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Silva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1660 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nieto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>Silva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
- Silva.
- MSS. Lisb.
- I. Silva.
- 1. Silva.
- 1-2. MSS. Lisb.
Geddes describes the auto da fé at Lisbon of May 10, 1682, as the "gravest and most terrible of the Portuguese inquisition," and adds that many of its dramatic personae were exported to Brazil as penitent new Christians.

Mr. Solomon Schloss has drawn my attention to a volume in his library dealing with this auto and called *Sermão do Auto da Fé... na Praça do Rocio...*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>Ex Valencia Auto, April 2, 1724.</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Liab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>1. Silva</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3. MSS. Liab.</td>
<td>1717(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>Haydn’s <em>Dictionary of Dates</em>, 20th ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>1. Silva</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30 and Nov. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2. MSS. Liab.</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>2. Geddes</td>
<td>1718(3)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>MSS. Liab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>MSS. Liab.</td>
<td>1719(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1719(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>1. Rel. Bodl.</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710(2)</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>1. Silva</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711(2)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>MSS. Liab.</td>
<td>1720(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1721(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Liab.</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>1. Silva</td>
<td>1723(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalogue de Vente de Castro, No. 570.</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSS. Liab.</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lisboa...em Presença de suas Altezas. Pregado pelo I. & R. S D. Diogo da Annuncianam Justiniano...Arcebispo que foi de Orangâor (Lisbon, 1705). This is an 8vo volume of 89 pages, but is evidently a reprint, probably of 1724. In the same volume is bound up a similar one of 104 pages, entitled *Respuesta al Sermon predicado por el Arcebispo de Orangâor...1705*. For the Author of las Noticias Reconditas de la Inquisicion. Obra Posthuma impressa en Villa-Frana por Carlos Vero a la Insignia de la Verdad. Mr. Schloss also possesses the “Noticias Reconditas” here referred to. The author is described as “Anonimo,” and its (fictitious) place and date are given as “Villa Franca, 1722.” It is also a dual volume similar in size, paper, and print to the “Sermam.” Of the two parts the first is in Portuguese and the second in Spanish (“Castellano”). Both works are written by the London Haham David Nieto, and published in London, the City of Freedom, “Villa Franca.” They are here referred to as “Nieto.” The former was translated into English by Moses Mocatta, The *Inquisition and Judaism*, London, 1845, and Philadelphia, 1860; vide Gaster’s *History of the Ancient Synagogue of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews*, London, 1901.

1 A contemporary *London Gazette*, 1723, 6207/1, announces “There will be an Auto da Fé in the Church of the Monastery of St. Dominick” (Lisbon); vide Murray’s Dictionary sub voce Auto da Fê.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Rel. Bodl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>Silva.</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9,</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
<td>1747(2)</td>
<td>Oct. 20,</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Silva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1752(2)</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732(3)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732(7)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734(2)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>Cappa 135-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737(2)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738(2)</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 1</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1761(2)</td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1763(2)</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1765(2)</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741(2)</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>May 31,</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744(2)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>Gottheil, J. Q. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Dec. 18,</td>
<td>Lisboa</td>
<td>MSS. Lisb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. N. Adler.
Es ist ein bleibendes Verdienst des Herrn H. Brody, dass er durch seine musterhaften, den strengen Bedingungen philologischer Arbeit entsprechenden Editionen und Erläuterungen der Klassiker der jüdischen Poesie die Behandlung dieser Litteratur neuerdings auf das Niveau wissenschaftlicher Anforderungen erhoben hat.

Wenn auch die "Dukes-Edelmann'sche Periode" durch die Wegweisung von Gelehrten wie S. D. Luzzato und Senior Sachs, durch das Beispiel, das sie in der Bearbeitung der jüdischen Dichtungen gaben, schon früher als überwunden gelten konnte, so wird die Neubelebung, Ausbreitung und Festigung der wissenschaftlichen Methode in der Textbehandlung und Exegese dieser Litteratur an die Arbeiten H. Brody's geknüpft sein, der das durch drei Jahrzehnte wieder vernachlässigte Werk Luzzato's auf breiterer Basis und in grossem Umfange weiterführt und vervollkommnet. Namentlich hat er durch die gewissenshafte Erforschung der metrischen Schemata, worin ihm zum Theil schon S. Kämpf vorgearbeitet hatte, nicht nur die eindringende Erkenntnis des Formenreichthums dieser Poesie gefördert, sondern zugleich durch die Ermöglichung grösserer Sicherheit in der Textgestaltung die feste Grundlage der correcten Erklärung geboten.

Mehr umfassend als seine Vorgänger hat sich ferner Brody um das Studium der Topologie seiner Dichter mit bedeutendem Erfolge bemüht. Durch den Nachweis der in der arabisch-jüdischen Poesie herrschenden typischen Redensarten, Metaphern und Bildern, durch die auf umfassende Beherrschung dieser Litteratur gegründete Sammlung der Parallelstellen für die bunten Varietäten innerhalb der constanten Typen, sind seine Commentare zu den weltlichen Dichtungen des Ibn Gabirol und Jehuda hal-Léwî zu einer reichen Fundgrube der Belehrung für das ohne solche Vorarbeit in vielen Fällen geradezu verschlossene Verständniss der arabisch-jüdischen Dichtersprache geworden.

Man hat schon längst eingesehen, dass man für das volle Verständniss der Phraseologie dieser Dichter, die sich an arabischen Mustern entschieden haben, die Editionen von H. Brody unerlässlich sind.

1 Studien zu den Dichtungen Jehuda ha-Levi's, von Dr. Heinrich Brody, I. Über die Metra der Versgedichte. (Berlin, 1895.)

In ersterer Richtung wird durch Herrn Brody und seine gelehrten Berather alles nur Mögliche geleistet. Vieles ist in diesem Zweige der jüdischen Litteratur noch für die Nachweisung der arabischen Vorbilder zu thun, ohne deren Kenntniss die Auslegung dieser Poesie immer lückenhaft bleiben wird. Wenn wir z. B. von Ibn Gabirol hören, dass er "die Kleidung der Nacht zur Hülle genommen" (אשמית מלך אלה לכת), so werden wir zur richtigen Würdigung dieser Redensart erst dann gelangen, wenn uns nicht unbekannt ist, dass der altarabische Dichter vom Ritter in finsterer Nacht das Bild gebracht, dass sich der Ritter in die Nacht als Kleidungsstück (dasselbe wird zuweilen auch nach seiner besonderen Art genau bezeichnet) gehüllt hat.

Die Berücksichtigung des poetischen Sprachgebrauchs der Araber ist allerdings auch von den Vorgängern Brody's nicht vollends

1 Abraham Geiger, Divan des Castiliens Abul Hasan Juda ha-Lewi (Breslau, 1851), p. 13. Luzzato im Han, III (1838), 18: Seno im c, III a, III a, einer der drei Gespeises der jüdischen Poesie, ein seltener und ungewöhnlicher Ausdruck für die Nacht, und der Ritter, der die Nacht auftritt, als einer der mit ihm verbundenen Sagen der jüdischen Litteratur.

2 Ich darf wohl z. B. auf die Einzelheiten verweisen, die in meinen Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie, II (Leiden, 1899), s. XLV, A. 2; XLVIII, A. 3; LIV, A. 4, angeführt sind.


* S. die Beispiele in den Abhandlungen zur Arab. Philologie, I, 157, A. 1; eine andere Beziehung hat JL, I, 37, 5, wo aber die Vergleichung des arab. Redens art mit dem jüdischen jedenfalls durch die Arab. Redensart beeinflusst ist.
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vernachlässigt worden. Luzzato hat einigemal ganz im allgemeinen darauf hingewiesen und auch in den Commentaren Brody's wird dies Erklärungsmittel, freilich ohne spezielle Nachweise, herangezogen.

Schon früher konnte den Erklärern der arabische Ursprung einiger in der arabisch-jüdischen Poesie unzähligemal wiederkehrenden Phrasen und Wendungen nicht entgehen, wie z. B. bei dem so häufig eingeführten (,kohanim) und bei dem ,; bei der in Freundschaftsbeheuerungen gerne gebrauchten Phrase "ich — oder meine Seele — mögen das Lösegeld (b.) sein u.s.w. für . . . .\) wo die Anwendung der Formen des Verbums darauf hinweist, dass die entsprechende Redensart der arabischen Poeten bei der Aneignung der mischnischen Formel mindestens mitgewirkt hat.

Zu den bekannteren Analogien gehören auch die dem Arabischen entlehnten Attribute der Dichtkunst selbst, in erster Reihe die Auffassung des poetischen Produktes als Gewebe oder kunstvolle Handarbeit in den Redensarten oder. Es ist bemerkenswert, dass Jehuda al-Charizi diese Metapher bereits in der weitergeführten Anwendung gebraucht, in der wir sie in der zeitgenössischen arabischen Poesie finden. Während das künstliche Weben oder Spinnen der Gedichte ursprünglich bloss ihren kunsttollen Charakter be-

1 Seine Anmerkung zu Geiger, Diván, 134.
2 In modernen Liedern auch, der Vögel des Wegganges; Dalman, Palästinischer Diván, 334, 8.
5 Der arabische Frauenname , Agáni, XX, 187 (unten), Kufámi, ed. Barth 17, 7, ist aus dieser Anschauung gebildet: sie ist so theuer, dass man für sie das Theuerste als Lösegeld hingabe. — S. über die Formel, al-Asma' in Gahit, Bajín, II, 36, 1.
6 Vgl. Abhandlungen zur ar. Philologie, I, 133; Dukes, Orient, 1851, 367; Brody, Anm. zu JL. Diván, I, 15, 35-36.
zeichnen soll, denkt der Dichter des XIII. Jhd. schon daran, dass das Gewebe seines Rahmgedichtes als Festtagskleid für die Person dienen möge, zu deren Ehren dies Kunstwerk verfertigt wurde:

Ebenso Charutz (Tachkem, ed. de Lagarde, 14, 22):


II.

Zunächst kann auf ein Moment des arabischen Einflusses auf den Sprachgebrauch der jüdischen Poeten hingewiesen werden. Er bekundet sich zuweilen in der Umschreibung der mit den hebräischen Worten und Phrasen verknüpften Vorstellungen. Hebräische Worte werden für Bedeutungen gebraucht, die sie in der alten hebräischen Sprache nicht besitzen, die aber dem etymologisch identischen Wort in der arabischen Sprache eigen sind. In weit grösserem Umfang als bei den Dichtern ist die Übertragung der arabischen Bedeutungen auf die etymologisch entsprechenden oder auch nur anscheinend

4 Es ist mir wahrscheinlich, dass unter diesen Gesichtspunkt auch der Gebrauch gehört, den die Übersetzer von den Derivaten der W. רֶמֶשׁ bei der hebr. Wiedergabe des arab. خلف machen; vgl. ושנו, sie sind verschiedener Ansicht, und hebr. Übers. des
ähnlichen, wenn auch etymologisch vollends verschiedenen hebräischen Vocabeln in der wissenschaftlichen Übersetzungsliteratur zur Geltung gekommen.

Bemerkungen zu neuhebräischen Poesie

ähnlichen, wenn auch etymologisch vollends verschiedenen hebräischen Vocabeln in der wissenschaftlichen Übersetzungsliteratur zur Geltung gekommen.

ähnlichen, wenn auch etymologisch vollends verschiedenen hebräischen Vocabeln in der wissenschaftlichen Übersetzungsliteratur zur Geltung gekommen.

ähnlichen, wenn auch etymologisch vollends verschiedenen hebräischen Vocabeln in der wissenschaftlichen Übersetzungsliteratur zur Geltung gekommen.


\[\text{"Das rühmende Attribut wird erst verständlich, wenn man erkennt, dass es eine wörtliche Übersetzung des arabischen "مُطْلِف" ist, das zum ständigen Inventar der Freigebigkeitsepitheta gehört, gewöhnlich in der Assonanz "مُطْلِف" ist. "Die Freigebigkeit ist"—nach dem alten Arab. Dichter—"als ruhmendes Attribut passt demnach ganz gut in die völlig arabische Umgebung jener Verseile."} \]

Aus diesem Gesichtspunkte wären noch die Termine der Mathematik zu untersuchen, z. B. Quadratwurzel = arab. "مَعْدَر".

1 Machbereth, 85.


3 Auch neben "אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל", "der (die Habe) Verderbende, Nützende," Ag. XIV, 95, 3 v. u.

4 Also neben "אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל", "der (die Habe) Verderbende, Nützende," Ag. XIV, 95, 3 v. u.


6 Auch der Hinweis auf die Erwartung des Nachruhms, s. einige Stellen in Muḥammad. Studien, I, 18, 8.
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Sehr früh hat die religiöse Legende das Epitheton Muhammeds, durch welches er selbst als Siegel der Propheten (chātām al-anbījā), d. h. als der endgültige Abschluss der grossen Reihe der Gottesgesandten bezeichnet wird, zu einem an Muhammed’s Körper sichtbaren Prophetenstempel umgedeutet, zu einem Mal, das als das zumeist bemerkliche äussere Erkennungszeichen seines Charakters gilt. An diesem ihm anerschaffenen Stempel lässt die Prophetenlegende des Islam auch gelehrte Juden und Christen den in ihren heiligen Schriften mit diesem körperlichen Zeichen angedeuteten letzten Propheten erkennen. Daran erkennt ihn der Mönch Bahira in frühem Knabenalter; das an der Schulter „des gotterwählten Knaben“ sichtbare, einem Granat-

1 S. ZDMG., XXXII, 378; nr. 35.


Bei Schreiner, in Kohut, Semitic Studies, 505 ult.

4 In einem Lobgedicht des zu Muhammed’s Lebzeiten bekehrten Dichters ‘Abdallah b. al-Ziba‘rt wird als Erkennungszeichen (alāma) des Propheten ein erwähnt (bei Ibn Hisam, 827, 16); doch ist die Echtheit des Gedichtes stark zweifelhaft.


6 Diese Localisierung ist in der älteren Tradition nicht constant;


III.

Bei der freien Übernahme der arabischen Metra hat gegenüber den aufgetauchten religiösen Bedenken (die z. B. dem Jeh. Hal. das freilich verspätete Bedauern darüber einflösten, in seinen Dichtungen die arab. Metrik angewandt zu haben) der in der arabischen Philosophie vorherrschende Gesichtspunkt1 mitgewirkt, dass das Metrum kein spezifisch nationales Element der Poesie sei, wie die Sprache, sondern eine wesentliche und natürliche, allen Völkern gemeinsame Eigentümlichkeit der poetischen Sprache.

Mit dem Metrum der Araber haben die jüdischen Dichter auch viele Eigentümlichkeiten der inneren Technik der arabischen Poesie übernommen.

Tabari, I, 975, wird Muhammed's Hers mit einem „Lichtsiegel“ geschlossen; dies sei das Siegel der Prophétie.


3 Disputatio pro religione Mohammedanorum adversus Christianos, ed. Van den Ham (Leiden, 1890), 217, 8.


Die traditionelle Disposition der arabischen Kasidenanfänge mit der Klage über das Scheiden der Geliebten, die Anrede an die fortziehende Karawane, die schmerzvolle Betrachtung der ehemaligen Wohnsitze, findet sich häufig am Anfange der gedehnteren hebräischen Gedichte. In kunstgerechter arabischer Kasidentechnik verläuft das Gedicht Nr. 100 im Dichter des JL. (Brody, I). V. 1-34 stellen ein regelreiches Nasib dar, wo selbst das in den arabischen Gedichten dieser Gattung häufige Detail angebracht ist, dass der Dichter die einstigen Wohnplätze der entfernten Geliebten um ihren jetzigen Zustand befragt, die befragten Steine aber stumm bleiben, unfähig eine Antwort ertheilen zu können (אלה המלאכות, v. 24).

---

2 Ibid., v. 145-154; 155-177.
4 Berliner's Magazin, V, 90, 4 ff.: 'Dass so wie die arabischen Anreden an die 'Flleinen, Abhandl. sur arab. Phil., I, p. 123. Das Wort selbst entspricht dem im Arabischen gewöhnlich an dieser Stelle stehenden 'sie haben den festen Entschluss gefasst (عزمت) fortzuziehen.'
7 Moses b. Ezra (Brody, Monatschrift, XL, p. 33, v. 1, 2), derselbe: יבש וֹיָּבִי (bei Geiger, Jüdische Dichtungen der spanischen und italienischen Schule (Breslau, 1856), Text, p. 6 zu 15).

Wie weit man in solcher Formaneignung gegangen ist, kann uns eine andere Zeile des Ibn Gabirol 3 zeigen:

Hier wird die Zahl 41 synthetisch in 10 + 10 + 11 + 4 + 6 zerlegt; eine Figur, die ihr volles Verständnis erhält, wenn man ihre jüdische Anwendung mit dem arabischen Vorbild vergleicht, über welches ZDMG., XLIX, p. 210 f., speziell abgehandelt worden ist; aus den dort angeführten Beispielen möge hier nur an die Zeile des As'ā erinnert werden:

"Ich habe getrunken acht und acht und achtzehn und zwei und vier." Ich glaube nicht, dass Ibn Gabirol die Zahlenzerlegung ohne Einfluss dieses oder ähnlicher arabischer Verse vollzogen habe 4.

Von den aus dem arabischen Sprachgebrauch entlehnten Phrasen möchte ich in dieser Gruppe noch eine hervorheben. Unter den arabischen Betheuerungsformen gilt als eine der feierlichsten, wenn jemand sich für den Fall, dass seine assertorische oder promissorische Aussage unwahr wäre, als von einer ihm werthvollen Verbindung

2Mehren, Rhetorik der Araber, 100.
3"ויל分かり נפש" [wahari nefeš], 30, v. 6.
4Ein späteres Beispiel, vgl. bei Kaufmann in Monatschrift, XL, 47 unt. Wie im Arabischen, so ist auch hier die addirende Synthese angewendet; für die multipliirende bietet ein Beispiel Abr. ibn Ezra's Widmung vor dem unvollständigen Pentateuchkommentar (Rosin, Reime und Gedichte des A. b. E., p. 55: ["יהוה יביו סדר ו TAX יִת כִּי סֶכֶס לִקיית הָאָדֶם" (8 x 8)]). Im Jahre 1156 hatte I. E. das Alter von 64 Jahren.
losegelöst erklärt. Es ist dies die Grundlage des sogenannten Lossagungsseides (jamin al-bar'ā'ati), dessen feierlichste Formen auf eine Lossagung vom Schutze Gottes, von der Gemeinschaft der Rechtgläubigen hinausgehen. Eine mildere Form der Lossagung ist die Eidesart, dass der Schwörende für den Fall, dass er eine unzutreffende Behauptung thät, den Zusammenhang mit seinen Ahnen als nicht bestehend erklärt: er möge nicht als der ehrliche Abkömmling derselben betrachtet werden, wenn . . . . So schwört einmal der Chalif Hārūn al-rāšīd: "Ich will nicht der rechtmäßige Sohn meines Vaters Mahdi sein, wenn ich dies und das nicht thue!"

Eine jüdische Anwendung dieses Bar'ā-Eides finden wir einmal bei Samuel han-nāgīd:


Der Dichter sagt sich hier in ganz arabischer Weise von seinen (levitischen) Ahnen los und ledig, wenn das in dem Verse Ausgesagte nicht zuträfe. Die Worte entsprechend dem in solchen Fällen gewöhnlich gebrauchten:


Ganz besonders bezeichnend für den Geist, in dem solche Entlehnungen vollzogen werden, ist die Erscheinung, dass auch die Attribute, die der Dichter seiner poetischen Thätigkeit und ihrem Ergebniss zueignet, den entsprechenden Anschauungen der arabischen Dichter nachgeahmt sind. In diese Reihe gehört ja zunächst auch die Bezeichnung des dichterischen Geschäftes als "Weben."

Jehuda haš, sagt einmal (I, 49, 44) von seinendichterischen Worten: "er habe sie gebändigt, und ihnen einen Zaum angelegt, nachdem sie früher wie ungezähmte Thiere wild einherliefen":


Dass die Dichtung mit einem störrigen, wild herumlaufenden Thier verglichen wird, das der geschickte Dichter bändig und im Zaume

1 Baihaki, Mahāsin, ed. Schwally, 543 ult.: 1
Vgl. ibid. 591, 12. 2
Vgl. ibid. VIII, 169, 2. 3
2 Ed. Harkavy, Studien und Mitteilungen, I, 95, 14, 15.
3 Zu Kehath vgl. JL., ed. Brody, I, 30, 6, 93.
hält, so dass es unter seiner Hand ein folgmales dahin wird, ist eine überaus beliebte Wendung der arabischen Dichter, über welche wir anderwärts eingehender geredet haben. Diese Anschauung hat dem JL. als Vorbild gedient. Auch moderne volkstümliche arabische Poeten vergleichen die Form- und Sprachkunst des Dichters mit der Kraft des Bändigers störriger Thiere. "Er zwingt die Verse aneinander, so wie ein bösertiges (Kamel) bezwungen wird, indem ihm ein Ring in die Nase gelegt wird."


Eine Anlehnung an die Denkweise arabischer Dichter findet man in Charizis Wort:


1 Abhandlungen zur arab. Phil., I, 94.
3 Socin, Divin. aus Centralarabien, 4, 3.
5 In seinem Einleitungsgedicht zu den Azhrā'oth; vgl. Sambari in Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles, ed. Neubauer, I (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Samitie Series, I, iv), 127.
6 Makame, ed. de Lagarde, 21, 10.
7 S. ZDMG., XLV, 687.
"Fürwahr, während die Dämonen aller anderen Dichter unter den Menschen weiblich sind, ist mein Dämon ein männlicher." Damit will er sagen, dass seine Dichtungen vorzüglicher sind, als die seiner Rivalen.

Die Vorstellung vom inspirierenden Dämon scheint den jüdischen Dichtern aus dem Gesichtspunkt ihrer religiösen Anschauung zur hebräischen Assimilation nicht gut geeignet gewesen zu sein. Sie lehnten sich leichter an die Musenvorstellung an, die bei ihnen unter der Bezeichnung der נֵבֶו (mit formeller Benutzung von Eccl. xii. 4) häufig wiederkehrt. 4 Darum musste sich bei Charizt die Gegenständersetzung der männlichen und weiblichen Dichterämonen zu der Antithese verflüchtigen, in welcher der Geschlechtsunterschied von den Dämonen auf die Dichter selbst übertragen wird. 5

Eine andere in diesen Kreis gehörende Antithese finden wir bei Ibn Gabirol 6:

Die trefflichen Gedichte werden den gesetzlichen Kindern verglichen (הָעַנְכָּה scheint wörtliche Übersetzung des arabischen 6 בְּנָרַת רֶשֶׁת zu sein, im Gegensatz zu יִרְעָא o. oder בְּנָו צַנִּיה 7 und den aus buhlerischen Verhältnissen entstandenen entgegengesetzt 8. Für die Anwendung dieses Gegensatzes auf den vorzüglicher und minderwerthiger Dichtungen steht uns keine arabische Parallele zur Verfügung. Auch die in den Anmerkungen Brodys zu JL. I, 43, 9-10 mit Beibringung zahlreicher Parallelstellen erörterte Redensart 9 geht auf eine in der arabischen Poesie sehr häufige Figur zurück, für die

1 Chisánat al-adab, I, 50.
2 Der Satz isovtcnvl*o (Abhandl. zur arab. Phil., I, 23 Anm.; vgl. die Nachweise bei Steinschneider, ZDMG., XXIX, 559, Anm. 20) wird in dem Epilog des Lehrgedichtes rp3mrp von Josef Esobi aus Perpignan in dieser Weise angewandt: סרֶע בְּנֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל נָכוֹץ Moses b. Efra (Monatschrift, 40, 168 [4 u. 61]).
3 Es ist mir nicht entgangen, dass Brody, Anmerkungen, JL. I, 58, v. 33-34, diese Antithese bei Charizt in einem viel allgemeineren Vorstellungsreich einordnet.
4 קרְעָא, I, 52; זִכְרָא יִשְׂרָאֵל, 9, v. 57.
5 Wir glauben nicht, dass der Gegensatz an Jea. i. 21 (I) angelehnt sei.
6 Abu Dâwûd, I, 225: מַּנִּי אָדָם וְלָדַה מִן גֵּשֶׁר רֶשֶׁת נָהֲרֶשֶׁת לֹא בָּרַת׃
7 Vgl. ZDMG., LI, 257.
Ibn al-Athir in seiner Rhetorik\(^1\) eine grosse Menge von Beispielen zusammengestellt hat, als deren Urbild ein Vers des Hassan b. Thābit in einem Panegyricus des Propheten gilt:\(^3\):

\[
\text{ما إن مَنَّىٰ مَهُّاً بِمَقَالِي لَكَنَّ مَنْ مَنَّى مَقَالِي بِحَمَّةٰ}
\]

"Nicht habe ich Muhammed gerühmt mit meiner Rede:— sondern ich habe meiner Rede Ruhm verliehen durch Muhammed." Ibn Gabirol hat diese Phrase fast wörtlich übersetzt, wenn er von dem Verhältniss eines seiner Ruhmesgedichte zu dem \textit{vir laudatus} die Worte gebraucht:\(^4\):

\[
\text{אינא רֵאָבָךְ אֵל לֹא רָאָבָךְ אֵל}
\]

V.

Noch zwei Beispiele werden wir hier für die Abhängigkeit des jüdischen dichterischen Stils von den in der arabischen Dichtkunst vorherrschenden Ideen darstellen.

1. Das erste könnte auch der Erscheinung angeschlossen werden, die wir im zweiten Abschnitt dieses Versuches als \textit{Umwehrung} der mit den hebräischen Ausdrücken verknüpften Vorstellungen bezeichnet haben.

In einem seiner nach arabischem Muster angeordneten Gedichte gebraucht Jehudah-hallewi die Wendung: 

\[
	ext{רְיָם אֲנַחְּרֵהּ לֹא לְבָּא הַיִּשְׁרָהּ בּוֹרְאֵהּ}
\]


\(^1\) \textit{Al-Mathala al-šbīr fi 'dād al Kātib waš-shīr}, 476. Vgl. Balikhî, ed. Schwally,


\(^4\) \textit{QEM}, v. 6.
der Litteratur, aus den volksthümlichen Producten seiner arabischen Umgebung zugänglich waren, zeigt er selbst an dem am Schluss von Nr. 137 einverleibten vulgären Vers:

"Ist es nicht Sunna, dass wer seinem Liebchen begegnet es umarmt?"

2. Das zweite Beispiel betrifft ein poetisches Bild, dessen Entstehung die Lebensverhältnisse des arabischen Beduinenthums zur Voraussetzung hat.


Die Dichterin Chaula, Schwester des Hassän b. Thäbit, sagt in einem Trauergedicht:

"O, wenn ich nur nicht schlief und auch nicht schlaftrig würde; ich möchte die Nacht mit Weinen und Wachen hinbringen; trifft, niemand anderen als mich; denn ich bin der Imam der Liebe, ich habe darin mein madhab, in dem mir alle Welt folgt." Safi al-din al-Hiilî (st. 1349): "Ich bin ein Verliebter, dem das Religionsgesetz der Liebe (شرعتي) vorschreibt, dass er nur als Märtyrer sterben dürfte" (Ditdön, 127, 3 v. u.), und ebenso öfters, z. B. 276, 18: ما حالة عن شرخ يئيش؟... 

In einem mystischen Gedicht bei Jaffî (scribte 1449), Rawî al-rajadîn (Kairo, Castelli, 1279), Nr. 41, p. 55, 16, von der mystischen Liebe redend: "Ich bin ein Religionsgelehrter, der über die Sunnas der Liebe Lehrvorträge hält, wer kann mir dabei als Repetent dienen?"

1 In vulgärer Aussprache zu lesen.
3 Wörtlich: "und nicht nahe wäre, es zu thun" (zu schlafen): ًلم أوكذب.
Weinen über Helden, deren Verlust Unglück über mich brachte; sie waren meine Seile (an denen ich mich festhalten konnte); nun haben sie (durch ihren Hingang) meinen Arm geschwächt; Sie waren mein Schmuck und meine Hilfe; durch sie ist Unrecht und Unterdrückung von mir abgewendet worden; Nach ihnen bewache ich die Sterne und vergesse Thränen und der Gram wühlt in meiner Leber.

Und ein anderer Dichter:

"Der Kummer überkomm mich während der Nacht, . . . .
Ich beobachte jeden Stern auf der Milchstrasse, . . . . wie er einherzieht,
Wegen eines Kummerns, der mich unablössig quält, als ob das Herz von der Hitze der Kohle gesengt würde.

Das Bewachen der Sterne wird sehr häufig als Hüten auf der Weide bezeichnet; und dies hängt damit zusammen, dass die alten Araber die Sterne unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Herde betrachteten:

"Eine Nacht, deren Sterne langsam vorwärts schreiten, und die sich so in die Länge zieht, dass ich mir sage: Sie hat kein Ende und der die Sterne auf die Weide führte, wird heute nicht heimkehren" — so schildert al-Nâbîga eine lange Nacht. Das "Weiden der Sterne" wird nun besonders im Zusammenhange mit dem angst- und sorgenvollen Nachtwachen angewendet. Selbst in der vom Beduinenleben völlig losgelösten arabischen Poesie ist der Ausdruck:

"ich bringe die Nacht zu indem ich die auf der Weide befindlichen Sterne hüte" gleichbedeutend mit dem Gedanken: ich verlebe angst- und kummervolle Zeiten.

Man gebraucht die Phrase auch in Fällen, wo der Zustand des Sprechenden die Möglichkeit der Realität derselben geradezu ausschliesst; z. B. der Mann im Gefängnisse bringt die angstvolle Nacht hin indem er "die Sterne weiden lässt." Bis in die volks-

1 Ich lese für das unpassende "meine Berge" des Textes.
3 Aq., VI, 131 oben; XXI, 170 unten.
4 Nâbîga, I, 2, Ahlwardt; 3, 2, Denerbourg: "den Sternen der "al-jum"
6 Vgl. den Vers in No. 66, Anm. 14, meiner Ausgabe der Mû'mmarûn (Leiden, 1899).
7 Aq., V, 5, 6 v. u.
thümliche Poesie der neueren Zeiten hat sich diese Phrase aus der alten arabischen Dichtersprache fortgepflanzt 1.

Der Hinweis auf diesen Typus der arabischen Poesie fördert uns im Verständnis des Ausdrucks der hebräischen Dichter, "ein Huter zu sein der Gestirne des Himmels."

I. GOLDZIHER.

BUDAPEST, Januar 1902.

1 Vgl. z. B. die im maghribinischen Dialekt geschriebene 'Aṣīka des Sa'id al-Mendasi (verf. 1677, 6d. Faure-Biguet, Alger, 1901). Vers 73 (französische Übersetzung): "Pendant la nuit mon cœur veille en contemplant (im Original jar'a, weiden) les étoiles; les vicissitudes n'altèrent pas mon antique amour."
EARLIEST REPRESENTATION OF ARK OF THE LAW

On several glasses found in the Museo Borgiano at Rome, are given representations of Jewish objects of worship, which are probably the earliest in existence. No indication is given of the source whence they reached the Museo, but it is probable that they formed part of the relics found in the old Jewish catacomb when it was opened in 1864. The glasses, two of which are reproduced here, are figured in Garrucci, Arte Cristiana, vol. VI, plate 490.

The earliest of these glasses is probably the broken one containing the largest number of symbols. The Menorah, or Hanuka Lamp, is evidently imitated from that represented on the Arch of Titus, and gives a sharper reproduction of it than nowadays, when the weathering has almost destroyed the distinctness of outline. From the representation of the flame it is clear that the lamp was fed by oil, and that the tops of the branches were formed by miniature lamps, similar to those familiar to all visitors to classical museums, with the flame issuing from one of the ends. The Lulab and Etrog clearly resemble those in use nowadays, as might be anticipated; but from their comparative size it would appear that the original Lulab was smaller. The Laver was probably that used by the Levites in the sole sacerdotal function which they nowadays perform, and might be adopted as the recognized shape, since the community of Rome would have been in more direct touch with the Holy Land than that of almost any other European community. The two little circles are obviously intended to represent Mazzot, and it is curious to notice that their round form has persisted through the ages.

But the case or press at the top of the design is by far the most interesting thing in it. Its object is plain. The helical patterns in the nine divisions of it merely represent the ends of scrolls, and obviously, scrolls of the law. In other words, this case is the earliest representation we have of the Ark of the Law. Now it is equally plain that it is nothing more nor less than a bookcase as used at Rome in early times. The frontispiece to Dr. J. W. Clark's Care
of Books shows a book press of exactly the same form, and this is dated in the middle of the sixth century. It follows, therefore, that the early Ark of the Law was only a receptacle for the books of the Law in the ordinary form which a bookcase took in those days; and this shape is preserved in the next earliest Ark of the Law, of which we have record, in that formerly belonging to the Strauss collection, and now in the Musée Cluny; this was brought from Modena, and is dated 1505. It is an ordinary cupboard or press, precisely like those used in the Vatican Library as bookcases (see Jacobs and Wolf, Catalogue Anglo-Jewish Historical Expedition, p. 120, illustrated edition, plate 28; Clark, Care of Books, pass.). This
explains also and justifies the practice of the Sephardim in not having curtains to their Arks of the Law. Still more, it removes the ordinary assumption that the Ark of the Law replaces in the synagogue the Holy of Holies in the Temple, to which analogy, in large measure, the use of the curtain is due. I am informed by Dr. L. Ginzburg that so far from the Ark of the Law being a necessary part of synagogue furniture in Talmudic times, the scrolls were sometimes kept for the sake of safety apart altogether from the synagogue when this happened to be outside the city walls (Kidd. 33a).

There remain two figures which differ from the rest in being entirely symbolical. The lions are the conventional representation of Judah according to Jacob's blessing, Gen. xlix. 9. The doves are the usual symbolic representation of the synagogue, as based upon the verse, Ps. lvi. 1 (comp. Sank. 95a).

Joseph Jacobs.
ZU MEINEM ARTIKEL: "DER SIDDUR VON JEMEN."

(J. Q. R., XIV, 581 ff.)


W. BACHER.

BUDAPEST, Mai 1902.

DIE VON SCHECHTER EDIRTEN SAADYANA.

(J. Q. R., XIV 1.)


1 S. auch meine Artikel: "Ein neu erschlossenes Kapitel der jüdischen Geschichte"; "Aus einer alten Poetik (Schule Saadja's)."
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Anm. 2, 8 a, l. 8 b.— S. 466, Z. 23. Nach šavvi ist ausgefallen
mosb.— S. 469, Z. 21, wâ, l. 8. — Z. 23, bûna, l. 1. — S. 470,
Z. 6, šalâm, l. 8. — S. 473, zuzîr, l. 1. — S. 475, zû, l. 8.
— S. 476, šûra, l. 1. — S. 477, z. sâh, l. 1. — S. 478, z. sâh, l. 1.
— S. 480, z. 5 (recto), šûra, l. 1. — S. 484, z. 1, šûra, l. 1.
(gehört zu 620 in der folgenden Z.). — S. 501. Das
ganze Stück müsste noch einmal, mit genauerer Setzung der Punkte,
abgedruckt werden. So lautet Z. 9 (recto) richtig so:

Zu J. Q. R., XIV, 61, Z. 1. Ist kein Ortsname, wie
Schechter annimmt, sondern arabisches Verbum: 'sarr Darlegung.' Diese X. Form von šûra verzeichnet Friedländer,
Der Sprachgebrauch des Maimonides, I, 74. — S. 198, Z. 5,
— S. 208 f., No. XII, ist identisch mit dem Schlusse von XI, S. 207 f., 2 v, Z. 8 — 2 v, Ende. Die beiden Nummern sind aus einander zu berich-
tigen. Was S. 209, Z. 25, nach šâyân (l. 1. šâyân) noch folgt, fehlt am
Schlusse von No. XI. — S. 212, Z. 1, šûr, l. 1. — Lâlâm, l. 1.
(Kalâsim), l. 1. — Z. 3, šûr, l. 1. — S. 213, Z. 1, šûr, l. 1.
(Allâma), l. 1. — Z. 3, šûr, l. 1. — Z. 29, lâlâm, l. 1.
— S. 219, No. XXIV, Z. 12, šûr, l. 1. — Lâlâm.

W. BACHER.

BUDAPEST, Mai 1902.
AUS EINER ALTEN POETIK (SCHULE SAADJA'S).

Der liebenswürdigen Aufforderung Prof. Schechters (J. Q. R., XIV, 504) Folge leistend, gebe ich eine Übersetzung des von ihm als No. LI der Saadyana veröffentlichten arabischen Fragmentes. Das Fragment beginnt inmitten eines Satzes, der, wie aus der Fortsetzung ersichtlich ist, von einer Gattung der prosaischen Rede (יוֹפָוֹלִים) handelt.

"(Recto) ...und was dunkel daran ist. Und in Bezug darauf sagt der Fromme (Elıhu in Hiob, xxxii. 11): 'Siehe, ich harrte auf eure Worte, u. s. w.' Durch die (die in Frage stehende Gattung der prosaischen Rede) geschieht die klare Darlegung des Weges, auf dem man die richtige Beweisführung und Argumentation erlangt in Bezug auf Alles, was schwierig war oder dessen Erkenntniss gesucht wurde. Durch sie geschieht das Erkennen dessen, was unbekannt war und wird nachgewiesen das Verborgene, vereinigt (6) das Getrennte und Verschiedene. Von dieser Gattung der Prosa sagt der Weise (Prov. ii. 2-5): 'Aufmerken zu lassen auf die Weisheit dein Ohr,' u. s. w. Darum Heil dem, dem es gelungen ist, sie zu finden, so wie gesagt ist (Prov. iii. 13): 'Heil dem Menschen,' u. s. w.— Die zweite Abtheilung ist die theils aus Prosa, theils aus gebundener Rede bestehende Darstellung. (10) Dieselbe ist von vorzüglicher als die erste Abtheilung; denn sie bedarf des Unterscheidungsvermögens (Urtheils) und eines besonderen Masses von Geistesschärfe. Auch sie zerfällt in sieben Theile (Gattungen), die von einander gesondert sind. Die erste Gattung bilden die Dichtungen, die man in der Sprache der Araber al-chutab (Mehrzahl von chutba) nennt. Diese Gattung ist mit der Prosa verwandt; denn sie ist wohl in Verseilen gemacht (15), aber nicht gereimt. Beispiel hierfür ist die Dichtung Jose b. Jose's, sein Andenken sei zum Segen,

1 Statt or-rt-rtnn L orirrt'rfmn. Gemeint ist der Schluss des Verses: סל תצופי

2 Daraus ist ersichtlich, dass auch die erste Abtheilung (die Prosa) in sieben Gattungen eingetheilt war und der Anfang unseres Fragmentes die 7. Gattung der Prosa meint.

Die zweite Gattung ist die in der Sprache der Araber al-ragaz genannte Dichtungsform. Zu ihr gehört was sich in der Bibel an gereimten Sätzen findet, aber nicht Poesie ist. Z. B. Hiob, xxviii. 16 (אֵין מִסְטָר מַמִּית תְמוּנָה) (20); ebenso Hiob, xxi. 4 (וְקָנִית אֵין מִסְטָר מַמִּית תְמוּנָה); ebenso Jesaja, xlix. 1 — (Verso) — (שְׁמַיִם וּמַר שָׁלֵשִׁים וּמַר שָׁלֵשִׁים). Die dritte Gattung ist al-sag (Reimprosa). Sie ist rhythmisch gegliedert und gereimt, so dass die Endwörter mit einander verknüpft sind; aber das Versmaß (al-aruq) ist bald gedehnt, bald gekürzt. Beispiel hiefür ist die Dichtung des bekannten Jannai. — Die vierte Gattung ist die Pijjüt genannte Poesie. Sie ist die rhythmisch gegliederte, gereimte Dichtung, welche durch das Versmaß, das die Wage der Poesie ist, bestimmt und gemessen wird. Beispiel hiefür ist die Dichtung Eleazars, die mit יִרְבַּה beginnende für das Regengebet (am Schlussekte) und die mit נְהָר beginnende für das Thangebet (am Pesachfeste). Man sagt, dass die Beurteilung dieser Gattung durch den Geschmack geschieht, sowie es heisst (Hiob, xii. 11): "Fürwahr, das Ohr prüft die Rede und der Gaumen schmeckt die Speise." Dies bedeutet: der inhaltliche Zusammenhang der Verszeilen sei derart, dass sie nicht von einander geschieden seien; denn wenn sie von einander geschieden sind, ist die Dichtung lahm und verdorben. — Die fünfte Gattung ist die gewobene und geschmückte (eig. mit Laub gezierte) Dichtung, deren Beschaffenheit folgende ist: Der Dichter schreibt drei Bibelverse oder wieviel er deren will, ... die in den Ausdrücken einander gleichen (15); diese Bibelverse werden nach Belieben in die Rede und die Poesie eingewoben. Diese Gattung ist schwer und zum Theile sehr dunkel. Das Haupt der Hochschule (Saadja) hat Dichtungen dieser Art verfasst, ebenso andere Gelehrte. — Die sechste Gattung ist die Composition (al-ta'lıf): Bibelverse und ... Es sind das Sittensprüche und Betrachtungen (20), wie deren Ben Sira und Ben Irai und Andere verfasst haben. — Die siebente Gattung ist die Composition der Rede zur Erklärung "...

Ich lasse nur noch einige Berichtigungen zum Texte folgen, soweit ich sie nicht in den Anmerkungen gegeben habe:


W. BACHER.
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ZUR TOPOGRAPHIE VON CAESAREA.


---

\(^1\) An den zweiersten Stellen steht richtig בְּיוֹרֵכָה "in Weingärten," und der Zusammenhang erweist diese Lesart für richtig; an der dritten Stelle findet sich der leichte Fehler בְּיוֹרֶכֶת "in Städten."

überführte und dass man das in Einer Nacht bewerkstelligte. Man trug die Leiche Akiba’s wahrscheinlich in das nächste in jüdischen Händen befindliche Gebiet, und somit erfahren wir aus dieser Erzählung, dass Caesarea, welches fast ganz hellenisch war, schon in den Weinbergen, sozusagen vor den Thoren der Stadt, zum jüdischen Besitz gehörte. Wir haben nun die Illustration zu dem Ausspruch der Mischna (Oholot, XVIII, 9): Die Ostseite und Westseite von Caesarea sind voller Gräber (קברות), wurde doch auf der Ostseite unter Anderen auch R. Akiba begraben, und das war gewiss kein vereinzeltes Grab und befand sich auch nicht auf heidnischem Boden, in geweihter Erde, auf jüdischem Boden. Ich stelle mir die Sache so vor, dass im Osten, landeinwärts, zu jüdischen Gegenden hin, sich die Gräber der Juden befanden, während westwärts, zum Meere hin, also gewissermassen im Ausblick nach dem hellenischen Mutterlande, sich die Griechen von Caesarea zu Grabe tragen liessen.

Ebenso wie um Caesarea herum, befand sich auch um Askalon herum ein grosses Grab (T. Oholot, XVIII, 15) in der Gemarkung der Stadt (תaversable אסקלופ), und diese Grenzgebiete, die man früher für unrein hielt, wurden später von den Weisen für rein erklärt; es heisst nämlich: ומכ BALL, was sich nur auf jüdische Juden beziehen kann, denn auf die Stadt Askalon bezogen müsste es heissen ומכ לוהי, auch ist von Askalon selbst erst weiter unten die Rede (אסקלופ הוא אאות בenses). Demnach ist auch bei Caesarea nur von der Gemarkung der Stadt die Rede, also nach dem Wortlaut: vom Osten und Westen Caesarea’s; von der Stadt selbst wird erst in § 16 der Tosephtha abgehandelt. Schon darum ist die Auffassung Büchlers, dass in dem Schluss-Satze der Mischna: נשיבת ומכ על קני ומפורניה, statt vielmehr zu lesen sei, abzuweisen, denn von der Stadt Caesarea selbst wird hier gar nicht abgehandelt, ebenso wie unmittelbar vorher nur vom Osten Akko’s (ומאן לוהי), nicht von Akko selbst, die Rede ist.

In beiden Quellen, in Mischna und Tosephtha, sind die topographischen Angaben über Caesarea in einen Zusammenhang gestellt, der es gar nicht verkennen lässt, dass nur von der Gemarkung der Stadt die Rede ist. Es wird nämlich abgehandelt von Baulichkeiten, die nicht zur häuslichen Wohnung von Menschen, sondern nur zu deren Beschäftigungen dienen. So heisst ein allgemeiner Grundsatz: "die Säulenhallen [selbst wenn sie in heidnisches Wohngebiet eingeklebt sind] gelten nicht als heidnisches Wohngebiet." Zu dieser Kategorie

1 Die in Klammern befindlichen Worte befinden sich nur in der Tosephtha.


1 Also nicht “einen Theil der Ostseite Caesareas” erklärte R. Juda für rein, wie Büchler sagt, sondern nur eine Baulichkeit in Caesarea, die ebensowohl im Osten für rein gelten würde, wenn sie nicht, wie R. Juda das wissen mochte, wirkliche Wohnungen enthielt.


R. Samuel Gama (im 12. Jahrhundert) aufbewahrt (herausgegeben von S. Buber in Graetz-Jubelschrift). Hier lautet der erforderliche Passus wie folgt:


In Jerusalem, um den Tempel herum, gab es eine Exedra (אקזיפיס), das ist ein von Säulen getragener Vorbau; jeden Tag vertheilten sich die Priester in zwei Gruppen, die einen gingen in die Exedra nach Osten, die anderen gingen in die Exedra nach Westen (Mischna Tamid, I, Ende, vgl. Gemara, 28 b). Also wieder der uns wohlbekannte Parallelismus der Bauten; der Name Exedra beweist, dass wir es hier mit einem griechischen

1 Büchler ctitiert unrichtig קמרין, was in keinem Texte steht.
2 MS. Cambridge hat noch verderbter קמרין.
3 Zuckermandel verzeichnet die Variante קמרין, lies קמרין קמרין, wie es einen Absatz früher, in Nr. 12, heisst; קמרין bei Samuel Gama ist in קמרין zu emendieren.

In dem ganzen so räthselhaften Tosephtha-Satzen sind nur noch die Worte טוחן וֹבָא der Erklärung bedürftig. Das sieht zwar wie ein Name aus, denn in alterer Zeit finden wir mehrere mit ב beginnende Namen. Auch טוחן וֹבָא und andere Tannaiten, deren Vater טוחן וֹבָא hieß, finden sich genug häufig, ja, im Namen eines טוחן וֹבָא tradiern sogar die Rabbinen von Caesarea (j. Sabbath, II, 5 a, Seder ha-Doroth s. v.), was in unserem Falle, da von Caesarea die Rede ist, gut passen würde. Dennoch aber kann in dem fraglichen Satze ein Personennamen nicht untergebracht werden, denn es fehlt Alles, was

1 Vgl. die Schreibung von אֶפְשָׁרָה neben אֶפְשָׁרָה (Lehnordner, § 187). Freilich findet sich sonst nur אֶפְשָׁרָה, so dass die hier vorhandene Schreibung immerhin auffallend ist, auch wenn sie für möglich und sogar für richtig anerkannt werden muss.

2 דַּרְחַה der Mischna erklärt Aschori mit Exedra, so sehr ist dieser Bau hier am Platze.
auf einen Ausspruch eines Tannaiten schliesse. In dem Vordersatz haben wir zwar ein דין חמס נבי בר שמעון, aber in dem Nachsatz fehlt schon דין חמס נבי, und unsomehr vermisst man den Ausspruch selbst.


weil man an den fraglichen Ort Erde aus Heidenland gebracht haben kann; zweitens wegen der Unreinheit der menschlichen Gebeine. Ersterer Grund waltet ob im Süden und Norden von Caesarea, letzterer im Osten und Westen, mit den Ausnahmen, die oben berührt worden sind. Nach alledem lautet der schwierige Tosephtha-Passus wie folgt:

"Was ist der Westen von Caesarea? Von dem Kamarion der Exedra, das also ein Innenbau ist, bis zur alten Stadtmauer. Alles übrige aber (d. i. die anderen Gemarkungen von Caesarea) ist unrefin, weil es heidnisches Land ist."

Samuel Krauss.

Budapest, September 1901.
ZUM SCHRIFTTUM DER SÜDARABISCHEN JUDEN.


Das nebst den Commentaren umfasst Bl. 1-111 a. Es folgen dann verschiedene Beilagen, und zwar:


Bl. 113 b-116 a: "Jore Daia" aus derselben Schrift.

Bl. 116 b-118 a: "Jore Daia" aus einer unbekannten Schrift.

Bl. 118 b-119 a: "Jore Daia" aus derselben Schrift.

Bl. 119 b-137 b: "Jore Daia" aus derselben Schrift, die bekanntlich das Hauptstudium der Schächter in Jemen bilden, s. "Saphir I", 53 a, 61 b. Am Schluss endlich (fol. 137 b) enthält die Publication ein Formular, dessen Anfang lautet: "Maimonides' ",

1 Da die Handschrift nach der Erschaffung der Welt datirt ist, so könnte man daraus schliessen, dass sie nicht in Jemen entstanden ist, denn hier ist diese Aera nach "Saphir I", 62 b fast ganz unbekannt. Andererseits aber haben wir gesehen, dass im "Saphir I" eine jemenische Handschrift aus d. J. 5346 citirt wird und ebenso datiren die Rabbiner San'a's ihr Responsum an 'Ammod (s. weiter unten) nach dieser Aera. Auch die Daten auf dem Titelblatt aus d. J. 5346 sind, wieso in Aden gedruckt, nach Erschaffung der Welt ("ם" "ם") gegeben. In dem Formular des Scheidebriefs allerdings ("ם" "ם" fol. 33 b) ist nur die Contracten-Aera angewandt.
Man sieht daraus, was für hohe Anforderungen, auch in sittlicher Hinsicht, an einen Schochet in Jemen gestellt werden. Die eigentliche Ursache dafür ist die, dass in diesem Lande der Act des Schlachtens mit einem mystischen Nimbus umgeben ist, weil dort noch dem Glauben an Metempsychose und ähnlichen Vorstellungen Rechnung getragen wird. 'Ammûd sagt das ausdrücklich in seiner Vorrede und beruft sich dabei u. A. auf die entsprechenden Stellen im (dem Teil über Metempsychose und ähnlichen Vorschriften Rechnung getragen wird. 'Ammûd sagt das ausdrücklich in seiner Vorrede und beruft sich dabei u. A. auf die entsprechenden Stellen im \( \text{Taldir} \) (s. ed. Poritz, 1786, fol. 111 ff.) und in Elia Kohen's \( \text{Cap. 36} \). Aus letzterer Schrift gibt er auch (nach der Vorrede) ein diesbezügliches Gebet, das vor dem Schlachten zu recitiren ist. Man sieht daraus, dass der Aberglaube noch jetzt ebenso bei den Juden Südarabiens seine Herrschaft ausübt, wie vor mehr als 40 Jahren, damals als Saphir sie besucht hat, und dabei befindet sich doch speziell Aden in steter Berührung mit der Aussenwelt und ist 'Ammûd, wie wir gleich sehen werden, ein unter seinen Landsleuten verhältnismässig beachtenswerter Gelehrter.


1 In Anschluss daran findet sich folgender sonderbarer Passus in der Vorrede 'Ammûds, dessen Quelle aber nicht angegeben wird:

2 Vgl. auch Saphir I, 63 b.
Ausserdem aber enthält das am Schluss (von Bl. 45 ab) noch verschiedene Beilagen, und zwar:


Endlich enthält die letzte Seite 63 b zunächst wieder etwas Aberglaubisches, nämlich eine Auflösungsformel für Flüche, Gelübde und dgl. in Bezug auf einen Verstorbenen, die vor dessen Beerdigung zu recitiren ist (תִּשְׁלָשׁוֹת לֶצְמִית קְוָדָם שְׁכִובָרָיו, und das Kaddisch-Gebet, das auf dem Friedhof gesagt wird (נַנְנַת וְדוֹרֶשׁ שְׁכִובָרָיו).

Ich glaube nun, dass auch diese Publication uns einen Einblick in das gegenwärtige geistige Leben der Juden Südarabiens gewähren kann.

III. Zuletzt sei mir gestattet, in Anschluss an diese meine Beschreibung, Einiges zur Abhandlung Prof. Bachers zu bemerken: — p. 603, nr. 6. In Jerusalem erschien ebenfalls bei Zuckermann 1897

eine Pesach-Haggada mit dem Comm. ותניניו des Jahjá Şalíh (s. Luncz's Ḥapále, 5658, p. 98). Wahrscheinlich aber ist das nur eine Separatausgabe aus dem Siddur.


Endlich sei noch erwähnt, dass auch in Wien, 1896, ein ד'י סיה nach Ritus San'a erschienen ist (s. Steinschneider, Monatsschrift, 1901, p. 123), über den mir aber nichts Näheres bekannt ist.

Samuel Poznański.

Warschau, d. 8. Mai 1902.
CRITICAL NOTICES.

JASTROW'S "STUDY OF RELIGION."


So many persons are now interested in the historical study of religion, that a good book on the subject is sure to meet with a hearty reception; and to such a reception Professor Jastrow's volume is well entitled. Its purpose and scope differ from those of other works of "introduction." We have several admirable descriptions and discussions of social and psychological religious phenomena: the Manuel of Chantepie de la Saussaye, with its details (in the two editions) of the lower and the higher faiths; Jevons's attractive exposition of the stadia of religious development; Tiele's discussion of the elements of religious belief in his Gifford Lectures; to which may be added the material brought together by Max Müller in his Gifford volumes. Jastrow's object is to set forth the proper method of studying religion, and the relation of the science of religion to other allied sciences. The literature of the subject, which is extensive, is handled by him with ease; he writes out of a full mind, with clearness, force, and sympathy, and his volume ought to secure the end he has in view, namely, to recommend the historical study of religion to all educated classes in the community.

The material is divided into three parts. The first, "General Aspects," deals with the history and nature of the study of religion, the classification of religions, the character and the definitions of religion, and the origin of religion. The second, "Special Aspects," discusses the relation of religion to ethics, philosophy, mythology, psychology, history, and culture. The third, "Practical Aspects," points out the proper attitude of mind in the study of religions, the necessity of going to original authorities, the desirableness of introducing the historical study of religion into colleges, universities, and theological schools, and the value of museums as an aid to the student. Two Appendixes describe the programme of the Section of History of Religions in the Paris École des Hautes Études, and the
arrangement of the Musée Guimet. Finally a valuable selected bibliography is given, and an index. The historical survey in the first chapter is intended not only to exhibit the steps by which the study of religion has reached the position of a science, but also to enforce the proper method of study. The ancients, the author points out, concerned themselves very little with the investigation of alien cults; the Greeks alone—and they only to a limited extent—showed interest in the subject; it is, however, proper to observe that the spirit and methods of Herodotus, Plutarch, Pausanias, and the author of the De Syriis dea are not bad, and that, under favourable conditions, these writers would probably have produced valuable works. Dr. Jastrow then traces the development in Christianity—the intolerance of the middle period, when all other religions were regarded as beneath notice—the dogmatic hostile naturalism of the English deists, followed by the scepticism of the eighteenth century—the appearance of a broader and more sympathetic view in Spinoza, Lessing, Herder, Hegel, Carlyle and others—and finally (through the discovery of the great Eastern religions, and the growth of the historical spirit) the rise of the modern science, represented by Max Müller, Tiele, Réville, Tylor, Robertson Smith, Frazer, Jevons, Chantepie de la Saussaye, and others, and in magazines (the Paris Revue de l'histoire des religions and the Tübingen Archiv für Religionswissenschaft) and museums. To the nineteenth century is due the credit of having established the correct method of the study of religions—full and careful collection of material, and sympathetic and unbiased interpretation of the facts.

The difficult question of the classification of religions is discussed by Dr. Jastrow at length; he reviews the various schemes proposed, and gives his own. In the course of the discussion he mentions certain considerations that are of general interest. Thus, he points out the difference between types of religious faiths and phases of religion. There are stages of belief through which all communities, or in some cases all civilized communities, pass; animism appears to be universal in certain stadia of culture, and is, besides, not a religious faith but a scientific creed—a basis of religion, but not itself religion; magic and ancestor-worship exist or have existed everywhere in the world; the conceptions of the deity as manifesting himself in nature and in history (regarded by Max Müller as distinguishing the Aryans and the Semites respectively) are found among all cultivated peoples, and, in germinal form, even among savages; monotheism, which to many seems a satisfactory differentia, is a tendency rather than a distinctive creed—it is the goal toward which all cultivated society moves. Those things, then, Jastrow
concludes, cannot in themselves be regarded as valid distinguishing marks of religions. He insists, further, that there is a disposition to lay too great stress on race as a factor in social development: not only is it hard to define the term "race" (we know of no community of unmixed blood), but it is true that peoples of different ancestral origin will, under similar external conditions, develop similar mental characteristics. In this statement he is doubtless right, but it must also be admitted that, if we take "race" in the sense of a unitary social agglomeration, racial tendencies are important factors of growth—the differences between Hebrew and Hindoo, or between Chinese and Greek, are real and effective; and unity may be imposed on a mixed community by a single element, as in the United States (an illustration cited by Dr. Jastrow), where the motley mixture of nationalities is dominated and coerced by the Anglo-Saxon spirit. The caution against putting undue emphasis on racial divisions is timely; but there seems to be no objection to recognizing an old Semitic type and an old Greek (or perhaps West-Aryan) type of religion, and perhaps some others. Another remark of Professor Jastrow's, that no great religion stands as the representative of a single idea, may be heartily endorsed; the life of a civilized community, of which its religion is one expression, is too complicated to be reduced to a single element. Finally, Jastrow accepts, without discussion, the view, held by most recent writers (Mr. Andrew Lang is an exception), that there has been in general a steady advance, intellectual and moral, in the religious life of the world as a whole, and in the religious experience of every separate community. On the basis of these principles he passes judgment on the current systems of classification. It is a pleasant illustration of his sympathetic attitude that he has a friendly word for the impossible (but once popular) division of religions into true and false: even from the historical point of view, he remarks, such a division has a certain value, in so far as it recognizes a development of religious thought—a forward and a retrograde movement. As specimens of philosophical classifications he takes those of Hegel and Hartmann⁴, and rejects them for the reason that they attempt to characterize each religion by a single idea or salient point. Hegel's historical outlook is limited—he does not consider Buddhism, Mazdeism, or Islam; and, for the rest of the civilized world, it is obvious that, in defining the Greek religion as the religion of beauty and freedom, the Roman as that of organization, and the Hebrew as that of majesty, while his conception is original and attractive, he does not reach the

¹ Schelling's scheme also is interesting. There are some excellent remarks on the general subject in H. Schultz's *Alttestamentliche Theologie*. 
essential features of these faiths. Hartmann had the advantage of a better knowledge of the historical facts; but Dr. Jastrow finds his division of religious types into naturalistic and supranaturalistic unsatisfactorily vague, though acute and magnificent; thus Hartmann (following Hegel) makes the Greek religion the aesthetic refinement of naturalistic henotheism; certainly it may be said to be this, but it is something more. Max Müller's classification on the basis of language is now generally abandoned. Kuenen's division into national religions and universal religions (taking "universal" to mean "adapted to all times and places") brings out an important point (the non-local elements in certain religions), but puts into the background higher ethical and other resemblances: in this classification Christianity stands alongside of Buddhism and Islam, and apart from Judaism. The similar division into religions with and those without an individual founder is rejected by Jastrow for the reason that it lays the stress on a relatively unimportant point; all religious progress is due largely to individuals, and no individual is more than the organizer of already existing conceptions. Tiele, in his article "Religions" in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, after criticising other schemes, offers an elaborate classification of his own into Primitive Naturalism, Animism, National Polytheistic Religions, Nomistic Religions, and Universal Religions. The objections to the inclusion of animism and universal religions are mentioned above, and Jastrow further objects to this classification that it is inexact in that, for example, national polytheistic religions, having religious and civil codes, may also be classed as nomistic. Later, in his Gifford Lectures, Tiele so far modifies this scheme as to lay the principal stress on the division into the two main types, nature-religions and ethical religions—in the former of these types divine beings are not regarded as acting in accordance with ethical considerations. This general division, Dr. Jastrow holds, is valuable, yet hard to carry out consistently; thus, the Greek and Roman religions, which Tiele puts into his first class, must be regarded as ethical. Similar difficulties appear in Réville's classification into polytheistic and monotheistic, the former including animistic and fetishistic cults, national mythologies (China, Egypt, Babylonia, Greece, Rome, Germany), and legalistic religions (Brahmanism, Mazdeism, Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism), and the latter Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (though the emphasis put by Réville on legal organization is a valuable point). Raoul de la Grasse (in his Des Religions comparées, &c.) enumerates twenty-two proposed classifications, all of which are set aside by Jastrow as open to one or another of the objections above stated. His own classification is
based on the view that the highest form of religion is that in which there is complete accord between religion and life, and of such accord he distinguishes four grades: the religions of savages, in which the cult is meagre, and the superhuman powers are approached only in times of peril; the religions of primitive culture, characterized by animism, magic and ancestor-worship, and by an incipient union between religion and life, in which, however, there being little religious organization, large sections of life (such as marriage and the training of children) are omitted; the religions of advanced culture (India, Babylonia, Egypt, China, Greece, Rome), with powerful priesthoods and good general religious organization, so that a considerable proportion of the acts of life are in direct contact with religion; and finally, the religions that emphasize as an ideal the coextensiveness of religion with life (Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam). It must be admitted that this classification, which its author sets forth with great force and persuasiveness, avoids many of the faults of its predecessors, and is attractive by its simplicity and breadth. Abandoning the attempt to fix on any one doctrine or usage as a nota, it distinguishes religions by their degrees of intellectual and moral culture—that is, by the culture of the communities by which they are professed. Religion is thus treated as one element of general human culture, having of necessity close relations with all other elements. Dr. Jastrow remarks that all schemes of classification are beset with difficulties, and his own, well thought out as it is, suggests some questions. One is surprised to find Islam put higher in the scale than the religions of Greece and Rome. We must compare the highest forms of these religions—the cult of the populace is equally mechanical and non-spiritual in both—and in such a comparison Plato does not fall below Mohammed, or Plutarch, Agricola and Tacitus below the Calif Omar I; the general ethical level was higher in Greece and Rome than it has ever been in purely Moslem lands. Possibly the difficulty lies in the somewhat indefinite expression “the coextensiveness of religion with life.” This cannot be meant to indicate a condition of things in which there is outward recognition of the deity in every act of life, for it is precisely the lower forms of faith that are outwardly the more observant of religion. It must mean a purer and more strenuous ethical life, and in that case, putting aside dogma and creed, we cannot, in accordance with Dr. Jastrow’s general view, put any religion as a whole into any one category, but must always specify time and place; the Christianity of the Spanish peasant does not differ materially from the religion of the Greek peasant of Aristophanes’ time; the mediaeval robber
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baron is not to be compared with Epaminondas; in the Christian church of Corinth in Paul's day there were practices that no respectable club now would permit for a moment. If conduct be the test of excellence, the important thing for a religion is not how far it enters into life, but what sort of life it enters into. Religion never creates a system of morals, nor is there discoverable any relation of cause and effect between the intellectual and ethical conceptions of a given religion and the morals of its adherents. These both spring from certain social conditions, and therefore coexist in a given community. The fact seems to be that wherever there is religion there is a union of religion and life (so Jastrow, on p. 167); religions differ among themselves not in the extent but in the nature of this union. Thus, in respect of rationality and ethical power, religions may be ranked according to the degrees of culture of their communities; any religion, whatever its creed, is at any moment what its adherents make it. Within this general scheme there may be cross-divisions, based on such conceptions as the immanence or the transcendence of the deity, the organization of religious law and worship, the nature of sin and the plan of salvation. It is a great merit of Dr. Jastrow's discussion that it shows the futility of the current attempts to establish an all-embracing classification of religions.

The chapters on the character and origin of religion give full and judicious discussions of these points. Modern writers are substantially at one as to what is meant by "religion," and there will be no objection, except, perhaps, in the case of one expression, to the definition adopted by Jastrow: the natural belief in a Power or Powers beyond our control, on which we feel ourselves dependent, this sense of dependence leading necessarily to the establishment of relations between man and the extra human Powers; it may be well to add that religion proper is nothing but this sentiment, all dogmas, creeds, and ethical codes being the product of science or philosophy. The chapter on the origin of religion criticizes the various views on the subject, and accepts that of Max Müller and Tiele. In this discussion it would be well to distinguish between theories of origin proper and theories of earliest forms. In the latter category belong the theories that make animism, or the worship of ancestors or ghosts, or totemism, the starting-point of religious development; these do not touch the question of the psychological basis of religion—they merely state the phenomena that first called

1 The words "beyond our control" exclude certain forms of magic, which, in the opinion of some writers, are really forms of religion; for these words we might substitute "extrahuman."
into consciousness, and were systematized by the universal human instinct. Here also we must place the views that religion was created by a supernatural divine revelation, or that it is a device of priests to get control of the masses. The unsatisfactory character of such explanations is fully demonstrated by Dr. Jastrow—animism, ancestor-worship, and totemism are simply early forms in which the religious sense expresses itself. Religion, Dr. Tylor well says, is the belief in spiritual beings, and animism is the groundwork of the philosophy of religion, that is, the starting-point of religious, dogmatic, and ritualistic construction. The ultimate basis of religion is man's belief in an extrahuman Power that it behooves him to cultivate. In regard to the accuracy of the expression "the sense of the infinite" (adopted by Müller, Tiele, and Jastrow), opinions will differ; it is unnecessary to quote the criticisms made on the phrase. Probably all will agree that early man has a sense of something beyond and above him, and that this something later develops into the infinite; and the question whether this germinal sense is the sense of the infinite appears to be chiefly one of words. The determination of the origin of this sense is the task not of the history of religions, but of psychology and philosophy.

Part II of the volume deals with one of the most interesting of the questions connected with religion, namely, its relation to other lines of thought. The fact is recognized that religion and ethics are two entirely different developments, and the history of their affiliation is traced; ethical codes are created by experience, and are adopted by religion, which acts as a stimulus of moral life. In the earliest known period, Dr. Jastrow holds, ethics and religion stand quite apart from each other, then came into close union (in the cultivated religions), and later, under the influence of scientific and philosophic thought, the union is dissolved. As to this, I should prefer to say that the union between religion and ethics becomes more and more rational and spiritual: in the lowest cults religion accepts and guards the current system of morals (which may be low and mechanical), and in the highest (in the most advanced modern forms, for example) the union of religion and morality appears to be closer and more refined than ever before. So, one may doubt whether progress in religious organization entails loss of individualism (p. 217)—on the contrary, in religion, as in commerce, politics, and science, the more organization the more individualism; and in fact Jastrow seems to say this on the preceding page. He proceeds to point out how various problems (as the conceptions of God, sin, salvation) involved in religion have been taken up by philosophy, and how mythology is an appeal to man's emotional
nature and a conservative force; or, as it may be otherwise put, both philosophy and mythology belong in the category of science—both attempt to account for the world, human and extrahuman, and thus to supply a framework for the religious sentiment. He calls attention to the value of recent physiological-psychological investigations (by Wundt, Starbuck, and others), which undertake to determine the character of certain psychic phenomena—not merely visions, hallucinations, and the like, but all inward experiences, normal and abnormal (conversion and the religious emotional life generally); religious psychology must deal, indeed, with the whole history of man—the science is still in its infancy. It is obvious that religion is closely bound up with general history and culture, is in fact one element of these; and, among other things, Jastrow has admirable remarks on the so-called conflict between science and religion—a conflict historically real, but philosophically unreal.

Part III is a commendation of the historical study of religion, for the sake of culture and in the interests of religion itself. A comprehension of its nature and history, it is urged, must increase its power. The attitude of the student must be sympathetic without being vague and vacillating; he must recognize and endeavour to understand the various tendencies of human thought and the differing demands of diverse temperaments, and, at the same time, must have his own opinion, based on the probabilities of the case. If he be a Moslem, fully convinced of the truth and superiority of his faith, he must have his eyes open to what is true and praiseworthy in Buddhism; if he be a philosopher, standing above all religions, he must search for what is rational in all; Jews and Christians, Protestants, Romanists, and Greeks must be not inimical but hospitable each communion to the others. This is the only scientific attitude. Further, Jastrow insists, the student must go to the original authorities, and not judge any religion till he has studied its documents in the original tongue; Christians too much neglect the Talmud, and Jews the New Testament. It is not possible for one man to master all religions, but he may make himself familiar with one or two, and so acquire a sound critical method and a certain capacity of insight in dealing with religions for whose materials he must depend on the testimony of other men. The volume closes with an earnest plea for the prosecution of the historical study of religions in colleges, universities, and theological schools; the feasibility and desirability of such study is shown, and a programme is sketched. Well-constituted faculties of the new science have been established in France and Holland, and a beginning in this direction has been made in America. It is the business of universities, Dr.
Jastrow remarks, to conduct investigations in the history of religions; there can be no doubt that the establishment of chairs for this purpose in all higher schools of learning would promote the cause of religion and of general culture. No subject has a greater claim on society than the study of the paths by which mankind has reached its present position in regard to the relation between man and God. The details, including the establishment of museums (like the Musée Guimet in Paris), might be worked out by every university or college for itself.

This outline of Professor Jastrow's book by no means does justice to the fullness and suggestiveness of its contents; but it may serve to commend the volume to the attention of those who are interested in furthering the historical study of religions.

CRAWFORD HOWELL TOY.

Harvard University.

DALMAN'S NEW DICTIONARY.


After an interval of four years, Dr. Dalman has given us the second half of his Dictionary, and thus completed a scholarly, concise, and handy work. The great merit lies in its handiness, since it offers in one volume of moderate size all that the student requires for preparatory work, and is, at the same time, a lucid and reliable guide. For this reason its strictly alphabetical arrangement is a commendable feature, whilst its completeness is such, that it also deals with corrupted words for which the usual uncritical reprints of Targums and Rabbinic writings are responsible. As regards etymological research, the book will not, and is not meant to, supplant the existing larger works; but it offers much material for corrections of the same, especially in the way of vocalization. There is no doubt that, from this point of view, Dr. Dalman's book marks a progress over its predecessors. Considering the complex nature of the language to be dealt with, consisting of various Aramaic dialects, Aramaicisms in Hebrew words, Hebraisms in Aramaic words, foreign words, the fixing of vowels is a very arduous undertaking. The present condition of the printed Targums (with the exception of a few critical editions lately published) has been too long a source of dissatisfaction to the reader. This also applies to quotations from the
Talmud used for liturgical purposes, and Aramaic prayers in which the grossest misreadings have unfortunately acquired a hold made secure by age. Jewish students, in particular, should be trained to forsake the old slovenly ways, and read such texts according to the requirements of grammar. Some good beginnings, it is true, have been made, but this custom should be made much more general. With the material now available there is no longer any excuse for the intelligent reader to continue in the old methods. For some of the most common corruptions Dr. Dalman has substituted the correct pronunciation, with the evident intention of assisting the unmindful reader.

Dr. Dalman has also, in this second part of his book, taken no notice of Cod. Montefiore 116 (see preceding number of this Review p. 161, No. 7). This MS., written in 1486, and evidently copied from an excellent original, furnishes a considerable number of variations both as regards words and spellings. The following few instances are selected at random: 2 Sam. xiii. 18, M. אַלְנִיהָ, D. יַנָּה; xx. 26, נַמִּיר, M. missing (as also in Lagarde's edition); 1 Kings xiv. 3, M. הָלָז (see D., s. v. לָז); 2 Kings xiv. 13, M. פְּרָם (D., s. v. פְּרָמַם); xix. 21 (D., s. v. פְּרָמַם), M. מִסְפָּרָת; Isaiah xiii. 3 (D., s. v. הָרֶע); M. מִסְפָּרָת (Lagarde); xl. 4, M. מִסְפָּר (D., s. v. מִסְפָּר); lxvi. 20, M. רֹבּות; xiii. 4, M. מִסְפָּר (D., s. v. מִסְפָּר); Jer. iv. 14 (D., s. v. בּוֹרָה), M. כָּפָל; xx. 2, D. קַמְרָא, M. קַמְרָא (see Levy); Prov. vi. 31, M. מִסְפָּר, as D.; Lagarde ספָּר, &c.

As regards Yemenian MSS. of Targums, which have recently come much to the fore on account of their superlinear vowels, one must not forget that they are of comparatively late date. It is, therefore, a question whether their vocalization has been faithfully handed down to us, or whether it was in any way influenced by Arabic. מָעַרַת (Ar. מַחֲנָה, but Syr. מַחֲנָה, see Wright, Comparative Grammar, p. 85) might be regarded as an instance of this kind, because the word is so to be found only in Yemenian MSS. — With regard to סְחָר, zum Abfall (vom Gesetze) zwingen, it might have been hinted that the word is not a direct formation of סֵחָר, but rather a Shaf'el of סְחָר (Syr. to baptize), the v being subsequently omitted, and replaced in the usual way. This is an interesting case of popular etymology, helped into existence by the ordinary meaning of סְחָר both in Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic. The reading סְחָר is hardly correct, and should be סְחָר (see 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31). Piel forms of עֲנָר are not used at all.

When the living Aramaic dialect of the Jews east of Mosul becomes better known, it may prove useful for the further recognition of the language of the Targums and Rabbinic literature.

H. HIRSCHFELD.
DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE OF HEBREW MSS. OF THE MONTEFIORRE LIBRARY.

V (continued).

389. Cabbalistic treatises of Menahem Azariah of Fano.
1. תורת התשובה, according to the teachings of R. Isaac Loria, beginning תורת התשובה שרוש נרי זכר." י"א בלשון זכר נר מוזכרת תורת התשובה.
2. Fol. 53. ספר החלש השבך חכם." י"א חכם.
3. Fol. 57. Amidah, Spanish rite, with additional prayers.
4. Fol. 67. ספרא החושך והתרות רדידית.

Paper, Ital. curs. char., 14mo, ff. 69 [H. No. 43].

340. 1. ספר חלוש השבך, by Jacob Semah, beginning with Index; fol. 2v, י"א יבשות, composed of Num. x. 35-36, by writing the letters vertically in columns.
2. Fol. 47. ספר חלוש השבך, Biographical sketch of Isaac Loria.

 Owners: David Piazza in Ferrara, 1722; Moise Zoa of Rovigo.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 60 [H. No. 348].

341. ספר חלוש השבך, by Jacob Semah Hayyim, being based on the writings of Hayyim Vital. The work was commenced Tuesday, 7 Marheshwan, 5526 (1766) in Jerusalem. The MS. is a copy from the author's autograph.

Presented to Sir Moses Montefiore by Senior Salmond Seniorson in Jerusalem.

Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 84 [No. 452].

342. ספר חלוש השבך, also called ספר חלוש השבך, by Jacob b. Semah, headed by a poem beginning ד"ו פארא הרבבה ובסידרא. The author's preface begins על"ו לשבך א"ש שלם'(סידרא רב) ומשה לשבך נר(סידרא רב) על"ו לשבך א"ש光纤 שלם'(סידרא רב) ומשה לשבך נר(סידרא רב). The author's preface begins על"ו לשבך א"ש שלם'(סידרא רב) ומשה לשבך נר(סידרא רב) על"ו לשבך א"ש光纤 שלם'(סידרא רב) ומשה לשבך נר(סידרא רב).
2. Fol. 50v. ספר חלוש השבך, second part, from ch. xxxvi to lxxii.

Ital. curs. char., large fol., ff. 84 [H. No. 22].
343. a. Obituary notice on R. David [Aryeh Lida] of Amsterdam, with reference to his works, probably by his son.


d. Elegies, beginning "TWI VW3 TIN."

e. 1. Fol. 4. A piece headed "yah mvo in TIP in VNRWIN Ms TON; 2. [nDjaJ.Y'aanuron nvp; 3. Fol. 12. pnn iron; 4. Fol. 18v. miccta tiahn -no; 5. Fol. 21. nma nnain ♦1Kr6; 6. Fol. 41. The prayer "IONC (with Cabbalistic Commentary)."

Modern German curs., 4to, ff. 49 [No. 247].

344. noann nmpDl niDl^ynnBD, by Shabbethai Rafael, Cabbalistic (medical) treatise (printed).

Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 17 [No. 519].

345. [Halberstam erroneously apurbed], Commentary on the "ININTLHIN," by Jacob Marago of Tetuan.

Colophon: ""C מתאן טוב מאיהazar אטלגנער ושייחטש אוות הזע מ""Fוסיארש עשה אוות ה', המקובל אואר מ""N璘שבר סאמומא או""Zירוס החבד תוקב מאואר נ""N תוקא שמ זמאאט לוקרב.

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 64 [H. No. 23].


3. Fol. 69. תועל, Cabbalistic treatise on ritual matters.

4. Fol. 70. Glosses on marriage ceremonies, according to Moses Zacuto.


Owner: Emmanuel Colonna of Turin, 1737.

Ital. curs. char., large 8vo, ff. 74 [H. No. 78].

347. שתאר רアプリ, Discussions on the כסף רייאלאב', by Elyashvim Mehlsack(maidאלאך). German curs. char., 4to, ff. 19 [H. No. 44].

348. by Abraham Galante (1568), from the writings of Moses Corduero, Isaac Ashkenazi, Israel Saruk, Meir Cohen, Samson Cohen, and Isaac Loria.
2. Fol. 88. סְפִּיטֶר קְרֵנֵי תֹּכֶא, ascribed to the Patriarch Jacob, with Commentary (see Neubauer, *Cat. Jews' Coll.*, p. 28).
    Owner: Samuel Josef b. אַּדָּא רַ rode.
    Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 114 [H. No. 14].

349. 1. דִּרְמְשִׁים, by Moses Zaccuto.


3. Fol. 40. שָׁשֶׁת תַּעְקוֹבָא.


5. Fol. 57. לֶלְכָּה בְּוַתִּין שָׁתוֹמ לֶלְכָּה שִׁמְחָת בְּשָׁבוּת.

6. Fol. 63. בשיבושים.

7. Fol. 67. יֶרְשָׁה הָכְלָם.

8. Fol. 71. אֵּֽלֶךָ מְ, מַעָּלֶךָ; with many diagrams, and table of contents on fol. 1.
    Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 77 [H. No. 34].

    Bought of Israel Goldblum in Rome, 1889.
    Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 27 [H. No. 47].

351. 1. סְפִּיטֶר וְאֵֽלֶךָ, Cabbalistic treatise by David Majâr.


3. Fol. 67. סְפִּיטֶר יְהֹוָאָב יְסָכָּה, by the copyist Josef מַעָּרֵדָה (see below), bibliographical notes, chiefly based on Hayyim Josef David Azulai; fol. 72, List of the latter's works.

Written by Josef Murdach, who, in a note on fol. 17, states that he found the work mentioned under No. 1, in the house of Daniel מַעָּרֵדָה in Salonica. The copy was commenced on Purim, 5575 (1715).
    Orient. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 107 [H. No. 197].

352. Cabbalistic prescriptions in alphabetical order with explanations in (Jewish) German. On colophon, draft of a letter to R. מַעָּרֵדָה.
    German curs. char., small 8vo, ff. 21 [No. 449].

353. סְפִּיטֶר קְרֵנֵי תֹּכֶא, Cabbalistic commentary on [a printed edition, and pasted round the leaves of] סְפִּיטֶר קְרֵנֵי תֹּכֶא (Reggio, 1806), by Samuel Isaac b. Moses Hayy Finzi. The introduction is dated Ferrara, 28 Ab, 5605 (1845). On the last page there is a poem שַׁבָּעַה יְוַּעַרְבָּא מַעָּרֵדָה.
    Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 46 [H. No. 56].

354. 1. Cabbalistic treatise, beginning הֲוַיְּקָרֵדָה, commentary on the Sefirot. Fol. 197, are mentioned R. David, and his son
Abraham, further Isaac the Blind and his pupils: a. Ezra, who wrote Cabalistic commentaries on Canticles and obscure Agadah of the Talmud; b. Azriel, who wrote Cabalistic commentaries on Canticles and obscure Agadah of the Talmud.

2. Fol. 20. by R. Azriel; fol. 22, Jacob Nazeri mentioned.


Owner: Mordecai.

355. Cabalistic notes and observations by Nathan Aryeh b. David Zimmer, dedicated to Sir Moses Montefiore at the completion of his centenary (1885).
Observations on Ps. cxix; d. Fol. 92. Prayer; e. Fol. 100. Comments on behalf of Moses Ashkenazi. Ff. 24°, 26°, 27°, 82°, and 83° in Italian; many diagrams and marginal notes.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 114 [H. No. 19].

359. Several Cabbalistic treatises:
1. אוצרות חז' וראז [א] [דרור], with [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] by Hayyim Vital, and other abstracts from the latter’s writings.


3. Fol. 27. Cabbalistic prayer attributed to R. Imael.

4. Fol. 30. מדר חתוניה, by Hayyim Vital, headed תַּוְּכַה [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] by Moses Zaccuto: fol. 47, [Pot's for Passover; fol. 48, מְשַׁרְיָה תַּוְּכַה].

Cabbalistic prayer on the Passover Hagadah.

5. Fol. 40. שער הפרוטו

6. Fol. 43. קלי לי, by Isaac Loria.

German curs. char., small 8vo, ff. 47 [No. 463].

360. [Title on cover, inside], beginning wanting; a. Fol. 2. מחר העמיד; b. Fol. 109. מחר העמיד; c. Fol. 175. [Pot's for Passover; fol. 195. מְשַׁרְיָה תַּוְּכַה].

With many marginal notes.

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 203 [H. No. 18].

361. [also styled שָׁרִים], by Moses Zaccuto; fol. 47, מקוב for Passover; fol. 48, מְשַׁרְיָה תַּוְּכַה.

[The name is printed at the end of, מְשַׁרְיָה תַּוְּכַה, Salonica, 1755.]

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 48 [H. No. 27].

VI.

POETRY.

362. I. Poems by Judah al-Harizi, headed [י] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] [ד] by Moses Zaccuto; fol. 3b, מְשַׁרְיָה תַּוְּכַה. The following are the headings in which names of persons occur. Fol. 4, מְשַׁרְיָה תַּוְּכַה; fol. 4, מְשַׁרְיָה תַּוְּכַה.
II. Fol. 14. Moses b. Ezra, headed, beg. על יינו (2 II.); ibid., שאה האשה והשקית מי כו (2 II.), followed by a piece in rhymed prose, beginning בברט адреса שלטט נבשעל וד (2 II.)

על ספירת חתナイ תأمل וינע, ובשעת תורים וחציו יכין השחתה; ibid.,.getAddress address והירוג רכ保護 והתמכות (Share with the) תוכן בקשת לארז; ibid., המברק,.Bean נהרגו אורי רジー עד רמה (Share with the) תוכן בקשת לארז; fol. 15., headed, הבורammable אנרכ בתה בתה מ벗וע עצים לארז, עד עדית לטומן מפרק ויקי' ibid., בענה,_Modern Hebrew accent on the Mishnah; fol. 16, בענה, With many variations from the printed editions.
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III. Fol. 42. Solomon b. Gabirol, beg. (17 ll.); ibid., beg. (18 ll.); fol. 43, beg. (39 ll.); fol. 44, beg. (21 ll.); ibid., beg. (33 ll.); ibid., beg. (8 ll.).

III. Fol. 45. Leib Shaked (6 ll.); ibid., beg. (17 ll.); ibid., beg. (21 ll.); ibid., beg. (14 ll.); ibid., beg. (46 ll.); fol. 47, headed (45 ll.); fol. 48, Moses b. Ezra. (20 ll.); ibid., beg. (54 ll.).

III. Fol. 49, headed (55 ll.); fol. 50, beg. (10 ll.); ibid., beg. (48 ll.).

III. Fol. 51, headed (15 ll.); fol. 52, headed (44 ll.); fol. 53, headed (11 ll.); ibid., beg. (10 ll.); ibid., beg. (10 ll.).

IV. Fol. 54. Judah Halevi (see Luzatto, Divan, fol. 132); ibid., fol. 38, beg. (16 ll.); ibid., fol. 55, headed (18 ll.); ibid., fol. 56, headed (40 ll.); ibid., beg. (40 ll.).

IV. Fol. 57, beg. (5 ll.).
VI. Fol. 82. Headed "בכבלה וידיעת" (777), beg. מְלֹא הַמֶּשֶׁךָ, rhymed prose; ibid., Several epigrams of Abraham b. Ezra; ibid., שָׁפִּירֵי שְׁפִּירוֹת, fol. 84, "בר יִבְּרֵי", (4 ll.);
ibid., "שָׁפִּירֵי שְׁפִּירוֹת", (2 ll.);
ibid., "שָׁפִּירֵי שְׁפִּירוֹת", fol. 85, ibid., סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, ibid., סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר. (4 ll.);
ibid., סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 86v, אָדוֹן, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר; ibid., סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 88, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 89v, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 90, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר.

VII. Fol. 94. Moses b. Ezra, epigrams; ibid., סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 95, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 96, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 97v, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 98, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 99, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 100, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 101, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 102, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 103, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר, fol. 104, סֵלָמָתָן יִשְׁתַּחֵזֶר. Here the MS. breaks off.
THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

778


Span. curs. char., 4to, ff. 108 [H. No. 242].


2. Fol. 7v. Sefer Haichi, by Josef Ezöbi, copied from the edition (Venice), 1578.


5. Fol. 42v. More poems. After fol. 48 seven leaves have been torn out; ff. 49–95, blanks; fol. 96, Notice about the death of the writer’s father, 10 Sivan, 5539 (1779), of Josef Gedaliah, the 24th of the same month, and of Haiyim Gedaliah, 1806.

Modern Orient. curs. char., 1amo, ff. 106 [H. No. 268].


Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 26 [H. No. 372].

366. Secular poems by an unknown poet. The beginning is missing.

I. Fol. 1. Headed םירחואל הנהנ (see J. Q. R., vol. XII, p. 138); fol. 2v. שיר ליפור, שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (3 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (7 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (11 ll.); fol. 3, שיר ליפור, והFormatted (4 ll.); fol. 4, שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (5 ll.); fol. 5, שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, והFormatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, והformatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר ליפור, וה_formatted (4 ll.); ibid., שיר L
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A later copy of the poem, fol. 18 (inverted) is to be found at the end of the volume.

Ital. curs. char., 16mo, ff. 40 [H. No. 178].

367. סֵפֶר יִבְנֵי שָׂם נַתְנִי הָאָלֶגַי לְעֵדִים. Letters and poems, by Josef b. Judah p'TNT, in Ferrara, collected by his son Shealtiel. At the head the following poem:—

This is followed by a short introduction by the compiler. The work is divided into five sections:

I. Fol. 5. Letters to Benjamin b. Jequithiel of Corinaldo; various
letters and invitations, signed to R. Isaiah b. Nissim, and Mordecai b. Mordecai; fol. 22, Letter, written at Oria (Oria?), to Benjamin Corinaldo on the occasion of the marriage of the latter's daughter Abigail; fol. 23, Poem, beginning "I shall go forth to thee," beginning "I shall make thee", followed by "Rodeh shivah"; fol. 24, Wedding poems in honour of his relatives Isaac b. Zerahiah Zark; Menahem b. Moses; son-in-law of R. Nathan, called Bovino; Mordecai of Monselice; Judah Nehemiah; Solomon b. Isaac of Jerusalem; his pupil Jequthiel b. Isaac Finzi; fol. 31, Poem in honour of the circumcision of Benjamin b. Mordecai; Poem sent to Josef b. Judah (Ferrer) in Ancona.

II. Fol. 39. Headed "Letters of condolence to Jacob b. Moses and his brother Judah; Solomon b. Josef; Josef b. Josef; Menahem b. Judah of Jerusalem; his son Shealtiel; epitaphs on the wife of Abigedor of the family Hisdai; Maledictory distich on the death of Stella Finzi (Mozarab) who had caused a conflagration in Ancona, as follows:-

Fol. 53. Dirge on the death of Moses b. Eliezer; of Stella Finzi, at the request of Mordecai Finzi, in order to give comfort to her son David b. Jequthiel; on Dulcinea, mother of his daughter-in-law; on Sarah, wife of Obadiyah and mother of Sarah, written on behalf of Edith, wife of Jequthiel b. Nathanael; fol. 58, In memory of R. Hayyim b. Johanan; of R. Samuel Marsiniano, who died on the road between Mantua and Recanate; on Menahem b. Abigedor.

III. Fol. 62. Headed "Recommendations for Jacob Usque (Eskias), dated Iyyar, 5198 (April, 1438); a certain Meir (1436), and several women to the communities of Mantua, and to a certain Isaac b. Isaac in Recanate; Meshullam b. Menahem; a certain Moses; Aaron b. Moses (fol. 79); Jehiel b. Nathanael; Josef b. Mordecai of Recanate.

IV. Fol. 89. Headed "Poetic addresses (verse and rhymed prose) to the author's brother-in-law Judah";

followed by various imitations by the author; to Mordecai Finzi with a present; to Josef Hezekiah b. Moses; on behalf of Isaac Finzi to his brother-in-law, Menahem of Corinaldo, accompanying a gift of phylacteries; to En Mas'ud b. Jonathan in Ferrara; to Isaac Latif in Modena; Exchange of ditties with Jacob of Toscanella; Elijah b. Menahem; Leon; Judah b. Zerahyah; Benjamin of Legnano; Letter to his brother Shealtiel, and the latter's son Astruc Shealtiel, sent through another nephew, called Judah b. Zerahyah; to Josef b. Josef Kohsn; on behalf of Nathan, called Bonvino, sent to Mordecai of Celone on the occasion of the marriage of his daughter to Josef b. Hayyim; to his son Isaac in Ancona; Letter by Menahem of Judah in Jerusalem; to Benjamin Nathaniel b. Mordecai; to David b. Abraham (the martyr,;width of word); Short poem to his sons Isaac and Judah; to David b. Abraham, when leaving Recanate for Bonhomo (Benjamin) Josef Benveniste; Judah b. Solomon Hisdai; his brother Isaac b. Zerahyah; his pupil Jequthiel b. Isaac Finzi, followed by a quatrains by the latter; Letter to Benjamin b. Solomon of Pesaro in Legnano; to Jehiel b. Jehiel of Modena; (fol. 150) Benjamin b. Menahem Finzi; Solomon called אלכס, followed by various other letters and addresses. The end is wanting. The author wrote between the years 1419 and 1456 in Padua, Cinto, Recanate, and Mantua. Fol. 59, by a later
hand, recommendation of Isaac Blum, signed Mattathias Levi.

On the fly-leaf the following rhymes:

מלכ בהלכה ראה בותחים ולא
זרה ציחרתה כי מידי ליבו
שאל הערפהĂאămחיה אהוב
ונע הנמר לא יא יי אל כל אחיו

Censor: Domenico Ierosolimitano.

Owners: Solomon b. Nathaniel; Abraham Solomand; Jacobo el Comeno.

Ital., Gk. and Rabb. char., poems vocalized, 16mo, ff. 171 [H. No. 207].


b. Fol. 8. 1. beg. (27 ll.); 2. beg. (4 ll.); 3. beg. (5 ll.); 4. beg. (5 ll.); 5. headed (8 ll.).

c. Fol. 9. Eliah Hallevi, 1. beg. (2 ll.); 2. beg. (2 ll.).

d. Fol. 10. Poem in Portuguese (f.).

Ibid. 1. headed (3 ll.); 2. headed (19 ll.); 3. Eight short poems, the last being an acrostic of four lines.

f. Fol. 105. Poem in Portuguese (f.).


b. Fol. 61. Poems from another copy of the same work; fol. 63, Letter to Anselmo (En Solomon) Haninai, signed Solomon b. Reuben Bonfed; fol. 64, Letter to Jacob Alablag.

c. Fol. 71. Elegy on the death of a certain Solomon, and other poems.


Modern squ. and Rabb. char., fol., ff. 130 [H. No. 118].
371. Letters and poems, beginning (25 leaves) missing.

I. a. The author of the first group was probably called David, as may be gathered from a poem (fol. 17), which is preceded by the words 'נֶּאֶר מַמָּוִי לָדוּר'. This is followed by letters to Josef and Judah Benveniste; b. Fol. 18. Letters by Judah Zarqō to Josef b. Jahyah, Josef Hallēvi, Hayyim Ḡalēvi, Josef Ḥayyim, Josef Benveniste; c. Fol. 19. Hayyim Ḡalēvi to Judah Sarfāthi, and the latter's reply; d. Fol. 20. Eliezer Shimeōnī to Meir Kapsālī; e. Fol. 12. Josef Taitaqūq to Meir Benveniste and Isaac Abravanel; f. Fol. 13. Judah Ḥalēvi to Samuel b. Samu'el; g. Fol. 14. Solomon Hallēvi to Solomon b. Yahyah; h. Fol. 15. Benjamin Hallēvi to Josef b. Leb; i. Fol. 15. Elijah Obadiah to Jacob Benveniste; j. Fol. 16. Letters by Solomon b. Ḥayyim (Halberstam, Ḥayyim), (fol. 19) to Isaac Abravanel.


IV. Fol. 136. Fragment of a Commentary on Gen., ch. xli. For many pieces of II and III, see No. 363.

372. Simḥah Qalonymus' poem תְּנֵחַ תְּנֵחַ מָעוֹלָה in form of a dialogue between YirY and דָּרָדָד in four parts, 1. תְּנֵחַ; 2. תְּנֵחַ; 3. תְּנֵחַ; 4. תְּנֵחַ. Modern squ. char., st. 66, ff. 136, 137, later hand, ff. 21-33, blanks, after fol. 61, lacuna; ff. 137 [H. No. 243].


German curs. char., small 8vo, ff. 57 [No. 496].

875. itaLcurs,char.,8vo,ff.6 [H.No.306].

374. ItaLcurs,char.,8vo,ff.6 [H.No.306].


At the end the copyist calls attention to the same author's work.

Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 25 [H. No. 119].


Written Verona, Shebat, 5526 (1766). Autograph.

Ita. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 6 [H. No. 400].


380. Bridal poem by Absalom, written for the wedding of Gabriel Israel Josef Hayyim Triesti, also praising the house of Gabriel b. Jacob Triesti.

Ital. curs. char., 8vo, ff. 5 [H. No. 401].

381. Elegy by Joshua Josef b. David Levi on the death of the Sopher Moses Levi מָשְׂה in Venice, who was buried in Tebeth, 5467 (1707). Fol. 2 gives the names of the members of the Mahamad, and other prominent persons of the Jewish Community.

Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 17 [H. No. 379].

382. Poems by Daniel Belilios with illuminated title-page.

Ital. squ. char., 4to, ff. 16 [H. No. 306].

383. Dictionary of rhymes by Ḥayyim מַטְח in alphabetical arrangement.

Owner: S... b. Israel (outside cover).

Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 36 [H. No. 397].


Large 4to, ff. 84 [H. No. 530].

386. Poems by Moses Ḥayyim commenced in Ellul, 5538 (1778); author's autograph.

Ital. curs. char., 8vo, ff. 50 [H. No. 199].
387. Dramatic poems by Mattathias Nissim Tirni of Pesaro, 1770 to 1772, prefaced by Efraim Josef b. David Rimini.

4to, ff. 84 (and 39 blanks) [H. No. 203].

388. Poem by Elias Aaron Lattes, celebrating the gift of a scroll of the Law by Isaac Jonah Giron, and his son Judah Israel, to the Synagogue in Casale in the year 1820.

4to, ff. 6 [H. No. 374].


Large squ. char., 4to, ff. 3 [H. No. 364].

390. Poem dedicated to Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore, headed שיר Öläl התרורץ נון ורכס, by Josef Joel Rivlin, accompanied by an autograph letter from the author. The poem is an acrostic on the names שלמה ויהודה מונטיפיור.

Large squ. char., 4to, ff. 11 [No. 485].

391. שיר גהל התרורץ נון ורכס, Address and poem in memory of Sir Moses Montefiore's journeys to the East, by Judah b. David b. Aaron hal-Levi, called Leib Laser in Przemysl (Galicia), 1865.

Curs. and squ. char., 8vo, ff. 19 [No. 481].

392. containing two poetic addresses to Sir Moses Montefiore, 1. משלות וחללי, by Isaac Aryeh Leb Gelberg (father), of Kamianka in Galicia; 2. ברוך ולפיים, by Şebi Hirsch Gelberg (son), 7 Kislev, 5630 (1870).

Large curs. char., 8vo, ff. 14 [No. 482].

393. Poem in honour of Sir Moses Montefiore, composed by Mendel Lindo, and presented by the members of the congregation of Keidani and environs, 14 Iyyar, 5606 (1846). Pasted on fly-leaf, משלות ויהודה, poem by Solomon Salmon b. Judah Leb in Wilna.

Squ. char., 4to, ff. 6 [No. 476].

394. Poem presented to Sir Moses Montefiore, by the והבה כרחי, in Praga (May 19, 1846).

Curs. char., 4to, ff. 2 [No. 486].

395. Poetic account of the Damascus blood accusation, composed by Elijah Mordecai Werbel, Professor of Hebrew in Odessa, for the hundredth anniversary of Sir Moses Montefiore's birthday, and presented by the son of the author. On the fly-leaf, German title.

German curs. char., 8vo, ff. 25 [No. 479].
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396. שיר וмолא, Poem and prayer in celebration of Sir Moses Montefiore's return from Russia, by Abraham (autograph).
   Modern Orient. curs. and squ. char., 8vo, ff. 7 [No. 468].

397. Another copy of the same work (autograph).
   ff. 7 [No. 469].

398. שיר הניח, Poem in honour of Sir Moses Montefiore's visit to Jerusalem in the year 1875, by Israel Simon Schajin. Many letters gilt, and the pages with coloured borders.
   Large Orient. curs. char., 16mo, ff. 10 [No. 484].

399. אל אשר וResizable, Poem celebrating the return of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore from Damascus, by Isaac Benjamin Wolf Alschwanger, in Tauroggen, 1846.
   Modern German squ. char., 8vo, ff. 17 [No. 493].

400. הרוח ראית, Poems by Jacob Hallévi Sappir in Jerusalem, in honour of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore.
   4to, ff. 13 [No. 490].

401. שיר ל멀ילה מאשה סאץוש, Poem, accompanied by an English letter, and the pen and ink etching of a tree, by Moses Sacho of Meiningen in Jerusalem.
   8vo, ff. 5 [No. 542].

402. ויית רמות, Elegy on the death of Lady Montefiore, by Jomtob Spitz in Prague.
   4to, ff. 2 [No. 491].

   4to, ff. 25 [No. 489].

VII.

GRAMMAR AND LEXICOGRAPHY.

GRAMMAR.

404. סוף ודקיק, by Abraham b. Ezra, beginning with a rhymed riddle of nine lines. The solution of the latter is given on the fly-leaf by Simhah Pinsker (copyist?), who also provided the collation with other MSS. on the margin.
   German curs. char., 4to, ff. 17 [H. No. 316].

   German curs. char., 4to, ff. 50 [H. No. 2].
2. Fol. 10. ספר נקודות, Treatise on Phonology, ending סוף נקודות.
  Span. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 23 [H. No. 180].

407. 1. גודים וספירות, Grammatical treatise by Solomon b. Abbâ Mari Jarhi (see *NCat.*, No. 1486, and *HB.*, VIII, p. 27). Italian words used occasionally.
  Owner: S. D. Luzatto (No. 86).
  Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 20 [H. No. 181].

408. ספר נקודות, by Moses han-Naqdân of London (printed).
  German curs. char., 8vo, ff. 21 [H. No. 102].

409. Grammatical work, beginning with the words בורה וברא. The printed editions (Constantinople, 1515, and Venice, 1548) are minus the rhymes which divide the chapters. On the other hand, the chapter on מלחל הפסוקים (ed. Ven., fol. 117v) is not to be found in the MS., neither are the rhymes, ibid., fol. 128v, and all that follows after them. On the cover the work is erroneously styled מבוא על הלומדים על האשכנזים. The author's name seems to have been David (see No. 410).
  Finished 16 Tammûz, 5231 (July 4, 1471), in the seventysixth year of the writer, whose name is, however, not disclosed.
  Owners: Eliezer.
  Censor: Luigi del ordine de S. Dominico, 1599.
  Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 39 [H. No. 124].

410. 1. מבוא על התקורים, by a certain Benjamin. The work is headed by an acrostic on the author's name, which is mentioned a second time immediately afterwards in some lines of rhymed prose. The author wrote his book for the benefit of his brothers, chiefly his brother Aaron (fol. 10).
2. Fol. 12v. Glosses on part of Genesis, with constant reference to Rashi, Hezekiah b. Manoah (מקראות), and once to Elyâqim (folio 13v).
3. Fol. 16. Grammatical treatise by Meir b. Solomon b. David haq-Qâtôn, divided into seven chapters. In the preface the author refers to his grandfather, the author of ספר ורבים (see previous No.).
4. Fol. 18v. Extracts from Solomon Parḥon's lexicographical work, with additions.


6. Fol. 21v. Josef Qamhi's סמס ווהברח (Berlin, 1888, is based on this MS.).

7. Fol. 46v. הבהניבים והספרטם והודוקים, Grammatical definitions and rules.

8. Paradigm of verb with Italian translation.

The codex originally consisted of two separate MSS., the first comprising Nos. 1-5.

Owner [of Part II]: Eliezer b. Isaac (fol. 21v).

German curs. char., different hands; last page, Ital. curs. char., ff. 48 and 49, pasted together; 4to, ff. 49 [H. No. 157].

411. IṣpnEHpn f1EI>ISIK, based on Qamhi's and David b. Jahya's לְכָּלַה. The work consists of four chapters; ch. IV gives a list of nominal forms.

Ital. curs. char., 16mo, ff. 62 [H. No. 460].

412. EHI pn DBD,Grammatical work by Solomon Hena (Hanau). Some corrections on the fly-leaf.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 64 [H. No. 72].

418. 1. Masoretic notes, according to Qamhi's לְכָּלַה. מַכְלָלָה.

2. Fol. 3. Composition embodying the various forms of roots with ָי.

3. Fol. 17. סמס והברח, by R. Eliezer, in six chapters. The technical terms are in Italian, but written in Hebrew characters, on the margin.

4. Fol. 20. מסמך והבר, Grammatical compendium. The headings of the chapters, however, correspond to the preceding work.


7. Fol. 64. Compendium of Logic and Psychology, styled סמס והבר, קולות על התשרי. Technical terms as in No. 3.


10. Fol. 118v. סמס על שורת אלפים של שיבתא. מַכִּלָּל הַיּוֹם.


Writer: Jair b. Shabbethai, 14 Shebat, 5327 (Jan. 24, 1567).

Ital. curs. char., 8vo, ff. 131 [H. No. 229].

b. לִקְשַׁרוֹת, Hebrew Dictionary by the same author.

Large 4to, pp. 136 and 131 [No. 528].

**Lexicography.**


Owner: Isaac b. Gershōn in Modena, Wednesday, April 4, 5266 (1506).

German Rabb. char.; headings and catch-words squ. char., the poem Ital. curs. char., 4to, ff. 385 [H. No. 90].

416. 1. Annotations to the Talmud vocabulary, chiefly in reference to the Arūkh. The author also mentions Rashi and Maimūnī, and quotes Greek and Latin words.

2. Fol. 89. Metaphysical essay on Gen., ch. i, with reference to the Sefer Jeṣirāh. Rashi, Maimūnī, Nahmanides, and Levi b. Gershōn are repeatedly quoted. This is followed by some observations on other verses of Genesis.


Ital. Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 113, many blanks [H. No. 158].

417. 1. מָסְרָה לְזָרְעָן, Hebrew-German glossary.


3. Fol. 43. Treatise on the miracles performed for the Patriarchs and Prophets.

4. Fol. 48. לֹא הָֽאָדָם לְהַשָּׁמֶר, Chronological tables from Moses to the expulsion of the Ten Tribes.

Written 1766.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 49 [No. 512].

418. 1. מָסְרָה לְזָרְעָן [appended to a printed copy of יַכְר בֵּי מָשָׁס, by Benjamin Musafia, Berlin, 1766], Hebrew-German glossary, not identical with the preceding No., although by the same author, but without explanations.

2. Fol. 68. Table of verbal forms.
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3. Fol. 72. שער התوبة, Grammatical treatise in five chapters.
4. Fol. 76. סֵמֶר הָלֵּשָׁה, but the work is in reality Moses b. Habib's elementary Hebrew Grammar וְסֵמֶר הָלֵּשָׁה, and ends כָּמָר מִדֶּרֶךְ (printed).
5. Fol. 80. naam nDD, by Elias Levita (printed).
6. Fol. 84. I1DB'nnip3m:nK'nnUDHN,3, with tables appended, showing the inflexions of nouns.

German cura. char., after fol. 83 many blanks, 4to, ff. 91 [No. 513].

VIII.

MATHEMATICS, ASTRONOMY, ASTROLOGY, MAGIC.

419. 1. Abraham b. Ezra's arithmetical treatise סֶפֶר הָסֶמֶר with a supplementary problem (fol. 44v), not to be found in the printed edition (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1895). This problem is headed ד' ג' וט' מ' י', and begins צו'ר ודיינא

The fly-leaves are occupied by various accounts, anecdotes, and tables of mōlādās and ciphers.

Owner: Samuel David Luzatto (1541).
Scan. Rabb. char., 8vo, ff. 56 [H. No. 126].

Writer: B. Goldberg.
German cura. char., 4to, ff. 61 [H. No. 171].

421. a. סֶפֶר מִזְנוֹת מִסֶּפֶר, Treatise on arithmetic by Saadyah b. Elijah Shelah, in seven chapters. The work is preceded by an acrostic on the author's name; b. Fol. 60. Glosses on Maimuni's הלכות מחוּת; c. Fol. 79. Explanations on some terms used by Maimuni: d. Fol. 82. Glosses on Maimuni's מַשְׁמַת רַוִּית (Kil'aim, ch. iii); e. Fol. 88v. Glosses on מַשְׁמַת מְכַסְתוֹת. At the end a long poem.

Author's autograph; finished Tuesday, 24 Tebêth, 5444 (1684).
Maghribine Rabb. char., 4to, ff. 109 [H. No. 343].

422. Abraham b. Hiyyä's סֶפֶר חָסָם הַמַּעֲלוֹת (printed). The introduction and table of contents, as far as ch. xiv, are missing.
but replaced by a later hand. Fol. 87, Lunar eclipses in 1135, 1136, 1138, and 1139; solar eclipses in 1139 and 1140. Fol. 93, Rules for finding the Tequfot.

Colophon (fol. 85) bran xxmb "i^nonnncn tm nrniesdhnbui m-bi-a njHoa b"t	*"n'~
town p t> prnd: btianxv dd-un 'cnno ^nsN^ n'tryKim dvh nvnoa '1dv ~
myb a"a i"xnn rur nnno (7 Iyyar, 4896 = April 10, 1136).

Syr. Rabb. char., fol. 84', portion missing; 8vo, ff. 96 [H. No. 110].

423. 1. ז"ותה ה"ארים, by Abraham b. Hiyya (printed). The first four chapters and a portion of the fifth are missing; ff. 1-4 are misplaced.

2. Fol. 67. קינור צורה נבריא, by Judah han-Nasi; compendium of the preceding work.

3. Fol. 79. Commentary on Immanuel b. Jacob's astronomical treatise ש ש ב נ בפ (written 1415, see fol. 81), followed by the work itself with the tables and marginal notes.

4. Fol. 131. Treatise on the astrolabe, according to Ptolemy, beg. שער הראשה בודקיכו כל האצטומכל התשאלה והכלים. It ends והנה שלמר האצטומכללגמלים התבשנ בירה ודעא TRI טעומ ק"ה.

5. Fol. 145. Purbach's Theorica, beginning with a dedication to Solomon pñrño; it ends ההנה שלמר תבשנ הגלגל השطني ע"ה קייל. After this follow the mathematical figures (see HB., XI, p. 124).


Syr. Rabb. char., fol. 75 damaged; 4to, ff. 200 [H. No. 134].

424. 1. ספר פרסי האסטרונומיה, Sacrobosco's astronomical work, translated by Solomon b. Abraham Abigedor (printed); finished Tebeth, 5186 (1426).


Owner: Masliah Finzi.

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 20 [H. No. 244].

425. 1. ביאוזר סעשת כל האצטומכל, Instructions for making an astrolabe.

2. Fol. 8v. Some observations on the stars of the Zodiac, by Levi b. Gershōn, taken in 1325.

3. Fol. 8v. Tables showing the latitudes and longitudes of stars of the first and second magnitudes.

4. Fol. 9v. Tables showing the latitudes and longitudes of important towns in Asia, Africa, and Europe.


Colophon: הנלת מסר פירס אמת ממלכת תשבית חוכם והתה בתכنو נבכד ר"ע עקבין ח"ע ב' הבור התות ר' מעור לא מסתת ויהי אלה בהרוי.

7. Fol. 32. Jacob b. Makhir's (Profet Tabbôn) treatise on the Quadrant in sixteen chapters.

8. Fol. 45v. Fragment of a treatise on the stations of the moon.


[Owner: Samuel David Luzatto.]

Vellum and paper, Span. Rabb. char., No. 3 later; on ff. 10, 13, 68, and 70, diagrams of spherical figures and astrolabes; 8vo, ff. 70 [H. No. 127].

426. 1. Hâyîm Vital's astronomical work in four parts, copied from the author's autograph (Pt. I printed). The work, which was written 1521 (cf. fol. 38), refers several times to the tables of Abraham Zacuto (see below), the ראשת תכנית of Isaac b. בירב (fol. 44v), and to Ibn Ezra's astrological treatise ת"ך הלשון.

2. Fol. 53. Abraham Zacuto's Astronomical Tables. Tab. XIX, Eclipses of the moon according to Jacob Priel.


4. Fol. 75. Treatise on geomancy, beg. רע כב מַר לְמִיל דּוֹע; fol. 81, א"י מְסְזוֹרֵי תַּפְלָה וְדְוָרַי אֲשֵׁר לְאוֹבִּית; fol. 82, Horoscope (פַּמָּשׁ) set by Abraham Zacuto, in Damascus, Monday, 26 Shebat, 5275 (read Sunday, 11 February, 1515); ibid. v, Charm against toothache.

5. Fol. 83. Hâyîm Vital's Cabbalistical work סֵפֶר אוֹלָפָּן, according to the teachings of Isaac Loria. Ff. 115 to 132 (after fol. 32 of this work) are occupied by a commentary on the אֱמָרָא אַזְרָיִל, styled עַד חַעֲלוֹת.

Writer of No. 5: David [Buschweiler].

Owner: Josek hak-Kohen.

Span. Rabb. char., various hands, 4to, ff. 217 [H. No. 241].

427. מְסֶר אָרוֹבִּית עֶסֶמֶט, by Israel b. Moses Samosc, a work on astronomy. The end is wanting.

Owner: Zunz (No. 25).

German curs. char., fol., ff. 79 [No. 421].
1. Calendar Tables, beginning 5205 (1444), ending 5207 (1446); fol. 47, the rhymes—

2. Fol. 5. Rhymed conundrums and epigrams.

3. Fol. 53. Beg. יבשות הטהורים מהתודיס עתעלת, rules for the calculation of moon eclipses, illustrated by the Mūlād of Nisān, 5104 (1344).


5. Fol. 101. Rhymed rules for pairing the sections of the Pentateuch, with commentary.

6. Fol. 111. Poem, beginning נַאַל כָּל תַּחְתָּו תַּחְתָּו (see Letterbode, VII, p. 169), with commentary.
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8. Fol. 15v. Letter of Profez Duran (Profez Duran) to the physician Bonet, beg. one page only, and incomplete.


10. Fol. 19v. for Passover, beginning בְּםָם בְּחַגּוֹ בְּגַזָּה בְּחַגּוֹ בְּגַזָּה בְּחַגּוֹ בְּגַזָּה בְּחַגּוֹ בְּגַזָּה בְּחַגּוֹ בְּגַזָּה בְּחַגּוֹ בְּגַזָּה

b. Addereth, Meir (of Rothenburg), Isaac of Corbeil, and Judah b. Benjamin. The end is wanting.

20. Fol. 69v. Some records in connexion with the weekly portions, and accounts in Italian.

21. a. Fol. 71. Shehitah rules in rhymes. The first seven strophes give the acrostic תנא הובנ; b. Ibid.v. Another poem on the same subject. The strophes are alphabetically arranged, and end with the acrostic תנא הובנ; c. Fol. 72v. שער; d. Ibid. תנא הובנ; e. Fol. 75v.AJORUS HEBREW: Interpretation of dreams and suggestions for each day of the month; f. Fol. 76v. DMTN for a wedding banquet; g. Fol. 79. Various poems.

22. a. Fol. 83. מזון דם, Weather forecasts; b. Ibid. מזון דם; c. Ibid.v. Time table for bleeding; see also fol. 90 in Italian.


24. Fol. 91. Interpretations of dreams.


Nos. 1-9, Ital. Rabb. char.; Nos. 10-14 and 23, Span. Rabb. char., various hands; Nos. 15-22, Ital. Rabb. char., various hands; ff. 73 sqq., slightly damaged, 4to, ff. 91 [H. No. 188].

482. Calendar rules and calculations, beginning עופר סמואל:øשיטלב תורחת רות, fol. 7; fol. 16, תורחת; fol. 24, ס"מ לע הלוך דו; fol. 28, ס"מ לע הלוך דו; fol. 33, Table of Christian Festivals.

Written 1797 (see fol. 8).

German curs. char., 4to, ff. 36 [H. No. 183].

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD.

(To be continued.)
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