



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

charity of truth. There is nothing more remarkable, I think, in moral literature than the blending in Tobit of the doctrine, *Virtue is its own recompense*, with the doctrine, *Virtue will be surely rewarded.* Alms do deliver from death, and "if thou serve God, he will also repay thee." Yet Tobit himself, the pattern of piety, suffers so severely, that, like Job, he cried, "It is profitable for me to die rather than to live." But further, Tobit, unlike Job, does not come off in the end with an increment of prosperity. He simply becomes again as he was. He recovers his sight after eight years, but he does not gain any sudden or divinely-sent accession of wealth, and has those eight years of sorrow and tribulation, shall I say to the good or the bad? The author of Tobit was indeed torn two ways. Charity was a virtue to be followed, whatever its results; *yet* its results were surely profitable. And it must be confessed that this doctrine is not much out of accord with the full truth, so far as each of us knows it in his own experience.

I think that the frequent allusions to the burial of the dead are thus explained. They are in the first place the result of an imitation of the style and contents of Genesis, in which the burial of the dead is so constant a factor of patriarchal piety and sensitiveness. They are, moreover, due to the author's conviction that charity to the dead is the type and acme of disinterested love, of disinterested love which, by the strange ways of Providence, does find its reward.

I. ABRAHAMS.

Asher ben Saul and the Sefer Haminhagoth.

HERR HALBERSTAM writes with reference to Mr. Schechter's article on the ספר המנהגות that he agrees with Mr. Schechter's identification of the author as R. Asher ben Saul, and not as Asher ben Meshullam, and that R. Jacob Nazir was the brother of the former, and not of the latter. Herr Halberstam adds that it is probable that R. Jacob ben Saul is also the R. Jacob Nazir who wrote a commentary to Job, quoted by Dr. Gross in Graetz's *Monatsschrift*, 1874, p. 173. Perhaps he is, indeed, one of the Fathers of Jewish Mysticism who taught it to the ראב"ן. The dates agree excellently, as R. Jacob was the elder brother of Asher, who always calls him אחי הגדול. So, p. 20 of JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, a passage of Asher is quoted which has a cabbalistic colour, and this he derived either from ראב"ן or from R. Jacob. Gross, *ibid.*, p. 175, wrote that

Asher ben Meshullam cannot possibly have been a Cabbalist ; and, according to Mr. Schechter's view, the Cabbalist is Asher ben Saul, and not Asher ben Meshullam. This enables us to place the inception of the Cabbala at a somewhat earlier date than Graetz assigns in his History (vii., 424). The MS. quoted by Mr. Schechter from the Letters of Luzzatto is Cod. 69 (Cat., קהלת שלמה), and there, also, Samuel ben David, and not Ishmael ben David, is quoted.

ISAAC OF HURFORD.

THE Tosaphoth of Aboda Zara (21a) mentions an Isaac of הרפוט, whom Zunz quotes without a word or an identification of the individual named. I think he may be set down as an early, if not the very earliest, Rabbi of England, and an inhabitant of Norwich. He is mentioned by Rashi the illustrious, who also has an allusion to האי "the island," viz., England (Zunz, *Life of Rashi*, 285 note). Bloch, in his biography of Rashi, likewise alludes to this Rabbi, but confesses he does not know who he is.

הרפוט as it is printed may be either Erfurt in Germany or Hereford in England. It cannot well be the former, because transliteration is ordinarily very exact, and Erfurt would not assume the Hebrew form here given. The aspirate ה is opposed to any such contention. It cannot be Hereford for a similar reason. The form in this case would be היריפוט with the vowels inserted.

Now, in the famous tallage roll of 1195, containing the names of the Jewish contributors to the ransom of Richard I., we find the Jews of Norwich and those of Hereford apart from each other. But, immediately following Norwich and distinct from it comes "Hurford" with its two Israelites, Bonenfant and Morel. These two are well-known individuals, cited usually as of Norwich, not of Hurford. How comes the discrepancy? They are one and the same, for Hurford is Norwich, although Norwich is not Hurford, much in the same way as Highbury is London, but London is not Highbury. Hurford was an outlying hamlet of Norwich, possessing its castle and its bridge. Blomfield, the historian of Norwich, has a good notice of it. It was evidently the first settlement of the Jews of Norwich before they made their way into the Conisford Ward, subsequently pushing as far as the public market. If my hypothesis be correct, and I see nought to invalidate it, then Isaac of Hurford must have been a very early resident, for he was a contemporary of Rashi, who died in 1096. Later