



CINCINNATI, O.....AUGUST 9, 1872

VARIETIES.

Victoria, Australia, counts 731,528 souls, among them 3,571 Jews.

Young men without ambition are birds without wings; they will never rise.

Mr. Baruch Wormser of Karlsruhe died July 3d, and Rabbi Leberles of Bretten on the first of July.

For the Orphan Asylum in Cleveland \$5.00 by Mr. A. Friend, Silver City, Nevada Territory.

Envious people are sick at heart. The only cure for them is to convince them of their own worthlessness.

Nellie Grant is in Vienna, says the telegraph and General Grant will soon arrive in Galena, Ills, the people say!

Fertile brains without the seed of correct knowledge grow weeds and wild flowers, many of which are poisonous, most all of them useless.

Judaism is a system of principles and a code of duties. Whoever knows not the former and lives not up to latter, is not of Israel in the spirit.

In New South Wales, a change of cabinet having taken place, Mr. Saul Samuel, a well-known politician, was appointed president of the Upper House of the Colonial legislature.

Our agent, Mr. H. M. Davis, will visit our friends in Indianapolis, Lafayette, Chicago and Milwaukee, to do general business for these papers. Our friends are kindly requested to give him their advice and support.

Dr. Eisenberger, physician in Tschuss, eighteen years ago embraced Christianity, to enable him to marry a Hungarian countess. Last month he publicly returned to Judaism, in Vienna, and his wife followed him into the covenant of Israel.

We had the pleasure of a call by the reverend gentleman called to take charge of the congregation in Augusta, Georgia. Rev. Mr. Rozsasy was for some time Hebrew teacher in the Cleveland Orphan Asylum. He appears to be a gentleman of excellent qualities for the ministry.

Generosity is defined in the Talmud to act "over and above the line of duty or law," to do more and better than duty requires. It is duty to give shelter, food and garment to the poor. It is generous to let him have it, choice and in abundance, secretly and without his knowledge of the donor.

The following accurate anatomical statement in the Zohar—Idra rabba iii, p. 136—is remarkable, indeed. "The skull has three cavities, in which the brain is placed. It is enveloped in one thin and one thick skin. It runs out in thirty-two channels—thirty-two pairs of nerves—which go through the whole body."

It has been stated by one of our contributors and, by mistake, printed in the ISRAELITE, that some Hebrew Masons in this city have applied for admission in the order known as the Knights of Malta, and were elected. This is a mistake. None applied and none were elected. The matter has been fully discussed in our last remarks on an item of the Masonic Review.

Why does the Cincinnati press systematically ignore the THE ISRAELITE? is the question addressed to us the other day by a Cincinnati reader. We return the question, why does the Cincinnati press ignore *The Star of the West* and every other liberal paper published here or elsewhere, and notices only the most orthodox sheets? Why, in their religious columns, have they never a word to say about Jews, Unitarians, Universalists, and other liberal sects? Because it does not pay. The tone of society hereabout is rather orthodox, those papers and

sects are the disturbing element, not exactly welcome to the masses who read the news in the dailies, and so it appears best to say nothing about them.

It is a matter of business. We for our part can well stand it to be ignored, because we speak for ourselves, if we want to be heard. We do not know how our colleagues from the liberal side of the house feel about it; but we do positively not care about being noticed or ignored. Whenever the masses will be liberalized, the dailies will follow suit. This, however, is our business and not theirs.

Rabbi Jannai exclaimed over those who are learned and impious, "Mourn over the man who has no house and makes a door to it." Elsewhere in the Talmud this idea is expressed thus: "The man of learning without fear of the Lord is like unto the treasurer who possesses the keys to the inner doors of the treasury but none to its outer doors."

Cincinnati is growing rapidly in importance and fame, we have no doubt. True we have no university yet, and most likely will have none in the next decade; but we had another horse people celebration last week, and every motion of the noble animal was carefully noted in our daily papers, representing the prevailing sentiments. We are going to be a great people shortly, no doubt. May be, we will have a dog fight next week.

The attention of parents and teachers is politely called to the brief historical lesson for the young, which we commence this week and will regularly continue week after week, till we shall have narrated to our young readers the entire post-biblical history of our people, from the fall of Jerusalem 586 B. C. to our time. The narrative will be concise, clear and popular. Parents should call particular attention of their children to this lesson, as ignorance of our children in our own history is a general evil.

The term *Mitsvah* "commandment" in the Five books of Moses, we have maintained in our "Essence of Judaism" to refer to the moral law only; but it has been considered an innovation. Those critics ought to look to the statement of Rashi, taken from Bereshith Rabba, to Genesis xxvi, 5. He defines *mitsvah* "Laws if they had not been written (in the Bible) ought to be observed anyhow, like robbery, murder, &c." Again in regard to our statement, that the Biblical laws not contained, expressed or implied, in the Decalogue, were originally intended for Palestine only, also considered an innovation of ours—we refer to Moses himself to the Siphri, and to Ramban to Genesis xxvi, 5, where he states this clearly and expressly in the name of the rabbis of the Talmud וישיבתו אחרתהו בארץ בלדו.

The law against the Jesuits in Germany is also directed against all monasteries, and probably also against the nunneries. Monks and nuns, it is supposed, are no less enemies of the German empire than the Jesuits. We pity the monks of Cologne who, with their Hohenstratten and Pfeiffercorn have worked so hard to burn the Talmud and to overthrow Reichlin, which brought about the Reformation under Martin Luther. Must they also go? They ought to be spared as a monument of the past. It is true, monks and nuns are anomalies of society who have no business to exist; but we would plead after all for the Dominicans of Cologne, who ought to be preserved as historical munimies, and a perpetual warning to all fanatics and obscurants. Most likely they will come to the United States and give us a chance to preserve them for future reference.

The Prussian higher schools, says the *Frankfort Zeitung* are frequented, out of every 10,000 souls in the *Gymnasium*, Jews 194, Protestants 31, Catholics 21.

Realschulen, Jews 121, Protestants 22, Catholics 7.

Other high schools, Jews 315, Protestants 53, Catholics 7.

Jews out of 10,000, 1 630
Protestants " " 108
Catholics " " 35

That's what is the matter in Prussia.

The United States brought to general notice and respect the system of Federal Republicanism, based upon extensive municipal rights, with personal liberty and independence as its basis.

We hope the principle of arbitration between nations, now tried at Geneva to supercede the barbarity of appealing to arms to settle disputed points, will also prove a success. It has to come to this, not merely because Isaiah prophesied it, but chiefly because the human family rapidly advances to the appreciation of the principle of justice, as it was in the mind of Isaih. Wars like rules are relics of barbarism, starting from the principle that might makes right. Modern civilization, acknowledging inalienable rights in man, starts from the idea of right absolute and universal. Hence war must cease, whenever right shall achieve its last victory.

It is the duty of all who work in the vineyard of Israel to preserve Judaism intact and in its purity; that coming generations inherit and promulgate what has been handed down from sire to son, in a regular line of succession from Abraham and Moses to the present generation, for the salvation and blessing of the human family. It matters not how forms and observances change, or customs are dropped, the eternal truth in principle, doctrine and law is "the law which Moses commanded us, the heritage of the congregation of Jacob." Whoever has risen above the level of the atheist must worship the God of Moses and the prophets, whatever name or appellation he may give to the great I Am. Whoever believes in justice and liberty must bow down in reverence before the Decalogue, which is the law of laws. Also the fundamental idea of political government, as advanced by Moses, is acknowledged to be the best, and most certain to secure liberty. He wanted in Israel twelve independent tribes, under one federal head, and one chief tribunal of justice and legislation, which is now imitated in our country and Switzerland, and which is the form of government for free nations. In theology, ethics and politics, it is Moses who has furnished the fundamental ideas, expounded by the prophets and teachers of Israel, enlarged and applied by the most revered apostles of humanity. Civilization in its onward march has not reached Sinai and Horeb yet. Just think, how in politics, in the very thing which concerns every body, only two countries, say fifty millions out of twelve hundred, have realized the fundamental idea of the Mosaic fabric of government, and then, please make your calculation how neglected the human family is in theology and ethics. Therefore it is certainly every Israelite's holy duty to weigh and judge carefully before he declares a law of Moses out of date, and much more so before he gainsays a principle advanced in the Pentateuch. We hear them often say, this or that law of Moses has no meaning for us in this century; but in most instances it is not true. Take for instance the law concerning the prophet, and we have none now, hence the law is of no use to us; but the assertion is not true. That very law involves a number of eternal principles, only one of which we will point out. It ordains that every body should obey the prophet, the living oracle of the Deity, the most sublime and holiest man of the nation. But if one refuses obedience to the prophet what must be his punishment? Is it death on the pyre for rebellion against the Church, or death on the gallows for rebellion against the king or emperor? Is it in the dungeon of the inquisition, or in the subterranean hell of the king's fortress, where the rebel must pay for his audacity and depravity? Nothing of the kind. The Law says, "I will require it of him," (Deut. xviii, 19). God will punish the man who shall disobey the prophet, no man has the right to it. Hence, however great a man shall be, and however immense his authority, it can not outdo the prophet's, disobedience to his teachings is no crime punishable by man. Therefore none in Israel would be punished bodily for his refusing to obey the precepts or teachings of any one person; and the wicked Ahab, in order to move Naboth out of his way and to get possession of his property, would not resort to violence or to any pretended offense given him. Witnesses had to testify that Naboth blasphemed, that is, cursed God and the king. Is mankind so far? No, is the correct answer. Honest investigation will show the same thing precisely in every law of Moses. Each involves a principle which must be understood, and each requires particular and very careful study before we can say with certainty, this or that is out of date. Men of conscience must be sure, very sure, before they refuse to

perform a duty. Without the Law of Moses carefully and conscientiously understood, we can not preserve Judaism, for without Moses there is none.]

Some of the Democratic papers of Germany, misunderstanding the situation, are opposed to the election of Greeley and Browne, without stating their reasons in plain language; still as they are in the habit of doing, giving one ample chance to read between the lines. It is fashionable just now in Europe to raise the old and unreasoning cry, "Down with the Catholics." It is true that the Catholic hierarchy under control of the Jesuits, especially in Italy, Spain, France and Southern Germany have conjured up that evil spirit, by their steady and fanatical opposition to unification, and the progression of popular liberty and science. Plus IX has placed himself and the Church in direct and deadly conflict with the democratic and scientific spirit of the nineteenth century. This naturally made all European exponents of democracy and the chief apostles of science enemies of the Roman Catholic Church. It is no less true, however, that at the bottom of the thing is the predominance of England and Prussia with the inveterate hatred of Protestantism against the Catholic Church, which gives tone and sanction to the spirit of persecution; and atheism, which, naturally opposed to all religious systems, attacks that most violently, which is least in a state of defense. It is no less true that one extreme produces the other, although both are wrong. In Germany and Italy, where democracy still fights for an existence, it battles most violently against its most outspoken enemy, and makes use of the Protestant hatred against Catholicism. It is a state of unbloody warfare conducted by democrats for the triumph of democracy, and by Protestants for the triumph of Protestantism. It is persecution all round, coupled with fanaticism, and wedded with injustice, whether justifiable or not, always wrong in principle. In America, however, democracy does not fight for an existence. We are all democrats, whatever party name we may assume. Democracy is the principle upon which our form of government and our government is settled. The aristocracy does not count at all. Church and State are separated on the "let-us-alone" basis, and the non-persecution principle. To us, as citizens, Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism are equally indifferent and equally entitled to protection and public respect. As citizens, we have no religious differences to fight out. Therefore every breath of persecution on the lips of an American statesman against this or that religion, is a disgrace and a crime. But we have inherited the old quarrel of Protestants and Catholics, and we have plenty of demagogues to use and abuse it. No honest American statesman can abuse, decry or persecute any religious denomination, as long as it interferes not publicly with the Government. When, for instance, a number of Protestant, evangelical and very orthodox gentlemen banded together in a public conspiracy against religious liberty, and expressed their fanatical desire to impose a theological amendment on the Constitution of the United States, it was the business of statesmen to battle against the suicidal enterprise, but it would have been madness to preach a crusade against Protestantism. If Catholic journals or priests assail religious liberty, as they often do, it is in its place to attack and instruct those journals or those priests, but it is wickedness to abuse or persecute Catholicism, because some of its expounders are mad. If four or five rabbis in New York, Philadelphia and Chicago maintain their exposition of the law must be regarded higher than the law of the country, and run themselves into a state of fanatical excitement over the matter, no honest statesman will on that ground find it excusable to persecute Judaism, and cry horror that the Jews and the Catholics obey foreign potentates, and place their own construction of law higher in authority than the law of the country.

Every religious persecution is a crime, but in this country it is an abominable one. That is the very thing which our European democrats and many of our home partisans do not appear to understand. Horace Greeley, however, did, and does understand this principle. As a statesman and journalist, he was obliged to respect and support it, and so he has invariably done. Mr. Greeley stands outside of the orthodox religious circle. No orthodox Jew will allow him to

be a Jew, and no orthodox Christian recognize him or his sect (Universalist) as Christian. In one of his speeches, "The God of Israel," reprinted in *THE ISRAELITE*, Mr. Greeley openly, boldly and clearly expressed his theology, to show and to wit, that he stands outside of the orthodox circle; hence he has no reason at all to abuse or persecute any religious denomination. Therefore, as a journalist, Mr. Greeley took invariably the part of the persecuted or wronged denomination, Jewish, Catholic, Mormon or Heathen. Therefore, he is looked upon as a special friend of the Catholics, hence decried by European democratic organs. We, for our part, would not vote any man into high position, who manifested a spirit of persecution at any time. We did not vote for President Grant on account of his notorious Order No. 11. We could not possibly vote for Mr. Wilson, because, as a Know-Nothing, he hated and persecuted foreigners and Catholics, and at the first occasion offering in the Senate of the United States, he proved a vulgar Jew-bater. We would never cast our vote for any person identified with intolerance and injustice, because he is unfit to be the banner-bearer of liberty, and unsound, either in his judgment or in his moral character. We vote neither for the demagogue nor for the idiot, and the intolerant politician proves to be either. It is with particular pleasure, however, that we shall vote for Horace Greeley; not merely on account of his superior intelligence, statesmanship and stern honesty, but also because he has proved himself invariably just, tolerant and liberal to all sorts of people and all classes of ideas. That is the truly Democratic type of manhood. These are particular graces of an American statesman, to command our respect and confidence.

Dr. Julius H. Dessauer, who left New York on the Fourth of July to cross the ocean, and take up his residence in Germany, was missing on the fifth, that is, the next day after his departure from New York, and was found no more. He was a particular friend of ours, and we consider it our duty to gainsay the frivolous rumor spread, as though he had committed suicide. The day before his departure from New York he wrote us a letter, informing us of his future residence, Wurzburg, and of his appointment as Consul of the United States in that city. Besides, he informed us, that he would give his time and attention to translating his "History of the Jews" into English; as we had advised him several times. He declared his intention in that letter, to continue his history up to 1870, and to pay particular attention to the history of American Jews and Judaism, and requested us, therefore, to furnish him such items as were within our reach, and mention to him such books and periodicals which might give him the facts. He furthermore requested us particularly to communicate with him in Wurzburg. We do not publish the letter, because it is too flattering to us personally; but vouch with our honor for the above particulars. A man of sixty-six years of age, of Dr. Dessauer's intellectual capacity and learning, who writes such a letter on the third, detailing clearly his plans for the future, if there is any truth in psychology, commits no suicide on the fifth, only two days after, without any intervening emergency to produce insanity.

The rumor frivolously spread appears to us unfounded and wicked. Dr. Dessauer, a graduate of Erlangen in philosophy and philology, was distinguished in Bavaria as a successful teacher and a useful writer. Dr. Julius Fuerst in his *Bibliotheca Judaica*, p. 206, records nine books by Dessauer, published in Germany, between the years 1832 and 1846, some of which [his history of the Jews &c.] were republished lately by Mr. Skutsch of Breslau. In company of his wife and younger children, he followed his elder sons to America, and we met him in Cincinnati in 1854. Shortly after that in 1855 he succeeded Mr. Isaac Schoenbrun as head teacher of Hebrew and German in Talmud Yelodim Institute in Cincinnati, where most all our young people were under his care, and learned to admire and love the man of stern character and affectionate attachment to his classes. He taught in this institution up to 1862 when he resigned, and went into business with one of his sons. A few years after he retired altogether to private life. He had no enemy among us, but a large number of friends especially among our young people here. May God receive his soul in grace; to us, his memory will always be dear and sacred.

AFTER THE FALL OF JERUSALEM.

A LESSON FOR THE YOUNG.

Jerusalem was destroyed. The temple was in ruins. The land of Judah was laid waste. Most of the defenders of that country were slain, and the survivors were either dispersed or led away into captivity, far away to the lower Euphrates and Tigris. Nebuzraddon, the chief general of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, at the head of his army, accomplished this work of destruction in the year 586 before the vulgar era.

Those Hebrews who took no part in the last struggle, and those who sided with the Babylonians, remained in Judea. But they were few, discouraged, and mourning upon the ruins of their country. Others had fled to the neighboring tribes in the wilderness, or had found hiding places in the mountains.

Judah being now a province of the Babylonian empire, the king appointed one Guedaliah, son of Ahikam, and grandson of Shaphan, governor of Judah. He had his residence at Mitspah, and had with him Hebrew and Chaldean warriors, to protect him, and to govern the country. After the enemy had left, many of the fugitives came back to Mitspah. Guedaliah received them kindly, promised them protection, and told them to return to their respective homes, and to harvest for the Winter as much of the vine, olive, and other fruit as they could find. The people obeyed, and had confidence in the governor. It appeared for a short time that those remaining in the country would enjoy peace and security.

Among the returning fugitives there was also one Yishmael, son of Nethaniah, a descendant from the royal family of David. He felt aggrieved that one who was not of royal descent, governed in the place of his ancestors, and secretly schemed the destruction of Guedaliah. Yishmael was kindly received at Mitspah by the governor, among the other warriors, who had returned to him, and, together with the remaining women of the royal family and officers of the late king, he was permitted to eat at the governor's table. He was suspected by Guedaliah's friends, who told him that Yishmael was a hired assassin, supported by Baalis, king of Ammon, and proposed to slay him secretly. Guedaliah did not give his consent. On the day of New Year, the first day of the seventh month, when many assembled around the governor, Yishmael was also present with ten conspirators, and partook of the governor's banquet in the evening. After the banquet the conspirators assassinated Guedaliah and many of his Hebrew and Chaldean warriors.

The horrid deed was done in the silence of night, the sun on the second day of the month rose over the innocent blood shed at Mitspah. The little power left to the head of the conquered people was now in the hands of Yishmael and his villainous conspirators, but he knew not what to do with it. He kept his misdeed secret. The second day after it, eighty mourning pilgrims from the North came down to see Guedaliah and to offer up incense on the ruins of the temple. Yishmael went out to receive them, led them into the city, and there he slew seventy of them. Ten of them escaped by an appeal to his avarice, telling him that they knew of treasures hidden in the field.

In order to escape the revenge sure to come, Yishmael took all the people of Mitspah captives, and fled toward the land of Ammon. But the friends of Guedaliah had heard of the misdeed, and under the lead of one Johanan, son of Koreah, they pursued the assassin and overtook him at Gihon. The captives went over, and Johanan and Yishmael with eight men escaped into Ammon. His name was mentioned no more.

Johanan, with the rest of the people, went now westward as far as the vicinity of Bethlehem. Fear, lest the king of Babylon should revenge on them the death of Guedaliah, matured in them the resolution to emigrate to Egypt. They requested the prophet Jeremiah to pray for them, to God, that He might enlighten them which home they should now choose. Jeremiah prayed, and after ten days informed them that it was God's will they should stay in their country, and fear not the Babylonian who would take no vengeance on them. But fear overcame their patriotism, and in spite of the threats uttered by Jeremiah, of misery that would befall them in Egypt, they went to that country, taking also Jeremiah

along, whom they dismissed after their arrival. He returned to Judah, and nothing more was heard of the Hebrews in Egypt.

The land of Judah was almost stripped of its inhabitants. People of Ammon, Moab and Edom overrun the country and took possession of the deserted lands and houses. Hebrew patriots, upon the ruins of their country, sang sadder elegies, some of which were preserved in the book called *Echah* or "Lamentation," and some also in the book of Psalms; then the harp of Judah was silent.

"My portion is the Lord, said my soul, therefore I will hope."

HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

After the Fall of Jerusalem Before the Romans, and Origin of the Talmud. From Dr. Graetz's Vol. 4, translated for THE ISRAELITE.

BY REV. DR. GOLDAMMER.

CHAPTER II.—Continued.

Second: Tanaite Generation—Restoration of the Patriarchy—Rabbi Gamaliel's efforts toward Union—His rigorous Anathemas—His Removal and Reinstatement—First Start of the Mishna—Collection.

From 80-118, A. C.

SCOPE OF THE SECOND GENERATION.

GAMALIEL'S ANATHEMA RIGOR.

Rabbi Gamaliel, supposing Rabbi Josua to be the head of that party, treated him in a manner as to make him feel his official superiority, and met him with acrimonious reprimands until, at last, the long restrained opposition burst out and turned into an open revolution in the very heart of the Synhedrin. It was on a day when Rabbi Josua was contemptuously reprimanded by the chair for his tacit insubordination and objection against an established Halacha, and when the accused denied his objection as far as to practice, that the patriarch gave way to animosity, as to permit himself to exclaim: "Arise then, that witness may testify against thee," for such was the judicial formula of accusation. The audience was just in full attendance and a bustling confusion arose at the affront offered to so highly reverent and honored a member.

The counterparty took courage and gave utterance to their indignation: "There is not one man here who has not experienced thy severity," was the general cry. And soon the members constituted themselves into a tribunal, and upon the spot divested Rabbi Gamaliel from his official dignity. With him had fallen all those regulations which were objected to by the members; the porter was dismissed, the school opened to the public; and soon the number of the disciples increased with eighty, according to others, with three hundred. The leaders now anxiously sought after another incumbent for the vacancy of the most important office. Rabbi Josua was not elected, for there was yet prevailing respect enough toward the ex-patriarch as to replace him by his chief opponent. Rabbi Elieser, who had a claim to the dignity, could not suit the purpose, because he was under anathema, and, besides, unequal to such a high office.

Rabbi Akiba, although adequate to this dignity by the superiority of his genius and character, yet his name dated but of yesterday, and, to that, he was deficient of the proof of nobility, so necessary to the maintenance of the patriarchal power.

The college, therefore, directed their choice upon Rabbi Eleazar ben Asarya, the youngest member of the Synhedrin, who at that time was sixteen years old. His noble descent from a series of ancestors ascending until Ezra, the Sopheric new founder of Judaism, his immense wealth and his reputation by the Roman authorities, contributed decidedly in his favor, and having been nowise inferior to his colleagues as to intellectual faculties and morality, he was elected as patriarch. This removal and the new election was an event of great effects for latter times and the day of its occurrence was as momentous as to be particularly denoted: ON THAT DAY.

THE FIRST MISHNA COLLECTION (ADOYOTH).

It appears that the Synhedrin—perhaps by motion of Rabbi Josua—had resolved to take under reconsideration all those laws, which by Rabbi Gamaliel's authoritative influence have been decided upon, through the mediation of the *Beit Kol*, in favor of the Hillelentic school. Rabbi Josua disapproving, as above said, the decision by the *Beit Kol*, urged now the college

to institute the only lawful decision by the majority.

The Synhedrin, consisting at that time of the unusual number of 72 members, called forth-with, in behalf of the re-examination of the Halachoth, such men for the testimony as were in possession of traditions. More than twenty names, and among them two weavers, once inhabitants of a poor quarter near the Rabbish-door at Jerusalem, are mentioned as witnesses to the traditions they were in possession of. In many cases the majority took the middle course between the disputants and decided, "not in favor of Hillel, nor of Shammai." In divers cases it was discovered that even Hillel himself, or his school had receded from their original opinions and adopted those of Shammai. Also in regard to other different Halachoth testimony had been produced on the same day. It appears that the testimonial assertions have been recorded by special scribes; as similarly under the older Synhedrin, the votes, both positive and negative, were enacted by a special amanuensis.*

The testimonial assertions laid down on that day to ascertain the validity of the Halachoth are codified in the digest called, *Adoyoth* (testimonial assertions); or, *Bechirtha* (selection), and, no doubt, is the oldest Halacha collection, which is evidently shown by the plainness of its composition in the ancient artless traditional manner, and more by its lack of any systematic arrangement of the precepts which are merely numbered and ranked together with their author's name. There are, however, in this collection additional components appertaining to later times.†

AKABYA BEN MAHALLALEL.

The Tanaite's zealous and conscientious pursuit in the course of their labors is manifested by the following episode in the proceedings: Akabya ben Mahallalel testified in regard to two Halachoth just at variance with their current tradition, and when the college requested him to desist from his assertions, and promised him the honorable meed of the Ab-beth-din office (vice Nassi), he indignantly replied: "I would rather be called a fool all the days of my life than to appear one moment as a rascal before God."

In regard to another Halacha, an appeal was made against his decision to an analogue instance with the anti-Herodian presidential pair, Shmaya and Abtalyon, to which he returned: "What has been done by those two, it was done merely for the purpose of formality." (Dokema.) Either by reason of this disparaging utterance, or because of his obstinate opposition in general, he was put under anathema, which he abode submissively and without receding from his persuasion until his death. Before his death, however, he advised his son not to abide by the father's doctrines, "for," said he to the surprised son, "concerning myself, I have heard these traditions from many of the sages; as to thyself, thou hast heard them but from an only one (thy father), thou art, therefore, under obligation to abide by the majority." When asked by his son for a recommendation to the college, he answered: "My son, there is no use to recommend thee, thy own actions will either recommend or disgrace thee."‡

"That day of the testimonies" was important also in regard to two questions of general interest.

PROSELYTISM.

A Gentile appeared, namely, on the same day before the Synhedrin, requesting to be adopted as a proselyte. Rabbi Gamaliel declared such an adoption as an aggression against the Scriptural Law: "An Amonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of God, even not of the tenth generation." A heated dispute arose in which Rabbi Gamaliel endeavored to carry his views, colliding with Rabbi Josua's, who demonstrated the literal import of the Law as being no more applicable to the condition of those tribes at the time in question. For the Amonites, in the ancient sense of the word, were no more in existence, since by the Lesser Asiatic invasions, all nationalities were indiscriminably intermixed and almost obliterated.‡

*Synhedrin 36.

†Rappaport Kerem Chemed, 1941, 176.

‡Adoyoth v. 6, Kerem Chemed ibid. I maintain yet Rappaport's opinion as to Akabya's life and excommunication being a contemporary with Gamaliel. Frauke's adverse quotations (Darch ha-mishna, 56) are harmless. The dialogue, N-golim ii. 3 could have taken place in the latter days of Rabbi Akiba's life, when Gamaliel's deposition and become almost a matter of course. One must observe that Akabya's attitude, Abtalyon's disapproval of Rabbi Josua's decision, and Josua's disapproval of the Temple like Rabbi Uchania Sagana ha-Kohanim.

‡Adoyoth iv. 4.