



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.

6. *pirān* is interpreted by Dr. Horn, "the sheikhs." In line 10 it seems more naturally to mean *barān*, "concerning that," and I have therefore rendered it as the equivalent of that word throughout.

7. *kudyat* properly means "begging"; but in the lengthy descriptions of the profession which the writers of Maḳāmahs give us, it comes so near "theft" that there is no difficulty in rendering it so.

9. The word *ahula* is clearly corrupt for *hawāla*. *tūs* is given in the Arabic and Turkish dictionaries with the meaning "nature, disposition, origin, race, family."

11, 12. This sentence is rather troublesome. It is probable that *durust-būd* is a compound meaning "agreement." Since "from their hand" of line 11 apparently refers to the same as "from the hand of Daniel and Azariah" in line 12, it would seem that Hannah must be speaking in line 11; and indeed the tenor of the document makes it necessary for her to say something somewhere. The words *istāsam*, *satsum*, *satsīm*, and *satsan*, may be all referred to the verb *sitādan*, "to take," of which a variety *sitāshtan* is quoted in the Persian dictionaries. The arrangement agreed on was that the transaction should be regarded as an ordinary purchase of pearls by Daniel from Hannah and her family.

13. The "suitable vessel" is regularly mentioned in these documents.

14. The formula *biṭṭūl kull mudda'a* occurs in other documents. In one in Arabic which precedes this in the same volume it implies that the purchaser has no further claim on the vendor, should he find the article damaged.

15. *būzishṭ* is incorrect for *pūzish*, "excuse." The Persian form of the Arabic *ḥujjat* renders it hard to recognize. *izmerish* may be compared with *izmera* of line 5; in that phrase *ra* is otiose, and in this its synonym *mer*, of which Jewish writers are fond.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

"EUILAT" IN THE LXX.

THE Greek version of the Bible known as the LXX renders the Hebrew word עוּלָה in Gen. ii. 11 by *Εὐλάτ*. Jerome, the author of the Vulgate, follows their example, and also puts "Euilat"¹. This

¹ I used the edition of the Bible *Lutetiae Parisiorum*, 1645, and several more modern editions, without having found on this point any important variation. Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaeorum*, I, 6, 1, has in the table of nations only *Εὐλάς δὲ Εὐλαίου ἐπίσεν οἱ νῦν Γαιτούλοι* (Getuli) *λέγονται*. (Cf. עוּלָה גַּיְתוּלִי from Yerahmel recently published by Neubauer, *J. Q. R.*,

is very remarkable, the Hebrew word, if correctly rendered, demanding the Greek form *Εὐλά*, and not *Εὐλάτ*, a form, the termination of which cannot be explained¹. The explanation given by Bochart (*Geographia Sacra*, fol. 225, to חוילה²) does not satisfy. “*Ex חוילת in regimine, vel ex plurali חוילות chavilot facti sunt Chaulotäi.*” Why should the name of a country be taken from a status constructus or from a plural form? The context of the passage in which חוילה occurs, excludes the assumption of a form *in regimine* or a plural.

The word itself offers the difficulty that it is provided with the ה of the definite article ארץ החוילה. Although such determination of names of countries and towns is not without parallel in Hebrew, yet, wherever it appears, it is strange, and is almost always due to a corruption of the text. Especially in our passage, where a name of a country occurs in the Bible for the first time, this ungrammatical form is very remarkable. It is of no use to say that the ה in החוילה was put in order to distinguish it from the Joktanides and Kushites (Keil, *Commentar*, Leipzig, 1866, p. 48); for no author would use an ungrammatical form for the purpose of distinction³. All that Dillmann (*Die Genesis*, fifth edition, p. 59) could say about it was, that the Hebrews were still able to perceive the original meaning of the word as an appellative. But can this explanation be called satisfactory? There is any number of names of countries in Hebrew, the meaning of which is much more conspicuous than that of Chavila, without, however, the article being added.

I believe a remedy can here only be found by having recourse to a radical cure. The Samaritans do not read the ה in החוילה, it strikes us, therefore, that we have here a corruption of the text; besides, the ה may owe its insertion to its similarity with the following ח.

XI, 367.) Here there is evidently no sign of “Euilat.” The editor Niese notes, however, to *Εὐλάτ* (among the Semites) a different reading *Εὐλάττ*, and from Eusebius the form *Εὐλάτ*; but these forms undoubtedly owe their origin to the LXX.—Of the Vulgate, I used the edition of Ratisbon, 1863, which had the approbation of Pope Pius IX; there we find “Hevilath.” But the afore-mentioned polyglot Bible, and other editions, have “Evilath” or “Evilat.”

¹ The E-sound for the Hebrew ח is found in *Ἐνώχ*, *Nῶε*, and other names.

² *Lugduni Batavorum*, 1707.

³ The Chavila of the Paradise (Gen. ii. 11) and Chavila in the table of nations (Gen. x. 7, 20) are different places. Here again a distinction must be made between Chavila of the Hamites and Chavila of the Semites. Bochart speaks of Chavila of the Paradise, since he compares therewith the name of the people of the Chaulotäi.

A correction having thus become necessary at the beginning of the word, it will only be consistent to suspect, in the same way, the letter at the end of the word and to put a ת instead of the ה. In that case the rendering of חוילת by *Evilat* in the LXX is explained. This will distinguish חוילת in Gen. ii. 11 from חוילה in other passages (Gen. x. 7, 29, xxv. 18; 1 Sam. xv. 7; 1 Chron. i. 9)¹. I hope to be able to show afterwards the probability of this assumption on internal grounds; but as a further external proof I adduce here the circumstance that, in the Vulgate, the חוילה of the Paradise is rendered "Evilath," whilst the same word in all other passages is correctly given as "Euila." It is, however, different with the LXX; there חוילה in Samuel and the Chronicles is likewise translated *Evilat* (*Evilat*); but this rests hardly on proper tradition; the circumstance that חוילה, in the other passages, is given as *Evilá*, *Evilá*, gives rise to the suspicion that the form terminating in *t* is correct only in the first passage, the other cases being due to a misprint.

The inquiry about the חוילה of Paradise assumes in this way quite a different form; for, suppose even that our emendation into חוילת be not adopted, the rendering of "Evilat" in the LXX presents at all events a name which requires explanation, and quite new data will be discovered in reference to the land of Evilat of Paradise. The Greek translators must have had some conception or other as to the position of Paradise, otherwise they would not have put the well-known names *Aithiopia*, for כּיּוּ, *Tigris*, and *Euphrates*. The question is whether we are able to identify the land Evilat of Paradise, and whether the name is known to us from other sources also.

It is true, the Greek and Roman authors do not know such a name, but other ancient witnesses, namely, the fathers of the church, know the name of Evilat as the current and well-known name of a country.

If it were only the testimony of Epiphanius, who stated that he personally had seen the river Pishon and the land Evilat encompassed by it², it would not be of much weight, Epiphanius not being very reliable, and his statement being possibly only a reproduction of the

¹ It is noteworthy that the Arabic translation puts also in Gen. ii. 11 *زویل* = *Zeila* (a name known at that time), whilst in other passages (e. g. in Sam. xv. 7) *حويلا* is put, which correctly renders the Hebrew form.

² Ancyrotus, c. 58 (*Epiphaniï Episcopi Constantiæ Opera*, ed. G. Dindorfius, vol. I, Leipzig, 1859): *καὶ ὁρώμεν τὸν Φεισῶν ἐπ' ὄψεσιν ἡμῶν· καὶ Φεισῶν μὲν ἔστιν ὁ Γάγγης παρὰ τοῖς Ἰνδοῖς καλούμενος καὶ Αἰθίοψιν, Ἕλληνας δὲ τοῦτον καλοῦσιν Ἰνδὸν ποταμόν· πᾶσαν γὰρ τὴν Εὐίλατ περικυκλοῖ, τὴν μικρὰν καὶ τὴν μεγάλην, τὰ μέρη τῶν Ἑλυμαίων . . .*

record contained in the Greek Bible¹. But a man like Cosmas Indicopleustes, whose reports are considered to possess considerable value², also gives a minute description of the land of Evilat from his own inspection³. Taking this in connexion with the tradition equally preserved among the Talmudic and Hellenistic Jews, to the effect that by Chavila the land of India is meant⁴, I believe that scientific method requires that such hints thrown out in ancient times ought to be followed up, and that we must look in India for the Biblical חוילה⁵. This will certainly modify our view as to the position of the Paradise; but that is a question into which we will not enter for the present.

It seems that even as late as the Middle Ages the land of Chavila was known as India; for in the pseudo-Philonic work, *Antiquitates Biblicae*, which was recently mentioned in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW (X, 307 sqq.), Chavila is also spoken of as a gold-producing country. The Targum to 1 Chron. i. 23 puts: וית חוילה אתר, מפקנות מרגליהא, where "margarite" seems to mean "gold." Also in the book edited by I. Lévi as ספר אלכסנדרום מוקדון (The Book of Alexander of Macedonia)⁶, חוילה ארץ occurs in a connexion⁷,

¹ Although in that case there would be no reason for him to speak of a small and a great Euilat.

² Cf. Paul de Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, Göttingen, 1891, IV, 194.

³ In Montfaucon's *Nova Collectio patrum*, Paris, 1707, II, fol. 339; in the *Topographia Christiana*, liber II: *pāsan δὲ τῆν Ἰνδικὴν καὶ τῆν Οὐννίαν διαίρε ὁ Φεισῶν ποταμός. καλεῖται γὰρ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς χώρας Εὐιλὰτ . . . σαφέστερον αὐτὴν ὀνομάσας . . . καὶ Εὐιλὰτ ἐν τῇ Ἰνδία ἔστι: τὰς δύο γὰρ ταύτας χώρας ὁ Περσικὸς κῶλπος διαιρεῖ . . .*

⁴ It is known that נישן was already identified by Josephus (*Antiquitates*, I, 1, 3) with the Ganges, i. e. with an Indian river. Both Jerusalemite Targums translate חוילה by הנוקי = *Ἰνδική*. The old Bochart found this so strange that he expressed himself about it in the following terms: "At *prudendo errore* Chavilam uterque interpres הנוקי *Indiam* reddit."

⁵ The modern commentators who discussed the identification of חוילה, for instance, Halévy in *Revue des Études Juives*, XIII, 23, who identified it with Chaulan, in the south of Arabia, premise the identity of חוילה of Paradise with Chavila of Genesis x. I, on the other hand, assume them to be totally distinct from each other, and consider the name of the former not to have been חוילה, but חוילה.

⁶ In the work להלה לשמה (*Steinschneider-Festschrift*, Leipzig, 1896), Hebrew part, p. 158. Cf. the Alexander Romance, also edited by I. Lévi, in the second volume of the Society נרמים, p. 66 (*India Phasiaces*, *ibid.* 54 b, *Bactrii, Scithes*).

⁷ Immediately before it ארץ יגויה or יגוילה; cf. Thal Iordia (?), perhaps valley of Iogria or Ugria (?), in *Epistola ad Aristotelem*, in Zacher's *Pseudo-Callisthenes* (Halle, 1867), p. 162.

which marks it as a country situated in India. A clinching proof that Evilat was considered to be a country in India is found in the Hungarian Chronicles of the Middle Ages, written in Latin; they represent, on the ground of an ancient national tradition, the hero Nimrod, the type of the Scyths, to have emigrated to Evilat, where he founded a kingdom¹. But the existence of an Indo-Scythian kingdom is an historical fact that underlies no doubt, for coins of that kingdom are still extant; and, besides, in the above-quoted record of Cosmas, Hunnia (*Oύννια*) is mentioned together with Evilat. Considering all this, the identity of חויליה, respectively Evilat, with India appears to be a fact with which history will have to reckon, and I shall be glad if I have, by this article, directed the attention of historians to this point.

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

A HEBREW MS. ILLUSTRATED BY GIOTTO.

LOT 26 of the late Earl of Ashburnham's "Appendix" MSS., which was sold at Sotheby's for Mr. Yates Thompson on May 1, 1899, is catalogued as follows:—

"*La Guida dello Popolo de Israele, in Hebrew, XIV Century*; vellum, 12mo, 4½ × 3 inches, ff. 150.

In the original binding of oak and ebony, inlaid with mother-of-pearl. On each cover is a shield of ivory, the one with the arms and initials of Galeotto Malatesta engraved upon it, the other with the arms of Cardinal Gozio Battaglia.

A note in the autograph of the cardinal states that this book was written at his desire by a learned Jew, by name Aramban; and that the miniatures (of which there are twenty-seven, besides ornamental borders), were painted by Giotto, or, in the Venetian dialect, Ziotto da Fiorenza and his most distinguished pupil, whose name is not given. Both the painter and the scribe were at Avignon in attendance upon Pope Benedict XII about the time when this book was presented by the Cardinal to Galeotto Malatesta, to be placed in his library at Rimini. After the above note is a licence to read and keep this book, granted by Benedict XII, dated Avenione, anno iiiij (1338).

An account of the Pope's residence in Avignon, and some notice of the Cardinal, will be found in "S. Baluzii Vitae Paparum Avenionensium."

¹ I discussed this at length in the Hungarian magazine, *Ethnographia*, IX (1898).