



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.

For if we reflect on the economic conditions of England in Anglo-Saxon times, there was no room in the national economy for persons like Jews, who could not join the guilds, and had no scope for usury in a country living almost entirely by barter (Ashley, *English Commentary*, I. i., c. i. § 6, p. 43). The chief export of England consisted of slaves (*ibid.*, p. 70), and we know that the Jews were the great dealers in this class of commodity. It is accordingly significant that in the later code of Egberht, (c. A.D. 760), the only two provisions about Jews (6 and 8) dealt with their purchase of slaves, and their proselytising zeal, which we know applied to their slaves—a trait of some interest, as it implies a humane interest in their human chattels. Altogether, therefore, I am inclined to refer the ecclesiastical ordinances to passing intercourse with Gallo-Jewish slave-dealers, and not to any permanent Jewish population of England before the Conquest.

I would bring this conclusion into connection with a famous episode in our annals. Every one remembers the incident at the market-place of Rome, which led to the Christianising of England, and brought it into the European concert. Now we find the very same Gregory, when he became Pope, complaining of the sale of Christian slaves to Jewish slave-dealers in the north of Gaul (*Epistola*, ix. 35, 109, 110), and it requires very little stretch of imagination to suppose that they likewise crossed the Channel. Remembering that slaves have no nationality, I would therefore suggest that if Gregory had stated the prosaic fact in his world-famous remarks about the chubby, blond-haired lads exposed for sale on the Roman slave-market, he would have said, "*Non Angli nec angeli sed —Judæorum servi.*"

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Shanah.—In his interesting article on "The New Year and its Liturgy" in the first number of *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Mr. M. Friedmann states that the substantive *shanah* "year," is derived from *shanah*, "to repeat." Enough is now known of Semitic phonetics, however, to enable us to say with certainty that *shanah* "year" is derived from a stem *shanah*, which means "to change," while שנים, "two," is derived from *shanah*, "to repeat." A study of the corresponding Aramaean forms, not to speak of other cognate languages, makes this point clear. (Compare *Hebraica*, vol. I., p. 220.)

CYRUS ADLER.

Tobit's Dog.—The Greek version of the Apocrypha states that when Tobiah was on his journey to Rages, the "young man's dog" went with him. But the dog was not regarded among Eastern peoples with feelings of affection. It seems, therefore, highly improbable that Tobiah was actually accompanied by a dog. The Hebrew and Chaldee versions of the text entirely omit the dog incident. Can its presence in the Greek version be accounted for? Now, the original language of the Book of Tobit was, despite Prof. Nöldeke's opinion to the contrary, probably Hebrew or Chaldee. This supplies the clue to our difficulty. Tobiah was directed by Raphael to extract the heart of the fish that he caught, as well as (the liver and) the gall. It was *the heart* (הלב), and not *a dog* כלב that the young man took with him. My suggestion relies on a very simple mis-reading. The word הלב occurs several times in this part of the narrative, and a careless copyist might easily have made the slip I suppose to have occurred.

I. A.