THE NOMENCLATURE OF JEWS IN CHINA*

by Rudolf Löwenthal 羅文達

Though much has been written about the Jews in China one of the problems that has not yet been properly discussed is their nomenclature. The present data, containing a number of new items and corrections of earlier statements, have been divided into the four following groups:

I. Chinese biblical names contained in the four Jewish stone inscriptions of 1489, 1512, 1663, and 1679 at Kaifeng with their Mohammedan, Nestorian, Catholic, and Protestant equivalents.

II. Jewish theological titles borrowed from the Mohammedans contained in the four stone inscriptions.

III. Jewish surnames contained in the four stone inscriptions.

IV. Chinese designations for Jews, Judea, Hebrew, etc.

I. CHINESE BIBLICAL NAMES CONTAINED IN THE FOUR JEWISH STONE INSCRIPTIONS OF 1489, 1512, 1663, AND 1679 AT KAIFENG WITH THEIR MOHAMMEDAN, NESTORIAN, CATHOLIC, AND PROTESTANT EQUIVALENTS

Nine personal and two other biblical names have been compiled from the Jewish inscriptions. Their renderings in the Mohammedan and Nestorian religious writings and their contemporary standard equivalents in the Catholic and Protestant Bible translations have likewise been given. It may be due to the differences in pronunciation of such names in the respective languages that they have nothing in common with each other. But it is surprising that the Jewish and Mohammedan transcriptions are likewise different, although the Jews otherwise readily adopted Mohammedan terms. This fact is the more

* This article appeared originally in the COLLECTANEA COMMISSIONIS SYNODALIS, Peiping, vol. XVII, May/December, 1944, pp. 354-370. Owing to the Pacific War only some ten copies of the issue in question were actually preserved. As the article contains, among other items, a number of historical data related to the Yüan period, it has been thought worthwhile to republish it. For this purpose it has been revised and considerably enlarged (Editor).
LIST OF CHINESE BIBLICAL NAMES FROM THE FOUR JEWISH STONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>English name</th>
<th>inscription and pagination*</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Mohammedan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>1512:63</td>
<td>A-ho-lien 阿呼裏</td>
<td>A-lung 阿龍</td>
<td>Ha-lun 哈倫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>1489:39</td>
<td>Ai-tzu-la 臧于剌</td>
<td>I-ssu-la 依斯拉</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>1512:63</td>
<td>I-ssu-ha-ko 以思哈高</td>
<td>I-ssu-ha-k'o 景司哈克</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>1512:63</td>
<td>Ya-ho-ch'üeh-wu 稣呼誓侶</td>
<td>Yeh-erh-sun-po 揚耶孫伯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>1512:63</td>
<td>Yu-ssu-wo 由素窩</td>
<td>Yu-ssu-fu 由斯府</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>1489:38, 1512:58, 63, 1663:66</td>
<td>Mieh-she 乜撕</td>
<td>Mu-sa 母撒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>„</td>
<td>1512:57</td>
<td>Mo-she 默合</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>1512:63, 1679:105,2:34/35</td>
<td>Nu-wa 女娲</td>
<td>Nu-hai 努海</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1489:52</td>
<td>I-ssu-lo-yeh 依思樂</td>
<td>I-ssu-ma-erh-lai 依斯留來</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1512:57</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-ssu-la 依斯拉</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1663:65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Mt Sinai</td>
<td>1489:39, 1663:66</td>
<td>Hai-na-shan 峨眉山</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hsi-na-shan 西那山</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first figure refers to the year of the inscription concerned, while the second figure indicates the pagination in Tobar, op. cit., for the inscriptions of 1489, 1512, and 1663; or in White, op. cit., vol. II, for the inscription of 1679.
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### INSCRIPTIONS WITH THEIR MOHAMMEDAN, NESTORIAN, CATHOLIC, AND PROTESTANT EQUIVALENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>renderings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Nestorian</strong></th>
<th><strong>Catholic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Protestant</strong></th>
<th><strong>remarks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nestorian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya-lung</td>
<td>Ya-lung</td>
<td>Ya-lun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya-pa-lang</td>
<td>Ya-pa-lang</td>
<td>Ya-po-la-han</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-lo-han</td>
<td>A-lo-han</td>
<td>Ya-lo-han</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-t'an</td>
<td>A-t'an</td>
<td>Ya-tang</td>
<td>Ya-tang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai-ssu</td>
<td>Ai-ssu</td>
<td>I-ssu-la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'e-la-ssu</td>
<td>T'e-la-ssu</td>
<td>O-tzu-la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai-hsieh</td>
<td>I-sa-ko</td>
<td>I-sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya-ko-po</td>
<td>Ya-ko-po</td>
<td>Ya-ko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao-su-o</td>
<td>Yao-su-o</td>
<td>Yüeh-shu-ya</td>
<td></td>
<td>also Yüeh-shu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-shih</td>
<td>Mei-she</td>
<td>Mo-hsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-o</td>
<td>No-o</td>
<td>No-ya</td>
<td></td>
<td>formerly also No-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-la-erh</td>
<td>I-la-erh</td>
<td>I-se-lieh</td>
<td></td>
<td>for further Catholic renderings see part IV, nos. 26-38; the Mohammedan terms are also used for Israel, the son of Abraham.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** The Mohammedan equivalents are due to the kindness of Mr. Yang Hsüeh-men (Ju-chi) 楊雪門, secretary at Yenching University. Regarding the Nestorian names, the work by P. Y. Saeki, Nestorian documents (cf. footnote 74), has been consulted. The Catholic and Protestant renderings were furnished through the courtesy of the Rev. PP. Gabriele Maria Allegra, O.F.M., and Paul Chou Lien-ch'ih 周連墀 of the China Synodal Commission, Peiping.
understandable as New Persian, the *lingua franca* all over the Far East during the Middle Ages, was presumably used by both of these minority groups. Regarding the Chinese Jews Lauffer came to the conclusion that at the time of their immigration “the language spoken by them... was most probably New Persian.”

Although all these names are Chinese phonetical transcriptions, and therefore represent an indivisible unit, they have been treated in the inscriptions like surnames and given (personal) names. When mentioned a second time only the last two characters were repeated in case the name contained more than two characters, e.g. the name of A-wu-lo-han 阿無羅漢 (Abraham) was repeated only in the form Lo-han 羅漢. As a matter of fact, in the inscription of 1679, he was only called by this abbreviated name.

Some of the names need further elucidation. Adam is called P’an-ku A-tan 盘古 阿耽 (no. 3) in the inscription of 1489. P’an-ku 盘古, a Chinese mythological figure has been described by Giles in as follows:

“The first being brought into existence by cosmogonical evolution. The Great Monad separated into the Male and Female Principles (the Yin and the Yang).”

The amalgamation of these two mythological figures has led to confusion. According to the inscription of 1489 Adam (P’an-ku A-taŋ) is an ancestor of Abraham in the nineteenth generation. In


This work contains the original Chinese text and an annotated French translation of the three stone inscriptions of 1489, 1512, and 1663, as well as other materials pertinent to the Kaifeng Jews. The first complete English translation of the three inscriptions and of the partial reconstruction of a fourth one of 1679, with notes and reproductions of the original Chinese texts, are contained in the work by William Charles White: *Chinese Jews. A compilation of matters relating to the Jews of K’ai-feng Fu*. Toronto, 1942. Part II: Inscriptional.

Throughout this article the pagination anted the inscriptions follows Tobar, except in cases when reference has been made to the work of Bishop White.
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the inscription of 1663, however, Adam has been presented as a descendant of P’an-ku in the nineteenth generation. The inscriptions of 1512, 1663, and 1679, wherein Adam is simply called A-tan 阿 亙, agree in the statement that Adam was followed by Noah and Abraham; i.e., that Adam and Abraham were only two generations apart. Apparently the author of the inscription of 1663 made this interpolation attempting to reconcile the two versions of the earlier inscriptions. The Mohammedan term for Adam is A-tan jen-tsu 阿 丹人 祖. The first two characters render phonetically the sound of the foreign name, while the last two characters describe him as the “ancestor of man”.

The name of Noah, Nü-wa 女 娲, represents another mythological allusion as has already been pointed out by D. MacGillivray:

“The name adopted for Noah is 女 娲 Nü Wa, who is one of the line of Chinese mythical sovereigns, said to be the successor of Fu Hsi, 2738 B.C. These two characters were chosen because Nü Wa was fabled to have mended the skies with five-colored stones and stopped the flooding waters, and Noah’s rainbow was a sign that the floods would no more descend to destroy the earth. (The identification of 女 娲 with Eve is forbidden by the context.)”

The Chinese names of Moses (nos. 8a-b) and Mt. Sinai (nos. 11a-b) have both been rendered in two versions in the inscriptions of 1489 and 1512 on the one hand and in that of 1663 on the other.

The Jews called themselves I-ssu-lo-yeh 嘉 樂 業 (Israel) in the three inscriptions of 1489, 1512, and 1663. They were not familiar with the term Yu-t’ai 猶太, by which they are generally known today, as we learn from Father Ricci’s report.

II. JEWISH THEOLOGICAL TITLES BORROWED FROM THE MOHAMMEDANS CONTAINED IN THE FOUR STONE INSCRIPTIONS

The Jews borrowed two Chinese renderings of theological terms from the Mohammedans, both indicating the title of “rabbi.”

4) Tobar, op. cit., p. 65; cf. also fn. 2.

Cf. also Giles, op. cit., p. 601, no. 1578. — According to one account, Nü Wa was the sister and successor of the legendary emperor Fu Hsi.

a. MAN-LA 滿刺 or 嘴喇 7

The term man-la has been mentioned six times in the inscriptions of 1489 and 1663, but not in those of 1512 and 1679. It has been rendered by the Chinese characters 滿刺 in the inscription of 1489,8 where it occurs only once and is preceded by a list of fourteen persons. It has been expressly stated there, however, that some more people also carried this title. In the inscription of 1663 the term appears five times represented by slightly different characters of the same sound value 嘴喇. Four persons have been enumerated as possessing the title of man-la; in all cases the title precedes the name of the person concerned.

It is rather unusual that there should have been so many rabbis in such a small community,9 but that may be due to the extraordinary circumstances under which the community lived in the diaspora. The tasks and qualifications attached to this rank have been generally described in the inscription of 1489.11 A man-la was well versed in the Hebrew scriptures, exhorted others to lead a good life, and had to take charge of the synagogue and its affairs. As its “patron” he was expected to care for the upkeep of the synagogue according to his means. On various occasions, when the buildings were destroyed or damaged, these rabbis discharged themselves of their responsibility most generously. It was only after destitution had overcome the community and after its absorption by the surrounding Chinese and Mohammedans had advanced too far that the synagogue fell into disrepair and gradually into ruins.

Tobar quotes 11 the following passage from Terrien de Lacouperie 12 about this problem:

“The mahometan influence was very great at K’ai-fung-foo, and many Turkish and Arabian words were imposed on the Chinese; and as the Jews were

7) A more recent Chinese rendering is mu-la 滿喇, but at present the term a-heng 阿衡 (usual Romanization “ahung”) has replaced it.
8) Tobar, op. cit., p. 46; cf. also fn. 2. — Laufer, op. cit., p. 193.
9) Ibid., p. 75, cf. also fn. 2; and pp. 86 and 87.
10) According to the Chinese-Hebrew MS. described by Laufer (cf. p. 195, fn. 1), the Kaifeng community counted 712 persons between 1660/70, 453 men and 259 women. Including children the population figure hardly exceeded 1,000 persons.
11) See footnote 8.
12) Transact. of the Meriden Scient. Ass’n, vol. 7, 1895, p. 27.
confounded with the Mahometans by the Chinese, it happened that this Chinese-Turkish title was bestowed by the emperor on several of the Jewish 'Sinagogue rulers'."

Tobar is right in rejecting this statement, as there exists no indication in the inscription that the emperor conferred this title on any of the persons listed in the text. Such an event would have been of great importance to the community and would certainly have been recorded in detail. Nor is there any reference to such an act in Chinese literature.

b. **WU-SSU-TA 五思達**

Five times occurs the term **wu-ssu-la** ¹³ signifying "rabbi" or — if so pretentious a title be admissible in such a small community — "grand-rabbi."

1 and 2. In the inscriptions of 1489 and 1679 this term is linked up with and following the names of Lieh Wei 列微 ¹⁴ and Li Wei 利未 ¹⁵ respectively. Both of these are phonetic renderings of the name of Levi, who was charged with the administration of the Jewish community and under whose auspices the synagogue was built for the first time in 1163.

3 and 4. In the inscriptions of 1489 and 1679 the term refers to an unnamed rabbi, who rebuilt the synagogue in 1279.

5. In the inscription of 1663 it refers to an unnamed rabbi, who rebuilt the synagogue in 1356.

Concerning this problem Tobar inquired from the French consul and sinologue, Gabriel Deveria. The latter furnished the following data after consultation with other orientalists: ¹⁶

---


¹⁴) White, op. cit., II, 37, lines 3 and 4 from the right.

¹⁵) Ibid., line 3. — On pp. 97 and 102, note 2, White gives the correct Romanization of Li-wei for the inscription of 1679. But in the corresponding Chinese text on p. 105, line 3, nos. 34-35, he actually repeats the Chinese characters for Lieh Wei 列微. That may be due to a clerical error of the scribe who prepared the Chinese text of the inscription for publication. But in the Chinese text of the inscription of 1489 (p. 37, line 3) the alternate characters for both transliterations, Lieh Wei and Li Wei, are reproduced.

¹⁶) Tobar, op. cit., p. 44, fn. 1. — Cf. also Lauffer, op. cit., p. 192: "... the Chinese Jews designated the rabbi by the word ustād ('teacher', 'master'), used in the same sense by the Persian Jews; thus our earliest inscription speaks of a Lie-wei Wu-se-ta, 'Rabbi Levi.'"
...Ou-se-ta est la transcription du mot person Oustâd, vulgo Oustâ, qui signifie, maître (senior) d'une communauté ou assemblée quelconques. — Les Juifs persans ont adopté ce terme pour traduire le mot Hébreu Râb (Rabbin) et les rabbins persans s'intitulent par suite Oustâ", "Le titre de Oustâ précède les noms: Oustâ Abraham, Oustâ Mosé, &. Pour ma part, je trouve cette explication plausible."

The title of wu-ssu-ta follows the name of the person it refers to in the two cases that it has been given. Nevertheless, the Indo-Persian Jewish immigrants doubtlessly borrowed this Chinese rendering from their Mohammedan neighbours.

The grand-rabbi as the spiritual head of the community also possessed jurisdiction over its members, an arrangement similar to that of the Mohammedans. The wu-ssu-ta was responsible for his flock to the Chinese authorities and it is likely that the ordinary rabbis (man-la) assisted him in this task, although nothing has been handed down to us about such a tradition.

In the inscription of 1663 occurs twice the title of chang-chiao or "chief of the religion". It precedes in both cases the name of Li Chen 李禎, the contemporary grand-rabbi of that period. He supervised the collation and revision of the saved scriptures and repaired a copy himself. The term chang-chiao had at that time superseded the earlier wu-ssu-ta.

c. YEN TU-LA 傳都剌 (inscr. of 1489; in the inscr. of 1663 and 1679, the last character, la 剌, has been rendered differently).

Yen Tu-la has been presented by White "as a Chinese transliteration of a non-Chinese name of probably Persian origin, and obviously designates the office of supervisor of buildings. For instance, in the inscription of 1679 Chao Ying-ch'êng 趙映乘 is seen to have been a Yen-tu-la."19

The last part of this statement must be considered an error. Even in his own translation of the inscription of 1679 White does not say so. It is true that in 1423 the emperor conferred upon the

17) See footnotes 15 and 16.
18) Tobar, op. cit., pp. 75 and 86.
19) White, op. cit., II, 21, note 16; cf. also II, 102, notes 3 and 11, and III, 120. In addition, Yen Tu-la is mentioned in the translations of the inscriptions: II, 11 and 14 (1489); 62 (1663); 97 and 99 (1679).
20) Ibid., II, 99.
physician Yen Ch'êng 亱賾 the name of Chao 趙 as surname, which was the emperor's own family name, and promoted him to the rank of colonel\(^1\). Another member of the Yen family was Yen P'ing-t'u 亱平徒, one of the rabbis (man-la) in charge of the synagogue according to the inscription of 1489\(^2\). The name of Yen also occurs in the inscription of 1512, but without personal name\(^3\), referring presumably to both, Yen Tu-la and Yen Ch'eng. It is only natural that the name of Yen disappeared, after the emperor had bestowed his own name of Chao on Yen Ch'eng.

III. JEWISH SURNAMES CONTAINED IN THE STONE INSCRIPTIONS AND IN THE CHINESE-HEBREW MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clan names, inscr. of 1489</th>
<th>man-la (rabbis) listed in: inscr. of 1489(^4) 1663(^5)</th>
<th>man-la (rabbis) listed in: Chin.-Hebrew MS. (1660/70)(^6)</th>
<th>clan names contained in Chin.-Hebrew MS. (1660/70)</th>
<th>men</th>
<th>women(^7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ai 亱</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang † 亱賾</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao 趙</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin † 亱賾</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou 周</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang 黃</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao 高</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li † 李</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu 穆</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieh 殷</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai 白</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shih 石</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tso 左</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen 亱</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 14 4 93

453 men & 259 women, excl. children\(^5\)

---

1) Tobar, op. cit., p. 43. 4) Laufer, op. cit., pp. 194-196.
2) Ibid., pp. 75, 86, and 87. 5) White, op. cit., III, 188-190.
3) White, op. cit., III, 35-71. 6) This clan name is represented twice.

---

21) Tobar, op. cit., 47, 64; White, op. cit., II, 12, 98.
22) Ibid., 46; ibid., II, 12.
23) Ibid., 64; ibid., II, 46.
There is, however, no reason to assume that Yen Tu-la is not a personal name. White's surmise that it designates a "supervisor of buildings" has no basis. The Mohammedans do not use any such term; but the name of Abdullah is rendered with characters of similar sound value in their writings.

The inscription of 1489 contains a list of seventeen surnames, three of which are represented twice: Chang, Chin, and Li. Hence, there remain the fourteen above clan names. The list of man-la includes fourteen persons, nine of whom belonged to the Li family, two to the Ai family, and one each to the families of Chang, Chou, and Yen.

In the inscription of 1663 seven clan names are engraved on the reverse of the stèle, their members having contributed to the restauration of the synagogue just after the middle of the 17th century. They include the names of Ai, Chang, Chao, Chin, Kao, Li, and Shih. They likewise occur in the Chinese-Hebrew MS. (Codex). Laufer affirms that several of the missing clan names are to be traced in this "register" among the names of women. Actually, the names of Chou, Huang, Pai, and Tso are to be found there, in addition to the seven clan names. White omitted to provide these four names with an asterisk (*) to denote them as Jewish family surnames which they certainly are, thus wrongly classing them as "non-Jewish Chinese names."

Four man-la have been enumerated in the inscription of 1663, belonging respectively to the families of Li, Ai, Chang, and Shih. They each collated and repaired one of the copies of the scriptures which were saved after the flood of 1642. Li Ch'eng-hsien 李承先.

24) Tobar, op. cit., p. 43.
25) Laufer, op. cit., p. 194, made a slip here; he mentions sixteen clan names.
26) Tobar, op. cit., p. 46.
27) Ibid., p. 83.
29) Laufer, op. cit., p. 194.
30) White, op. cit., III, 188, no. 446; cf. also p. 66, no. 639, and p. 71, no. 699; cf. also III, 82.
31) Ibid., p. 189, no. 456; cf. also p. 66, no. 598.
32) Ibid., p. 190, no. 472; cf. also p. 57, nos. 395, 399, and p. 60, no. 486.
33) Ibid., p. 190, no. 482; cf. also p. 60, no. 529.
34) Ibid., see note on top of p. 188; cf. also the last column of the above "List of Chinese-Jewish surnames."
35) Tobar, op. cit., pp. 75 and 86.
36) Ibid., p. 87.
who has been mentioned twice, was in charge of this work jointly
with the grand-rabbi Li Chen 李顓.35 With the exception of the
first mention of Li Ch'eng-hsien, the names of all of them appear on
the reverse side of the stele.

The 23 references to man-la in the above list, extracted from the
Chinese-Hebrew MS. (1660/70), in some instances, include a number
of repetitions and sometimes it is not quite clear to which clan they
belong. Nevertheless, that column gives a fairly good idea of the
relative importance and traditional learning of the various clans.

Originally more than seventy Jewish families settled at Kaifeng.37
The Rev. A. C. Moule's surmise that "seventy' is perhaps a mistake
for 'seventeen';"38 because of the seventeen names given on the stele
of 1489, is improbable. Moule evidently confuses clans and families.
Even in 1901, when the community had dwindled to 250 souls, they
formed about 50 families of the names Kao, Li, Chao, Shih, Chin,
and Chang.39 In addition, the inscription of 1679 contains a definite
statement to the contrary for the year 1163, when the synagogue was
first erected: "There were then 73 clans (hsing 姓 ), more than
500 families (chia 家 ) altogether".40 But Moule is right in saying
about the names that "these all except Li and Ai have been carefully
erased, only Kao, Mu, Chao, and Chin being recognizable while the
remaining eleven are quite illegible" on the facsimile published by
Tobar.41

The Li clan was leading in number as well as in importance, at
least until the end of the 17th century. Nine out of fourteen rabbis
listed in 1489 belonged to them,42 likewise one out of four in 1663.
In addition, they then provided the grand-rabbi or "chief of religion".43
Their 109 individuals listed in the register between 1660/70 amounted...

37) Ibid., p. 43; inscr. of 1489.
38) A. C. Moule: Christians in China before the year 1550. London, New
York and Toronto, 1930, p. 2, fn. 3.
39) Laufer, op. cit., p. 196.
41) Moule, op. cit., p. 2, fn. 3. — The present writer was quite unable to
decipher any but the names of Li and Ai on the rubbing of the inscription of
1489 in his possession.
42) Tobar, op. cit., p. 46.
43) Cf. footnote 35.
to almost a quarter of the total male population at that time. The number of their man-la mentioned in the same place, according to the above table, amounted to 13, as compared to 39, belonging to the Ai clan and 22, belonging to the Chao clan.

Whether or not the Jews adopted other surnames than those enumerated above is a matter of conjecture. At least one name occurs in two transliterations which is not listed above, namely that of the grand-rabbi Lieh Wei (inscr. of 1489) or Li Wei (inscr. of 1679), under whose auspices the synagogue was first erected in 1163. These phonetic renderings ostensibly correspond to the name of "Levi"; they are quite exceptional, because Laufer affirms that in the Chinese-Hebrew MS. "there is no relation between the Chinese and Hebrew names". The Rev. D. MacGillivray ventured guesses at identifying the seventeen Chinese surnames, but his Hebrew equivalents must be considered as spurious.

The present writer is convinced that for the past fifty or a hundred years there existed no pure Jews. Most likely they were absorbed by their neighbours through frequent intermarriage with Chinese and Mohammedan women during the past three centuries. Actually, 41 women with non-Jewish Chinese names are entered in the register between 1660/70. Bishop White of the Canadian Church of England, formerly stationed at Kaifeng, claims that the seven clan names mentioned by Ricci and included in the inscription of 1663 "are borne today by the Jewish remnant". According to him "seven names or eight clans" (ch'i-hsing pa-chia 七姓八家) is still the conventional account of the Jewish community. This statement is more specified in his latest work, where he writes:

"Even today the Jews of Kaifeng and their neighbours speak of the Jewish community as the Seven Surnames and Eight Families (Ch'i Hsing Pa Chia), because there are two branches of the surname Chao."

44) Laufer, op. cit., p. 195.
45) Cf. the above "List of Chinese-Jewish Surnames", col. 4.
46) Tobar, op. cit., p. 44.
47) Cf. footnote 44.
49) White, op. cit., III, 188-190. — The names of Chou, Huang, Pai, and Tso are likewise Jewish; cf. footn. 30-33 of the present article.
51) Cf. Moule, op. cit., p. 10, fn. 11.
52) White, op. cit., III, 3.
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It is true that the Yen clan adopted the surname of Chao, as we have seen above. On the other hand, the Chang, Chin, and Li clans had likewise two branches each.\(^{54}\) Hence, it may be open to discussion how the term ch'i-hsing pa-chia originated; the more so, as recent informants claim that both, the Li and Chang clans, have two branches each.

The latest available reports on the Kaifeng Jews are due to the Japanese who, during their occupation of that city, took a particular interest in them. Apparently they suspected these descendants of Perso-Indian immigrants either of Communist tendencies or of pro-Allied leanings. Two articles, although that is not especially mentioned, evidently represent the results of these semi-official investigations. Mikami\(^{54}\) and Sogabe,\(^{55}\) both of whom visited Kaifeng in the autumn of 1940, each wrote a rather weak article which, nevertheless, contain a few useful items for our purpose.

In both instances the survival of descendants of the seven clans has been confirmed. Both authors mention the designation of ch'i-hsing pa-chia, that the Li clan has two branches, and that the whereabouts of the Chang clan are unknown. Sogabe claims that there are also two branches of the Chang's using different characters for their names, namely, 章 and 章. The Rev. P. Antonio Cattaneo, P.I.M.E., then Rector of the Regional Seminary of the Catholic Mission at Kaifeng confirmed this statement by letter in 1943. He also informed the present writer that there were a few Jews left within and outside of that city and that the Shih family had become Catholic in 1924. Actually, one of their members entered the seminary to become a priest in 1941, but later on changed his mind.\(^{56}\) The conversion to Catholicism of this family accounts perhaps for the fact that the surname of Shih has been omitted in the article of Sogabe. Mikami states that the Jewish community numbers approximately a hundred persons. According to Sogabe there are

\(^{53}\) Cf. the above “List of Chinese-Jewish Surnames”, col. 1.

\(^{54}\) Mikami, Teichō 三上清聽: 開封猶太教徒の現状者. ("Report on the actual conditions of the Kaifeng Jewish community.") Shina Bukyō shigaku 支那佛敎史學, Tokyo, 5:1, June 25, 1941, 76-77.


180 Jews locally, with another 80 members of the community residing at Shanghai.

Hence, because of the recent origin of the term ch‘i-hsing pa-chia, it appears more logical to the present writer that either the Li or the Chang clan is referred to as the eighth family.

IV. CHINESE DESIGNATIONS FOR JEWS, JUDEA, HEBREW, ETC.

(a) Nomenclature from documents of the Yuan dynasty.

The earliest Chinese names given to the Jews during the Mongol period were derived from the New Persian Djuhud or Djahud. They are documented in decrees which were promulgated in the years 1280, 1320, 1329, 1340, and 1354. These are reproduced in the Yuan-shih and the Yuan-tien-chang 元史 and the Yuan-tien-chang 元典章.

(1) CHU-HU HUI-HUI MEI 兀忽囘回毉.

The decree of January 27, 1280, represents the oldest reference to the Chinese Jews during the Yuan period. Khubilai khan issued it to prohibit the ritual slaughtering of sheep according to the Mohammedan and Jewish custom (Sunnah). He recalled in the introductory part of the edict that already Chinghis khan had forbidden the practice of this ritual, because as conquered slaves they should be content to eat Mongol food. Chinghis had provided for their punishment in case of disobedience, but this injunction had fallen into oblivion and disuse. Khubilai khan, however, re-introduced...
THE NOMENCLATURE OF JEWS

this prohibition and strictly forbade the ritual killing of animals, no matter by whom it was practiced, and transgressors were threatened with severe punishment. Thus the Mongol way of eating was made obligatory for everybody, including the Mohammedans and Jews, notwithstanding their peculiar religious prescriptions.

Both, the Mohammedans and Jews, are designated in the decree by the collective term of Hui-hui 合眾，which at that time was applied to all Central Asiatic peoples, although originally only the Ouigours were called by that name.

The Mohammedans were named in this edict Mu-su-hi-man Hui-hui mei 木速魯罕合眾每 and the Jews Chu-hu Hui-hui mei. The final particle mei 每 denotes the Chinese plural-affix of that time.

(2) CHU-HU 朱忽.

This term, which occurs in decrees dating from 1329 and 1354, coincides with the preceding one, but the final compound Hui-hui has been omitted.

The edict of April 19th, 1329, deals with the taxation of Nestorians, Jews, and Mohammedans,62 while that of the fifth moon (May 23rd to June 20th), 1354, pertains to the summons of the wealthy Mohammedans and Jews to the capital for military service.63 Both documents were consulted by the Archimandrite Palladius, who first identified this particular term as designating Jews.64 He was, however, mistaken in his notion that the reference of 1329 represents the earliest mention, because he overlooked the decrees of 1280 and 1320.65 Yet, his merit to priority over other authors remains unimpaired. Noyé has discussed both of these edicts,66 but that of 1329 escaped his attention. Moule67 as well as Haenisch68 have examined

62) Yüan-shih, Po-na-pen 百納本, Shanghai (Commercial Press), chiān 33, f. 37b.
63) Ibid., chiān 43, f. 10b.
65) Cf. terms no. 1 and 3.
67) Cf. Moule, op. cit., p. 221, fn. 14 (edict of 1329); p. 224, fn. 17 (edict of 1320).
the decree of 1320. But none of these authors has realized and corrected the error of Palladius.

(3) CHU-HU 竹忽.

In the edict of 1320, issued between July 7th and August 4th, the first character chu 竹 has replaced the earlier form 竹. This decree, like that of 1329, regulated the taxation of minorities, such as Mohammedans, Nestorians, Jews, and Dasmans.

The remark by Haenisch that behind the term Chu-hu the character ts 答 has to be supplemented, is quite uncalled for. In six instances do we find third final characters. Their sound values, however, differ; namely, tc 得 (nos. 11 and 17) or 德 (nos. 13 and 14), t'c 赤 (no. 10), and tai 代 (no. 15).

(4) CHU-WU 主吾.

The characters employed here entirely differ from the preceding transliterations. Chu-wu was used by the censor Shih T'u-erh T' unt, who, on November 24th, 1340, advised the government to forbid the Dasmans, Mohammedans, Jews, and others to marry their paternal cousins.

Thirteen more Chinese transliterations of the word Djuhud have been traced from secondary sources. But these deviations are due to the jumbling of characters, because the authors had in mind only the sound value of the Chinese rendering.

(5) CHU-HU [HUI-HUI] 主鶼 [囬囬].

The term Chu-hu (no. 5) is mentioned in a work by Yang Yü 杨 翡, the preface of which is dated 1360. The passage under discussion contains the following statement:

69) Yüan-tien-chang, suppl. II, f. 35b.
70) Haenisch, op. cit., p. 38, fn. 3.
71) Yüan-shih, chüan 40, f. 9a.
72) This is in line with the Chinese social customs. Actually, in the seventh moon (between July 25th and August 23rd) of the same year a similar provision had been made against levirate marriage (Yüan-shih, chüan 40, f. 7b). By decree foreigners were prohibited from levirate marriage, an abomination in the eyes of the Chinese, which was practiced among Mohammedans and Jews. (Cf. Laufer, op. cit., pp. 190-191.)
"The officers of the Hangchow Sugar Bureau were all wealthy merchants of Jewish (? and Mohammedan) extraction."

Chu-hu Hui-hui in term no. 5 may be a tautological designation and simply apply to "Jews", as in term no. 1, where such a compound expression has been used, or it may mean "Jews and Mohammedans. Although grammatically both views are tenable, the compiler is inclined to the second alternative.

A list of appellations, compiled by the Japanese scholar P. Y. Saeki74 contains the following four, which have not been mentioned elsewhere.

(6) CHU-HUI 朱炭.
(7) CHU-HO 珠赫.
(8) CHU-HU 珠忽.75
(9) CHU-YÔ 主語.76

Noyé has contributed two more terms:77

(10) CHU-HU-T'E 專忽瞥.
(11) CHU-HU-TE 朱乎得.

The Rev. C. F. Hogg has collected the following three renderings:78

(12) CHU-HU 祝虎.
(13) CHU-HU-TE 尊虎德.
(14) CHU-HU-TE 尊乎德.


75) Ibid., p. 518. Saeki states there that this term is to be found in the decree of April 19th, 1329, in the Yüan-shih, chüan 36. But, actually, that decree is in chüan 33, while chüan 36 does not contain any reference to the Jews. Moreover, Saeki gives the first character wrongly as 聖, instead of 專. (Cf. term no. 2 and footn. 62.)

76) Presumably this appellation is identical with term no. 4; i.e., Saeki apparently confused the second character yü 聖 with the similar character wu 武 which occurs in the Yüan-shih under the year 1340 (cf. footn. 71).

77) Noyé, op. cit., 22:268, Dec., 1935, 651. — These terms are, however, also mentioned elsewhere.

78) "Mahommedanism." Chinese Recorder, Shanghai, 23:2, Feb., 1892, 61.

MS. Vol. XII, 8
The Rev. Isaac Mason, among others, has mentioned the following transliteration:  

(15) CHU-HU-TAI JEN 朱呼代人.

The present writer has added two more terms:  

(16) CHU-HO 主鶴.  
(17) CHU-HU-TE 諸呼得.  

(b) Renderings adopted by the Jews, Catholics, Protestants, and Mohammedans.

(18) YU-T'AI 猶太.

The most general term for Jews is Yu-t'ai. It was presumably introduced by the early Jesuit missionaries, most likely by Father Matteo Ricci. He used it in his work T'ien-chu shih-i 天主實義 (De Deo vera ratio) of which the first edition appeared in 1595, although Pfister mentions an earlier version entitled T'ien-hsüeh shih-i 天學實義. 82 Ricci stated in his letter of July 26th, 1605, to the Jesuit General  

that the Jews were not familiar with this name.

Other renderings must be considered merely as variant contemporary transcriptions:  

(19) YU-T'AI 猶泰.  
(20) YU-T'E 攸特.  

Ju-te-ya (no. 21) is the equivalent for Judea, Syria, and Palestine. The authorship for this term must be likewise ascribed to Ricci who used it in his famous world map 84 which was first dressed in 1584. 85 This name has been generally accepted and kept in constant use until  

---


81) Cf. term no. 5. The second character ho 鶴 (no. 16) represents apparently an erroneous substitute for the character hu 鳳 (no. 5).


84) 萬國全圖.

today, together with Yu-t'ai-kuo 猶太國 (cf. no. 18). The contemporary term for Palestine is Pa-le-ssu-t'an 巴勒斯坦. The Mohammedans have a different name for Judea, namely, Yu-na-ni (no. 22).86

(21) JU-TE-YA 如德亞.
(22) YU-NA-NI 有那泥.

The Jews called themselves in the three stone inscriptions of 1489, 1512, and 1663, I-ssu-lo-yeh (Israel).87 Possibly they adopted this appellation already at the time of their arrival at Kaifeng during or previous to the 12th century; they certainly could not have done so before the 10th century, when they first entered China in the company of the Mohammedan-Arabic traders. If that should be the case, this might be considered their oldest authentic name.

(23) I-SSU-LO-YEH 一賜樂業.

The Mohammedan transliterations of “Israel” are I-ssu-ma-erh-lai (no. 24),88 which also represents the personal name of Israel, the son of Abraham, and I-ssu-la (no. 25).89

(24) I-SSU-MA-ERH-LAI 易斯瑪爾來.
(25) I-SSU-LA 以思啦.

The richest harvest of Chinese renderings of this name is to be found in the Catholic theological literature which dates back further than that of most of the other alien religious groups.90

(26) I-LA-ERH 義辣爾.
(27) I-LA-ERH 義臘爾.
(28) I-SA-O-ERH 義撒厄爾.
(29) I-LA-ERH 伊拉爾.
(30) I-SA-ERH 伊撒爾.
(31) I-LA-ERH 亦拉爾.
(32) I-SA-O-ERH 亦撒厄爾.

87) Tobar, op. cit., p. 52 (inscr. of 1469); p. 57 (inscr. of 1512); p. 65 (inscr. of 1663).
88) Through the kindness of Mr. Yang Hsüeh-men (Ju-chi) 楊雪門 (啟信).
89) Mason, op. cit. (cf. footn. 79), p. 4.
The Protestants use the following transcription:

(39) I-SE-LIEH 厥 色 列.

Most likely the Catholic missionaries introduced also the phonetic rendering of the word “Hebrew”:

(40) HSI-PO-LAI 希 博 来.

Ch'i-hsing pa-chia or “seven [clan] names or eight families” is a popular designation applied at the present time to the Kaifeng Jewish community.91

(41) CH'I-HSING PA-CHIA 七 姓 八 家.

(c) Unauthenticated “Nestorian” name.

(42) SHIH-HU (-JEN) 石 忽 (人).

The term Shih-hu or Shih-hu-jen, men of the Shih-hu country, was discovered by Saeki. He asserts that it applies to Jews. It occurs ten times in “The Lord of the Universe's Discourse on Alms-giving, Part III” (Shih tsun pu shih lun ti san 世 尊 布 施 論 第三).92 Saeki ascribes it to the Nestorian Bishop Alopên (A-lo-pen 阿 羅 本), or, as he calls him, Abraham.93 Probably Saeki is right, when he identifies Shih-hu-jen as Jews, though there is no real indication that Alopên is the author of the document under consideration. In addition, it would be more correct to call this Chinese adaptation of the “Sermon of the Mount”94 Christian rather than Nestorian, for its

91) See section III, p. 10; cf. also footn. 50-52. Mikami (footn. 54) and Sogabe (footn. 55), both of whom visited the Kaifeng Jews in 1940, confirm the use of this term.

92) Saeki, op. cit., pp. 211 (verse 66), 212 (v. 71), 216 (v. 119, 123), 217 (v. 132-133), 218 (v. 137), 223 (v. 191, 193, [194], 196).

93) Ibid., pp. 84-85, note 10; and p. 113. — The Syriac name of Alopên was Jab-allaha.

94) Ibid., p. 232, note 2; p. 242, note 18.
character is quite Monophysite which is in contrast to the Nestorian beliefs.95

It will largely be the task of the phonologist to solve this riddle, before it can be decided, whether or not Shih-hu-jen really applies to Jews. In any case, Saeki has touched upon an important problem that may shed new light on the Jewish nomenclature. Shih-hu would represent by far the oldest Chinese name if Saeki's contention were definitely proved to be correct, because the document dates from 642 A.D.

It is, however, impossible to agree to two other identifications of Saeki. He claims that Fu-lin 楊林, a name frequently substituted for that of the country of Ta-ch'in 大秦, represents the “Chinese phonetization” of the Syriac word “Phrim” or “Ephrim”; i.e. Ephraim.96 Secondly, in “The Lord of the Universe's Discourse on Alms-giving” is mentioned “the walled city of Ita” (I-to-ch'en 伊大城) which Saeki identifies with Judea.98 It appears rather implausible that Judea, a country, should be introduced here as a “walled city”, apart from the fact that the obscure context does not justify such an assumption.99

(d) Names indicating a Mohammedan connotation.

The close relationship between the Chinese Jews and Mohammedans is clearly indicated by the Chinese nomenclature, particularly by those terms coined with the compound Hui-hui 回教, which has also been used in the decree of 1280 (no. 1; cf. also no. 5). Hui-hui may either precede or follow the actual name.

(43) HUI-HUI KU-CHIAO 回回古教.

“Old Mohammedan Religion” is a term to which the Bishop J. Rizzolati100 and the Rev. W. C. Milne101 drew attention (cf. also term no. 52).

95) The attention of the present writer was drawn to this fact by Prof. William Hung 汪, whom he has consulted about this intricate problem.
96) Ibid., pp. 109-111, note 32; cf. also p. 83, n. 5; p. 89, n. 16; and p. 241, n. 16.
97) Ibid., p. 223, verse 194.
98) Ibid., p. 244, note 28.
(44) LAN-MAO (-TZU) HUI-HUI 藍帽 (子) 回回.

"Mohammedans with blue turbans" represents a name given to the Jews in order to distinguish them from the Mohammedans who used to wear turbans of different colours. According to Noyé this term is still being used in Sian.

(45) CH'ING HUI-HUI 靑回回.

"Blue Mohammedans", a name mentioned by two writers, might conceivably allude to the blue turbans of the Jews (cf. no. 44).

(46) CHEN HUI-HUI 真回回.

"True Mohammedans" is a popular contemporary appellation applied to the Kaifeng Jews.


Liu extracted his facts from a "Guide to Kaifeng" 関封案內, which the present compiler has been unable to obtain. That article had been contributed by a Japanese visitor to Kaifeng, who had received his information from a Mr. Shih 石 of the local Jewish community.


Bruno Navarra mentions in his book, China und die Chinesen, Bremen-Shanghai, 1901, p. 38, that the Kaifeng Jews were known by the name of "Huei Tse", d.h. sieben Stämme."

The term Hui-tzu 回子, however, applies to Mohammedans, while the compound expression Lan-mao Hui-tzu (or Hui-hui) has been used to designate Jews. Perhaps that is the reason for Navarra's claim. His explanation of the Chinese term as 'seven tribes' or 'clans' is evidently due to a confusion of his data. Presumably he had some information in regard to the seven clans (cf. no. 41) and, by mistake, threw the two unconnected items together.

105) This information was furnished by the courtesy of Dr. Hellmut Wilhelm after his visit to Kaifeng in 1934/35.
(47) **T'IAO-CINH-CHIAO** 挑筋教.

(48) **T'IAO-CINH HUI-HUI** 挑筋回回.

(49) **TIAO-CINH-CHIAO** 筒 (not *tao*) 筋 教.

A differentiation from the Mohammedans is indicated by the two renderings *T'iao-chin-chiao* (no. 47) and *Tiao-chin-chiao* (no. 49); *i.e.*, “the sect which extracts the sinews”, alluding to Jewish prescriptions for the slaughtering of animals.106 Ricci was the first to mention this popular distinction between the Mohammedans, who were not allowed to eat pork, and the Jews, who ate sinews (“*huomini che non mangiano nervi*”).107 *T'iao-chin Hui-hui* (no. 48), or “the Mohammedans who extract the sinews”, is an expression found by the American Chargé d’Affaires, Charles D. Tenney, who visited the Kaifung Jews in 1918.108 This term again proves that the Chinese consider the Jews merely a Mohammedan sect.

(50) **T'IAO-CHING-CHIAO** 挑筋教.

*T'iao-ching-chiao*, according to Liu Lung-kuang,109 means “the sect which does not accept Christianity.”110 This term as well as *Chiao-ching-chiao* (no. 56) evidently form substitutes for the somewhat disparaging terms *T'iao-chin-chiao* (no. 47) and *Tiao-chin-chiao* (no. 49).

(51) **ERH SHIHI CHIH JEN** 二氏之人.

Literally, this expression means “members of the two families (religions).”111 Originally it was used by the Confucianists to denote

---

106) “The children of Israel eat not (of) the sinew.” Genesis, 32, 32. J. de Mailla, in his *Histoire générale de la Chine*, v. XIII, ed. by Grosier, Paris, 1785, p. 616, explains this custom as follows: “*Tiao-kin-kiao*, pour signifier qu'ils s'abstiennent du sang, & qu'ils coupent les nerfs & les veines des animaux qu'ils tuent, afin que tout le sang s'écoule plus aisément.”


110) Liu asserts that this term actually refers to the Nestorians, whose creed has been known by the name of *Ching-chiao* 猜 教.

the Buddhists and Taoists, but it has also been adopted by the Moham-
medans as a technical term for Jews and Christians.

c Designations anent the Jewish religion.
The following two terms are perhaps intended to express a
contrast to Islam:

(52) **KU-CHIAO 古教**.
“Loi ancienne” is mentioned by two Jesuit fathers, namely, by
Gozani in his letter of November 5th, 1704, from Kaifeng, and
repeated by de Mailla in his *Histoire générale de la Chine* (1785) (cf. also no. 43).

(53) **CHIU-CHIAO 古教**.
“Ancient faith” is another designation of the same meaning, cited
by the Rev. F. Porter Smith.

(54) **T'ien-chu-chiao 天竺教**.
“The religion which came from India” is a term which was chosen
because the first Jewish immigrants came either from or through
India. It was dropped by the Jews during the Christian persecu-
tions. They wanted then to avoid disadvantageous consequences by
being confused with the Catholics, who had adopted a name of
almost the same sound, though of a different meaning and written
in different characters: **T’ien-chu-chiao 天竺教**.

has also been mentioned by Gabriel Devéria: “Notes d’épigraphie mongole-
1896.)

112) **Lettres édifiantes**, nouv. éd., Paris, 1781, XVIII, 45. (Ed. Panthéon
littéraire, III, 149-154.)


114) A vocabulary of proper names in Chinese and English of places, persons,
tribes, and sects. Shanghai, 1870, p. 22.

115) Tobar, op. cit., p. 43 (inscr. of 1489); p. 57 (inscr. of 1512); p. 72
(inscr. of 1663).

Cf. also [George Smith and W. H. Medhurst]: “A narrative of a mission of
inquiry to the Jewish Synagogue of Kaifung fu, on behalf of the London Society
for promoting Christianity among the Jews.” *The Chinese Repository*, Hongkong,
20:7, July, 1851, art. 7, p. 449.
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(55) T'IEN-CHIAO 天教.
“Religion of Heaven” was formerly used, but eventually abandoned.117

(56) CHIAO-CHING-CHIAO 教經教.
“The Religion which teaches the Scriptures” is a term of similar nature as the above two118 (cf. also nos. 47-50).

(57) “MUSSAUITES”.
Musauites, “followers of Moses”, derived from Musau — Moses (cf. table of Chinese renderings of Biblical names, nos. 8a-b), is a term mentioned by Sir Henry Yule in the Introductory Notice to “The journey of Benedict Goes from Agra to Cathay.”119a

(f) Modern coinages.

(58) YI-TI-SHIH(-TI) 益迪士 (的).
Yi-ti-shih is a proposed phonetic rendering of the word “Yiddish” which is usually circumscribed by a whole sentence.

(59) YI-TI YÜ 伊地語.
Yi-ti yü, a very appropriate phonetic equivalent for the “Yiddish language,” was formed by Keng Sheng 更生.119b

(60) HSIN-FENG YU CHIH-MIN CHU-I(-CHE) 信奉猶民主義 (者).

(61) YU CHIH-MIN CHU-I 窮民主義.

(62) CHI-AN-HUI 辰安會.

(63) HSI-AN CHU-I 辰安主義.

(64) YU-TAI MIN-TSU CHU-I 窮太民族主義.

(65) HSÜN-KUANG YÜN-TUNG 鄉光運動.

(66) HSÜN-SHAN YÜN-TUNG 鄉山運動.

119a) Henry Yule: Cathay and the way thither, London, 1916, vol. IV, p. 175. Most likely this name is based on the Mohammedan transliteration Mu-sa 母沙 (Moses) which has also been used by Yü Cheng-hsieh 余正孝: Kuei-ssu ts'un-kao 結巴存稿. The 1st ed. was publ. in 1849; the ed. consulted was publ. in Shanghai, 1941, tse 2, chüan 13, fol. 397.
The seven above expressions for “Zionist” (no. 60) and “Zionism” or “Zionist movement” (nos. 61-66) have been newly created from contemporary concepts.120

(g) Erroneous identifications of names.

In addition to the above nomenclature of sixty-five terms there have to be mentioned three more because of the frequent and persistent misconception that they apply to Jews:

(1) The oldest of these is the conjecture of the Rev. Alexander Wylie that the Hsien-chiao 聖敟, mentioned in the Chinese annals, referred to the Jewish religion.121 The followers of this sect have meantime been identified as fire-worshippers or Parsees. Wylie’s assumption was in so far close to historical facts, as both, the Chinese Jews and Parsees came from India.

(2) The term wo-t’o 從 脫 has been wrongly identified as applying to Jewish money-lenders, while actually it refers to “Mohammedan commercial organizations”, the members of which invested money for the Mongols. This has first been explained by Paul Pelliot.122 Wêng Tu-chien 翁獨健 in his article, “A study of wo-t’o”,123 and the present writer in his bibliography124 have dealt in detail with this problem. Lack of space does not permit to repeat the details here.

The original mistake can be traced back to Hung Chün 洪錦, from 1887 to 1890 Chinese minister to Russia. There he had apparently the opportunity to consult a rare fragment of the Ching-shih ta-chien 經世大典, with or without the assistance of foreign scholars. In his Supplement to the translation of the history of the Yüan dynasty, dealing with the various religious sects,125 he sets forth his

120) The terms no. 60-62 were taken from Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary 美國新耶路撒冷大學字典, Shanghai, 1933; while the nos. 63-66 were traced in various modern dictionaries.


125) 元史考異征補, 1897, chüan 29, 元史各教名考, fol. 3a.
argumnet: that *wo-t'ou* has the same sound value as *Yu-t'e* 优 特 and *Ju-te* 如 德. He then concludes that the Jews are identical with the *wo-t'ou*. But from his own wording it is quite obvious that the *Ching-shih ta-chien* never contained such a statement, it represents merely his erroneous theory based on superficial phonological comparisons. A number of Chinese, Japanese, and foreign authors have accepted and reproduced his contention as proved facts, without questioning and testing their linguistic and historical accuracy. Hence, Hung's mistake has been perpetuated in the related literature.

(3) Saeki has listed the term *ch'ing-chen* 清 真 as a Chinese name for the Jews. That assumption appears to be rather far-fetched. The expression occurs eight times in the Jewish documents in various combinations:

nos. 1-4. *ch'ing-chen-ssu* 清 真寺 “the true and pure Temple” (synagogue), the customary technical term for Mohammedan mosques, which was also adopted by the Jews.

no. 5. *ch'ing-chen hou-jen* 清 真後人, “descendants of the true and pure (Law).”

126) Cf. terms no. 20 and 21.
128) Saeki, op. cit., p. 239, term no. 9.
129) Laufer, op. cit., p. 193, has objected to the translation “pure and true.” According to him that expression “is the technical term for ‘Allah,’ and *ch'ing-chen-ssu* ‘is simply a mosque; for Jews it signified ‘temple of God’ or simply ‘synagogue’.” But on inquiry the present writer has been unable to corroborate the first part of this statement.

Gozani, throughout his letter of 1704, op. cit. (cf. footn. 112), pp. 31-48, called the Kaifeng synagogue *li-pai-ssu* 禮 拜 寺. This is also the technical term for Mohammedan mosques. Whereas the Jews themselves speak of their synagogue as *l-ssu-le-yeh tien* — 賴 樂 椿, or “Temple of Israel”, in the inscription of 1489 (cf. Tobar, op. cit., p. 52).

130) Tobar, op. cit.: (1) p. 52 (inscr. of 1489); (2) p. 65 (heading of the inscr. of 1663); (3) p. 20 (tablet formerly placed above the big entrance gate of the synagogue; 1658); (4) White, op. cit., II, 104, line 1, characters 5-7 (inscr. of 1679).

131) Tobar, op. cit., p. 54 (inscr. of 1489).
no. 6.  *ch'ing-chen chiao-chu* 清真教主 “the Lord of the pure and true [Law].”

no. 7a.  *ch'ing-chen fang* 清真坊 “the Ch'ing-chen (synagogue) archway” which was erected by the Chao 趙 family. The character *fang* 坊 stands here for the compound expression *p'ai-fang* 牌坊 (archway).

no. 7b.  *ch'ing-chen i fang* 清真一坊, “‘this’ Ch'ing-chen (synagogue) archway” likewise refers to the Chao archway.

Saeki apparently based his claim on the strength of the fifth term, though he does not express it explicitly. In that particular case the Jews have been alluded to by implication. But in none of the above quotations does *ch'ing-chen* directly apply to the Jewish people or their religion. It may not, therefore, be classed as an appellation of the Jews.

**CONCLUSION**

A review of the findings of this article shows that the biblical names from the four Jewish stone inscriptions represent phonetic renderings. They are unrelated to any Chinese names and to subsequent Mohammedan, Catholic, and Protestant renderings, or to previous Nestorian transliterations.

The family and personal names adopted by the Jewish immigrants likewise bear no relation to their original Hebrew names, with two exceptions: (1) the name of the first grand-rabbi *Lieh-wei* or *Li-wei*, the phonetic rendering of “Levi”; and (2) the name of *Yen Tu-là*, the transliteration of “Abdullah” or some other name of New Persian-Hebrew origin. Both of these persons lived in the 12th century, during the earliest known historical period of the Chinese Jews.

Manifold relations are shown between the two neighbouring Semitic races, the Jews and Mohammedans:

---

132) Ibid., p. 17 (tablet formerly placed outside the front-building of the synagogue; 1679).
133) White, op. cit., II, 104, line 2, characters 4-6 (inscr. of 1679).
134) Ibid., II, 106, line 13, characters 4-7.
THE NOMENCLATURE OF JEWS

(1) The theological titles of man-la and wu-ssu-ta through the medium of New Persian, their common language, and the expressions ch'ing-chen and li-pai-ssu were borrowed by the Jews from the Chinese-Islamic terminology.

(2) A number of official and popular appellations, particularly those formed with the compound Hui-hui, allude to the close association of the two minorities in the minds of their Chinese hosts.

(3) The Kaifeng synagogue "was built after the model of a mosque" according to the assurance of Laufer.135

(4) Intermarriage with Mohammedan women was very frequent.

The Jews and their religion were called by numerous Chinese names. They themselves adopted the term I-ssu-lo-yeh (Israel). It represents probably their oldest appellation and it is first documented in 1489. It may, however, date back to the tenth century, when the first Jews entered this country by sea in the company of the Arabic Mohammedan traders.

The rendering of Chu-hu (Jews) in a number of different transliterations during the Mongol period, fell into disuse after the overthrow of the Yüan dynasty by the Chinese.

Possibly the term Shih-hu, employed in a Christian document of 642 A.D., refers to the Jews. It would antedate any other designation by several centuries, if that fact were to be definitely established.

A number of terms were introduced by the early Jesuits. Among them are designations like Yu-t'ai (Jews) and Ju-te-ya (Judea, Palestine) which are in current use even today. Presumably the word Hsi-po-lai (Hebrew) too has to be classed in this category. Most of the other names were given by the Chinese referring to the origin of the Jewish religion and to the relationship of the two Semitic races, while the rest consists more or less of local popular nicknames.

135) Laufer, op. cit., p. 193. His statement is somewhat contradicted by Smith-Medhurst, "A narrative of a mission of inquiry" (cf. footn. 116), p. 445. The two Chinese emissaries, who visited the synagogue in 1850/51, reported as follows: "The Jewish synagogue at K'ai-fung fu resembles a Chinese temple, with ornaments, &c, and many Chinese characters are written there, by the front, and above the doors."
Modern equivalents for such terms as "Zionism", "Zionist", and "Yiddish" represent paraphrases combined with phonetic transcriptions.

The small, but interesting group of Jewish settlers, who shared the vagaries of Kaifeng's fate for about a millennium, have been gradually absorbed into the great mass of the Chinese and of the local Mohammedan population. The Jewish communities in South China along the Arabic trade route have long since disappeared without leaving a trace; no records by or about them have as yet been found.

N.B. While this article is in press, Professor Boris Pankratoff kindly furnished the following information: te (terms no. 11, 13, 14, & 17) or t'e (no. 10) represent Chinese phonetizations of the Mongol plural suffix "-d", while tai (no. 15) renders in Chinese the Mongol suffix added to tribal names.

R. L.