Like the confusion of Ch’üan-chou and Chang-chou (note 6), like the confusion of bamboo and cotton wool (section 4), like the failure to realize that Penlian and K’ai-feng are the same place (see the Comment on Quotation I in section 20), and like myriad other blunders (not all of which are articulated in the negative reviews, including this one, and the negative letters to the editor), putting either a latter-day Moroccan Arabic word or, even worse, its English or French reflex into the mouth of an alleged thirteenth-century Italian Jew allegedly visiting a probably non-existent Jewish community in Persia points to latter-day fakery, all the more so when it appears in the alleged "translation" in precisely the same spelling that those two reflexes have in nontechnical English and French. Which brings us to another matter.

English "mellah" and French "mellah" are nonlinguists’ respellings of the linguist's mellāh~mellah~mella:h~mella:h~mellāh~mella:h, that is, with removal or replacement of the special symbols. Since those respellings arose only in the nineteenth or twentieth century, the respelling could not be older (as the English and French citational evidence indeed suggests). We thus have here not only a blatant anticipatory anachronism and a blatant ectopism but also a blatant and ectopic anticipatory spelling.

Had that Moroccan Arabic word been used in Persia of the 1270s (let us assume that possibility for the sake of argument though in reality it is an impossibility), had there been a "Jacob of Ancona," had he been there during that time, and had he wanted to record the word in the Roman alphabet, he would have had to decide how to record its last phoneme, /h/, and he would not have chosen b because that Italian grapheme corresponds to no Italian phoneme (which is to say that the letter b is silent in Italian).

"Basically educated Tuscan," like all other varieties of non-Jewish Italian, has never had either /h/ or /x/ and when allolingual words having one or both of those phonemes are borrowed into non-Jewish Italian, they are replaced by /k/, for example, Spanish jícara /xikara/ is the etymon of Italian chicchera ~ chichera /kikera/. The same happens when Italophones speaking languages having those phonemes cannot pronounce them correctly, for instance Spanish ajo /axo/, giro /xiro/, bija /ixa/, hijo /ixo/, and paja /paxa/ are respectively pronounced /ako/, /krio/, /ika/, /iko/, and /paka/ by Italian-speakers unable to pronounce /x/.52

Furthermore, since "basically educated Tuscan" would not have word-final */k/, the alleged "Jacob" would have added a final vowel, as has happened, for example, in Italian fondaco 'storehouse, warehouse' and sceico 'sheik', which come respectively from Arabic fund_q and Old French cheic. Thus, he would have presumably written *mellache,*mellacho,*millache,*millacho, or something similar, where ch represents /k/ and final e or o represents a non-etymological vowel the purpose of which would have been to make that consonant nonfinal and thus phonotactic (see section 14 on Italian Borbone, Daniele, Davide, Digione, Edoardo, Gabriele, Isacco, Ismaele, Michele, Nemrotte, Rachele, Raffaele, and Simone).

As for the b of "mellah," that letter has just a few functions in Italian: "nelle parole italiane non rappresenta alcun suono proprio: è puro segno diacritico nelle voci bo, bai, ba, banno del verbo 'avere' e in molte esclamazioni (ab, abi, obimè, s, ma ecc.); compare nei digrammi eb e gh per segnalare la pronuncia velare ([k] et [g] rispettivamente) davanti ad e, i (inchino, schema, ghetto, giuro) || si trova in numerose parole straniere di varia origine (hotel, hamburger, harem)" (Palazzi et al. 1992:847, s.v. b).53 The spelling "mellah" falls into any of those categories:
A. It is not a form of the Italian verb *avere*.

B. It is not an Italian interjection. (Interjections are the only Italian words which end in *h*, that state of affairs being due to the influence of the spelling of Latin, where the only words so ending are likewise interjections, like *prob [...]*, which is also spelled without an *h*).

C. The *h* of "mellah" is not part of the Italian digraph *ch* or *gh*.

Consequently, no writer of "basically educated Tuscan" in the thirteenth century would have written "mellah." As with all the other myriad anomalies in Selbourne's enterprize, if you assume him to be the real "Jacob," everything is easily explained: he must have found the word "mellah" in some latter-day English- or French-language publication about Jews in Morocco but, being Jewishly unknowledgeable, did not know that (1) its immediate etymon, Arabic *mell_h*, is used only in Morocco, (2) in the sense 'Jewish quarter [...] the word is only about two hundred years old (or, as I suppose, somewhat older but, as all knowledgeable people agree, certainly not a usage of the 1270s), and (3) the lay romanization "mellah" dates only to the nineteenth century.

Anachronisms, contradictions, sundry other anomalies, absurdities, ignorance, vagueness, sloppiness, and unwillingness to face the music are written all over Selbourne 1997a and his related publications.

For a similar situation see section 14 on the revealing spelling "Toutson," likewise an Italian spelling impossible for the thirteenth century. 54

8. A. No Jews known in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Florence, Arezzo, Fano, or Sinigallia.  
B. Still more unusual Hebrew.  
C. The non-existent Jewish "Book of Forgiveness" and a misunderstood Jewish custom

A. No Jews known in twelfth- and thirteenth-century

Florence, Arezzo, Fano, or Sinigallia

We have already noted that Hormuz probably had no Jews in the 1270s. "Jacob" told us of other places too which, as we will see, are like Hormuz in that respect.

That such an extraordinary voyage as the alleged "Jacob of Ancona"'s would be known to us only from the alleged "original manuscript" also casts doubt on its existence or, if it exists, its authenticity. Still stranger, if such is conceivable, is the fact that in no source known to exist do we find mention of any "Jacob of Ancona" in any connection whatsoever or even of any "Jacob" even vaguely resembling the one portrayed in the tale. Surely that alleged thirteenth-century equivalent of... whom? -- Marco Polo? Christopher Columbus? Meriwether Lewis and William Clark combined? Charles
Lindbergh? -- would have been famous not only in his own little Jewish community of Ancona (the city had so few Jews at the time that such signal qualities and achievements would be known to every one of its members) but in the entire Italian Jewish world (ditto), and in parts of the non-Jewish world as well (ditto), so that we expect at least some mention of him in other people's extant authentic writings, like diaries, chronicles, laudatory poems, or public records. Yet nothing of the sort has been brought forward, whether by Selbourne or any of his few supporters. Contrast the fame of Marco Polo just a few years later, in Italy, after returning from a long journey to Asia (the question of whether he visited all the places he said he did being irrelevant here). Why did he become known but not the alleged "Jacob"?\textsuperscript{55} How could the alleged "Jacob" not become known?

Our failure to find mention of the alleged "Jacob of Ancona" in any source available to us is all the more unusual in light of the fact that Selbourne told us that "Jacob refers several times in the manuscript to his 'legnaggio rabbinico nobile' "noble rabbinical lineage", which can only mean that he was descended from a distinguished line of rabbinical sages and takes pride in it" (Selbourne 1997a:377).\textsuperscript{56}

Since an Orthodox rabbi tries to make at least one contribution to rabbinical learning by publishing at least one book in the field (and in that way also leave his mark for posterity) and in a family of many rabbis we are therefore likely to find many books falling into that category, it is curious that the "noble rabbinical lineage" in question has bequeathed us nothing more than what Selbourne claimed it has.

For two additional reasons, we are all the more astonished that no member of the "noble" rabbinical family in question is mentioned in any known source:

\textbf{A.} Anyone acquainted with rabbinical literature knows that authors of rabbinical works often quote one another, the desiderata being to be acquainted intimately with that entire body of literature, to show that one knows it thoroughly by citing it whenever relevant (the Mishna says \textit{kol haomer davar beshem omero mevi geula laolam} [\textit{Avot} 6:6] 'whoever says something in the name of the person from whom he learned it brings salvation to the world'), to build on the work of predecessors, to stand on the shoulders of giants, to help build a coherent edifice by contributing one's own well-made brick or bricks. Yet nowhere in the vast sea of rabbinical literature, including responsa, where citations and references abound, do we find mention of even one person who might even remotely be considered a member of such a distinguished family, to say nothing of even a single text that might reasonably be ascribed to him.

\textbf{B.} The Italian Peninsula has been one of the relatively more peaceful areas of Europe for Jews. True, they were periodically expelled from this or that Italian state but precisely because the peninsula was not unified politically until the mid nineteenth century, Jews ejected from one of the states did not have far to go to reach another state on the peninsula where they could find refuge, there never being a coordinated effort on the part of all the states or even of some of them to expel the Jews (in contrast to, say, the Iberian Peninsula, where, with the political unification that came at the end of the fifteenth century, just three orders of expulsion -- of the Jews of Castile and Aragon in 1492, of Navarre in 1497, and of Portugal in 1498 -- were enough to make being a Jew illegal throughout the peninsula). Moreover, although individual Jews and small groups of Jews were periodically murdered in what today would be called \textit{bias crimes} and certain taxes were levied only on Jews, censorship of Jewish books, burning of Jewish books, unjustified confiscation of property, forced religious disputations with
Christian theologians (invariably presided over by Christian judges...), conversionist sermons, forced baptisms, blood libels, and other humiliations and restrictions of sundry kinds (which is to say, the minimum punishment which "Christians" felt that the Jews deserved), the Jews of Italy, in comparison with Jews in many other countries, did not suffer major catastrophes until the late 1930s and early 1940s.

Thus, if Jewish communal records were destroyed, it was generally because of accidental fires and other natural elements like mildew and mold (the alleged "original manuscript" was a notable exception, surviving for an amazing seven hundred years in such an excellent state that even as late as 1997 Selbourne could describe it, as we will see at the end of section 12, as being "clean, fine paper").

How tragic and how inexplicable, therefore, that an entire rabbinical family -- a "noble" (and armigerous?) one, "a distinguished line of rabbinical sages" -- has disappeared from the face of the earth, leaving not a single trace apart from one alleged manuscript, which no one but Selbourne, so we are asked to believe, was privileged to see (and then only between September 1991 and June 1996).

But here is some good news. Thanks to Selbourne, at least part of that "noble rabbinical line" has been saved from oblivion, so that we know, for example, that his father's name (the fictitious "Jacob"'s father, that is) was shelomo 'Solomon', that one of his grandfathers was named yisrael 'Israel', and that said grandfather was a rabbi in Florence. But rather than rely on Selbourne, let us allow the alleged "Jacob" to tell the tale in his own words. Here, in Selbourne's alleged "translation," is the opening paragraph of the text which he (Selbourne) dubbed The City of Light:

It was in the year 1270, which is to say 5030 years from the creation of the world, blessèd be He, upon the sixteenth day of April and the twenty-third day of Nisan when Giovanni Confaloniere was podestà and Matteo Angeli and Giacomo Bladioni were captains of the people, that I, Jacob, son of Salomon of Ancona and grandson of the great rabbi Israel of Florence, may his memory be recorded, merchant of Ancona, embarked on board ship for my departure to Greater India and the farthest shores of the earth (Selbourne 2000:34)

Bear in mind not just the words "rabbi Israel of Florence" but "the great rabbi Israel of Florence."

The first two sentences in the entry for Florence in the new Encyclopaedia Judaica read as follows: "Jewish merchants may have lived in Florence in the Roman period, but there is no evidence to support this assumption. A few Jewish residents--doctors, merchants, and moneylenders--are mentioned in the 14th and the beginning of the 15th centuries" (Cassuto and Roth 1972:1350).

And then the entry goes on to relate later events. Which is to say that for the centuries immediately preceding the fourteenth we have no evidence of any Jewish presence in the city, not even of a few Jewish residents: no one has ever found remains of any synagog, of any Jewish cemetery (not even of one Jewish tombstone), or of any Jewish ritual bath from that time; nor do we find any depictions thereof (say on maps or cityscapes), any mention thereof in written records, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, or any evidence of any thirteenth-century Jews named, say, *'David the Florentine' or
"Jacob," Selbourne claimed, was born in 1221. If so, his grandfathers were presumably born in the second half of the twelfth century. It would not be strange if it turned out that a small number of Jews were living in Florence during the second half of the twelfth century even though we had no evidence for any Jewish presence there until the fourteenth century (evidence could have been destroyed or it could be extant but undiscovered or the number of Jews could have been so small that they passed under the radar). Here, however, we are asked to believe in nothing less than a prominent rabbinical family in Florence at the time (a "noble rabbinical lineage"), at least one of whose recent members, a Florentine, was not just a rabbi but a "great rabbi." It is as if Selbourne had asked us to believe that a "great rabbi" of "noble rabbinical lineage" were now living in, say, a small town in Alaska not known to have any other Jewish residents, all efforts to verify his existence were in vain, and much evidence led us to conclude that he did not exist.

Traditional Jews, like the alleged "Jacob"'s alleged family, endeavor to live in an organized Jewish community (*Ethics of the Fathers* 2:5 quotes Hillel as saying *al-tifrosb min-batsibur* 'separate not thyself from the congregation'); traditional Jews have a strong sense of being different from non-Jews and a strong desire to keep on being different; to live thoroughly Jewish lives, they need Jewish institutions, which cannot survive without a large enough number of Jews to support them; as a perennially persecuted group, they know that there is less danger in numbers; being a Jewish Jew, ensuring that one's descendents be Jewish Jews, and that they have ample opportunity to meet and marry Jews thus require a tightly knit community as large as possible.57

Which is to say that we do not expect a rabbi, even less so, a "great rabbi," even less so, a "great rabbi" of "noble rabbinical lineage" to have been living in Florence when, so far as we know, no other Jews were living there or when, we assume, it had no Jewish community. It is as we were asked to believe that a Roman Catholic archbishop was living in a city without any other Roman Catholics.

Selbourne might argue that "great" was merely an admiring grandson's exaggeration, but even if we conceded that point to him, it would be a tiny victory, because he could not reasonably play down everything about this "noble rabbinical lineage" (we would propose, however, that if we conceded that point, he, in a fair exchange, concede that *rabbinico* is a gross anticipatory anachronism proving either the non-existence or the inauthenticity of the alleged "original manuscript").

If you believe Selbourne about "the great rabbi Israel of Florence," the only reasonable conclusion you should draw is that all the archeologists of Florence and all the historians of Florence and all the genealogists of Florence must now put aside their labors, take a cue from the incredible revelation in an unseen, presumably non-existent manuscript that in the twelfth century Florence counted among its residents a "noble rabbinical family," which implies the existence of an organized Jewish community, which in turn implies the existence of a synagog, a Jewish ritual bath, and a Jewish cemetery, and, in consequence of this "new knowledge" (see section 7), drop everything they are doing and redirect their excavations and other investigations.58

Our failure to find mention of "Jacob of Ancona" or of any known member of his "noble rabbinical lineage" elsewhere is all the more unusual for a second reason. Expectedly, Jewish creativity in thirteenth-century Italy was concentrated in the southern part of the Italian Peninsula, not in places as far north as Ancona, and certainly not in Florence, which was even farther north.59 Ancona, though
it had a Jewish community in "Jacob"'s day, was not a center of Jewish culture in Italy (and of Florence in his day we have already said enough). Therefore, if such a genius as "Jacob of Ancona" penned not only a magnum opus of 280 leaves but also one in a language in which probably no other Jew at the time could write so much (the vernacular language of Anconitan Jews at the time was Jewish Italian, Yevanic, or both, and Jewishly educated males would have been able to write in Hebrew-Aramaic too, the language they would have in fact preferred because of its prestige in the Jewish world), he was so exceptionally able that either he would have gravitated southwards (if prompted to live where his Jewish intellectual peers in Italy were then concentrated) or, if not, at least he would have become known in Jewish intellectual circles in the south (because, barring recluses, like J.D. Salinger, the more a prominent person lives in a smaller community, the more he stands out both from a local and a nonlocal perspective), as a result of which we would have some record of him in Jewish writings from southern Italy, or, he would have been so extraordinarily preeminent in Ancona ("local boy makes good") that he could not fail to be mentioned in Jewish Anconitan records and maybe non-Jewish ones too.

Even if Selbourne could prove (could he?) that Encyclopaedia Judaica, published in 1972, is by now outdated regarding Florence because evidence of an earlier Jewish presence has since been found (has any?), the earlier presence could not have been significant, so that the foregoing remarks would in all likelihood remain valid. And whatever he found, it would probably still not prove the existence of "the great rabbi Israel" or the alleged "Jacob"'s "noble rabbinical lineage." As Selbourne needed to be reminded time and again, responsible researchers (forget the Mickey Mouses Selbourne hobnobbed with) accept as "new knowledge" (see section 7) only knowledge derived from texts or parts of texts that have been produced, authenticated, and found to be reliable.

Even if Selbourne could prove (could he?) that Encyclopaedia Judaica, published in 1972, is by now outdated regarding Florence because evidence of an earlier Jewish presence has since been found (has any?), the earlier presence could not have been significant, so that the foregoing remarks would in all likelihood remain valid. And whatever he found, it would probably still not prove the existence of "the great rabbi Israel" or the alleged "Jacob"'s "noble rabbinical lineage." As Selbourne needed to be reminded time and again, responsible researchers (forget the Mickey Mouses Selbourne hobnobbed with) accept as "new knowledge" (see section 7) only knowledge derived from texts or parts of texts that have been produced, authenticated, and found to be reliable.

See section 11 for more on "the great rabbi Israel" and section 15 for the presumed reason that the real "Jacob" made him a Florentine.

*  

The alleged "Jacob"'s tale mentions his contemporaries "Isaac d'Arezzo," "Dattalo Porat de Fano," "Haim ben Abraam Ha-Levi de Sinigaglia," "Jacob de Sinigaglia," and "Nathan ben Dattalo de Sinigaglia," all five of them Jews. Again we turn to Encyclopaedia Judaica, where mention of the earliest Jews in the three places mentioned reads as follows:

A. "Jewish loan bankers were established in Arezzo from the close of the 14th century" (vol. 3, col. 408, s.v. Arezzo).

B. "Jews lived in Fano from the 14th century under special protection" (vol. 6, col. 1174, s.v. Fano).

C. "Jewish loan bankers made their appearance there in the 14th century" (vol. 14, col. 1160, s.v. Sinigaglia).

As with Florence, here too we would be willing to entertain the possibilities that an earlier Jewish presence was discovered after that work of reference went to press, an earlier Jewish presence mentioned in extant documents has gone unnoticed, or an earlier Jewish presence was so small that it passed under the radar and no evidence of it remains, but, if so, the burden of proof would be on Selbourne to show why we should believe that any Jews were living in the four places in the 1270s or
just before. He would probably again claim that "Jacob" provided us here with "new knowledge" (see section 7). However, there are too many unbelievable "firsts," too much weird "new knowledge," too many blunders, and too many other anomalies in Selbourne's enterprise for us to believe that his book anything but cover-to-cover fiction or to believe anything Selbourne said. He long ago lost all credibility with me -- I smelled a rat as soon as I read Kristof 1997, which first brought me news of his enterprise.

It is not without coincidence that for all four places Encyclopaedia Judaica mentions the fourteenth century as the time of the earliest known Jewish presence, inasmuch as that is the time, as we know from reliable documents, when the area in question (the eastern and central parts of the Italian Peninsula more or less between 43° and 44° north latitude) was opening up to Jewish settlement. Again, see notes 58 and 59 (or any geographically slanted study of Jewish settlement history of Italy).

The real "Jacob" should therefore have put those imaginary characters' places of birth or residence in the south of Italy. Had he done so, he would have had to call the fictitious "Jacob," say, "Jacob of Bari" or "Jacob of Trani." Had he done that, the alleged "original manuscript" would probably have had to be "found" in the south rather than "near Urbino." Had that been done, the real "Jacob" would have had to make "the present owner" a resident of the south. Had that been done, Selbourne, living in Urbino, would probably not have met "the present owner." Had they not known each other, the alleged "original manuscript" would have probably remained "hidden" for another seven hundred years. And we all know what a tragedy that would have spelled.

The real "Jacob" would thus have made things easier for himself had he lived in southern Italy before embarking on his enterprise.

It would be good to know in what alphabet the names "Isaac d'Arezzo," "Dattalo Porat de Fano," "Haim ben Abraam Ha-Levi de Sinigaglia," "Jacob de Sinigaglia," and "Nathan ben Dattalo de Sinigaglia" appear in the alleged "original manuscript" and precisely how they are spelled there. When we have that information, whatever its nature may be, I will reveal more anomalies in Selbourne's enterprise.

B. Still more unusual Hebrew

The opening paragraph of "Jacob"'s tale, quoted in subsection A of this section, contains more oddities:

A. Although mention of a non-Jewish date is not impossible (see section 13), we expect the Jewish date to appear first. But since that may be a mere quibble (see note 157), let us not make much of it and instead go on to something important.

B. "It was in the year 1270, which is to say 5030 years from the creation of the world, blessèd be He." Elsewhere in the book we find a wording similar to "blessèd be He," namely "the Holy One, blessèd be His Name" (Selbourne 2000:107).
Hebrew has the phrase \textit{baruch hu}, Jewish Aramaic has the phrase \textit{berich hu}, and they are indeed rendered in English as \textit{blessed be He} (for a Hebrew example, see the Service for the Redemption of the First-Born; for a Jewish Aramaic one, see the Mourner’s Prayer; for Selbourne’s correct use of the English one, see the quotation from Selbourne 2000:56 in “Third Instance” in section \textsection{6}). However, they are always preceded by mention of God, as may be expected from the fact that they contain a pronoun (\textit{hu ‘He’}), which requires an antecedent noun or noun phrase marked [+ masculine singular].

As for "the Holy One, blessèd be His Name," Hebrew indeed has \textit{baruch shemo} 'blessed be His name', but so far as I can tell in no extant text is that collocation preceded by \textit{hakadosh 'the Holy One'}. Will Selbourne now contend that he forget to translate something, he mistranslated something, or the "original manuscript" is defective in some way? It would indeed be easy for him to make unverifiable claims when nobody is allowed to see the alleged "original manuscript" (the sky’s the limit), but would he be believable? If he contends that the manuscript is defective, why did his overall description of the physical state of the alleged "original manuscript" not mention any damaged pages (Selbourne 2000:5-6) and why did he not indicate in his "critical apparatus" a break in the "original manuscript"? But those questions are merely rhetorical; once you believe that no "original manuscript" exists, you have no patience with Selbourne’s the dog-ate-my-homework-kind of "explanations."

Let’s get out of Selbourne’s Fantasyland and back to reality: we assume that the real "Jacob" wanted to give the English "translation" a Jewish flavor (see section \textsection{6}), scoured English translations of Jewish prayers, and came across the phrase \textit{the Holy One, blessed be He} and the phrase \textit{blessed be His name}, but did not know the collocational restrictions on their use and did not bother to determine them (as we learned way back in Introduction to Teaching Second Languages 101, it is not enough that people learning second languages be taught lexical units -- they also have to be made aware of their collocational restrictions). The blunder is thus analogous to two noted in section \textsection{7}: to use the Arabic word \textit{mell}_h correctly, you have to know, among other things, its spatial distribution (Morocco) and its temporal distribution (presumably after 1667), which is to say its restrictions. A little knowledge is little knowledge.

\textsection{C.} "the great rabbi Israel of Florence, may his memory be recorded."

Hebrew has the phrase \textit{zichrono livracha} (with reflexes in Yiddish and presumably other Jewish languages), added to the name of a revered deceased Jewish male (corresponding feminine singular, masculine plural, and feminine plural forms exist too), which is conventionally translated into English as \textit{may his memory be for a blessing}. Granted that Selbourne need not follow English convention; nonetheless, the question arises: what led him to choose the word recorded? Could we know what the "original" has or why he chose recorded? Will he try to squirm away, as he did in another connection (see note \textsection{44}), by claiming that "I may have mistranslated"?

In sum, all those misused or non-existent Jewish expressions, instead of giving the alleged "translation" a Jewish flavor, gave it an un-Jewish one. Only someone as Jewishly unknowledgeable as Phillips might share her opinion that "Jacob”’s tale is "an intensely Jewish text" (Phillips 1998). It is an intensely pseudo-Jewish and un-Jewish imaginary text.

\textsection{C. The non-existent Jewish "Book of Forgiveness"}
As we frequently see in Selbourne's enterprise, the fictitious "Jacob"'s blunders were Selbourne's too and vice versa; and as we often find too, Selbourne was adept at packing in many blunders in small spaces. Here is an example of each (in the following passage, "Jacob" is about to set out on his alleged journey):

"I also had fear that some harm or accident could befall a member of my household, as that the sickness and infirmity of my father, may he be inscribed in the book of forgiveness, might grow worse in my absence, for so it befell, and that the fortunes of our house might go from bad to worse and to ruin. ¶ With such thoughts, praying also to God, blessed be He, that I might keep the Sabbath and that I be not driven to eat abomination, I besought Him to preserve my household in peace and health, and my own self in safety. Thus in my purse, which I kept hidden about me, I placed the golden besant which had been given to me by our sage Rabbi Menahem, and which I had undertaken to restore to him upon my safe return, God willing" (Selbourne 2000:36).

Note 32 reads as follows: "This is presumably a reference to the local contemporary rabbi who evidently practised the superstitious Jewish tradition of giving Jacob a coin as a kind of talisman, or protection, against misfortune, a tradition that continues among Jews to the present day" (idem, p. 496).

Judaism knows of no "book of forgiveness." Selbourne must have had a vague recollection about the Book of Life (= Hebrew sefer hachayim), which is mentioned in the prayers recited during the Penitential Days (which come before the High Holidays) and in the prayers recited during the High Holidays, when Jews ask God to inscribe them in the Book of Life for the coming year, that is, to keep them alive for the whole year:

"BOOK OF LIFE: The metaphorical concept of a Book of Life dates from the Bible (cf. Exodus 32:32, Malachi 3:16, Psalms 69:29); to be omitted or 'blotted out' from the book means death. This idea was subsequently connected with the notion of an annual balancing of the heavenly books on the Day of Judgment, i.e. Rosh Ha-Shanah and the Day of Atonement. In his examination of conscience during the penitential days, the Jew is bidden to think of there being three books -- for the righteous, the average persons, and the sinners. If the individual's balance is positive, he will be inscribed in the Book of Life on the New Year, and the entry will be sealed on the Day of Atonement. Various additions containing references to the Book of Life are inserted in the amidah during the penitential days. The traditional New Year's wish 'may you be inscribed [and sealed] for a happy year', refers to the same idea" (Werblowsky and Wigoder 1983:74).

Might Selbourne have long ago seen an English-language greeting card for the Jewish New Year mentioning the Book of Life (it would not be unusual to write on such cards "May you be inscribed in the Book of Life") and years later misremembered the Book of Life as "the book of forgiveness"?

A custom widespread at least among Ashkenazic Jews is to give a traveler whom one wishes Godspeed a sum of money to be donated to charity at the final destination, the custom resting on the belief that since God will allow no harm to befall anyone traveling with a charitable aim in mind, it is
advisable to create the fiction, by giving him money to be donated to charity after arriving at his final
destination, that the trip is being undertaken for a charitable purpose. The traveler thus gives the
money away after reaching his final destination (say, to a poor person or a charitable institution there),
not brings it back. Selbourne is also mistaken in believing that the purpose of giving money to a
traveler is to protect someone staying behind ("some harm or accident could befall a member of my
household, as [...] my father"). Its purpose is only to ensure the traveler a safe journey (one way).

The custom is definitely Ashkenazic. Has it ever been observed by non-Ashkenazic Jews (of
whom the alleged "Jacob" was presumably one)?

No Jew, all the less so, no rabbi, all the less so, no rabbi of "noble rabbinical lineage," all the
less so, no rabbi of "noble rabbinical lineage" who was, to boot, the grandson of "the great rabbi Israel
of Florence" would have blundered as crassly as the fictitious "Jacob" did in matters of Jewish interest.
Nay, it must have been the real "Jacob," Jewishly ignorant, who did. See elsewhere in the present essay
for similar blunders.


A. The Gemara in Hebrew?

We are told that "Jacob of Ancona" arrived in Cochin, where he found that the Jews had "their
Talmud [...] all in Hebrew" (Selbourne 1997a:80).

As it has come down to us, the Talmud consists of the Mishna, the language of which is
Hebrew containing some loans from Latin and many from Greek and showing the marked influence
of Jewish Aramaic (thus, on the whole still much more Hebrew than anything else), and the Gemara,
the language of which is a mixture of Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic (probably with more of the latter
than the former).

Such is the case of all known copies of the Talmud everywhere in the world and from no
quarter, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, do we hear any claim of a Talmud "all in Hebrew."

Presumably, the real "Jacob" wanted to suggest that the Jews of Cochin were -- wonder of
wonders! -- so Jewishly knowledgeable that they could study the Talmud in the original and thus
needed no translation into their vernacular. Had he restrained himself by saying just that, we might
have been fooled (though I for one would have been suspicious because the absence of any
translations until the twentieth century tells us that it went without saying in the traditional Jewish
world that if you wanted to study the Talmud, you first had to learn Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic).

However, in his zeal to give the text a "Jewish" flavor by adding the detail "all in Hebrew," he
slipped up. Instead of finding out in what languages the Talmud is written, he guessed and his guess
was in part wrong. That blunder is not unexpected of someone lacking substantial Jewish knowledge, inasmuch as such a person is likelier to have heard of Hebrew than of Jewish Aramaic and thus not unlikely to think that the Talmud and other sacred Jewish writings were originally written "all in Hebrew." In contrast, the Jewishly knowledgeable "Jacob," had he existed, would in a thrice have been able to distinguish Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic and he would have known in what language or languages major Jewish sacred works, not just the Talmud, were written.

We thus now know that Selbourne -- no surprize here -- had never even seen a page of the Talmud "in the original" and presumably had never read anything substantial about it either.

In sum, the Wassersteins are right in saying "Of the Jews of Cochin, he mentions that 'their Talmud [is] all in Hebrew'; this is indeed a strange formulation, which one might have expected the grandson of Rabbi Amiel to query. Most of the Talmud is written in Aramaic. No such thing as a Talmud 'all in Hebrew' has been known to exist in Cochin -- or anywhere else for that matter" (Wasserstein and Wasserstein 1997:16). Regarding the Wassersteins' astonishment that "the grandson of Rabbi Amiel" did not query the alleged "Jacob"'s claim (instead of the last seven words, I would say, "made the fictitious 'Jacob' say that the Talmud was all in Hebrew"), they should read H. Selbourne 1989.

The foregoing criticism is based on a plain reading of the tale. However, in section 18 we will return to the matter and suggest a possible deeper meaning: there we will explain our supposition that the real "Jacob" may have put those words about a Talmud "all in Hebrew" into the fictitious "Jacob"'s mouth in order to wow us and thus make The City of Light even more "sensational."

**B. The Mishna and the Talmud separate works?**

Having read the foregoing paragraphs, you know what's wrong here: "They know much of the Mishnah and the Talmud, giving themselves to the study of the law both day and night [...]" (Selbourne 2000:80, that being Selbourne's "translation" of a remark by "Jacob" when he allegedly visited the alleged Jews of Hormuz -- the same probably non-existent Jews mentioned in section 7, who were allegedly living in a "mellah").

Since even a Jew with nothing more than a speck of Jewish knowledge knows that the Talmud consists of the Mishna (Mishnah is an acceptable English spelling too) and the Gemara, one so Jewishly learned as "Jacob," one stemming from a "noble rabbinical family," one who had a grandfather who was not just a rabbi but a "great rabbi," one who was a rabbi himself, would no more speak of "the Mishnah and the Talmud" than a member of the Christian clergy (or even just a Christian possessing even just a thimbleful of Christian knowledge) would speak of "the New Testament and the Christian Bible," "the Gospels and the New Testament," or "The Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews and the Pauline Epistles." Before we can comment further on that wording, a short digression (between centered asterisks) is needed.

*
As mentioned in note 44, Selbourne once tried to get out of a bind by saying "I may have mistranslated." In the absence of the alleged "original manuscript," such an assertion was easy for him to make, impossible for him to prove, and impossible for us to verify (all of which, in research conducted at a high level, makes it an assertion that is not to be believed). But at least in the present instance, if he claims he may have mistranslated, we have a way of testing him, as we will now see.

Selbourne gave us two pieces of strong evidence that even after the alleged "present owner" broke off all contact with him, the two were again in touch: (1) the "present owner"'s alleged conveyance to Selbourne of permission and vestment (see note 160) and (2) Selbourne's ability to compare the French translation of his "translation" (which was made after the alleged rupture) with the alleged "original manuscript" (see that note).

Therefore, if Selbourne now alleges that "I may have mistranslated," he can easily decide whether he did by comparing his "translation" with the alleged "original manuscript" or by allowing us to do so. If he decides that he did not mistranslate, that alleged document, if it exists, cannot be authentic, for no Jewishly learned Jew would speak of "the Mishnah and the Talmud." If he decides that he mistranslated, he should be able to tell us what he thinks the right translation should be. Tertium non datur.

After Selbourne informs us of his decision about whether he mistranslated, I will reveal another card in my hand and prove that the corrected translation cannot be right either, so that in one way or another we will find against Selbourne.

A minute ago we mentioned that the fictitious "Jacob" and Selbourne often blundered in the same way. Likewise with respect to "They know much of the Mishnah and the Talmud [...]": Selbourne's failure to point out that blunder in his "critical apparatus" implies that, just like the alleged "Jacob," he believed that the Mishna and the Talmud are separate works (for an analogous blunder on "both" their parts, see the last paragraph of subsection B of section 17 on "the kiddush and amotzi"). As the present essay notes many times, the alleged "Jacob"'s blunders were often Selbourne's too and vice versa (see, for example, subsection A of section 17). A coincidence or a sign that Jacob of Ancona was Selbourne's pen name?

10. Aquinas, yes, but nothing about the controversy over Maimonides?

Among the arguments in Kaveney 1997 against the authenticity of "Jacob"'s tale is the reviewer's comment that "the virulently anti-Christian d'Ancona was surprizingly well-acquainted with Aquinas when you think that the very few copies of the latter's work in existence would have been Church property."

Thomas Aquinas is thought to have been born in 1224 or 1225 and is known for certain to have died in 1274. He began writing after 1252, probably in the 1260s. In the thirteenth century, Aquinas's works (all composed in Latin and not translated into any other language until long after his
death) circulated only in manuscript and relatively few copies existed. Christians and Jews lived in largely separate worlds: Christian institutions like monasteries, churches, and universities had libraries, which held mostly Christian theological works, in which most Jews had no interest.64

Only a few wealthy Christians had any libraries of note and public libraries were unknown. The few schools opened by municipal councils in Christian Europe beginning in the mid-twelfth century for the children of Christian burghers probably had no libraries; even if they did, they would not have had Aquinas's writings because those texts would have been far too hard for any child to digest; and, in any case, Jews were neither teachers nor pupils in those schools nor did they want to be -- they had their own religion; their own civilization, their own cultures, their own way of life, their own norms about what an educated person needed to know; their own schools, their own preferred texts; they were not isolated from non-Jews but they were, with exceptions, insulated from them; they were not banging on the doors of non-Jewish schools and non-Jewish libraries to be let in; all they asked of non-Jews was to be let alone, to be able to practice their religion freely, to ply their trades freely, to be allowed to live their lives in peace, in the manner they wished.65

Jews' exposure to Aquinas's writings at the time was therefore unlikely, especially since few Jews then, as now, knew Latin, the language of all Roman Catholic ecclesiastical writing.66 Fewer would have been interested, as now, in Christian theology and even fewer would have taken, as now, as serious an interest in Aquinas as the alleged "Jacob." All things considered, the chance was slim that thirteenth-century Jews would have even recognized Thomas Aquinas's name, much less taken an interest in his writings, all the less so if the Jews in question were rabbis.

But slim does not mean 'impossible' and we indeed find that a few Jews, including at least two thirteenth-century Italian Jewish thinkers, did translate some of Aquinas's writings into Hebrew and that Aquinas's influence is "noticeable in medieval and later Jewish works" (Liebeschütz 1972:230).

The two Italian Jewish thinkers are:

A. Hilel ben-Eliezer ben-Shemuel (c.1220-c.1295), who in his Tagmule-hanefesh (composed after 1287, possibly between 1288 and 1291), included his Hebrew translation of the first chapter of Aquinas's Tractatus de Unitate Intellectus contra Averroistas (not saying that it was his translation from Aquinas and in fact not mentioning Aquinas at all, Hilel presented it as his own work originally written in Hebrew). Elsewhere in his book, Hilel quotes several times from eight of Aquinas's other writings.67

B. Yehuda ben-Moshe ben-Daniel Romano, who lived in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, translated parts of Aquinas into Hebrew.68

Since "Jacob" was allegedly born in 1221, allegedly returned to Italy in 1273, and Hilel did not write Tagmule-hanefesh until after 1287, if the alleged "Jacob" read that work, he was sixty-six at the youngest. Do we assume, therefore, that "Jacob" began writing his account at that age, fourteen years after his return (if so, why did he wait so long?), or that he wrote it earlier but later interpolated material on Aquinas gleaned from Tagmule-hanefesh? The question is merely rhetorical, for, as the Yiddish dictum goes, of a mayse fregt men nisht ka kashes 'you don't ask questions about a tale [because tales are not logical].69

As for Yehuda, since he may have finished his translation when the alleged "Jacob" was in all likelihood dead, he is probably not relevant.
Then again, since the alleged "Jacob" was an exceptional Jew in his day (nay, the most exceptional Jew of all time), he must have known Latin (see section 5 on his knowledge even of Latin of the future) and thus needed no translation (Selbourne never told us in what circumstances, which must have been unusual for a Jewish trader and rabbi, he learned it). If so, he presumably went directly to a church, a monastery, or a university, where he must have spent quite some time reading (despite pressing business as a trader, rabbi, and physician). He would not have been allowed to remove anything from the premises, though presumably he would have been allowed to copy out as many leaves as he wished (owners' rules were less strict in those days than in our's).

The foregoing notwithstanding, since Aquinas (who began writing after 1252, probably in the 1260s, and died on 7 March 1274) was ill-disposed toward Jews (see his *de Regimine Judaeorum*, where he recommended, for example, that on both religious and moral grounds the Jews be held in perpetual servitude), and since the alleged "Jacob" was virulently anti-Christian, it is surprising that he even bothered with Aquinas and that he never mentioned Aquinas's hatred of Jews. Expectedly, Selbourne never mentioned it either. As we have said more than once, often in this tragicomedy, what the imaginary "Jacob" did not know or mention, Selbourne did not either -- and vice versa.

Furthermore, if the alleged "Jacob" knew Latin or was interested in Aquinas, he was one of an exceptional and tiny group of Italian Jewish males. People with special interests tend to know one another (birds of a feather...) or, at least, of one another (see earlier on the likelihood that he would have either gravitated to southern Italy or been known in Jewish intellectual circles there). And if one of their number had made such an extraordinary trip as "Jacob"'s and returned to tell about it, word would have gotten around even in those days before mass communication (think again of Marco Polo), so that somewhere, at some time, in some extant document, we should see mention of him. Yet we do not.

Once again, therefore, we are amazed that in no document known to us, Jewish or non-Jewish, is that "astonishing intellectual titan" (see note 35) mentioned even in passing. Presumably, therefore, Selbourne wanted us to believe that the alleged "Jacob of Ancona" was what francophones call *un illustre inconnu* and, in imitation of them, anglophones and lusophones respectively call *an illustrious unknown* and *um ilustre desconhecido*. If so, we cannot so believe, for:

A. although the alleged "Jacob of Ancona" allegedly lived in not one but several worlds, from none of them has any even fleeting mention of him come down to us: the Jewish world, the Italian Christian world, the countries he allegedly visited, the world of learning (including the world of medicine), the world of commerce, and maybe others too.

B. "Jacob" is not the only illustrious unknown in this tragicomedy -- for example, we are also asked to believe in "the great rabbi Israel of Florence," of whom nothing is known either (see part A of section 8), and "Aaron of Barcelona," who was allegedly "the great Jew of Aragon" (see section 11 on Selbourne's deficient knowledge of geography).

C. and then we have the equally unknown "noble rabbinical lineage" (see that section).

All in all, the alleged "Jacob"'s mention of Aquinas, though not impossible, was unusual.

Were Selbourne 1997a and Selbourne's related publications to inspire a large measure of confidence, we could take some things on faith, but as matters stand, we are being asked to accept
every detail on faith. Scientists, however, are by nature skeptical and science is based on verified and verifiable facts.

Maimonides, the Jewish philosopher and codifier of Jewish law who was born in 1135 and died in 1204, was a towering figure in the Jewish world in his day and still is. "Maimonides and his followers were accused [by certain other Jews (D.L.G.)] of excessive rationalism, bordering on -- or at least encouraging -- heresy, and of undermining the belief in revelation and in traditional dogmas and law. For over a century the conflict between Maimonists and anti-Maimonists rent Judaism into almost two camps, but finally the name of Maimonides became established as the symbol of the pure and orthodox faith" (Werblowsky and Wigoder 1966:272). Sermoneta speaks of "the events that agitated the world of Jewish scholars in France and Italy at the end of [the thirteenth] century, following the Maimonidean controversy. This had reached such proportions that the works of Maimonides and his followers were threatened [by certain rabbis] with the ban, and it widened the rift in Judaism in the minds of believers who were in doubt over the question whether the source of truth is revelation or whether truth is rational and derives from the human mind" (Sermoneta 1981:iv).

Many other descriptions of that bitter intra-Jewish controversy could be quoted, but those two are enough to set the stage for this observation: it is not believable that the rabidly anti-Christian and proudly Jewish "Jacob" would lavish attention on the anti-Jewish non-Jewish Aquinas yet neglect to record his position in a battle then raging in his very own community, the Jewish community. Indeed, the alleged "Jacob," a "rabbi" himself who was of "noble rabbinical lineage" and the grandson of "the great rabbi Israel of Florence," did not even allude to the controversy. Expectedly, Selbourne never remarked that "Jacob"'s silence in that regard was unusual. Thus, once again, "Jacob" and Selbourne behaved strangely and identically.

How authentic would you judge an alleged but unseen diary allegedly kept by an unknown Orthodox Jew in Europe in the late 1930s and early 1940s who allegedly came of "noble rabbinical lineage" who failed to mention therein any of the events of the Holocaust but did devote considerable space to Christian and Muslim theology? To say nothing of the oddity of devoting space to a Christian theologian in the account of a voyage to non-Christian countries for purposes of trade, as if Lewis and Clark's account of their expedition included extensive passages on the political situation in Europe during the first years of the nineteenth century or the accounts of any of the polar explorers included extensive passages on conditions in Africa. To say nothing of devoting considerable space to expressing anti-Christian feelings in the account of a voyage to non-Christian countries.

The imaginary "Jacob"'s tale is so blatantly aimed, primarily, at rebroadcasting Selbourne's ideas (see section 16) -- secondarily, at making "Jacob" the first to do this and the first to do that -- that you almost expect that at the end of the book that allegedly "astonishing intellectual titan" (see note 35) will say, "David, before I put down, er..., 'my' pen, do you have any more ideas you want me to mention?"

The more you ponder the alleged "Jacob"'s alleged tale, the more you tend to think that he, just like the alleged "present owner," said only what Selbourne wanted him to say; that "Jacob" knew only what Selbourne knew (or thought he knew); that what Selbourne did not know, Jacob did not know.
either; and that "Jacob" was merely Selbourne's mouthpiece. We are reminded of Horace's line, "mutato nomine de te fabula narratur" *(Satires* I, 1, 69) 'change only the name and the story could be told of you'. See note 29.

Note 94 ventures a guess why the alleged "Jacob" did not mention the controversy between Maimonides's supporters and critics.

11. "San Giovanni d'Acri" and "the holy fast of Ramadan" from a Jew as Jewish and as anti-Christian as the alleged "Jacob of Ancona"?; a misuse of the glottonym *Frankish*; Another "First" for the Fictitious "Jacob": Barcelona is in Aragon; "Lazzaro Ha-coen"?; "Ioshua"?; and "Menorah (hébreu): chandelier à sept branches utilisé à Hanoukkah"?

A. "San Giovanni d'Acri" and "the holy fast of Ramadan" from a Jew as Jewish and as anti-Christian as the alleged "Jacob of Ancona"?

Although the alleged "Jacob" expectedly referred to the city of Acre by its everyday Italian name, *Acri* (Selbourne 1997a:40 and 43), he also called *San Giovanni d'Acri*, literally 'Saint John of Acre' (idem, p. 38), which is one of the longer names bestowed on it by the Crusaders in various languages (like French *Saint-Jean-d'Acre*). Traditional Jews carefully try to avoid anything smacking of Christianity. All the more so a virulently anti-Christian Jew like "Jacob." All the more so if he was writing in the 1270s, when it was still fresh in people's memories that the fuller name had been bestowed on the city by the Crusaders, at whose hands Jews in several countries suffered considerably. It is thus astounding to find "Jacob" use the longer name, though we would not be surprized if the real "Jacob," who gave every evidence of being Jewishly unknowledgeable, used it. Since Selbourne did not remark in his "critical apparatus" on the weirdness of the longer name in "Jacob"'s tale, we assume that he found nothing wrong with it.

Astounding too is the adjective in the phrase "the holy fast of Ramadan" (Selbourne 2000:136). Muslims consider the month itself, not the fast, to be holy, but since anyone can misplace a modifier, that is not my point. Rather, we do not expect the word for 'holy' or 'sacred' to appear in connection with anything non-Jewish.

B. A misuse of the glottonym *Frankish*
"Jacob," writing about Quanzhou, said that "the city is a mixture of temples, and each people in the city, of which there are said to be as many as thirty, even those that have inhabited it a long time, has its own language. Therefore the Saracens speak in Arabic, the Franks in the Frankish language [...]" (Selbourne 1997a:137).

The phrase "the Franks in the Frankish language" is anomalous because the Franks (that is, Europeans or Western Europeans) spoke more than one language. Since "Jacob," had he existed, would have known that the Franks were not monolingual, he could not have been the author of that phrase. By process of elimination, we conclude that the real "Jacob" wrote it. Selbourne will presumably try to squirm out of that bind by claiming that "language" in the passage quoted is a misprint for "languages." Since he could not prove that it was and we could not prove that it was not, let's dismiss the foregoing as a quibble (see note 157) and move on to serious matters.

C. Another First for the Fictitious "Jacob": Barcelona is in Aragon

"We also hear from Jacob of galleys setting out on the Indian Ocean, owned by a certain Aaron of Barcelona, the «great Jew of Aragon», titles that improbably mix what were then two very distinct political entities (though they shared a single ruler). Much is known about the merchants, Jewish and Christian, of medieval Barcelona, and the idea that any of them traded to China by way of the Indian Ocean in the thirteenth century is completely at odds with all the information we have about the range and interests of Catalan merchants at this period" (pp. 63-64, with bibliographical references). Selbourne's alleged "translation" also called this Aaron "Aaron of Aragon," "Aaron of Barcelona," and "Aaron of Barcelona in Aragon" (Abulafia 1997c:passim).

Barcelona is in Catalonia, not Aragon. True, in 1137 or 1140 Aragon and Catalonia came to be united in a personal union, but that meant only that they became subject to the same personal ruler; each continued to maintain its independent sovereignty, the borders of neither state changed as a result of the personal union, and they did not merge -- just Poland and Lithuania from 1385 to 1589, Great Britain and Hanover from 1714 to 1820, and, on one hand, Denmark and, on the other, the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein for many years were affiliated through personal but not national union.73

Consequently, just as we do not expect an authentic English text to speak of, say, William Pitt the Younger as being "of Hanover," we do not expect anyone to identify the alleged "Aaron of Barcelona" with Aragon or the alleged "Aaron of Aragon" with Barcelona. Since the alleged "Jacob," had he existed, would have been an "astonishing intellectual titan," he would not have thought Barcelona to be in Aragon. It must therefore be the real "Jacob" who blundered. How interesting that, once again, Selbourne did not correct "Jacob"'s blunder or even remark on it. As we often see in this tragicomedy, what Selbourne did not know "Jacob" did not know either -- and vice versa.

As for "Aaron of Barcelona," "the great Jew of Aragon," his status is identical with that of another "great," namely "the great rabbi Israel of Florence" (see section 8): we have no evidence for either one. Were the two obscure, had the real "Jacob" not called them "great," we could understand the absence of evidence, but once he attached that adjective to them, we expect them to have gone
down in history.

D. "Lazzaro Ha-coen"?

The cast of characters in this tragicomedy includes "Lazzaro Ha-coen," presumably just as fictitious as most of the other characters. If Selbourne could tell us how Lazzaro Ha-coen is spelled in the alleged "original manuscript," we might have another smoking gun.

E. "Ioshua"?

On page 536 of the French version of Selbourne's book, he implied that "Jacob" wrote "Ioshua": speaking of the spelling of the personal names in the alleged "original manuscript" and how he rendered them in the alleged "translation," Selbourne said "[...] quant aux autres, je les ai laissés tels qu'il les donne dans le manuscrit, à ceci près que j'ai remplacé les «I» de Ioshua et de Iuda par des «J» [...]" That anyone in thirteenth-century Italy, whether Jew or non-Jew, would write "Ioshua" is not believable:

A. Word-initial io is extremely rare in Italian of the thirteenth century, the only known example being io 'I'. In fact, that digraph (representing [jo]) is rare word-initially all the way up to the nineteenth century. Palazzi et al. 1992 list only seven words so beginning (the date being that of first known use):

i. iota 'iota' (fourteenth century)

ii. ionico 'Ionic' (1436)

iii. iota 'galore' (before 1484)

iv ioide 'hyoide' (1584)

v ionadattico 'gergo scherzoso formato da vocaboli che iniziano con le stesse lettere di quelle veramente occorrenti (arciconigli per arciconsoli)' (1673)

vi ionio 'Ionian' (1749)

vii iodle 'yawl' (1798).

We thus have here, mostly, words of Greek origin (i, ii, iv, and vi), one of English origin (vii), two of unknown origin (iii and v), and four of them learned words (those of Greek origin). The Italian for 'Joshua' (which is now Giosuè) fits into none of those categories. Furthermore, sh (representing /ʃ/) is an English spelling convention, which did not enter Italian until the nineteenth century. Thus, the real "Jacob"'s knowledge of the history of Italian spelling was, as expected, faulty (see section 14 for another example).
B. As for "Iuda," word-initial *iu* is either recent in Italian (as in *iugoslavo* 'Yugoslav') or a now archaic imitation of Latin spelling (as in *inbilare* 'rejoice'). It is hard to believe that supremely Jewish Jew like the alleged "Jacob" would follow Latin spelling when mentioning a fellow Jew's given name. If, on the other hand, that spelling is Selbourne's only, we would like to know what the alleged "original manuscript" has.

F. "Menorah (hébreu): chandelier à sept branches utilisé à Hanoukkah"?

The glossary of the French version of Selbourne's book has the entry "Menorah (hébreu): chandelier à sept branches utilisé à Hanoukkah" (p. 532). The appearance of a word in the glossary means that it occurs in the alleged "original manuscript." However, the Jewish Italian name for the object used during the holiday mentioned in the definition is actually *xanuka* (finally stressed), a word which the alleged "Jacob" would have known (it also designates the holiday). How curious therefore that he used an entirely different word (with a final suspicious *h*), which in Jewish Italian designates the seven-branched candelabrum used in the First and Second temples.

Since it is unreasonable to assume, as presumably even Selbourne would agree, that someone as Jewishly learned as the alleged "Jacob" would have confused words so different as Jewish Italian *xanuka* and Jewish Italian *menora*, we can suppose only that the confuser was someone else, specifically someone who knew a language in which *menora*~*menorah* designates both the candelabrum in the First and Second temples and the object used during the holiday in question. Besides Jewish Italian, we must exclude Israeli Hebrew (which distinguishes *menora* and *chanukiya*), Judezmo (which distinguishes *menorá* and *xanukia*), Yiddish (which distinguishes *menoyre* and *khanike-lomp*~*khanike-lamp*), Moroccan Jewish Arabic and Tunisian Jewish Arabic (which distinguish *menora* and *henke*), and probably many other Jewish languages.

Indeed, the only lect which so far as I know makes no lexical distinction is Jewish English, which has *menora*~*menorah* as the name of both objects. We are thus reminded of section 7, where it is concluded that "mellah" in the alleged "Jacob"'s alleged "original manuscript" comes from English or French. Presumably, "menorah" does too.

How curious that Selbourne, who was able to accomplish the astounding feat of identifying "occasional phrases [of] the mediaeval Jewish dialect of Ancona" (see note 10), which implies that he had a good command of Jewish Italian, failed to point out "Jacob"'s glaring misuse of Jewish Italian *menora*. As we have said and will say many times, "Jacob"'s blunders were often Selbourne's and vice versa.

We are not yet finished with Selbourne, who, apparently, lacked even basic knowledge about the Jewish holiday in question. The candelabrum in the First and Second temples indeed had seven branches (Exodus 25:27), but the object used during the Jewish holiday in question has nine spaces, one for each of nine lights (why I use the vague words *space* and *light* will become clear presently): one light is kindled on the eve of the first day of the holiday, two on the eve of the second, and so on until
on the eve of the eighth and last day eight are lit; the light used to kindle the others also has its space.

Traditionally, the lights consist of wicks dipped in oil (the tradition is alive and well among traditional Jews), but in the nineteenth century Reform Jews in Germany began substituting candles for oil-dipped wicks, that innovation later spreading to many Jews elsewhere. All pre-nineteenth-century exempla of the ritual object in question indeed have a row of eight small cups, dishes, or depressions for the oil and wicks and one usually larger cup, dish, or depression for the oil and wick used to kindle the other eight.

So much for Selbourne's alleged "interest in Judaica, including the history of medieval Jewry in Italy" (Selbourne 1997e), a claim that seems to have been thought up merely to justify his undertaking the alleged "translation" (see the last paragraph of note 56).

I have not bothered to check precisely what the alleged "Jacob" said in the alleged "original manuscript" about the holiday in question. If he mentioned candles instead of wicks dipped in oil, we have another smoking gun. If he mentioned an object with seven branches, we have yet another. I will be grateful if someone can check (for some inexplicable reason, none of the publishers of any of the versions of Selbourne 1997a has ever favored me, its by far most careful reader, with a review copy).

12. Selbourne's suggestion that the alleged "original manuscript" might not be the real "original manuscript"

"That the work is in the vernacular Italian, or volgare, rather than in Latin, may raise a presumption -- but no more -- that the text was not written by Jacob d'Ancona in his own hand, but was a translation (perhaps from a Hebrew original) into the more accessible vernacular, in order to meet a secret demand. However, it should be pointed out that Latin was in any case generally eschewed by learned Jews -- although there are also passages in Latin in the manuscript -- it being considered the alien language of the Church. Moreover, the oldest example of the written vernacular in Italy dates back to AD 960; and as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries was gradually coming into usage.

"Hence I retain an open mind about whether the manuscript was written in Jacob's own lifetime, but am inclined, perhaps from wishful thinking, to believe that it was, and is in his own hand, from the egregious mixture of languages (Italian, Hebrew and Latin, with some Arabic and Greek words in their original scripts) employed, and which point away from a later copyist or translator" (Selbourne 1997a:5-6).

Either way, Selbourne came out the loser, as we will now see (in the following discussion, we assume for the sake of argument that "Jacob of Ancona" existed and that the "original manuscript" which Selbourne alleged he saw exists, though in fact we hold both to be figments of his imagination; for clarity's sake, we will use Manuscript One to designate the text which "Jacob" allegedly wrote and Manuscript Two to designate the text which Selbourne alleged he saw).
Possibility A. If Manuscript Two is also Manuscript One (thus, if what Selbourne alleged he saw is in "Jacob"'s hand), it should either contain no anomalies or, if it does contain anomalies, they are such that could reasonably be due to "Jacob"'s lack of knowledge or inadvertence (thus, at the very least, given "Jacob"'s being a rabbi, it should contain no mistakes of Jewish interest). However, since Manuscript Two does contain such anomalies (see, for example, section 17 on not only his son's being circumcized before his eighth day but also his not expressing astonishment at the timing of the event), possibility A cannot be right. Thus, if Selbourne saw any manuscript, it was not Manuscript One. It must have been, if he saw any manuscript, Manuscript Two.

Possibility A cannot be right for a second reason. Selbourne claimed in the front matter of Selbourne 2000 (I have mislaid the page number) that the "original manuscript" is written in "an italic hand." Since that hand was developed by Renaissance humanists around 1400, by which time "Jacob" would have long been dead, if such a document exists (which we doubt), it could be from the fifteenth century at the earliest.

Possibility B. If Manuscript Two is not Manuscript One (= the only other possibility), the former (which we doubt exists) can be no older than 1890 (see note 6) and is thus a late-nineteenth or, more likely, twentieth-century piece of writing. If so, we have two subpossibilities:

Subpossibility B.1. Manuscript Two is based on no vorlage or set of vorlages going back to Manuscript One. That is the contention of the Scourges of Jacob: either what Selbourne alleged he saw in the alleged "present owner"'s house is a fake or, more likely, he in fact saw nothing (if no "original manuscript" exists, his alleged "translation" is actually his original piece of fiction).

Subpossibility B.2. Manuscript Two is based on one or more vorlages, the earliest of which is Manuscript One. Selbourne was willing to entertain that possibility. For subpossibility B.2. to be entertainable (mind you, merely entertainable, not necessarily proven), Manuscript Two must meet this condition: if it contains any anomalies, each of them must be reasonably attributable either to the alleged "Jacob" or to one or more other people, namely one or more copiers. However, Manuscript Two contains anomalies which fall into neither category. For example, neither "Jacob" nor a copier could have confused Quanzhou and Zhangzhou (see note 6): "Jacob" could or would not have done so because, having visited one of them, he was able to write an informed description of it, and the copier could or would not have done so either because that person would have had no reason to replace "Jacob"'s entire description of one city by one of the other. Subpossibility B.2 thus a logical impossibility, it should be ruled out.

No other possibilities or subpossibilities exist. Having ruled out possibility A (for two reasons) and subpossibility B.2, we are left with subpossibility B.1. As Sherlock Holmes says, "When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth" (though in this case what remains is not improbable). We are now back to the major thesis of the present essay: once again the spotlight is shining on you-know-whom; in light of his lack of knowledge in several relevant fields, we suspect him of being the blunderer; and since he would not have (indeed, for lack of knowledge, he could not have) written a 280-leaf manuscript in order to translate it, he must have committed all those blunders in what must be his English original. Thus, David Selbourne appears to be the real "Jacob" and the "original manuscript" appears to be the first draft of a work of fiction penned by him in English.
The notion of "copying" is unrealistic for at least two more reasons:

A. Selbourne seems to have had delusions of grandeur when imagining the possibility of an original "original manuscript" (its proper name is *Codex Urbinatensis O*), besides one or more later "original manuscripts" (their proper names are *Codex Urbinatensis O bis*, *Codex Urbinatensis O ter*, and so on), and the possibility of a "secret demand." What did he think the alleged text was? The Holy Writ of some religion? A play by Dante? A chronicle of the lives of the Dalai Lamas? The Magna Carta? Which is to say that whereas sacred texts, other religious texts, texts having literary value, important political documents, and so on are not unlikely to be copied and recopied over the years, diaries, journals, and the like written by obscure people tend to exist only in the original, unless the writers become famous, in which case varying percentages of their writings may be copied and recopied, a notable example being Marco Polo. But the alleged "Jacob" was no Marco Polo as far as fame is concerned. On the contrary: he is mentioned in just one manuscript -- to boot, an alleged manuscript -- which no one (including, we suppose, the real "Jacob") has ever seen.

B. Selbourne claimed that for many generations the alleged "original manuscript" lay with a Jewish family. Jews would not have shown a virulently anti-Christian manuscript to any non-Jew, much less let anyone copy it, for fear they might be reported to the secular or ecclesiastical authorities or both. Consequently, whenever the family decided that the manuscript needed recopying and updating (just as Lenin's rotting corpse gets freshened up every so often), they would have done it themselves or turned to other local Jews, but that supposition is not entertainable either, for now we would have not only a unique but unknown "Jacob of Ancona," an unspecified number of unique but unknown "originals," an erratically behaving "present owner" (just as unknown as everyone and everything else), and a "translator" and "editor," whom we do not believe, but also an (unknown) erratically behaving Jewish family who was somehow getting updates from the four corners of the earth, for instance, that since the Italian word *rabbinico* had now come into use, it could be used in a future recopying to "retouch" the alleged "Jacob"'s description of his family, or that since the Jews of Hormuz, Persia, were now using the word *mell_h* (which had reached them from Morocco in an English or French spelling), that word could be used in "retouching" his account of his visit to the Jews of that place.

When you work out all the logical (hence inescapable) details of the scenario which Selbourne sketched only in part, you cannot avoid the conclusion that it is the fantasy of someone naive enough to believe that we would be naive enough to believe him.

Everything has a reason. My guess is that Selbourne thought up that notion about the possibility of recopying and said that he would "retain an open mind" in order to give himself as many routes of escape as possible:

A. If people believed that the "original manuscript" was in "Jacob"'s hand, he could say that the possibility of copying need not be entertained.

B. If people did not believe that the "original manuscript" was in "Jacob"'s hand, he could say that he has indeed left open the possibility of a later copy, not in "Jacob"'s hand.

C. If critics found anticipatory anachronisms, he could claim that "Jacob"'s text was later copied or recopied and the new, hence younger, version included linguistic items that had now come into use. However, he apparently did not realize that to claim that the alleged anticipatory
anachronisms were not really anachronisms, he would have to say that he had worked from a text no older than 1890 (see note 6 on how the real "Jacob" presumably leaned on G. Phillips's publication of that year).

*

Since we have been talking about copying, let us say a few more words about handwriting, on which subject Selbourne made contradictory statements, and about paper.

Speaking of how he allegedly had to prepare himself to translate the alleged "original manuscript," he said that "I also had the task of mastering the handwriting of the scribe" (Selbourne 2000:1-2), yet just four pages later, still speaking of the text he was to translate, he said that "It is written on clean, fine paper in a small but careful and usually clear running hand, although with quite a large number of deletions, emendations and marginal comments, some in a different hand from that of the main text" (Selbourne 2000:6).

If making out a handwriting has to be "mastered," it is presumably not a "careful and usually clear" handwriting. If it is "careful and usually clear," it does not need to be mastered. Thus, another internal contradiction in Selbourne's enterprise.

Since the (unknown) Jewish family allegedly owning the "original manuscript" (the many "original manuscripts"?) presumably kept all the versions (for they were Holy Writ), this must have been quite an enterprise (multiply 280 leaves by however many copies you think there may have been). If so, its house must have been a veritable scriptorium and archives (to say nothing of the sectaries who must have come and gone in the dark of night century after century to study and copy and recopy and recopy the Holy Word of Jacob) and the family must have included at least one person at least every two generations who knew how to conserve paper, for Selbourne also asserted that he translated from a text written on "clean, fine paper." Apparently, then, with little or no creasing, cockling, foxing, water stains, embrittlement, softness, sponginess, flaking ink, or other kinds of damage to the substrate or the ink familiar to people who handle old documents. Verily, a fabulous story and another "first" for the fictitious "Jacob."*

*

In sum, since we have no evidence that the alleged document has ever existed, we have no evidence that anyone copied or recopied it either. We do have strong circumstantial evidence that either the alleged document has never existed (the likelier possibility) or that, if it exists, it is a fake.

Selbourne's claim that he saw "quite a large number of deletions, emendations and marginal comments" implies much handling of the alleged document, which in turn implies that down through the years it was considered to be a very important one, one on which attention was lavished. If so, it is all the more curious that not even an allusion to it is found in known documents.

See the Comment on Quotation G in section 20.
Wasserstein and Wasserstein 1997, citing Benjamin Braude, voice doubt that a thirteenth-century Jew could write as many as 280 leaves in the Roman alphabet: "Benjamin Braude, a specialist in travel literature and Jewish history, pointed out [...] that whereas 'Jacopo' was stated by Selbourne to have written largely in 'medieval Italian vernacular' in Latin characters, Jews in medieval Christendom invariably used the Hebrew alphabet. Also Selbourne insisted that Jacopo always made a point of giving both Hebrew and Christian dates side by side - a practice unknown among medieval Jewish writers. The use of the Anno Domini was indeed repugnant to medieval Jews, since it implied recognition of Jesus Christ" (p. 15).

It is easy to agree with almost all those criticisms. Regarding dates, the Wassersteins are almost fully right. Jewish dates predominate among traditional Jews (see the second paragraph of part B of section 8), but "Years enumerated according to the Muslims or Christians are also found in Hebrew and Jewish Arabic texts. For example, Joseph Sambari (seventeenth century), writing in Egypt, gives Muslim correspondences at several places in his Divre Yosef. Years which are (Heb.) leminyanam 'according to their calculation' are reasonably common in Hebrew works written in areas under Christian influence, and as (Heb.) sefirat hanotserim, they are common today (e.g., 'Tishe 1987' and 'Passover 1988'). An interesting twist is to use the Christian month names and dates with the Jewish year, out of unwillingness to date anything according to the era of the birth of Jesus (we find this, for example, in the travelog of Meshullam da Volterra, late fifteenth century)" (Ward 1987:244). Reif 1999 gives an example of Christian dating in a Hebrew document (written in 1096 CE); in translation, it reads 'David was killed in the synagogue here in Monieux in this year, 1096 of their reckoning.' Thus, although the author mentions a non-Jewish date, he characterizes it, as expected, by the Hebrew word leminyanam 'according to their reckoning' (of their reckoning' in Reif's translation), where 'their' need not be more specific than it is because it is a conventional way in traditional Jewish discourse of referring to non-Jews and thus clear in meaning (another instance of 'they' = 'non-Jews' is Yiddish zey, as in the set collocations ba zey ~ ba zey beneyhem 'among non-Jews, in non-Jewish circles', literally 'among them', and the free collocation "dos past nor far zey" 'that's appropriate only for them', which occurs in a well-known Yiddish song).

Still, the Wassersteins are essentially right, for two chief features of the alleged "Jacob"'s use of non-Jewish dates are unusual: the high frequency with which he used them (in authentic Jewish texts they occur sporadically) and his failure to add leminyanam after them. The first part of that criticism might legitimately be dismissed as a quibble (see note 157), but not the second. The real "Jacob" presumably did not know that Hebrew word and its use.78.

* 

At least once, the alleged "Jacob"'s mention of a Jewish date too is unusual, maybe unparalleled in Jewish literature (Selbourne's enterprize, as we know by now, is studded with incredible "firsts"): "Upon the tenth day of Tishri, abstaining from all food, I prayed that all my sins committed against God might be forgiven, and that for the sins [...]" (Selbourne 2000:167). True, the tenth of Tishre (do Italian Jews really say *?"Tishri"?) is the Day of Atonement, but we expect Jewish Italian and Italian Hebrew-Aramaic kipur here, not anything translating as 'the tenth day of Tishri'. Christians do not
usually say *"How are you celebrating December 25?"*, do they? By the same token, Jews usually refer to the holiest day on the Jewish calendar not according to its position on that calendar but its name. That too may be a quibble on my part (see note 157), but all the little quibbles help build a case against Selbourne's enterprise by exposing its numberless inauthenticities (the devil is often in the details), which do add up to something significant. 79

14. Selbourne will not have the last word: a triple-barreled smoking gun: "Toutson"

The present essay deals mostly with Jewish aspects, non-Chinese linguistic aspects, and logical aspects of Selbourne 1997a and related publications because I feel at home in those departments. If Chinese aspects are mentioned, it is mostly by way of quotations from Sinologists' reviews and letters to the editor or because, though not being a Sinologist, I need only simple logic to be able to spot this or that anomaly of Chinese interest or refute this or that contention by a supporter of Selbourne's (see section 20). Two contributions of Chinese interest possibly original with me are, however, offered. One is given in the Comment on Quotation I in section 20 and the other, concerning the spelling "Toutson," follows here.

Certain peoples of eastern Asia (at least the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Vietnamese) have a custom of giving new names to the deceased, names which replace entirely those by which they were known during their lifetime. Such names are known in onomastics as temple names and posthumous names. They are not chosen while people are alive.

Chinese kings and emperors had at least two names during their lifetimes: the name bestowed at birth and the one bestowed when the person was designated heir to the throne. Once the latter name was chosen, it replaced the birth name.

Thus, the emperor belonging to the Southern Sung dynasty who reigned from 1264/1265 to 1274 was called at birth Chao Meng-ch'i (Chao was the imperial family name of the Sung dynasty and Meng-ch'i was his given name). When, at the age of thirteen, he was designated heir apparent to the throne, his given name was changed to Ch'i (thus, his full name then became Chao Ch'i, this name, consequently, replacing his birth name, Chao Meng-ch'i). After he died, he was given the temple name of Sung Tu-tsung, which consists of the name of his dynasty (Sung), the adjective tu (to distinguish him from the other emperors of the same dynasty whose temple names begin with Sung and end with -tsung) and the noun tsung 'ancestor' (the temple names of eight of the nine in the Northern Sung dynasty and all the other seven of the Southern Sung dynasty so begin and end, for example, Sung T'ai-tsung, the name of the second of the Northern Sung emperors, and Sung Kao-tsung, that of the first of the Southern Sung emperors).

The full temple name is informally shortenable, for instance, Sung Tu-tsung --> Tu-tsung, Sung T'ai-tsung --> T'ai-tsung, and Sung Kao-tsung --> Kao-tsung. The mere presence of the word tsung 'ancestor', whether in the full or shortened temple name, is enough to indicate that the bearer is dead, it being as explicit in that respect as, say, the English phrases the deceased and the late preceding a person's
name or the late preceding a kin term (as in "my late great-aunt").

Since Selbourne's book alleged that the alleged "Jacob" returned to Ancona in 1273, he would have heard the reigning Southern Sung emperor called only Ch'i or Chao Ch'i and could not possibly have heard the names Sung Tu-tsung or Tu-tsung, which were chosen only in 1274, after the alleged "Jacob"'s departure and after the emperor's death.

Throughout Selbourne's book, the alleged "Jacob" calls the emperor "Toutson," as in this sentence: "[... the Mancini of the south [...] live under a king called Toutson [...]]" (Selbourne 2000:127). "Toutson" can be nothing other than a modification of Tu-tsung (which is the Wade-Giles romanization of the short form), as we have seen, of the emperor's full temple name (in that romanization, t and ts represent unaspirated /t/ and /c/ respectively; in the Pinyin romanization, the short form is spelled Du Zong, where d and z respectively represent those sounds). The closest we could come to thinking up an equally ridiculous sentence in English would be something like this (say, in a diary entry or in a letter): "Tomorrow, 15 May 2006, I'm having tea with the late Queen Elizabeth II of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland." That anomaly in Selbourne's alleged "translation" of the alleged "original manuscript" is a smoking cannon.

Everything has an explanation. Because Sinologists follow the Chinese custom of referring to people by their temple or posthumous names if they have such and they often use the short forms of those names, Sung Tu-tsung is likeliest to be known in the West as Sung Tu-tsung or Tu-tsung. Thus, in prefatory remarks to its chart headed "Major Chinese dynasties" (vol. 3, pp. 222-228), the 1991 imprint of the fifteenth edition of The New Encyclopædia Britannica says that "The name by which each ruler is best known is indicated in italics" (p. 222) and, going down that list, we are not surprized to find that Chao Hsien is not italicized and (Sung) Tu-tsung is (p. 227). Not surprizingly, either, in its entry for the Sung dynasty, which is the only other place in that imprint of the encyclopedia in which Sung Tu-tsung is mentioned, he is called by the short form of his temple name: "[...] Tu-tsung (reigned 1264/65-1274) indulged excessively in pleasure, though much of it was carefully concealed from the public" (vol. 16, p. 103).

We therefore suppose that the real "Jacob," who presumably lived in the nineteenth or, more likely, the twentieth century, found the short form of Sung Tu-tsung's temple name in some Western source, was ignorant of the Chinese custom of temple names, and therefore had no idea that putting it into the fictitious "Jacob"'s mouth in contexts in which the emperor was alive was a dead giveaway of a fabrication of some kind. Since Selbourne's in his "critical apparatus" expresses no astonishment that the alleged "Jacob" used temple names in that anomalous way, we have circumstantial evidence of the strongest kind that he (Selbourne) was ignorant of the Chinese custom. As is often the case with Selbourne's enterprize, what the imaginary "Jacob" did not know, Selbourne did not know either and vice versa.

Selbourne could claim a misprint ("live" instead of "lived" in the example from Selbourne 2000:127 quoted three paragraphs above), as he did in response to the Wassersteins, who note that "the Feast of Gedaliah" in his "translation" should be "the Fast of Gedaliah," but then we would point out to him that "Jacob" always called the emperor "Toutson" (not just in the sentence on page 127) and that the temple names of other people alive in the early 1270s also occur in his tale. Those smoking cannons are too numerous to all be the result of misprinting.
Obviously, then, this was not the imaginary "Jacob" writing his journal from 1270 to 1273, for he would have heard the names by which the people were known when alive. The Scourges of Jacob note that anomaly early in their assault on The City of Light: "[Columbia professor Robert] Hymes and Harvard professor Peter Bol, the top Sung-dynasty experts in the United States, say that 'City of Light' is riddled with major problems. For example, Jacob refers to the Sung emperor by his posthumous name, 'Toutson.' Problem is, Jacob leaves China in 1272, and the emperor doesn't die until 1274" (Chang 1997).

Selbourne's "explanation" of that anachronism -- which he offered not in his "critical apparatus" or elsewhere in his book but only after the critics made him aware of it -- was that the "original manuscript" was written later, after the alleged "Jacob" returned to Italy: "I myself showed that no date before the 1280s was possible [for the alleged manuscript (D.L.G.)], from the presence of words not current until then. Thus certain alleged 'anachronisms' -- such as the name 'Toutson' which Jacob gives to the Sung emperor -- could only be anachronisms if an earlier date than the earliest I proposed myself is attributed to the manuscript; and some critics did precisely that" (Selbourne 2000:442-443).

We wonder how Selbourne "showed" what he claimed he did. Did he do so as convincingly as he "showed" that the post-eighteenth-century English word "mellah" or the post-eighteenth-century French word "mellah" was used in Persia in the 1270s? Did he "remove" the anachronisms by circular reasoning, that is, by claiming, for instance, that since "Toutson" was not coined until after the emperor's death, the alleged "original manuscript" must have been written after that event, so that "Toutson" is not an anachronism after all? If that was his modus operandi, we can show that the alleged "original manuscript," if it exists (we do not believe it does), was written no earlier than 1890 (see section 2, especially note 6) or, possibly, no earlier than 1903 (see section 18). As usual in this tragicomedy, Selbourne alleged or is alleged to have "shown" this or that, but we never get a step-by-step proof of his allegation, as science requires. Again, therefore, we ask: where did Selbourne "show" what he claimed he showed and how did he show it?

*

Giving Selbourne the benefit of the doubt by assuming that the alleged "original manuscript" exists and is authentic, Barrett tries to offer an explanation for "Toutson" but realizes that attempting to account for prochronisms in "Jacob"'s tale increases the number of metachronisms and vice versa: "[...] in describing the monarchs of East Asia our author consistently uses their posthumous, 'temple names', the designations used by later historians (e.g. p. 106). This raises no problems in the case of the Chinese ruler Duzong, who was born in 1240 and died in 1274--though it is rather alarming to find Jacob describing him as 'advanced in years'. But Kubilai the Mongol did not die and receive the Chinese title given in the text until 1294--and we may presume that the news took some time to reach Italy. If in fact Jacob was not the mature and wise man the text shows at the time of his China visit, but an immature stripling who considered a thirty-one year old emperor 'advanced in years', and who only wrote up his travels some forty, fifty or sixty years later, one might thereby stretch the chronology of composition to encompass many of the anachronisms that have been pointed out in this work, though this would both diminish his overall reliability as a witness and make the other sort of anachronisms which suggest that 1271 is already too late a date of composition (such as those to do with the Chinese examination system, pointed out in my earlier review) even more stark" (Barrett 1998a:1020-1021).
Which is to say that if Selbourne assumes the date of composition to be earlier (before 1271) in order to get rid of, say, a certain metachronism (see Barrett 1997 on the Chinese examination system, which was defunct by the time of the alleged "Jacob"s alleged trip to China), he decreases, to his advantage, the number of metachronisms but increases, to his disadvantage, the number of prochronisms (like the description of Du Zong, who was born in 1240, as 'advanced in years'); on the other hand, if he assumes the date of composition to be later (say, to account for the fact that someone born in 1240 is described as 'advanced in years'), he decreases, to his advantage, the number of prochronisms but increases, to his disadvantage, the number of metachronisms. For instance, since Selbourne claimed that the alleged "Jacob" was born in 1221, an assumption that he "wrote up his travels forty, fifty or sixty years later" (after returning from China), that is, between 1313 and 1333, would, unbelievably, make him between 92 and 112 years old at the time he penned his masterpiece (for more on prochronisms and metachronisms, see note 118). I am reminded of a bad tailor whom my mother knew in _agów, Poland, where she was born in 1912 and lived until 1928. If you tried on a garment you had ordered from him, you inevitably realized that it did not fit well. If you said to him, for example, "of di linke zayt past es nisht" 'it doesn't fit on the left side,' he would give a tug on the right side. If you then said, "atsind past es nisht of di rekhte zayt" 'now it doesn't fit on the right side,' he would give a tug on the left side. If you then said.... Selbourne cannot eat his cake and have it too. He cannot get rid of internal contradictions that are irremediably built into his enterprize.

Since we cannot get around the fact that, whatever date of composition we pick for the alleged "original manuscript," inexplicable anachronisms, whether prochronisms or metachronisms, soon become apparent, the only solution is to ditch the Ptolemaic system (= the assumption that the alleged "original manuscript" exists and is genuine), accept the Copernican system (= the assumption that the "original manuscript" is Selbourne's first draft of an original historical novel in English), and assume that the anachronisms resulted from Selbourne's copying details from (primary or secondary) sources without regard to their temporal currency, another outstanding example being the word "mellah," which is also a stellar example of an ectopism and of a spelling impossible for any variety of Italian.

See the Comment on Quotation G in section 20 for more on the allegation "advanced in years."

* Tousson" is not a smoking gun but a smoking cannon, for it is triply suspicious: (A) it is, as we have seen, anachronistic, (B) it is used with present-tense verbs (see, for example, quotation B in note 24), and (C) its spelling is as glaringly fake as that of "mellah" is. Before proceeding, we should point out that Selbourne's alleged "translation" spells the emperor's always as "Toutson," so that in any defense of that spelling, Selbourne could not claim that on such and such a page of his alleged "translation" he misspelled it or that on such and such a page of the alleged "original manuscript" the text was not clear and hence "Toutson" was just his guess of what the text had at that place. Thus, because Selbourne without exception spelled the name as "Toutson," he will not be able to avoid saying that that is the spelling throughout the alleged "original manuscript." However, as we will now see, it is impossible that "Toutson" is thirteenth-century Italian.

Romanization often depends on what Roman-letter language is guiding you. For example, to represent /s/, a speaker of Dutch would pick sj (as in Dutch kousjer ~ koosjer"kosher"); of English, sh (as in English shallow); of French, ch (as in French chose 'thing'); of German, sch (as in German Schrift
'writing'); of Hungarian, ș (as in the Hungarian place name Budapest); of Lithuanian, š (as in the Lithuanian place name Anykščiai); of Polish, sz (as in Polish szkoda 'pity'); of Rumanian, ş (as in the Rumanian place name Ploieşti); and so on.

Since the alleged "Jacob" was a writer of Higher Macaronic and the chief component of that lingo was "basically educated Tuscan," we expect basically educated Tuscan spelling of the 1270s to have guided him in his romanizations. Let us therefore see what the real "Jacob" did with respect to "Toutson" and what he should have done had he followed the spelling of thirteenth-century Tuscan:

A. T. We have no criticism.

B. ou. A smoking gun. The imaginary "Jacob," had he existed, would have chosen u. No variety of Italian, including Tuscan, acquired the digraph ou until the late eighteenth-century at the earliest and possibly not until the nineteenth century, when orthographically unassimilated loans from French like ouverture began entering the language (in the twentieth century, English was also a source of that digraph, as we see from Italian words like out, outburst, outdoor, output, and outrigger, which are likewise orthographically unassimilated). See section 11 on "Joshua" and "Iuda" for more evidence of the real "Jacob"'s faulty knowledge of older Italian spelling.

C. ts. A smoking gun. Had he existed, the imaginary "Jacob" would have chosen z or zz. No variety of Italian, including Tuscan, acquired the digraph ts until recent times, when words like shorts, tsar, tse-tsé, and tsunami (all three of which words are orthographically unassimilated) began entering the language (today, the more frequent spelling of the first word is zar, which is the assimilated spelling).

D. o. We have no criticism.

E. n word-finally. A smoking gun. Word-final n is extremely rare in "basically educated Tuscan" (only in 'in', non 'not', and un 'one' come to mind). It does occur in nonstandard varieties which have lost word-final unstressed vowels, like Milanese, Sicilian, and Venetian, as in provolone (from provolone) and in non-monosyllabic family names which derive either from words ending in /n/ (like the Jewish family name Coën, which comes from Hebrew kohen 'member of the Jewish priestly caste') or from words ending in a vowel which was dropped (it remains to be seen into which of those two categories the non-Jewish Italian family names Agamben, Bastianon, Saragat, Soggio, and Trevisan fall), but Tuscan is not one of those varieties, so that the imaginary "Jacob," had he existed, would have chosen ne or ne because speakers of Italian, including Tuscan, almost without exception added a vowel when assimilating nonmonosyllabic loans from other languages ending in a consonant, as we see from the Italian personal and place names Borbone 'Bourbon', Daniele 'Daniel', David 'David', Digione 'Dijon', Edoardo 'Edward', Gabriele 'Gabriel', Isaac 'Isaac', Ismaele 'Ishmael', Michele 'Michael', Nemrotte 'Nimrod' (but Nemrot occurs too), Rachel 'Rachel', Raffaele 'Raphael', and Simone 'Simon', all of which have a non-etymological final vowel the purpose of which is to prevent any consonant from occurring word-finally (see section 7 for a contrast between the un-Italian spelling "mellah" and the hypothetical Italianized forms *mellache, *mellacho, *millache, and *millacho). Which is to say that Italian tends to have open syllables (CV), a trend which was strong in twentieth-century Italian, including Italian outside Italy (see, for example, New York City Italian Flabuscia 'Flatbush', the name of a Brooklyn neighborhood, whence New York City Italian flabuscia 'cemetery', that commonization being due to the fact that a certain cemetery much favored by Roman Catholics of Italian ancestry was located in that neighborhood).
Thus, three of the five selections were smoking guns, for we expect *Tuzone, *Tuzonne, *Tuzonne, *Tuzone, *Tuzzone, *Tuzzone, *Tuzzone, *Tuzzone, or *Tuzzone (even if you do not know any Italian but have seen the written language, you will agree that those eight hypothetical spellings look more Italian than "Toutson," which does not look Italian at all). Or, if "Jacob" wanted for some reason to leave the word-final /n/, he should have written *Tuzon or *Tuzzon.

In sum, the imaginary "Jacob," had he existed, would for three reasons not have chosen the spelling "Toutson" (to say nothing of not having used a temple name at all when referring to a living person). The real "Jacob," therefore, in the nineteenth or, more likely, the twentieth century, must have chosen it. If so, let us now see how he presumably went about doing so. As we will demonstrate, all anomalies disappear once we discard Ptolemy (thus, the assumption that "Toutson" was chosen in the thirteenth century) and accept Copernicus (thus, the assumption that "Toutson" is a twentieth-century contrivance from the pen of a botcher who did not know enough older Italian to pick a spelling appropriate for the thirteenth century).

* 

Thomas Francis Wade (1818-1895) first used his romanization of Chinese in his *Peking Syllabary*, published in 1859. Herbert Allen Giles (1845-1935) first used his modified form of that romanization in his *Chinese-English Dictionary*, the first edition of which appeared in 1892. The modified form later became known as the Wade-Giles Romanization of Chinese. In that romanization, which became extremely popular in Roman-letter languages, the short form of the temple name of the emperor in question is, as we have seen, Tu-tsung.

In 1956 the Committee on Language Reform of the People's Republic of China adopted Pinyin Zimu (known for short as Pinyin), a romanization of Chinese different in certain respects from the Wade-Giles Romanization. The committee published a modified Pinyin Zimu in 1958 and in 1979 the modified version became the official romanization of Chinese in that country. As we have seen, the short form of the emperor's temple name in modified Pinyin Zimu is Du Zong.

Many other romanizations of Chinese have been devised, those being the two best known in the late twentieth century. Most Western books in Roman-letter languages up to 1979 and even later follow the Wade-Giles system. Thus, the real "Jacob" was likelier to come across the short form of the emperor's temple name in its Wade-Giles than in its Pinyin or any other spelling. Tu-tsung and "Toutson" are indeed not far apart (though Selbourne could claim, legitimately, that because they are variant romanizations of the same name, they are bound to be similar). We assume further that he knew that he could not use the Wade-Giles spelling without changing it because had he not done so, people would recognize it immediately as a spelling which is no older than the second half of the nineteenth century.

If those assumptions are right, let us see how the real "Jacob" reshaped Tu-tsung into something less immediately recognizable as the Wade-Giles spelling.80

A. T was retained.

B. The digraph ou was substituted for the letter u. Since the Wade-Giles romanization has ou (though not in Tu-tsung) and that digraph is found in certain English loans from Chinese (like the art term tou ts'ai), the real "Jacob" was probably familiar with it. If so, he presumably thought that ou had
two advantages: it was different from o (so that it was a good choice in an attempt to modify the spelling *Tu-tsung* and it was frequent in Chinese romanizations (so that it would not look out of place in the romanization of a Chinese name). Yet, as we have seen above, it was a bad choice from the viewpoint of thirteenth-century Tuscan. Thus, the real "Jacob" forgot that he should weighed plausible spellings according to a thirteenth-century "basically educated Tuscan" metric.

C. The hyphen was eliminated, which was a good choice because hyphens are absent in older Italian (not surprisingly, the earliest evidence for the Italian word *lineetta* 'hyphen' is only from 1820; even today, hyphens are rare in Italian, they being found mostly in compound adjectives, like *italo-spagnolo* 'Italo-Hispanic', compound place names, like *Trentino-Alto Adige*, and some recent, orthographically unassimilated loans from other languages, like *bull-dog*). See section 11 for more on hyphens.

D. The digraph ts was retained, which, as we have seen, was a bad choice from the standpoint of thirteenth-century "basically educated Tuscan."

E. Since ou had already been picked as the substitute for the first u, the real "Jacob" presumably thought that choosing that substitute a second time would result in a telltale parallelism: u₁ --→ ou₁, u₂ --→ ou₂. Therefore, now just o was chosen, the result being a dissimilarity: u₁ --→ ou₁, u₂ --→ o. That change is identical with the replacement of u by ou in that both are minor changes, thus enough to make a difference but not radical enough to draw attention. However, unlike that other change, which was a bad choice from the viewpoint of thirteenth-century "basically educated Tuscan," u₂ --→ o was not a giveaway.

F. Replacement of ng by n was a good choice because word-final ng looks un-Italian and word-final g occurs in Italian only in some latter-day orthographically unassimilated loans (like *bull-dog*), but it was not the best choice because it left n in word-final position, which, as we have seen, is extremely rare in Tuscan.

Consequently, although the real "Jacob" made a few good choices, some were bad or not so good, as a result of which the spelling he picked, "Toutson," fails to pass muster not only as a thirteenth-century Italian spelling but also as a good disguise of the spelling *Tu-tsung*. Rather, "Toutson" leaps to the eye as merely a slight modification of the Wade-Giles romanization (hence easily identifiable as such).

"Toutson," moreover, looks English and French. What a coincidence that Selbourne's native, primary, and habitual language is English and he has some knowledge of French.

In sum, "Toutson" is a three-barreled smoking gun: a temple name is out of place when speaking of a living person; a temple name should occur with past-tense verbs; and the spelling "Toutson" looks not thirteenth-century Italian but English and French.

As with many other anomalies in Selbourne 1997a, the name and the spelling "Toutson" are, as we have just seen, not plausibly explainable if you accept Selbourne's story, whereas if you accept the thesis that certain portions of the alleged "Jacob"'s tale were adapted from latter-day Western sources by a late-nineteenth- or twentieth-century botcher more unknowledgeable than knowledgeable, all anomalies vanish and you can in fact reconstruct, with a good chance of being right, how he went about his business.
As Rey counseled hoaxers, 'Be careful to mix some truth with your lies' (Rey 1925:27), but as I add, make sure that you put the right ingredients into the cocktail shaker and that you shake them up in the right way.81

To the Chinese busy "analyzing" the Chinese names in Selbourne 1997a (see section 20), I say: if you adopt my way of analyzing them (see above on the proposed etymology "Tu-tsong > Toutson" and sections 19 and 20 for more examples), all the puzzles will be solved in a thrice.82
52. No examples of "non-Italian /h/ > non-Jewish Italian /k/" occur to me at the moment ("Greek khálaζa > Italian calaza") will not do because the etymological chain is actually "Greek khálaζa > Modern Latin chalaza > Italian calaza"), but there must be examples from southern Italy, where Arabic and Italian were in contact. Examples of "/x/ > /k/" in non-Jewish languages of Europe not having /x/ are easy to find, like "Hebrew al tehe kaavotecha > Medieval Latin Alteca Boteca" (see note 116), where Hebrew /x/ (romanized here by ch) became the second /k/ (romanized here by c) of the Latin name.

53. Because the letter b stands for no sound in Italian and it is little used in that language, its Italian name, acca, has in informal speech and writing acquired the meaning 'zilch', as in non capire un'acca (de...) 'understand zilch (about...), not to be able to make heads or tails of...', non sapere un'acca (de...) 'know zilch (about...)', and non valere un'acca 'not be worth a fig'.

54. Since the small number of residents of Persia who have been primary speakers of Arabic have lived primarily on the islands in the Persian Gulf (and in Khxzst_n), we also have to note that "Persian Arabic mahallah > Persian 'mellah,'" which is presumably the etymology which the ArabiсCless and Persianless Selbourne and Parfitt might propose (we would rewrite it as "Persian Arabic mahallah > non-existent Persian 'mellah,'"), would be impossible on phonological-orthographical grounds because someone writing "basically educated Tuscan" in the thirteenth century would have romanized the Arabic word as *macalla or *macalla.

55. Selbourne would presumably claim that the alleged Jewish family's alleged zealous guarding of the alleged "original manuscript" prevented word from leaking out. But the alleged "Jacob" should have been known even in the absence of his alleged "account." Note that here, as everywhere else in the present essay, every single element of Selbourne's enterprise is alleged, it is alleged only by him, and it is uncorroborated by any evidence that would be accepted in a court of law or in the highest research circles. True believers have to accept his entire package on faith. See note 126.

56. Of the three words in that short Italian noun phrase, two are, each to a different degree, unusual:

1. In section 3 we have seen the double anticipatory anachronism rabbinico.

2. Because of its meaning, we do not expect nobile coming from a traditional Jew when speaking about his family, especially if it is a rabbinical family. The alleged "Jacob," who bestowed the word nobile liberally (he called a Quanzhou local with whom he became pals "the noble Pitaco"), was not the only one unfamiliar with conventional Jewish terminology: speaking of his mother, Selbourne said that "It was at this time, in August 1936, that [my father] married my mother, who had been brought up in a high rabbinical household in Belgium before becoming a student at the Institut Supérieur de Commerce in Antwerp" (Selbourne 1989:13). Jews would say not "high rabbinical household" but rabbinical family or ultra-Orthodox Jewish family. Collocations with a Christian connotation like high Anglican, high Calvinist, and High Church influenced Selbourne here. See note 70.

57. Jewish law requires that Jews who want to organize a community have a synagogue, a ritual bath, and a cemetery (a rabbi is not needed because, with the exception of ordaining rabbis, adult Jewish males are allowed to carry out all rabbinical functions, including performing marriages, if a rabbi is not available, said ceremony being performable by any two adult Jewish males). With respect to desirability of living in a Jewish community, see too Weinreich 1967.

In connection with the "doctors, merchants, and moneylenders" mentioned by Cassuto and Roth, students of Jewish settlement history recognize here a familiar pattern: the first Jews in a place are usually people who have gone there solely to earn a living, as much as it pains them to leave an organized Jewish community. For an example, Selbourne need not have gone farther than Urbino: the first Jew known to have lived in the city was Daniel of Viterbo, who in the fourteenth century was authorized to trade and open a bank there.

Or, in America the first Jews in smaller urban areas and in rural areas were storekeepers, peddlers, sutlers, and the like. Organized Jewish communities came later, if at all; and rabbis came even later, if at all (as just noted, an organized
Jewish community does not need a rabbi).

To take a third example, when living in Mexico (from July 1964 to August 1965), I heard from Jews in Mexico City about the only Jew in Mérida, the capital of the State of Yucatán (apparently, he was the only Jew in the entire state too), who had settled there only to earn his livelihood (if memory serves, he was a jeweler). Being a non-Christian and the only Jew in the area, he was harassed by some of the locals (it was yet another instance of the direct proportion between "piety" and inhumanity), who did not desist until the bishop, in his sermon one Sunday in the cathedral, directed that the man be left in peace. Jews know, maybe better than many other peoples, that there is less danger in numbers than in isolation, yet the man stayed in Mérida because his livelihood was there.

Most non-Jews and most nontraditional Jews have probably never met traditional Jews and become acquainted with traditional Jewish life. Here is one example of many of the strong sense of community which traditional Jews have (the story was told to me by the protagonist herself): in the mid 1930s Eydl Fin (after marriage known as Eydl Vays), a resident of Anykšiai, Lithuania, was a pupil in a Jewish secondary school in nearby Ukmergė. She would leave for school on Sunday morning and return to Anykšiai on Friday afternoon to spend the Sabbath with her family. One Friday afternoon, she and some classmates happened to leave Ukmergė late, and as the horse-and-wagon on which they were returning to Anykšiai was reaching Kurkliai, she realized that she would not make it home before sundown. Being a traditional Jew and thus not wanting to violate Jewish law [which forbids riding in any kind of vehicle or on any animal on the Sabbath, which begins and ends at sundown], she decided that she would not make it home before sundown. Being a traditional Jew and thus not wanting to violate Jewish law [which forbids riding in any kind of vehicle or on any animal on the Sabbath, which begins and ends at sundown], she decided to get off in Kurkliai (her schoolmates, less religious than she, continued on home) and, though she knew not a single Jew there, ask a Jewish family to put her up for the Sabbath, thus, for a little more than twenty-four hours. Having asked her fellow schoolmates, who were less Orthodox than she, to inform her parents that she would spend the Sabbath in Kurkliai, she got off the horse-and-wagon, walked over to the first house through the window of which she saw Sabbath candles burning inside, knocked on the door, explained what had happened, and was taken in, no questions asked — her native Yiddish (see note 60), her Jewish facial features, and her Jewish way of dressing making it immediately evident to the Jew who opened the door that she was a fellow Jew and therefore entitled to help. Nor were her parents worried when they learned why she did not come home that day, for they too were confident that Jews would take her in, lodge her, and see that no harm came to her.

Today, that esprit de corps has largely disappeared. One example of many: when the Six-Day War broke out, in June 1967, the American Jewish Congress canceled all its tours to Israel and evacuated all the people, mostly Jews, on its tours already in the country. Could it not have offered tourists already there the alternative of volunteering in hospitals, old-age homes, day-care centers, post offices (huge piles of mail had accumulated), and the like, which were seriously understaffed because of the general mobilization, or of helping out at the numerous roadside stands offering free food and drink to soldiers on the move? So far as I can tell, no one already on one of its tours or about to embark on one thought of that alternative either. Apparently, then, Israel for many non-Israeli Jews is nothing more than entertainment to be enjoyed from a comfy seat in an air-conditioned bus. But I digress.

58. We have no evidence that any Jews were living in Florence in the thirteenth century. Possibly one reason is that at that time the Jews of Italy were concentrated in the south (see the next note). Possibly a second reason is that it was not advisable for Jews to be living there. "In the 13th and 14th centuries, Florence was the battlefield of the Guelfs and the Ghibellines, factions that alternately ruled the city in uncomfortable union or engaged in open warfare with one another. Alliances with popes or foreign powers, warfare with other Italian cities (notably Ghibelline Pisa), and the temporary ascendancy of one or the other party (with or without intrigue, popular support, or bloodshed) made of the centuries a confusion of rulers and transfers of power, of changing forms of civic and regional rule, and of shifting allegiances and balances of power among groups of nobles and the several major and minor merchant and craft guilds" (Ehrlich 1991:304). A Yiddish saying goes ven trey goym shlogn zikh, misht zikh der yid nisht araynet 'when two non-Jews are fighting [physically], a Jew does not interfere'. As Jews know only too well from history, when major conflicts break out someplace between non-Jews, Jews there are bound to suffer. For their own good, they knew they should stay away.

Nor does it come as any surprise that many of the family names of the Jews of Italy derived from Italian place names refer to places in the southern part of the peninsula (like Mitranī [= Hebrew mi 'from' + Trani 'Trani']), fewer to places
in central Italy (like Terni), and fewest to places in northern Italy (like Pontremoli). It is unclear, by the way, how many tokens of the Italian Jewish family name Fiorentino indicate a connection with Florence and how many with Castiglione Fiorentino, but even if the first possibility is true, the name could not serve as evidence of a Jewish presence in thirteenth-century Florence because it is attested only from the eighteenth century (and, anyway, as illustrated in Gold in preparation 5, detoponymical family names do not necessarily indicate birth or residence in the places to which they refer).

Nor is it any wonder that the latter-day Jewish Italian of central and northern Italy has features of southern origin.

Indeed, from much evidence of several kinds (two have just been mentioned) we know that Jewish settlement in Italy began in the south, only later did Jews settle in the central part of the country, and only still later in the north (though Ashkenazim, coming southward from beyond the Alps, were an early and later significant presence in Italy more or less north of the Po River, as were Occitan Jews, coming from the west, in northwestern Italy).

In contrast, the picture in our times has been just the opposite, as a result of Jews', like other people's, natural desire to be where opportunities are best: they are now concentrated in the most developed part of the country, namely the big cities of the central and northern parts of the country, not in the Mezzogiorno. Consequently, in a work of fiction set in today's Italy, no suspicion would be voiced if one or more of the characters were Florentine Jews or a Florentine rabbi (a "noble rabbinical lineage" in today's Florence would, however, be strange).

Selbourne expressed an "interest in Judaica, including the history of medieval Jews in Italy" but he furnished us with abundant evidence that he never went beyond expressing it. For more on that hollow claim, see sections 11 and 15, note 86, subsection G of section 17, note 116, note 124, section 21, and subsection G of section 22.

59. "Sin verso la fine del tredicesimo secolo, l'attività filosofico-culturale degli ebrei d'Italia si svolge quasi totalmente nel meridione: lo stesso Hillèl ben Shemuèl ben 'El'azar da Verona [...] trascorre gran parte della sua vita a Capua, ed è soltanto verso la fine dei suoi giorni che, per cause ancora ignote, si trasferisce nel nord [...]. Una sola città sembra fare eccezione alla regola: Roma [...]. A Roma era sempre esistita una grossa comunità giudaica [...]" (Sermoneta 1965:6-7). See also Fonseca et al. 1996 and the previous note.

60. Several negative reviewers have remarked on the impossibility that an Italian Jew of the thirteenth century could write 280 leaves in Italian (the equivalent in the Christian word at the time would have been, say, 280 leaves in Latin written by a Portuguese peasant). In connection with that matter, here is the beginning of Robert Bonfil's English translation of a letter written in Hebrew by a Jew in Lugo, Italy, on 14 November 1586 to his brother-in-law in Finale:

I heard your apology from the words of your letter that reached me written in Christian writing. It is strange to me to see your fingers' markings written with the finger of a foreign God. You, blessed by God, seed of sanctity, whom only a few days ago I urged to write in Hebrew. You have reverted to your former deviation after I have only just left you, it has become a burden for you to write in the writing of truth, as if you had to climb over hills and mountains. Now, Josef, you behave foolishly and you have lost stature in my mind, for you have thus provided me with a true sign that you, God forbid, do not dedicate yourself to the study of Torah at fixed times, and therefore you find it difficult to write even two lines in the Holy tongue. If this is true, you must know that your sin is great (Bonfil 1994:62-63).

The translation is a bit awkward in places (like "fingers' markings written with the finger"), but the point is clear. Anyone acquainted with the traditional Jewish world understands the values and the concerns expressed in the letter, values and concerns which by no means have disappeared: in ultra-Orthodox Ashkenazic circles to this day, written communication in Hebrew-Aramaic between adult males is frequent and usual when the subject is a Jewish religious one. The words 'Christian writing' (probably meaning 'Roman-letter Italian') are akin to the Yiddish lexemes mentioned in note 66.
Furthermore, unless writing for Jewish women (most of whom, after Hebrew ceased being anyone's native language, could not read it) and/or for Jewish men who could not read Hebrew-Aramaic or not understand it easily, Jewish writers in Europe possessing the Jewish knowledge that "Jacob" allegedly did would have invariably chosen Hebrew-Aramaic, as we see from the bibliographical evidence: most pre-nineteenth-century Jewish writing that has come down to us from around the world is in Hebrew-Aramaic (and an even larger portion of pre-nineteenth-century Jewish writing is in the Jewish alphabet).

Although the following datum is from a different time and a different place, it is not irrelevant because it is a latter-day manifestation of an age-old Jewish tradition: when ultra-Orthodox rabbis in Brooklyn, New York, became alarmed in the 1990s at the erosion of Yiddish in their communities, they issued a call urging people to continue using the language. You might at first think that they would practice what they preached by drafting the call in Yiddish but they chose Hebrew-Aramaic, though not because, as certain outsiders misunderstood, the rabbis were hypocritical, but because, whatever the subject, that is the language in which Jewishly educated traditional Jewish males write for publication within the community.

If it is not immodest to speak of oneself: if a Jew feels comfortable communicating with me, whether orally or in writing, in any of the three Jewish languages in which I feel at home, I prefer it to any non-Jewish language, for I believe that only when Jews live in a Jewish language are they living in the Jewish world. Yiddish saying: *ven a yid redt yidish, hot er an ander ponem* 'when a Jew speaks Yiddish, he's a different person [from the one he seems to be when speaking a non-Jewish language]. As Roland Breton said, 'Considering a language as no more than a means of communication is dangerous reductionism.' Or, as Kirmen Uribe puts it in "A Language," a Basque poem translated by Elizabeth Macklin Graywolf, "A language is like a shadow. / If you raise a fist, / it will raise one too. / If you run away, it too / will flee, right behind you" (Uribe 2006). See note 57.

In sum, the language we expect someone like the alleged "Jacob" to have chosen, had he existed, would have been Hebrew; if he had chosen Jewish Italian, we would not have been surprised (for we would assume that he had the broadest possible Italian Jewish audience in mind); if he had chosen Italian, we would find it unbelievable; since the alleged "Jacob" picked Higher Macaronic, we are sure of a hoax of some kind.

61. After the foregoing was written, David Abulafia sent me a copy of Abulafia 1997c, where we read that "Jacob is said to be the grandson of a Florentine rabbi, but around 1200 Florence, then a place of rather limited significance, cannot be shown to have had a Jewish population. At that time, by far the greater part of the Jewish population of Italy lived in the deep south; Florence only became an important centre of Jewish settlement after 1400" (p. 63). Apparently, Selbourne's "new knowledge" did not reach Abulafia's ears either.

62. Had Selbourne known even basic Hebrew, he would have found the correct usage hundreds of times if not more in the writings of his maternal grandfather, Moshe Avigdor Amiel. To take just one example, Hellinger, translating from Amiel's Hebrew, quotes a passage with the phrase "the Holy One, blessed be He" (2001:64), the original obviously being *hakadosh baruch hu*.

At least in the French version of his book, Selbourne claimed that in the "original manuscript" "Dieu [est] très souvent désigné par de Saints" (p. 551). The only plausible Hebrew equivalent of "le Saint" is *hakadosh 'the holy one', which is never used without *baruch hu* after it. Selbourne thus appears to have gathered up bits and scraps of Jewish information, improperly digested them, and blundered numberless times when regurgitating it back into the alleged "original manuscript": here *hakadosh baruch hu* is truncated to "hakadosh," there it is truncated to "baruch hu," nowhere is the full form given, and so on. But we may be sure that he has an "explanation": "I may have mistranslated," "a misprint," and so on.

63. Even Ernest Gordon Rupp, who at the time of writing was nothing less than the Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Cambridge, blundered about the language of the Jewish Scriptures: "But Luther's was the controlling genius, and the resulting New Testament (published in September 1522), like the Old Testament translated from the Hebrew, which followed later (1534), was a monumental work, which had deep and lasting influence on the language, life, and religion of the German people" (Rupp 1991:369). Hebrew is indeed the language of most of the Jewish Scriptures,
but Daniel 2:4b-7:28, Ezra 4:8-6:18 and 7:12-26, and Jeremiah 10:11 are in Jewish Aramaic, and bits and pieces of Jewish Aramaic are scattered elsewhere, as in Genesis 31:47, where a Jewish Aramaic place name appears (see the entry Aramaic in the new Encyclopaedia Judaica for a full list; the entry Aramaic in Achtemeier et al. 1985:43, by Anthony J. Saldarini, wrongly says that Jeremiah 10:10 is in Aramaic).

From the pen of someone else of Jewish extraction we read of "[...] Aramaic, an ancient dialect of Hebrew [...]" (Goodstein 2007). Aramaic is not a variety of Hebrew.

64. We never cease to be amazed, or angered, at latter-day pseudo-Jews (those who in recent years have come to be called Jew-ISH, that is, 'Jew-like'), whether their language is German, English, or some other non-Jewish language, who claim that European Jewry in former times was "excluded from society." The fact is that Jews, except prospective converts, were not interested in joining non-Jewish society and did not care in the least that non-Jews "excluded" them. Indeed, Jews wanting to remain Jews and wanting other Jews to remain Jews welcomed the exclusion because it made straying from the fold harder (see Weinreich 1967 for some details).

To be sure, the Arab-Israeli dispute has its disadvantages but the resulting sharp divide between Jews and Arabs does have a positive effect on Jewish cohesiveness in Israel (imagine if Israel were located instead between two countries friendly to it, like Canada and the United States). Still, as I was told around 1980, about five hundred Israeli Jews a year were then marrying Arabs. But I digress.

65. One should not forget that until recent times (and maybe even today) the world norm has been not literacy but illiteracy. Even in the United States even as late as the Civil War, the average number of school days was only 434. Imagine what it was in the thirteenth century, especially in a country, like Italy, the population of which belonged mostly to the Roman Catholic church, which for centuries before and afterwards discouraged literacy in order to keep the faithful as ignorant as possible and thus facilitate its manipulation by the clergy. (For that reason, too, the Roman Catholic church for many centuries so vehemently opposed translations of the Christian Scriptures into any vernacular that it went so far as to kill at least one person who disobeyed: in 1536 William Tyndale paid with his life for his English translation of the New Testament.) If, therefore, relatively few Christian males in Italy could read Latin, even fewer were the Jews who could.

66. Selbourne himself remarked that "Latin was [...] generally eschewed by learned Jews" (1997a). In the thirteenth century, it was avoided by almost ALL Jews. To this day, the identification of Latin with Christianity is preserved in one of the Yiddish names for the language, galkhishe os, literally 'Priestish' (= Yiddish galekh '[Christian] priest' + the glottonymic suffix -ISH). We may also note:

A. the pejorative Dutch Yiddish name for the Dutch language (and maybe for any language spoken by Christians), galkhes: "The last Chief Rabbi to preach in Yiddish was Dusnus of Leeuwarden, who officiated until 1886. When, after his death, the new Chief Rabbi for the first time delivered a sermon in elegant Dutch, part of the old guard left the synagogue in dismay, saying: in shuul veln mir keyn galkhes beem 'in the synagogue we will not listen to the Christian language'" (Beem 1954:133).

B. Yiddish galkhise os ~ galkhisber os 'letter of the Roman alphabet' (literally 'priestly letter') and galkhishe tsifer ~ galkhisber tsifer 'Roman numeral' (literally 'priestly numeral').

C. the (solely Eastern) Yiddish glottonym goyish, literally 'Gentilish' (= Yiddish goy 'non-Jew' + the glottonymic suffix -ISH), used to designate any non-Jewish language (in general) or some specific one.

See too the mention of 'Christian writing' in note 60.

67. Tagmule-hanefesh was published in 1874, from an imperfect manuscript and with many misprints, and republished in 1981, in an excellent critical edition by Yosef Sermoneta (Sermoneta 1981).

68. See Kristeller 1992:176 for more references to both those Jews.
69. It would be good were someone to see whether anything about Aquinas in that work is similar to anything that "Jacob" says about him (if nothing is similar, "Jacob" did not lean on any of Hilel's writings known to us that mention Aquinas). If no one undertakes the task, we will understand: the world of research has higher priorities than dealing with what gives every evidence of being an imaginary thirteenth-century manuscript by an imaginary thirteenth-century author.

See note 160 for another application of the Yiddish dictum.

70. In one regard, Selbourne's book reminds us of *Dombey and Son* just as Dickens filled his novel with caricatures who could not exist anywhere at any time, the real "Jacob" made the imaginary "Jacob" an impossible character:

A. For a thirteenth-century rabbi, he knew too much (for example, he was able to write 280 leaves in "basically educated Tuscan" and, since he was acquainted with Aquinas's writings, he must have been able to read Latin).

B. For a rabbi, he knew too little (consider all his blunders of Jewish interest).

C. He was not of his time (his ideas were of the late twentieth century, not of the thirteenth, and he used too many linguistic forms presumably or definitely not yet coined).

D. Even though the ostensible goal of his trip was business, he did not seem terribly interested in it: the bulk of his account of the trip to China and back was devoted to broadcasting ethical, philosophical, political, and social ideas which sounded identical or nearly so to Selbourne's. Which is to say that the real "Jacob" gave every evidence of using the trip merely as a framework on which to hang his own ideas.

E. Despite his being a supergenius who, among many other accomplishments, chalked up numberless "firsts," he remained, astonishingly, unknown to the world for some seven hundred years until, by sheer chance, he happened to be discovered in September 1991 by someone who, by sheer chance, espoused ideas either identical with or remarkably similar to his.

Thus, the more the real "Jacob" got carried away when cramming what were apparently Selbourne's ideas into the imaginary "Jacob"'s head, the less he remembered that he was supposed to be creating a thirteenth-century character and the more the book came to seem like a poorly written late-twentieth-century historical roman à thèse set in the 1270s. In a word, the fictional work called *The City of Light* was impossibly overwritten and, in particular, the fictional character "Jacob of Ancona" was impossibly overpainted.

Come to think of it, how curious that "Jacob" and Selbourne were alike or somewhat alike in at least eighteen ways:

A. Their ethical, philosophical, political, and social ideas were identical or similar.

B. Both were keen on broadcasting their ideas.

C. "Jacob" and Selbourne at times committed the same blunders (see the next-to-the-last paragraph of section 10).

D. Both were grandsons of rabbis.

E. Both rabbis were once well known; one, "Jacob"'s, was eventually forgotten entirely, and the other, Selbourne's, is now largely forgotten (see section 17).

F. "Jacob" was of "noble rabbinical lineage" and Selbourne's mother was "brought up in a high rabbinical household" (see note 56).

G. Both, as explained in that note, expressed the ancestry mentioned in D in an un-Jewish way (however, whereas Selbourne's poor diction here was not surprising, "Jacob"'s was).
H. "Jacob" was a physician and so was Selbourne's father.
I. Both "Jacob" and Selbourne traveled to India and to China.
J. Both wrote about those trips.
K. Selbourne's accounts of those trips and "Jacob"'s account of his were published within a few years of each another.
L. Selbourne published his father's diary (Selbourne 1989) and "Jacob" wrote his tale, which is to all intents and purposes a diary.
M. "Jacob" suddenly fled China for dear life and Selbourne (suddenly?) abandoned the United Kingdom and academia (see note 75).
N. Both ended up in Italy.
O. Though at different times, both lived near each other in Italy.
P. Their reaction to "sages" they despised was the same (see the next-to-the-last paragraph of note 147).
Q. "Jacob" suffered from chronic acute logorrhea and one of Selbourne's avowed recreations was talking (see note 124).
R. Both, especially Selbourne, were more than occasionally prone to Madison-Avenue small-townisms and bombasticisms. Among Selbourne's exaggerations were:
   i. "brilliant" ("[She] brilliantly exposed [...] the machinations of scholars who stopped the work's first intended US publication").
   ii. "distinguished" (the alleged "Jacob" descended from "a distinguished line of rabbinical sages" and in China he was allegedly considered "a distinguished foreigner").
   iii. "eminent" ("un éminent savant arabe," "d'éminents érudits chinois").
   iv. "fait autorité."
   v. "great" ("the great rabbi Israel of Florence," "I would then have written one of the great works of European fiction," "the great Jew of Aragon," "the grandson of one of the greatest of modern rabbinical philosophers, Moshe Avigdor Amiel").
   vi. "noble" ("noble rabbinical lineage").
   vii. "scholar" ("a French scholar," "Chinese scholars," "[Selbourne is] one of the few scholars who could have done justice to the translation and annotation of Jacob d'Ancona's many-faceted manuscript" (see note 157).
   viii. "specialist" ("d'autres spécialistes qui m'inspirent davantage de respect," "les spécialistes chinois," "d'autres spécialistes, parmi lesquels d'éminents érudits chinois").

Those similarities or approximate similarities lead one to wonder whether, consciously or subconsciously, the real "Jacob" created the fictitious "Jacob" in Selbourne's image (see note 29).

One major difference, however, was that "Jacob" was a merchant (because he needed a reason to undertake his commercially uneventful but ideologically rich voyage) and Selbourne was not (because he had other ways of disseminating
his ideas).

71. Astonishingly for a trader, "Jacob"’s intellectual interests extended far beyond trade, far beyond even Thomas Aquinas. According to the alleged "translation," while in China, "Jacob" engaged in long, detailed debates with Confucianists, high government officials, and other intellectuals. For example, "Jacob records debates among residents of Zaitun about whether to organize an army to fight the Mongols -- and risk a vengeful slaughter if they lost -- or to give up immediately and hope for mercy. ¶ Jacob writes that as a distinguished foreigner, he was invited to join the debates, but they became so furious that they collapsed into mob attacks and his patron was stabbed. Jacob recounts that he rushed from the scene, gathered his notes and set sail immediately, on the night of Feb. 24, 1272" (Kristof 1997:A18).

How lucky for someone as lowly as a trader that he was considered "distinguished," how lucky for a foreigner momentarily in the country that this Henry Kissinger before the letter was invited to take part in a debate on national security, and how lucky for posterity that he took notes (The City of Light almost rivals Hansard and Congressional Record). Since the debates account for over half the book, you get the feeling that this rabbi-physician-trader decided to go to China not for the purpose of business but to sound off in general and to polemicize in particular. And when you read his rantings, you see not only that they deal with subjects on which Selbourne had written but also that the fictitious "Jacob"'s stands were identical or nearly so to Selbourne’s.

No wonder the real "Jacob" sent along from Italy two clerks (fully a fifth of the fictitious "Jacob"’s entourage, the other members of which were two cooks, a cook’s apprentice, two washerwomen, two bodyguards, and a navigator) -- how else to get down on paper almost three years of rantings? Fortunately, since "Jacob" did not engage in much trade, the clerks had to devote probably just a little time to keeping business records and were thus free for the more important task of getting "Jacob"’s harangues down on paper.

Three people cooking and two laundering for eleven people (that is, including "Jacob") is also unusual (the sailors would have had their own cooks and washed their own clothes) -- and even stranger still because the washerwomen were "for the washing of my clothes" only (so says the fictitious "Jacob").

"Surviving contemporary records show that medieval traders with unauthorized women in their entourages could be arrested, and all their property forfeited. Jacob tells us that the women were there 'for the washing of my clothes,' but would he, who cared so much about money, have taken such a risk? [...] The insertion of the two women into the narrative - - one is a harridan and one is a wanton -- suggests rather a convenient device for enriching the action with unwanted pregnancy, forced abortion and shrill complaint, all of which duly occur" (Spence 1997:20). How unusual for a rabbi-physician-trader, an "astonishing intellectual titan" of "noble rabbinical lineage" and the grandson of "the great rabbi Israel of Florence" to take along a harridan and a wanton.

Are you wondering how the Chineseless "Jacob" could not just follow the debates in China and take notes but also participate? Luckily for him, Mr. Serendipity happened to meet a resident of Quanzhou who turned out to be an at least trilingual half-Italian half-Chinese person who readily agreed to serve as interpreter.

If "Jacob" was "distinguished," why is he not mentioned in any factual document known to us? Could it be that he was made "distinguished" only for the purpose of explaining how a mere trader -- a foreigner, to boot -- was invited to take part in local discussions on security? "It is most improbable that Chinese mandarins or scholars would have condescended to debate with a visiting European trader as an equal. It is hard to understand how Jacob could have participated so effectively in these debates when he was working through an interpreter. It is equally improbable that their debates could have had any effect on the way the city as actually run. Above all, it is obvious that the terms of the debates are flagrantly anachronistic" (Irwin 1997).

72. New Catholic Encyclopedia erroneously gives the city’s longer French name as "St. Jeanne d’Acre" (vol. 1, p. 73).

73. The 1991 imprint of the fifteenth edition of The New Encyclopædia Britannica says that "Catalonia and Aragon were united under the same king in 1137" (vol. 2, p. 944) and it speaks of the "union of Aragon and Catalonia" as having taken place in
1140 (vol. 1, p. 512). Which date is right?

74. See note 126.

75. Selbourne's words "secret demand" could be a Freudian slip expressing a yearning for recognition, which, if he felt it, he would have felt more keenly after being black-balled at Ruskin College, after leaving not only academia but also the British Isles (see subsection F of section 22, including note 147), and after the Conservatives, among whom he had had, through his writings, some influence, lost their majority in the British elections of 1990. Like Sir Andrew Aguecheek in Shakespeare's Twelfth Night, he could thus have thought to himself, "I was adored once too," and rued his now diminished status.

The least we may say is that The City of Light provided Selbourne with a potential new forum from which to rebroadcast his ethical, philosophical, political, and social ideas, but since even all the imprints of the book did not add up to a best-seller (not even to a succès d'estime), it had no effect in the long term, probably because:

A. Selbourne having already presented his ideas in many other publications, the book was, to borrow a phrase from Juvenal, *crambe repetita* 'a stale repetition' (literally, 'warmed-over cabbage').

B. The City of Light was boring as fiction (see notes 35, 94, and 157) and of no scholarly value as nonfiction.

C. Most thinking people today have schedules so full that they have no time to plow through a historical novel, especially a poorly written one (the tale is full of longueurs in treacly, cacozealous English), just to tease out the author's rehearsed ideas -- they want fresh insights, in lean expository prose and with no frills like an imaginary thirteenth-century Jew's imaginary trip from Italy to China and back.

By using the word *secret*, Selbourne seemed to want us to imagine something like a Confraternity of True Believers in Jacob the Sage's Holy Word, the members of which piously copied and recopied the Supreme Leader's Sacred Text over the centuries, during all of which time not a word about this coterie reached the ears of outsiders who could have left some record of it that has come down to us (naturally, to understand the sacred text, those esoterics would have to have been well versed in Higher Macaronic, a lingo used in no text known to anyone but Selbourne).

For other possible Freudian slips, see section 15, note 98, and the paragraph to which note 106 is attached. The similarities between the alleged "Jacob's" and Selbourne mentioned in note 70 are relevant too.

In section 15 we will return to the alleged "secret demand." By the way, how did Selbourne learn of that "demand"? If from the alleged "present owner," how did that person learn about it? Is not the alleged "secret demand" a figment of Selbourne's imagination?

76. Honigsbaum 1997 says that the alleged "original manuscript" is written on "discoloured vellum," a description based on his misreading of Selbourne's story, which is actually that the "original manuscript" was bound in now discolored vellum.

See the next note.

77. It would be good to hear from knowledgeable people about whether paper could, without modern means of conservation, survive for some seven hundred years, especially 280 leaves "written on both sides of almost every page and perhaps 550 pages in all" (Selbourne 2000). The older paper is, the likelier the ink is to seep into it; with writing on both sides, the writing is likely to penetrate from one side to the other, making both sides hard to read. That probability is consistent with Selbourne's need to "master" the handwriting but not with its allegedly being "usually clear."

Mind you, Selbourne spoke of paper, which is more fragile than parchment or vellum.

Or are we to assume that the family pioneered modern means of conservation, say, by regulating the temperature and the humidity of the scriptorium and by putting each folio in a sleeve made of inert polyester? You may think the question facetious, but it is actually the result of thinking through, logically, all the implications of the scenario which
Selbourne merely sketched. He has scores of critics' questions to address, not merely the few posed in the brief reviews and letters to the editor.

See paragraph B in part A of section 8.

78. For a recent example analogous to 'Passover 1988' see the entry for Schirmann 1970 in References.

79. Speaking of time, let us note a lead that should be followed up. Rabinowitz 1943:160 remarks that "the dependence of navigation on the monsoons made it necessary to remain in Ceylon until the breaking of the eastern monsoon at the end of December or the beginning of January, and rendered the shortest possible time for the return journey from Parama to Ceylon nine months." Since all long-distance sea navigation before the advent of steam depended on the winds, it would be good to examine the chronology of "Jacob"s round trip in light of what is known about the winds in the waters through which alleged being is supposed to have passed. Would they have been favorable at the times indicated in his tale?

For instance, according to page 137 of the French version of the alleged "Jacob"s tale, he set sail from southern India for Ceylon on 12 January 1271, and according to page 502 of the same version, he reached the island in mid-June 1272 when returning to Italy. Since the monsoon winds in that area blow from the northeast between mid-October and April and from the southwest between the latter part of April to mid-October, wasn't his ship -- his wind-driven ship -- going against the wind both times?

Abulafia 1997a observes that "Jacob" followed non-existent trade routes on impossible ships" and Irwin 1997 observes that part of the route was "improbable." Abulafia gives details in Abulafia 1997c and adds some more in a letter to me dated 12 June 2006:

"Selbourne's 'translation' described massive ships typical of the Ming voyages around 1420 (ships which have themselves been the subject of an enormous amount of new rubbish). From what we know about Catalan trade, we may be sure that Western merchants never traveled on such large vessels and, in fact, did not own the vessels in which they traversed these waters (according to the 'translation,' 'Jacob' had his own ship and took along two navigators). ¶ Bits of the 'translation' concerning trade routes in fact seem to be based on published documents once in the Cairo Geniza, which for the most part predate 1150."

The French version of Selbourne's book, however, contains the following passage:

"[Abulafia] a déclaré au Times que Jacob n'aurait pu faire voile depuis Ancône en 1270 puisque à cette époque, assurait-il catégoriquement, les Vénitiens avaient «supprimé les voyages depuis Ancône vers les riches portes de l'Orient». Ce qui est faux, ainsi que le montre J. F. Leonhard dans son livre sur Ancône au Moyen Âge.1

"A la fin des années 1220 et par la suite, Venise avait bien essayé d'imposer un blocus, mais ses efforts avaient échoué, si bien qu'en 1270 la ville d'Ancône était une cité marchande indépendante et florissante. Elle possédait sa monnaie. [...] Dans sa correspondance privée, Abulafia a reconnu plus tard que le commerce anconitain était «très actif», en particulier avec le Levant, à l'époque où Jacob a commencé son voyage en Orient. Le même Abulafia avait assuré dans les pages du Times que Jacob, dans le récit de son voyage au golfe Persique vers la Chine, avait décrit des «naveaux impossibles» (c'est-à-dire «trop grands» pour cette époque). Ultrérieurement, il a reconnu que la taille des navires était «plus proche de la réalité [qu'elle] le supposait[il]» (p. 566, where footnote 1 reads "J. F. Leonhard, Ancona nel Medio Evo, Ancône, 1992, p. 106-109, 252, 268-269")."

It would thus seem that, after writing Selbourne to correct himself about the size of the alleged "Jacob"s alleged ship (no later than April 2000, when the French version came off the press), Abulafia reversed himself by re-spousing his criticism (no later than 12 June 2006, that is, in his letter to me of that date). Twice I asked him, by letter, to state his current position, but I got no response.

On the absurdity of hiring a navigator in Italy for a voyage through Asian waters see note 158 (where he is called a pilot).
For an elaboration of Irwin's characterization of the routes as "improbable," see his review.

80. For two reasons we will not be concerned with the Pinyin Romanization: as noted, the real "Jacob" was less likely to be acquainted with it; if perchance he did know it, he probably realized that it was much newer than the Wade-Giles Romanization and thus would inevitably be seen as a smoking gun even if modified.

81. In 1839 Théodore Hersart de La Villemarqué published a collection of Breton poems, Barzas-Bròis, the authenticity of which was doubted by certain students of Breton literature at the time, but in the 1980s Donatien Laurent proved that some were authentic. Hersart de La Villemarqué thus followed Rey's advice even before Rey was born but he was ultimately unmasked because he did not mix in the lies properly.

Probably all fabrications, whether in literature, art, music, or any other field, will ultimately be uncovered as our tools get more sophisticated. With software now available, it would be interesting to compare the style of the alleged "Jacob"'s tale (provided the Wardour Street English could be factored out?) and Selbourne's acknowledged writings: how much are they alike in form? See section 16 on similarity of content.

82. HistoricalNames.com and Dictionary.com lists the European family name Toutson, extant during the Renaissance and maybe before too. It presumably played no role in the real "Jacob"'s romanization of the short form of the emperor's temple name, but we cannot rule that possibility out.