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In 1851 an American Episcopal missionary clergyman, the Rev. Edward W. Syle, advised the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church of a recently published report of an ancient Jewish community at Kaifeng, an old imperial city west of Beijing. The Board of Missions maintained Foreign and Domestic Committees and the latter had oversight of a Mission to Jews in America. As the following note indicate, the missionaries in China were aware of the Jewish community at Kaifeng.

JEWS IN CHINA.\(^1\)

The Rev. E. W. Syle, Missionary in Shanghai, has sent to the Domestic Committee a copy of the facsimiles of the Hebrew manuscripts, obtained at the Jewish Synagogue in K'ae-fung-foo.\(^2\) Any persons who would wish to examine them can do so by calling at the Mission Rooms.\(^3\) In the next number we will make a few extracts from the narrative of the Mission of Inquiry, and from the introduction of the Bishop of Victoria, which was received at the same time. Of the facsimiles his Lordship speaks as follows:—"They brought back also eight MSS. of apparently considerable antiquity, containing portions of the Old Testament Scriptures, of which facsimiles are subjoined. These eight MSS. are written on thick paper, bound in silk, and bear internal marks of foreign, probably of Persian origin. The writing appears to have been executed by means of a style, and to be in antique Hebrew form, with vowel points."\(^4\)

---


3 Spirit of Missions, Vol 17 No 2, February 1852, pp 37-41.


Location of Kaifeng.
Over the years since 1849 four primary sources have emerged for the study of the Kaifeng Jews.

- Engraved inscriptions on stone, including several stele;
- Kaifeng Hebrew manuscripts held in various institutions outside China;
- Vague mentions in Chinese official gazetteers and, in the context of this paper,
- Reports of early Catholic and later Protestant missionaries.

There are four known stele, dated 1489, 1512, 1663, and 1679. The inscriptions on these four monuments provide the bulk of indigenous Jewish history at Kaifeng. The 1489 inscription gives a description of the arrival of the Jews in the city. It records that the synagogue was built in 1163, rebuilt 1279, restored 1421, and enlarged between 1461 and 1489. The 1421 restoration reflected the rise of a Jew into the scholar-gentry class. White gave this translation.

Yen Ch'eng, the physician, in the nineteenth year of Yung-lo (1421), received from the emperor, through Chou-fu Ting Wang, a present of incense and (permission) to rebuild the synagogue (Ch'ing Chen Ssu). In the synagogue (was placed) the Imperial Tablet (Wan Sui P'ai), acknowledging allegiance (feng) to the ruling emperor of the Ta Ming Dynasty. In the twenty-first year of Yung-lo (1423) a memorial was presented on the merits (of the above-mentioned physician), and by Imperial decree he was given the surname Chao, and there was conferred upon him the grade of Embroidered Robe Body-guard (Chin Yi-wei-chih-hui), and he was promoted to be colonel in the constabulary (Chih-hui) of the Chekiang (Che-chiang) Province.

The importance of achieving literati or scholar-gentry rank is an important strand in the story of the decline of the Kaifeng community and is discussed later.

It has been remarked that studies of Kaifeng Jewry “have reached saturation point” which is a bit off-putting when attempting yet another. This paper seeks to place the “discovery” of the Kaifeng Jews within the discourse of 19th century evangelical Protestant values, particularly the function of the Bible as the supreme standard for Christian belief and conduct. It also attempts to explain and illustrate items for non-Jews.

Syle’s report was one of many Protestant missionaries most of whom, in the mid-19th century, were evangelicals. Christians have a long-standing interest in finding the most ancient versions of the Old Testament to confirm their conviction of the preeminent authority of the Bible. Textual

5 A Canadian visitor to Kaifeng reported that the stele were stored in a municipal storehouse after being removed for safe keeping. Peter Sternberg, “Chinese Jews,” Globe and Mail, Toronto, 21 March 1985. They are now in the Kaifeng Museum and can be viewed by prior arrangement.


7 The best account of these monuments and the inscriptions is White, William C. Chinese Jews: A Compilation of Matters Relating to the Jews of K'ai-feng Fu, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1966).


10 A bibliography of published material on Kaifeng is: Lowenthal, Rudolf, The Jews in China: A Bibliography, (Peking, c1937; republished and annotated, Peking c1940. A Supplementary volume was published c1946).

11 For traditionally minded Anglicans and Episcopalians the authority of the Bible is stated in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion—Article VI: Of the Sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for salvation.

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical
authenticity is central in understanding the enthusiasm of the early Catholics and later Protestants in China in securing Torah\textsuperscript{12} and other scrolls at Kaifeng that they believed might be among the most ancient versions available and free of errors by later Jewish scribes.\textsuperscript{13} It must have been a disappointment to scholars to find that the Kaifeng scrolls showed little difference to those already available in Europe.\textsuperscript{14}

The evangelically supported London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews (SPCJ)\textsuperscript{15} encouraged the search hoping to obtain:

A copy of the Scriptures belonging to the Jews of the East, who might be supposed to have had no communication with Jews in the West, has been long considered a desideratum in Europe; for the Western Jews have been accused by some learned men of altering or omitting certain words in the Hebrew text to invalidate the arguments of Christians. But Jews in the East, remote from the controversy, would have no motive for such corruptions.\textsuperscript{16}

The SPCJ was disappointed when it discovered that the scrolls and other Hebrew materials were:

For the most part copied from those with which the Jews, generally speaking, and the students of Jewish literature, have long been familiar.\textsuperscript{17}

A description was given of nineteen manuscripts containing prayers that corresponded with similar prayers used in other parts of the world.\textsuperscript{18} The SPCJ reported that it had obtained six of thirteen copies of the Torah and had presented one copy to the Bodleian Library at Oxford University, another to the British Museum and a third to Cambridge University.\textsuperscript{19} The Sino-Judaic Institute published Michael Pollak’s account of the dispersal of various manuscripts:

By 1850-51, poverty and ignorance are so widespread that the surviving Jews sell six of their Torah scrolls and sixty-three smaller synagogal books to emissaries of the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews (now the Church's Mission to the Jews). In ensuing years, three more Torahs and at least two smaller synagogal manuscripts are sold.\textsuperscript{20}

Berg locates copies in North America at Toronto University, Southern Methodist University, American Bible Society, Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Theological Seminary.\textsuperscript{21}

Chinese official restrictions on foreign travel inside China in the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century made it impracticable for foreigners to visit Kaifeng. The Anglican Bishop of Hong Kong, the Rt. Rev.

\begin{enumerate}
\item First five books of the Old Testament. In Greek, known as the Pentateuch.
\item Finn 1872, p. 56.
\item See historical summary online at — http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Church\%27s_Ministry_Among_Jewish_People
\item Ibid, pp 909-910.
\item Jewish Intelligence and Monthly Account of the Proceedings of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, Vol XIX, January1853, pp1-5.
\item Ibid, p. 1.
\item Ibid, p. 7.
\end{enumerate}
George Smith, was the principal agent of the SPCJ in this matter. While visiting Shanghai, the Rev. Walter Medhurst of the London Missionary Society in Shanghai recommended two Chinese Christian converts.\(^{22}\) The two men visited Kaifeng in 1849.\(^{23}\) Their names were K’iu Tien-sang and Tsiang Yungchi. They carried a letter of introduction, in Hebrew, written by an expatriate Jewish merchant in Shanghai—a member of the expatriate firm of Sassoon & Co.\(^{24}\)

In the name of God shall we do and prosper. This the 25th day of the month of Heshwan, in the year \[5\]6\(i\) the year five thousand and six hundred and eleven from the creation of the world (=1850).

Great peace be unto the city wherein there is the holy congregation of Israel, Kai-fung-foo!

After due inquiry about your good health and well-being: this is to inform you that our health is good and pleasant, and I have come to inform you that I am Isaac Faraj the son of Reuben Jacob, may his Creator preserve him and keep him alive, from Babylon (Baghdad), and I came to the city of Shang-hai in the year \[5\]6\(0\)\(6\) (=1845-6), and I settled there for trading purposes. And I have heard that there are Israelites in your city, and I am very pleased to be cognisant of your welfare, and to send you a letter so as to hear news of joy and happiness from your city, and I beg you to send me a reply to what I ask you. Let me know: is there a scroll of the Law in your city? and do you read the Haftaroth from the Prophets? and do you possess the four and twenty books of the Bible; the Mishna and the Zohar? and in what books do the children learn? and from which tribe are you? I beg you to excuse the trouble I am putting you to, and I request you to answer me, and further to tell me all about your city, and to let me know if there is another city wherein Israelites are to be found. And if you wish to have anything from me, such as Pentateuchs, Prophets, and Hagiographa, and any other books, I have faith in His Name, may He be blessed, that He will fulfil your wishes, and I shall send you an answer, and whatever else you wish for. It would have given me great pleasure to come and visit the children of Israel of your city and to learn of your welfare, had it not been that I were afraid of the fatigue of the journey, and certain other matters, and travelling difficulties. And we are still in exile; may He shortly send us our Messiah, speedily in our time, Amen. Isaac Faraj ben Reuben Jacob, may his end be good.\(^{25}\)

The expedition was financed by the SPCJ through a substantial donation by a generous evangelical philanthropist, Miss Jane Cook of Cheltenham.\(^{26}\) Medhurst wrote an account of the expedition to the Rev. Dr. Arthur Tidman, Secretary of the LMS in London.\(^{27}\) A second visit was made in 1851.

\(^{22}\) Finn 1872, pp 52-53.
\(^{23}\) Sending Chinese inland on behalf of foreign missions was a common practice. Lo Sam-yuen (Luo Shenyuan), a convert of the German missionary Karl Gutzlaff, was sent by Bishop Smith to make contact with the Taiping rebels in South China at about the same time i.e. c1849.
\(^{24}\) Finn 1872, p. 53. Smith 1851, p. viii.
\(^{27}\) The British Banner, April 1851, p. 243.
The Illustrated London News published a report of the visit in December 1851 that included images of two Chinese who accompanied the scrolls to Shanghai but who are not to be confused with the original Chinese emissaries. One of these Kaifeng Jews set about learning Hebrew from one of the Protestant missionaries. Images of the two men confirm their thorough assimilation into the surrounding Chinese culture.

The Rev. William Milne, of the LMS, gave this account of the two men after their arrival in Shanghai.

They brought with them two Chinese Jews, with whom I had frequent interviews, as they resided in our mission during their sojourn at Shanghai. Neither of them had a Hebrew name. The one was forty years old, and other about forty-five. They had both submitted to the rite of circumcision in infancy. One of them had a remarkably Jewish cast of countenance. But in nothing were they distinguishable from the surrounding masses, except in religious profession; for they talked the Chinese language,
dressed in the Chinese style, and had the usual Chinese manners and customs.\textsuperscript{31}

The two also had a good deal of interaction with Sassoon & Co, and through that firm had contact with Dr. Nathan Marcus Adler, the Chief Rabbi of London apparently with the object of sending a religious teacher to Kaifeng. The Sassoon advice was that such a scheme was impossible given the Taiping Rebellion. The Rabbi of San Francisco proposed going to Kaifeng himself, a risky proposition given the ban on foreign internal travel in China while the synagogue in New Orleans raised a large sum for the same purpose but the project ended with the Civil War.\textsuperscript{32}

Milne indicated the general interest of missionaries and other Christians in the antiquity of the Kaifeng scrolls and their place in Biblical studies.

These MSS, lying imbedded in the interior of China for centuries, may be of service to those engaged in the collation of ancient Hebrew Scriptures.\textsuperscript{33}

The pioneer American Protestant, the Rev. Dr. E. C. Bridgman of the Baptist mission, reported on the purchase of the Hebrew scrolls\textsuperscript{34} in a detailed report of the 1849 visit to Kaifeng. He suggested that the scrolls might be very ancient and of valuable in affirming the authenticity of the Bible.\textsuperscript{35}

A British Army officer, Captain Broughton, sent the Irish Academy the report of the visit in early 1852 provided by Bishop Smith.\textsuperscript{36} A further report was issued in 1853 by two distinguished

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{32} Finn 1872, pp 95-96. \\
\textsuperscript{33} Milne 1857, p. 405. \\
\textsuperscript{34} Bridgman, Rev. Dr. E. C., Shanghai, 18 Jan 1851 cited in “Jews in China,” pp 341-342 in \textit{Journal of the American Oriental Society}, Vol. 2, 1851. \\
\textsuperscript{35} Chinese Repository, Vol. XX, Art VII, July 1851, pp 436-466. This is the major report on the 1849 visit to Kaifeng. \\
\end{flushleft}
American academics based on the Smith report. Over the next sixty years interest in Kaifeng waxed and waned until the tragedies of the Jewish communities in Poland and Russia drew attention to Europe.

The Treaty of Tientsin [Tianjin] in 1858-1860 gave foreigners the right to travel anywhere in China, subject to having a passport issued by their Consul and acceptable to Chinese officials. An account of the first known visit by a foreign Jew in 1864 was published in London in February 1868. Research raises questions about the authenticity of claims by two different Jewish writers (Aaron Halevi Fink and J. L. Liebermann) to have made the visit. Leading authorities on Kaifeng Jewry concluded that the accounts of Fink and Liebermann:

Tell of meetings that actually took place over a period of several days between the Jews of Kaifeng and a foreigner who was well-versed in the traditions of Judaism and was himself Jewish. …we believe that the preponderance of the evidence … suggests that Fink is more apt to have been the true author of the report and, accordingly, the man who in 1864 arrived in Kaifeng and met with the remnants of its old Jewish community.

In 1866 one of the most distinguished American missionaries and government employees to serve in China, the Rev. Dr. W. A. P. Martin, visited Kaifeng and reported his impressions. Bishop Samuel Schereschewsky of the Episcopal Church, a Lithuanian born American convert from Judaism, visited Kaifeng in 1867 for 20 days, until driven away by a riot fomented by a second degree literati. Despite his profound knowledge of Hebrew, the bishop provided little information about the community.

A letter in 1924 said that the Taiping Rebellion and the Jews were massacred along with other Chinese in addition to experiencing disastrous floods as the Imperial forces sought to prevent the Taiping movement towards Beijing. Whatever had survived of the Kaifeng synagogue was destroyed by the flooding and surviving bits and pieces were sold off. The Taiping had a policy of destroying Chinese temples and would not have excluded what was left of the Kaifeng synagogue. Chinese archives are silent on the subject of the Kaifeng Jews and their synagogue. The earliest research from a Chinese source appeared in 1945.

---

43 Martin 1906, p. 3.
The Protestant reports of the mid and later 19th century included respectful acknowledgement of the earlier work of Jesuit missionaries although some Protestants thought that the Catholics focused too much on intellectual enquiry and neglected basic Christian evangelism. Others suggest that the Jesuits were just as interested as the Protestants in seeking manuscripts of the Old Testament closest to the original text.  

Fr. Francis Xavier, the pioneer Catholic missionary to China was told of the presence of Chinese Jews in 1545 but the information was patchy and attracted only passing interest. The first detailed knowledge about the Kaifeng Jews in Henan Province was conveyed to Europe in the early 17th century by another Catholic pioneer missionary, Fr. Matteo Ricci. Ricci was visited in Beijing in 1605 by Ai T’ien, a Kaifeng Jew.

We learned this (about Christians in Kaifeng) through a Jew by profession of his faith … nationality and features, [Ricci’s Diary—His face was quite different from that of a Chinese in respect to his nose, his eyes and all his features,] who came to visit me during the past days because of my reputation and because of the many printed books concerning our activities. He, therefore, understood that we were neither Moors [Muslims] nor gentiles and thought that we were of his faith.

The question of achieving scholar-gentry status and the long-term effect on the brighter members of Kaifeng Jews has already been mentioned.

Ai T’ien was another of a number of Kaifeng Jews who qualified for public office through the Chinese examination system. Achieving literati or scholar-gentry status demanded conformity with the conventional Confucian culture. Katz commented that all Jewish communities, and indeed all minorities, enculturate their religious beliefs and behaviour as part of a process of assimilation with the dominant culture that included acknowledgement of ancestor worship and other features stating the commonalities of Judaism and Chinese religion. In addition to Chinese Confucian influences there are also indications that the Kaifeng Jews borrowed from their Muslim neighbours.

Ai claimed to have been excluded from the synagogue in consequence, although Ricci seems to have doubted this. Assimilation was an ongoing issue for cultural minorities that is mentioned many times in other reports. Ai did say, according to Ricci, that circumcision was at best rare and that necessity made it difficult and even impossible to observe Jewish dietary laws.


49 Laufer 1930, p. 192.
is repeated in later reports. By the mid-19th century the synagogue was no more and there was no-one who could read the surviving Hebrew manuscripts.\(^{50}\)

An American scholar remarks that:

The Jews took and passed the Chinese civil service exam in disproportionate numbers to their population, leading to their being assigned cities other than their own, to the Confucianization of intellectuals, intermarriage in their newly adopted towns and the acculturation of the Kaifeng Jewish community which was still under the influence of these Jewish Confucians.\(^{51}\)

This assessment reflects that of the Australian Donald Leslie, among the leading research specialists on Kaifeng Jewish history:

The terminology of the Chinese inscriptions from the synagogue is highly Confucian, with a few touches of Taoism. The ideas expressed are sometimes Jewish in Confucian garb, but more often Confucian per se. We hardly ever find passages from the Jewish Law translated into Chinese.\(^{52}\)

The following Catholic report appeared in 1835 and remains among the most definitive sources about the Kaifeng Jews.

**THE JEWS OF KAIFENG AND THE JESUITS.**

The Romish missionaries, soon after they entered this country, found a synagogue of Jews in some of the northern provinces. “Father Ricci who made this discovery,” says a writer in the Asiatic Journal, “was not able to draw from it those advantages which he had desired. Confined to the city of Peking, by the duties of his mission, he could not undertake a journey to Kaefung foo, the capital of Honan, which is distant therefrom about two hundred leagues. He contented himself with interrogating a young Jew of this synagogue, whom he met at Peking. He learned from him, that at Kaefung foo there were ten or twelve families of Israelites; that they had come thither to rear again their synagogue; and that they had preserved, with the greatest care, for five or six hundred years, a very ancient copy of the Pentateuch. Father Ricci immediately showed him a Hebrew Bible. The young Jew recognised the character, but could not read it, because he had devoted himself solely to the study of Chinese books, from the time that he aspired to the degree of a scholar. The weighty occupations of father Ricci did not permit him to add to this discovery. It was not until after the lapse of three or four years that he obtained the opportunity of sending thither a Chinese Jesuit, with full instructions to investigate what he had learned from the Jewish youth. He charged him with a Chinese letter, addressed to the chief of the synagogue. In this letter, father Ricci signified to him, that besides the books of the Old Testament, he was in possession of all those of the New, which testified that Messiah whom they were expecting, was already come. As soon as the chief of the synagogue had read the part of the letter, which related to the coming of Messiah, he made a pause, and said, it was not true, as they did not expect him in less than ten thousand years. But he intreated father Ricci, whose fame had apprized him of his great talents, to come to Kaefung foo, that he might have the pleasure of surrendering to him the care of the synagogue, provided he would abstain from the meats forbidden to Jews. The great age (174) of this chief, and the ignorance of his successor, determined him to make these offers to father Ricci. The circumstance was favourable for obtaining information of their Pentateuch; and the chief readily consented to give them the beginning and end of every section’ they were found perfectly conformable to the Hebrew Bible of Plautin, except that in the Chinese copy there were no vowel points.

In 1613, father Aleni who, on account of his profound knowledge and great wisdom, was called by the Chinese themselves, the Confucius of Europe, was commanded by his superiors to undertake a journey to Kaifung foo the purpose of ascertaining what could be gained from the discovery. He was

\(^{50}\) Ibid p 34.


\(^{52}\) Goldstein 1999 p. 134.
the fittest man in the world to have succeeded in it, being well skilled in Hebrew. But times were
changed. The old chief was dead. The Jews with readiness showed father Aleni their synagogue, but he
never could prevail on them to show him their books. They would not even so much as withdraw the
curtains which concealed them.\(^{53}\) Such were the feeble beginnings of this discovery, which fathers
Trigault and Semedo, and other missionaries, have transmitted to us. Learned men have often spoken
of them, sometimes very incorrectly, and have always expressed a desire of further information.

The residence afterwards established by the Jesuits at Kaefung foo excited fresh expectations.
Nevertheless fathers Rodriguez and Figueredo wished in vain to profit by this advantage. Father
Gozani was the first person who was at all successful in his endeavors. Having an easy access, he took
a copy of the inscriptions in the synagogue, which are written on large tablets of marble, and sent it to
his superiors at Rome. These Jews informed him, that there was a Bible at Peking, in the temple,
where were kept the king, or canonical books of strangers. The French and Portuguese Jesuits obtained
permission from the emperor to enter the temple and examine the books. Father Parennin was present.
Nothing of the kind was found. Father Bouvet said, that they saw some Syriac letters, and had every
reason to believe that the master of the pagoda gave bad information to the Jesuits in the course of
their search. It would now be very difficult to obtain admission into this library; and every attempt
hitherto made by father Gaubil has been unsuccessful. He never could understand what these Hebrew
and Syriac books were. In the interim, a Tartar Christian, to whom he had lent his Hebrew Bible,
assured him also that he had seen books written in the same character; but he could not tell him what
these books were, not what might be their antiquity. He only declared to him, that it was a thora, that is
to say, a book of the law. While the Jesuits were making these fruitless researches in Peking, the Jews,
less reserved than the Chinese, gave voluntary information of their different customs to father Gozani;
and by the beginning of the century, he was enabled to publish an account as circumstantial as could
have been expected from one who was not acquainted with the Hebrew language. This account is
published in the eighteenth volume of the Lettres edifiantes et curieuses. In a letter to a member of the
society of Jesuits, dated at Kaefung foo, in Honan, Nov. 5th, 1704, J. P. Gozani thus wrote:—

“As to what regards those who are here called tiao-kin-kiao, (tenou kin keaou, or 'the sect that
plucks out the sinew,') two years ago I was going to visit them, under the expectation that they were
Jews, and with a view of finding among them the Old Testament. But as I have no knowledge of the
Hebrew language and met with great difficulties, I abandoned this enterprise for fear I should not
succeed in it. Nevertheless, as you remarked to me that I could oblige you by obtaining information
concerning this people, I have obeyed your orders, and have executed them with all the care and
precision of which I was capable. I immediately made them protestations of friendship, to which they
readily replied, and had the civility to come to see me. I returned their visit in the li-pae-sou, (le pae
sze) that is in their synagogue, where they were all assembled, and where I held with them long
conversations. I saw their inscriptions, some of which are in Chinese, and the rest in their own
language. They showed me their books of religion, and permitted me to enter even into the most secret
place of their synagogue, where they themselves are not permitted to enter. There is a place reserved
for the chamkias (chang keaou,) or chief of the synagogue, who never enters there unless with
profound respect. They told me that their ancestors came from a kingdom of the west, called the
kingdom of Juda, which Joshua conquered after having departed from Egypt and passing the Red sea
and the desert; that the number of Jews who came out from Egypt was about six hundred thousand
men.

They assured me, that their alphabet had twenty-seven letters, but they commonly only made us of
only twenty-two; which accords with the declaration of St. Jerome, that the Hebrew has twenty-two
letters, of which five are double. When the they read in the Bible in their synagogue, they cover the
face with a transparent veil, in memory of Moses, who descended from the mountain with his face
covered, and who thus published the decalogue and the law of God to his people. They read a section
every Sabbath day. Thus the Jews of China, as the Jews of Europe, read all the law in the course of the
year. He who reads, places the ta-king on the chair of Moses. He has his face covered with a very thin

\(^{53}\) The curtain that covers the ark is called the Parochet. It symbolizes the curtain that was in the Holy Temple. As
it is written (Exodus 40:21), "He brought the ark into the Tabernacle and placed the screening dividing curtain so
that it formed a protective covering before the Ark..."
For examples of modern paroches see — http://www.stam.net/torah-ark-curtains.aspx

12
cotton veil. At his side is a prompter, and some paces below a moula, to correct the prompter should he err.—They spoke to me respecting paradise and hell in a very foolish manner. There is every appearance that what they said was drawn from the Talmud. I spoke to them of the Messiah, promised in the Scriptures. They were very much surprised at what I said to them; and when I informed them that his name was Jesus, they replied to me that mention was made in the Bible of a holy man named Jesus, who was the son of Sirach, but they knew not the Jesus of whom I spake to them.⁵⁴

Syle’s report centred on the pamphlet prefaced by the Anglican Bishop of Victoria, Hong Kong, the Rt. Rev. George Smith and published by the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews mentioned above.⁵⁵ In 1816 the Society had published reports on the existence of the Kaifeng community, based on the earlier reports of Catholic missionaries.⁵⁶ There is also a report that a year earlier:

Some Jews of London had had dispatched a letter in Hebrew for this synagogue. It was conveyed thence by a travelling bookseller of the Ho-nan province. He delivered it at Kae-fung-foo, to a person whom he found to understand the letter perfectly, and who promised to answer it in a few days, but the bearer taking alarm at a rumour of civil war, left the place without waiting for the reply.⁵⁷

The Chief Rabbi of London, Dr. Marcus Adler stated:

I found among the MSS. in the British Museum an elaborate letter written in elegant Hebrew by the Raham Isaac, the son of the well-known David Nieto, dated Adar I, 5,520, that is the year 1760, in which, in the name of the London Jewish Community, he affectioately addressed his brethren dwelling in the furthest East, and implores them to tell him as to their condition and their origin. He subjoins a list of questions which he asks them to answer. Appended to this document is a letter, unsigned, addressed by the writer at the request of his friend, Mr. David Salamons, to a member of the, East India Company, asking him for his good offices in getting the letter delivered to the Jewish community in China.

My brother, Elkan Adler, has called my attention to a book written originally in Hebrew by a Morocco Rabbi—Moses Edrehi by name—which was translated into English and published in 1836. Nieto's letter is given in full, and Edrehi states "an answer to the letter was received, and it was couched in the Chinese and Hebrew languages." The original was placed in the museum at the India House. Edrehi says he could not find it. I regret to say I have had no better success.⁵⁸

In his introduction to the report published by the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews, Bishop Smith stated that after enquiries among the expatriate community in China there was:

No intelligence whatever could be procured respecting even the existence of any native Jews in China at the present time. So far as we known, not a single native Jew has ever been met with by any Protestant Missionaries, or other foreigners now resident in China.⁵⁹

---

54 The Chinese Repository, Vol III No 4, August 1834-1835, p 172, citing Le Gobine.
58 Adler 1900, p. 31.
59 Smith 1851, p. vi.
The two Chinese Protestants actively distributed Christian tracts in the various towns and villages through which they passed on their long journey (twenty-five days). The two men carried a letter from Mr. Temple Layton, the British Consul at Xiamen [Amoy] instigated by James Finn, a member of the SPCJ, seeking to buy some of the Kaifeng Hebrew manuscripts. The Chinese Protestant agents found a community illiterate in Hebrew that had been without a Rabbi for 50 years—a circumstance repeated in almost every subsequent report. The fact that there was a rabbi suggests that the community did maintain, however inadequately, some links with other Jews in China if not beyond but by the beginning of the 19th century even this vague connection had gone and they were without a teacher or ritual leader, Jewish observances progressively declined. Even the basic rite of circumcision had weakened yet somehow the issue of Jewish identity had endured as it had done for nearly a thousand years.

Layton ... turned up a Chinese Moslem soldier from Kaifeng, who gave a fairly detailed report of the Jews in his native city, whose numbers he estimated at about one thousand. Layton's further inquiries during that year and the next produced no additional intelligence: 'Money alone will obtain information', he reported, 'and perhaps Sir Moses Montefiore or some wealthy Hebrew will pay it.' Layton died at his post in China in 1850, but in June of the following year his widow in London finally had word of a reply received at Amoy from the Jews of Kaifeng, an answer to Finn's letter, which had been brought to the interior by a fur merchant. Mrs. Layton herself expressed the fascination for the Chinese Jews which she shared with her husband, and noted that nothing 'from my childhood has ever possessed such an interest to me as God's wonderful dealings with this strange people, to-day as of old time.' The letter itself, the first to be received in Europe from that long-lost corner of Israel in Kaifeng, was written in Chinese and dated 20 August 1850.

The full text of the letter sent to Layton is as follows:

Translation of Chinese letter from the Jews in Kae-fung-foo, addressed to Mr Consul Layton of Amoy.

(On the Envelope).

"The inclosed letter to be delivered to His Worship Mr Layton, H.B.M. Consul at Amoy, in the province of Fuh-kien, for transmission to the chief teacher of the Jewish religion.

"Year, Kang-siu seventh month, thirteenth day. Sent from the street Siao-kiai’

"On the 23d of the month of the year Kang siuh (1850), we received your valued letter, and acquainted ourselves with its contents.

"In reply to the inquiries which you therein make, we have to state, that during the past forty or fifty years, our religion has been but imperfectly transmitted, and although its canonical writings are still extant, there are none who understand so much as one word of them. It happens only that there yet

60 Smith 1851, pp 2-3 ff.
62 This man died in 1810. His name or title may have been "Zhanijiao." Berg 2000. Footnote 9. Whether he was a rabbi in any modern sense is unclear. What does seem clear is that this man was the last to have a good command of written Hebrew. Milne op cit p. 407 said that his title was Mullah, possibly a status relationship to Islamic religious leaders.
63 Smith 1851, pp viii-ix. The Journal of Kiu suggests that circumcision was still practiced as a cultural rather than religious rite. (p. xii). Martin 1866 is reported by Perlman that circumcision was no longer practiced. North China Herald, 2 January 1909, pp 35-38.
64 James Finn was a British official who served in the British Consular system. He was an evangelical Christian and a member of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews. Online at — http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Finn
survives an aged female of more than seventy years, who retains in her recollection the principal tenets of the faith.

“Morning and night, with tears in our eyes and with offerings of incense, do we implore that our religion may again flourish. We have everywhere sought about, but could find none who understood the letters of the Great Country, and this has occasioned us deep sorrow. But now the unexpected arrival of your letter fills us with happiness. We heard that a letter had last year been received by one Tie, from a country of the Western Ocean (Europe), but this to our regret we never got a sight of. However, the receipt of your present letter assures us that the holy religion (Shing-kiao) contains still a germ of vitality, and that in the great English nation the history of its origin has not been lost. If it shall be possible again to erect our temple, it will give joy not only to our own community but likewise the holy men of Tien-chuh [reference to India] will rejoice exceedingly. It will be needful, meanwhile, that the proceedings with a view to this end be conducted prudently and with caution.

"Our temple in this place has long been without ministers; the four walls of its principal hall are greatly dilapidated, and the compartments of the hall of the holy men are in ruins. The water chamber (bath) [Hebrew mikvah] and the treasury are in ruins likewise. Through the whole day have tears been in our eyes, and grief at our hearts, at the sight of such things. It has been our desire to repair the temple, and again to procure ministers to serve in it; but poverty prevented us, and our desire was vain. Daily with tears have we called on the Holy Name. If we could again procure ministers, and could put in order our temple, our religion would have a firm support for the future, and its sacred documents would have a secure repository. This it needs no divination to be assured of.

"In our community the family of Chao has produced the men who have been most distinguished, who have held offices in the government, been eminent in the arts, and enjoyed the imperial confidence. One of its members in former times, Chao-yong-ko, was an intendant in the province of Yun-nan, and another, Chao-yang-shing, was a General in the province of Che-kiang. " This is with the salutation of CHAO-NIEN-TSU.

Chao listed the names of the men who were at the centre of disposing of what was left of the synagogue and other items.

Chang-ching, Kao-my-fung and Kaokin-in [brothers]; Si-Sao-li and Chao-nin-tuh, have mortgaged part of the building. Those who have pulled them down to sell are — Kao-poan, Kao-Siao-tuh and Chao-ta-kiao.

Finn analyzed the principal observances described in Chao’s supplement and confirmed that many, although not all, paralleled Jewish observances in Europe.

Chao’s frank assessment of the poverty of the community and the disposal of its assets by some of his own clansmen was accepted as accurate by every foreign observer, some of whom had first-hand experience of Kaifeng. Bishop Schereschewsky wrote to the Rev. Henry Blodgett, a colleague in Beijing in 1867 that:

They have entirely lost their religion and are scarcely distinguishable in any way from the heathen. They have idols in their houses, and ancestral tablets. One has become a Buddhist priest. They intermarry with the natives and have ceased to practice the rite of circumcision. In features, dress,

66 Milne 1853, p. 406 and Finn 1872, op cit, p. 67 explain that it was the Kaifeng practice for men and women to wash their bodies before entering the synagogue. This practice was apparently different to other Jewish communities where persons needed to regain ritual purity. At Kaifeng, it appears that ritual impurity was regarded as the permanent condition of all the Jews as a result of their assimilation with the wider Chinese community. The Mikvah at Kaifeng were connected to the groundwater well that still exists in the hospital that now occupies the site of the synagogue.

67 Finn 1872, op cit, pp 39-41. Chao added additional notes describing the festivals still observed by the Kaifeng Jews.

68 Ibid, p. 44.

habits, religion, they are essentially Chinese. … They cannot read the law, although the manuscripts are still in their possession. … It is not known that they have ever had any religious works in the Chinese language.  

Although dated 1850 the letter in response to Layton did not reach England until April 1870 and was widely disregarded as Smith’s report of the two Chinese Christians visit to Kaifeng published in 1851 had been disseminated throughout the English speaking world.

A Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jewish Synagogue at Kaifung foo, on behalf of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews.  

This interesting account is written by the two Chinese who were sent from Shanghai in November last to the capital of Honan to learn what is the present condition and numbers of the Jewish community residing there, and to induce some of them to visit Shanghai. The narrative is preceded by an introduction by the Bishop of Victoria, from which we learn that the undertaking was set on foot by the Committee in London for promoting Christianity among the Jews, to whom funds had been left by Miss Cook for the purpose of prosecuting such an inquiry. Bishop Smith’s kind assistance was engaged by the Committee before he left England to cooperate in their attempts to carry out this truly philanthropic design, and on his reaching China he set on foot some inquiries, which resulted in ascertaining that no foreigner in late times has ever met a Chinese Jew; he then, in conjunction with Rev. Dr. Medhurst, planned the scheme of dispatching two trustworthy Chinese to Honan to learn all they could of the Jews. One of these, named K’iu T’ien-sang, had long been in the employ of Dr. M., and his journal affords good evidence that he had been taught to observe things with an intelligent eye. The other, Tsiang Yungchi, is a native Chinese Christian, who has been employed as a teacher in Shanghai. An introductory letter in Hebrew addressed to the Jews was furnished them by a Jewish merchant in Shanghai, and proved very useful. The general results of this mission to this secluded community—one to whom the words of Isaiah were found literally applicable, “a nation scattered and peeled”—were satisfactory, so far as collecting more precise information of their present state went…

On their second visit to Kaifeng in 1850 the two Chinese Protestant agents purchased six scrolls of the Torah for 400 taels of silver as well as an assortment of other documents. These purchases demonstrate the primary interest of the SPCJ and the foreign missionaries in Shanghai in obtaining ancient and authentic biblical resources.

The Five Books of Moses in China.

The two Chinese travellers, K’hew-t’heen-sang, and Tseang-young-che, who formerly visited K’hae-fung-foo, have paid that city a second visit, and returned. They embarked on the 20th of July, having been absent two months. Their object in going was to obtain the rolls of the law, and to bring away some of the Jews, in both of which they have been completely successful. Some difficulty was at first experienced, when they announced their object to the assembled Israelites in K’hae-fung-foo; a part of them being favorable thereto, and the rest averse. A fortnight was spent in deliberations, during which time our travellers gradually won more of the professors of Judaism over to their side. Lest they should think, however, that strangers wished to obtain their records for nothing, they were willing to pay a suitable price for what they received. This reasoning gradually prevailed; at first they brought a few of the miscellaneous portions of the Law, written in separate pamphlets, similar to those which had been previously procured. These amounting

70 Muller 1937, p. 72.
72 K’iu was the younger of the two men and wrote good English. He was from Medhurst’s London Missionary Society mission school in Batavia, Indonesia and was working as a printer in LMS mission in Shanghai. Tsiang was a Chinese literary graduate who was employed as a teacher of Chino a missionary in Shanghai.
74 Smith 1851, p. xii.
to several tens, will probably make up altogether a considerable part of the five books of Moses. There is among them, also, a chronicle of three or four Jewish families, with the names written both in Chinese and Hebrew. Unfortunately this is without dates, otherwise it would have been a valuable historical document. After some delay, and debating about the price of the rolls, one was at length brought to the inn where the travellers lodged, but in a very decayed condition. This was objected to, on account of its apparent incompleteness; but the Jews said, the roll in question was more ancient than the rest, and that its decayed state was to be ascribed to its having been immersed in the flood which occurred in their city two or three hundred years ago. At length a meeting of all the professors was held in the synagogue, amounting to several hundreds, when it was decided that more rolls should be given; and five additional ones, in a good state of preservation, were handed over in the presence of all, and the sum agreed for paid. On examining the six rolls now brought, they are found each one to contain a complete copy of the five books of Moses (excepting the one first brought which is defective), some more ancient, and others more fresh in their appearance. They are all beautifully written, without points or marks for divisions, on white sheep skins, cut square and sewed together, about 20 or 30 yards long, and rolled on sticks. They are for the present to be seen at the house of the Rev. W. H. Medhurst, and will, when good opportunities offer, be successively forwarded to the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, through the Bishop of Victoria, to be ultimately deposited in the British Museum, where a number of ancient copies of the Scriptures already lie.— *The North China Herald.*

The Jewish community in Kaifeng originated in ancient trading links between China and the West although it is unclear whether these routes were by land, the ancient “Silk Route” or by sea from India originating in Jewish communities in Mesopotamia. Laufer, and many others, favour the arrival by sea, and possibly arrival in many small groups over a period of years. He states:

Ying-tou. Two facts are conspicuous in the history of the Chinese Jews: they hailed from Persia and India and reached China by way of the sea. The historical portion of the earliest inscription of 1489 points to India (T’ien-chu) as the country from which the Jews had started on their way to China—seventy families, bringing cotton goods of the Western countries as tribute to the court of the Sung and settling at Pien-liang (the older name for K’ai-fung). No date for this event is fixed, nor is the name of the Sung emperor given. All that can be safely asserted is that the first settlement of Jews in the Sung capital took place between the years 960 and 1126 when the city was conquered by the Jurchi and the capital was removed to Hang-chou.

Peculiar stories about Jews in China appeared occasionally, including a fantasy in a Kentucky newspaper during the Civil War. It seems to be a distorted report about the Taiping rebels, rather than an accurate account of Chinese Jews. It ends with an odd reference to synagogues in Europe.
The Kaifeng synagogue was built early in the 12th century (c1163-5), repaired after flooding (c1488-1506), and finally destroyed in the mid 19th century. There is a suggestion that the prosperity of the community declined as the overland silk route was replaced by direct European shipping initiated by the Portuguese but this must be balanced against the view above that Jews were familiar with the seaports of China.79 The synagogue site was sold in 1914 to the Anglican Diocese of Henan and is now a hospital.80 Parts of the building and its internal furnishings were sold and some are now reputedly incorporated in a Confucian temple and a mosque.81 The North China Herald described the abject poverty of the small Jewish population, the ruinous state of the synagogue building and hence the desire, by whomever had possession, to sell artefacts including the Hebrew scrolls that none of the community could read.

Seven Kaifeng Jewish families or clan names have been identified—Ai (艾—Ezra), Shi (石—Shimon), Gao (高 Cohon), Jin (金—Gilbert), Li (李—Levy), Zhang (張—Joshua), and Zhao (趙—Jonathan).82 The register of names lists 453 males in the clans above, possibly representing 200 families. The largest clan, with 109 males listed, was Li (李). Kao-Gao (76), Chao-Zhao (74), Chang-Zhang (73), Ai (56), Kin-Jin (42), Shi (23). 259 female names are listed, mostly under clan names.

---

78 Bulletin, Maysville, Kentucky, 5 May 1864. From the Jewish Record, 14 November 1862 (Finn 1872, p. 96). Apparently published in Albany NY.
79 Review of Tobar SJ, Inscriptions Juives de Kaifongfou in North China Herald, 11 April 1900, p. 634.
The Leaders of the Community, from the Chinese-Hebrew Memorial Book. 83

Paris, Bibliothèque National.

Members of Kaifeng Synagogue, 14th century.

83 Hebrew Union College, Cincinatti, has a collection of Kaifeng mss purchased in 1920, including a prayer book containing a list of members from the 14th century. The list is in Chinese and Hebrew.
Many of the women were not Jews by birth and, given the decline in Jewish observances, it seems unlikely they went through the traditional mode of conversion to Judaism by baptism. No children were listed. The total number of male and female adults was 712 with perhaps 300 or so children. The 1850 Protestant visitors estimated the total Jewish population as around 200 people. A 1903 letter suggests that there were about 50 families and perhaps still some 200 people who considered themselves Jews. Berg observes that the contemporary Kaifeng Jews consider themselves Jews because they have maintained a tradition of being Jews who never became Muslims, Buddhists or Christians. He also noted that there were about 140 families with six of the traditional Jewish surnames—totaling perhaps 200 people or slightly less. The Chinese authorities do not recognize them as Jewish but encourage the economic benefits of foreign Jewish tourism.

There were Jewish communities at Hangchow [Yangzhou], reputedly larger than Kaifeng, Guangzhou, Xi’an, Ningxia, Qangzhou, Nankin, Beijing, Ningbo and elsewhere but there is detailed information only on Kaifeng. The Jews of Ningbo sent one or two scrolls to Kaifeng.

---

84 Laufer, 1930, op cit, p 189.
85 Laufer 1930, p. 194-196.
87 Adler 1900, p. 19. Berthel E. M. “Chinese Hebrews”, North China Herald, 1924 p 305 states that the synagogue at Hangchow was larger than that of Kaifeng. It was destroyed c1860 by Taiping rebels and not rebuilt.
88 The last four Jewish families in Nankin adopted Islam in the 17th century, “they being the last of their race…” Finn 1843, p. 7.
89 Xu 2003, pp154-165. See Berthel, E. M. “Chinese Hebrews”, North China Herald, 1924 p 305 for a mention of
indicating that the two Jewish communities knew of the other s.\textsuperscript{90}

The city of Kaifeng, located approximately 300 miles from Beijing, contains the remnants of a Jewish community which flourished in the city from about the ninth to the seventeenth centuries, and which continued to be identifiable Jewish until the 1840s. The origins of the community are unclear, although they appear to be derived from an invitation extended by a Sung Dynasty emperor to a group of Jews to settle and manufacture cotton fabrics in Kaifeng, which at that time was the imperial capital. Approximately 1000 Jews responded as a group and formed a community, which reached its peak in the Middle Ages, when Jews from Western and Southern Asia (principally Iran, Afghanistan and India of today) were actively involved in the China trade. They settled in at least six other cities throughout China, including Beijing in the seventeenth century. Of those communities, only Kaifeng Jewry flourished sufficiently to survive for a millennium, preserving some traces of their Jewishness until their synagogue was destroyed by an earthquake in the 1840s and the last of them assimilated. The only remnants of the community today are a knowledge of the site of the synagogue, upon which another building now stands; a stele\textsuperscript{91} from the Middle Ages with inscriptions of major events in the history of the community carved into it, but no longer legible; and a practice, still preserved by some, of avoiding the eating of pork.\textsuperscript{92}

The Jesuit reports provide a description of the Kaifeng synagogue buildings in the early and middle part of the 18th century. By the 1850s there were only ruins of a once grand complex.

The architecture of this synagogue building was that of a typical Confucian shrine… the building contained a number of synagogue specific features—a Chair of Moses, from which (atypically) the Torah was read; several inscriptions containing the words of the Shema… a bowl for ritual hand-washing; a Holy Ark containing the Torah scrolls\textsuperscript{93}; and bookcases for copies of Scripture and prayer-books… The structure also contained, at its front, tablets and incense bowls where ancestors like Abraham could be paid worship and patrons offered homage.\textsuperscript{94} As Steinhardt writes “If one were to remove the Chair of Moses and replace it with a Confucian tablet and substitute Chinese inscriptions for Hebrew, the interior space becomes that of a Chinese hall.”\textsuperscript{95}

\textbf{An Ark of the Covenant, Istanbul, Turkey.}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{ark_of_covenant.png}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{90} Leslie 1967, p. 354. See also Review of Tobar SJ, Inscriptions Juives de Kaifongfou in North China Herald, 11 April 1900, p. 634.

\textsuperscript{91} Chang Hisang-wen (Chung An) op cit.

\textsuperscript{92} Elazar, Daniel J., “Are There Really Jews in China?” Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, Daniel Elazar Papers Index.

\textsuperscript{93} The Holy Ark (Aron Kodesh) in the Ashkenazi Synagogue, Istanbul, Turkey, Online at — http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Torah#Ritual_use

\textsuperscript{94} Ancestor worship at Kaifeng is discussed in Katz, Nathan, The Judaisms of Kaifeng and Cochin” Parallel and Divergent,” pp 118-140 in \textit{Numen}, Vol 42 Fasc 2, May 1995, pp 126 ff. There is no indication that Kaifeng Jews actually worshipped their ancestors in the same way as other Jews. In having tablets to honour the Emperor and donors to the synagogue they were respecting the values of the wider Chinese society. An example of a donor scroll is Sassoon, David S. D., Inscriptions in the Synagogue in Kai-Fung-Foo,” \textit{Jewish Quarterly Review}, New Series, Vol 11 No 2, October 1920.

Sketch of the Temple Buildings at Kai-fung-foo. 96

The site covered a space of from three to four hundred feet by 150 feet, and there were four courts proceeding from east to west. The synagogue proper faced west, the direction in which Jerusalem lay. In the centre of the first court there stood a large triumphal arch, called Pai-leou, adorned with a Chinese inscription recording its dedication to the Creator and Preserver of all. There were bath-houses and water-chambers in the precincts of this court. The second court was entered by a great gate (only opened on great occasions), and by side doors. The walls were flanked north and south by dwelling-houses for care-takers and keepers. The third court had in its centre a small triumphal arch, flanked on each side by pavilions in which were enshrined two of the engraved stone tablets of which I have already given an account. On the south side of this court was a commemorative chapel in memory of a Jewish mandarin, Tchao, a mandarin of the second degree, who rebuilt the synagogue after its destruction by fire. And on the north side there was another chapel in memory of one who erected the edifice then standing. There were also reception-rooms for guests. The fourth court was divided by a long avenue of trees. Halfway stood a great brazen vase of incense, on each side of which there was a brazen vase containing flowers, and a marble lion upon a pedestal. Adjoining the northern wall was a recess in which the nerves and sinews of the animals slain for food were extracted. Some importance seems to have been attached to this rite, and up to the present time the Jewish community are known under the name of "Teaou-kin-keaou," the sect "that pluck out the sinews." In the second division of the court was the hall of ancestors (Tsoo-tang). Here were venerated—probably at the high festivals in the spring and autumn—the Patriarchs of Old Testament history after the Chinese manner. The name of each was recorded on a tablet; there were no pictures; to each of them was assigned a censer for incense, the largest being for Abraham, others for the other patriarchs, Moses, Aaron, Joshua and Ezra. Then there was an open place where they put up every year, on the Feast of Tabernacles, a booth covered with boughs and ornamented with flowers.

The synagogue proper was a building sixty feet by forty feet, to which access was gained by a portico with a double row of four columns. The handsome roof was supported by columns in the usual style of Chinese domestic architecture.

Model of the Holy of Holies at Kaifeng Synagogue.

This appears to be the buildings at the back, or top, of the preceding drawing of Diaspora Museum, Tel Aviv, Israel.
2. Interior view of the K'ai-fêng synagogue

In the centre of the building was the so-called chair of Moses, corresponding, I presume, to our platform, the Almemar; it was a grand seat or pulpit with an embroidered cushion, on which the scrolls of the Law were laid when opened for reading.

The Kaifeng “Chair of Moses.”

Domenge 1722.

In this original sketch the attendants have bare feet—a custom unique to Kaifeng Jews.

In front of this pulpit was a tablet on which the name of the emperor was emblazoned in golden letters with a prayer that he might live ten thousand myriads of years. From the dome above were suspended the words in Hebrew—"Hear, 0 Israel, the Lord our God I The Lord is one," and other appropriate quotations in Hebrew.

Shema Yisrael

On a large table by the door stood six candelabra, a vase for incense, and a tablet recording the acts of kindness of the emperors of the Ming dynasty, who had directed the burning of the incense.

At the western extremity of the building, on an elevation, was the so-called Teen-lang—the House of Heaven, or Bethel, as the Jesuits call it, to which access was gained by steps on both sides. Here the ministering Rabbi and priests only were allowed to enter. In the Teen-lang were

97 In his report of his visit to Kaifeng in 1849, K’iu T’ien-sang noted that the rabbi wore a blue headdress and blue shoes but no other men wore shoes. Finn 1872, p. 67.
98 Shema Yisrael, from Deuteronomy Ch 6 v 4. Repeated twice daily by observant Jews.
placed the thirteen scrolls of the Law, each in a separate case, and enclosed in silk curtains.\(^{100}\) The scroll in the middle was the one most venerated, and it would appear that the other ten or all the twelve were merely copies or transcribed from the venerated one in the middle.\(^{101}\) At the western end of the building two tablets were conspicuous; they were inscribed with the Ten Commandments in golden letters. The synagogue was known in Chinese as the "Li-pai-se," meaning the weekly meeting-house, because the principal meeting was held on the Sabbath Day.\(^{102}\)

**Artist’s Impression of the Interior of the Kaifeng Synagogue c1827.**\(^{103}\)

---

100 The Old Testament scrolls were described as being 30 feet in length by 203 in breadth. Smith op cit, p. x.
101 Finn 1843, p. 28.
102 A scholarly and detailed discussion of specific Jewish observances at Kaifeng is Simons, Chaim. *Jewish Religious Observance by the Jews at Kaifeng China.* Online book at — [http://chaimsimons.net/Kaifeng.pdf](http://chaimsimons.net/Kaifeng.pdf)


The dark structure at the rear of the room may be the Holy Ark where the Torah scrolls were kept.
Father Domengo describes fully the visit he paid to the synagogue on Saturday, October 3, 1722. It happened that this was the eighth day of the festival of Tabernacles, and the visitor comments upon the fact that the portion of the Law that was read upon that day was not the festival portion, but the Song of Moses, Deut. xxxi-xxii. The following day was the Rejoicing of the Law; which the congregants celebrated, as we do, by making circuits with the scrolls around the synagogue.

As in most Eastern countries, worshippers used to take off their shoes when they entered the house of God, and they put on a blue head-dress in contradistinction to the Mohammedans in China, who used a white head-dress. Whilst reciting the Law the reader covered his face with a transparent veil of gauze, and wore a red silk scarf dependent from the right shoulder and tied under the left arm; by his side stood a monitor to correct him if necessary. The Hebrew books were kept in repositories at the synagogue, and they were rarely allowed to be taken home. This may account for the ignorance of their literature shown by the Chinese Jews. The missionaries give full information as to the mode in which the Jews pronounced the-Hebrew. The calendar and the mode in which the festivals were fixed were identical with our own, and resemble in many respects the calendar of the Chinese themselves, who, like the Jews, regulate the year by the moon, the ordinary year consisting of twelve lunar months, every second or third year being a leap year consisting of thirteen months. The Sabbath they observed with great strictness; the food was prepared on the day preceding. Their customs and observances accorded entirely with those of the Rabbinitic Jews of the present day with the one exception that they regarded the New Moon as a festival.  

Scholars report that there were 13 Torah scrolls; two scrolls on the observance of the Passover; prayer books and many other Hebrew documents showing evidence of Persian-Jewish origin.

The Protestant rediscovery of Kaifeng Jewry resulted the purchase of several of the surviving scrolls and the accompanying publicity in Shanghai stimulated the expatriate Jewish community to offer, nominally, assistance with a teacher or removal to Shanghai. Part of the letter declared:

We address you, brethren in faith, having heard that in days gone by you had a synagogue at Kai-fung-foo, and ministers who taught you the ordinances and laws, how to worship the Lord God of Israel. We now learn that your House of Worship is destroyed, and that you have no Rabbi or teacher to instruct you and show you…the law of Moses… We are told you have forgotten everything, and have gone so far as, three or four months ago, to have sold a scroll of the Law, which our own eyes have seen in the hands of those that are not of the seed of Israel. And we are further told that you are about to dispose of three or four more scrolls because you are in dire distress, and urge as your excuse that you and your children cannot read.

Chinese official records say little about the Jewish communities in China and there may be only a single verifiable Chinese Jewish item. Most of what is known, or presumed to be known, comes from stone tablets that survived the destruction of the synagogue.

104 Adler 1900, pp 25-30.
105 A Kaifeng resident who studied Judaism in Israel stated: “Of the 13 Torah scrolls the community once had, none remain in Kaifeng. Ten were sold to Western collectors … and three were lost entirely.” Hellman, Avi, Jerusalem Post, 25 October 2010, p. 28.
106 The most detailed account of Kaifeng scrolls (notes in Hebrew) is Neubauer, A, “Jews in China,” pp 123-139 in The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol 8 No 1, October 1895. For an English language discussion of the scrolls see Finn 1843, pp 28-49.
Lowenthal wrote:

In April 1901 a Kaifeng Jew went with his son to Shanghai. Another delegation of eight Jews arrived there in March 1901.\(^{110}\)

Li King-sheng was the name of the man who arrived with his son. He was about 52 years old and died in Shanghai in 1853.

Li King Sheng and his son Li Tsung-mai, c1900.

The picture below, dated 1902, appears to be a photograph of Li Tsung-mai (left), with an older Jewish boy identified only as Israel, an unusual name for a Chinese Jew:

The boy Israel with Li Tsung-mai. (Rzra 1902).

---

\(^{110}\) Lowenthal, Note 27, p. 266.
Li King-sheng wrote a letter to the Rescue Society describing the situation in Kaifeng at the beginning of the 20th century.

At that time there were about 50 families in existence of the names Kao, Li, Chao, Shi, Kin, and Chang, numbering about 250 souls. None of them, he said, could write or read Hebrew; none observed the Mosaic Law. The Sabbath was not kept. They were scattered about all over the city, some employed in government offices as junior assistants, others keeping small shops, and the sole distinction between them and the other Chinese being that they did not worship idols and did abstain from pork.\textsuperscript{111}

The visitors from Kaifeng were well received by the expatriate Jewish community of Shanghai, given employment and taught Hebrew and Jewish rites and customs but the educational efforts failed and the men eventually left Shanghai.\textsuperscript{112} The visitors said that there were still about 1000 Jews in Kaifeng but that they did not practice circumcision or other Jewish rites or ceremonies.\textsuperscript{113} Among the Shanghai sponsors, operating as the Shanghai Society for the Rescue of the Chinese Jews, were Messrs Lewis Moore; S. J. Solomon; D. E. Abraham; Sir Edward Sassoon, Edward Isaac Ezra\textsuperscript{114} and others.\textsuperscript{115}\textsuperscript{116} As mentioned earlier, the mass pogroms or persecutions of Jews in Eastern Europe

\textsuperscript{111} Laufer 1930, p. 196.
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{New York Times}, 3 May 1903.
\textsuperscript{113} \textit{North China Herald}, 2 January 1909, pp 35-38.
in the late 19th and early 20th centuries refocussed Jewish philanthropy to deal with much greater problems than those represented by a few Chinese Jews whose religious identity, as indicated by Li King-Sheng was in doubt.117


116 Deseret News, 23 May 1903, p. 18.

117 Laufer 1930, op cit, p. 196. There are frequent mentions of the unfolding tragedy of the anti-Semitic prejudice of 19th and 20th century Europe that culminated in the German Nazi directed Shoah or Holocaust of the 1930s and 1940s. The issue of the Jews was in almost every issue of the North China Herald as well as in the foreign press generally.