

I, 10–11 *Seventh Session of the Rabbinical Court of Fustat*

Fustat, June 14, 1098

I, 10. ULC Add. 3414, f. 1

I, 11. ULC Add. 3414, f. 2

The two sheets were originally not connected, but were (correctly) combined by the librarian.

An oath by the {with a} Torah was a very grave affair—not a mere formality, as oaths are often regarded nowadays (see Goitein, *Med. Soc.*, 2:340). Consequently, ‘lovers of peace, upright elders’ (line 13) intervened, and the two litigants agreed to take no further action until a messenger to be appointed by ‘the Jewish court of the lands of Yemen and India,’<sup>1</sup> to serve as a representative of Ḥasan b. Bundār arrived.

Two side issues were also settled. One Joseph b. Solomon al-Qudṣī (native of Jerusalem) had given Jekuthiel  $16\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{48}$  (=  $\frac{29}{48}$ ) dinars (certainly in goods) and the latter had asked Lebdi to buy merchandise for this sum in Aden. Lebdi had done so, but the goods bought (like those of Lebdi and Jekuthiel handled by Ḥasan b. Bundār) had not yet arrived. Now, al-Qudṣī undertakes to pay this sum to Lebdi, and Jekuthiel promises to pay it to al-Qudṣī immediately after the arrival of the aforementioned messenger.

Secondly, since Joseph Lebdi had made good his promise to redeem (as partial payment for indigo bought through Jekuthiel) the promissory note of  $33\frac{3}{4}$  dinars given by the latter to Abū Naṣr Maṣṣūr b. Azhar (see I, 3), the three parties no longer had any claim against each other in this matter.

<sup>1</sup> So in line 17; in verso, line 10: ‘lands of India and Yemen.’ The court had its seat in Aden. {Goitein, “From the Mediterranean,” 191 (n. 14), 195, with reference to this document, calls it the court of ‘Aden and India.’ However, lines 16–17 literally says: “until after the period, during which will arrive the messenger—who it was decided will be appointed by the court—from the lands of Yemen and Hind.” As such, the words ‘the lands of Yemen and Hind’ do not define ‘the court,’ and I am unaware of any source that confirms the existence of one court for the Jews of Yemen and India. See further, below, 200, n. 14, 557, n. 18, and 633–34. In Egypt, ‘India and Yemen’ were sometimes coupled as one large geographical unit. Mūsā b. Ṣadaqa ‘the Jewish trader’ (*al-tājir al-yahūdī*), writes in a petition to the caliph, (VI, 35, line 9) that “he has arrived from *al-Hind wal-Yaman*” with merchandise that was seized. For the geographical area which *dīyār al-Hind* designates, see above, 6–7. Margariti, “Aden,” 306, states that Maḍmūn b. Japheth (see chap. 2) bore the title *negid ‘adan wal-hind* (lit., ‘Nagid of Aden and India’), “that is supreme leader of the broader Jewish community of the Indian Ocean.” This is apparently an error. She quotes no source, nor am I familiar with one.}

I, 12 *Eighth Session of the Rabbinical Court of Fustat*

Fustat, August 18, 1098

Bodl. MS. Heb. d. 66 (Cat. 2878), fol. 66

The text of I, 13 begins on verso of this leaf.

When still nothing was heard from Aden, Jekuthiel, here described with his Hebrew title *peqīd ha-sōharīm*, representative of the merchants (line 5), and Joseph Lebdi came up with the idea of sending a man to the southern Arabian port to fetch the goods belonging to both. After much squabbling the parties retracted their proposal, which obviously was found to be impracticable. Since nothing had been achieved in this session, no signatures were attached. The session was held on a Wednesday, probably for other, more urgent cases; see I, 6–7.