

The *Talmud Yerushalmi* on Kodashim

Rabbi Yosef Gavriel Bechhofer, Editor, Or Shmuel, Rosh Kollel, Frumi
Noble Night Kollel of Hebrew Theological College.

I

It seems clear from the Rishonim that they had access to the *Talmud Yerushalmi* on Seder Kodashim. In the introduction to his commentary on the Mishnah, the Rambam states explicitly that on the first five sederim, both the *Talmud Bavli* and *Talmud Yerushalmi* are extant. During the course of time, however, the *Yerushalmi* on the entire seder of Kodashim was lost, and for several hundred years no manuscript on this seder was known to exist. (See the introduction of Rabbi Mordechai Zev Segal of Lvov to the Zhitomer [1866] edition of the *Talmud Yerushalmi*.)

In the year 1907, however, a mysterious person suddenly appeared in Hungary, calling himself Rabbi Shlomo Yehuda Algazi-Friedlander. Rabbi Algazi-Friedlander published what he claimed to be the *Yerushalmi* on tractates Chullin and Bechoros, thus instigating a battle royal amongst the *Gedolei Hador*. A personal account of this chapter in the history of the *Talmud* was written by Rabbi Yekusiel Yehuda Greenwald of Columbus, Ohio, and printed in the *Sefer Hayovel* of *HaPardes* (1953). Here is a synopsis of the story.

That year (1907), Rabbi Greenwald was learning in Chust, Hungary. One day a guest appeared in the Beis Hamidrash who made an immediate and strong impression. Yekusiel Yehuda — then a young bochur — inquired after the identity of the visitor. The whispered reply was, *He is a Sephardic rabbi who speaks only Hebrew with a Sephardic accent and does not understand Yiddish. He wears two Tefillin on his head [a prevalent practice then amongst Sephardim] and his name is Yehuda Algazi-Friedlander. He has found the single extant manuscript of the Yerushalmi on Kodashim.* Yekusiel Yehuda asked how he had accomplished this. He was told that Rabbi Algazi-Friedlander's brother had acquired it on a business trip to Izmir, Turkey. There the brother had borrowed ancient sefarim from the

estate of Rabbi Yehoshua Beneviste, the author of a commentary on the Yerushalmi called the Sde Yehoshua. Amongst Rabbi Yehoshua's sefarim was one received from a Portuguese marrano named Avraham HaLevi. Rabbi HaLevi, who had returned to the fold in Constantinople, originally purchased the manuscript from a priest in Barcelona, Spain. Rabbi Algazi-Friedlander delighted in his brother's acquisition, which he identified as the long-lost Yerushalmi on Kodashim.

After davening, the visitor approached the Rosh Yeshiva (Rabbi Moshe Greenwald). With great flourish, he produced copies of the manuscript and letters of endorsement from *Gedolei Yisrael*. He brought special attention to that of Rabbi Shalom Mordechai HaKohen of Brezhoun, one of the foremost *Talmidei Chachamim* in Hungary. He then requested a *haskama* (approbation) from the Rosh Yeshiva. Upon reviewing the evidence the Rosh Yeshiva rejected the request, stating that this was not the genuine text. After great remonstrations, the Sephardi left the Beis HaMedrash with a great show of anger.

Despite the Rosh Yeshiva's rejection, the young bochur was much impressed by the visitor, and went to visit him at his lodging place. Rabbi Algazi-Friedlander befriended the impressionable youngster. This relationship afforded Yekusiel Yehuda an intimate opportunity to later judge the authenticity of the Yerushalmi on Kodashim.

A few months later Rabbi Algazi-Friedlander printed the volume in question (the first of two). The title page proudly extolled the work and an added attraction of a commentary by the respected Rabbi Shalom Mordechai. The editor of this major contribution to Talmudic literature identified himself thus:

אנכי הצעיר במשפחת רם ונשאה אלגאזי יצ"ו שלמה יאודה ס"ט בהגאון מהר"ם ז"ל

השמרדי המכונה מרידלענדער

In some editions the second page bore a similar inscription printed in German — with the added title of *Doctor*. There Rabbi Algazi-Friedlander also thanked Dr. Solomon Schechter of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, Dr. Moses Goodman of Vienna, and Rabbi Shlomo Buber of Lvov for providing him with funding. Rabbi Buber (a pioneer in the publication of manuscripts) also wrote a preface, citing the Rishonim who mention the Yerushalmi on Kodashim. He also explained difficult passages and words. An impressive array of *haskamos* followed: Rabbi Shalom Mordechai;



Title page of the Talmud Yerushalmi on Kodashim

to Rabbeinu Tam. When Rabbi Aryeh Leib asked his aged father why had began doing so, the Chofetz Chaim replied that in the new Yerushalmi Menachos, the Gemorah ruled explicitly like Rabbeinu Tam. Rabbi Aryeh Leib was hard pressed to prove that Friedlander was a well-known forger and the Yerushalmi on Kodashim a fraudulent work.¹

Controversy first began to grow in 1908. That year, the rabbinical journal *Tel Talpioth* published articles by its own editor, Rabbi David Kotzberg, and by the head of the Agudas HaRabbanim in Hungary, Rabbi Avraham Frankel, declaring Friedlander a forger and demanding that the real Avraham Rosenberg, if there be one, step forth. Rabbi Meir Simcha HaKohen of Dvinsk (the *Or Sameach*) joined in the fray, publishing two letters demanding that the Yerushalmi on Kodashim be condemned and withdrawn.

At first, Yekusiel Yehuda joined the opposition to Friedlander, and even sent a letter to Rabbi Meir Dan Plotsky of Dwartah (the *Kli Chemdah*) describing the irregularities he had noticed and the fact that his Rosh Yeshiva, Rabbi Yehuda Greenwald of Satmar, now regretted his *haskamah*. Friedlander, however, using his tremendous powers of persuasion, was able to win Rabbi Yehuda back over to his side, and Yekusiel Yehuda together with him. They hurriedly sent emissaries who succeeded in recalling the letter before Rabbi Meir Dan could publicize it.

In the meantime, opposition mounted. Various journals published essays by respected scholars — including Rabbi Ber Rothner, author of the monumental *Ahavath Zion U'Yerushalayim* on the Yerushalmi — proving that Friedlander's work was a forgery. Although Friedlander, under his pseudonym, published a rejoinder entitled *Anei Kesil* (*Answer a fool*), he succeeded only in adding fuel to the fire, for the pamphlet carefully avoided pertinent issues and concentrated on insulting his detractors.

Other *Gedolim* joined the battle. The Ridbaz (author of a commentary on the Yerushalmi) pointed out obvious inaccuracies. The *Avnei Nezer* decreed that no one should buy the work until Friedlander produced the actual manuscript. (In the preface to the first volume, Friedlander claimed that since he had only been loaned the original manuscript, he had copied it in stenographic shorthand — incomprehensible to anyone but himself). Rabbi Yosef Rosen of Dvinsk (the *Rogatchover*), the Gerer Rebbe, and Rabbi Meir Yechiel

of Ostrovitze requested that he produce evidence of the existence of the mysterious individuals, *Yaakov Kubi* — whom Friedlander had identified as his brother's partner in the search for the manuscript and *Suleiman Beneviste* — the heir to the manuscript who supposedly loaned it (for a sizeable fee) to Friedlander's brother in Izmir. One rich individual offered a reward of ten thousand crowns to anyone who could discover the whereabouts of these mysterious people. Obviously pressure was mounting. What was the persecuted Friedlander to do?

Suddenly the word went out that Friedlander was in mourning. Yekusiel Yehuda visited him and asked him who had passed away. Friedlander replied that his *brother* Eliyahu, who had purchased the Yerushalmi, had died in Turkey. He asked Yekusiel Yehuda to write letters and publicize his sorrow and regret that, since his brother had died, it was now impossible for him to procure the information requested.

Despite the fact that Yekusiel Yehuda knew all this to be untrue, he still believed that Friedlander had actually found the bona fide Yerushalmi on Kodashim, if not in Izmir, then in some library in Germany, and that he created the exotic stories in order to embellish his find. As for those discrepancies in style found by the *Gedolim*, he rationalized that it was possible that the Yerushalmi on Kodashim was edited in a different yeshiva than the other sedarim. However, a newly published revelation would soon change his opinion.

II

As late as 1911, Rabbi Yekusiel Yehuda Greenwald still believed it possible that the Yerushalmi on Kodashim was a legitimate work. In his article *Chullin* in J. D. Eisenstein's encyclopedia *Otzar Yisrael*, published that year, Rabbi Greenwald wrote: *In our time, Rabbi Friedlander published Tractate Chullin of the Talmud Yerushalmi which he found in a manuscript. Some people dispute its authenticity.* Friedlander complained vehemently. How could Rabbi Greenwald breach the covenant of their friendship and publicize the aspersions cast upon his monumental work? Greenwald apologized and their friendship was restored.

As we have noted, Rabbi Greenwald still believed that Friedlander's Yerushalmi was genuine; it was the tale of its history that he doubted, theorizing that he had actually found it in some obscure German

library, rather than in Izmir, Turkey. He attributed differences in style and phraseology to the editors — perhaps students of a different yeshiva than the editors of the other sedarim of the Yerushalmi.

A sudden shock, however, struck all of Friedlander's friends and supporters. *Tel Talpioth* published a letter from Rabbi Tzvi Halevi Horowitz, of Hermanstadt, which cited an article from the rabbinical journal *Hamelitz* published some twenty years earlier (1892). The article proved that Friedlander, then a teacher in Klausenberg, had peddled an amulet purportedly written by the great Rabbi Yonasan Eybeshutz, while in fact he himself had written it. Eyewitnesses had heard him then relate proudly to the Rabbi of Klausenberg, Rabbi Moshe Shmuel Glazner: *I admit without shame that I did not procure any [genuine] amulet. Rather, I myself produced it with great skill and art in order to demonstrate my skill in all fields of wisdom and craft.* Not only did he possess the knowledge of Kabbalah requisite to pass off an amulet as written by Rabbi Yosanan, he even had mastered the craft of aging paper, so that a document he had himself written recently seemed almost two hundred years old.

Friedlander was broken and dejected by this revelation. In a terrible state of despair, he came to Rabbi Greenwald to seek his counsel. Rabbi Greenwald suggested that he flee Hungary; having lost his reputation and reliability, who would now believe his claims? Friedlander then made his confession. He was loathe to leave Hungary with its innocent, simple, gullible Jews who believed the story of any charlatan and trickster. Where else could he be favourably received? As to the Yerushalmi: *True, I forged it. I did not find the manuscript, but all that I wrote are the words of Chazal* which I quoted from various places.

Good friend that he was, Rabbi Greenwald at first agreed to help Friedlander cover up and refrain from revealing his confession. Ironically, however, he shortly thereafter married the daughter of Rabbi Horowitz of Hermanstadt, whose letter had proven a turning point in the controversy. Therefore, when Friedlander published a derisive rejoinder, *HaMa'aneh*, Rabbi Greenwald sent him an ultimatum — either Friedlander would publish a retraction or all would be revealed.

Friedlander declined to do so, and so Rabbi Greenwald published an essay *LeMa'an HaEmes (For the Sake of Truth)*. At the beginning of the piece he published letters from the authorities of Mulhouse,

לזכרון עולם!



הרבנים חכמים ונכונים ורשי תורה ומדע ושוחרי תורה ומדמה המתגברים בעם, ומאשר ומכספם, שהיו בעד הדפסת הירושלמי כתיי על סדר קרשים. שוכן שחקים ירוק עליהם ברכה והצלחה וכל משאלת לבם המהירה לשובה ימלא אכירי:
וכראש כולם יתברך ממקור הברכות הזה הרב הגדול בתורה בחכמה ומדע וכלל מלאכת נור נור ישראל ותפארתו:

מיה שנייאר זלמן שעכטער הי"ד

אשר נתן לכסף מוצא מאוצר כיהמ"ד להכמת ישראל העומד תחת פקדתו והשתחו

בעיר נעור - י א ר ק י צ י

די חלה גדול מהוצאות הרפום, זכרו יהי ברוך לעולמי עדי



הרב הגדול החכם הגפלא הישיש פאר ערמו נורו ותפארתו

מיה משה ריי גירעמאן הי"ד

רב ואכירי רמים ורען וזכרה

מכספו נתן מתנה הנגה למוכת ההדפסה והבשית נכ לעשת עי אחיים באשר יעוב חלק היא את מכבש הרפום לזכר עולם צירקנו עומדת לער:



ואחרון חביב עלי היה הרב הגדול הנכיר הישיש הנכבד

מיה שלמה באב ער הי"ד

אכן ימרה בקק לכוך יציה עצתו ינחני כל ימי'משך הרפום. כרע כאה השתתף בצערי ושפח כשמתו אנא ה' השקפה נא מן השמים מכן שבתך וברך אותו באריות ימים ושנים וכמים לשמת כל לו ונפש חכם בישראל, ונתוכם גם נפש הצעיר:

המחבר.

Dedication page of the Talmud Yerushalmi on Kodashim

Our text:

רבי חגיגא בעא קומי
 רבי יוסי לית הדה
 אמרה שאסור להמציא
 להן עוברין, אמר לי
 כבר קדמוך רבי אבון
 בשם רבנן גתמן זאת
 אומרת שאסור להמציא
 להן זרע.

Friedlander:

רבי חגיגא בעא קומי
 דרבי יוסי לית הדה
 אמרה שאסור להמציא
 להון עוברין, אמר לי
 כבר קדמוך רבי אבון
 בשם רבנן דתמן זאת
 את מר שאסור להמציא
 להון עוברין.

The next segment relates a *derashah* which is the source of the *halachah* that a calf born to Jewish partners is subject to the laws of Bechorah. In Friedlander's version, Rabbi Yochanan states explicitly that once we know the *derashah* that Jewish partnerships are subject to Bechorah, obviously Jewish-gentile partnerships are not, thus eliminating a problem noted by Tosafos (Bechoros 2a, *d.h. v'hamishtatef*) (as Friedlander himself points out in his commentary *Tosafos d.h. shutfus*). The last discussion on the page, as Friedlander himself notes (*Tosafos d.h. Taman*), parallels the Yerushalmi in Pesachim and Avodah Zarah.

Again and again Friedlander took *sugyos* in the Bavli, Yerushalmi, and Tosefta, and changed names, views, and statements to suit his purposes. Indeed, in his preface to the work, he himself hints at his methods. In his effort to prove the accuracy of the scribe (whom he named Yitzchok ben Yosef ibn Ilbarglioni, who, he alleged, copied the copy his father had made of Rav Hai Gaon's text in the year 1212), he contrasts parallel texts from the Yerushalmi, demonstrating how the new version excludes the errors of Terumos, and includes the omissions in Nazir. He continues to cite examples of places where the Yerushalmi on Kodashim *rectifies* errors in the other sedarim, and concludes: *Behold, I only noted several pages which come to mind first, but you, the reader, take in hand Tractate Bechoros, carefully examine every page and you will find wonders, for at times we are enlightened by this Yerushalmi in other places which are unintelligible.* (Rabbi Shalom Mordechai HaKohen of Brezhon was indeed obviously taken by this characteristic of the Yerushalmi on Kodashim. The commentary which he was inspired to write deals with numerous problems and issues that Friedlander's work resolved — whether in the Bavli and Yerushalmi or in the *Rishonim* and *Poskim* — probably in more places than Friedlander himself had realized!).

It is worthwhile to note that according to an unverified legend related in the Yeshiva world, Friedlander's creativity was flawed. The legend maintains that Rabbi Yosef Rosen (the Rogatchover), one of the greatest masters of Talmudic knowledge of all time, realized that the work was a forgery because he had noticed that each tractate in the Talmud contains the name of at least one *Amora* who is never mentioned anywhere else. In his care not to raise doubts as to the work's legitimacy, it seems that Friedlander only used the names of known *Amora'im*!

Although Rabbi Greenwald left the field of battle over the Yerushalmi in 1912, when he was drafted into the Hungarian army, it seems that by that time the war had been more or less won. The publications we mentioned and others by renowned scholars and *Gedolim* had turned the tide against the beleaguered Friedlander. Eisenstein, in the last volume of *Otzar Yisrael*, published that year, in the entry on *Talmud* declares that it was conclusively proven that the Yerushalmi on Kodashim was just a compilation of various other sources concerning these tractates. (He — rather insolently — compared it to the work of Rabbi Gershon Chanoch Leiner of Radzhin on the Mishnayos Taharos, who had compiled the extant Gemaros on Keilim and Ohalos and had written a learned dual commentary on them. Some years earlier, that work — the *Sidrei Taharah* — had stirred controversy when some *Gedolim* opposed the format in which it had been printed, that of the standard Talmud, lest it be mistaken for, and accorded the authority of, actual tractates of Gemara).

Yet, after all is said and done, Friedlander remains an enigma. He was a prolific writer and publisher, all of whose works are suspect. Yet he was obviously a *Talmid Chacham* of the first degree — to the extent that *Gedolei Hador* were amazingly expansive and emphatic in their praise of his scholarship and knowledge.

Little of his personal life is known. He was born in Beshnekovitz in 1860 and died in 1923 in Vienna. He probably learned in the great Yeshiva of Volozhin in his youth, and then wandered from town to town. We have no notion of what drove him to commit these acts of forgery and deceit. Was it a quest for money or honor, was it jealousy, or was it a private campaign to mock other *Talmidei Chachamim*? (The third possibility is somewhat supported by his attacks on others, both in the introductions to his work and in the pamphlets he issued).

Even later, Friedlander still had his supporters. In 1930 his son Meir printed his *Mavoh LaTosefta*, an introduction to his magnum

הסכמות

נתכבדת במוך דען זכבד מאד
 נעלה דיה כבוד הרב הנאון
 הגדול סרע דמהולל מאד בכל קצו
 ארץ מרה שלמה יהוד פריעלענדער
 נ"י שבא לנאן להפיק ארז ספרו
 הקדוש והראה לי את ספרו חשק
 שלמה אשר מעל ועשה על כל שם
 דהוספא דכולל הנחת פירוש והנה
 תל דערזי לא בא עז כבושם הנה
 זכר יקר ונתיין בספרו דור כבוד
 והלמלא לא ראינו לא האמנו כי יעלה
 ביד היה יתיר לפקול כזה להגיד את
 כל השם דהוספא המשובש מאד
 עמי רב החסר שהיה לפניו לבואר
 ולפרש באר היטיב בעין הרעב והרש
 על המשנה שבנצח לזה עין רב ושקדה
 עזומה אין דוגמתו כלל כן אנקש את
 דרכים הדריבים הנכל איתר ואיתר
 לעמוד ליפין הדמסה בכל מה דאפשר
 כי היום אשר יתל שם דהוספא עם
 פירוש חשק שלמה דביל ימא
 הא מנא לרבנן כהיום אשר יל השם
 משנה בפנים ראשונה עם הרעב והרש
 עי הנאון בעל תריש דל בשנת שעזר

שבת אצלו היה הרב הנאון הגדול אחד
 המיוחד מנהלי חובנים שבדורנו
 מרה שלמה יהודי על. חיש
 דרש מה כבודנים דקארלין ופינסק
 ושפתים ישק וברוך וכן שברו מה
 הראה לי את סלאכתו סלאכת הקדוש
 פירוש חשק שלמה על כל שם
 דהוספא סוגית בתכלית ודגה המפורשת
 כפירוש הנינו קצו קל בעין הרעב
 וחויש תל וברנתי ברין שככה לו בעולמו
 ונקטו אני ארז הרב הנאון הניל כי
 וזה לוח כי התק הוצאת שם דהוספא
 סוגית המפורשת כהיום משנה דיי מרגש
 כמסרות דרכיות זה כמה מאות שנה.
 אוקדו כי כאשר יתל אידת דרשים
 דהוספא עם פירוש חשק שלמה
 דביל דרנבה הרעת הרנבנה והבו
 ישראל ישקו על דלתי שם דהוספא
 כמו ששוקדים על דלתי שם משני אותה
 כן אקוה ואנקש ואתלה לאחיי אחיי
 חתה ושוחרי מוסה שיטתו בכל כולם
 להספא דבר גדול וקדוש כזה אשר
 לא בא עז כבושם דיה בספרות
 דרבנות מאות שנה.

הגני חתם בכרס כתיב נ בשבת
 לסדר נה הרעב למה ברעוון יקא.

ולא כה דברי המדבר לכבוד האורה
 לא סנסקקאלין ד חוכה חרעב.

הק' שלום מרדכי הכהן
 אבד רסק הניל

דוד פרידמאן
 חתה מה קק הניל

ובקרי כבוד אהונו ארסור הרב דאי נאון אבד ריש מרנבנא דיה סון
 מה איקעור דוד גרווד' בשוחוץ אליו

חתיני איש מהי כלאכתו סלאכת שבתורה הטוח הנאון הסמוס סרה שלמה
 יודא פריעלענדער ע"ה אשר הלוא הנדיל לעשות חיבה גדול
 על דהוספא אשר על ומה נה כמה שנים לעוק ולסקלה ספעוחים ושיבושים
 ולשור תורסאות דהוספא דראוה ונס עשרה בלית חן ביארים קרים ונקבו בשם
 חשק שלמה והנה כנה יצא להספא סניטין בעולם כאשר תל ירושלמי על סוד
 קדשים וקרה אשר כבר הלך לטעות קבלו ידשי לעשות לו שם ותסדילה
 בארין כדוצאות חיבר הניל על דהוספא אשר אין ספק שיתקם בשמים המצויים
 כי דרבה סרז ונען כמה שנים לשים לילת כיסים כשקדה נלואה להשלים סלאכתו
 מעשה יד אופן נלא סק חוי כמה נאוי ארץ אשר העידו עליו ועל מעשה
 חקו ונבוטו. ונה אנו התירו חוי לי שעשועים כים דאירי עוצם כקאוחו
 וקע כי הנצאות יכו מאד מאד להרסם חבור תרל כנה סהבון להיות סביע'י
 ביד הירשום כסיעת שיש נה משה להפיק את חבור הניל ולהעביל דרעה
 ולהארידה.

הביד יום ד יתרו חרסד סק סאמאר יקא.
 אליעזר דוד
 כלאמאר פנים נורד ונלחה

Hashkamos of Friedlander's last work (published ponthumously):

opus, *Cheshek Shlomo* on the Tosefta. The sefer was adorned by the *haskamos* of Rabbi David Friedman of Pinsk (the foremost scholar of pre-war Europe) given in 1912, Rabbi Shalom Mordechai HaKohen's, given in 1901, and Rabbi Eliezer David Greenwald of Satmar's from 1924, who even mentioned the fame he attained in publishing the *Yerushalmi on Kodashim*. All three *haskamos* lavish praise and esteem on הרב הגאון הגדול אחד המיוחד מגדולי הרבנים שבדורנו מ"יה שלמה יהודה פריעלענדער despite the fact that by the time they were issued the controversy had been well-publicized and all the accusations made. Obviously, Friedlander was a man of intense magnetism with a powerful force of persuasion, leaving us to ponder even more so — why did he choose this strange path?

NOTES

1. In fact, the Chafetz Chaim actually quotes the Yerushalmi on *Kodashim* in his *Likutei Halachos* (a work on Seder *Kodashim* meant to parallel the Rif's work on the other sedarim of the Talmud), in *Messechta Bechoros*, chap. 6, in his commentary *Ein Mishpat* note 50 (page 40 in the standard editions). He explains that there are difficult passages in the Rambam based on a source which is found in the *Yerushalmi on Kodashim*.

"כדאינתא בירושלמי דבכורות (שזכינו כעת לאורו)!"

2. Rabbi Yanofsky and Friedlander were old foes. In the years 1889-1893 Friedlander had published in Pressburg an edition of the Tosefta on the sedarim of *Zeraim* and *Nashim* with his commentary *Cheshek Shlomo*. In this work, he altered certain passages based on an ancient manuscript he claimed to have discovered. Rabbi Yanofsky published a pamphlet refuting these claims — to which Friedlander had replied with his own pamphlet *Kesher Bogdim (Plan of Traitors)*, a typical example of Friedlander's style with little in the way of discussion of the issues, but laden with vitriolic attacks on his adversary's person and wisdom.

Twenty years later, when Friedlander responded to Yanofsky and Rabbi Greenwald, he was true to form. The pamphlet *Letz HaYayin (Drunken Fool)* viciously attacked both Rabbi Yanofsky and Rabbi Greenwald, whom he called *a newborn chick whose eyes were not yet open*.

3. The Rogatchover's actual objections to the Yerushalmi on Kodashim are detailed in his responsa, *Tzafnas Paneach* (Jerusalem, 1979), chaps. 113- 15. (Two of those responsa are addressed to Rabbi Meir Dan Plotsky, who had sent him the Yerushalmi for him to examine.)

4. He claimed to have written on all Bavli, Yerushalmi, Tosefta and the *Sheiltos D'Rav Achai Gaon*. Most of this is unsubstantiated but it is recorded that he published *Hatikkun* in 1881 (an attack on Chassidus), part of a commentary of Yerushalmi Yevamos in Frankfurt under the name Aryeh Leib Friedlander in 1885, the aforementioned Tosefta in 1889-1890, a complete edition of the commentary on Yevamos in 1905, two volumes of the Yerushalmi on Kodashim, 1907-1909, and the volume of *Cheshek Shlomo* published posthumously.

ADDENDUM

An original copy of the Yerushalmi on Kodashim is in the collection of the Rabbi Saul Silber Library of Hebrew Theological College.