

the experiments of Jansky, Moss and Landsteiner—shows that there are only four principal types of human blood, into which all mankind may be divided. These types are known as A, B, AB and O, or as 1, 2, 3 and 4. The blood types are inherited in accordance with Mendelian principles. (Recent research revealing the existence of sub-types has not changed the basic findings of the blood group researchers.) Simple chemical tests determine what group a sample of blood belongs to, although it is impossible to tell, in the laboratory, the race of a person whose blood is under examination.

Samples of Type One blood from a Norwegian Protestant, a Spanish Catholic, an Argentine Jew and a Japanese Buddhist are identical, but the proportions of individuals having the four types of blood—the so-called blood index—varies in different geographical localities. The blood index of the Belgians, for example, differs from that of the people of Utah; in Germany there are blood index differences between the people living in the east and those in the west. The Guinea Negroes have a different index from the Australian Bushmen. But all four types of blood are found in every racial and geographical group, and no group has any blood type not found elsewhere. And, because blood index differences are due not to racial characteristics but to geographical isolation and to inbreeding, geographically separated people of the same race may have different indices, while vastly dissimilar races may have the same index.

The indices of the Jews in different localities is not constant. In the eastern and western sections of Germany, the indices of the Jews resembled those of the neighboring non-Jews, not each other. In the Balkans the indices of the Jews vary considerably from place to place, in each case tending to correspond to the indices of the several Balkan peoples. The slight differences in the blood indices of Jews and non-Jews living in the same district are due chiefly to the tendency of the two groups not to intermarry.

Blood transfusion is performed after matching individuals' blood according to rules discovered by Landsteiner and others. Since the blood of Jews falls into the customary four types and is no different in chemical composition from other blood, transfusions are performed between Jews and non-Jews, as between any other individuals. This process has been repeated thousands of times in the regular hospital practice in New York city and elsewhere.

MAXWELL J. MACKBY, M.D.

Lit.: Wiener, Alexander S., *Blood Groups and Blood Transfusion* (2nd ed., 1939) 203 et seq.; Schiff, Fritz, *Jüdische Familienforschung* (1926); idem, *Die Blutgruppen und ihre Anwendungsgebiete* (1933) 229 et seq.; Zimmerman, Leo M., and Howell, K. M., "History of Blood Transfusion," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, New Series No. 4, 1932, pp. 415-33.

BLOOD ACCUSATION, or ritual murder accusation, a libelous charge against the Jews, made chiefly in European countries during the past 800 years. The charge is that Jews murder Christians to use their blood in certain rituals, particularly in the Passover ceremonials, where blood is allegedly employed in the preparation of the Matzoth and in the four cups of red wine for the Seder service. Although Biblical injunction forbids the consumption of any kind of

blood and even forbids the eating of meat unless the blood has been drawn and discarded, the accusation still persists.

There has never been any known legitimate basis for the accusation. In all the cases in history, the guilt of Jews charged with ritual murder has never been proved. Upon the application of torture, confessions have been obtained, but none of these was substantiated by witnesses or other evidence admissible in a modern court of law. Except when the text of Bible, Talmud, or rabbinical commentary was grossly and deliberately misinterpreted, no foundation for the accusation has ever been found in Jewish literature. The validity of the charge has been repeatedly denied by popes, sultans, and groups of clergymen and theologians. Yet almost 200 cases are on record in which Jews were charged with ritual murder.

Beginnings of the Blood Libel. The origins of the ritual murder charge are obscure. Josephus accuses Apion of spreading the tale of Greeks being used for annual sacrificial slaughter; and the Greek writer, Demokritos, also charges the Jews with human sacrifice. Neither of these mentions the use of blood.

In the 12th cent. the blood accusation flared up in England, and spread from there all over Europe. The earliest case was that of William of Norwich, a four-and-one-half year old boy who was found dead on Good Friday, 1144. According to a convert, this was the annual Passover sacrifice made by the Jews of Europe in some designated town. No one was tried for the murder, but the story of William spread after he was canonized as a martyr. Ritual murder accusations were levelled at the Jews in Gloucester (1168), Bury St. Edmunds (1181), Bristol (1181), and Winchester (1192), where boy-martyrs were created. The fiction of the blood murder now appeared on the continent, with accusations in Blois, France, in 1171, and in Erfurt, Saxony, in 1199. There were fifteen repetitions of the charge in the 13th cent., including the case of Hugh of Lincoln (1255), made famous in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. Thereafter the slander spread through Europe.

The stories of most of these cases follow the same pattern. A person, most often a child, disappeared, or was found dead. Someone recalled that the deceased was seen in the vicinity of the Jewish quarter, or that the Jews were about to celebrate a holiday; perhaps the body was discovered near a Jew's home. Accusations followed. In medieval times a ritual murder accusation usually ended in torture and forced confessions, death or expulsion or heavy fines for the Jews. In more modern times, fair court procedure has been available, and the accusers have invariably been shown to be wrong. The more important individual cases are treated separately, in this encyclopedia, in the articles dealing with the cities where they occurred.

Characteristics of the Accusation. In searching for an explanation of the phenomenon of blood accusations, it is well to note that Jews are by no means the only people who have suffered from such a libel. The early Christians (themselves a minority religion, little understood and regarded only with suspicion) were victims of the same charge. Tertullian complains: "We are called the most villainous of mortals because of the secret practice of killing and eating children."

Similarly, heretical Christian sects—the Gnostics, the Montanists, the Manicheans—were all accused of using human blood. As late as 1466 the blood accusation was directed against an Italian sect; and still later, during strife between the monastic orders, the Franciscans accused the Dominicans of using the blood and eyebrows of a *Jewish* child for secret purposes (Bern, 1507). In China, in 1870, Christian missionaries were still accused of stealing native children in order to turn them into magic medicines. In Madagascar, in 1891, the foreigners were summarily charged with devouring human hearts; the administration, in order to pacify an incensed population, had to issue a decree forbidding foreigners, particularly the French and English, from indulging in such practices. Ridiculous as those charges are, they are of the same nature as the accusations against the Jews. It is pertinent, too, to point out that such New Testament passages as: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you" (*John* 6:53) might be used as the basis of a blood accusation against Christians by hostile and unscrupulous critics, particularly if the quotations were removed from their context. Actually no one seriously entertains the idea of Christian use of blood.

The notion of the healing or curing properties of blood, a basis of some of the medieval blood murder accusations (e.g. Fulda, 1235), is an old one. Early Christian writings relate how the faithful rushed into the arena to smear themselves with the blood of the martyrs. Medical books of the Middle Ages are full of the most astounding recipes with animal and human blood among the components. How far ignorance and superstition may lead is shown by this historical fact: in 1890 a Galician "magician" was convicted of stealing the corpses of two Jewish children to fumigate a house infected with typhoid. When people could entertain such beliefs, the idea of the Jews' curing themselves with Christian blood was not impossible.

The basis of superstition in the blood libel accusations is shown by the number of miracle stories used to "prove" the charges. In the Blois case the only evidence was the claim that a groom had seen a Jew throw a murdered child into the river Loire. To prove his veracity the groom underwent a "trial by ordeal": he was placed in a boat filled with water, and when the boat failed to sink, his statement was interpreted as the truth. On this evidence thirty-one Jews were burned to death. Another reputed miracle occurred in the Pforzheim case (1267), wherein a drowned girl is said to have bled in the presence of the accused, and to have raised her hands the second time the accused were brought before her. At Weissenburg (1270) a body is supposed to have bled for five days, although the Jews had been charged with having drawn all the blood. Another body, that of the boy St. Werner (1286), is supposed to have floated up the Rhine River, radiating a halo of light. The number of miracles involved in ritual murder charges decreases after the 14th cent. and later the frequency of the murder charges likewise slackens. It is clear that the spread of enlightenment is inimical both to the belief in such miracles and to the popular acceptance of ritual murder charges.

Another characteristic of medieval blood accusations

is the heavy reliance on forced confession. With proper application of torture, any kind of confession could be produced, and some astonishing statements have thus been included in the history of this libel. In the Valréas accusation (1247) tortured Jews confessed that they had drawn Christian blood with which to hold communion on Easter Sabbath, although there is nothing approaching communion in Jewish ritual. In the Trent trial (1475) Jews were forced to admit that ritual murder had been committed because it was a Jubilee year—as a matter of fact, while 1475 was a Jubilee year for the Catholic Church, the Jews had not celebrated the Jubilee since the first destruction of the Temple, 586 B.C.E. At Tyrnau (1494) the confession was actually wrung from witnesses that Jewish men drank Christian blood during their own periods of menstruation.

Occasionally the ritual murder accusations had an economic sidelight worthy of historical note. Fines levied on the Jewish communities were always welcome additions to a prince's treasury. Philip Augustus, king of France, is known to have used blood accusations to replenish his funds with Jewish money (1180). In Hungary, in 1529, Count Wolf of Bazin had thirty Jews burned alive after they had confessed the ritual murder of a Christian boy. Later the lad was found living in Vienna; the Jews, it was discovered, had been creditors of the count.

The Libel Refuted. The blood accusation has been discredited in many ways. Non-Jewish authorities have been distinctly prominent in exposing the absurdity of the charge. Pope Gregory X defended the Jews in his bull *Sicut Judaeis* (1272). Sixtus IV refused to canonize Simon of Trent. Others who condemned the blood libel included Innocent IV, Clement IV, Gregory X, Innocent V, Martin V, Nicholas V, Paul III, Benedict XIV, Clement XIII and Clement XIV. Among the Christian theologians and scholars who have refuted the libel have been Strack, Wülfer, Wagenseil, Schudt, Franz Nöldeke, Franz Delitzsch, McCaul, Döllinger, Semler, Neander, Königsberg, Renan, von Liszt, Michaelis, Kokovzev, Wünsche, and Masaryk. Theological faculties of the universities have repudiated the accusation, e.g. Leipzig, 1714, and Amsterdam, 1882. Jewish scholars have of course dealt with the subject fully. Such rabbinical conferences as the ones at London (1840) and Cracow (1906) issued solemn declarations that the Jews have never used human blood for ritual or any other purpose.

Reference to the Scriptural text points to the impossibility of there being a Jewish blood ritual. *Lev.* 17:10 forbids the consumption of blood: "I will set My face against that soul that eateth blood," and the injunction is repeated in verse twelve: "No soul of you shall eat blood," and in verse fourteen: "Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh." Further prohibitions of the consumption of blood are contained in *Lev.* 3:17; 7:26-27; 19:26; *Deut.* 12:16; *I Sam.* 14:32-34; *Ezek.* 33:25.

The literature that defends the validity of the accusation has been generally declared worthless. Much of it, surprisingly enough, appeared in the 19th cent. In 1803 a Moldavian monk, Neophite, published what became a source-book for those who wished to press charges of ritual murder. The author claimed to be

the converted son of a rabbi, and purported to reveal the secrets of his father's faith. He stated that Jews believed they served God by killing Christians, that among the Jews those who used the most Christian blood were considered to be the most holy. He went on to state that Jews sprinkled themselves with Christian blood, the symbol of Jesus' blood, as a precaution in case Jesus were the true Messiah. Translated into Greek and Arabic, the book had a wide circulation. Neophite's authority, however, eventually was discredited by the Russian Council of State, which condemned the book as unscientific and spurious. The supposed citations from the Talmud were shown to be so twisted and full of mistakes that they could never come from the hand of a rabbi's son. Other "evidence" was equally weak.

A second work claiming to establish a basis for the blood accusation was Pawlikowsky's *Der Talmud in der Theorie und Praxis* (1866), in which are listed seventy-five supposed cases of human sacrifice by the Jews. After the publication of this work came August Rohling, anti-Semitic professor of theology at the University of Prague, who declared that he could substantiate on oath the ritual murder accusation in the Tisza-Eszlár case (1882). His evidence was successfully attacked by Hermann L. Strack, Franz Delitzsch, and Joseph Samuel Bloch. The latter, a rabbi and member of the Austrian Reichsrat, accused Rohling of having offered to commit perjury, and prompted him to bring suit for libel. During two years of litigation Rohling was discredited. He withdrew his suit and, at the request of the ministry of instruction, resigned his professorship. Bloch published the record of the case in *Akten und Gutachten im Prozesse Rohling-Bloch* (Vienna, 1892).

What is virtually a text-book on ritual murder was written by H. Desportes in 1888: *Le mystère du sang chez les juifs de tous les temps*. Desportes admits that there are no passages in the Talmud hinting at the use of Christian blood, but insists that "dangerous passages have disappeared from the Talmud, but the corresponding pages were left blank; when the father of a family or a rabbi reaches that place he stops reading and explains to the listeners the doctrine that should have been there." Desportes thus sets up an ingenious scheme by which he can accuse the Jews of any crime at all, by merely insisting that the passage advocating the crime is no longer in writing. Desportes further invalidates his work by relying on the spurious revelations of the monk Neophite.

A final bit of blood accusation literature is in the Milan paper, *Osservatore Cattolico*, which, in 1892, published a series of articles (Nos. 8438-73) on the ritual murder practised by the Jews. These are largely plagiarisms from Rohling and Desportes.

A series of ritual murder trials in Russia, spread over more than a century, indicate the impossibility of finding even a little truth in the ancient libel. The first such trial, in White Russia, resulted in an acquittal in 1799, as did the Velizh trial of 1823 to 1835. In the Saratov case of 1852 to 1853, neither the special commission of investigation, nor the Senate, nor the Council of State found the defendants guilty of ritual slaying; one man was found guilty of the less sensational crime of murder, however, and was sentenced

to hard labor. The Beilis trial at Kiev in 1913 was virtually an attempt by government officials to prove the existence of a Jewish blood cult; it resulted in a clear acquittal by a Russian jury.

In Modern Times. The enlightenment of the 19th and 20th centuries has not brought the blood accusation entirely to an end. While both courtroom trial and scholarly examination have shown the falsity of the charge, accusations have nevertheless been made sporadically. Forty-two cases are listed in the 19th cent., including the important Rhodes and Damascus (1840), Tisza-Eszlár (1882), Xanten (1891) and Polna (1899) cases. The bloody Kishinev massacre of 1903 was based upon a ritual murder charge; the eyes of the entire world were focussed on the Beilis trial a decade later. Even in the United States the ancient libel once appeared; for in 1928, upon the disappearance of a Christian child in Massena, N.Y., the rabbi was quizzed by officials to determine whether ritual murder was part of the Yom Kippur ceremony. The child was later found, unharmed, wandering in the forest near her home. As a result of the incident the Permanent Commission on Better Understanding Between Christians and Jews in America issued a statement calling the blood accusation "an abhorrent fiction, calculated to transplant into American minds a long-refuted medieval libel," and declaring flatly that "there is no custom, ceremony or ritual among Jews anywhere . . . and nothing in their traditions or literature, which calls for the use of human blood for any purpose."

After the World War the blood accusation began to appear in a troubled and hate-ridden Eastern Europe. In 1928 there was a wave of ritual murder scares in Poland; flurries of similar charges swept Lithuania in 1929 and 1930 and Bulgaria in 1934. As early as 1928 the German anti-Semitic press charged ritual slaying upon the discovery of any suspicious murder. On May 1, 1934, Julius Streicher's *Der Stürmer* devoted a special twelve-page issue to the revival of all the old ritual murder accusations. Since then the libel has been repeated regularly in the Nazi press, usually as a generalized condemnation of the Jews, occasionally—the Bamberg case (1937) or the Welhartitz, Czechoslovakia, case (1940)—as the revival of a previously refuted and almost forgotten accusation.

Following is a list of the better-known cases of the blood accusation. The larger type indicates special articles. Many of the others are dealt with in articles treating the cities where they occurred.

Abbreviations: A. (Austria); A.-L. (Alsace-Lorraine); B. (Bohemia); E. (England); F. (France); G. (Germany); H. (Hungary); It. (Italy); P. (Poland); R. (Russia); Rm. (Roumania); Sp. (Spain); Sw. (Switzerland); T. (Turkey); Y. (Yugoslavia).

1144	Norwich, E. (WILLIAM OF NORWICH)
1168	Gloucester, E.
1171	Blois, F.
1180	Paris
1181	Bury St. Edmunds, E.
1181	Bristol, E.
1192	Winchester, E.
1199	Erfurt, G.
1232	Gloucester, E.
1235	Wolfsheim, G.
1235	Fulda, G.
1247	Valréas, F.
1255	Lincoln, E. (HUGH OF LINCOLN)

- 1267 Pforzheim, G.
 1270 Weissenburg, A.-L.
 1281-83 Mayence, G.
 1285 Munich
 1286 Friesland, G.
 1286 Oberwesel and Boppard, G. (St. Werner)
 1287 Salzburg, A.
 1288 Troyes, F.
 1290 Laibach, A.
 1292 Colmar, A.-L.
 1292 Krems, A.
 1294 Bern, Sw.
 1302 Remken, G.
 1303 Weissensee, G.
 1305 Vienna and Prague
 1308 Thuringia, G.
 1317 Chinon, F.
 1331 Überlingen, G.
 1345 Munich
 1387 Strasbourg, A.-L.
 1401 Diessenhofen, G.
 1407 Cracow, P.
 1420 Vienna
 1428 Regensburg, G.
 1430 Ravensburg, Überlingen, and Lindau, G.
 1435 Palma, Majorca, Sp.
 1442 Lienz, A.
 1453 Arles, F.
 1453 Breslau, G.
 1462 Rinn, G.
 1468 Sepulveda, Sp.
 1470 Eendingen, G.
 1473 Regensburg, G.
 1475 Trent, It. (SIMON OF TRENT)
 1476 Regensburg, G.
 1480 Venice
 1490 La Guardia, Sp.
 1494 Trnava (Tyrnau), H.
 1504 Frankfort, G.
 1505 Budweis, B.
 1518 Geisingen, G.
 1529 Bazin, H.
 1536 Nagyszombat, H.
 1540 Neuburg, G.
 1545 Amasia, Asia Minor
 1553 Asti, It.
 1554 Rome
 1564 Bielsk, P.
 1570 Brandenburg, G.
 1571 Hellerspring, G.
 1593 Frankfort, G.
 1598 Luck, P.
 1623 Ragusa, Dalmatia
 1636 Lublin, P.
 1637 Cracow, P.
 1639 Leczyca, P.
 1650 Razinai, A.
 1668 Vienna
 1670 Metz, A.-L.
 1691 Vilna
 1696 Posen
 1698 Kaidan and Zausmer, P.
 1705 Viterbo, It.
 1710 Neamtz, Rm.
 1712 Frankfort, G.
 1714 Roman, Rm.
 1721 Danzig
 1721 Sinigaglia, It.
 1736-40 Posen
 1743 Jaslau, P.
 1745 Fürth, G.
 1756 Jampol, R.
 1764 Orcuta, H.
 1783 Botoshani, Rm.
 1791 Tasnad, H.
 1797 Galatz, Rm.
 1799 White Russia
 1801 Bucharest
 1803 Neamtz, Rm.
 1811 Talowitz, Rm.
 1816 Piatra, Rm.
 1816 Grodno, P.
 1823-35 VELIZH, R.
 1824 Bakau, Rm.
 1829 Boleslaw, P.
 1834 Neuenhoven, C
 1837-47 Fiorenzola, Buffeto, Monticelli, and Cortemaggiore, It.
 1838 Ferrara, It.
 1840 Aix-la-Chapelle, G.
 1840 DAMASCUS
 1840 Rhodes
 1840 Jülich, G.
 1843 Marmora, T.
 1844 Stobikowka and Tarnow, P.
 1852-53 SARATOV, R.
 1859 Galatz, Rm.
 1861 Chavlian, Rm.
 1863 Smyrna, T.
 1867 Galatz, Rm.
 1867 Calrash, Rm.
 1875 Ostrovo, P.
 1879 Kutais, R.
 1882 Rzeszow, P.
 1882 TISZA-ESZLÁR, H.
 1891 Corfu, Greece
 1891 XANTEN, G.
 1891 Nagyszokol, H.
 1892 Eisleben, G.
 1892 Ingrandes, F.
 1892 Bakau, Rm.
 1893 Kolin, B.
 1893 Holleschau, A.
 1893 Prague
 1894 Tatar Pazardzhik, Bulgaria
 1894 Berent, G.
 1898 Skaisgirren, G.
 1899 POLNA, B.
 1900 Nachod, B.
 1900 Vilna
 1900 KONITZ, G.
 1903 Kishinev, R.
 1911-13 Kiev (BEILIS CASE), R.
 1924 Aleppo, Syria
 1924 Targumenes, Rm.
 1926 Dobrzyn, P.
 1926 Kanieff, R.
 1928 Massena, N. Y.
 1928 Petrovo Selo, Y.
 1929 Manau, Bamberg, and others, G.
 1929 Memel
 1929 Vilna
 1929 Salonika, Greece
 1929 Kovno, Lithuania
 1930 Novosimera, R.
 1936 Memel
 1937 Bamberg (revived), G.
 1940 Welhartitz, B. ANATOL SAFANOV.

Lit.: Strack, Hermann L., *The Jew and Human Sacrifice* (1909); Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel Among the Nations* (1904) 36-142; Bloch, Joseph Samuel, *Israel and the Nations* (1927); idem, *Akten und Gutachten im Prozesse Rohling-Bloch* (1892); Solomons, D., *An Account of the Recent Persecutions of the Jews in Damascus* (1840); Jacobs, Joseph, *The Jews of Angevin England* (1893); Stern, M., edit., *Die päpstlichen Bullen über die Blutbeschuldigung* (1893); Roth, Cecil, edit., *The Ritual Murder Libel and the Jews* (report of Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli, trans. 1935).

BLOOD REVENGE, an institution whereby relatives of a murdered man revenged themselves on his murderer or on the murderer's family in expiation for the crime. Blood revenge was practised extensively among nomadic peoples. It was known among the earliest Semites and is current today among the Bedouin, and among primitive European peoples such as the Albanians and Corsicans. The Israelites were, in fact, among the first to abandon it.