

THE ENIGMA OF THE LOST SECOND TEMPLE LITERATURE
ROUTES OF RECOVERY

Steven A. Ballaban

Thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

Cincinnati, Ohio
December, 1994

Referee : Dr. Ben Zion Wacholder
Co-Referee : Dr. Mark Washofsky

For Julie:

על כן יעזוב-איש את אביו ואת אמו ודבק באשתו
והיו לבשר אחד

Digest

The two centuries prior to the destruction of the Second Temple in Israel were a time of great literary activity for the Jewish people in Israel and the diaspora. They wrote hundreds of books in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. This era was also characterized by a great diversity of belief, with the majority of Jews practicing Sadducean, Essenic or Pharisaic Judaism. The destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. brought an end to this literary activity. With the burning of the Temple, most of the books and the sects who wrote them disappeared.

Nearly 1000 years later, the Jewish communities in Europe began to experience a literary renaissance of their own. They wrote long historical romances, *piyyutim* and ethical treatises, as well as legal encyclopedias. The breadth and volume of production was unmatched since the destruction of the Temple. Interestingly enough, this seems to be more than mere coincidence. For many of the books which disappeared from Jewish literature following the national disaster in 70 were at the heart of the European renaissance.

This book is an examination of the paths by which this long-lost literature returned to Jewish hands. It identifies the way in which Moshe haDarshan, the director of the academy of Provence, brought these books to Europe from Persia, and inaugurated a new era of European Jewish learning.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Preface	vii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Problem: The Lost Literature?	9
Chapter 2: The Recovery of the Works of Moshe haDarshan	42
Recovery of His Works	42
Identification of His Sources	59
Other Books Used by Moshe haDarshan	75
Chapter 3: The Literature of the Second Temple in <i>Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer</i> and <i>Jossipon</i>	90
<i>Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer</i>	90
<i>Josippon</i>	104
Chapter 4: Second Temple Literature in the Remains of the Cairo Geniza	120
Damascus Covenant	120
Ben Sira	124
Testament of Levi	131
Sefer Hagu	134
Unnamed Fragment of Priestly Law	141
Tobit	142
Lives of the Prophets	151
Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Youths	154
Megillat Benei Hashmonaim	157
Conclusion	168
Chapter 5: Previous Scholarship	170
Rabbinic Suppression	170
Secret Circulation	172
Medieval Discovery of Qumran	175
Retranslation	182
Chapter 6: Proposed Solution	200
Index of Biblical Citations	220
Bibliography	221

Acknowledgements

It is difficult to begin to acknowledge the great debt which I owe to so many for the completion of this project. If it is true that it takes a village to raise a child, it is also true that it takes a community to undertake a graduate degree. I am indebted to my many friends, colleagues and fellow-students who have encouraged me and supported me each step of the way. In particular, Ann Millin helped to "teach me the ropes," and has always provided timely and instructive advice.

I am also deeply indebted to all of the instructors at the Hebrew Union College who have shared this wisdom, knowledge and dedication with me. I can truly say that all that I know I gained sitting at their feet. In particular, Dr. Edward Goldman who taught me to think like the rabbis, and to appreciate and understand their books; Dr. Barry Kogan who taught me Jewish Philosophy; Dr. Isaac Jerusalmi, who introduced me to Syriac, and impressed upon me its importance in the transmission of Greek culture and Dr. Mark Washofsky, who served as an example, offered his valuable time and advice to me and who graciously agreed to be my second reader. Any errors in this work are the result of my own shortcomings, while any credit for this work is richly deserved by my teachers. I would also like to thank Dr. Alan Cooper, Director of the School of Graduate Studies, for his flexibility in my program and his encouragement of my progress. The library staff have also been invaluable in their assistance. In particular, Dana Frederikson, Noni Rudavsky, Dr. Ida Selavan, and Dr. David Gilner have been most generous in making the resources of the library available to me. I could not have completed this project without their constant aid.

I also wish to thank Dr. Ben Zion Wacholder. He has been my mentor, teacher and friend for over a decade. He is truly a teacher's teacher: his deep

respect and concern for his students, and his love of all Jewish learning, and his zest for teaching will be with me always.

אם אין קמח אין תורה - "Without flour there is no Torah." I could not have thought about embarking on a project such as this without the gracious financial support of Dr. M. Mayerson, who provided my fellowship for these past three years. I would also like to acknowledge the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture for their support in my last year of dissertation research, as well as the Greater Cincinnati Area Mensa Society for their aid during my program. The assistance of these individuals and foundations afforded me the opportunity to complete my work on this project.

My family has been a source of strength and encouragement throughout this project. My children Reuven Sol, Aryeh Ethan and Gavriella Michal have been enthusiastic in their support, and patient while "my work" took me away from them. Julie has been my wife, friend, teacher and a patient ear to bend: אני לדודי ודודי לי. I also thank my parents, Carolyn and Christopher Ballaban for their encouraging words, their love of learning and books and their financial assistance throughout my degree program.

Steven A. Ballaban
Cincinnati, Ohio

December 7, 1994
4 Tevet, 5755
פרשת ויגש

I would also like to add my thanks to Dr. Richard Sarason for his careful reading of my manuscript, and his many insightful comments. His advice and friendship over the years has been deeply appreciated during my years as his student.

May 12, 1995
12 Iyyar
פרשת אמור

Preface

The Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical literature comprised an extensive body of literature prior to the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. There were literally hundreds of books which were in current use by both the Palestinian and Diaspora Jewish communities. The presence of some of these works at Qumran and Masada, as well as their preservation within the Ethiopian Jewish community and the early Christian literary tradition reveals the appeal of this material to many of the major Jewish communities during the late Second Temple period.

Despite the wide circulation of these works, all traces of their existence seem to have disappeared among Rabbinic Jews following the *hurban* — the destruction of the Temple. With the exception of several isolated references to Ben Sira, and several allusions to ספרים חיצוניים — "extraneous books," Rabbinic literature of the "Classical Period" - (200 C.E. — 600 C.E.) appears to show no awareness of the existence of this enormous body of literature. This silence, whether by design or accident, is in itself a significant riddle.

More puzzling still is the sudden reemergence of these books during the late Geonic period. Beginning around 900 C.E. with some of the minor midrashim ("Midrash Tadshe" and "Megillat Hashmonaim"), and larger collections such as *Tanhuma*, *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Jossipon*, the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical literature reemerged so that, by the fourteenth century, there were extensive Jewish collections which contained these books. They ultimately came to play a significant role in the renaissance of Jewish literature in Europe at the end of the Middle Ages. While the silence of the early Rabbinic literature has been noted and debated briefly, the reappearance of this material has been met with almost complete silence.

This book is a study of the process by which Jewish authors came to reclaim a literary heritage which had been lost to them for nearly 1000 years. It includes a review of previous attempts to answer this riddle. It also contains a summary of all of the versions of Second Temple literature which are found in medieval texts, including a fragment of the *Sefer Hagu*, a book mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls but which has been lost until now. Finally, it proposes a solution to this riddle which addresses the many different paths by which these books returned to the people among whom they originally were born.

Introduction

The Riddle of the Lost Ancient Jewish Literature

Many scholars have recently proposed solutions to the enigma of the "lost" Jewish literature. The loss goes back to the early centuries after the *Hurban*—the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. By that time, the canon of the Hebrew scriptures had been closed. What Christians called Apocryphal works, like *Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus)*, *Judith*, *Tobit* and other ancient Jewish compositions, ceased to circulate, or are presumed to have ceased circulation among the mainstream of the rabbinic tradition. The Mishna, which contains traditions taught orally for centuries, was edited ca. 200 C.E. The Talmuds (Bavli and Jerushalmi) which contain amplifications of the Mishna, as well as Midrashic commentaries on Scripture such as the *Sifra*, *Sifre*, *Pesiqta* and other Midrashim, became the main occupation of the Amoraic and Geonic academies.

In addition to these were also the Aramaic paraphrases of Scripture (*Targumim*) such as Onkelos, Jonathan ben Uzziel, Neophyti, along with other Aramaic literature. In the Geonic period, beginning around the time of the Islamic conquest in the mid-seventh century, through the eleventh century, new genres of writings started with *Sheelot U'teshuvot* (responsa), halakhic collections such as the *Halakhot Gedolot* and the *Halakhot Pesuqot*. Beginning with Saadya Gaon in the tenth century there developed a philosophic tradition. In 1832 Leopold Zunz, in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, traced the development of Jewish literature. It is interesting that Zunz treated only superficially the branch of literature that had been lost. Not included in his study were the so-called Pseudepigraphical books, and a host of other literature like the Hekhalot texts—ancient mystical writings.

In marked contrast to the apparent silence of the early Rabbinic sources, later medieval works contain a wealth of references to books written while the Second Temple still stood. Many of these Apocryphal writings suddenly reemerge around 900 C.E., beginning with the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* and Saadia Gaon. This sudden efflorescence continued with the minor Midrashim ("Midrash Tadshe," "Megillat Hashmonaim" and "Midrash Vayissau") and larger collections such as the *Josippon* and the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabba*. By the fourteenth century, there were extensive collections of these works which circulated. They came to play a significant role in Jewish literature through their inclusion in such works as the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* and the *Sefer haYashar*. This sudden reappearance of books which had been lost to the Jewish community for nearly a millennium is a riddle. How did Jews begin the process of recovering these ancient texts?

Beginning after Zunz, the riddle of the lost ancient Jewish literature began to be unraveled with the discovery of these lost texts in presumably Jewish Rabbinic sources. In 1278, the Dominican father Raymundo Martini published his voluminous *Pugio Fidei*, which was most remarkable in several ways. First, it is the only Christian text known to have cited Rabbinic and Jewish literature from the Mishna, Talmud Bavli, and medieval writers. Martini's collection contains more than 1000 such citations. Most notably, these texts were not cited in the Latin translation alone, but in their original. The uniqueness of this work is that it addressed itself to the Jews as much as to the Christians. Martini proposed to show that the ancient Jews recognized the deity of Jesus which his contemporary Jews did not. Secondly, among the many works recognized by Jews, there were also passages that fifteenth-century authorities such as Abrabanel and others did not recognize. Among these many texts which Martini cited were some which seemed to allude to a Messiah. Abrabanel and his contemporaries believed that these originated with Martini and his converso assistants.

The problem with Martini's citation, of course, is that no one has ever questioned his citations of Talmudic, Geonic literature, Rashi, ibn Ezra and Maimonides. But they did wonder about the provenance of a work called *Rabba d'Rabba*, which cited the *Bel and Dragon* in an Aramaic version with the introductory citations, "Amru rabbotenu"—"our rabbis said." The implication is clear, that the *Bel and the Dragon*, attributed to Daniel and found in the Septuagint (Greek) version of Scripture, is a rabbinic work, and is attributed to the sages. Another example are passages from the *Rabba d'Rabba* (obviously a title which expanded upon Midrash Rabba) that were not known from any other literature. Some of these passages contained allusions to the destruction of the Temple with messianic implications. On the one hand this book seemed to be standard Midrash, but on the other it had a flavor of Christianized Midrash. Isaac Abrabanel, commenting in the disputation of 1414, said, "we do not have such a midrash." Zunz did not know of such a work. However, he alludes to it in a footnote which he received from S. L. Rapoport, and a heated discussion ensued. This debate was resolved only in the 1940s. It is remarkable that Jewish scholars, beginning with Abarbanel, through Schiller—Szinnessy and Baer, charged Martini with manufacturing a midrash which he could barely translate, much less invent. The full story of Martini and the *Rabba d'Rabba* has not been dealt with. I take up this issue below, in Chapter One.

The polemics over the *Rabba d'Rabba*—whether it was a Christian forgery or a genuine Jewish work—became connected with R. Moshe haDarshan, who flourished in Narbonne in the eleventh century. R. Moshe is known to us through citations by R. Natan b. Jehiel, the author of the first comprehensive lexicon of Rabbinic literature, as well as Rashi (1040-1105), Rabbenu Jacob Tam (100-1171) and Nahmanides (1194-1270), all of them pillars of the Jewish community. The nature and extent of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan's work has been difficult to determine. Until recently, most scholars believed that his work had

entirely perished. Even the early authors differed over the character and titles of his writings. For example, Rashi quoted midrash from a work called *Sefer haYesod*, but Ibn Ezra and Nahmanides appear to describe it as a lexicon. In this century, a clearer picture of Moshe haDarshan has begun to emerge. S. L. Rapoport's discovery of a manuscript that A. Neubauer and Epstein have linked to R. Moshe haDarshan began the process of reconstructing his literary corpus. A full treatment of the debate over the authenticity of the works of Moshe haDarshan, his Second Temple literary sources and the reconstruction of his corpus can be found in Chapter Two.

Another piece of this puzzle is the book of *Josippon*. During the middle ages this *Josippon* was confused with Josephus. Josephus Flavius (ca. 26 C.E. - 95 C.E.) who wrote the *Wars* and *Antiquities* in Greek, was hardly cited up until Eusebius, in the 5th century. Thereafter he became an important source, and is preserved only in the Greek. However, since the late middle ages a Hebrew work known as *Josippon* has circulated. This work was attributed to Joseph ben Gorion, one of the Jewish generals in the great rebellion against Rome. During the middle ages it was frequently cited by Jewish writers, such as Nathan ben Jehiel and Rashi. The authors of the *Tosafot* too seemed to know the book of Judith through the *Josippon*. The book itself is written in a clear rabbinic Hebrew, with a clear dramatic style as a moving pathetic history. There are several versions in manuscript, some beginning with the Alexander Romance, others with 1 and 2 Maccabees. In addition, it contains many works preserved only in the Apocrypha, such as the *Bel and the Dragon*, and the *Additions to Esther*. It concludes with fall of the Temple and the suicide of the garrison at Massada. Although the author of this book describes himself as Joseph the son of Gorion, who knew the writings of Nicholaos of Damascus, Strabo, and Livy, this is clearly a pseudepigraphic attribution. Who this Joseph ben Gorion actually was has been the subject of many learned articles. What is

of interest to this present study is the fact that this work, in its various editions, contains versions of many of the Apocryphal writings. By what route did these Second Temple Jewish works come into the *Josippon*? An attempt to resolve this puzzle is treated in Chapter Three.

Closely related to the *Josippon* is the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. This is clearly a rabbinic midrash. Yet the nature and origin of it are quite puzzling. It seems to be a composite work. The basic framework is a commentary on the ten occasions on which the *Shekhina* descended to earth. Within this framework it contains a history of the seven days of Creation, a midrash on portions of the liturgy and a history of the calendar. The *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* seems to be a collection of standard midrash, but it also includes non-standard esoteric literature which circulated on the margins of the mainstream. Its contents are puzzling, and have so far not been adequately examined. What brings this work into the perspective of this monograph are some of its remarkable contents. It seems to have citations from Enoch, and Pseudo-Philo—texts not found elsewhere in Rabbinic literature. A discussion of this book, and its use of Second Temple era sources is found in Chapter Three.

Yet another piece of this puzzle is found in the midrashic texts known as the "minor Midrashim." Adolf Jellinek published six volumes of *Beit haMidrash*, containing over 100 passages of lost midrashic texts. What amazed Jellinek and subsequent scholars is that some of these midrashic passages contained texts that either resembled, or quoted from, or alluded to *1 Enoch* or the *Book of Jubilees*. Now *Jubilees* had been known in the middle ages from citations by Syncellus and the Church Fathers as "Leptogenesis" or "The Lesser Genesis." But it was only in the eighteenth century that a full text of this work came from the Ethiopic version of the Old Testament, along with a full text of *1 Enoch*, and the Book of Adam and Eve. Scholars such as Abraham Epstein and Yitzhak Baer wondered how midrashic texts found in Jellinek's collection

had Hebrew fragments that seemed almost certainly to have been taken from Jubilees. For example, Jellinek published an excerpt from a medical text by "Asaph." This text claimed to be a copy of the book of remedies given by the angel Raphael to Noah on "Mt. Lubar," a clear reference to Jubilees 5:28.

Other surprising discoveries followed the publications of Jellinek, when Solomon Schechter, S. A. Wertheimer and others retrieved a cache of ancient books from the Ben Ezra Synagogue of Jews from Israel, referred to as the Geniza in Cairo. The contents of the Geniza are now found in such disparate collections as the Imperial library at Leningrad, HUC-JIR, and JTS. The largest collection is found in the Taylor—Schechter collection at Cambridge University, in England. The importance of the Geniza became apparent in 1910, when S. Schechter published the *Fragment of the Zadokite Text*. This work gave rise to a scholarly dispute that raged for more than four decades, until 1947. Was this a work composed during the period of the Second Temple, or was it, as many scholars contended, a composition which belonged to Qaraite and related movements which began in the eighth century? Few scholarly disputes can have their full resolution. But this one does: in 1947, among the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, several versions of this text were found. These fragments placed the origins of Schechter's *Fragments* unquestionably in the Second Temple era.

Schechter published two different manuscripts of his *Zadokite Text*. But there were other remarkable finds yet to be published. Among the other books of Mishna, Talmud and Midrash were found versions of almost the entire Apocryphal book of *Ben Sira*. More importantly, the final chapter of one manuscript appears to contain a sectarian hymn which intermingles the "Sons of Zadoq" with prayers of the echoes of the traditional Amidah—the 18 benedictions of the Jewish prayer book. This additional hymn, which is not found in the Greek, Latin or Syriac versions of *Ben Sira*, appears to connect the Genizah

manuscript with the Dead Sea Scrolls. In Chapter Four I discuss the preservation of the Second Temple era texts published by Jellinek, as well as those discovered in the Geniza.

The existence of this riddle is not unknown to modern scholarship. There have been several attempts since Rapoport to solve the problem. Many attempts at solving some aspect of this riddle exist, particularly as it relates to the problem of Moshe Hadarshan. Opinions on the relationship of Rabbinic Literature to the lost literary corpus of the Second Temple period can be divided into three groups. One group of scholars maintained that this literature circulated among Rabbinic Jews prior to 70 C.E., but was suppressed by the Rabbis, beginning with the "council of Yavneh." Through their persecution of this literature, it was lost to the Rabbinic tradition entirely. Another group of scholars proposed the theory that this literature continued in circulation within an "inner circle" of Rabbis, who kept it as a secret lore. Sometime in the late middle ages, it was given wider circulation for reasons unknown. This accounts for the absence of any references in early Rabbinic literature to the Second Temple corpus. Still another group of scholars believe that this material was suppressed by the early Rabbinic schools, but that it was restored to them by a discovery reported in a letter by Timotheos I, the Nestorian Patriarch of Seleucia around the year 800. These authors believe that these books then circulated among the Qaraites—a Jewish schismatic movement which began in the late eight century—but were resuppressed by the Rabbinite community, following the precedent of the council of Yavneh. Most recently, several scholars have advanced the theory that the Apocrypha, along with some books of the Pseudepigrapha, were retranslated into Hebrew from the Greek versions. These authors claim that this work was done in Byzantine Italy during the ninth-tenth centuries. These various theories are discussed and analyzed in Chapter Five.

Although various aspects of this riddle have been discussed, I know of no previous attempts at a comprehensive solution to this problem. An amazing

possibility is proposed in Chapter Six. The greatest number of books written during the Second Temple period and retranslated into Hebrew and Aramaic were made from Syriac texts. These Syriac translations were made from Greek versions at the Christian academy found in Nisibis. A Jewish academy flourished in this same city at the same time, and had a curriculum which was nearly identical. Indeed, there are a number of historical examples of cooperation between Jews and Christians in this city, and in Babylonia in general. The literary and historical evidence indicates clearly that the Syriac-speaking Christians and the Aramaic-speaking Jews in Nisibis influenced each other. This influence is seen not only in Jewish texts, but in Christian texts as well. But how did Moshe haDarshan, who lived in Southern France, acquire books from Nisibis, a small town in Southern Syria? I believe that Moshe haDarshan, the first great scholar of the school of Provence, was not from France at all, but from Persia, possibly even Nisibis itself. A full discussion of the literary and historical evidence for the various modes of preservation of this lost literature is found in Chapter Six.

Chapter 1

The Problem: The Lost Literature?

During the Middle Ages, the traditions of the Rabbis were the subject of great controversy in Christian Europe. In 553 C.E., the Emperor Justinian I promulgated his Novella 146, which prohibited the use of "deuterosis" in the explanation of Scripture. While the Novella only mentions the Mishna specifically, it is hostile to all Rabbinic interpretations:

We decree, therefore, that it shall be permitted to those Hebrews who want it to read the Holy Books in their synagogues and, in general, in any place where there are Hebrews, in the Greek language before those assembled and comprehending... We also order that there shall be no license to the commentators¹ they have, who employ the Hebrew language to falsify it at their will, covering their own malignity by the ignorance of the many... What they call the Mishna, on the other hand, we prohibit entirely, for it is not included among the Holy Books, nor was it handed down from above by the prophets, but it is an invention of man in their chatter, exclusively of earthly origin and having in it nothing of the divine. Let them read the holy words themselves, therefore, in unfolding these Holy Books for reading, but without hiding what is said in them, on the one hand, and without accepting extraneous and unwritten nonsense they themselves had contrived to the perdition of the more simple minded, on the other hand...

We pray that they shall avoid the evil of the commentators when they hear the Holy Books in one language or another, and that they shall not turn to the naked letter but perceive the reality and grasp the more divine sense, in order that they shall study better what is more beautiful and cease at some time to err and to sin in what is vital above anything else, we speak about the hope in God. For this reason we opened before them all the languages to read the Holy Books, that when all shall acquire knowledge of them they shall become readier to learn the better matters. It is commonly agreed, that one raised up on the Holy Books is far readier to discern and to choose what is better—and but little is wanting for his amendment—than he who does not understand a thing in them but clings to only the name of religion as though held by holy anchors and believes that God's doctrine is but the name of heresy.²

¹ i.e. the *meturgaman*. This was a person who translated the Scriptural lesson into Aramaic as it was read from the Torah Scroll in Hebrew.

² Amnon Linder, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1987) 408-410.

This Novella opposed all rabbinic teachings and explanations of Scripture taught from the pulpit in the Synagogue, or studied in written form in the *Beit Midrash*. Moreover, it identified these as the reason for the persistence of Jews in their faith, and their rejection of Christian interpretation of Scriptural prophecy. In the eyes of Justinian, the interpretations of the Rabbis caused the multitude of Jewish faithful to be a people who "cling to only the name of religion as though held by holy anchors."

Disparagement of Rabbinic literature continued throughout the Middle Ages. However, European Christians were unable to read this literature because of the language differences. As a result, their attacks remained general. But by the late middle ages, an increasing number of Jews were living under Christian control as a result of the Reconquista in Spain and the Crusades in the East. Some of these Jews were converted to Christianity—many by force, but others voluntarily. These voluntary converts brought with them a knowledge of Jewish texts which had been previously inaccessible to Christians. In an effort to demonstrate their enthusiasm for their new faith, some of these converts began to launch attacks on their former faith and its sacred texts. Beginning in the mid-thirteenth century these attacks led increasingly to seizure, censorship and destruction of Hebrew manuscripts.

The immediate protagonist for this wave of hatred against Jewish books was a Jewish convert to Christianity, Nicholas Donin. In 1236 Donin sent a letter to Pope Gregory IX in which he denounced the Talmud on a number of charges. He claimed that the Talmud contained numerous insults against the Holy Family, and that the Jews accorded the Talmud Scriptural status. In 1239, following an investigation, Gregory ordered his ecclesiastical representatives in France, England, Spain and Portugal to seize all Jewish books. Fortunately,

only Louis IX of France obeyed his order. In June of 1242, the executioner of Paris set fire to 24 cart-loads of Hebrew manuscripts. Although Hebrew manuscripts continued to be burned for centuries afterwards, destruction on such a scale was not repeated until our own century. The entire episode is described by Odo of Chateauroux, papal legate of France, in a letter to Pope Innocent IV dated 1247:

To the most holy father and lord, Innocent, high priest by the grace of God, from Odo, by divine goodness Bishop of Tusculum, legate of the apostolic throne...

Recently it pleased your Holiness to order me to have the Talmud and other books of the Jews displayed before me, to inspect them, and, after having inspected them, to show tolerance to the Jews with regard to those books which may seem worthy of tolerance because they are not injurious to the Christian faith, and to return these to the Jewish teachers.

...let your Holiness know that at the time of the holy Pope Gregory of happy memory, a certain convert, by the name of Nicholas, related to the said Pope that the Jews, not satisfied with the ancient Law which God had transmitted in writing through Moses, and even completely ignoring it, assert that a different Law, which is called "Talmud," was handed down to Moses verbally and was implanted in their minds.

It was thus preserved unwritten until certain men came whom they call "sages" and "scribes," who, lest this law disappear from the minds of men through forgetfulness, reduced it to writing the size of which by far exceeds the text of the Bible. In this are contained so many unspeakable insults that it arouses shame in those who read it, and horror in those who hear it. This too is the chief factor that holds the Jews obstinate in their perfidy.

...He [Gregory] sent orders to the Bishop and the Prior of the Dominicans and to the Minister of the Franciscan friars of Paris, as follows: "Wherefore, since this is said to be the most important reason why the Jews remain obstinate in their perfidy, we, through apostolic letters, order your Discretion to have the Jews who live in the kingdoms of France, England, Aragon, Navarre, Castile, Leon, and Portugal, forced by the secular arm to give up their books. Those books, in which you will find errors of this sort, you shall cause to be burned at the stake. By apostolic power, and through use of ecclesiastical censure, you will silence all opponents...

...A careful examination having afterwards been made, it was discovered that the said books were full of errors, and that the veil covers the heart of these people to such a degree, that these books

turn the Jews away not only from an understanding of the spirit, but even of the letter, and incline them to fables and lies...³

As a part of his campaign against his former faith, Donin also attacked the Talmud in the first public disputation in Christian Europe. The debate was held in Paris in 1240. In fact it could more properly be described as a public trial, with the Jews defending their literature, and Donin acting as Inquisitor. The Jews were forced to defend the Talmud against Donin's accusations. The penalty for a loss would be the burning at the stake of the Talmud. Rabbi Jehiel of Paris and his delegation were unsuccessful in their defense, with the result that the 24 cart-loads of manuscripts were burned two years later.

Ironically, in the midst of this bitter campaign against Jewish intellectual life in Europe, a new form of argumentation grew out of Donin's efforts which would ultimately lead to the preservation of many thousands of Jewish manuscripts which Donin had wished destroyed. This approach involved the use of Rabbinic texts to prove the doctrines of Christianity, turning the shield of the Jews into a weapon against them. The first to exploit Hebrew texts in this way was, like Donin, a convert to Christianity. His name was friar Pablo Christiani. Like his predecessor a generation earlier, he ordered the foremost Jews of his generation to defend their faith at a public disputation. Unlike Donin, Christiani used the Talmud and Midrash instead of attacking it. At best, this new approach was difficult for Nahmanides and the other Jewish participants to defend against. Despite Nahmanides' assertions to the contrary, the disputation ended without any victor emerging. In his study of the proceedings, Robert Chazan concludes: "the results were sufficiently ambiguous to allow both

³ Jacob R. Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World* (New York: Atheneum, 1976) 146-8.

parties to claim success. At the same time, to be sure, both parties had to feel a measure of dissatisfaction as well. But this rarely shows up in written records left for posterity."⁴

Christiani's arguments at Barcelona were more effective to the extent that they were difficult for Nahmanides and other Jewish scholars to reject out of hand. In particular, the decision to use Rabbinic texts proved particularly discomfiting for Nahmanides. Nahmanides had argued against the rationalism of Maimonides, who had written that Rabbinic texts which were obviously contradictory to reason had to be reinterpreted. Christiani forced him to contradict his earlier position in his efforts to repel his argument. Christiani believed that this represented a victory:

Although he was not willing to confess the truth unless compelled to do so by the force of authoritative textual evidence, when he could not refute such evidence he said publicly that he did not believe in those texts which had been adduced against him, even though they are in ancient and authentic Jewish books, because they are *sermones*, in which their doctors very often lied for the sake of exhorting the people. He thereby impeached... both the doctors and the scriptures of the Jews.⁵

Thus, Nahmanides was caught in a dilemma: If he argued for the literal truth (as opposed to allegorical interpretation) of Rabbinic literature, as he had earlier in the anti-Maimonidean controversy, then he must accept the arguments of Christiani. If he rejected Rabbinical literature as allegory, or literary works, then the reliance of the contemporary Jewish community on those works meant that there was no substance to their tradition. Nahmanides ultimately found a defense, arguing for a two-fold division of Rabbinic literature: the Aggadah and

⁴ Robert Chazan, *Daggers of Faith* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989) 83.

⁵ Y. Baer, "The Disputations" cited in Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithica: Cornell UP, 1982) 120.

the Halakha. The Aggada was literary, and Jewish law did not require its acceptance as authoritative. The Halakha, on the other hand, was authoritative and legally binding. Since Christiani had only introduced examples from the first category, Nahmanides felt himself vindicated.

Christiani's limited knowledge of Rabbinic literature and the novelty of his approach were his chief liabilities. However, a Dominican who was just beginning his career in 1263 seized on Christiani's method and developed it into a well-planned, intricately constructed edifice. Raymond Martini was a Dominican Friar who had committed his life to the conversion of Jews and Muslims to the Christian faith. Before Martini, as we read in the letter of Odo, Jews had been able to argue that the *oral* tradition contradicted the arguments of their Christian adversaries. Christians, ignorant of the contents of Rabbinic literature, were unable to prevail against this defense. Martini determined to defeat the arguments of the Rabbis, not just by studying the oral tradition upon which the Jews had relied but by demonstrating that it, like the Bible, actually proved the truth of Christianity.

Despite Martini's central role in Christian polemical literature, few details about his early life have survived. He was born in Spain sometime between 1210 and 1215 and joined the newly-established Dominicans sometime between 1237 and 1240. The Dominicans were founded as a preaching order in 1216. The first mission of its members was to fight Christian heresies in Provence. This role quickly expanded, and as an extension of their mission against Christian heresies they were appointed as Inquisitors in 1232. As Inquisitors, the Dominicans grew aggressive fighting not only Christian heresies, but also attacked Judaism and Islam as false faiths predicated on ignorance. Because of their dual role as Inquisitors and missionaries to the Jews, Pope Gregory charged them with collecting and investigating the Hebrew

manuscripts confiscated following Donin's denunciation of the Talmud. However, Dominicans who had been born Christians could not read either Hebrew or Aramaic. As a result, the Dominicans established a school in Tunis in North Africa for the study of Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic. Martini was sent as part of the first group of students to this academy in 1250, where he distinguished himself. As a result of his progress, he was returned to Barcelona and in 1264 was appointed as censor of Hebrew manuscripts there.

As a result of the mass confiscations of Hebrew manuscripts which began two decades earlier, Martini had access to a large body of Rabbinic literature. During his examinations of these manuscripts, Martini encountered many passages which seemed to support Christiani's thesis: the early Rabbis recognized the truth of Christianity and the Divinity of Jesus, but in their stubbornness to persist in error they had rejected him. Martini served as censor of Hebrew manuscripts until 1281. In the early part of his career in Barcelona, Martini continued in his quest to convince the Muslims and Jews of their error by composing two works, one directed against Islam, and the second an attack on Judaism. One account of his career, composed several years after his death recounts:

He first composed several treatises against the Saracens. It was known as *Contra Alcoranum legem Saracenorum* — ***Against the Koran, Law of the Saracens*** and Lusitanus translated it. It... was written in Arabic, and has been completely ignored.

Afterwards, he wrote — entirely in Latin — a work which was brief, and was called *Capistrum* [***Bridle***]. Lusitanus added *Judaeorum* [***of the Jews***]. It is also completely neglected, for no one mentions its name.⁶

⁶ Quetif, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum* vol. 1:397: "Primo composuit diversas summas Saracenorum. Intellige "contra Alcoranum legem Saracenorum," ut interpretatur Lusitanus. Has forte Arabice scripsit, & ideo neglectae alicubi jacent.

Postea composuit solo Latino opus quoddam compendiosum quod apelatur "capistrum." Lusitanus addit "Judaeorum." Hoc & alicubi jacet neglectum, nam se vidisse nullus nomenclator afferit."

Disappointed by these two failures, Martini set out to compose a work which the Jews could not ignore. Their argument against the *Capistrum* had been that all the Hebrew and Aramaic texts were cited in Latin translations. By attacking the translations, the Rabbis were able to rebut their opponents easily. Martini resolved to develop an irrefutable argument against these "stubborn Jews."

Between his appointment in 1264 and 1278 he collected over 1000 citations from Rabbinic literature which he believed to be Christological in character. These citations he found in Talmud (Palestinian and Babylonian), Midrash, Philosophy and Commentaries. As his *magnum opus*, Martini arranged these texts into a handbook for Christians who wished to dispute the Jews. He provided an outline which he believed proved the central tenets of the Christian faith, accompanied by Rabbinic texts which "acknowledged" those truths in Hebrew along with translations into Latin. This work was completed around the year 1278, and was called *Pugio Fidei adversus Judaeos et Mauros* — "Dagger of Faith against Jews and Moors." Quetif, Martini's biographer, describes his triumph:

Finally, because the Jews, in their evil perfidy, considered that work of small weight, since it was published in Latin, he published a work which he titled *PUGIONEM [Dagger]*. It was well written in Hebrew and Latin.⁷

The *Pugio* represented a major advance for the Dominicans along a number of fronts. First, it provided all Christian disputants, regardless of background, with a ready handbook of Rabbinic texts. Any Jew who questioned a citation might be shown it in the original Hebrew. Secondly, it provided a full outline for a disputation, with damaging arguments to which Jewish participants

⁷ Ibid: "Tandem considerans Judaeorum astutam malitiam, qui parvipendunt quicquid illis Latine profertur. Editit opus quod *PUGIONEM* vocavit, & hoc Latine & Hebraice totum manu propria scripsit."

had no ready reply. This was made available to all Christian disputants, who no longer had to rely on ability and training in their public disputations. Thirdly, Martini was able to exploit the weaknesses in Nahmanides' argument in 1263, and to find strong supports for the weaknesses in Christiani's argument, by including many texts which were Halakhic in his compendium, and offering a much more detailed argument based upon a larger selection of texts. Martini's efforts were so successful that no effective Jewish rebuttal would arise for over a century.

Following publication of the *Pugio*, Martini must have been recognized for his brilliance in Hebrew and Aramaic studies among his Dominican colleagues. His work revealed his mastery of Jewish literature and law and an understanding, albeit misguided, of Jewish theology. Most likely as a reward for his achievements, Martini was appointed as director of the Dominican "Studium Hebraicum," and was charged with the responsibility of raising up disciples to follow in the method which he had pioneered. He died while serving in this office, sometime between 1285 and 1290. Martini left a treasured legacy to his fellow Dominicans, who continued to preach for centuries to and against the Jews from his textbook.

A study of the *Pugio* reveals that Martini used his Hebrew texts in a variety of ways. Often he cited passages which appeared to support doctrines in Christian theology:

Rabbi Yossi bar Hanina said: 'Moses enacted four decrees concerning Israel. And four prophets came and annulled them. Moses said, **'And Israel shall dwell in safety alone at the fountain of Jacob'** [Deut. 33:28: Rashi glossed this, 'When shall Israel dwell in safety? When they are like the fountain of Jacob']. Amos came and annulled it, as it says (Amos 7:5-6): **'God, please forgive; how shall Jacob stand** [Rashi glossed this: who is able to be as righteous as Jacob] for he is small.' And it is written: **'God was appeased concerning this; indeed this shall not come to pass.'** Moses said, **'They shall have no place for repose among those nations'** (Deut. 28:65). Jeremiah came and annulled it, as it is said: **'...even when I go to grant him rest'** (Jer. 31:1). Moses

said: 'visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children...' (Ex. 34:7). Ezekiel came and annulled it, as it says, 'That soul which sins, it shall die' (Ezek. 18:4) — a son shall not bear the sin of his father, nor shall the father bear the sin of his son. Moses said, 'You shall be lost among the nations' (Lev. 26:38). Isaiah came and annulled it, as it is said: 'And on that day it shall be blown upon the great shofar, and those who disappeared in the land of Assyria, and those who were exiled to the land of Egypt shall come and prostrate themselves to the LORD upon the sacred mountain in Jerusalem' (Is. 27:13)⁸⁹."

Martini used this passage to demonstrate that later prophets could—and did — annul earlier laws and decrees, supporting the Christian abandonment of the ritual laws contained in the Hebrew Scriptures.

In other cases, Martini used midrashic techniques to prove Christian Dogma. For example, he used Rabbinic syllogism to demonstrate that Rabbinic literature confirms that the Messiah is in fact divine. Martini cites Ps. 91:1 as the foundation for his argument: "ישב בסתר עליון בצל שדי יתלונן" "He who abides in the shelter of the *Elyon*, who lodges in the shadow of *Shadai*." Martini notes that the two terms *Elyon* and *Shaddai* are equivalent, and both refer to God. Using this derived meaning for *Elyon*, Martini applies the midrashic technique of *Gezerah Shava* (equivalency of terms) to a passage from *Exodus Rabba* 19:7:

"Sanctify to me all the first-born (Ex. 13:2): Rabbi Nathan said: 'The Blessed Be He said to Moses, Just as I made Jacob my first-born, as it says 'You are my son, my first-born,' so likewise I

⁸ Cf Makkot 24a

⁸⁹Pugio Fidei 806: א"ר יוסי בר חנינא ארבע גזרות גזר משה על ישראל ובאו ארבעה נביאים ובטלו משה אמ' וישכון ישראל בטח בדד עין יעקב [פי' רש"י אימתי ישכנו ישראל לבטח כשיהיו כעין יעקב] בא עמוס ובטלה שנ' יהוה סלח נא מי יקום יעקב [פי' רש"י מי יכול להיות חסיד כיעקב] כי קטון הוא וכתוב נחם יהוה על זאת גם היא לא תהיה. משה אמר ובגוים ההם לא תרגיע בא ירמיהו ובטלה שנ' הלוך להרגיעו ישראל. משה אמ' פוקד עון אבות על בנים בא יחזקאל ובטלה שנ' הנפש החוטאת היא תמות בן לא ישא בעון האב והאב לא ישא בעון הבן. משה אמר ואבדתם בגוים בא ישעיהו ובטלה שנ' והיה ביום ההוא יתקע בשופר גדול ובאו האובדים בארץ אשור והנדחים בארץ מצרים והשתחוו ליהוה בהר הקדש בירושלם.

make the Anointed King a first-born, as it says: 'I shall make him [i.e. the Messiah] *Elyon* for all the kings of the earth.'¹⁰

Using his previously derived meaning of *Elyon*, Martini interpreted this passage to mean that the Messiah would be identical with God, as asserted in Christian theology.

Finally, in other cases Martini cited passages which appear to echo episodes from the Gospels:

"Then it shall be said to Jacob, 'What has God wrought' (Num. 23:23). Balaam saw with his eyes that Israel was sitting before the Blessed Be He as a student before his teacher in the future, asking Him concerning each and every verse, 'Why was this written?' And thus he says (Is. 23:18): 'For they shall be sitting before the LORD, and they shall be negotiating to eat to satiety, and to wear fine clothing.' And it says, 'Your teacher shall no longer be hidden from you; but your eyes shall see your teacher' (Is. 30:20). And the ministering angels shall be asking them, 'What has the Blessed Be He taught you?', for they will be unable to enter into their midst, as it is said, 'Then it shall be said to Jacob, What has God wrought?'.¹¹

Martini interpreted this as descriptive of Jesus' ministry of teaching, examples of which are found frequently throughout the Gospels.

One of Martini's more important Rabbinic sources was the *Bereishit Rabba* of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan. Martini cited Moshe haDarshan more than any other single author, with more than 90 citations, or about 9% of all the

קדש לי כל בכור. א"ר נתן אמר הב"ה למשה כשם שעשיתי יעקב בכור שנ' ¹⁰ בני בכורי ישראל כך אני עשה למלך המשיח בכור שנ' אני בכור אתנהו עליון למלכי הארץ.

¹¹ *Numbers Rabba* 20:20. כעת יאמר ליעקב מה פעל אל. ראתה עינו של בלעם שישראל ישבין לפני הב"ה כתלמיד לפני רבו לעתיד לבא שואלין ממנו כל פרשה ופרשה למה נכתבה וכן הוא אומר כי ליושבים לפני יהוה יהיה סחרה לאכול לשבעה ולמכסה עתיק ואומר לא יכנף עוד מוריד והיו עיניך רואות את מורידך ומלאכי השרת שואלין אותן מה הורה לכם הב"ה לפי שאינן יכולין להכנס למחיצתן שנ' כעת יאמר ליעקב ולישראל מה פעל אל

quotations from Rabbinic literature. Moreover, the texts introduced by Martini and attributed to Moshe haDarshan seem to lend themselves to Martini's argument more than any other Jewish texts. For instance, Martini cited a Midrash which affirms that Jews believe that the Messiah has been born:

"Rabbi Shmuel son of Nahman said: 'Whence do you claim that the day on which the Anointed [*Messiah*] was born was the very day on which the Temple was destroyed? It [Scripture] says: **'Before she has labor, a woman shall deliver; before she has travail, give birth to a son. Who has heard of such a thing; who has seen such a thing?'** [Is. 66:7]. When the Sanctuary was destroyed, they [i.e. Israel] cried out like a woman in labor, for it [Scripture] says: **'For I have a voice like a woman birthing; in pain as one with her first child'** [Jer. 4:31]."¹²

This text seems to contradict Martini's thesis, since Jesus was born 70 years before the destruction of the Temple, as Christians' Jewish opponents had pointed out. Martini responded to this by adopting the position that the Jews had hidden the truth of Jesus identity as true Messiah by saying that the Messiah was born on the day the Temple was destroyed, and not before the Temple was destroyed:

From this, and similar ones the Jews in their madness have said that the Messiah was born on the day of the destruction of the Temple. In the first place, concerning this tale it is said in Ps. 119:85 **"Godless men had dug pitfalls for me, men who do not conform to Your law"**—*"The impudent have dug trenches for me"*: for example they have related shameless tales *"which are not from your law"*. It is certainly not in this kind of tale which the Law of God revealed the Messiah and established the birth, and his coming before the destruction of the Temple. Rather, it is more

א"ר שמואל בר נחמן מגיין אתה אומר בו ביום שנולד משיח בו ביום חריב¹²
 בית המקדש שנ' בטרם תחיל ילדת בטרם יבא חבל לה והמליטה זכר מי שמע כזאת מי
 דאה כאלה בשעה [שחרב] בית המקדש צעקו כיולדה שנ' כי קול כחולה שמעתי צרה
 כמבכירה

truthful that "The scepter shall not depart from Judah [until Shilo—i.e. the Messiah—has come]".¹³

Martini used this passage to prove that Jews accepted a fundamental truth—the birth of the Messiah during the Second Temple period. At the same time, he believed that they deliberately hid that truth by surrounding it with a fable which had no basis in Biblical prophecy and which he believed actually contradicted Biblical prophecy. For Martini believed that Gen. 49:10 revealed the proper sequence for the appearance of the Messiah: The Messiah would be born, and then Jewish hegemony would cease. For Martini, any midrash in which these events occurred simultaneously contradicted Biblical prophecy.

Martini cited another text from Moshe haDarshan which appears to support numerous Christian doctrines:

"Two years later Pharaoh had a dream... (Gen. 41:1): As it says, (Ps. 146:7), 'God will release the Issurim (reading midrashically, "forbidden things," rather than literally *assurim* — "the prisoners"). All those animals which are unclean in this world, the Blessed Be He will declare clean, as they used to be clean for the sons of Noah, as it says (Gen. 9:3): '[Every creature that moves shall be food for you; I give you them all] as once I gave you all green plants.' Just as the green plants are all clean, so also were the wild and domestic animals clean for them, and in the future God will permit all that had been forbidden. And why did He forbid them in this world: To see who would accept His words, and who would not. What is the meaning of 'God will release the forbidden things?' There is no more stringent prohibition than that against the woman in mensus; for she sees [her menstrual blood] and is forbidden [to her husband]. But in the future the Blessed Be He will make her permissible, for it says, 'I will also remove the prophets and the spirit of defilement I will cause to be dispersed from the earth' (Zech. 13:2). The only

¹³ Ex his, & similibus habet insania Judaeorum dicentium Messiam fuisse natum in die destructionis templi. Ad fabulam itaque prima positam dicatur illud Psal. 119 v. 85. כרו זרים לי שיחות אשר לא כתורתך. *Foderunt mihi protervi fossas: vel narraverunt mihi impudentes fabulas quae non sunt ut lex tua.* Non sunt utique hujusmodi fabulae ut lex Dei quae Messiam ostendit & natum fuisse, & venisse ante destructionem templi, ut per, *Non auferetur Sceptum de Juda*, superius probatum est.

'defilement' is menstruation, for it says (Lev. 18:19) **'you shall not approach a woman who is in the defilement of her menstruation.'** There are those who say that sexual relations shall be forbidden in the future, just as He prohibited them sexual relations for the three days prior to that day on which the Blessed Be He revealed Himself on Sinai. For it says (Ex. 19:15): **'Be ready by the third day; do not approach a woman.'** Why? Because on the third day, God will descend on Mt. Sinai. And if He prohibited them three days for an appearance of one day, in the future, in the days of the Anointed, when the *Shekhina* will dwell among them, how much more so would it be prohibited. Rather, to what does, 'God will release the *assurim*' refer? Those restrained in Sheol, those restrained in death."¹⁴

As Martini read it, this text seemed to confirm several tenets of Christianity. He thought that the lifting of the taboo against forbidden foods appeared to agree with Matthew 15:11: "A man is not defiled by what goes into his mouth, but by what comes out of it." Martini linked the abrogation of the "ritual" law and the end of prophecy with Matthew 5:17: "Do not suppose that I have come to abolish the Law and the prophets; I did not come to abolish but to complete..." In Martini's eyes, this text proved that Jews were in error because of their continued adherence to a law which had been fulfilled and annulled in the coming of Jesus.

Besides those texts which appeared to Martini to be Christological, he also cited books which were considered part of the canon by Christians, but non-canonical by Jews. These texts (later labelled the Apocrypha by Protestant)

ויהי מקץ שנתים ימים ופרעה חולם זה שאמ' הכתוב יהוה מתיר אסורים כל ¹⁴
הבהמה שנמאאת בעולם הזה הב"ה מטהר אותה לעתיד לבא כשם שהיו טהורים תחלה
לבני נח שנ' כירק עשב נתתי לכם את כל מה הירק עשב טהור לכל אף החיה והבהמה
היו טהורים להם ואף לעתיד לבא הוא מתיר את כל מה שאסר ולמה אסרם בעולם הזה
לראות מי מקבל דבריו ומי לא מקבל ומהו יהוה מתיר אסורים אין אסור גדול מנדה
שהאשה [רואה דם] ואסרה הב"ה [לבעלה] ולעתיד לבא הוא מתירה וכן הוא אומ' וגם
את הנביאים ואת רוח הטומאה אעביר מן הארץ ואין טומאה אלא נדה וכן הוא אומ' ואל
אשה בנדת טומאתה לא תקרב ויש אומ' עף תשמיש המטה הוא יהיה אסור בפעמים
לעתיד תדע לך שכן יום שנגלה הב"ה על הר סיני אסרם בתשמיש המטה שלשה ימים
שנ' היו נכונים לשלשת ימים אל תגשו אל אשה למה כי ביום השלישי ירד יהוה על
הר סיני ואם יום אחד שנגלה הב"ה אסר עליהם שלשה ימים לעתיד לבא בימות המשיח
שהשכינה ביניהם לא כל שכן אלא מהו מתיר אסורים אסירי שאול אסירי המות.

or references to them were found within the work of Moshe haDarshan. One example of a longer selection found in the *Bereishit Rabba* of Moshe haDarshan is the episode of Daniel and the Bel. This book is appended to the Greek book of Daniel as chapters 14ff. It contains two separate episodes in which Daniel proves that the gods of Babylonia are mere idols. In both episodes Daniel outwits and humiliates the idolatrous priests. These episodes are not preserved in Jewish texts of Daniel, nor are they mentioned in the early Midrashic texts. However, part of one of the books is found in the work of Moshe haDarshan, as cited by Martini:

"...And they cast him into the pit..." (Gen. 37:24): As it is written concerning Daniel: 'And the Babylonians assembled against the king, and they complained against him, saying to one another: The King is a Jew! He destroyed Bel, and he killed the Dragon, and he has put all of the priests to death. And they came before the king, and they said to him: Either surrender Daniel to us, or if you don't, we will kill you and all of your household. And the king saw that all were against him as one, and his hand was forced, and it was necessary that he give Daniel over to them. They led him off (that is Daniel), and brought him and threw him into the pit of the seven lions. And they usually gave them two human corpses every day, and two lambs per day, but on those days they did not give them anything, so that they might eat him and consume him (that is Daniel). And there was a prophet, Habakkuk, in Judea; and he had boiled up a stew, and he had put bread in the bowl. and he got up and went out to carry it to the field for the harvesters. And an Angel of the LORD said to him, 'Go carry this food which you have to Daniel, who was thrown into the lion pit in Babylon.' And Habakkuk said, 'Sir, I never saw Babylon, and I do not know where that pit is.' So the Angel put his hand on the head of Habakkuk and took him by the hair of his head, and put him in Babylon, above the pit, by the power of the Holy Spirit. Habakkuk called out and said, 'Daniel! Daniel! Arise, take these foodstuffs which God has sent you.' And Daniel said, 'God has remembered me, and in His mercy he has not abandoned me, and I know that You do not abandon those who love you.' So Daniel got up, and took and ate. The Angel took Habakkuk at that same time, and took him back to the place from which he initially took him. And now the king came on the seventh day, to weep for Daniel, because he was like a son to him. And he came to the pit, and he looked into the pit and he saw Daniel sitting around. And he gave a loud cry and said, 'Great is the God of Daniel!' And he raised him from the pit. And with regard to the enemies of Daniel, who had plotted against him and sought to kill him, he

threw them into the pit. And immediately the lions ate them in the presence of the king, and in the presence of Daniel."¹⁵

Martini cited another passage from the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabbi Moshe haDarshan* to prove that the Rabbis also believed the traditions of the fallen angels found in Jude 6 and 2Peter 2:4. According to the tradition, the angels came down to earth and assumed a human form and a material body. This text is actually based upon the "Book of the Giants" found in 1Enoch 6-10:

"**'And the Angels saw that womankind was beautiful'** (Gen. 6:2) The Blessed Be He is patient with everything except licentiousness. What is the Scriptural proof for this? **'And the Angels saw that womankind was beautiful.'** What is written in Scripture concerning this? **'I will destroy mankind'**. Rabbi Joseph said: The Angels saw that God regretted creating humanity. Immediately two Angels stood before the LORD — their names were Shemhaze and Azazel — and they said to Him, 'Lord of the World, at the time that you created the world, did we not say to you not to create human beings?' as it says, **'What is man that you take note of him; the son of man that you remember him.'** (Ps. 8:50) The Blessed Be He said to them, 'and what should become of the world?' The Angels said to him, 'we will occupy ourselves [with it].' He said to them, 'it is clear to me that if you were in his [i.e. man's] world, and the Evil Inclination were to dominate you as it did mankind, you would be even worse than him.' They said to him, 'give us permission to dwell among mankind and you will see how we sanctify your name.' He said to them, 'I have already permitted you.' They went down, and immediately the evil inclination overcame them. As soon as they saw how beautiful the daughters of man were, they lusted after

¹⁵ PF 802-3:

וישליכו אותו הבורה הה"ד בדניאל ואיתכנשו בבלי על מלכא ואתהפכו עליו ואמרין חד לחד יהודאה הוא ליה מלכא לביל תבר ולתנינא קטל ולכמריא קטל קטלינון ואיתון גב מלכא ואמרין ליה או אשלם לן דניאל ואי לא קטלינון לך ולביתך וחזא מלכא דקמו עלוי כולהון אכחדא ואתאלץ ליה ואלצאית אשלמיה להון לדניאל וחינון דברוניו לדניאל ואזל כאמוניו בגובא דאריותא שבעה ויהבין להון ברין פגרין ביזמא וברין דכרין ובהנין יומיא לא יהבי להון מדם דנאכלין אך דני דניכפנון ונאכלוניו לדניאל ואיתא חבקוק נביא ביהודה ובשיל בישאלא ופת פתי בערבא וארמי ביה ואזל דיובל לחלקא לחצארי וא"ל מלאכא דיהוה זיל אוביל מיוכלתא הדא די עלך לדניאל דרמי בגובא דאריותא בבבל לעיל מן גובא בעוזא דרוחא דקודשא וקדא חבקוק ואמ' דניאל דניאל קום שקול שארותא הוא דשדר לך אלהא ואמ' דניאל אתדכרן אלהא ולא שבוק רחמיו מיני וידענא דלא שאבקת לאילין דרחמין לך וקם דניאל היך דהוא מן קדם ואתא לוות גובא ואדיק בגובא וחזיה לדניאל כדיתב ויהב קלא רמא ואמ' רב הוא אלהיה דדניאל ואסקיה מן גובא ולבעלי דבבין דדניאל הדין דאכלו קרציו ובעין למקטליה אשרי אנון כגובא ובה בשעתא אכלו אינון אריותא קדמיו דמלכא וקדם דניאל.

them, and they were unable to overcome their evil inclinations, as it says 'and the Angels saw...' Shemhaze saw one virgin, whose name was Astera. He set his sights on her and said, 'submit yourself to me.' She said to him, 'I will not submit myself to you until you teach me the Ineffable Name, by means of which you ascend to Heaven as soon as you mention it.' As soon as he taught it to her she mentioned it and ascended to Heaven. The Blessed Be He said, 'since she cut herself off from sin, I will make an example of her so that she shall be remembered forever.' Immediately he fixed her among the seven stars of the Pleiades. When Shemhaze and Azael saw this, they rose up and married women and fathered children. Rabbi said, 'If it should occur to you to say, how is it that flesh and blood can touch angels (for does it not say, **'His servants are flames of fire** (Ps. 104:4), this teaches that when the angels fell from their holy place — from heaven — the evil inclination overcame them like mankind, and their power and stature became like that of man, and their skin was clothed in dust [i.e. a material body], as it says, **'My flesh is clothed in worms, and my skin is dust** (Job 7:5). And Rabbi Zadok said, 'The giants who ruled according to the wickedness of their hearts, and in their enormity they were reaching out their hands in every type of theft and sexual immorality and bloodshed as it says, **'And there we saw the fallen angels — the giants who are descended of the fallen angels — and we would be as grasshoppers in their sight, and so were we in their eyes'** (Num. 13:34) and **'and there were giants...**' (Gen. 6:4) They taught 'Shemhaze fathered two sons, and their names were Hayya and Chayya. And they married women, and fathered sons—Sihon and Og. They said concerning Shemhaze that he repented and suspended himself between heaven and earth, with his head downwards and his feet upwards so that he would have no opportunity¹⁶ to speak with the Blessed Be He. And to this day he is suspended in penitence between heaven and earth. But Azael did not repent. And he is appointed over all types of make-up and jewelry by which women entice men to sin. And he remains still in his sin. And for this reason Israel was sacrificing and were casting one lot for the LORD to atone for all of the sins of Israel, and one lot for Azazel, so that he would bear the sins of Israel. As it is written, **'And Aaron cast lots over the goats; one lot for the LORD and another for Azazel. And Aaron sacrificed the goat upon which the lot for the LORD fell, and he made him a sin-offering. But the goat upon which the lot for Azazel fell remained alive before the LORD to atone for him, in order to send him to Azazel in the wilderness.'** (Lev. 16:)¹⁷"

¹⁶ Lit. "no opening of the mouth"

¹⁷ ויראו בני האלהים את בנות האדם כי טובות הנה על הכל הב"ה מאריך אפו חוץ מן הזונות מט' ויראו בני האלהים את בנות האדם מה כתיב בתורה אמהה את האדם ר' יוסף אומ' ראו המלאכים שהיה הב"ה מתעצב על שברא בני אדם מיד עמדו שני מלאכים לפני הקב"ה ששם שמחזי ועזאל אמרו לפניו רשל"ע הלא אמרנו לפניך בשעה שבראת עולמך אל תברא אדם כענין שנ' מה אנוש כי תזכרנו וכן אדם כי תפקדנו אמ' להם הקב"ה ועולם מה תהא עליו אמרו לו אנו מתעסקין אמ' להם גלוי וידוע לפני אלו הייתם בעולמו ויה"ד שולט בכם כשם ששולט באדם הייתם קשים מהם

The citations attributed to Moshe haDarshan became controversial soon after Martini wrote the *Pugio Fidei*. By the time of the disputation of Tortosa in 1413, Moshe's work was unknown to the Jewish community. The rabbis at that disputation objected to quotations drawn from his work on the grounds that they were unfamiliar with the works cited. As in the disputation which opened this era in 1263, the disputation of Tortosa ended in 1414 without any clear victor. Consequently, several of the participants published works which reiterated and reinforced the arguments which they had presented orally. None of the Jewish participants in the disputation charged Martini with forgery either during or following the proceedings. However, a late apologist for the Jewish position, Don Isaac Abravanel, introduced a new defense against these pseudo-

אמרו לו תן לנו רשות ונדור עם הבריות ותראה היאך אנו מקדשים שמך א"ל הבה כבר נתתי לכם רשות מיד ירדו והשליט בהם יה"ר כיון שראו בנות האדם שהן יפות תעו אחריהן ולא יכלו לכבוש ביצרן הה"ד ויראו בני האלהים ראה שמחויי רבה אחת ששמה אסתירא נתן עיניו בה אמ' לה השמיעי לי אמרה לו איני שומעת לך עד שתלמדני שם המפורש שאתה עולה בו לרקיע בשעה שאתה זוכרו מיד למדתה והזכירתו ועלתה בו לרקיע אמ' הבה הואיל ופירשה עצמה מעבירה אעשנה דוגמה שתזכר לעולם מיד קבעה הבה בין שבעה כוכבים של כימה כוין שראה כך שמחויי ועזאל עמדו ונשאו נשים והולידו בנים ר' אומ' וכי תעלה על דעתך שבו"ד יכול ליגע אצל מלאכים והלא כתיב משרתיו אש לוהט אלא מלמד שכיון שנפלו המלאכים ממקום קדושתן מן השמים שלט בהן יה"ר כבני אדם וכחן וקומתן כבני אדם ולבשו גוש עפר שנ' לבש בשרי רמה וגוש עפר א"ר צדוק מהן נולדו הענקין המלכין כודנות לבם ובגובהן ומשלחין ידיהן שנ' ושם ראינו הנפלאים בני ענק מן הנפלאים ונהי בעינינו בכל גזל וחמס ושד' כחגבים וכן היינו בעיניהם ואומ' הנפלאים היו בארץ תנו שמחויי הוליד שני בנים ושמותם הייה וחייה ונשאו נשים והולידו בנים לסיחון ולעוג אמרו עליו על שמחויי שחזר בתשובה ותלה עצמו בין שמים וארץ ראשו למטה ורגליו למעלה לפי שלא היה לו פתחון הפה לפני הבה"ה ועד היום תלוי בתשובה בין השמים ובין הארץ אבל עזאל לא חזר בתשובה והוא ממונה על כל מיני צבעונים ועל כל מיני תכשיטין של נשין שמסיתין בני אדם לדבר עבירה ועדיין הוא בקלקולו ולכך היו ישראל מקריבין קרבנות והיו נותנין גורל אחד ליהוה שיכפר על כל עונות ישראל וגורל אחד לעזאל שיסבול עונותיהן של ישראל הה"ד ונתן אהרון על שני השעירין גורלות גורל אחד ליהוה וגורל אחד לעזאל והקריב אהרון את השעיר אשר עלה עליו הגורל ליהוה ועשהו חטאת והשעיר אשר עלה עליו הגורל לעזאל יעמוד חי לפני יהוה לכפר עליו לשלח אותו לעזאל המדברה וכולם.

Christological passages¹⁸. He claimed that Joshua HaLorqi (who had argued on behalf of the Christians) had tampered with and even manufactured texts.

Abravanel wrote his work in response to the Hebrew version of Joshua HaLorqi's polemical work, *Sefer haPiqurim*. HaLorqi selected his passages from the *Pugio*, as he had during the disputation in Tortosa. In fact, during the disputation HaLorqi did not cite a single text which is not found in the *Pugio*. Among these selections were several from the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabbi Moshe haDarshan* and from the *Bereishit Rabba k'tanna*. By the time of Abravanel, the work of Moshe haDarshan was certainly unknown. Abravanel wrote that he had not seen any work by Moshe haDarshan: ואני כבר הודעתך שלא ראיתי ב"ר — "and I have already informed you that I have not seen the *Bereishit Rabba* of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan"¹⁹ One passage which described the ten kings who would rule the earth, which HaLorqi had cited as the *Bereishit Rabba*, but which Martini attributed to Moshe haDarshan resembles the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. The version of Moshe haDarshan states that the tenth and final king will be God. Abravanel had never seen this version, nor did he find it in the *Bereishit Rabba*. Because of the mistaken attribution, Abravanel assumed that HaLorqi had forged the passage:

And although their words seem good and honest, they are built upon a line which is void, and stones which are chaos. For this passage—as the apostate cites it—does not appear thus. But he forged it as he pleased, in order to derive from it a worthless decoy and vanities. And behold, the ten kings who ruled from one

¹⁸ Isaac Abravanel, *Yeshuot Meshiho* (Koenigsberg: H. Gruber and Langrien, 1861).

¹⁹ Abravanel, *Yeshuot Meshiho* 62b.

end of the world to the other are recounted in the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer*.²⁰

However, it is clear that Abravanel accused HaLorqi of forgery because of the erroneous attribution, not because of the contents of the passage.

Abravanel accuses HaLorqi of forgery again when he discusses a passage from the *Bereishit Rabba K'tanna*:

And all that which he added is worthless, and a lie. For it is only written in the Midrash up to "For I will bear;" and how much the more so are all the other things which he fabricated from his own imagination. And he continued his nonsense, saying that the name "Judah" which appears in prophecies refers to their supposed Messiah.²¹

Two things are clear from Abravanel's comments. First, he does not deny that a work by Moshe haDarshan existed. Indeed, Rashi, Nahmanides and other well-known writers referred to this work. Secondly, Abravanel only charged forgery in those instances when HaLorqi incorrectly attributed a passage taken from the work of Moshe haDarshan to a different work. On the other hand, in every case in which Abravanel cites texts attributed to Moshe haDarshan he explains them in a way which refutes HaLorqi's (and Martini's) Christological interpretation.

For the next 450 years after Abravanel Jewish writers ignored the *Pugio Fidei* and the texts which it contained. In addition, knowledge of Moshe haDarshan and his compositions almost completely disappeared. All that survived of

²⁰ Abravanel, op. cit. 64b. ועם היות דבריהם טובים ונכוחים הנה הנם בנוים על קו תהו ואבני בזהו לפי שאין המאמר הזה כמו שהביאו המפקד ולא נמצא כן והוא זיפו כרצונו להוליד ממנו משאת שוא ומדוחים והנה העשרה מלכים שמלכו מסוף העולם ועד סופו נזכרו בפרקי ד"א...

²¹ Abravanel, 58a. וכל זה שהוסיף הוא שוא ודבר כזב כי לא נכתב במדרש כי אם עד כי אני אסבול ואמלט על אחת כמה וכמה ושאר הדברים בדה מלבו ונמשך לשטותו לומר ששם יהודה שבא בנבואות יאמר על כל המודים במשיח המדומה

his work were the few citations which were collected and published by S.L. Rapoport in 1829²² and later, more completely by A. Epstein in 1891²³. Then in 1832, Zunz published his monumental work, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* ("The Sermons of the Jews") which traced the history of Jewish literature from the Second Temple period through the late middle ages. In his history, Zunz described the work of Moshe haDarshan and speculated on the scope and importance of his contributions to Jewish literature. Zunz used the *Pugio* as his main source of information on Moshe haDarshan: "Die Untersuchung über die Leistungen des R. Moses wird durch folgenden Umstand auf eigene Weise verwickelt. Es citirt nämlich der Mönch Raymund Martin in seinem *pugio fidei* eine beträchtliche Anzahl von Stellen aus dem grossen Bereschith rabba des R. Moses haddarschan'..."²⁴. However, in Zunz's days the charge of forgery had not yet been laid against Martini.

In 1877, two authors inaugurated the modern debate over Martini with the publication of their book, *The Psalms with Introduction and Critical Notes*.²⁵ They attack Martini as a forger and his texts as unreliable:

The reader is warned against accepting as genuine the citations from Jewish works in Schoettgen's *Horae Hebraicae* and Raymund Martini's *Pugio Fidei*. Both works are utterly untrustworthy. Raymund Martini (*Ordinis Praedicatorum adversus Mauros et Judaeos*, fl. cir. 1250) is notorious for the questionable expedients which he adopted in endeavoring to refute the Jews from their own books. With that well-meaning dishonesty which too frequently marked the controversialists of his age, he alters the text of the Talmud, Midrashim, etc., to meet his occasion, and even devises whole passages where convenient. Martini was a sound Hebrew scholar, and as his forgeries are generally clever adaptations and

²² S.L. Rapoport, *Bikkure ha'Itim* 1829:7-79; 1830:81-

²³ A. Epstein, *Rabbi Moses haDarshan*.

²⁴ Zunz, 287.

²⁵ As quoted in Neubauer, *The Book of Tobit* (Oxford: 1878). I have been unable to locate the book cited, or to identify the authors.

combinations from other parts of Hebrew literature, it is only by reference to the actual texts of these Jewish works that his impostures are betrayed.²⁶

Their claim that Martini's forgeries were "notorious" is a great exaggeration; it was in fact his literary heir HaLorqi who had been accused of forgery by Abravanel and others who followed him.

Later that same year, Adolph Neubauer and Samuel Driver published an anthology of Jewish commentaries on Isaiah 53.²⁷ Neubauer and Driver decided (at the request of Edward Pusey, general editor of the anthology) to include several controversial passages from the *Pugio* in this collection. These were attributed to the Midrash texts in which Martini originally found them. This decision was somewhat remarkable, since these passages were not to be found in the manuscripts or printed editions available to these two scholars. By their decision, Neubauer and Driver publicly affirmed the reliability of Martini as an independent textual witness. In his introduction to this volume, Edward Pusey discussed the controversy surrounding Martini and his citations. He mentions that Martini "has lately been denounced as one 'guilty of impostures,' well-meaning dishonesty'... 'audacious alteration of the text,' &c."²⁸ Pusey defended the authenticity of Martini's passages and his method of collecting texts, if not his motives in selecting those texts. Pusey asked the question, "Either Martini was what he has hitherto been accounted, an able and laborious and conscientious man with vast resources at his command, which have since been lost, or he was a forger, a liar, and a hypocrite. There is no doubt of his

²⁶ Neubauer, xx.

²⁷ Ad. Neubauer and S. R. Driver, *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpreters* (Oxford: 1877).

²⁸ Ibid. xxx.

ability... Did he abuse these powers, lying in the name of God?"²⁹ Pusey defended Martini with three arguments: 1) throughout the middle ages, and up through modern times the loss of Hebrew manuscripts has been enormous, resulting in many important works surviving only in quotations, or even only by name, 2) if Martini had actually forged texts, these would have been challenged almost immediately; this was in fact not the case—these texts remained unchallenged for more than 140 years and 3) Martini would have jeopardized his entire enterprise, and his character as well if he had actually resorted to such forgeries.

The following year, Neubauer published his discovery of an Aramaic text of the apocryphal book of *Tobit* from the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabba*. *Tobit* describes the righteousness and misfortunes of one of the exiles to Assyria after the fall of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. Although it was preserved in the Septuagint (Greek) and the Vulgate (Latin) translations, it was not included in the list of Hebrew books chosen by the Rabbis for the canon. In addition, Neubauer included a full text of the *Bel and the Dragon* which was partially cited by Martini. Neubauer discovered these texts during his research as Librarian of Jewish Manuscripts at the Bodleian Library. Like Pusey, Neubauer defended Martini's citations. He repeated Pusey's argument that it was not unusual for a work to survive in citations alone. He also argued that many of these disputed midrashic passages are found in other collections, obviating the need to forge an entire work to contain them. He reserved his strongest defense for Martini's knowledge and character: "Martini was neither an apostate, like Joshua [HaLorqi], nor a liar, like Galatin, but a deeply-learned man, who did

²⁹ Ibid. xxxi.

not require to strengthen his numerous extracts from well-known Halakhic and Aggadic writings with the addition of fraud."³⁰

The first to initiate a detailed reexamination of the contested texts of the *Pugio* was Schiller—Sziessy³¹. Schiller—Sziessy renewed the debate over Martini's texts in response to Pusey's inclusion of Martini's texts in his anthology, again raising the charge of forgery. Unlike Abravanel, Schiller—Sziessy knew that the source for HaLorqi's citations was actually the *Pugio Fidei*. However, he suggested a new theory for the origin of these suspect passages: he charged that these problematic texts were composed by Pablo Christiani, as part of an entirely new work—the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabba*. He also credited Christiani with the composition of the *Pugio* itself. His attack actually consisted of six separate charges, which were detailed and examined by Neubauer in his rebuttal.³² The central thesis of his argument was a) the passages attributed to Moshe haDarshan are far too heterodox to have been composed by a devout Jew and b) that Martini was too ignorant of Hebrew to have written those passages. So for instance, Schiller—Sziessy says of Moshe haDarshan's midrash on God's command to the angels to worship the newly created first man, "Can anybody who is in the least acquainted with rabbinical literature believe that any rabbi would teach so monstrous a piece of nonsense, nay idolatry, as is here attributed to R. Mosheh Haddarshan, that the Lord should have commanded the angels to worship the first man?"³³ However, by this time

³⁰ Ad. Neubauer, *Tobit* xix.

³¹ Schiller—Sziessy, in the *Journal of Philology* vol. xvi no. 31, 130ff as cited by Ad. Neubauer, "Jewish Controversy and the 'Pugio Fidei,' in *Expositor* 7(1888) 81-100; 190-197.

³² Ad. Neubauer, "Jewish Controversy and the 'Pugio Fidei,'" in *Expositor* 7(1888) 81-105; 179-197.

³³ Neubauer, "Jewish Controversy" 184.

a manuscript of Moshe haDarshan's work had been discovered. Rejecting the manuscript evidence of a large collection by Moshe HaDarshan, Schiller—Sziinessy wrote of the announcement with contempt:

Through the kindness of Mr. S. Buber of Lemberg, we have before us a copy of the so-called *Bereishit rabbathi* of Rabbi Moses Haddarshan. We can positively assure the reader that the late learned Rabbi S. L. Rapoport, in this respect, first deceived himself, and then deceived Zunz, who in his turn deceived many others in declaring the contents of this MS. to be Rabbi Moshe Haddarshan's, although it is no doubt an early Midrashic commentary on the book of Genesis. In a general way we must caution the reader against the conjectures into which Rapoport's genius led him, against the notices of Zunz founded on these conjectures, and against the buildings reared by the idle on their idol's foundation. At all events, this so-called *Bereishit rabbathi* does not throw the least light on the *Pugio*; the only piece it has in common with it is on the death of Moses...³⁴

In 1887³⁵ Abraham Epstein described the works of Moshe haDarshan, and the unusual texts in his collection. Although Epstein alluded to the controversy which surrounded the work, and even attributed its disappearance to its unusual contents, he did not present an argument for its authenticity. However in 1888³⁶—following the publication of Schiller—Sziinessy's attack—Epstein did enter the debate over the *Bereishit Rabbati*, Moshe haDarshan and Martini's texts. In response to Schiller—Sziinessy, Epstein showed that the *Bereishit Rabbati* contained no less than 17 passages which were cited by Martini as the work of Moshe haDarshan. Furthermore he showed that other texts in the *Bereishit Rabbati* which were not cited by Martini are also heterodox, and could be understood to be contrary to orthodox Jewish thought. From this, Epstein

³⁴ Schiller—Sziinessy, op. cit. in Neubauer, "Jewish Controversy" 104.

³⁵ Ab. Epstein, *Miqadmaniyot haYehudim* (Vienna, 1887) 139-140.

³⁶ Ab. Epstein, "*Bereishit Rabbati*, Moses ha-Darshan und *Pugio Fidei*," in *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* (1888):1-35.

concluded that the manuscript before him was an excerpt from the work of Moshe haDarshan, and that Martini's citations were authentic.

In 1888 Neubauer too came to Martini's defense with a rebuttal of Schiller—Sziinessy's article, along with a detailed history of Jewish and Christian polemical argument. In his earlier research, Neubauer had concluded that the manuscript of the *Bereishit Rabbati*, originally discovered by S.L. Rapoport and described by Zunz, was authentic. He examined it carefully and noted the many similarities between it and the texts cited by Martini. His comparison of these texts, as well as his study of the *Pugio* led him to conclude: "...the Midrash of Moses haDarshan is at present lost, and we cannot compare all Martini's quotations, but we have seen that where we have the means of confronting him with the remains of this Midrash he stands blameless"³⁷. Neubauer also showed that Martini was quite competent in Hebrew and Aramaic: "Martini made perhaps a dozen errors in the course of some hundred quotations, and on this account is charged with ignorance. If that however is to be the rule of judgment, very few scholars will be left for Oriental philology at all"³⁸.

The most detailed defense of Martini's reliability was published by S. Lieberman³⁹. His argument consisted of three main points: a) Martini's Hebrew was certainly not good enough for him to produce credible forgeries, nor was his knowledge of Jewish texts sufficient to imitate the style of Rabbinic texts, b) Martini could not have been the sole researcher and translator at work on the *Pugio* and c) It would have made no sense at all for Martini to deliberately

³⁷ Neubauer, "Jewish Controversy" 189.

³⁸ Ibid. 188-9.

³⁹ S. Lieberman, *Sheki'in* (Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1940).

forge passages and endanger the success of his monumental project. In support of his first point, Lieberman wrote:

And it seems to me that it is possible to bring evidence from his book which will prove to us that Martini did not learn Talmud in his youth. This evidence will shed light on his general knowledge of Talmud. Let us examine a few of his translations of the Talmudic passages which he cites.⁴⁰

Lieberman went on to cite ten passages from the Talmud which Martini translated incorrectly. In all cases, Lieberman argued, the errors were of a sort that no knowledgeable Jew would have made. As a result, he believed that this refuted conclusively the claims of Schiller—Szinessy and others who claimed that Martini was the pen name of a Jewish apostate, possibly even Christiani himself:

It is possible to add many more examples like these, but those already cited are sufficient to prove that Martini was not in command of the necessary basics of Talmudic style, and certainly he was not a Rabbi, nor had he learned Talmud from his youth.⁴¹

This being the case, Lieberman asked, how could Martini ever have assembled over 1000 citations from Jewish literature spanning legal, midrashic, philosophical, and grammatical works along with Biblical commentaries?

Lieberman speculated that it was not in fact Martini who collected these passages at all:

It appears to me that we have a... rational answer. Martini was not just a Censor of Jewish books, but he was also a member of the court appointed over the censors... and it is extremely reasonable to presume that the different censors and their assistants presented to Martini material from Talmudical literature. And as a result of this, there is no cause for amazement at the great volume

⁴⁰ Lieberman 44: ונדמה לי שאפשר להביא ראיה מתוך עסם ספריו שתוכיח לנו כי מרטיני לא למד תלמוד מילדותו. ראיה זו תפיצ לנו אור על ידיעותיו התלמודיות בכלל. הבה נבדוק קצת מן התרגומים שלו לפסקאות התלמוד שהוא מביא.

⁴¹ Lieberman 43: על דוגמאות אלו יש להוסיף כהנה וכהנה, אלא שכל הנ"ל מספיק כבר להוכיח שמרטיני לא שלט כל צרכו בסיגנון הספרות התלמודית. ומכל שכן שלא היה רב ולא למד תלמוד מילדותו.

of Talmudic material in the book, *Pugio Fidei*, since the material was collected by several people (among them, certainly, Jewish apostates). And it is very possible that some of them included commentaries and translations to the passages which they excerpted from the Talmudic literature, but that Martini arranged the Hebrew text and the translation himself, and certainly he himself translated most of the passages.⁴²

Here as before, Lieberman cited a number of passages to prove his thesis. He showed that in several instances the same passage is translated differently. At times, when two translations appear in different sections of the *Pugio*, one is incorrect while the other is accurate. On other occasions, the Hebrew or Aramaic original appears in two different versions. As before, there are times when one version is accurate, while the other diverges from the standard version. To Lieberman, all this indicated at least two different scholars at work. According to Lieberman, the activities of these different researchers, who may have incorporated their own glosses and explanations into the text, vindicate Martini of any accusation of forgery. These additions were not by his own hand, nor was he aware of their presence.

Lieberman's final argument in defense of Martini is the fact that the initial accusations of forgery were not made until two centuries after the *Pugio* was completed. It was only after Abravanel's initial accusation that the charges of forgery multiplied:

And the question remains, how can the fact that over time the suspicions of forgery increased more and more be explained? It appears to me that it is possible to resolve this question (at least in part) in simple manner. The Jews in the time of Martini delivered their books themselves to the government. The disputations were

⁴² Ibid, 46: נדמה לי שיש לפנינו פתרון הרבה יותר רציונלי. מרטיני לא היה רק מבקר ספרי היהודים אלא חבר הבית דין הממונה על המבקרים... ומתקבל מאד על הדעת שהמבקרים השונים ועוזריהם... המציאו לו למרטיני חומר מן הספרות התלמודית. ולפי"ז אין להתפלא על ריבוי החומר התלמודי שבספר פגיון האמונה, שהרי החומר נאסף ע"י כמה אנשים (ביניהם בוודאי גם יהודים מומרים). ויתכן מאד שכמה מהם צרפו גם פירושים ותרגומים לפיסקאות שהוציאו מן הספרות התלמודית, אלא שמרטיני ערך בעצמו את הנוסח העברי ואת התרגום, ובוודאי ברגם בעצמו את רוב הפיסקאות.

conducted from passages taken from the books which the Jews brought to be censored, and the citations were essentially correct. However, because of the great deceit of the Christians who were persecuting them, the copyists began to change small things in their books, and to extirpate known expressions... And the rabbis who learned from these new books, which had been copied for the Yeshivot claimed that the statements and expressions upon which the Christians relied did not appear in their books. However, Joshua haLorqi drew most of his statements from the *Pugio Fidei*, which still contained the passages in their original form, without the scribal emendations.... And over time, the scribes emended more and more, so that by the time of Rabbi I. Abravanel the scribes had so changed the books, that it is not surprising that he was angry with the rabbis of the disputation, that they had not made a charge of forgery.⁴³

Thus, following Lieberman, it would be more accurate to say that Jews, and not Martini were more open to the charge of forgery. They had so changed the texts after centuries of disputations that they could no longer recognize the authentic traditions preserved by Martini.

The final and most detailed attack on Martini was written by Yitzhak Baer⁴⁴. Shortly after Lieberman published his defense of Martini, Baer returned to Abravanel's attack against the *Pugio*. His article was an attempt to substantiate the objections of the Jewish participants at Tortosa. Baer's approach was based upon the premise that the texts cited by Martini were so obviously Christian in nature that no responsible Jew could have penned them. As evi-

⁴³ Lieberman, 69-70: ונשאלת השאלה כיצד מתבאר הדבר שבמשך הזמן התרבו החשדות בזיוף יותר ויותר. נדמה לי שאפשר לפתור את השאלה (לכל הפחות בחלקה) באופן פשוט. היהודים בזמנו של מרטיני המציאו בעצמם את ספריהם לשלטונות. הוויכוחים התנהגו על סמך הפיסקאות מספרי היהודים שהובאו לבקורת, והציטטות היו בעיקרן נכונות. אולם מחמת הוויית הנוצרים המציקים התחילו הסופרים לשנות קצת בספרים ולהשמיט ביטויים ידועים... והרבנים שלמדו בספרים חדשים שנעתקו בעד הישיבות טענו שאין בספריהם מאמרים וביטויים ידועים שהסתייעו בהם הנוצרים. אבל יהושע לורקי שאב את רוב דבריו מפגיון האמונה, ושם היו עוד הפיסקאות הקדומות לפני תיקוני הסופרים... ובמשך הזמן תוקנו הספרים יותר ויותר, עד שבזמנו של ר"י אברבנאל נשתנו הספרים עוד יותר, ולא נתפלא שהוא כבר הברגז על הרבנים המתווכחים למה לא טענו טענת מזוייף.

⁴⁴ Yitzhak Baer, "Ha-Midrashim ha-mezzuyafim shel Raymundo Martini" in *Sefer Zikkaron l'Asher Gulak* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1942)

dence, he claimed that these texts were highly persuasive, and had convinced many Jews to convert to Christianity:

Many from among the Jews of that period, especially some from among the finest of the people, read Midrashim from Martini's collection and their eyes were "opened," and they saw the truth of the matter, that the entire doctrine of the Christians was supported by the words of the sages. What caused them such conclusions? Is there no distinction between Christian theology and the faith of the sages of the Mishna and Talmud? Or perhaps the Jews of the middle ages—both those who converted as well as those who remained faithful to their Judaism—did not know the nature of these distinctions in depth; and the entire matter of religious disputation, of the reinforcement of faith and apostasy, disappeared in a foggy air of unclear arguments, and foolish minds? Did the apostates renounce their faith because of a clear and well-founded recognition, and because of a living and awakened adherence in the doctrine of the redemption of the sages of the Mishna and Talmud which continues to stand in complete opposition to the core principles of the New Testament and the Christian Church Fathers? Questions such as these revealed to me the need to stand on my side against these Midrashim upon which the religious disputation relied.⁴⁵

Baer offered no evidence for his belief that Jews had read the *Pugio* prior to conversion. Nor did he cite any examples of Jews, prominent or simple, who had been persuaded by Martini's argument. In fact, the work would have been far beyond the reach of any but the most educated, since the entire argument is written in Latin. Furthermore, the expressed audience of the work was the Christian clergy, and not Jewish laity.

רבים מבין היהודים של אותה התקופה וביחוד אחדים מטובי האומה, קראו⁴⁵ מדרשים מאוצרו של מרטיני ונתפקחו עיניהם וראו שאמת הדבר ותורה שלימה של הנוצרים טמונה בדברי חז"ל. מה גרם להם להנחות כאלה? כלום אין גבול ומחיצה בין התיאולוגיה הנוצרית ואמונתם של חכמי המשנה והתלמוד? או שמא היהודים של ימי הבינים—גם הבוגדים וגם הנאמנים ליהדותם—לא ידעו את טבע המחיצות האלה על בורין וכל הענין של ויכוח דתי, של חיזוק אמונה ושל המרה, עבר באויר מעורפל של מושגים בלתי בהירים ושל מוחות מטומטמים? ההמירו המומרים את דתם מתוך הכרה ברורה ומבוססת ומתוך הדבקות חיה וערה בתורה הגאולה של חכמי המשנה והתלמוד שנשארה עומד בנגוד גמור לעקרונות של הברית החדשה ושל אבות הכנסיה הנוצרית? שאלות כאלה גילו לי את הצורך לעמוד גם מצדי על אפים של המדרשים שעליהם התנהל הויכוח הדתי <Baer, 29>.

In his argument, Baer analyzed the Latin protocols of the disputation of Tortosa. He examined those passages in which the Jewish respondents stated that they were unfamiliar with a passage, the work of Moshe haDarshan, or a commentator named "Rabbi Rahmon." All of these texts were originally found in the *Pugio*, since HaLorqi relied upon that work alone for his alleged proofs. Baer stated that these disputed passages were the work of Martini himself. Rabbi Rahmon was his joke—his pen name, inserted into the text. In addition, Baer charged that even when texts were not outright forgeries, Martini selectively edited his texts by combining two or more texts, or omitting portions from longer midrashim which would contradict his argument.

Baer faced the additional challenge of responding to the newly-published *Bereishit Rabbati*, which contained many of the very texts criticized by Abravanel. Baer dismissed these by declaring that later Jewish copyists, who had heard these passages at disputations, or who had read Christian polemical literature, had inserted them into the authentic compendium of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan: יוצא מן הכלל דק מאמר אחד בבראשית רבתי שכבר הוכחנו את זיופו על ידי ריימודוס מרטיני, ובלי ספק הוכנס בזמן מאוחר מאד אל כתב-היד יחידי של בראשית רבתי ("only one statement in the *Bereishit Rabbati* is unusual, which we already have proven to be a forgery from the hand of Raymond Martini. And without a doubt it was introduced much later into the only manuscript of the *Bereishit Rabbati*")⁴⁶. In this way, Baer argued for a late contamination of authentic Rabbinic sources.

⁴⁶ Ibid. 46.

Currently, scholars regard the case closed and Martini vindicated.

Recent authors such as Jeremy Cohen⁴⁷ and Robert Chazan⁴⁸ accept Martini's texts as authentic, devoting almost no attention to the arguments against them.

Cohen summarizes the debate in *The Friars and the Jews*:

Debate over this question has continued for the past century, carried on most recently by Yitzhak Baer and Saul Lieberman. Baer has castigated Martini as an indiscriminate forger of evidence, pointing to the lack of correlation between readings in the *Pugio* and those in the common Jewish versions of the same works, to discrepancies among multiple citations of the same text by Martini, and to inconsistencies between quotations and translations in the *Pugio* itself. Lieberman, however, has responded convincingly that especially when viewed in terms of medieval standards of accuracy, Martini was faithful in his transmission of rabbinic material.⁴⁹

Indeed, forgery would have been easily discovered by the earliest generations of Jews to dispute against Martini's manual. This would have rendered Martini's entire enterprise worthless. Again, while the texts attributed to Moshe haDarshan are important to his argument, none of them is so crucial that the argument could not stand without them. Finally, I have found parallels to nearly all of the texts which had been previously labelled "unattested"⁵⁰ in published works and manuscripts.

Although the question of the authenticity of Martini's passages has been answered, another problem raised by the debate has not been addressed. Many of Martini's critics commented on the problematic nature of Moshe haDarshan's work. He included material which appeared Christological in his collection. His commentaries at times appeared to contradict accepted Rabbinic law. Even

⁴⁷ J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithica: Cornell UP, 1982)

⁴⁸ op. cit.

⁴⁹ Cohen 135.

⁵⁰ S. Ballaban, "Lost Midrashic Passages on Genesis from the *Pugio Fidei*" (Thesis: Cincinnati, 1986).

more difficult to understand was his use of the Christian version of the Bible as a source in his work. Even Martini's defenders have noted Moshe haDarshan's naive willingness to include in his writings *anything* which came his way. To date, no one has adequately examined this problem: how did Moshe haDarshan come to possess these Christian materials? And, more specifically, how did Moshe haDarshan get access to Second Temple literature like *Tobit*, *Bel and the Dragon* and *1Enoch*, which appear to have been preserved only among the Christians?

Chapter 2

Moshe haDarshan of Narbonne:

One of the Transmitters

Little is known about the life of Moshe haDarshan. The historical information which has come down to us is mentioned only incidentally by those who lived in the generations after him. We do not know when he was born, or in what year he died. It is possible to place him within the eleventh century, most probably within the first half of that century. In the first generation immediately after him, we have two sources which discuss him. The first is his most renowned student, Rabbi Nathan ben Yehiel (1035-1110). Rabbi Nathan is best known as the first European to compose a lexicon of difficult or unusual words found in the Midrash and Talmud. Known as the *Aruch*, it is still in use today. Rabbi Nathan studied with Rabbeinu Gershom, "Light of the Exile." Afterwards, he travelled to Provence to study with Moshe haDarshan, the other great scholar of his generation. He wrote several times in his lexicon, the *Aruch*: שְׁמַעְתִּי מִפִּי מְרַבִּי מֹשֶׁה הַדְרָשָׁן — "This I learned [directly] from Rabbi Moshe haDarshan"¹ and וְרַמְ"הּ מִנְרֵבֹנָה שָׁנָה לָנוּ — "And Rabbi Moshe haDarshan taught us (orally)."²

Rashi (1040-1105 C.E.) also lived in the first generation after Moshe haDarshan, and was a contemporary of Rabbi Nathan. Although he was not acquainted directly with Moshe haDarshan, he reports studying with his

¹ s.v. אֲדִנְדְּנָקִי.

² s.v. קֶצֶר. R. Nathan also mentions Moshe haDarshan under the following entries: כֹּה and צִדִּיק.

nephew: כך שמעתי מפי רבינו שלמה ב"ר לוי בן אחותו של רבינו משה הדרשן —
 "thus I have heard from the mouth of Rabbi Shlomo the son of Rabbi Levi the
 son of the sister [sic] of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan."³ This expression, "I have
 heard from the mouth" is identical to the one used by Rabbi Nathan to describe
 his studies with Moshe haDarshan. It is reasonable to understand from Rashi's
 remark that he was at some point a student of Rabbi Shlomo. Moreover, it
 would appear that this Rabbi Shlomo passed on to Rashi some of the teachings
 of Moshe haDarshan.

In the third generation after Moshe haDarshan, Rabbenu Jacob Tam, the
 founder of the Tosafist school of Northern France, and the grandson of Rashi,
 mentioned him in his collection of responsa, the *Sefer haYashar*⁴: הלא כמה
 רבנים יצאו מארצך ולא הדיחו את יושבי עירם, כי יצא הרב ר' משה דרשן וה"ר לוי
 — "have not several rabbis come from your
 country, and they have not misled the inhabitants of their cities [away from
 proper practice of the law]; for Rabbi Moshe haDarshan, and Rabbi Levi his
 brother after him, and Rabbi Joseph Tov Elem came [from your country]."
 Rabbenu Tam's remarks were addressed to Rabbi Meshullam ben Nathan of
 Melun, who lived in the twelfth century. Rabbi Meshullam was born in Nar-
 bonne, but settled in Melun in Northern France. Rabbenu Tam carried on a
 lengthy argument with Rabbi Meshullam, accusing him of leniency in the laws
 regarding contact with non-Jews. He also charged him with introducing innova-
 tions in Jewish law which were without precedent. Rabbenu Tam appealed to
 the memory of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan as the *sine qua non* of Provencal Jewry,
 and as a model of orthodoxy and careful adherence to the law.

³ Rashi on 2Chron 2:14.

⁴ Sefer haYashar 74b.

Nearly 350 years after Rabbi Moshe's death, Abraham Zacuto (1452- ca. 1515) wrote the *Sefer Yuhasin* which traced all the generations of teachers of the oral law from Moses through Zacuto's own generation. The printed edition of the work (1504), reported that the students of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan included Rabbi Moshe "the humble", Rabbi Moshe ben Rabbi Joseph ben Rabbi Maron haLevi, Rabbi Levi the nephew of Rabbi Yitzhaq, Rabbi Avraham ben David (the RaBaD), and Rabbi Zerahiah haLevi among others. However, as S.L. Rapoport has convincingly shown,⁵ the printed text of the *Sefer Yuhasin* is corrupt. In the original text these famous scholars were not in fact his students.⁶ Nevertheless, this passage continued to be cited for many years. Thus, Moshe haDarshan was so prominent a figure among the Jewry of Narbonne that the obvious historical contradictions were overlooked in order to enhance his reputation.

We also know from the sources that Moshe haDarshan lived in Narbonne in Southern France. In the eleventh century, Narbonne was the capital of an independent kingdom known as Septimania. It lay between France to the North and the Christian kingdoms of Spain to the South, several miles from the Mediterranean Sea. Jewish settlement in the area began not later than the second century C.E., and the earliest documents relating to the Jewish community date from the fifth, sixth and eighth centuries. According to legend⁷, the Jews of Narbonne assisted Pépin the Short in driving out the Muslims from the town in 759. As a reward, they were granted the right to appoint a "Jewish King" over the community. Another legend, preserved in the *Sefer haQabbala* of R.

⁵ See *Toldot R"N* in *Bikkure ha'Itim* 1829:7-79; 1830:81ff

⁶ Buber, "Rabbi Moshe haDarshan" in *HaMaggid* 18(1874) no. 16:140.

⁷ found in the *Gesta Caroli Magni ad Carcassonam* and the Jewish work, *Milhemet Mitzvah*.

Avraham ben David (the RaBaD), relates that King Charlemagne requested that the Caliph Harun ar-Rashid send him a scholar to guide the Jewish community of his realm. Harun ar-Rashid sent him R. Machir ben Judah, who founded the Talmudical Academy of Narbonne. After R. Machir ben Judah, the first named scholar of this Academy was Moshe haDarshan.

In Moshe haDarshan's time the Jews in this region enjoyed greater liberties than in any other portion of Christian Europe. They had their own leader of the Jewish community, who had been granted revenues from the land seized from Muslims and given to the Jews. They also enjoyed a life relatively unencumbered by the various anti-Jewish laws which had been enacted to annoy and persecute the Jewish residents of other regions under Christian control. Our sources report that Moshe haDarshan lived in this city. Rabbi Nathan, wrote in the *Aruch*: רבי משה הדרשן מנרבונא שנה לנו — "Rabbi Moshe haDarshan from Narbonne taught us..."⁸ Rabbenu Tam alluded to the birthplace of Rabbi Meshullam when he stated that Rabbi Moshe haDarshan was from "your country." The final source which identifies Moshe haDarshan's home is the *Sefer haEshkol*, by Rabbi Avraham ben Rabbi Yitzhaq of Narbonne (1110-1179). In this work it states שמענו משמיה דר' משה הדרשן מפה — "we have heard in the name of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan from here"⁹—from Narbonne.

The scarcity of details on the life of Moshe haDarshan and the apparent disappearance of his literary works have contributed to the controversy over his compositions. The few details gleaned from the sources leave many questions. Where did Moshe haDarshan come from? Although all the sources say that he was from Narbonne, he seems not to have been from that culture; his knowl-

⁸ s.v. קצר.

⁹ *Sefer haEshkol* (Halberstadt, 1768) Hilkhoh Mikvaot, s. 58.

edge implies that he was educated elsewhere, even if he were indeed born in Narbonne. Moreover, Nahmanides reveals that he was acquainted with Persian, Syriac, Talmudic and Targumic Aramaic as well as Hebrew; Rabbi Nathan's quotes show that he was also familiar with Arabic. Such a combination of languages was not common in the early eleventh century among Jews living in Christian Europe, even at the border with Muslim Spain. Those comments on the Talmud which survive show that he was a student in a place where advanced Talmudic studies were taught. Yet Martini's citations from the Aggada give an inkling of a wide familiarity with the Aggadic literature which had only recently seen a renaissance with the production of the *Tanhuma* and the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* in the east, but were still unknown in Europe. On the other hand, he appears to ignore the many advances in philosophy and rationalism which were made by Saadia Gaon in Babylonia only half a century before. Instead, the surviving fragments of his work appear to be thoroughly "medieval" in their approach: fanciful, full of miraculous tales, and difficult to reconcile with a rationalistic approach. He was the central figure in the premier *Yeshiva* (the Talmudic Academy) of Provence, yet his works appear to contain material which directly contradicts and even refutes Rabbinic teachings.

It must be seen that the argument over the authenticity and character of Martini's texts has for the most part been a debate built upon a fallacy. Those who charged Martini with forgery believed that the questionable passages were simply too Christological to have been composed by a believing Jew. Martini's defenders accepted the characterization of these selections as Christological, but defended Moshe haDarshan as an eclectic who took passages from whatever sources came before him. Thus, both positions accept Martini's characterization in the case of Moshe haDarshan alone. They do this despite the evidence of his contemporaries, and those who lived shortly after him, who

referred to him with respect as the premier scholar of Narbonne Jewry, and a model of Orthodox thought and practice.

This unchallenged characterization of Moshe haDarshan is the crux of the debate over the nature of his work and the origin of his citations. Moshe haDarshan's work is the only one of all the sources cited by Martini which has not survived. Explanations range from that of Schiller-Szinessy who claimed that it never existed, to Rapoport, Neubauer and Lieberman, who argued that it was abandoned by the Jewish community because of its apparent heterodoxy. Yet none have examined these controversial texts in the context in which they originally appeared. No scholars have attempted to show how Moshe haDarshan's words, like those of the Talmud and other Midrashim, were manipulated and cited out of context.

Indeed, no Jewish scholar has ever advanced the position that the Talmud was "too Christological" because Martini used it extensively in the *Pugio*. Nor were those passages which seemed promising to Martini edited out of the Talmud. Instead, in every other case where a known Jewish source was used by Martini, medieval and modern Jewish scholars have argued that the context and content of the passage disprove Martini. Had the Talmud not survived, would the case have been made that it never existed? Would it be possible to advance the argument that the Jewish community destroyed all traces of it because it lent itself so well to polemical usage against them? Yet this has been precisely the treatment which Moshe haDarshan has received.

Scholars had long supposed that the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabbi Moshe haDarshan*, if it had ever really existed, had completely disappeared.

Beginning with the disputation of Tortosa, Jews had said "hunc sermonem non

habemus"—"we do not have that midrash"¹⁰, implying that they could not comment on a text which they did not know. Later, Abravanel stated "I have already informed you that I have not seen the *Bereishit Rabba* of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan"¹¹. For nearly five centuries afterwards, no new references to this work surfaced. Then, in 1829 S.L. Rapoport, the great savant of his generation, and one of the most distinguished scholars of the *Haskala* movement, wrote a biography of Rabbi Nathan ben Yehiel.¹² In his book, Rapoport examined the sources and teachers of Rabbi Nathan, among them Rabbi Moshe haDarshan. He considered Moshe haDarshan one of the principle influences on the work and thought of Rabbi Nathan:

These precious studies and remarkable ideas he acquired from his teachers, whose reputations were the greatest in all Israel. And they [were] Rabbi Gershom "The Light of the Exile"; Rabbi Moses "The Preacher" from Narbonne; and Rabbi Matzliah. And it is possible that he learned more about law and legal dialectic from Rabbi Gershom, and from Rabbi Moshe [he learned] more about hermeneutics of difficult passages in Scripture, Talmud and Midrash, even though he [Moshe] was also a great sage in law and legal dialectics.¹³

Rapoport expanded on the name and work of Moshe haDarshan in a footnote to this passage. This footnote marks the beginning of modern scholarship on the figure of Moshe haDarshan. In it, Rapoport collected all of the known references to Moshe from Rabbi Nathan's *Aruch*, and the commentaries of Rashi and Nahmanides on Scripture. Based on these citations, Rapoport specu-

¹⁰ From the protocols of the disputation of Tortosa, cited by Baer, 37.

¹¹ Abravanel, *Yeshuot Meshiho* 62b.

¹² Rapoport, *Toldot R"N*

¹³ Ibid. 11 הלימודים היקרים והידיעות הנפלאות האלה, היו לו מרביותיו רבנים מפורסמים אשר עשו שם בישראל. והמה רבינו גרשום מאור הגולה. ר' משה הדרשן מעיר נר"ב יונא. ור' מצליח. ויתכן שמרביתו גרשום למד יותר באורי הלכות ופלפולים, ומר' משה למד יותר פירושי מאמרים קשים בתנ"ך ותלמוד ומדרשים, אע"פ שגם הוא הי' חכם גדול אף בפסקים ופלפולים.

lated on the life and the influence of the work of Moshe haDarshan. Rapoport believed that he composed commentaries on all the books of the Torah: וכפי הסברה נראה שלא רק על ס' בראשית לבד חבר ר"מ הדרשן מדרש כזה רק גם על שאר ספרים—and logically it appears that he composed a Midrash not only on the book of Genesis, but also on all the other books [of the Torah].¹⁴ Rapoport also noted his eclecticism and his use of material which came to be seen as antithetical to orthodox thought:

And since we have seen that he also used the grammatical works of the [North] African sages in his explanations of the Arabic language, it appears that his Midrashic collection was a great anthology, containing simple explanations along with many homiletical interpretations. And many of them were strange and suspect [Christologically?], and their lineage could not be determined. And one may conclude that it was for this reason that the Sages of Israel were not diligent in copying this collection, and it sank in the sea of forgetfulness.¹⁵

These two brief paragraphs by Rapoport have defined the outlines of all later discussion of Moshe haDarshan, his life and his work.

Following Rapoport, Zunz probed more deeply into the problem of Moshe haDarshan. In contrast to Rapoport, he determined that the primary witness to the scope of his work were not Jewish writers, but rather the Dominican friar Martini:

The question which requires clarification, is whether R. Moses also composed [works] on the other books of the Pentateuch, etc. which likewise containing Aggadic collections. One must quickly agree, after comparing several passages from the [other] four Books of Moses and the Aggadic *Bemidbar Rabba*, which resembles it [i.e. the *Bereishit Rabba*], that although they are deserving

¹⁴ Ibid. 87.

¹⁵ Ibid. ואחרי שכבר הראינו שהשתמש ג"כ בספרי הדקדוק של חכמי אפריקא. בענין דרישת לשון ערבית. נראה שמדרשו הי' ילקוט גדול כולל פירושים פשוטים וגם אגדות הרבה ובהם כמה זרים ונחשדים שלא נתקבלו ולא נודע מבטן מי יצאו, ויש לשער שמפני הטעם הזה לא השגיהו חכמי ישראל על ילקוט זה להעתיקו ונטבע בים הנשי

of notice, Raymond Martini gives no information about any such books.¹⁶

Zunz, like Rapoport before him, recognized Moshe haDarshan's importance in the development of late medieval Jewish literature. Zunz saw Moshe haDarshan as a literary pioneer. He believed that his work was the first attempt to collect and incorporate all of the smaller narrative tales and legends circulating in Jewish hands, and to connect them with the tradition of the greater midrashic collections. In this, he saw Moshe haDarshan as the literary precursor to the enormous Medieval collection the *Yalkut Shimeoni*. This collection, which has survived, reproduced on a smaller scale and in a more polished form the task which Moshe haDarshan accomplished in his *Bereshit Rabba d'Rabba*.

After his article on Rabbi Nathan, S.L. Rapoport discovered a manuscript of a part of Moshe haDarshan's great work on Genesis. Unfortunately he did not publish the manuscript, or his opinion on it. However, Zunz reproduced Rapoport's description of the manuscript from a private correspondence:

Concerning this remarkable manuscript I have learned the following from Rapoport, in whose possession it is: It is 88 pages (paper) in Quarto, missing the end, and eight pages are damaged. The Hebrew cursive script is Spanish, and very unreadable. Neither the scribe nor the date are given. The text begins immediately with the first page, and over the first line we find only the words: "Bereishit Rabbati, which I found in a manuscript." It seems not to be the work of a professional scribe, but rather [it is the work of] a private copyist made for his own use. The contents of the Midrash are divided according to the twelve lectionary portions of Genesis, and there come following each of the individual portions the following number of pages: 1) 13, 2) 3, 3) 4, 4) 4, 5) 4, 6) 5, 7) 11, 8) 12, 9) 4, 10) 6, 11) 6, 12) 16. The last legible words are: "The Holy One Blessed be He said: ('You saved four) lives, one from the pit and three from burning; so I will save (from your

¹⁶ Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin: 1832) 292-3. "Die Frage, ob die Erklärungen, welche R. Moses auch zu anderen Büchern des Pentateuch u.s.w. verfasste, gleichfalls Hagada—Sammlungen enthielten, sollte man, nach den Anführungen zu einigen Stellen des vierten Buches Mose und den ähnlichen Hagada'sin Bamidbar rabba, fast bewogen werden zu bejahen, obgleich es einige Beachtung verdient, dass Raym. Martin von solchen Büchern keine Kunde giebt."

descendants) four: three from the furnace and one from the pit." And because he saved four lives, (his father gave him) four names of might: Gur, Aryeh, Kalbaya K'aryeh..." The words in parenthesis were supplied by Rapoport.¹⁷

This manuscript was subsequently copied at least twice. One copy, a defective one in the possession of S. Buber, was used by Schiller—Sziessy in his attack on Martini. The other manuscript, which was superior, was used by Neubauer, Epstein and Albeck. The original manuscript from which the copies were made appears to have disappeared. The text remained unpublished until 1940, when Ch. Albeck published a transcription of the better of the two copies along with an introduction and notes. This manuscript represented the single greatest advance in the study of Moshe haDarshan. For the first time in five centuries, Moshe haDarshan could appear as a witness on his own behalf. His writings could be studied first-hand, rather than through the polemics of a Christian opponent of Judaism, or a collection of fewer than two dozen brief citations by Jewish authors. Yet even this discovery was not universally received as authentic.

One generation after Zunz, Neubauer discovered additional fragments from Moshe haDarshan's collection. These he found in British Museum ms. no. 2339. Neubauer believed that it was "copied in the fifteenth century in

¹⁷ Zunz, 288 note d. "Ueber dieses merkwürdige Manuscript habe ich durch *Rapoport*, der es besitzt, folgendes erfahren: Es ist 88 Blatt (Papier) in Quart stark, am Ende defect, auch im achten Blatte beschädigt; die hebräische Cursivschrift ist spanischer Character und sehr unleserlich; Schreiber und Datum sind nicht angegeben, der Text fängt gleich mit dem ersten Blatte an, und über der ersten Zeile finden sich nur die Worte: בראשית רבתי אשר מצאתי בכתיבת יד. Es scheint demnach kein Abschreiber, sondern ein Privatmann zu seinem eigenen Gebrauche, sich diese Copie angeeignet zu haben. Der Inhalt des Midrasch ist nach den 12 Parascha's der Genesis abgetheilt, und kommt auf jede einzelne Parascha folgende Anzahl von Blättern: 1) 13, 2) 3, 3) 4, 4) 4, 5) 4, 6) 5, 7) 11, 8) 12, 9) 4, 10) 6, 11) 6, 12) 16. Die letzten leserlichen Worte lauten: א"ל הק"בה (אתה הצלת ד') נפשות א' מן הבור וג' מן השדיפה אף אני אציל (מבניך) ד' ג' מן הכבשן וא' מן הבור ולפי שהציל ד' נפשות (נתן לו אביו) ד' שמות של גבורה גור אריה כלביא כאריה. Die eingeklammerten Worte hat Rapoport supplirt. (s. Jalk. Gen. 49b)."

Greek-rabbinical characters."¹⁸ The source from which these citations were taken is identified as the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabba*. One of the fragments was the full version of the text of the *Bel and the Dragon* which Martini had cited. The other text was an Aramaic version of the Book of *Tobit*. This manuscript was of importance for several reasons. It was an additional independent witness that Moshe haDarshan had used texts which were canonical among Christians, but not Jews. It was also another text against which to compare the citations which Martini attributed to Moshe haDarshan, and also the newly discovered manuscript of the *Bereishit Rabbati*. Neubauer published the *Tobit* and the *Bel and the Dragon* along with an introduction and a discussion of Moshe haDarshan and the *Pugio* in 1878. In that same work, Neubauer stated his belief that Rapoport's manuscript was truly the product of Moshe haDarshan, while the *Rabba d'Rabba* or *Bereishit major* represented a distinct work from a different hand:

Raymund Martini... gives in his *Pugio Fidei* a large number of extracts from a Midrash B'reshith (i.e. on Genesis) major, and amongst them a part of the history of Bel and the Dragon, agreeing *verbatim* with the text here published from our MS. In our MS. it is said to be extracted from the Midrash Rabbah de Rabbah. It is certain therefore that the Midrash major on Genesis of Martini and our Midrash Rabbah de Rabbah are identical... Martini gives also many extracts from a B'reshith major on Genesis, attributed to R. Moses had-Darshan, which Zunz thinks identical with the already-mentioned B'reshith major. They are, however, in our opinion, two different books... Martini had therefore, no doubt, two Midrashim furnished him by the Jews, either in two distinct MSS. or in one, where the text was the Midrash major and the marginal notes or addition by R. Moses had-Darshan. This last was the case with the MS. of the Midrash Rabbathi, formerly in possession of the celebrated Rapoport, and now in the library of the Jewish congregation at Prague, and which Dr. Jellinek describes as the work of R. Moses had-Darshan.¹⁹

¹⁸ Neubauer, *Tobit* vii.

¹⁹ Ibid. viii-ix.

Thus, in contrast to Zunz, it appears that Neubauer did not consider Moshe haDarshan to be a significant literary figure in his own rights. At most, he supplied marginalia which came to be incorporated into the body of an earlier anthology.

S. Buber shared Neubauer's belief that the manuscript described by Rapoport and Zunz and the *Rabba d'Rabba* of Neubauer were not the same work. However, Buber believed that it was Rapoport's manuscript that was not the work of Moshe haDarshan. In a series of articles published in *Hamaggid*²⁰, Buber compared the manuscript to the surviving citations in Jewish sources. He relied greatly upon the work of Abravanel as a principle witness to the contents of the work of Moshe haDarshan. Buber found that in no case did the manuscript of the *Bereishit Rabbati* correspond to any of the known citations. This led him to state conclusively: וכאשר התבוננתי ראיתי את אשר לא פללתי, כי נתיחס בטעות אל רבי משה הדרשן, והוא לא הולידו ולא דרוש דרש משה הדרשות ההן — "But when I investigated, I saw that which I had not expected: that it had been mistakenly attributed to Rabbi Moshe haDarshan, but he did not sire it, nor did he compose a single one of these midrashic passages."²¹ It is notable that Buber arrived at his conclusions without any examination of the text of the *Pugio Fidei*, or the passages which it attributed to Moshe haDarshan. Instead he relied solely upon Abravanel's *Yeshuot Meshiho* for purposes of comparison.

In 1894 Buber returned to the question of another work attributed to Moshe haDarshan in Jewish sources, but not by Martini — the *Sefer haYesod* — with the publication of the *Midrash Aggadah*. Buber's introduction addressed the possibility that this work represents the work which was known by Rashi

²⁰ *HaMaggid* 18(1874) nos. 16:140; 17:148; and 18:158-9.

²¹ *Ibid.* 140.

and Nahmanides as the *Sefer haYesod*—"The Book of Foundation". From medieval citations it appeared that this work contained midrashic and grammatical glosses on the text of the Bible. Buber again compared the citations found in those medieval sources to the parallel texts in his manuscript. Unlike the *Bereishit Rabbati*, this time he found that he could not decide conclusively whether these parallels were taken directly from the *Sefer haYesod* or not, although he was inclined to believe that they were secondary citations from Rashi:

For this reason it seems more likely to me that this midrash manuscript was taken from a composition which had already seen Rashi's commentaries on the Torah, as well as the *Lekah Tov*. And he included also in his collection passages from the early Midrashim, and he used as his foundation the Babylonian Talmud, Mekhilta, the Sifra and Sifre, Bereishit Rabba, Vayiqra Rabba, the Tanhuma haQadum as well as the Tanhuma haNidpas, the Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer, Pesiqta d'Rav Kahana, Pesiqta Rabbati, Avot d'Rabbi Nathan, and there are also occasionally found passages which are drawn from the Palestinian Talmud... And in any case, I will leave the final decision with those readers who are interested; they can decide whether this Midrash is connected with Rabbi Moshe haDarshan or not. But I, for my part, cannot decide the matter clearly.²²

At the same time that Neubauer and Buber were recovering manuscript fragments which might shed light on Moshe haDarshan, Abraham Epstein began to examine several published texts which might have used books written by Moshe haDarshan as a source. His first book was a collection of essays, *Miqadmaniot haYehudim*. In it, he noted that *Numbers Rabba* used Moshe haDarshan as a source. Thus, he wrote:

²² S. Buber, *Midrash Aggadah* vi-vii. לכן נראה בעיני יותר כי מדרש כתב יד הזה נסדר מן מסדר אחד אשר כבר ראה פירוש רש"י על התורה גם המדרש לקח טוב, ואסף לאסיפה גם מאמרים מן מדרשי קדמונים, והיה לו ליסוד תלמוד בבלי, מכילתא, ספרא ספרי, ב"ר, וי"ר תנחומא הקדום, גם תנחומא הנדפס מכבר, פדר"א, פסיקתא דר"כ, פסיקתא רבתי, אדר"נ, וכן נמצא לפעמים מאמר ששאב מהירושלמי... ובכל זה אניח המשפט לקואים המעיינים שהם ישפטו אם יש ליחס המדרש הזה לר' משה הדרשן או לא, כי כשאני לעצמי לא אוכל לחרוץ הדבר בבירור.

Aside from those sources which I mentioned above, it appears that the redactor drew also from the Midrash of R. Moshe haDarshan. Rabbi S.L. Rapoport (*Bikkure ha'Ittim* 1830:87) and Zunz (*Die Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* p256 note 4) already noted that that which Rashi cites in Numbers 7:18-23 in the name of Moshe haDarshan is found in *Numbers Rabba* chapters 13-14. And I have also found other, similar instances of which I will cite several here.²³

He also concluded that there were several different works which all shared the title of *Deuteronomy Rabba*. Epstein believed that one of these was in fact the work of Moshe haDarshan:

aside from the *D'varim Rabba* and the *Tanhuma* which we have, there were three other, different midrashim on *Deuteronomy* which the earlier sages possessed. One was the Midrash of R. Moshe haDarshan on the book of *Deuteronomy*... And this midrash of R. Moshe haDarshan resembles *Numbers Rabba* derived from the Midrash of R. Moshe haDarshan, and he cited legal material from the Sifre and other sources in [his midrash on] *Deuteronomy* as well, just as he cited them in *Numbers Rabba*.²⁴

Epstein's most significant contribution to the study of Moshe haDarshan's sources were his observations on the *Midrash Tadshe*. This midrash itself is a brief commentary on the Torah, beginning with the third day of creation. It is not a thorough commentary, but rather appears to represent a brief series of selections from other sources which are gathered into one work. It was first published by Jellinek in his series *Bet haMidrash* 3:xxxiii-xxxvi; 164-193. Jellinek examined the parallels to this midrash, and commented on its unusual attribution to the little known and rarely mentioned Tanna, Rabbi Pinchas ben

²³ Epstein, 67. חוץ מהמקורות שהזכרתי לעיל, נראה שהמסדר שאב גם ממדרשו של ר' משה הדרשן. כבר העיר הר"ר שי"ר (בכורי העתים תקצ"א 87) גם צונץ (שם 256 הערה ד'), שמה שרש"י מביא לבמדבר ז, יח—כג בשם רמ"ה נמצא בבמדבר רבה פי"ג ופי"ד. ואני מצאתי עוד מקומות כאלה ואביא פה כמה מהם...

²⁴ Ibid. 72-3. חוץ מדברים רבה והתנחומא אשר לנו, היו לעיני הקדמונים עוד שלשה מדרשים שונים לספר דברים. האחד הוא מדרשו של ר' משה הדרשן לספר דברים... והמדרש הזה של רמ"ה היה דומה לבמדבר רבה הנובע ג"כ ממדרשו של רמ"ה, והביא גם בדברים דברי הלכה מהספרי ושאר מקורות, כמו שהביאם בבמדבר רבה

Yair. One of the significant parallels which he found was in the *Numbers Rabba*. Epstein seized upon this similarity, and discovered many other parallels within that work, and the *Bereishit Rabbati* as well: ככל מדרש תדשא נכיר את רוח רמ"ה. חוץ מהגימטריאות הרבות, שהן דרך רמ"ה, יש בו הרבה דברים שווים — לבראשית רבתי ולבמדבר רבה "throughout the entire *Midrash Tadshe* we recognize the spirit of R. Moshe haDarshan. Aside from the many numerological comments (*Gematriot*) which are typical of R. Moshe haDarshan, there are also many parallels with the *Bereishit Rabbati* and the *Numbers Rabba*."²⁵

When Jellinek first published this text, he recognized that it reproduced an early literary source. By the time of Epstein, that source had been identified—it was the book of *Jubilees*. *Jubilees* was a type of "rewritten Bible," in some ways similar to First and Second Chronicles. It derives its name from the fact that time is calculated not only in years, but in numbers of Jubilees and weeks of years. By Epstein's time, it was believed that this book was actually written before the destruction of the Second Temple. Epstein realized that he had before him a Rabbinic work which had used an ancient, possibly pre-Rabbinic document as a source. He cited a number of parallels between these two texts as proof. For example, he noted that *Midrash Tadshe* does not use the conventional names of the months. Instead it refers to them only by their ordinal number: the first month, the second month, etc. *Jubilees* uses precisely the same calendar, rejecting the Babylonian month names for the Biblical system. Additionally, the contents also share explanations which show a dependence of the *Midrash Tadshe* on *Jubilees*:

In Section 6: '24 species were created in the world during the seven days [of creation]. On the first day 7 etc. corresponding to the 22 letters in the alphabet, and corresponding to the generations from Adam to Jacob.' And Jellinek already noted in his introduc-

²⁵ Ibid. 140.

tion to the *Midrash Tadshe* (*Bet haMidrash* v.3) that the book of *Jubilees* also divides the creatures into 22 in this way, and that it also says that this corresponds to the 22 generations from Adam to Jacob. And I will add that *Midrash Tadshe* took this from *Jubilees*, just as it took many other things [from it].²⁶

Epstein believed that this document had been pseudonymously attributed to Pinchas ben Yair precisely because his name is mentioned so rarely in Rabbinic literature. This pseudepigraphic attribution lent an air of acceptability to a document which obviously contradicted the Rabbinic legal tradition. Epstein concluded that the *Midrash Tadshe* was actually Moshe haDarshan's notebook of excerpts from that work, to be included later into his other compendia:

In my opinion, *Midrash Tadshe* is the work of R. Moshe haDarshan, who selected passages from the *Jubilees*, and arranged them according to the books of the Torah, in order to insert them afterwards into his Midrashic works which he composed. It is also possible that some copyist, later than R. Moshe haDarshan, collected from his Midrashic works all the passages which are cited in the name of R. Pinchas ben Yair. In any case, the *Midrash Tadshe* is the work of R. Moshe haDarshan.²⁷

Epstein's conclusions were revolutionary. For the first time an actual early non-Rabbinic source for Moshe haDarshan's work had been identified; a work which contradicted Rabbinic opinion, but which had been composed long before the first Christians.

²⁶ Ibid. 134. בסימן ו' כ"ד מינים נבראו בעולם בו' ימים, ביום א' ו' וכו' כנגד כ"ב אותיות שבא"ב וכנגד הדורות מאדם עד שבא יעקב. והעיר הר"ר א. יעלליניצק בהקדמתו למדרש תדשא (בית המדרש ח"ג) שגם בספר היובלים מחלק כן את הכ"ב בריאות, ושגם הוא אומר שזה נגד הכ"ב דורות מאדם ועד יעקב. ואני אוסיף שמדרש תדשא לקח זה מספר היובלים כמו שלקח גם דברים רבים אחרים.

²⁷ Ibid. 139. לפי דעתי, מדרש תדשא הוא מעשה ידי ר' משה הדרשן שלקט מאמרים מספר היובלים וסידרם על פי סדר ספרי התורה, למען יכניסם אחר כך לתוך המדרשים שחיבר. גם אפשר שאיזה סופר מאוחר לרמ"ה אסף מתוך מדרשיו את המאמרים שהביא בשם ר' פנחס בן יאיר. ועל כל פנים מדרש תדשא הוא מעשה ידי ר' משה הדרשן.

Epstein continued to research Moshe haDarshan and his sources over the next few years. In 1888 he produced an article²⁸ which examined in detail the manuscript which Rapoport had discovered and described more than 60 years before. This manuscript still awaited publication, although Jellinek had included selections from it in his *Bet haMidrash*. Rapoport's attribution to Moshe haDarshan was now doubted by some scholars. Epstein's article was an attempt to show that the *Ber. Rabbati* was in fact the work cited by Martini as *Bereishit Rabba major*, and by Neubauer's manuscript as *Rabba d'Rabba*—and that all three came from the hand of Moshe haDarshan. Epstein first demonstrated that a number of citations of *Bereishit Rabba* in Rabbinic literature are actually taken from our *Bereishit Rabbati*. Next, Epstein showed that the work of Jehuda Gedalia contained 9 references to a "Rabba-rabbati." Of these, 8 appear in the manuscript of the *Bereishit Rabbati*, and the ninth he found in the *Pugio Fidei*. Finally, Epstein found 17 selections in the *Pugio Fidei* attributed to Moshe haDarshan which also appeared in the manuscript. From this, he concluded that the *Bereishit Rabbati* was in fact an abbreviated version of Moshe haDarshan's larger collection:

The *Bereishit Rabbati* is a shortened version of a large anthology, which contained heterogeneous material: old sermons, fables and many things which were taken from the *Yesod* of Moshe haDarshan. This anthology was called *Rabba rabbati* or *Rabba d'Rabba*, and it is distinct from the well-known, shorter collection *Bereishit Rabba*.²⁹

²⁸ Ab. Epstein, "Bereschit-rabbati. Dessen Verhältniss zu Rabba=rabbati, Moses ha=Darschan und *Pugio Fidei*" in *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 1888; subsequently reprinted separately under the same title in Berlin, 1888.

²⁹ Epstein, "Bereschit-rabbati" 6. "Denn Bereschit-rabbati ist eine gekürzte Version eines grossen Sammelwerkes, welches verschiedenartige Stoffe enthielt: alt Homilien, Erzählungen und Manches, das aus dem *Jesod* des Moses ha-Darshan entnommen war. Dieses Sammelwerk nannte man *Rabba-rabbati* oder *Rabba-d'Rabba*, um es von dem bekannten, kürzer gefassten *Bereschit-rabba* zu unterscheiden."

Epstein also examined the sources used by the *Bereishit Rabbati*. He identified three sources which influenced the writings of Moshe haDarshan: *Jubilees*, Christian literature, and Islamic literature. He believed that *Jubilees* had not disappeared after the destruction of the Temple, but had instead been attributed to R. Pinchas ben Yair, and survived:

It has already been proved by me that a *Book of Jubilees* was still present in Hebrew in the Babylonian Academies of the Jews in the tenth century. This was attributed to Pinchas ben Yair. It was also before Moshe haDarshan, and one finds in every sentence of the *Midrash Tadshe* parallels with the *Book of Jubilees* which Professor Dillman edited. Our manuscript contains many things which spring from this source...³⁰

Epstein noted that Moshe haDarshan was not unique in using sources which appeared to be Christological. He explained that some of these sources, like *Jubilees*, were actually from before the rise of Christianity. These passages were then exploited by Christians in the late middle ages. However, in the eyes of those Rabbis who cited them there was no reason to suspect them, nor should they have read them as supportive of Christian ideology:

In Rabbinic literature one sometimes encounters Christological ideas in Rabbinic covering. Some of these date from pre-Christian times; Jews and Christians inherited them independently of each other. In this category one may include the tales of the affliction of the Messiah. Others can be explained through the gradual association of the Jewish-Christians with the Jews. Thus the idea of the compassion of God and the "abrogation of his law" which the Jews in their stubbornness rejected.³¹

³⁰ Ibid. 30. "Es ist von mir bereits nach-gewiesen worden, dass es noch im 10. Jahrhundert ein Buch der Jubiläen in hebräischer Sprache auf den babylonischen Akademien der Juden gegeben hat. Dasselbe wurde dem Pinchas ben Jair zugeschrieben. Es lag auch M. ha-Darschan vor, und finden sich ganze Sätze in dessen Midrasch Tadsche, welche mit dem von Prof. Dillmann edirten Buche der Jubiläen überein-stimmen. Unser Ms. enthält Vieles, was dieser Quelle entspringt..."

³¹ Ibid. 31. "In der rabbinischen Literatur begegnet man zuweilen christologischen Ideen in rabbinischer Hülle. Einige darunter datiren wol aus vor-christlicher Zeit; Juden und Christen ererbten sie unabhängig von einander. Zu dieser Kategorie find die Sagen über die Leiden des Messias zu rechnen. Andere bürgerten sich durch den Verkehr mit Judenchristen bei den Juden allmählig ein. So die Idee von der Mitleidenschaft Gottes und das 'Erlahmen seiner Rechten' wenn die Juden in Bedrängnis gerathen."

The final source for seemingly Christian beliefs within the work of Moshe haDarshan, according to Epstein, was through an Arabic intermediary: "Begegnung mit man in späteren jüdischen Werken christlich gefärbten Ideen, so kann man a priori annehmen, diese Werke seien aus dem Oriente herübergekommen"—"One also encounters in later Jewish works ideas tainted with Christianity, so that one may *a priori* assume that these works came over from the Orient."³²

Despite the continued interest and controversy over the manuscript originally discovered by Rapoport, it remained unpublished until 1940. In that time, Buber had made a poor transcription of the original, which added to the controversy. Epstein also had a copy made from the original, but his transcription was very carefully made, after which he checked it against the original and made the necessary corrections.³³ A. Aptowitzer later acquired Epstein's copy following his death. This copy was then made available to Ch. Albeck, who was commissioned to edit it for publication. The original was not available to Albeck, nor have I been able to find it listed in any catalogs of Hebrew manuscript collections. Albeck's edition, therefore, must be relied upon in place of the original manuscript.

Albeck included in his volume the first introduction to the style and method of Moshe haDarshan which was based upon a complete work, rather than fragments or secondary citations. He believed that the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabba* was in fact an expansion of the *Bereishit Rabba*:

The method of the *Bereishit Rabba major* was to cite first the *Bereishit Rabba* verbatim, or with changes, and [then] to expand

³² Ibid. 33.

³³ Ch. Albeck, *Bereishit Rabbati* (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940), preface.

and add to it from various sources. At times it was so altered by the additions that it became a new midrash.³⁴

This opinion agrees to some extent with Neubauer's: Moshe haDarshan's work was an eclectic enlargement of the much older *Bereishit Rabba*, rather than a free-standing commentary or anthology on Genesis. Albeck also accepted Epstein's argument for the attribution of the work to Moshe haDarshan. Most convincing for him were the 17 passages found in the *Bereishit Rabbati* which appear in the *Pugio Fidei* as Moshe haDarshan's. Albeck believed that Epstein's evidence refuted Buber's argument convincingly.

Certain that the manuscript before him was in fact the work of Moshe haDarshan, Albeck turned his attention to another work published by Buber, the *Midrash Aggada*. At first, Buber had suspected that Moshe haDarshan was responsible for this collection, or at the very least that his Midrash had served as a source for it. However, after comparing it with the corpus of Moshe haDarshan known at the time, he was inclined to believe that it was not. But there were several flaws in Buber's approach. First, he relied solely upon secondary citations found in Jewish authors. He did not examine the *Pugio* as a reliable witness for Moshe haDarshan. Secondly, he had mistakenly concluded that the *Bereishit Rabbati* did not come from the hand of Moshe haDarshan. He concluded this based upon his prior oversight, and from his faulty transcription of the manuscript. Finally, because of this faulty reading of the *Bereishit Rabbati* manuscript he failed to note the correlation between it and his manuscript of the *Midrash Aggada*.

³⁴ Ibid. 3. דרכו של המדרש "ב"ר גדולה" היתה להביא בתחילה את הב"ר. פלשונו או בשינוי ולהרחיבו ולהוסיף עליו ממקורות שונים. פעמים המאמר השתנה ע"י ההוספות כל כך עד שנעשה למאמר חדש.

After he had carefully edited Epstein's good manuscript, Albeck examined Buber's text. He found, contrary to Buber's earlier opinion, that the two were in fact very closely related. Albeck cited more than 40 instances in which the two texts showed either a dependence of one upon the other or agreed verbatim with each other. Based upon these textual similarities, he concluded that the *Midrash Aggadah* was also the work of Moshe haDarshan. Albeck's argument has been accepted since the publication of the *Rabbati*. Next, Albeck turned his attention to the large Midrash on the Biblical book of *Numbers*, the *Bemidbar Rabba*. Rapoport and Epstein had long suspected that these had been written by Moshe haDarshan, or had relied upon a Midrash by him. However, without a larger corpus there was no way to test this theory. Epstein had cited four passages in which he found agreement between *Bemidbar Rabba* and the *Bereishit Rabbati*. Albeck continued and refined Epstein's research, and discovered 32 more parallels between the chapters *Bemidbar* and *Naso* in *Bemidbar Rabba* and *Bereishit Rabbati*. He also discovered numerous parallels between *Midrash Aggadah* and these same two chapters. From this he concluded "the chapters *Bemidbar* and *Naso* in [*Bemidbar*] *Rabba* are excerpted from the book of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan."³⁵

Albeck's research supplied scholars with two long works, and part of a third by Moshe haDarshan for examination: "It is clear that the *Bereishit Rabbati*, the *Midrash Aggadah* and the first part of *Bemidbar Rabba* are based upon the work of R. Moshe haDarshan."³⁶ With the publication of the *Rabbati* and the attribution of these other two works, scholarship on Moshe haDarshan

³⁵ Ibid. 14. מזה יש להסיק שהסדרים במדבר ונשא ברבה מלוקטים מספרו של ר"מ הדרשן.

³⁶ Ibid. 15. איך שיהיה הוכח, לדעתי, ברור שהבראשית רבתי ומדרש אגדה: וחלק ראשון במדבר רבה נוסדו על ספרו של ר"מ הדרשן.

entered a new era. No longer was the scholarly question, "Did Moshe haDarshan really write the type of unusual and unorthodox commentaries attributed to him?" Instead the focus shifted to examining the sources for Moshe's unusual commentaries, and his motivation for including them in a Rabbinic work. Here, as before, Albeck began with Epstein's research. Epstein believed that the *Midrash Tadshe* was a sort of copy book by Moshe haDarshan, in which he wrote out excerpts from *Jubilees* which he later included in *Bereishit Rabbati*. Epstein also believed that Moshe haDarshan had the complete book of *Jubilees* before him. Albeck agreed that *Midrash Tadshe* relied on *Jubilees*, but he argued that Moshe haDarshan used that Midrash as a source for his work. In his mind, Moshe haDarshan was not immediately acquainted with *Jubilees*, but came to know it second-hand. Albeck also reiterated Epstein's contention that the author of *Midrash Tadshe* was acquainted with the works of Philo,³⁷ the first-century Alexandrian Jewish philosopher. His works were composed in Greek, and had not been translated into Hebrew either before or during the Middle Ages.

Besides these two non-Rabbinic sources, Albeck stated that "Moshe haDarshan used the Apocrypha."³⁸ By this time, Neubauer had written that Moshe haDarshan had used both *Tobit* and *Bel and the Dragon*, and Epstein had shown that he knew *Jubilees* and Philo (if only indirectly). Albeck now discovered another Second Temple source for his great collection: the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (T12P). This work was originally a collection of independent "Testaments" (צוואות or διαθεκε) spoken by the twelve sons of Jacob on their deathbeds. They imitate the deathbed recitals of Jacob and Moses: they

³⁷ See Epstein, "Le Livre des Jubilés; Philon et le Midrasch Tadsché," in REJ 22(1888) 1ff.

³⁸ Ibid. 17: כבר אמרנו שר"מ הדרשן השתמש בספרים הגנוזים .

offer both a retrospective of the subjects' life, and a vision of the future of his offspring. At some point, these independent works were collected and redacted by an editor. In its present form, it reflects the influence of at least one Christian editor. Albeck showed that Moshe haDarshan used the Testaments of Judah and Naftali in the *Bereishit Rabbati*. He also found that *Jubilees* served as a source for the *Midrash Aggada*, and allusions to *Jubilees* and the *Testaments* appear in the early chapters of *Bemidbar Rabba* attributed to Moshe haDarshan.

Albeck noted that Moshe haDarshan introduced his sources in a similar fashion in *Bemidbar Rabba*, *Bereishit Rabbati* and *Midrash Aggada* as well as in Martini's citations in the *Pugio*:

To that which was said above, it is necessary to add that it was the method of R. Moshe haDarshan to cite the passages by well-known authors which he uses by the name of the authors of those works. *Midrash Tadshe* (supra, p. 16) he cites in the name of 'Rabbi Pinhas ben Jair'; in the *Bemidbar Rabba* (supra, p. 11 note 1) he cites the *Seder Eliyahu* by the name 'Elijah says'; in the *Bereishit Rabba major* (in the *Pugio*) he cites the *Pirge d'Rabbi Eliezer* by the name, 'Rabbi Eliezer says' (supra, p. 3 note 1).³⁹

Unlike these well-known works, Moshe haDarshan's Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal sources had no known Jewish authors. Moshe haDarshan chose to introduce his selections from these books by the phrase, "our Rabbis said," or "our Rabbis taught."⁴⁰ In one unusual case he selected an example from the tale of Eldad ha-Dani, the Ethiopian Jewish traveler who visited the Babylonian Jewish community in the tenth century. He introduced this passage

³⁹ Ibid. 18: על האמור לעיל יש להוסיף שדרכו של ר"מ הדרשן היה לכנות את המאמרים שמביא מספרים המיוחסים למחברים ידועים בשם המחברים הללו. המדרש תדשא הוא מביא בשם ר' פנחס בן יאיר (לעיל אמ' 16), בבמ"ד מובא הסדר אליהו בשם אליהו אומר (לעיל עמ' 11 אות 1). בב"ר הגדולה (בפוגיא) מובא הפרקי דר"א בשם ר' אליעזר אומר (לעיל עמ' 3 אות 1).

⁴⁰ תנו רבותינו or אמרו רבותינו.

by writing, "Our Rabbi Joshua ben Nun said."⁴¹ Moshe haDarshan's intent was most likely not to deceive. Rather, he recognized the Jewish origins of these texts. However, because they were anonymous, at least in the form in which he encountered them, he cited them in the traditional way in which an anonymous tradition is cited in Rabbinic literature. These references to the lost literature of the Second Temple, and the unique literary features increase the likelihood that these books are all from one hand, and that the author was Moshe haDarshan.

Albeck's publication and analysis of the *Bereishit Rabbati* shifted the focus of scholarship on Moshe haDarshan. Outside of Baer's final attack on the authenticity of the citations attributed to him, no doubt remained that Moshe had included these pseudo-Christological passages in his collection. Newer scholarship began to address the question of the sources from which he gathered these passages. In particular, scholars began to examine the Second Temple era literature which had long since disappeared from Rabbinic literature. Books like *Jubilees*, *Tobit* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* had been excluded from the literature circulated by the Rabbis in the generations following the destruction of the Second Temple. As early as the redaction of the Palestinian Talmud, the phrase in Mishna Sanhedrin 10:1 "ספרים חיצוניים" had been understood to mean the extra-canonical books.⁴² Indeed, Epstein had anticipated this new focus on Moshe haDarshan when he suggested that *Jubilees* had circulated in the Talmudical academies of Babylonia, and had been pseudonomously attributed to R. Pinhas b. Jair.⁴³

⁴¹ אמר רבנו יהושע בן נון

⁴² See ySan 50a and bSan 100b.

⁴³ "Bereishit Rabbati" 30

Following the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, interest in the fate of these books grew. The long-held belief that Rabbinic Judaism had rejected all the extra-canonical books, which only Christians preserved, began to be challenged. In the last decade of the nineteenth century, Solomon Schechter arranged a visit to the great synagogue in Cairo. He received permission to remove all of the manuscripts which he found in a storage chamber for discarded and damaged books, called the Geniza. During his stay, he removed over 100,000 manuscripts. Some of these were nearly complete treatises, while others were no more than scraps containing only a few lines or even words. Following his return to England, Schechter and other scholars began to examine and catalog the find. From this enormous mass there emerged four texts which seemed on the one hand to have originated before the destruction of the Second Temple, and on the other hand reflected the theology of the anti-Rabbinic sect of the Karaites. Schechter published two of these manuscripts in 1910 with the title *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*. Almost from the moment this work was published, debate raged over its origin. Büchler and Zeitlin led the way in arguing for a late date for the text. In part their evidence was the charge of forgery made by Rabbinite Jews against the Qaraites. One of the earliest sources for this accusation was the *Sefer Tamim* of Rabbi Moshe ben Hisdai "Tequ" (fl. ca. 1240). In it he wrote:

And so in the *Shiur Qoma* in which is written the *Alphabet of Rabbi Akiba*: "there is no end, nor surcease nor limit to the matter"; if this is an authoritative source, since it is not found in our Talmud (i.e. Babylonian), nor in the Palestinian Talmud, nor in the great Midrash collections. For there are books which the *minim* wrote to deceive everyone, such as the *Pereq Shira*. And at the end of it is written: 'anyone who contemplates this always will deserve such-and-such, and so-and-so and so-and-so agree.' And so likewise is that which is written in the *Book of the Name of the Limbs*. 'The right palm—thus is its name, and of the left—thus is its name.' And at the end, 'Everyone who knows this secret, Rabbi Ishmael said, I and Akiba agree in this matter, that in this world he will merit a good life.' And there is no reason to believe that they write this in order to strengthen their argument. For he

have already heard from our Rabbis that Anan the Heretic (the *min*) and his associates wrote heretical and false books and buried them in the ground. And afterward, they were bringing them out and saying, 'thus we have found in the books of the ancient ones.'⁴⁴

On the other hand, Schechter and Charles believed that it was actually written in the second century B.C.E. While the dispute continued, three more books which had been discovered decades earlier in the Geniza were found to be almost exact copies of scrolls written while the Second Temple was still standing, and unearthed at Qumran and Masada: *Ben Sira*, *Testament of Levi* and an unnamed "Priestly Fragment" which refers to the "Sons of Zadoq." With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, interest focused almost immediately on the riddle of how these works survived almost 1000 years in versions which in some cases were identical nearly to the letter.

As publication and scholarship on the "Dead Sea Scrolls" continued, J.T. Milik noticed that Moshe haDarshan had preserved yet another one of the newly-discovered books: the *Book of the Giants*, which formed a section of *I Enoch*. Remarkably, the version which Moshe haDarshan incorporated into his anthology agreed with the manuscripts found in the Dead Sea excavations. This discovery was notable, for the books which had been discovered in the Geniza seemed never to have circulated outside of the Palestinian Jewish communities—Rabbanite or Qaraite. The Geniza manuscripts included two copies

⁴⁴ R. Kirchheim, "The *Ketab Tamim* of Rabbi Moshe Tequ" in *Ozar Nechmad* (Vienna: 1860) vol. 3:61-62: 'וכן בשעור קומה שכתוב במדרש א"ב דר' עקיבא "אין לדבר קץ ולא סוף ולא שעור", אם הוא בר סמכא, כיון שלא נמצא בתלמודינו ולא בתלמוד ירושלמי ולא במדרשים הגדולים, כי יש ספרים שזייפו המינים להטעות את העולם כמו פרק שירה, וכתוב בסופו "כל מי שהוגה בו תמיד זוכה לכך וכך ופלוני ופלוני ערבים". וכן מה שכתוב בספר שם האברים. "כף הימין כך שמו ושל שמאל כך שמו". ובסוף הדברים: "כל מי שיודע דו זה אמר ד" ישמעאל אני ועקיבא ערבים בדבר שבעולם הזה הוא בחיים טובים". ואין להאמין, כי כותבים כך כדי להחזיק דבריהם. וכבר שמענו מרבותינו כי ענן המין וחביריו היו כותבין דברי מינות ושקר וטומנים בקרקע ואח"כ היו מוציאין אותם ואמרים כך מצאנו בספרים הקדמונים.

of the *Damascus Covenant*, five of *Ben Sira* and one of the *Testament of Levi*. These manuscripts had been written between 875 CE — 1200 CE. Nevertheless, despite their longevity and the many copies, none of these books is represented outside of the Geniza, nor are there copies made by a "European" hand. Even more remarkable was the fact that no trace of the *Book of the Giants* was found in the Geniza. Instead, it emerged independently in Southern France.

Milik identified a number of features of Moshe haDarshan's version which showed agreement with the manuscripts found at Qumran, and with the Manichaean (Persian) version, but not with versions known among Christians:

- 1) The form of the names of the sons of the angels: "Now, it seems beyond question to me that these narratives are derived directly from the Book of Giants in its Manichaean form. Although greatly corrupted (היוא והיִיא, היוא והיִיא B; היוא והיִיא S; היוא והיִיא M; היוא והיִיא R), the names of the two sons of Šemḥazai are certainly אֱוֵהִיָּה and הֶהֱיָה, which we find in QEnGiants, 'why' (occasionally 'hy') and 'hy' which are found in the Manichaean Kawân..."⁴⁵
- 2) The agreement of the dreams: "The tablet mentioned in line I of this fragment [i.e. 2Q26 I] is conceived as being of wood... since [its writing] is effaced by washing; the midrash transforms it into an engraved stone slab. The tablet, which symbolizes the generation of the flood, is submerged by the waters of the flood, just as in the Manichaean fragment the board is thrown into the water."⁴⁶

These points of agreement, and other features of the midrash led Milik to conclude:

Be that as it may, the midrash of Šemḥazai and 'Aza'el provides us, in a very shortened form, with the longest sequence of the Book of Giants which has been preserved up to modern times: from the sin of the angels, the mission of Enoch to the chief of the fallen angels, the lamentations of the latter... up to the announce-

⁴⁵ Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1976) 333-4.

⁴⁶ Milik 335.

ment of the salvation which will be accomplished by Noah and his three sons.⁴⁷

Milik's study also identified a number of other literary allusions to the *Book of Giants* in Jewish literature. These occur in both the Midrash and the Talmud. The Talmudic references (found in bYoma 67b and Niddah 61a) provide a *terminus ante quem* of the sixth century for the reappearance of the *Book of Giants*. The earliest midrashic allusions are found in *Deuteronomy Rabba* and *Aggadat Bereishit*.⁴⁸ While Milik noted the influence of the *Book of Giants* on these Midrashic collections, he was unaware of the research of Epstein and Albeck linking *Deuteronomy Rabba* and *Aggadat Bereishit* to Moshe haDarshan.

Milik devised a theory to account for the reappearance of this text, presumed lost, in a late medieval midrashic anthology. He noted that in those places where the midrash agreed with Qumran texts, it also agreed with the Manichaean version as well. Milik appeared to propose that the Manichaean version of the *Book of Giants* was a translation and abridgement of a Jewish Aramaic original. This version, along with a Syriac version was used by Jewish scholars to prepare a Mishnaic Hebrew translation for Jewish audiences:

The Manichaean Book of Giants, too, shortened the Jewish Aramaic original, but with more discrimination than the medieval rabbinical midrash. The latter was rendered into Mishnaic Hebrew from an Aramaic which was relatively close to Syriac... It seems to me extremely likely, in fact, that it is directly dependent on the Manichaean work on the Giants, and more exactly on its original wording, in the Aramaic dialect used by the Manichaean writers, and not on just any version... A scholarly Babylonian rabbi could have found and understood without difficulty the Syriac Book of Giants, as recently as the early Middle Ages.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Milik 339.

⁴⁸ Milik 331-2.

⁴⁹ Milik 335.

Milik's presentation does not make it entirely clear whether the Syriac or the Manichaean version exercised the primary influence on later Jewish literature. Milik also did not present evidence that a Syriac version, independent of the Jewish Aramaic version, actually existed. His only argument would appear to be the use of the term *מסתפקין* — "we will be sufficient" in three of the four Jewish versions of the midrash. According to Milik, this "verb is not attested in its reflexive forms in Judaeo-Aramaic; it is attested, however, in Syriac and in Christian Palestinian."⁵⁰

However, it is entirely possible that the Syriac writers knew the *Book of Giants* in a Jewish Aramaic version. Thus, one of the earliest references in a Syriac source is found in the *Cave of Treasures*⁵¹. In this source, the author follows the Syrian tradition of associating the *B'nei Elohim*—the "sons of God"—with the children of Seth, who are seduced by the daughters of Cain. However, *The Cave of Treasures* also reports that

certain ancient writers have fallen into error, and have written, "The angels came down from heaven, and had intercourse with men, and by them these famous giants have been produced." But this is not true, for those who have written in this manner did not understand... Behold, O my brother readers, and know ye that it is not in the nature of beings of the spirit to beget, neither is it in the nature of the devils—who are unclean beings, and workers of wickedness, and lovers of adultery—to beget, because there are neither males nor females among them... And if the devils were able to have intercourse with women they would not leave unravished a single virgin in all the race of the children of men.⁵²

⁵⁰ Milik 329 note c.

⁵¹ Bezold, *Die Schatzhöhle* (Amsterdam: APA-Philo Press, 1981 <repr.>); E.A. Wallis Budge, *The Cave of Treasures* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1927).

⁵² Budge 102-3 (=Bezold, *Die Schatzhöhle* <repr.> (Amsterdam: APA, 1981) 18 (German); 78 (Syriac):

ומטל הדא טעו מלפנא קדמא וכתבו דמלאכא לם נחתו מן שמיא ואשתותפו עם בנת אנשא ומנהון אתילדו הלין גנברא דשמהתא. ולו שריר מטל דלא אתבינו אמרו הכנא חזו אנתון או אחי קרויא ודעו דלית בכינא דרוחנא הדא. ואפלא שאדא הנון דאיתיהון טנפא וסעדו בישתט ורחמי גורא אית בכינהון הדא מטל דלית הוא בהון דכרא ונקבתא ולא אתתוספן על מנינהון הא מן דנפלו ולא חד. אלו משכחין הוו דיוא דנשתותפון עם נשא לא שבקין הוו חדא בתולתא בכלה גנסא דבנינשא דלא מחבלין הוו

It is not clear whether the author knew *The Book of Giants*, or at least this legend, in Jewish Aramaic or Syriac. His citation includes the term ܠܐ — "verily", which is found in Syriac, but not in Jewish Aramaic. This suggests that his source was actually Syriac. On the other hand, he clearly identifies his source as "ancient teachers"—a term which seems to refer to pre-Christian sources (i.e. *Enoch* and *Jubilees*).

Reeves rejected Milik's hypothesis as without precedent in Jewish literature: "We know of only a few examples where Jewish scholars demonstrate their familiarity with Manichaean mythology, despite that literature's biblical roots and imagery."⁵³ Instead, Reeves suggested his own theory for the appearance of this legend in Jewish texts:

...it seems much more plausible to assume that these stories are both textual expressions of an early exegetical tradition circulating in learned groups during the Second Temple era. One version appeared in Aramaic at Qumran and was presumably the version later studied and adapted by Mani. Another version of the same tradition recurs in Hebrew in the early Middle Ages. Still other versions... apparently influenced Islamic exegetes of the Qur'anic passage regarding the sins of Hārūt and Mārūt (Sura 2:96).⁵⁴

Most recently, Martha Himmelfarb has suggested a different route for the transmission of the sources which appear in the works of Moshe haDarshan.

She has noted the difficulty of tracing his sources:

It is much more difficult to explain how medieval Jews came to know the pseudepigrapha than the Apocrypha, which had become part of the Christian Bible and thus was widely available in Europe in the Middle Ages. The possibility that Jews borrowed pseudepigrapha from Christians cannot be ruled out, but many of the pseudepigrapha were not known to the Christians of Europe. For example, the Book of Jubilees, which leaves traces in several

לה.

⁵³ J. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony* (Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1991) 88.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

post-talmudical works, including R. Moses', was preserved not by European Christians but by the Ethiopic church... In some instances medieval Jewish works seem to reflect knowledge not of the pseudepigraphic texts that have come down to us, but of works on which those texts drew. That is, the authors of the medieval works seem to have had access to the sources of the surviving texts.⁵⁵

Himmelfarb's studies have concentrated specifically on identifying the way in which these sources became available to Moshe haDarshan. In her first study, "R. Moses the Preacher," she examined the claims of Albeck that Moshe haDarshan knew the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. She noted that this work did not become available in Latin in Western Europe until 1235, long after the death of Moshe haDarshan. On the other hand, "the Testaments seems to have been known widely among Greek-speaking Christians throughout the Middle Ages."⁵⁶ Himmelfarb concluded that his knowledge of the *Testaments* came through a Hebrew translation which had been brought to Provence from southeastern Italy

which then formed part of the Byzantine Empire. Byzantine Italy contained several flourishing Jewish communities. By the mid-ninth century the town of Oria was a center of talmudic study, and after its decline, it was replaced by Bari and Otranto... Bari was also the seat of an archbishop, which suggests a certain amount of Christian learning as well, and thus possibly the availability of a manuscript of the Testaments.⁵⁷

Finally, Himmelfarb proposed that such a translation could very easily have been brought from Italy to Provence:

Nathan b. Yehiel of Rome, the compiler of the *'Arukh*, was a student of R. Moses the Preacher, and he seems also to have studied with Moses Kalfo of Bari. Through such channels a Hebrew translation of the Testaments or of excerpts from the Testaments might have reached Narbonne, for it seems reasonable to suppose that the

⁵⁵ Himmelfarb, "R. Moses the Preacher" in *AJS Review* 9(1984) 56-7.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 59.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 73.

translation was made by a Byzantine Jew, who would have known Greek better than a Jew from Provence.⁵⁸

Himmelfarb was aware of the difficulties which this theory involves— to begin with, the fact that the evidence for this method of transmission is tenuous at best. The entire argument depends upon conjecture, with no literary sources, manuscripts, or historical references to support it. However, an even more serious problem exists: Moshe haDarshan also cited the *Bel and the Dragon* in Syriac. Himmelfarb dismisses this casually, stating "It is unlikely that a Provençal Jew would have had access to the Peshitta. It seems more likely that R. Moses had before him a text of *Bel and the Dragon* that had been transliterated into Hebrew characters by Jews who lived among Syriac-speaking Christians."⁵⁹ In her article she does not consider the possibility that the Hebrew versions of the *Testaments* may also have originated with Jews who lived alongside Syriac-speaking Christians.

In a subsequent study of Moshe haDarshan's sources,⁶⁰ Himmelfarb examined his use of *Jubilees*. Like the *Testaments*, this book did not exist in Latin during the lifetime of Moshe haDarshan. However, unlike the *Testaments*, the Greek version of *Jubilees* also seems to have disappeared long before his lifetime. Himmelfarb's solution to this problem was to suggest that the Byzantine chronographers preserved *Jubilees* traditions which were themselves drawn from earlier chronographers. She suggested that "it is not too difficult to imagine a Jewish reader somewhere in Byzantium, perhaps in Byzantine Italy,

⁵⁸ Ibid. 73-4.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 77.

⁶⁰ M. Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of *Jubilees* in Medieval Hebrew Literature," in J. C. Reeves, *Tracing the Threads* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 115-141. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Reeves for calling my attention to this article, and for supplying me with a copy.

coming upon such collections and translating into Hebrew materials that he found particularly interesting."⁶¹ Himmelfarb examines 7 different passages from works ascribed to Moshe haDarshan: *Midrash Tadshe* and *Midrash Aggada*. For six of these, she finds evidence of similar traditions in early Greek chronicles. The seventh, a list of the names of the wives of biblical figures, has no such immediate antecedent. However, Himmelfarb noted that similar lists are found in Greek, Syriac and Armenian.⁶²

She examined another work which had long been known⁶³ to reflect traditions found in *Jubilees*, the *Sefer haRefuah* ("Book of Healing") of Asaph the physician. This book was pseudonymously attributed to Shem, and the introduction states that it was given by the angel Raphael to Noah, who bequeathed it to Shem. Himmelfarb accepted the date proposed by Lieber⁶⁴ of the ninth or early tenth century, in Byzantine Italy. As evidence, Himmelfarb states that it "seems to have been known to Shabbetai Donnolo" who lived in Italy in the tenth century. She also noted that Flusser, who edited a critical edition of the *Josippon*, speculated that the author of the *Josippon* was also an Italian physician of the tenth century. The author of that work made use of several books of the Apocrypha, including 1 and 2 Maccabees, as well as a Latin digest of the histories of Josephus. According to Himmelfarb, these two sources pro-

⁶¹ Ibid. 118.

⁶² Ibid. 127.

⁶³ M. Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature* (1857) 301.

⁶⁴ E. Lieber, "Asaf's *Book of Medicines*: A Hebrew encyclopedia of Greek and Jewish Medicine, Possibly Compiled in Byzantium on an Indian Model," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 38: *Symposium on Byzantine Medicine* (ed. John Scarborough; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1984) as cited by Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes".

vide further evidence of Jewish borrowing of Christian-Greek sources in the ninth and tenth centuries in Italy.

Himmelfarb concluded that the cumulative weight of this evidence points to transmission of these sources from Byzantine Italy in the ninth-tenth centuries, and from there to Provence. Although Himmelfarb did not directly suggest it, it appears that her proof that such exchange of literature *could* take place is again the person of Nathan b. Jehiel, the author of the Hebrew lexicon the *Aruch*. Her theory fails to address one very serious challenge: the mention of a book of *Jubilees* by R. Saadia Gaon in Babylonia in the mid-tenth century. Epstein was the first to draw attention to this in his *Miqadmaniot haYehudim*:

And there in the Academy of the Geonim in Babylonia was found the *Book of Jubilees* in the Holy Tongue, it would seem. But it was more complete than the *Jubilees* which we have, which was translated from the Ethiopic. In the commentary attributed to one of the students of R. Saadia Gaon, on *1Chron* 23:3 it is related: 'And in the matter of these words, from the sources of the sages, and from the *Book of Jubilees* which al-Fayumi, Rabbi Saadia Gaon cited from amongst the books of the Academy: 'In the year 40 of the reign of King David, in the middle of the Jubilee, on the fourth day of the week, he ordained the Priestly and Levitical courses.' Besides what is said in the commentary, that R. Saadia Gaon cited the *Jubilees*, we can recognize from the language of the passage which is cited that it is from the book of *Jubilees*. And in that book of *Jubilees* is speaks of the time of David. If so, it was more complete than the book of *Jubilees* which we now have.⁶⁵

This direct reference to *Jubilees* by Saadia Gaon casts serious doubt on the theory of Himmelfarb, since it comes at least a century before Nathan b. Jehiel, and since there is no evidence of Italian influence in the Babylonian academies of the tenth century.

⁶⁵ Epstein, *Miqadmaniot* 135-6: והנה בישיבת הגאונים בבבל היה נמצא ספר היובלים כנראה בלשון הקודש, והוא היה שלם יותר מספר היובלים אשר לנו, שהועתק מלשון כושית. בפירוש המיוחס לאחד מתלמידי ר' סעדיה גאון לדברי הימים-א כג, ג יסופר: ובענין דברים הללו מעיני במדות חכמים ובספר היובלות שהביא אל פיומי רב סעדיה גאון מספרי הישיבה: בשנת ארבעים למלכות דוד בחצי היובל בד' בשבוע התקין משמרות כהונה ולויה וכו'. חוץ ממה שאומר בפירוש, שרס"ג הביא ספר היובלות, נכיר בלשון המאמר המובא שהוא מספר היובלים. והנה בספר היובלים ההוא ידבר מזמן דוד, אם כן היה יותר שלם מספר היובלים שלפנינו.

Other Books Used by Moshe haDarshan

In addition to these 5 books used by Moshe haDarshan, viz. *Tobit*, *Bel and the Dragon*, *Jubilees*, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *1 Enoch*, Moshe haDarshan cited other works preserved only in Christian sources. I have not found these citations discussed in the scholarship associated with R. Moshe haDarshan. They are found in the commentaries of R. Moses ben Nahman (Nahmanides, or the Ramban). Nahmanides lived in the latter half of the thirteenth century, and was familiar with the works of Moshe haDarshan. Indirect evidence of this comes from the disputation of Barcelona, at which he was the most prominent Jewish scholar. Nahmanides never disputed the citations attributed to Moshe haDarshan, either during the proceedings or afterwards in his written protocol. Direct evidence comes from his use of Moshe's work, the *Sefer haYesod*, in his sermons and commentaries.

In his commentary on Deut 21:14⁶⁶, Nahmanides wrote:

In the Persian language they call 'labor' and 'service' *amira*; I learned this from the *Yesod* of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan. And this is true, for I saw there (i.e. in the Palestinian Talmud, Pereq "Rabbi Akiva said," and in Pereq "all of the idols") that they called a good worker an *amira*. And this is also common in Aramaic, as is written in the *Scroll of Susanna*: 'And the King of Assyria sent to all the subjects in Nineveh, and all those who lived along the sea, and all those who lived in Carmel and in Gilead. And all the inhabitants of the land rebelled, nor did they fear him...' and so in many places in that book, they call the inhabitants of the land *amorei ar'a*⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Ch. Chavel, *Perushei haTorah l'Rabbenu Moshe ben Nahman* (Jerusalem: Mossad haRav Kook, 1970) 444.

⁶⁷ בלשון פרסי קורין לעבודה עמירה מיסודו של רבי משה הדרשן למדתי זאת. וזה אמת שכן ראיתי בירושלמי תמן צוותין לפעלא טבא עמירא בפרק אמר רבי עקיבא ובפרק כל הצלמים ומורגל הוא אף בלשון ארמי כמו שכתוב במגלת שושן ושדר מלכא דאתור על כולהון עמירה דננוה ועל כל דעמרין על יד ימא ועל עמיר דכרמלא ודגלעד ואהפיכו פתגמא דנבוכדנצר כולהון עמורייא דארעא ולא תדחלון מיניה וכן במקומות רבים בספר ההוא יקראו יושבי הארץ עמורי ארעא...

I. Lévi⁶⁸ and A. Di Lella⁶⁹ considered this passage evidence that Syriac (the Aramaic dialect used by Syrian Orthodox, Nestorian and Jacobite Christians in the Near East), and Syriac texts were known among the Jews of Spain in the thirteenth century. Additional evidence often cited is the book of *The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira*, from the second century B.C.E. 5 copies of it were found in the Cairo Geniza between 1895 and 1931. Although it is mentioned several times in Rabbinic literature from before 500 C.E., no new material from it was mentioned until Saadia Gaon quoted from it in his *Sefer haGalui*. Saadia's quotation, and the Geniza pages were the subject of controversy, with many authors arguing that those pages were really a retranslation into Hebrew from another language: Greek, Persian or Syriac. I. Lévi⁷⁰ argued that at least some of the verses showed that they were based upon a Syriac version which had been misunderstood and mistranslated by the Jewish retranslator.

Nahmanides also quoted from an Apocryphal work, the *Wisdom of Solomon*. This quotation, too, is in Syriac, from the Peshitta—the Syriac translation of Scripture.⁷¹

But rather, as King Solomon (peace be upon him) wrote in the book which is called *Hokhmata Rabta d'Shlomo*, in which it is written: 'And it was He who gave [me] true knowledge, of how the world and the servants of the planets [i.e. the elements] exist, The courses and limits and middle-courses of the times, the nature

⁶⁸ I. Lévi, *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (Leiden: 1904)

⁶⁹ A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach* (London: Mouton & Co., 1966)

⁷⁰ op. cit. x.

⁷¹ אלא כמ"ש שלמה המלך ע"ה בספר הנקרא חוכמתא רבתא דשלמה ששם כתב, והוא דיהב אידעתא דלא דגלותא למידע היכן קם עלמא ועובדיהון דמולאתא, שוריא ושולמא ומציעתהון דומני, שולחפי דונבותא ודהיכן עבדי זמני ריהטיהון דשמיא וקבעיהון דכוכבי, מתנא דבעירא וחימתא דחיואתא, עוויהון דרוחי ומחשבתהון דבני נשא, גונוי דנציבתא וחיליהון דעיקרי, כל מידם דכסי וכל מידם דגלי ידעית. Ch. Chavel, *Kitve Ramban* (Jerusalem: Mossad haRav Kook, 1963) 163.

of domesticated beasts, and the behavior of wild animals, the strength of the winds and the thoughts of men, the types of plants and power of roots; everything which is hidden, and everything which is manifest, I have known it. (Wisdom 7:16-22)

Nahmanides knew that this text had not been preserved by the Jews as sacred literature, as is demonstrated by his "Sermon on the words of Kohelet":

And we have found another book, which is called *The Great Wisdom of Solomon*, and it is in a very difficult form of the language of the *Targum* [i.e. Aramaic]. And the non-Jews translated it from that language. But I think that the men of Hezekiah did not translate it [into Aramaic], but rather it went down with them to Babylonia orally, and there they repeated it in their language, for they were wise sayings and not Divinely inspired.⁷²

Himmelfarb cited these passages as proof that Jews in Christian Spain had access to certain Apocryphal texts in Syriac, and that they were not averse to citing them: "In Christian Spain in the thirteenth century, Nahmanides, who used Judith and the Wisdom of Solomon in Syriac, developed a theory to account for the problems raised by the fact that the Wisdom of Solomon was preserved by the Christians."⁷³

While Lévi, Di Lella and Himmelfarb all conclude that "Syriac was known among the Jews"⁷⁴ based upon Nahmanides' citations, I believe that Nahmanides actually relied upon Moshe haDarshan as his source for these materials. There are several compelling reasons to believe this. First, Nahmanides believed that he was quoting from the "Scroll of Susanna" although he actually quoted from *Judith*. *Susanna* is part of the Christian canon, and is generally prefixed to *Daniel*. It describes the efforts of the young Daniel to res-

⁷² ומצינו עוד ספר שנקרא חכמתא רבתא דשלמה, והוא בלשון תרגום חמור מאד, והגויים העתיקו[הו] מן הלשון ההוא. ואני חושב שלא העתיקוהו אנשי חזקיהו מלך יהודה, אלא ירד עמהם לבבל על פה, ושם אמרוהו בלשונם, כי היו חכמות ולא נאמר ברוח הקודש. Ch. Chavel, Ibid. 182.

⁷³ Himmelfarb, "Rabbi Moses" 76.

⁷⁴ Di Lella, op. cit. 108.

cue a Jewish woman, defamed and condemned to death by the corrupt Jewish elders of Babylonia. On the other hand, *Judith* is the story of a virtuous young woman who rescues Jerusalem from a siege by beheading the Assyrian general Holophernes. If these Syriac texts were indeed known among the Jews, it would be highly unlikely that Nahmanides would confuse them.

Indeed, these books were treated very differently by the Jews in the Middle Ages. While *Judith* came to be used frequently, because of its connection to the festival of Hannukah, *Susanna* was almost entirely neglected. *Judith* was known among the Jews in Arabic as early as the eleventh century. Rabbi Nissim ben Jacob ben Nissim Ibn Shahin (c. 990-1062)⁷⁵ included an adaptation of it in his collection of tales of miraculous redemptions, *Hibbur Yafeh m'haYeshua*⁷⁶. Judith's name is absent from this version, along with the names of Antiochus and Holophernes. However, two generations later, the well-known Tosafist and grandson of Rashi, Rabbi Samuel ben Meir (RaSHBaM, ca. 1080-1174⁷⁷) cited the book as a justification for the requirement of women to participate in the festival of Hannukah: "For they too were included in the miracle: For it was by their hand that they were saved. And thus it is in the scroll by Esther, and at Hannukah by Judith."⁷⁸ Furthermore, a fuller manuscript version of *Judith* was published by Gaster.⁷⁹ Gaster gives a date in the tenth or eleventh century for the manuscript, although this seems unlikely.

⁷⁵ Encyclopedia Judaica XII:1183.

⁷⁶ Ch. Hershberg, *Rabbenu Nissim b"r Yaakov m'Qairuan: Hibbur Yafeh m'haYeshua* (Jersalem: Mossad haRav Kook, 1934) 54-56.

⁷⁷ Encyclopedia Judaica, XIV:809.

⁷⁸ Tosafot on Babylonian Talmud tractate Pesahim 108b: [שאף הן] היו באותו הנס. פי' רשב"ם שעל ידם נגאלו וכן במגילה ע"י אסתר ובחנוכה ע"י יהודית

⁷⁹ M. Gaster, "An Unknown Hebrew Version of the History of Judith," in *PSBA* 1894.

However, it contains glosses in Old Persian from the thirteenth or fourteenth century. Thus, the ms. might in fact date from the eleventh to thirteenth century. Finally, a liturgical poem for the festival of Hannukah, *Mi Kamocha Adir Ayom v'Nora*—"Who is like you, Mighty, Terrible and Awe-inspiring.." includes a reference to the book of *Judith*, and is dated around this same time.⁸⁰

In contrast, there are no early versions of *Susanna*. The earliest Hebrew ms. is British Museum (Neubauer Catalog) 2797, which is an autograph written between 1325 and 1341. Jellinek found a copy of this version in München 117.6, which he published in his collection of small midrashic texts, the *Bet haMidrash*.⁸¹ This Hebrew translation has not been considered a significant witness of the text, and has not been studied closely. However, there are several reasons to believe that it was made from a Syriac version. First, the earliest citation of it in any Jewish source is found in Nahmanides' commentary, where the name appears as it does in the Syriac: שושן — "Shoshan". Furthermore, the Hebrew has several textual peculiarities which can be clarified by examining the Syriac, but not the Greek:

1. 1:5 (Jellinek) Hebrew:

אז מנו שנים זקנים שופטים אל העם בשנת שיצא דבר ה' על חמם
הזקנים

Then they appointed two elders as judges over the people, in the year that the word of the Lord went out concerning the licentiousness of the elders

Syriac (transliterated into Hebrew characters):

בזבנא הו קמו קשישא בעמא תדין. דאיתיהון הוו דשנא ודינא בשנתא הי.
דעליהון מלל אלהא דמנהון נפוק דושעא מן בבל מנהון מן קשישא ומן
דינא הנון דמשמשין הוו בהיכלא.

At that time, there arose two elders over the people, who were leaders and judges in that year, concerning whom God said "from

⁸⁰ Davidson, Ozar 1143.

⁸¹ Jellinek, op. cit. VI.xxxi; 126-128.

them there would go forth wickedness from Babylon, from the elders and from those judges who were serving in the Temple."⁸²

Theodotian:

καὶ ἀπεδείχθησαν δύο πρεσβύτεροι ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ κριταὶ ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐκείνῳ, περὶ ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ δεσπότης ὅτι Ἐξῆλθεν ἀνομία ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἐκ πρεσβυτέρων κριτῶν, οἱ ἐδόκουν κυβερνᾶν τὸν λαόν.

And there were appointed two elders from the community as judges in that year, about whom God said: "Lawlessness shall go out from Babylon from the elders who are judges, who were supposed to govern the people.

The Hebrew appears to reflect a corruption which originates in either a poor translation or a defective ms of the Syriac. Thus, תריין is mechanically reproduced as שנים instead of שני. The phrase עליהון מלל אלהא דמנהון נפוק ("About whom God said that 'from them there shall go out...'.") appears completely corrupted as: שיצא דבר ה' ("there went out the word of God..."). Again, בשנת הי—"In that year" has been shorted to בשנת.

2) 1:6 (Jellinek) Hebrew:

ומתדירים בכל יום השכם והערב בבית יהוכין לשפוט את כל העם
And they were [staying] every day, from early in the morning until nightfall in the house of Jehoiakin, judging the entire nation.

Syriac:

הנון הלין. אתין הוו אמינאית לביתה דיוקים. ואתין הוו כל אילין דאית
הוא להון דינא ומתדינן.

These were coming constantly to the house of Jehoiakim. And anyone who had a case would come, and they were being judged.

Theodotian:

οὗτοι προσεκαρτέρουν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Ἰωακίμ, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτοὺς πάντες οἱ κρινόμενοι.

And they were constantly in Joakim's house, and all those who had a case to be judged came before them.

⁸² Susanna 1:5.

In the Hebrew, the word מתדירים is problematic; no such word exists. It could be understood as a neologism, meaning "constantly," from the known word תדירים. Or it could be understood as a Hitpael of the root דור, meaning they "lodged" or "stayed" with him. However this construction also does not appear in Jewish Aramaic texts. I would suggest another possibility: it represents a corruption of the Syriac מתדינן—"were sitting in judgment." Since the translator has either misread or misunderstood this verb, he has supplied the meaning by substituting לשפוט את כל העם—"to judge all the people." At the same time, he has retained the word which was unclear in his original.

Thus, although there is no one phrase or passage which points conclusively to the Syriac, there is certainly good reason to consider the possibility.

Thus we see that Nahmanides confused a work which was well known in Hebrew versions and in the liturgy with a work which was almost completely unknown in Jewish circles in his time. This would seem to argue against Nahmanides as a primary witness for these two texts. Therefore we must look to Nahmanides' source for the confusion. I believe that Nahmanides' was in fact citing from the *Sefer haYesod* of Moshe haDarshan. His introductory remark is a lexical comment: "In the Persian language they call 'labor' and 'service' *amira*; I learned this from the *Yesod* of Rabbi Moshe haDarshan." Based upon citations in the *Aruch* as well as Nahmanides' remark, Moshe haDarshan's *Yesod* was probably a lexicographical work, giving definitions of difficult Biblical and Talmudic terms, as well as examples from other Semitic languages which used the same root. Thus, in the *Aruch* we find that Moshe haDarshan often brought examples from Arabic. Nahmanides next interjects his own observation, confirming the definition given by Moshe haDarshan: And this is true, for I saw there (i.e. in the Palestinian Talmud, Pereq "Rabbi Akiva said," and in Pereq "all of the idols") that they called a good worker an *amira*."

Nahmanides' next remark has traditionally been understood to be his own observation on the root 'amr. Levi, Di Lella and Himmelfarb believe that Nahmanides gleaned them himself from a Syriac text or texts. However, the error in identifying the source of the passage and the way in which representative verses from *Judith* were selected based upon their inclusion of the root 'amr suggests a dictionary or comparative lexicon as the source. This becomes even more apparent if we look for a reason for the switch of titles. Although *Judith* and *Susanna* have little in common either in plot, subject or treatment in Jewish sources they have one common feature: the use of the root 'amr in the opening lines of the book. As Nahmanides quotes *Judith*: וּשְׁדֵר מַלְכָּא דַּאֲתוֹר עַל כּוֹלְהוֹן עֲמִירָה דְּנִנְוָה וְעַל כָּל דְּעֲמָרִין עַל יַד יָמָא וְעַל עֲמִיר דְּכַרְמֵלָא וְדַגְלָעַד וְאַהֲפִיכּוּ פִּתְגָמָא — "And the King of Assyria sent to all those who were dwelling in Nineveh ['mire d'ninveh] and to all those who dwelt [d'mrin] along the sea, and all those who dwelt on the Carmel ['mir d'karinel] and Gilead; and all those who dwelt in the countryside ['morei 'r'a] sent back word to Nebuchadnezzar that they were not afraid of him." Similarly, the opening verse of *Susanna* is: אֵיתָּ הוּא גְבֵרָא חָד וְעֹמֵר הוּא בָבֶל — "There was a man who dwelt [v'mar] in Babylonia." The verse from *Judith* which Nahmanides' cites is verse 7. How then could these two books be confused, unless they were originally cited from a lexical entry, which contained a homoioteleuton under the lemma 'mr?

The lexicon from which Nahmanides took his initial comment was the *Yesod* of Moshe haDarshan. It is reasonable to believe that Nahmanides returned to that work immediately following his own confirmation of the affinity between the Persian and the Jewish Aramaic. In this case, we can add to Moshe haDarshan's sources *Judith* and *Susanna*, both in Syriac.

Finally, Moshe haDarshan used certain legends or passages found in the *Vita Adae et Evae*. This is more properly a cycle of materials composed around

the creation of Adam and Eve, their sin and expulsion from Eden, and their life outside of Eden. These works originated in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic circles and are found in Syriac, Arabic, Latin, Greek and Slavonic versions. The oldest portions of the text date from the decades before the destruction of the Second Temple. The younger portions were written centuries later. In its present form, it is a Christian document.

Schiller—Sziinessy discussed a passage attributed to Moshe haDarshan, in which the angels were ordered to worship Adam:

And all the days which Adam lived were 930 years, and he died. Our Rabbi Joshua ben Nun said: 'On the day that Adam's intelligence was infused into him, God said to the ministering Angels: 'Bow to him.' The ministering angels came and submitted to the will of the Holy One Blessed Be He. But Satan was greater than all the ministering angels in heaven. And he said to the Blessed Be He: 'Lord of the world, you created us from the radiance of the Divine Presence, and shall you now tell us to bow to one whom you created from the dust of the earth?' The Blessed Be He said to him, 'This one who is of the dust of the earth, he has wisdom and understanding which is not found in you.' But because he didn't wish to bow down to him, nor would he heed the voice of the Blessed be He, he was cast down from heaven and became Satan. And it is about him that Isaiah says, '*How have you fallen from the Heavens, Hillel the son of Shahar.*'⁸³

In response to this passage Schiller—Sziinessy wrote: "Can anybody who is in the least acquainted with rabbinical literature believe that any rabbi would teach so monstrous a piece of nonsense, nay idolatry, as is here attributed to R.

Mosheh Haddarshan, that the Lord should have commanded the angels to wor-

⁸³ ויהיו כל ימי אדם אשר חי תשע מאות ושלשים שנה וימת אמר רבינו יהושע בן נון ביום שנתקבצה אליו דעתו של אדם הראשון דבר ה"ב"ה למלאכי השרת השתחוו לו [באו מלאכי השרת לרצונו של ה"ב"ה] והשטן היה גדול מכל מלאכי השמים וידבר לה"ב"ה רשל"ע יצרת אותנו מזיו שכינה ותדבר נשתחוה לאשר יצרת אותו מעפר האדמה דבר לו ה"ב"ה זה שהוא מעפר הארץ יש בו מן החכמה ומן הבינה מה שאין בכך ויהי כי לא אבה להשתחות לו ולא שמע לקולו של ה"ב"ה אז טרדו מן השמים ונעשה שטן ועליו ישעיהו אומר איך נפלת משמים הילל בן שחר.

ship the first man?"⁸⁴ This passage formed an important argument in his claims of fraud against Martini.

However, a similar passage is found in the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. This book contains a number of references to sources from the Second Temple, including Enoch, the Testament of Judah and the Books of Adam. Because of references to the Omayyad dynasty, it is dated to the first half of the eighth century. Furthermore, it follows the legal scholars found in Israel almost exclusively, which has led scholars to conclude that this must have been its place of origin.⁸⁵ This passage appears to allude to the same incident mentioned explicitly by Moshe haDarshan:

"Envy, Jealousy and [desire for] honor take a man out from the world." The ministering angels said before the Holy One Blessed be He, 'Lord of the world, What is man that you are mindful of him; man resembles vanity. There is none like him on the earth.' He said to them, 'just as you are praising me in the upper realms, so he professes my unity in the lower regions. Not only that, but are you able to stand and call the names of all the creatures?' They stood, but they were unable. Immediately, Adam stood and called out the names of all the creatures, as Scripture says And the man called the names of every beast, etc.⁸⁶ And when the ministering angels saw this, they said 'if we do not arrive at a plan to cause the man to sin against his Creator, we cannot overcome him.' And Samael was the great prince of heaven; the heavenly beasts and the Seraphim have 6 wings, and Samael had 12. He took his band and descended...⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Neubauer, "Jewish Controversy" 184.

⁸⁵ Stemmerger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 357.

⁸⁶ Gen. 2:20.

⁸⁷ הקנאה והתאוה והכבוד מוציאים את האדם מן העולם. אמרו מלאכי השרת לפני הקדוש ב"ה רבון כל העולמים מה שאתם מקלסין אותי בעליונים הוא מיחד אותי בתחתונים ולא עוד אלא יכולין אתם מיד עמד אדם וקרא שמות לכל הבריות שנאמר ויקרא האדם שמות לכל הבהמה וגו' וכיון שראו מלאכי השרת אמרו אם אין אנו באים בעצה על אדם שיחטא אין אנו יכולין בו. והיה סמאל השר הגדול שבשמים וחיות ושרפים משש כנפים וסמאל משתים עשרה כנפים לקח את הכת שלו וירד...

This passage from the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* appears to complement the text of Moshe haDarshan. The latter states that after God infused intelligence into Adam, the angels were ordered to bow to him. At this point, both agree that Samael/Satan balks at this demand, since his origin is superior to man's. While Moshe haDarshan's text hints at God's rebuke of Satan, and man's greater intelligence, the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* explains explicitly how God humiliates Satan and demonstrates man's superior intellect. In Moshe haDarshan's account, Satan was cast out from heaven; in the account of the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* he descends voluntarily. The divergences of these two versions indicate that they are independent of each other. On the other hand, their agreement indicates a common source.

Only one source contains both the common points as well as the divergences of both texts, the *Vita Adae et Evae*:

And with a heavy sigh, the devil spake: 'O Adam! all my hostility, envy, and sorrow is for thee, since it is for thee that I have been expelled from my glory, which I possessed in heavens in the midst of the angels and for thee was I cast out in the earth.' Adam answered, 'What dost thou tell me? What have I done to thee or what is my fault against thee? Seeing that thou hast received no harm or injury from us, why dost thou pursue us?'

The devil replied, 'Adam, what dost thou tell me? It is for thy sake that I have been hurled from that place. When thou wast formed, I was hurled out of the presence of God and banished from the company of the angels. When God blew into thee the breath of life and thy face and likeness was made in the image of God, Michael also brought thee and made us worship thee in the sight of God; and God the Lord spake: Here is Adam. I have made thee in our image and likeness.'

And Michael went out and called all the angels saying: 'Worship the image of God as the Lord God hath commanded.'

And Michael himself worshipped first; then he called me and said: 'Worship the image of God the Lord.' And I answered, 'I have no need to worship Adam.' And since Michael kept urging me to worship, I said to him, 'Why dost thou urge me? I will not worship an inferior and younger being (than I). I am his senior in the creation, before he was made was I already made. It is his duty to worship me.'

When the angels, who were under me, heard this, they refused to worship him. And Michael saith, 'Worship the image of God, but if thou wilt not worship him, the Lord God will be wrath with thee.' And I said, 'If he be wrath with me, I will set my seat above the stars of heaven and will be like the highest.'

And God the Lord was wrath with me and banished me and my angels from our glory; and on thy account were we expelled from our abodes into this world and hurled on the earth. And straightaway we were overcome with grief, since we had been spoiled of so great glory. And we were grieved when we saw thee in such joy and luxury. And with guile I cheated thy wife and caused thee to be expelled through her...⁸⁸

Moshe haDarshan's account seems to be a paraphrase of this much longer version. There are no significant points of disagreement. Minor disagreements which arise can easily be explained as the process of abridgement of the original. For instance, in Moshe haDarshan's account God supervises the worship of Adam; in the *Vita* the Archangel Michael carries out God's commands. On the other hand, this text also served as the inspiration for the editor of the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. The superscription to the entire episode is "Envy, Jealousy and [desire for] honor take a man out from the world." In the *Vita* the Devil begins his speech with the remark, my "hostility, envy, and sorrow is for thee." Furthermore, the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* concentrates on the actions of Samael and his band; Moshe haDarshan focuses only on Satan.

Thus, based upon the points of agreement and disagreement between the *Vita*, the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabbi Moshe haDarshan* and the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* it is clear that the latter two works drew independently upon the first. Yet which version of the *Vita* did Moshe haDarshan know? At preset, the *Vita* is found only in a Latin translation. However, a version of this legend is preserved in the Syriac book *The Cave of Treasures*.⁸⁹ This book was originally attributed to the Syrian Church father, St. Ephraem (306-373). However Budge and Bezold, who both edited the work, believed that as it presently exists, it is not older than the sixth century. This work refers to several Second Temple

⁸⁸ Charles, *APOT* 137.

⁸⁹ E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of the Cave of Treasures* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1927).

works including Enoch. It also contains later materials, and refers to contemporary Jewish opinion. It also contains versions of the Adam legends, including the fall of Satan:

And when the prince of the lower order of angels saw what great majesty had been given unto Adam, he was jealous of him from that day, and he did not wish to worship him. And he said unto his hosts, "Ye shall not worship him, and ye shall not praise him with the angels. It is meet that ye should worship me, because I am fire and spirit; and not that I should worship a thing of dust, which hath been fashioned of fine dust." And the Rebel meditating these things would not render obedience to God, and of his own free will he asserted his independence and separated himself from God. But he was swept away out of heaven and fell, and the fall of himself and of all his company from heaven took place on the Sixth Day, at the second hour of the day. And the apparel of their glorious state was stripped of them. And his name was called "*Satana*" because he turned aside [from the right way]...⁹⁰

This version also agrees closely with the *Vita* although, like that of Moshe haDarshan, it is a paraphrase. However, it diverges from the *Vita* in two points: 1) Satan's objection is based upon Adam's material origins, not on his later creation, and 2) Satan receives his name after his fall. Moshe haDarshan also diverges from the *Vita* in these two points, and agrees with the *Cave of Treasures* in both of them, as well as also being a paraphrase of the *Vita*. Thus, Moshe haDarshan may have been familiar with the *Vita* through the *Cave of Treasures*, or some common Syriac intermediary version.

This summary of the work and sources of Moshe haDarshan leaves no doubt that he relied upon sources which were written during the time of the Second Temple period. He seemed to introduce a number of Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical books into Rabbinic literature. Moshe haDarshan's critics

⁹⁰ Budge 55-6 (=Bezold 16) וכד חזא הא תגמא מרודא הנו דין חד מן תגמא דרוחנא אידא רבותא אתיהבת לה לאדם חסם בה מן הו יומא ולא צבא דנסגוד לה ואמר לחילותא לא תסגדון לה ולא תשבחון עם מלאכא. הו זדק דנסגוד לי דאיתי נורא ורוחא ואנא לא אסגוד לעפרא דאיתוהי מן דחייחא. וכד הלין אתרעי הוא הו מרודא ולא הוא משתמענא. והו בצבין נפשה וחאדותה פרש נפשה מן אלהא ואסתחף ונפל הו וכלה תגמא ביומא דשתא בתרתין שעין הות מפולתה מן שמיא נפלו. ואשתלחו מנהון לבושי תשובחתהון ואיתקרי שמה סטנא על דסטא.

and defenders agree that his use of such sources led to the abandonment of his work within several generations after his death. Yet it is reasonable to ask whether Moshe haDarshan received these works directly from the hands of Christians, or whether he discovered them in Jewish manuscripts, from which he took them. By examining both published books as well as unpublished manuscripts, we find that Moshe haDarshan had ample precedent for his literary activities, and extensive Jewish sources from which he drew.

Chapter 3

The Literature of the Second Temple in *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* and *Josippon*

Scholars both sympathetic and hostile towards Moshe haDarshan have treated him as a unique phenomenon: a medieval Jew who introduced Christian texts into a collection of homilies on Scripture. Rapoport, Epstein and Albeck claimed that this was the reason that later generations of Jews ignored and discarded his books. Schiller—Szinnessy and Baer believed that this was proof that a believing Jew didn't write these books at all. At no point in these debates did anyone suggest that Moshe haDarshan was in fact following the well-established precedent of generations of writers before him. Indeed, two medieval works—the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Josippon*—became quite popular, and are found in numerous manuscripts and printed editions. Even though these works are also eclectic and include material preserved mainly in Christian circles, or customs which contradict Rabbinic practice, they did not disappear.

The *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*

The earliest example of a Jewish work which draws on sources from the Second Temple period is the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. Its final redaction must certainly be placed after the mid-seventh century. The text as it stands now contains the names of two of the wives of Muhammed, Fatima and Aisha. It also mentions the Dome of the Rock, the mosque which stands upon the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. It contains other allusions to events which can be understood to apply to several different periods. The dating is complicated by

the presence of many different levels of the text. For example, chapters 5-8 contain both the pre-Geonic and post-Geonic calendars. At present, the early material and later material are so mixed together that it is impossible to draw any conclusions from this. The situation could either be the result of a deliberate attempt to revise early material to agree with current practice, or the product of generations of copyists who revised the text carelessly, so that there are obvious contradictions between the two calendars as well as obvious errors. For example, we find in chapter 5¹: **יחשבון ימות שנת החמה שס"ה יום ורביע** — "The number of days in the solar year is 365 and 1/4 days." However, several lines before the text reads: **וימות חדש החמה שלשים יום ועשרים שעות** — "And the days of the solar months are 30 and 20 1/2 hours." It would appear that the author intended 1 day to contain 24 hours: **וכל מזל משרת את** — "And every planet serves 2 days and 8 hours in the lunar month; three planets in 7 days." Based upon this calculation, many of the manuscripts imply that the solar year is 360 days + ((12*20 1/2 hours)/24) or 370 days 6 hours long. On the other hand, other manuscripts read "30 days and 10 1/2 hours" or 360 + ((12*10 1/2)/24) or 365 1/4 days. Similar errors and interpolations are frequent throughout the text.

As the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* is presently found, it is actually a composite work into which at least three distinct works have been incorporated. One clear block of material can be termed "The Midrash on the Ten Descents of God's Presence." This section describes the first eight of ten occasions on which God's presence descended to earth. The absence of the last two descents indicates that at least a part of that early source is missing. The second block which

¹ M. Higger, "Pirke Rabbi Eliezer" in *Horeb* 8(1944) 98.

is found is a "Midrash on the Liturgy," including a commentary on the the Doxology and the Eighteen Benedictions. Friedlander, in the introduction to his translation, believed this section to be limited to a midrash on the eighteen benedictions.² The final block was a mystical book which contained angelologies and early secret traditions which resembled *I Enoch* on the one hand and the medieval *Sefer Yetzira*³ on the other.

A careful reading of these three apparent blocks of material reveals that they in turn drew upon other, even earlier sources. The problem of identifying the various strata of material is made more difficult by the present arrangement of the book. The materials have been rearranged to follow the Biblical chronology, and have been mixed with much younger material taken from Arabic legends. All in all, in its present state it is impossible to determine at which point in time the Second Temple materials were introduced into the collection, or even the form in which they were known: either firsthand, or through secondary and tertiary citations. Despite this difficulty, it is possible to identify several sources from the Second Temple which have influenced the work.

Israel Lévi⁴ was the first scholar to note the appearance of the so-called Pseudepigrapha in the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. In his article he compared the account of Adam's penitence in the various versions of the *Life of Adam* with the account found in the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*:

On the first day of the week he went into the waters of the upper Gihon until the waters reached up to his neck, and he fasted seven

² G. Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (New York: Hermon Press, 1970 <repr.> xvi.

³ For instance, at the end of Chapter 5 we find: שלש אותיות של השם כתוב על לבו — "Three letters of the Ineffable Name are written upon his [the sun's] heart." (Higger, op. cit. 100).

⁴ I. Levi, "Éléments Chrétiens dans le Pirké Rabbi Eliézer" in *REJ* 18(1894):83-89.

weeks of days, until his body became like a species of seaweed. Adam said before the Holy One, blessed be He: Sovereign of all worlds! Remove, I pray Thee, my sins from me and accept my repentance, and all the generations will learn that repentance is a reality. What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He put forth His right hand, and accepted his repentance, and took away from him his sin, as it is said, "*I acknowledge my sin unto thee, and iniquity have I not hid*" (Ps. 32:5) - Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer XX⁵.

Which resembles the *Vita*:

And Adam said to Eve: 'Thou canst not do so much as I, but do only so much as thou hast strength for. For I will spend forty days fasting, but do thou arise and go to the river Tigris and lift up a stone and stand on it in the water up to thy neck in the deep of the river... And Eve walked to the river Tigris and did as Adam had told her. Likewise, Adam walked to the river Jordan and stood on a stone up to his neck in the water...' ⁶

The disagreement in the number of days is not significant, since the Slavonic⁷ reads 44 days instead of 40.

Lévi rejected the possibility that this tradition had been preserved orally for centuries, only to reappear in the high Middle Ages. Instead, he believed that the author of the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* had found the story among the Christians, and reintroduced it to Jewish readers:

La conclusion serait plus convaincante encore si nous découvrions dans la littérature chrétienne la légende qui s'est glissée dans le Pirké de R. Eliézer. Cette contre-épreuve ne nous dera pas défaut, et justement nous la rencontrerons dans le milieu où a été écrit notre Midrasch et dans une des langues qu'a pu connaître l'auteur du Pirké.⁸

⁵ Friedlander, op. cit. 147. באחד בשבת נכנס אדם במימי גיחון העליון עד שהמים הגיעו עד צוארו והיה מתענה שבע שבתות עד שנעשה גופו כמין ירוקה ואמ' אדם לפני ה' רבון כל העולמים העבר נא חטאתי מעלי וקבל את תשובתי וילמדו כל הדורות שיש תשובה, מה עשה ה' פשט את יד ימינו וקבל את תשובתו והעביר את חטאתו מעליו, שנ' חטאתי אודיעך ועוני לא כסיתי סלה (Higger, "Pirke Rabbi Eliezer" in *Horeb* 9:139).

⁶ Charles, *APOT* 2:135.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Levi, "Elements" 88.

He believed that the author of the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* possessed a form of the work *The Penitence of Adam*, which was translated by the Nestorians (a sect of Syriac-speaking Christians) into Armenian. The appearance of this tradition led Lévi to conclude "Ce qui peut induire en erreur sur la date de composition du Pirké R. Eliézer, c'est qu'il paraît avoir conservé des vestiges d'anciennes traditions qui ne se retrouvent plus que, d'une part, dans les apocryphes juifs perdus chez les Juifs..."⁹

Several years after Lévi's article appeared, Gerald Friedlander published the first English translation of the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*.¹⁰ In his introduction, Friedlander addressed many of the problems surrounding the text. As a part of the study, Friedlander discussed the Second Temple sources used by the editor of the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. He discovered that in addition to the *Life of Adam and Eve*, the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* also drew upon 1 and 2 *Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 4 *Ezra* and the *Books of Adam and Eve*.¹¹ Friedlander believed that the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* did not merely repeat these materials, but occasionally took a polemical stance against them: "Our book does not merely re-echo the esoteric doctrines of Apocalypse, it occasionally dares to speak with its own voice and at times deliberately modifies the teaching of the old Pseudepigrapha. For instance, the calendar doctrines set forth in *Jubilees* and part of the *Enoch* literature are rejected and opposed."¹² As he notes, the astronomical tables and calendrical materials in chapters 6-8 recall

⁹ Ibid. 89.

¹⁰ G. Friedlander, op. cit.

¹¹ Ibid. xxi.

¹² Ibid. xxii.

some of the terminology of Enoch and Jubilees, yet the calendar is clearly the Rabbinic calendar of the Talmudic period:

Enoch 72

The book of the courses of the luminaries of the heaven, and the relations of each, according to their classes, their dominion and their seasons, according to their names and places of origin, and according to their months, which Uriel, the holy angel, who was with me, who is their guide, showed me; and he showed me all their laws exactly as they are, and how it is with regard to all the years of the world and unto eternity, till the new creation is accomplished which dureth till eternity. And this is the first law of the luminaries: the luminary the Sun has its rising in the eastern portals of the heaven, and its setting in the western portals of the heaven. And I saw six portals in which the sun rises, and six portals in which the sun sets: and the moon rises and sets in these portals, and the leaders of the stars and those whom they lead: six in the east and six in the west, and all following each other in accurately corresponding order: also many windows to the right and left of these portals...

Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer 6

In 366 degrees the sun rises and declines, it rises 183 degrees in the east and it declines 183 degrees in the west corresponding to the 365 days of the solar year. [The sun] goes through 366 apertures and enters by the east; 90 days it is in the south[east] quarter, 91 days in the north[east] quarter and one aperture [literally, "window"] is in the middle and its name is Noga...

Friedlander also supplied an exhaustive list of all traditions or remarks which seemed to suggest that *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* used traditions found in Enoch. So for instance 1Enoch 6:2 "And the angels, the children of the heaven, saw and lusted after them, and said to one another: 'Come, let us choose us wives from among the children of men and beget us children'..." Friedlander believed this to be the source for *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* 21 (p161):

"The angels are called 'Sons of God,' as it is said, "When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job 38:7); and whilst they were still in their holy place in heaven, these were called 'Sons of God,' as it is said, 'And also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them; the same became the mighty men, which were of old, men of renown' (Gen. 6:4)." Another tradition about the giants in 1 Enoch states: "And they became pregnant, and they bare great giants, whose height was three thousand ells, who consumed all the acquisitions of men. And when the earth could no longer sustain them, the giants turned against them and devoured mankind. And they began to sin against birds, and beasts, and reptiles, and fish, and to devour one another's flesh, and drink the blood. Then the earth laid accusation against the lawless ones."¹³ Friedlander compared this to *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* 21 (p160):

The angels who fell from their holy place in heaven saw the daughters of the generation of Cain walking about naked, with their eyes painted like harlots, and they went astray after them, and took wives from amongst them, as it is said, "And the sons of Elohim saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took wives of all that they chose..."

Rabbi Zadok said: From them were born the giants (Anakim) who walked with pride in their heart, and who stretched forth their hand to all (kinds of) robbery and violence, and shedding of blood...

Friedlander also noted the many similarities between *Jubilees* and the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer*. Many of the passages cited by him can be ascribed to the similarity of both to 1 Enoch, which seems to have been a common source. However, Friedlander noted other parallels which seem to be genuine indications of the dependence of *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* on *Jubilees*. To begin with, the entire arrangement of *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* seems to echo the structure of *Jubilees*: "Jubilees and our book are alike in being practically Midrashic para-

¹³ Charles, *APOT* 2:192 (=1 Enoch 7:2-6).

phrases and expansions of the narratives contained in the Book of Genesis and part of the Book of Exodus."¹⁴ Both works also seem to share many doctrines in common, including a belief in the coming eschaton. So Jubilees 1:29 predicts the destruction of the present world and its recreation:

And the angel of the presence who went before the camp of Israel took the tables of the divisions of the years—from the time of the creation—of the law and of the testimony of the weeks of the jubilees, according to the individual years, according to all the number of the jubilees [according to the individual years], from the day of the [new] creation when the heavens and the earth shall be renewed and all their creation according to the powers of the heaven, and according to all the creation of the earth, until the sanctuary of the Lord shall be made in Jerusalem on Mount Zion, and all the luminaries be renewed for healing and for peace and for blessing for all the elect of Israel, and thus it may be from that day and unto all the days of the earth.

Which Friedlander compared to *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* 51:

Rabban Gamaliel said: Just as the New Moons are renewed and sanctified in this world, so will Israel be sanctified and renewed in the future world just like the New Moons, as it is said, "**Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be Holy: for I the Lord your God am holy**" (Lev. 19:2). The sages say: The heavens and the earth are destined to pass away and to be renewed. What is written concerning them? "**And all the host of the heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll**" (Isa. 34:4). Just as when a man reads in a scroll of the Torah and he rolls it, and again he opens it to read therein and he rolls it (together), likewise in the future will the Holy One, blessed be He, roll together the heavens like a scroll, as it is said, "And the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll"... Rabbi Eliezer said: All the host of heaven in the future will pass away and will be renewed... No more shall there be evil, and no more shall there be plague, and (there shall) not be the former misfortunes, as it is said, "**For, behold, I create new heavens**" (Is. 65:17)¹⁵

Friedlander also believed that the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* contains certain legendary material which seems to draw on *Jubilees*. Thus, Jubilees claims that

¹⁴ Ibid. xxii.

¹⁵ Friedlander 410ff

the angels taught Noah the art of medicine to combat the evils which the Prince of Mastema had released upon the earth:

...And the Chief of the spirits, Mastema, came and said: 'Lord Creator, let some of them remain before me, and let them hearken to my voice, and do all that I shall say unto them; for if some of them are not left to me, I shall not be able to execute the power of my will on the sons of men; for these are for corruption and leading astray before my judgment... And He said: Let the tenth part of them remain before him, and let nine parts descend into the place of condemnation.' And one of us He commanded that we should teach Noah all their medicines; for He knew that they would not walk in uprightness, nor strive in righteousness... And Noah wrote down all things in a book as we instructed him concerning every kind of medicine...¹⁶

which seems to be the source for *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* 46: "When the ministering angels saw that the Holy One, blessed be He, gave the Torah to Moses, they also arose and gave unto him presents and letters and tablets for healing the sons of man..."¹⁷

Friedlander also cited numerous passages which he believed showed a connection between the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* and 2 (Slavonic) Enoch; the Testaments of Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Zebulun, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, Asher, Joseph and Benjamin; 3 (Greek) Baruch; 2 (Syriac) Baruch; the Book of Wisdom (i.e. Wisdom of Solomon); the Book of Adam and Eve; 4 Ezra; Ascension of Isaiah; and Assumption of Moses. He did not suggest that the author of *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* was directly acquainted with all of these works. Rather, Friedlander believed that these works influenced later adaptations which in turn supplied the sources for the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*:

It is not by any means definitely established that our author actually copied any of the afore-mentioned books. What is maintained, however, is the existence of some sort of literary connection between P.R.E. and these books. This may be explained by the existence of compositions based on the Pseudepigrapha or used

¹⁶ Charles, *APOT* 2:28 (=Jub. 10:7ff)

¹⁷ Friedlander 362.

by the authors of this class of literature. The link is missing and it would be extremely hazardous to do more than point out the existence of similar ideas and occasionally actual parallel phrases. It must not be forgotten that many of the ideas common to the Midrashim and the Pseudepigrapha were, so to say, common property, floating traditions which were recorded not only in Enoch or Jubilees, but also in the Books of Adam and Eve, and later in our book, and later still in such compositions as the Book of the Bee.¹⁸

Albeck also examined the influence of the literature of the Second Temple period on the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. He accepted the earlier studies of Lévi and Friedlander demonstrating *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer's* use of early sources: "Das Buch Pirke R. Eliezer ist besonders stark von pseudepigraphischem Schrifttum beeinflusst. Es lassen sich viele Agadot in ihm nachweisen, die dem pseudepigraphischen Schrifttum entlehnt sind."¹⁹ Albeck focused his attention on a passage in Chapter 5, which describes the division of the waters and the appearance of dry land:

And the gathering together of the waters he called seas.

Forthwith the waters became proud and they arose to cover the earth as at first, when the Holy One, blessed be He, rebuked them and subdued them, and placed them beneath the soles of His feet, and measured them with the hollow of His hand that they should neither decrease nor increase. He made the sand as the boundary of the sea, just like a man who makes a fence for his vineyard. When they rise and see the sand before them they return to their former place...²⁰

Albeck believed that underlying this description was the war between the trees and the sea found in 4 Ezra 4:13:

And he answered me and said: Once upon a time the woods of the trees of the field went forth, and took counsel and said: Come, let us go and make war against the sea, that it may retire before us,

¹⁸ Friedlander lii.

¹⁹ Ch. Albeck, "Aggadot im Lichte der Pseudepigraphen," in *MGWJ* 83(1939):162-169.

²⁰ Friedlander 27-8. (=Higger PRE 4 p. 95) ולמקוה המים קרא ימים... מיד נתגאו המים ועלו לכסות הארץ כבתחלה, עד שגער בם ה' וכנסם, ונתנם תחת כפות רגליו ומדדן בשעלו שלא לפחות ושלא להוסיף ועשה חול גדר לים, כאדם שהוא עושה לכרמו, וכשהן עולין ורואין את החול לפניהם חוזרין לאחוריהן...

and we will make us more woods. In like manner also the waves of the sea took counsel, and said: Come, let us go up and wage war against the wood of the field, that there also we may win us more territory. The counsel of the wood was in vain, for the fire came and consumed it; likewise, also, the counsel of the waves of the sea, for the sand stood up and stopped them...²¹

He provided another example: the dispersion of the plants from Eden throughout the rest of the world. This episode is also found in *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* 5:

He opened an entrance to the Garden of Eden because thence were planted upon the face of the earth all kinds of trees yielding fruit according to their kind, and all kinds of herbs and grass thereof, and in them (was said), as it is said, *Wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth* (Gen 1:11)²²

He compared this with 4 Ezra 3:6: "And thou leddest him into Paradise, which thy right hand did plant before ever the earth came forward..."²³ These similarities led Albeck to conclude that the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* was either directly or indirectly influenced by 4 Ezra: "Aus dieser oder ähnlicher Quelle schöpften Pirke R. El. die Anschauung, dass aus dem Paradies die Pflanzen der Erde stammen."²⁴

In addition to the sources identified by these authors, there is one more source for the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer*. In chapter 31, we read:

Rabbi Jochanan said: All the prophets prophesied in their lifetime, and Samuel prophesied in his lifetime, and after his death, because Samuel said to Saul: If thou wilt hearken to my advice to fall by the sword, then shall thy death be an atonement for thee, and thy lot shall be with me in the place where I abide. Saul hearkened to his advice, and fell by the sword, he and all his sons, as it is said "*So Saul died, and his three sons*" (1 Sam. 28:14). Why? So that

²¹ Charles 565.

²² Friedlander 28-9. (=Higger PRE 4, p95): ופתח פתח בגן עדן שממנה: נטעו על פני כל הארץ כל מין עץ אילן עושין פרי למינו וכל מין עשב ודשא מהן ובהן זרעו, שנ' אשר זרעו בו על הארץ

²³ Charles 562.

²⁴ Albeck, 169.

his portion might be with Samuel the prophet in the future life, as it is said, "*And tomorrow shalt thou and they sons be with me*" (1 Sam. 28:19). What is the meaning of "*with me*"? Rabbi Jochanan said: With me in my division of heaven²⁵.

Friedlander believed that this passage was based upon *Lev. Rabba* 26:7²⁶ and bBrakhot 12b²⁷: "See *Lev. Rab. loc. cit.* [26:7] and T.B. Berakhoth, 12b, which is probably the source of the Midrash"²⁸:

Lev. Rabba 26:7

bBrakhot 12b

...Moreover the Lord will deliver Israel also with thee into the hand of the Philistines (1 Sam. 15:19). Saul asked him: 'But if I flee?' He [the ghost of Samuel] replied: 'if you flee you will be saved,[" He said to him, "and if I make preparations for battle?" He said to him, "if you make preparations for battle, you shall be victorious - reading according to Margoulies] and [read: "However"] if you resign yourself to the Attribute of Justice, *Then to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me* (ibid.). What did he mean by '*with me*'? R. Johanan answered: By '*with*

And Samuel said... Tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me, and R. Johanan said: '*with me*' means, in my compartment [in Paradise].

²⁵ Friedlander 246 (=Higger, PRE 32 in *Horeb* 10(1948):200: ר' יוחנן אומ' כל הנביאים נתנבאו בחייהם ושמואל נתנבא בחייו ולאחר מותו, שנ' שמואל לשאול אם אתה שומע לעצתי לנפול בחרב ותהא מיתתך כפרה עליך ויהא גורלך עמי במקום שאני שמי שם ושמע שאול לעצתו ונפל בחרב הוא וכל בניו שנ' וימת שאול וכ' בניו למה שיהא חלקו עם שמואל הנביא לעתיד לבא שנ' ומחר אתה ובניך עמי, מה הוא עמי ר' יוחנן אומ' עמי במחיצתי

²⁶ Judah Slotki, "Leviticus Rabba" in *Midrash Rabba* (London: Soncino Press, 1983) 335. ויתן י"י גם את ישראל עמך ביד פלשתים. א"ל ולית לי למערך, א"ל אי את עבדך סדרי קרבא, א"ל אי את עבדך סדרי קרבא את נצח, ברם אם צדקת עליך את הדין למחר אתה ובניך עמי. מהו עמי, א"ל יוחנן עמי במחיצתי M. Margulies, *Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah* (New York: JTS, 1993) 605-6.

²⁷ I. Epstein <ed.>, *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Zera'im* (London: Soncino Press, 1948) 71.

²⁸ Friedlander 246 n. 6.

me' he meant: In my heavenly division.

In contrast to Friedlander's opinion, J. Heinemann²⁹ believed that this midrash was inspired by Islamic doctrine. Within Islamic theology, one who dies in a "holy war" — *jihad* — is assured of a place in heaven. Heinemann believed that the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* contains many polemical elements against Islam, as well as sections which show the influence of Islam upon Jewish practice in the time of the author. He cites this passage as proof:

The reader of these words hears here a clear echo of the teaching of the Muslim faith, that one who falls in a *jihad*—in a holy war—is promised forgiveness for all his sins, and a place in the world to come. And so this is stated explicitly in the Muslim legend of Saul; when "Thaulot"—this is Saul—raised Joshua(!) at Ov, he said to him, that if he would give up his kingship and go out to war with his sons on behalf of the true faith, and fight until his sons and he himself would find their deaths in battle—perhaps forgiveness would come to him...³⁰

Although the episode in *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* shows obvious parallels with Leviticus Rabba, and cites from it directly, it also contains an additional idea: that the death of Saul will atone for his sins. Heinemann credited this addition to dependence on Islamic theology and the parallel version of the story in Islamic sources. However there is a version which is closer to the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* than the Arabic, in a work now called *The Book of Biblical Antiquities*, or *Pseudo-Philo* and commonly referred to by an acronym from its Latin title, *LAB*. This book was probably composed sometime in the first

²⁹ J. Heinemann, "*Ibbude Aggadot Kedumot bRuah haZman bPirke Rabbi Eliezer in Jubilee Volume for Shimeon Halkin* (Jerusalem: Reuven Mass, 1975) 321-343.

³⁰ Ibid. 339: הקורא את הדברים שומע כאן הד ברור למדי לאמונה המוסלמית, שהנופל ב"ג'יהאד", במלחמת קודש, מובטחת לו כפרה על כל חטאיו וחלק בעולם הבא. וכך מוצגים הדברים בפירוש באגדה המוסלמית על שאול כאשר "טאלות", הוא שאול, העלה את יהושע (!) באוב, אמר לו שאם יוותר על מלכותו ויצא עם בניו למלחמה למען דת האמת ויילחמו עד שבניו וגם הוא עצמו ימצאו את מותם בקרב—אולי תבוא לו כפרה.

century C.E. by a Jewish author. It is a paraphrase and adaptation of the Bible from Genesis through the death of Saul. Our episode occurs near the end of the book:

...And Samuel said to him, "why have you disturbed me by raising me up? I thought that the time for being rendered the rewards of my deeds had arrived. And so do not boast, King, nor you, woman; for you have not brought me forth, but that order that God spoke to me while I was still alive. Now therefore tomorrow you and your sons will be with me when the people have been delivered into the hands of the Philistines; and because your insides were eaten up with jealousy, what is your will be taken from you." And Saul heard the words of Samuel and grew faint and said, "Behold I am going to die with my sons; perhaps my destruction will be an atonement for my wickedness."

And the Philistines attacked Israel, and Saul went out for battle, and Israel fled before the Philistines. And Saul seeing that the battle was very fierce said in his heart, "Why are you strengthening yourself for life when Samuel has announced death for you along with your sons?"³¹

This version contains many points in common with those found in the Rabbinic sources. Samuel is angry that he has been raised; he is confused and believes that it is judgment day; Saul considers preparing himself for battle. However the *LAB* is unique in introducing the idea that Saul's death will atone for his sins. So it appears that the *LAB* or some derivative of it may have influenced the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer*.

The author of the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* displayed a knowledge of an extensive body of literature which has been classified as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Because of the many corruptions in the text, and the absence of both a critical text and a detailed analysis of the sources it is impossible to know in what form he knew these works, or through what language they came to him. Yet we find many interesting parallels between the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* and the later work of Moshe haDarshan. Both show extensive evidence

³¹ Charlesworth, *PSOT* 2:377.

of early sources. Many of these sources are in fact common to both: *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the *Life of Adam and Eve*. Moreover, both of these texts often attribute these sources to ancient Rabbis, or cite them anonymously as "our sages." Certainly the use of these early sources in *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* merits much more attention that it has received up to this point.

The Josippon

Another early work which used books from the Second Temple era as sources is the *Josippon*. It is a history of the world through the destruction of the great rebellion against Rome and the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE. It concludes with the fall of the fortress at Massada and the suicide pact of its defenders. Although the main focus is the Jewish people and nation, the author also included a history of the origins of Rome and also the Christian religion. The core of the book is based upon the Latin digest of the *Jewish Wars* of Josephus: the *Hegesippus*. The work has been dated on the basis of two historical references. The *terminus ad quo* has been determined by a reference to the Hungarians, Bulgarians and Pechenegs occupying the land along the Danube. This situation did not exist until after 900 C.E. On the other hand, the book mentions the Arabs occupying Tarsus. Since Christians captured this city from the Muslims in 965, it is likely that a significant part of the editing of the work must have been performed some time between these two dates. Furthermore, the manuscript selected for the base text by David Flusser in his critical of the *Josippon* gives a date of 953 C.E. For this reason, Flusser believes

that this is the actual date of the composition of the entire work.³² The work was one of the most popular Jewish books among Christians and Muslims as well as Jews, and dozens of manuscripts and early printed editions exist.

The author of the *Josippon* included many Second Temple sources in his composition. These sources include 1 and 2 *Maccabees*, the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, the *Bel and the Dragon*, 4 *Ezra*, *Letter of Aristeas* and the *Additions to Esther*. They have been translated into a pseudo-Biblical Hebrew style which makes it difficult to identify the language from which the translation was made. Because the author used the Latin version of the *Hegesippus*, it is obvious that at least some Latin books were available to him. Most scholars have ignored these Hebrew versions of the Apocrypha as late, and of dubious value. Abraham Neuman summed up the modern opinion of the entire book: "The high esteem which *Josippon* enjoyed all through the Middle Ages was more than offset by the disparagement cast upon the book in modern times."³³

Neuman was the first to consider the possibility that the *Josippon* preserved sources which lay behind some of the books of the Apocrypha: "It is now proposed in this paper to examine some of the accounts in *Josippon* in which parallels are to be found in the Apocrypha, and by a comparative study to ascertain the degree of historic credibility to be attached to these sections of *Josippon*."³⁴ In particular, he examined the versions of the non-canonical materials on Daniel which are found in the *Josippon*—*Bel and the Dragon* and I *Esdras* (also called the "Greek Ezra"). Neuman also noted the absence of the

³² Flusser, *Jossipon* (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1980) 2:61.

³³ Ab. Neuman, "Jossipon and the Apocrypha," in *JQR* 43(1952) 1.

³⁴ Ibid. 2-3

other non-canonical books of Daniel, namely *The Prayer of Azariah*, *The Song of the 3 Youths* and *Susanna*. Based upon this, Neuman stated: "If an argument *ex silentio* be acceptable in this instance it would evidently point to a pre-Masoretic date for the *Ur-Josippon*. For otherwise *Josippon* would certainly have incorporated the theme of Azariah's Prayer and the Song of the Three Children."³⁵ Neuman compared the versions of the stories of Daniel and the Bel, and the killing of the Dragon, and the story of the riddle contest found in I Esdras and noted the many points of divergence as well as similarity. This led him to conclude that "the author of *Josippon* lived at a time when sources older than or different from the extant Apocrypha versions were still available for use as source material."³⁶ Based upon this conclusion, Neuman suggested that the *Josippon* be reconsidered both as a historical source, and as an important aid in understanding the Apocrypha and the history of the Canon.

Several decades later, David Flusser published the first critical edition of the text of the *Josippon*. This edition made it possible to examine the sources of the *Josippon* with some confidence. Flusser subsequently published a second volume, which contained an extensive introduction and analysis. In this essay, Flusser considered the date of the work, the title, its attribution to Josephus as well as its sources. Flusser assigned the date of 953 C.E. because of a remark in one of the manuscripts: ואנחנו כתבנו והעתקנו מן הספר, מספר יוסף בן גוריון — "And we have copied and translated from the book, *From the Book of Joseph ben Gurion the Priest* in the year 885 after the destruction" (i.e. 953 C.E.). Latin names frequently have been changed to a form which shows an Italian pronunciation, and masculine and

³⁵ Ibid. 4.

³⁶ Ibid. 20.

feminine nouns in the Hebrew are often treated as the opposite gender, as they are in Italian. This led Flusser to conclude that the author was a native of Italy, and that the book was composed there. The name of the work, *Josippon*, does not actually appear within the book itself. Rather, it is a superscript to a number of the manuscripts, and was eventually adopted as the title when it was first printed. Flusser studied the various possible origins of the name and concluded that it was based upon a Hebraized form of the Greek Iosipos in the accusative case³⁷:

The form Iosippos (or Iosipos) in Greek and also the Latin form Iosippus is derived from the change in the pronunciation of the vowel "long e" into the vowel "i" in Greek. This change had its beginnings already in the Roman period, and the *itacismus*, as this linguistic phenomenon is known, was unique to Byzantine Greek and modern Greek. If so, in the days of *Josippon*, Greek-speakers pronounced the name Iosepos as Iosipos (or Iosippos). Since we have already seen that Greek names with the ending "-os," which the Jews changed into the Greek Accusative case, these names receiving the ending "-on"; if we combine these two facts we see that the pronunciation of the name "Josippon" was already at the beginning *Josippon* (or *Josipon*), as it has remained among the people today...³⁸

Flusser considered the sources of the *Josippon* at length. He believed that the Latin synopsis and paraphrase of Josephus, the *Hegesippus* was the primary source for the author. He believed that although the author of the *Josippon* might have actually read Josephus, he did not refer to Josephus' works during the actual writing of the book:

³⁷ Flusser 2:71.

³⁸ Ibid. 71: Iosippos (או Iosipos) ביוונית וכן הצורה הלאטינית Iosippus מוצאה בשינוי של מבטא הצנועה e הארוכה ביוונית לתנועה i. שינוי זה התחולל כבר בתקופה הרומית, וה-*itacismus*, כפי שנקראת תופעה לשונית זו, היה למבטא היחיד ביוונית הביזנטית וביוונית החדשה. אם כן, בימי יוסיפון ביטאו דוברי יוונית את השם Iosepos בצורת Iosipos (או Iosippos). לאחר שראינו שהיו אז שמות יווניים המסתיימים בסוימת '-וס' שהיהודים הפכו אותם לצורת האקוסאטיבוס היווני ושמות אלה קיבלו בפי היהודים את הסיומת '-ון', הרי אם נצרף את שתי העובדות הללו נראה, שמבטא השם יוסיפון כבר היה מראשיתו *Josippon* (או *Josipon*), כפי שהוא מתקיים בפי העם עד היום...

We have said that if Josippon did know the *Wars* of Josephus, this knowledge was superficial and very poor, and certainly the book *The Jewish Wars* was not at hand while he was writing his book.³⁹

According to Flusser, the author mistakenly attributed the *Hegessipus* to "Joseph ben Gurion the Priest." This attribution was based upon a confusion of Joseph ben Gurion, who was appointed as one of the regional commanders during the Rebellion, and Joseph ben Mattithias the Priest, the true author of the *Jewish Wars*. This supplied further proof to Flusser that the author of the *Josippon* could not have relied upon the actual text of Josephus in his work.

In addition, Flusser believed that the author used several books of the Apocrypha. As with the *Hegessipus*, Flusser believed that he knew them through Latin translations. Flusser wrote about the *Wisdom of Solomon*: "Consequently Josippon knew the apocryphal book *The Wisdom of Solomon*, it goes without saying in the Latin translation of the Canon of the church, but he thought that it was written by King Solomon himself."⁴⁰ He also believed that the author cited a verse from Ben Sira 24:1-16: חכמים כעם יי לא היה בעולם הזה — "There have not been sages in this world like the people of God, nor has Wisdom ruled over any other than the people of God." Flusser also stated that he used 1 and 2 *Maccabees* extensively, and he noted that this section may have formed an early draft of the entire work, since a different translation of 1 and 2 *Maccabees* has been found.⁴² This translation

³⁹ Ibid. 2:131: אמרנו שאם יוסיפון הכיר רת ספר המלחמות ליוסיפוס, היתה זו ידיעה שטחית ורופפת מאוד ובוודאי שלא היה ספר מלחמות היהודים בידו בשעת כתיבת ספרו.

⁴⁰ Ibid. 132: יוסיפון הכיר אפוא את הספר החיצוני 'חכמת שלמה', כמובן בתרגום הלאטיני שבספרי הקודש של הכנסייה וחשב שהספר נכתב בידי שלמה המלך עצמו.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² In Paris ms. heb. 326, published by D. Chwolson, *Sarid uFalit* (1896)

is in a style which is very close to the Hebrew translations found in the *Josippon*, which can be characterized as a Pseudo-Biblical Hebrew. Flusser also considered the *Bel and the Dragon* to be part of the original composition, although he places *Susanna* in the appendix as a late addition. Flusser also treated the riddle-contest from I *Esdras* as an integral part of the *Josippon*, along with the apocryphal additions to Esther.

Although he stated that the author used the Latin version of the *Wisdom of Solomon*, Flusser reflected on the possibility that other Apocryphal books were known through Greek and Syriac translations. Flusser believed that Jews began to recover this lost literature during the middle ages, retranslating them into Hebrew:

It is not our task to settle the question, in what ways did the parallel material which was contained in the writings of the Jews during the time of the Second Temple come into the late Midrashic collections? This alone can be stated: it is a fact that in the late midrashic collections you find the overwhelming majority of the material the origins of which are in the compositions written during the ancient period; and there is a causal connection between this fact and the fact that during that unknown period Israel began becoming interested in the mine of information of Jewish literature from the Second Temple period, and they began to translate it from foreign languages into Hebrew.⁴³

In this context, Flusser noted Nahmanides' use of Syriac texts, discussed in the last chapter. He also considered the possibility that the Aramaic additions to Esther were made from a Syriac translation of the Greek: וכן ישפיעו בעקיפין ההוספות לאסתר שבתרגום השבעים על התרגום השני של מגילת אסתר, ונראה לי "And likewise the Additions to Esther which are in the Septuagint have indirectly influenced the

⁴³ Flusser 149: אין זה מתפקידנו לדון כאן בשאלה, באילו דרכים הגיע למדרשים המאוחרים החומר המקביל למה שכתוב בחיבורים יהודיים מימי בית שני. רק זאת יש לומר: עובדה היא שדווקא במדרשים מאוחרים תמצא את הרוב המכריע של חומר שמקורו בחיבורים שנכתבו בתקופה העתיקה, ויש בוודאי קשר סיבתי בין עובד זו לבין העובדה שבאותם הימים הבלתי-ידועים התחילו ישראל להתעניין באוצר הבלום של ספרות יהודית מימי בית שני והתחילו לתרגם אותה מלועזית לעברית.

Targum Sheni to the Scroll of Esther, and it seems to me that one cannot rule out the possibility that the intermediate stage was not Syriac."⁴⁴

As further evidence for his thesis that the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha were known to the Jews through Latin and Greek versions, Flusser compared the *Josippon* to another popular Midrash in later collections: the *Midrash Vayissau*. This brief Midrash was also known as "The Wars of the Sons of Jacob and the Sons of Esau." The first part of this midrash purports to be a history of the revenge taken by Judah, Simon and the other sons of Jacob against the Amorites for the rape of Dinah. The second part tells the story of the attack of Esau and his sons on Jacob while he was mourning Leah. In all of the different versions, Esau meets his death attacking his brother; according to some texts by the hand of Jacob, and in others by the arrow of one of his grandsons who is deaf and mute (and for this reason not culpable for his actions). This midrash contains a great deal of material parallel to accounts found in *Jubilees* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The first collection which used it would seem to the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*:

Rabbi Eliezer said: In the hour of the death of Jacob he called to his son Joseph, and said to him: O my son! Swear to me by the covenant of circumcision that thou wilt take me up to the burial-place of my fathers in the land of Canaan to the Cave of Machpelah... He kept (the oath) and did (accordingly)... And all the mighty men of the kingdom went up with him to bury him, and to show loving-kindness to Jacob his father...

When they came to the Cave of Machpelah, Esau came against them from Mount Horeb to stir up strife, saying: The Cave of Machpelah is mine. What did Joseph do? He sent Naphtali to subdue the constellations, and to go down to Egypt to bring up the perpetual deed which was between them... Chushim, the son of Dan, had defective hearing and speech, and said to them: Why are we sitting here? He was pointing (to Esau) with his finger. They said to him: Because this man will not let us bury our father Jacob. What did he do? He drew his sword and cut off Esau's head with

⁴⁴ Ibid. 149.

the sword, and took the head into the Cave of Machpelah. And they sent his body to the land of his possession, to Mount Seir...⁴⁵

This passage compares to the death of Esau found in the Midrash Vayissau:

And Esau went into a land away from his brother Jacob. He made a contract with him. Some say he went out of shame... Although he went away at that time, he came again to fight Jacob afterwards. Leah had just died, and Jacob and his sons were sitting mourning, and some of his children had come to comfort him. At that time Esau came against him with a mighty host, all clad in iron and brass coats of mail, all armed with shields, and bows, and lances. They were altogether four thousand men, and they surrounded the fortress. Jacob, his sons, his servants, and his cattle, and all that belonged to them, were gathered, for they had all congregated to comfort Jacob during his mourning. So they were all sitting peacefully, and never thought of any attack from any side whatsoever until that host approached the place where Jacob and his sons were dwelling... When Jacob saw that Esau dared to war with him, and that he had come to take the fortress and to slay them, and that he shot arrows against them, Jacob stood upon the wall of the tower and spoke to Esau words of peace, friendship and brotherhood. But Esau did not heed them.

After that, Judah spoke to his father Jacob, and said to him: "How long wilt thou speak unto him words of friendship and love, whilst he comes against us like an armed enemy... And immediately Jacob bent the bow, and killed Adoram the Edomite. And again he drew his bow, sent forth his arrow, and hit Esau on the right shoulder. Esau became weak from the wound, and so his sons took him up and placed him upon a white mule, and they carried him to Adoram, where he died...

The sons of Jacob pursued them [the forces of the sons of Esau] up to the city of Merodio. There in the citadel of Merodio they left the body of Esau lying on the ground, and they ran away to Mount Seir, to the place leading up to Aqrabim. The sons of Jacob entered Merodio and encamped there over night. Finding there the

⁴⁵ Friedman, 308-10 (=Higger PRE 38 in *Horeb* 10:216): 'ר' אליעזר אומ' בשעת אסיפתו של יעקב קרא ליוסף בנו ואמ' לו בני יוסף השבעה לי בברית מילה שאתה מעלה אותי לקבור עם אבותי לארץ כנען למערת המכפלה... ועלו עמו כל גבורי מלכות לקברו לגמול חסד עם אבינו יעקב... וכשבאו למערת המכפלה בא עליהם גשו מהר חורב לחרחר ריב ואמ' שלי הוא מערת המכפלה, מה עשה יוסף שלח לרכוש מזלות ולירד למצרים ולעלות כתב עולם שהיה בינם לכך הלך נפתלי שהוא אילה שלוחה, נושים בן דן היה פגום באזנו ובלשונו, אמ' להם מפני מה אנחנו יושבין כאן, הראהו באצבעו אמ' לו בשביל האיש הזה שאינו מניח אותנו לקבור את יעקב, שלף את חרבו והתיו את ראשו של עשו ונכנס הראש לתוך מערת המכפלה, ואת גוייתו שלח לארץ אחוזתו בהר שעיר...

body of Esau, they buried him out of respect for their father, Jacob...⁴⁶

This account is substantially the same as the original from which it was taken, in *Jubilees* 37-38. However, both agree in one respect against *Jubilees*: Esau was buried in the Cave of Machpelah. On the other hand, in *Jubilees* we find "And Jacob buried his brother on the hill which is in 'Aduram, and he returned to his house."⁴⁷ Thus, it would appear that the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* either paraphrased and changed the *Midrash Vayissau*, used a very different version of it, or a source which was a paraphrase of it. Although this work does not appear in the *Josippon*, Flusser considered it as an example of the transmission of Second Temple sources in the Middle Ages. He believed that it was a retranslation and amplification of a Latin or Greek text:

And concerning the "Midrash Vayissau", which is a Hebrew translation and reworking of a source common to the "Testament of Judah" and *Jubilees*, the forms of the names gives the appearance

⁴⁶ Gaster, *Chronicle of Jerahmeel* <repr.> (New York: Ktav, 1971) 84-7. כתוב וילך אל ארץ מפני יעקב אחיו. מפני שטר חוב ויש אומרים מפני הבושה. אמרו רבותינו סבוראי לפי שפנה עשו כליו מפני יעקב והלך לא שהסיר השנאה מלבו אלא ויטרף לעד אפו ועברתו שמרה נצח. אף על פי שהלך לו באותו זמן לאחר זמן בא עליו למלחמה והיא השנה שמתה לאה והיו יעקב ובניו יושבין באבילות וקצת בניו היו מנחמין אותו על לאה שמתה. בא עליהם בחיל גדול עורכי מלחמה לבושי שריונות ברזל ונחשת והיו מזוינים כולם למלחמה במגינים וקשתות וכידונים והיו ארבע אלף גבורים והקיפו לבירה אחת שהיו חונים שם יעקב ובניו הם ועבדיהם ובניהם וכל אשר להם כי נתקבצו כולם לשם לנחם את יעקב על אבילות לאה והם היו יושבים בשלוח ולא עלה על לבם שיבא עליהם שום אדם להלחם עמם. ולא ידעו מזה עד שדבקו כל החיל לאותה הבירה. לבד יעקב ובניו היו שם ומאתים עבדים שלהם. כיון שראה יעקב לעשו שהחציף פניו לבא עליהם למלחמה להרוג אותם בתוך הבירה והיה מורה עליהם חצים. באותה שעה עמד יעקב על חומת הבירה והיה מדבר עם עשו אחיו דברי שלום ריעות ואחוה ולא קבל ממנו עשו. מיד ענה יהודה ליעקב אביו עד מתי אתה מאריך עמו דברי שלומים ואהבה והוא בא עלינו כאויב לבושי שריונים להרגנו. כיון ששמע יעקב כן משך בקשתו והרג לאדורם האדומי ועוד משך קשתו והכה לעשו בכסא ימינית ואז נחלה מן החץ. נשאוהו בניו והרכיבוהו על עיר והלך ומת שם בארודין... ורדפו בני יעקב אחריהם עד ארודין העיר והניחו לאביהם עשו מת מוטל בארודין והם ברחו להר שעיר למעלה עקרבים. ובני יעקב נכנסו ונחו שם בלילה ההוא ומצאו לעשו מת מוטל וקברוהו מפני כבוד אביהם... Jacob Lauterbach, "Midrash Vayissau or the Wars of the Sons of Jacob" in *Abhandlungen zur Erinnerung an Hirsch Perez Chajes* (Vienna: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1933) 220-222 (Hebrew section).

⁴⁷ Charles, *APOT* 2:69 (=Jub. 38:9).

that the early composition was translated from a European language, from Latin or, which seems more likely, from Greek.⁴⁸

Flusser considered the role of Syriac literature in the transmission of Second Temple sources at length. He noted that the *Targum* (Jewish Aramaic translation) of Job is based upon the Syriac translation of Scripture, commonly referred to as the "Peshitta". Moreover, Flusser suggested a possible connection between the Syriac versions of the books of the Apocrypha and the Jewish versions, Hebrew and Aramaic, which are found in later manuscripts:

A simple examination will show what the connection is between the Syriac translations and the Jewish Aramaic versions of the Apocrypha, like the Aramaic version of the Additions to Daniel, among them the Song of the Three Youths who were in the fiery furnace, which are in the Jerahmeel manuscript.⁴⁹ This is the case for the Aramaic version of *Tobit*; this book has come down to us in both in Hebrew and Aramaic. And so likewise it is fitting to examine the fate of *Judith* among the Jews in the middle ages. The Jewish stories of Judith in the middle ages are divided into four basic versions. The fourth version is nothing but the citation of one verse of the book of *Judith* in Aramaic in the commentary of Ramban to the Lectionary portion "Ki Tissa" on the verse "you shall not subjugate her," by the name "The Scroll of Susan" (which is the story of Susanna from the Additions to Daniel; and the Ramban was mistaken), and the citation is nothing other than the Syriac translation of the book of *Judith*. The other versions are in Hebrew... Versions A and B are dependent on the Latin translation of the book of *Judith*. It is not known when the Syriac translation of *Judith* came into the hands of the Jews; in any case the three Hebrew versions of *Judith* already existed in approximately the year 1000, and with this we are in the time of the composition

⁴⁸ Flusser, 2:149: ומה שנוגע ל'מדרש ויסעו', שהוא, תרגום ועיבוד עברי של מקור משותף ל'צוואת יהודה' ו'ספר היובלים', צורת שמות הערים מראה שהחיבור הקדום תורגם בו מלשון אירופית, מלאטינית או, מה ששמתקבל יותר על הדעת, מיוונית.

⁴⁹ That is, British Museum ms. 2797 (Neubauer cat.). These texts were published by M. Gaster, "The Lost Aramaic Original of Theodotian's Additions to Daniel," in *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 16(1893-94):280-88;312-17.

of the *Josippon*, or close to it.⁵⁰

Despite the large body of evidence showing Syriac transmission, Flusser believed that the author of *Josippon* derived his material from Greek or Latin sources. Thus, in his discussion of *Judith*, Flusser continued to build his argument for the Latin or Greek transmission of these texts.

Flusser also discussed the Jewish chronological work *Seder Olam* as a work with a history similar to the *Josippon*. This work is commonly referred to as the *Seder Olam Rabba* (The Greater World History) to distinguish it from a later, shorter version of it called the *Seder Olam Zuta* (The Lesser World History). Flusser argued that this work was actually *later* than the *Josippon*, and was based upon Greek or Latin sources:

The second composition [which was later than the *Josippon*], which included material the origin of which was from a foreign language, from the ancient period, is the composition known as the *Seder Olam*, which is preserved in the Jerahmeel ms. and also in a Hebrew ms. found in Paris⁵¹. This composition includes interesting historical material, the source of which is in either Greek or Latin, and the *Josippon* mentions it explicitly... If so, the *Seder Olam* in its present form is later than *Josippon*, and at the latest from the twelfth century.⁵²

בדיקה פשוטה תעלה, מה הקשר של התרגומים הסוריים: 1-150, Flusser 50
לנוסחאות ארמיים יהודיים של הספרים החיצוניים, כגון הנוסח הארמי של הוספות
לדניאל וביניהם שיר של שלושת הנערים שבכבשן האש בכ"י ירחמאל. הוא הדין
בנוסח הארמי של ספר טוביה; ספר זה הגיע לידינו גם בעברית וגם בארמית. וכן ראוי
לבדוק את גורלו של ספר יהודית בקרב יהודי ימי-הביניים. סיפורי-יהודית היהודיים
של ימי-הביניים מתחלקים לארבעה נוסחי-יסוד. הנוסח הרביעי אינו אלא הבאת פסוק
אחד של ספר יהודית בארמית בפירוש רמב"ן ל'כי תצא' לפסוק 'לא תתעמר' בשם
'מגילת שושן' (הוא סיפור שושנה של ההוספות לדניאל, והרמב"ן טעה בזה), והמובאה
שוב איננה אלא מתוך הברגום הסורי של ספר יהודית. שאר הנוסחים הם בעברית...
נוסח א ונוסח ב תלויים בתרגום הלאטיני של ספר יהודית. איננו יודעים, מתי הגיע
התרגום הסורי של ספר יהודית לידי היהודים; מכל מקום שלושת הנוסחים העבריים
של ספר יהודית כבר היו קיימים בשנת 1000 בערך, ובוהאננו נמצאים בזמן חיבור
ספר יוסיפון או סמוך לו.

⁵¹ Paris ms. heb. 326.

⁵² Flusser, 152: החיבור השני, הכולל חומר שמקורו לועזי, מן התקופה העתיקה, הוא החיבור הנקרא 'סדר עולם', שנשתמר הן בכ"י ירחמאל והן בכתב-יד עברי אחד, הנמצא בפאריס. חיבור זה כולל חומר היסטורי מעניין, שמקורו ביוונית או בלאטינית, וספר יוסיפון נזכר בו במפורש... אם כן, בצורתו הנוכחית נכתב 'סדר עולם' זה אחרי יוסיפון ולכל המאוחר במאה השתים-עשרה.

Furthermore, Flusser argued that the historical novella, "The Life of Moses Our Teacher," was based upon Hellenistic Jewish sources. He even heard echoes of later European traditions, including the legend of Arthur and the sword Excalibur! According to Flusser, the work was composed after the *Josippon*.⁵³ Again, Flusser examined the Alexander romance, the most complete text of which is found in the Rothschild ms. of the *Josippon*. Based upon the Arabic translations of *Josippon* which include this text, Flusser dated its inclusion to the year 1148, or even as early as 1063. This material, too, Flusser believed was drawn directly from the Greek romances of Alexander, in particular the work known as "Pseudo-Callisthenes."

Citing these three sources, viz. *Seder Olam*, "The Life of Moses" and the "Legend of Alexander," along with the other works dependent on Latin or Greek sources, viz. 1 and 2 *Maccabees*, "Midrash Vayissau," the *Wisdom of Solomon* and *Judith*, Flusser argued that *Josippon* was but one book among many which Jews, knowledgeable in Greek and Latin, translated into Hebrew. Flusser wrote:

The purpose of this brief survey was to show, that the *Josippon* was just one of many compositions in which the Jewish copyists who knew Latin or Greek transmitted to their brethren the knowledge of the distant past in Jewish and Gentile history. The *Josippon* itself was the most important and respected and most comprehensive of these compositions, and if we were to investigate them in a fundamental way, and establish their provenance, the language from which they were translated and the chronological sequence in which they were written, we would be able to establish more exactly the place of the *Josippon* in this literary genre.⁵⁴

⁵³ Flusser 151.

⁵⁴ Flusser 153: תפקידה של סקירה קצרה זו היה להראות, שספר יוסיפון היה רק אחד החיבורים הרבים שבהם מסרו סופרים יהודיים שידעו לאטינית או יוונית לאחיהם ידיעות על העבר הרחוק בתולדות ישראל ואומות-העולם. ספר יוסיפון עצמו הוא החשוב והמכובד ביותר והמקיף ביותר בין החיבורים הללו, ואילו נחקרו באופן יסודי אותם החיבורים ונקבעו מוצאם, הלשון שממנה נותרגמו והסדר הכרונולוגי שבו נתחברו, היינו יכולים לקבוע ביתר דיוק את מקומו של ספר יוסיפון בסוג הספרות הזאת.

Flusser's arguments for Latin and Greek sources as the main route of transmission for the Second Temple sources of the *Josippon* are flawed in several respects. To begin with, Flusser believed that the author of the *Josippon* used 1 and 2 *Maccabees* in either Latin or Greek. However, a careful examination of both the versions found in the *Josippon* and in Paris ms. Heb. 326 shows that these translations were made from a Syriac, not a Hebrew version. The points of comparison between the Syriac and the *Josippon* are:

- 1) The name of the High Priest Onias: In the *Josippon* the name is spelled חוניה - *Choniah*. In the Greek his name is spelled 'Ονίου. It is clear that the Hebrew is not derived directly from the Greek. It is also not derived from the original Hebrew name of Onias, which is חנניה - *Chananiah*⁵⁵. On the other hand, in the Syriac of 2 Mac. 3:1, the name is spelled חוניא, nearly identical to the Hebrew.

- 2) In the *Josippon*, the description of Heliodorus' office is: אליאודורוס שר צבאו - "Heliodorus, the chief of his army"⁵⁶. In the Greek he is referred to as Ἡλιδωρος τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀπέστειλεν... - "Heliodorus, who had been appointed minister over his affairs..." Again, the Hebrew differs greatly from the Greek. However the Syriac reads: להלידורוס הו דעביד הוא על צבوتا... - "Heliodorus, who had been appointed

⁵⁵ Cf. 4Q477 flii: ואת חנניה בן שמ[עון], which I believe is actually a historical reference to Onias III, the son of Simon the High Priest.

⁵⁶ Flusser 61.

over the armies..." Again, the Hebrew shows a dependance on a Syriac original.

- 3) In 2 Macc. 7:1, Antiochus attempts to force the seven sons to eat pork. The Greek version reads: *τῶν ἀθεμίτων ὑείων κρεῶν* - "forbidden swine's flesh." The Hebrew reads: *בשר חזיר* - "swine's meat"⁵⁷. Flusser noted in his introduction that *בשר* is an unusual expression for meat, and cited it as proof of a Latin or Italian source⁵⁸. Yet we find exactly this wording in the Syriac: *בשרא מסיכא דחזירא* - "The unclean flesh of swine"

- 4) Antiochus V (Eupator) is called in the Greek *Εὐπάτορα*⁵⁹, while in the Hebrew his name is spelled *אאופטור* - *Aupator*, with no final 'a' as in the Greek. This corresponds to the Syriac spelling of his name, *אופתור*.

- 5) The name of Antiochus IV (Ephiphanes) is given in the *Josippon* as *אפיפנוס* - *Epiphanus*. The Greek is written *Ἐπιφανῆς*. Again, the Hebrew agrees with the Syriac, and in this case is identical: *אפיפנוס* - *Epiphanus*.

⁵⁷ Flusser 1:71.

⁵⁸ See Flusser 2:85: *יוסיפון גם מדבר על 'בשרכם אשר נזבחה' (טו, 46) על 'la carne באיטלקית (או caro בלאטינית)...* "Josippon also speaks about "The flesh which was sacrificed" (16:46), which corresponds to "the meat" in Italian (or meat in Latin).

⁵⁹ 2 Macc. 10:10ff

From this brief list of similarities between the Hebrew and Syriac versions, it is clear that a Syriac translation and not the Septuagint lay behind the version of 2 Macc. found in *Josippon*.

Flusser also stated that the *Seder Olam* should be dated after the *Josippon*. However, this is impossible since the Talmud already knows the work, and attributed it to R. Yosi. Although this attribution may very well be pseudepigraphic, nonetheless the text of the Talmud has preserved an authentic citation from the work:

And I maintain the view of Rabbi Josi who taught in *Seder Olam* "And that which your fathers possessed, you shall inherit" (Deut. 30:5) — the first inheritance. And they have a second inheritance. But a third they do not have. And Rabbi Yohanan asked, "Who taught Seder Olam? Rabbi Josi."⁶⁰

This passage is actually found in *Seder Olam* chapter 30.1. Thus, Flusser's conclusion that this was a late text, based upon Greek or Latin chronographies is highly doubtful. Finally, given the similarities between *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* 38 and the "Midrash Vayissau," it cannot be assumed that the latter text is a late translation from a Latin or Greek version of *Jubilees*. Indeed, allusions to this tale are found in *Bereishit Rabba* as well, which would indicate a very early date for the entry of this legend into Rabbinic sources, if it ever actually fell out of usage among Rabbinic Jews at all.

On the basis of these examples, it is possible to call into question Flusser's central thesis: that the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha were reintroduced into Jewish literature in Italy through Greek and Latin sources. Quite the contrary, the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* incorporates texts which would not appear in Christian Europe in Greek or Latin until centuries after it was composed. The

⁶⁰ bYebamot 82b (=bNiddah 46b): ואנא דאמרי כרבי יוסי דתניא בסדר עולם אשר ירשו אבותיך וירשתה ירושה ראשונה ושניה יש להן ושלישית אין להן ואמר דבי יוחנן מאן סדר עולם רבי יוסי

Seder Olam is at least 600 years older than the date Flusser assigned to it. And most significantly, the oldest elements of the *Josippon*—the synthesis of 1 and 2 Maccabees—show reliance on Syriac, rather than Greek or Latin originals. All these factors make it appear quite unlikely that the core of the *Josippon* was written in Italy. Instead, it would seem that a *Josippon* which already existed was extensively reworked with material available in Latin and Greek, but at a later date than the original composition.

Conclusions

On the basis of these two very different works, it is possible to conclude that Moshe haDarshan was not a unique figure in Jewish literature. The *Pirge d'Rabbi Eliezer* provides evidence that at an early date Jewish writers had access to Christian sources on the one hand, and Second Temple sources on the other. These sources were reworked so as to obscure their origins and their history. Later generations of Jews did not reject these works, or expunge texts from them. On the other hand, the *Josippon* demonstrates that Jews had access to whole books preserved among the Christians, which they copied and included in their collections. Furthermore, neither the authors nor later copyists saw the need to hide the origins or the sources of these books, or to emend them to make them more acceptable to Jewish audiences. This evidence directly contradicts the theories of Rapoport, Epstein, Zunz and Albeck, who believed that later generations of Jews let the works of Moshe haDarshan disappear by design because they were too heterodox, and too easily suborned to Christian polemics. On the other hand, it also refutes Schiller—Sziinessy and Baer, since we now know that pious Jews could compose works which would later be misrepresented in the name of Christian polemic.

Chapter 4

Second Temple Literature In the Remains of the Cairo Geniza

In addition to the *Pirque d'Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Josippon*, there are also a number of manuscripts which contain versions of Second Temple literature. Many of these manuscripts date from the centuries before Moshe haDarshan, while others are later. However, those later manuscripts reflect the literary tradition upon which Moshe haDarshan drew. These manuscripts fall into two main groups: texts for which parallels are found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and those which are later retranslations, or which have not been discovered among the dead sea scrolls. Most of those in the first group were discovered in the store-room in the Synagogue of Cairo, while those in the second group are found in European manuscripts which date from the twelfth century and afterwards.

Manuscripts with Dead Sea Scroll Parallels

I. Damascus Covenant

In 1910, S. Schechter published two mss¹. he discovered in the Cairo Geniza.² He did not give a title to the work which they represented. Instead,

¹ T-S 10 K 6 (ms. A) and T-S 16 311 (ms. B)

² S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries* (Oxford: Cambridge University Press, 1910) and reprinted in 1970 with a prolegomenon by J. Fitzmeyer (New York: Ktav).

he simply identified them as "fragments of a Zadokite work." These mss represented the first major documentary evidence for the existence of a sect by this name. Schechter distinguished this group from the Sadducees, with whom their name seems to be identical. The Sadducees were a religious sect of the Second Temple period. Their beliefs and membership are known from a number of different sources. Josephus describes them both in the *Antiquities* and the *Wars*. The Rabbinical Jewish legal work, the *Mishna*³, also mentions the Sadducees along with points of disagreement between this sect and the Pharisees. Finally, the New Testament contains literary testimony on the Sadducees and their relations both with the Pharisaic sect and the early Christians. In the *Mishna*, the name given to this party is "צדוקים" = *Tzeduqim*.

Despite the apparent similarity between the names Sadducee=Zadokite, Schechter suggested that the authors of the Damascus Covenant (CD) were in fact the Dositheans. He arrived at this conclusion based upon similarities in practices and beliefs between them and the religious practices described in the CD. He also linked this group with a group identified by Qirqisani⁴—a tenth-century Qaraite theologian, heresiologist and historian of the various Qaraite sects—as "Zadokites." At the same time, Schechter also noted the similarities between Falasha legal traditions and those of the Dositheans and the authors of this work. Schechter did not suggest a date of composition. However, he did offer a chronology of the sect based upon the opening paragraph of the document. That chronology would seem to suggest a date no earlier than 176 B.C.E. Schechter's edition included a Hebrew text and a translation. He

³ mYadayim 4:6-8.

⁴ L. Nemoy, "Al-Qirqisānī's Account of the Jewish Sects and Christianity" in *HUCA* 7(1930) 317-397. Schechter (op. cit. xviii) incorrectly dates this work to 637 C.E. The correct date is approximately 300 years later than this, in the middle of the tenth century.

described ms. A as "Oriental" from the 10th century. He wrote that ms. B was written in square characters, "with a tendency to cursive." He suggested a date of the eleventh to twelfth century.

Shortly after Schechter's edition appeared containing the Hebrew with an accompanying English translation, Charles published a new translation along with a critical introduction to the work. He dated the text more precisely, giving a date after 106 B.C.E.—his suggested date for the composition of *Jubilees*—and before 57 B.C.E. He theorized that the Zadokites were a party from within the priesthood, who were Sadducees. Charles believed that these Zadokites eventually became Christians *en masse*, and are the priests mentioned in *Acts* 6:7. Charles was extremely critical of Schechter's edition of the text, and wrote: "it is carelessly done..." and "If Dr. Schechter chooses to edit his text so carelessly that is of course his own concern..." Charles accepted Schechter's date for ms. A, but did not suggest a date for ms B.

Following Charles, a number of translations and studies were done. These focused on the identity and origin of the sect in which it originated, the laws of the sect, and the ultimate end of the sect. Schechter's title for the work was replaced with the title *Damascus Covenant*, *Damascus Document* or *The Covenant of Damascus* (abbreviated *CD* and *CDC*). This title may have been inspired by G. F. Moore's article, "The Covenanters of Damascus: A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect," in *HTR* 4(1911) 330-77. Fitzmeyer provided a full bibliography of the literature on the *CD* in his prolegomenon to the 1970 reprint of Schechter's book.

The mss themselves have been the subject of controversy. Schechter originally concluded an agreement which made them unavailable to the

scholarly community for five years following his publication.⁵ For this reason, all early translations and scholarship depended upon his transcription of the text.⁶ Schechter's edition included a facsimile of T—S 10 K 6 (page 1) and T—S 16.311 (page 20). Even after Schechter's ban on access to the manuscripts expired, they were not widely available to the scholarly community until Zeitlin published a full facsimile edition in 1952.⁷ The photographs in this edition were reduced in size from the original mss; T—S 10 K 6 (Ms. A) is reduced approximately 30%, while T—S 16.311 (Ms. B) is nearly full size. Zeitlin did not suggest a date for the mss. He did include an introduction which reviewed the previous scholarship, and summarized the different opinions on authorship and dating of the work. Zeitlin argued that the *CD* and the Scrolls found at Qumran were medieval forgeries of the Qaraites. In 1992 Elisha Qimron produced a new facsimile and text using newer technologies and photographic techniques. The sequence of the leaves was rearranged on the basis of the mss discovered at Qumran. The text was accompanied by a reexamination of the legal traditions extant in the work, and a bibliography of works on the *CD* from 1970 (the end-date of Fitzmeyer's bibliography) through 1989. Most recently, the text of the Qumran fragments 4QD^{a-h} was published by Wacholder and Abegg in 1991.⁸ No translation of these remaining fragments from Cave 4 has been done, nor are there any studies of it. None of the studies on the *CD* attempt to explain how

⁵ This set an unfortunate precedent in the scholarly world. Thus, generations of scholars were denied access to the mss. discovered at Qumran while a few scholars were allowed to publish the texts at a glacially slow pace.

⁶ Broshi, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992) 6.

⁷ S. Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952).

⁸ B. Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, *Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: Fascicle One*.

these two manuscripts, nearly identical to Qumran mss nearly 1000 years older, came to exist.

Examination of Broshi's facsimile edition yields a date of ninth-tenth century for Ms. A. It is written in a Palestinian square script. It has an average of 44 letters per line, and 21 lines per page through plate VIII. Plates IX-XII (the last complete page) have 23 lines per page. Close comparison of Plate IXff with Plates 1-VIII reveals the possibility of two different copyists for ms. A. Specific differences include: a different formation of the final *mem*, *taf*, and *alef*; the horizontal stroke of the *lamed* is at the same level as those of other letters in I-VIII, but is below that of the other letters in IX; the lack of consistency in page length. Ms. B is a Palestinian square script which appears to be younger than Ms. A. Some letters show a tendency towards a cursive. Dates of eleventh-twelfth century have been suggested for the ms. although it is unusual for Palestinian mss of this date to have an uneven left margin.

II. Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus)

The Apocryphal work known as *Ben Sira* has also been called *Sirach*, *Ecclesiasticus* and *The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira*. Most scholars date the work to around the years 190-170 BCE⁹ on the basis of literary evidence, including references to the high priest Simon (known as שמעון הצדיק in *Pirke Avot*). According to the introduction in the Greek, the work was translated by the author's grandson around the year 132 BCE. The work was included in the Canon of the Alexandrian Jews, and the early Christian churches. Independent

⁹ See E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987) III:202.

translations were made into Latin and Syriac as well as numerous daughter translations. Several authentic citations are found in early Rabbinic literature, and a medieval apocryphal version of it circulated as *אלפא ביתא דבן סירא* (*The Alphabet of Ben Sira*).

The Geniza manuscripts of *Ben Sira* have received more attention than any other medieval Hebrew mss of Second Temple literature. Beginning with the last decade of the nineteenth century, a total of five fragments of a Hebrew version of *Ben Sira* were discovered. These fragments were all discovered in the Cairo geniza. The first fragment was published by S. Schechter in 1896¹⁰. Additional manuscripts and fragments continued to be published through 1960¹¹. From the time of their discovery, considerable attention was paid to the possible authenticity of this material. Di Lella¹² has published the most extensive study of the Hebrew mss of Ben Sira. In it, he competently summarized the scholarship prior to 1963, and concluded that at least some of the manuscripts represent the original Hebrew version of the book. His study also contains an exhaustive bibliography of the publications and studies on the Hebrew mss. Di Lella speculated that the Geniza copies were the work of Qaraites.¹³ He also theorized that the disappearance of the work in the twelfth century was the work of Rabbanite Jews¹⁴:

¹⁰ S. Schechter, "A Fragment of the Original Text of Ecclesiasticus," in *Expositor* (5th series), 4(1896) 1-15.

¹¹ J. Schirrmann, "Additional Passages from the Book of Ben Sira" in *Tarbiz* 29 (1959-60), 129-134.

¹² Di Lella, *Sirach* 20-46.

¹³ Ibid. 151: "The Qaraites who recover the MSS of Sir from this cave [i.e. Qumran] are happy to obtain the Book in Hebrew and make many copies of it."

¹⁴ Ibid.

The Qaraite and other Jews — Saadia, for example — enjoy the use of *Sir* in Hebrew up to the twelfth century when the Rabbanites again succeed in suppressing the Book. Hence, since the Hebrew text of the Book disappears into the Genizas, Jewish authors from the Middle Ages to almost the beginning of the present century never again use it.

There are a number of problems with Di Lella's theory. First, there are no studies which identify Qaraite scripts specifically for this period. Consequently, it is impossible to confirm Di Lella's association of *Ben Sira* with the Qaraite by examining the mss. Nor is there literary evidence which would support such a claim. Furthermore, there is also no precedent for the Rabbanites successfully suppressing literature, sectarian or not. Furthermore, it is reasonable to ask what Rabbanite Jews could possibly have objected to in the work? Indeed, a pseudepigraphal version of the book, written and preserved by Rabbanite Jews—the *Alpha Beta of Ben Sira*—was far more objectionable to the rabbis. Yet they were unsuccessful in suppressing it, despite repeated attempts. Finally, as we have seen, there were many Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal works which circulated at this time. None of these were suppressed; indeed some, like *Judith*, became quite popular. Thus, Di Lella's theory is without support, and is indeed groundless. Yet if this is so, then why did the book disappear from the Jewish community?

Based upon the mss hands, it appears that the work never circulated outside of the Palestinian Jewish communities of Israel and Egypt. These communities went into severe decline in the twelfth century because of the destruction by about by the Crusades in Israel, and the disruption of the Islamic empire in Egypt. Qaraite scholarship, and the Qaraite community never recovered from the collapse of the Islamic empire and the devastation of the Jewish communities by the Crusaders. The Rabbanite communities in these two countries were also profoundly affected. Indeed, the same period saw the decline of the authority and scholarship in the Babylonian Rabbanite academies, the interrupt-

ion of the Palestinian Sanhedrin, and the independent development of Rabbanite legal traditions in Spain, Southern France and Europe. Proof of this decline, and the disappearance of much of the Jewish literature of the region may be found in the fact that "orthodox" midrashic collections which also disappeared, like the *Pesiqta d'Rav Kahana* and the many brief texts published in the *Batei Midrashot*¹⁵.

In 1964, Yigael Yadin discovered yet another ancient manuscript of *Ben Sira*. The manuscript was found during the excavations at Masada. It includes chapters 39:27-44:17. Although the Geniza mss agree for the most part with the Massada ms, they differ in places. Many of these differences are textual variations, while others are the result of retranslations from the Syriac version of Ben Sira. However, some differences must be considered the result of later emendations and adaptations of the book. Thus, Ben Sira 44:15-16 in ms. B agrees only partially with the Septuagint, and not at all with the Massada ms.:

44:15 B: ותהלתם יספר קהל חכמתם תשנה עדה
Massada: ותהלתם יספר קהל עדה

The assembly repeats their wisdom, and the community shall tell their praises,

σοφίαν αὐτῶν διηγήσονται λαοί,
καὶ τὸν ἔπαινον ἔχαγγέλει ἐκκλησία.

The people declare their wisdom, and the congregation will announce their praise.

44:16 והתהלך עם יי ונלקח חנוך נמצא תמים
אות דעת לדור ודור
[]

Enoch was found pure; he walked with God and was taken:
A sign of knowledge to every generation.

Ἐνωχ εὐηρέστησεν κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη

¹⁵ S. A. Wertheimer, *Batei Midrashot* <repr.> (Jerusalem: Ktab Yad Wasepher, 1989). See also L. Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies in Memory of Doctor Solomon Schechter* (New York: JTS, 1928).

ὑπόδειγμα μετανόιας ταῖς γενεαῖς.

Enoch was pleasing to God, and was translated,
An example of repentance to the generations.

The Massada ms. has a gap where 44:16 appears in both B and the Septuagint. There are three possible explanations for this: a) The original Hebrew (represented by Massada) did not mention Enoch, and the Septuagint is based upon a later Hebrew version, while B inserted this verse based on a retranslation; b) The original Hebrew (represented by Massada) did not mention Enoch, but the Septuagint and B are both based upon a later Hebrew version which did include him, or c) The original Hebrew (represented by Septuagint and B) included Enoch, but the editor of the Massada version edited him out. It would be difficult at this stage to determine which of the three possibilities is correct. However, b is the most likely. This conclusion is strengthened by the presence of a lengthy insertion in B at 51:12. The insertion includes the phrase: הוֹדוּ לַיהוָה — "Praise ye the one who chose the sons of Zadoq to be priests..." This psalm-like material is not found in the Septuagint. It is also not found in the Syriac translation, which was originally made from a Hebrew version, and later corrected to the Septuagint in places. The expression "sons of Zadoq", as well as "congregation" and "assembly" are all phrases common to the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus, B represents a sectarian version of *Ben Sira*.

Since the publication of Yadin's study on the Massada ms¹⁶, the authenticity of these Hebrew texts has been accepted as conclusive.¹⁷ One additional Hebrew ms of the work exists. However it is much later, and was produced independently of the Geniza fragments. It is contained in a Hebrew man-

¹⁶ Y. Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll From Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965)

¹⁷ Yadin, op. cit.; Schürer III:202

uscript of the Apocrypha described by Bialer in his catalog of the collection of the Chief Rabbinate in Israel¹⁸. Bialer concluded that the translation is based on the Latin, Greek and Syriac versions. This version has neither been studied nor published.

The Manuscripts:¹⁹

A	900-950	Palestinian Mashaitic Script
B	900-1000	Palestinian Square Script
C	900+	Palestinian Square Script
D	1100+	Egyptian Cursive Script
E	1050+	Egyptian Cursive Script
H-S	1500+	Italian

Other published mss:

Massada MS	100 BCE - 75 BCE	Y. Yadin
2QSir	50 BCE - 0	M. Baillet ²⁰
11QPs ^a	50 BCE - 0	J. A. Sanders ²¹

¹⁸ Bialer, *Min haGenazim* (Jerusalem: Heichal Shlomo, 1969)

¹⁹ These MSS are not dated in the secondary literature. I have dated them, and identified their script on the basis of Birnbaum, *The Hebrew Scripts*.

²⁰ M. Baillet-J. T. Milik-R. de Vaux, *Les Petites Grottes de Qumran* (Oxford: 1962) 75-77

²¹ J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* (Oxford: 1965).

Manuscript B has received a great deal of attention, particularly in recent years. It contains extensive marginal glosses in addition to a very carefully executed text. Most of these marginalia are in the same hand as the main text, although one or possibly two other, later hands appear.²² Unlike A, C and D it is arranged in hemistichs. This conforms to the mss found at Massada and Qumran. It would also appear that the mss which Saadya knew was arranged stychometrically, since in his *Sefer haGalui*²³ he discusses works which are written in this way, and were known in antiquity but were lost to Rabbinite Jews. The marginal glosses reveal an attempt to represent several available mss traditions, since they seem to agree at times with the Greek, at times with the Syriac versions. *Bmarg* agrees with D where texts appear for both mss.²⁴ Earlier editors assumed that B was an attempt to correct the Hebrew on the basis of the Greek or Syriac versions themselves, or Hebrew retranslations. Yadin demonstrated that in fact *Bmarg* often reflects the Massada version, and is as close to the original as *Btext*. In this sense, *Bmarg* represents another purely Hebrew version. Thus, according to Yadin, both *Btext* and *Bmarg* represent later versions of the original *Ben Sira*. On the other hand, the Massada text is closer to the original from which the original translator worked.

²² Some of these additional glosses are in Persian, and are clearly later than the original MS. So for instance, *The Book of Ben Sira* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1973) xv: "In MS B, there appears the following marginal note to verse 40:24: אף בלילא כל ימי עני רעים בן סירא אומ' כרמו ממטר גגים לגגו מעפר כרמו לכרמים בשפל גגים גגו במרום הרים כרמו ממטר גגים לגגו מעפר כרמו לכרמים. Added to it is a remark (in Persian) stating that these words were not contained in the original text, but represent rather an oral transmission."

²³ A. Harkavy, *Sefer haEgron v'Sefer haGalui* (Berlin: 1891)

²⁴ Yadin, op. cit. 7.

Mss A and C conform basically to 2QSir²⁵ where there is overlap. On the other hand, Di Lella has demonstrated that A and C also contain retroversions into Hebrew from the Syro-Hexaplar. His conclusions are based on a comparison with 2QSir. Because his original work on the book was completed prior to the publication of the Massada MS, he does not include a similar study of B. To date, no one has done such a comparative study to determine the extent to which *Btext*, *Bmarg* and D have been influenced by the Syro-Hexaplar.

In 1973, The Academy of the Hebrew Language published a comparative text of the 8 known Hebrew mss²⁶. It reproduces in an interlineal fashion all mss, as well as marginal glosses and erasures. It also includes a Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary. The edition was prepared on the basis of photographs and/or facsimiles of the mss. It includes neither a study of the texts, nor a review of the scholarship. It was intended as a lexicographical work.

III. Testament of Levi

The TLevi appeared in two different versions in Medieval Jewish literature. The first survives only in a citation by Rashi²⁷: ויש מדרש אגדה באלה הדברים רבה ששלח הקב"ה גבריאל והביאו לפניו וקרא לו שם זה ונתן לו כ"ד מתנות (There is a Midrash in D'varim Rabba that The Holy One Blessed be He sent Gabriel, and he brought him before him

²⁵ Di Lella, 79.

²⁶ *The Book of Ben Sira...*

²⁷ *Torat Hayyim* (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1986) 2:57 (=Gen.29:34). This *Midrash* does not survive in our texts of D'varim Rabba.

and called him by this name, and gave him the 24 gifts of the priesthood. And because he "accompanied" him with gifts, he called him Levi ["companion"].

This seems to be a summary description of the TLevi 5-8:2:

"At this moment the angel opened for me the gates of heaven and I saw the Holy Most High sitting on the throne. And he said to me, 'Levi, to you I have given the blessing of the priesthood until I shall come and dwell in the midst of Israel... There I saw the vision as formerly, after we had been there seventy days. And I saw seven men in white clothing, who were saying to me, 'Arise, put on the vestments of the priesthood, the crown of righteousness, the oracle of understanding, the robe of truth, the breastplate of faith, the miter for the head, and the apron for prophetic power.' Each one carried one of these and put them on me and said, 'from now on be a priest, you and all your posterity...'. "

The second version of TLevi corresponds to the Aramaic discovered at Qumran²⁸. This version was initially identified by H. Leonard Pass and J. Arendzen.²⁹ The initial ms. published by Pass and Arendzen is not identified by a catalog number. The second fragment of the same ms., published in 1906/7 was described by Cowley in the *Catalog of the Hebrew and Samaritan Mss.* as ms. no. 2835.27. A facsimile of one folio of the ms. accompanied the article. Pass and Arendzen describe the ms as an "oriental hand" dating to no later than the eleventh century. They also noted that the text of this ms resembled closely

²⁸ 1Q21: J.T. Milik, in *DJD* 1:87-91; Fitzmyer-Harrington 20. 4Q213: J.T. Milik, *Revue Biblique* 62 (1955), 398-406; 73(1966). 4Q214: (the continuation of 4Q213 and 2 small fragments) not yet published.

²⁹ H. L. Pass and J. Arendzen, "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," in *JQR* (O.S.) xii(1900) 651-661. Charles credits Pass with the discovery in his *Greek Versions* liii. K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 192 cites the republication of this initial fragment, along with a second discovered by A. Cowley from the same manuscript and published in "An Early Source of the Testament of the Patriarchs" in *JQR* (O.S.) 19(1906/7) 566-583, without mentioning Arendzen.

a Syriac fragment of TLevi found in Brit. Mus. Add. 17,193.³⁰ Pass and Arendzen noted that the Syriac is almost identical to the Aramaic in a number of places. Charles and Cowley³¹ republished a corrected reading of the original fragments, along with the fragment identified by A. Cowley in the Bodleian collection. They accepted Pass' dating of eleventh century, noting that it could possibly be earlier. Charles was of the opinion that this version of the TLevi was not the original Semitic of the Test. of XII Patriarchs. Rather, he believed that the Greek and the Aramaic were based upon a common source, shared also by *Jubilees*. Charles repeated this argument, in a much abbreviated form, in his *Greek Versions*.

In 1979 Greenfield and Stone published a new study on the Geniza texts.³² Their article included a revised text based upon improved photographic methods, and a facsimile of the Cambridge fragment originally identified by Pass and Arendzen.³³ They concluded that "the Geniza text was a medieval copy of a text similar to that which was found at Qumran, or was indeed based on a text which had come from the caves."³⁴ They also present the opinion of M. Beit-Arié that the ms itself is "from the earliest layer of Geniza material; despite the difficulty in dating the fragments due to the lack of comparative material it seems to me... that they were written before 1,000..." A com-

³⁰ The full description of the ms. is given by Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac MSS in the British Museum* II:997. The MS contains the date 874 C.E. Wright reproduces the text in its entirety in the catalogue. Pass and Arendzen reproduced the Syriac in their article (p.657 note 1), as did Charles in *The Greek Versions* 254.

³¹ R. H. Charles and A. Cowley, "An Early Source".

³² J. C. Greenfield and M. E. Stone, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza," in *RB* 86(1979) 214-230.

³³ T-S 16.94

³⁴ Ibid. 215.

parison with the earliest Ben Sira fragments would indicate that they are contemporary, if not older than mss A and B.

Most recently, M. de Jonge has discussed the Geniza fragments in several articles.³⁵ Like his predecessors, de Jonge believes that the Aramaic fragments of TLevi from the Geniza and Qumran represent a different work, independent of the Greek *Test. XII Patr.* He proposed retitling this work *Aramaic Levi*. He stated that *Ar. Levi* was used as a source for *Jubilees*, and is considerably older. He also noted that the remaining fragments from cave 4 had yet to be published (in 1988). However, he stated that "the Qumran fragments and the Genizah fragments partly overlapped and clearly represented the same document." To date, no arguments have been proposed which would account for this.

IV. Sefer Hagu, or the *Book of Hagu*:

The CD contains several references to a *Book of Hagu*. CD 10:6

(= Schechter XI:6, p79) states:

And this is the usage of the judges of the congregation. Ten men selected of the congregation according to the age [or for the time being]; four of the tribe of Levi and Aaron and six of Israel, learned in the Book of the Hagu and in the foundations of the covenant...³⁶

CD 17:5 (= Schechter XVII 1-6 states:

And the regulation of the dwellers of all the camps is: They shall be numbered all by their names, the Priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the proselyte fourth. And

³⁵ M. de Jonge, "The Main Issues in The Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," and "The Testament of Levi and 'Aramaic Levi'," both reprinted in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991).

³⁶ Schechter, 79 and Hebrew section p10 ll4-6: וזה סרך לשפטי העדה עד עשרה אנשים ברורים מן העדה לפי העת ארבעה למטה לוי ואהרן ומישראל ששה מבוננים בספר ההגו וביסודי הברית...

they shall be recorded by their names one after another, the Priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the proselyte fourth. And so they shall be seated and so they shall ask with regard to every matter. And the Priest who numbers the many (shall be) from thirty years old even unto sixty years old, learned in the Book (of the Hagu and) in all the judgements of the Law to direct them according to their judgements.³⁷

There has been considerable speculation since the publication of the CD about the nature and contents of this *Book of Hagu*. However, no other works were found in the Geniza which could explain these references. Following the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, even more references to the *Book of Hagu* or *The Vision of Hagu* were found. Yet here again, no actual copies or fragments of the book have been identified.

However, I have found a fragment of this book in a late medieval manuscript. The manuscript, British Museum ms. 2797 (hereafter MS2797), contains a messianic chronology with the superscription, "These secrets have been copied from the *Book of Hagu*." The text of the fragment is below. It is transcribed exactly as it appears in the manuscript:

סודות הללו נעתקו מספר הגו' בסדר תבא כתו' והיה כאשר שש כן
ישיש ישוש לא נאמ' אלא ישיש כלומ' משיש אחרים וזה רמז לקץ
גליותינו כמ' שכתו' בספר בקץ דניל ומעת הוסר התמיד ולתת שיקון
שומם ימים אלף ומאתים ותשעים. והנה כתו' בתוכחות כאשר שש
להרבות אתכם ולהטיב אתכם כן ישיש להאביד אתכם ולהשמיד אתכם
ונסחתם מעל האדמה וכו' להרבות אתכם במצרים שנ' בו ובני ישראל פרו
וישרצו להטיב אתכם במדבר ובארץ ישראל שהיתה השכינה שרויה ביניהם
וכל זה עמד אלף ומאתים שנה ותשעים ד' מאות היו במצרים ומצרים
עד הבית ת"ף והבית ת"י כמ' שאמ' חכמים בזאת יבא אהרן אל הקודש
בזאת עמד הבית הרי אלף ור"ץ וזה שנ' כאשר שש להרבות אתכם וכו'
כן ישיש להאביד אתכם וכו' כלומ' בימים שהרבה שהרבה אתכם כן תהיו
בגלות וזהו מועד מועדים וחצי מועד' מועד הראשון זמן כמ' מועד צאתך
ממצרי' כלומ' בשני מועדים של מצרים וחצי מועד חצי אותם שני
מועדים שהוא מועד שלישי והרי שלשה מועדים כמועד שעמדו במצרים
ואסמכתא על זה על שאמ' הפסוק ומושב בני ישראל וכו' והוא עדן ועדנין
ופלג עדן' ולמה כתב זה לפי שרצה לסתום וכן אמ' הושע וענתה שמה

³⁷ Charles, *APOT* 2:831 = Schechter Hebrew 14 113-8: וסדר מושב כל
המחנות יפקדו כלם בשמותיהם הכהנים לארשונה והלויים שנים ובני ישראל שלשתם
והגר רביע ויכתבו בשמותיהם איש אחד אחיהו הכהנים לראשונה והלויים שנים ובני
ישראל שלושתם והגר רביע וכן ישבו וכן ישאלו לכל והכהן אשר יפקד אש הרבים מבין
שלשים שנה ועד בן ששים מבונן בספר . . . בכל משפטי התורה לכברם כמשפטם

ביני נעוריה וכאם עלותה מארץ מצרים כימי נעוריה זה גלות מצרים
 וכיום עלותה זה מיציאת מצרים עד שחרב הבית הרי אלך ור"ץ הרי קץ
 בתוב בתורה ושנוי בנביאים ומשולש בכתובים בדניאל. והקץ האחר[ון]
 הכתו' באותו פסוק עצמו אשרי המחכה וכו' הוא נרמז באתם נצבים שנ'
 ואנכי הסתיר אסתיר תסיר ה"א של אסתיר שהוא שמוש התיבה ותמצא
 אלף ושל"ה כלומ' הסתר אסתיר פני מהם שלא לשמוע את תפילתם עד
 בא קיצם ובא קץ לקץ ארבעים וחמשה כי לקץ הראשון אלך ור"ץ שנים
 ובא משיח ולסוף מ"ה לביאתו תשקוט ויכבוש כל העולם תחת יד יש'
 ולכך בתי' שמה אשרי המחכה ויגיע וכו'

These Secrets were copied from the *Book of Hagu*: In the portion [Ki] Tavo [it is written]³⁸ "*Just as the Lord took delight in you, [increasing and prospering you,] so now will he delight [in destroying you and exterminating you, and you will be uprooted from the land which you are entering to occupy. The LORD will scatter you among all peoples from one end of the earth to the other, and there you will worship other gods whom neither you nor your ancestors knew, gods of wood and stone. Among those nations you will find no peace, no rest for the sole of your foot. Then the LORD will give you an unquiet mind, dim eyes and a failing appetite. Your life will hang continually in suspense, fear will beset you night and day, and you will find no security all your life long. Every morning you will say, "Would to God that it were evening," and every evening, "Would to God that it were morning," because of the fear that lives in your heart and the sights that you see. The LORD will bring you sorrowing back to Egypt by that very road of which I said to you, 'you shall not see that road again'; and there you will offer to sell yourselves to your enemies as slaves and handmaidens, but there will be no buyer."*] It does not say YSOS [in the *Kal*] but rather YSYS [in the *Hiphil*, which is causative], that is to say, *he will cause others to delight [in destroying you]*." And this is an allusion to the end of our exile, as is written in the Scroll [mentioned] in the end of Daniel³⁹: *From the time when the daily-offering is abolished and the abomination of desolation is erected, there will be 1290 days. [Happy the man who waits and lives to see the completion of 1335 days! But go your way to the end and rest, and you will arise to your destiny at the end of the era.]* And here it is written in the reproaches [of Moses] *Just as the Lord took delight in you, increasing you and prospering you, so now will he delight in destroying you and exterminating you and you shall be uprooted from the land [which you are entering to occupy]*"

Increasing you in Egypt, as it says⁴⁰ And the Children of Israel were fruitful and multiplied. And making you prosperous in the wilderness and in the land of Israel, for the Shekhina was dwelling

³⁸ Deut. 28:63ff

³⁹ Dan. 12:11

⁴⁰ Ex. 1:7

amongst them. And all this lasted 1290 years: 400 years they were in Egypt, and from [the exodus] Egypt until the Temple was 480 years. And the Temple [stood for] 410 years, as our sages said: BZAT (בזאת) *Ahron came into the Sanctuary*⁴¹. BZAT⁴² the Temple stood. Behold, [this adds up to] 1290⁴³. And as Scripture says, *Just as the Lord took delight in you, increasing you etc. he will cause others to delight in destroying you*. That is to say, for the same number of years which he increased you, so will you be in exile. And this is a time, times and a half of a time: The first time is a time like *the time of your going out from Egypt*⁴⁴; that is to say like the 2 times of Egypt. And the half of a time is half of those years⁴⁵, which is a third time. And the three times are equal to the time that they were in Egypt.

And Scriptural proof for this comes from the verse⁴⁶, *And Israel dwelt [in Egypt 30 years and 400 years]* - and this is *A time, times and a half of a time*⁴⁷. And why did he [Daniel] write this? Because he wanted to hide it. And likewise Hosea said⁴⁸: *And she will answer there like the days of her youth and like the day that she came up from the land of Egypt. Like the days of her youth: this is the exile into Egypt. And like the day she came up from the land of Egypt: This is from the exodus from Egypt up until the destruction of the Temple; and that is 1290. Behold "Qetz" (the end) is written in the Torah, and repeated a second time in the Prophets, and repeated a third time in the Hagiographia, in Daniel. And the final end [reading אחרון instead of אחר] is that one which is written in that very verse itself: Happy is the man [who lives and waits to see 1335 days]. This is alluded to in [the Scriptural portion] [Atem] Nitzavim⁴⁹ as Scripture says,⁵⁰ *And I shall surely turn aside (HSTR ASTYR) my face [because of the evil which they have done...] Remove the "A" in**

⁴¹ Lev. 16:3

⁴² The numerical value of BZOT is 410: B=2 Z=7 A=1 T=400.

⁴³ i.e. 400 + 480 + 410 = 1290.

⁴⁴ Deut. 16:6

⁴⁵ The meaning of this is unclear.

⁴⁶ Ex. 12:40

⁴⁷ Dan. 12:7

⁴⁸ Hosea 2:17

⁴⁹ Deut. 29:9ff

⁵⁰ Deut. 31:18

ASTYR, which is the preformative of the future first person singular, and you will find 1335. That is to say, "I shall surely turn aside my face from them, in order not to hear their prayer, until their end-time has arrived." And between end-time and end-time there is 45 [years]. For at the end of the first end-time is after 1290 years, and the Messiah shall come. And 45 years after his coming, the entire world will be stilled and conquered under the hand of Israel. And for this reason it was written there [in Daniel], *Happy is the man who lives and waits* etc.

This entire passage is quite obscure, and deserves a lengthy study. The task is made considerably more difficult by the later (presumably) Rabbinic interpolations into the much older text. In addition to these "Rabbinicisms," an attempt has been made to harmonize the underlying text with the prophecies of *Daniel*. Despite these difficulties, it is clear that a text from the Second Temple period underlies this passage. A number of factors contribute to this conclusion:

1) The title: There is no book known from either Rabbinic literature or Qaraite literature which even remotely resembles this title. Yet it is mentioned several times in the literature of Qumran: Damascus Covenant 10:6 and 13:2; Community Rule 1:7; 4Q417⁵¹ and cf. 1QSerek 6:7. The identity and nature of this book has been the subject of scholarly debate. While this question has not yet been resolved, it is clear that it formed a part of the required studies of the Qumran sect, and that mastery of it was essential for a judge within that community. The fact that this title has been preserved in this fragment indicates that even if nothing else of this passage is "authentic," the superscription is.

2) Similarities between the Damascus Covenant and our text:

a) The use of the word מועד — *Mo'ed*. Generally, this word is

⁵¹ See Wacholder and Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition* 2:66 116

translated as "time" or "season." In *Daniel* 12 it is understood as a period of 1 year. Thus, the general interpretation of Daniel 12 and 7 is "A year, 2 years and a half a year." Yet our passage appears to render the term *Mo'ed* as synonymous with *Qetz*, or an end-time. Thus, it appears that there are three end-times encompassed during the enslavement in Egypt: 400 years + 30 years + the moment of the redemption. All three are referred to as a single unit of time, the "400 years of exile in Egypt." This is not the common Rabbinic usage of *mo'ed* in this context, nor of these verses in Daniel. However, it does appear to parallel the usage of *Mo'ed* found in the Damascus Covenant:

[כי אין] לקדם ולאחר ממועדיהם []

[ה[לוא] חקק קצי ח[רון] לעם לא לידעהו]

"For the appointed times cannot be advanced, nor delayed []

[] Did He not inscribe the end-times of the Wrath against the People which does not acknowledge Him?"⁵²

and also עד תום המועד פקודה באחרית הימים — "Until the end of the period which has been established at the end of days."⁵³

- b) The absence of any mention of the Second Temple, the destruction of the Second Temple, or the exile after the destruction of the Second Temple. So MS2797 refers to the "first Temple" simply as the Temple (הבית) and the exile as the Exile in Egypt. This parallels the usage in the CD

⁵² Wacholder and Abegg 1:1

⁵³ Ibid 3.

chronology, which does not mention the Second Temple at all.

- c) The centrality of Deut. 28 to this entire passage, which mirrors the importance of Deut. 28 to the framework of the Damascus Covenant.
- d) The chronology of this passage appears to follow closely that found in the Damascus Covenant. Thus, our passage traces the following epochs:

Egypt	-	400 years
Construction of First Temple-		480 years
Destruction of First Temple -		410 years
Exile	-	430 years ⁵⁴
Period of Turmoil	-	45 years
ending with the restoration		
of the remnant of Israel.		

The chronology of the Damascus covenant is:

From the destruction of the Temple until the deliverance		
of the remnant	-	390 years
Period following the True teacher-		40 years ⁵⁵

⁵⁴ This can be inferred from the section of this passage which deals with the enslavement in Egypt, which consisted of 3 periods; 400+30+the day of redemption.

⁵⁵ *Documents* 100:13 ולא יהיה להם ולמשפחותיהם חלק בבית התורה ומיום האסף יוריה היחיד עד תם כל אנשי המלחמה אשר הלכו אם איש הכזב כשנים ארבעים — And there shall be not portion for them, nor their households in the House of the Torah. And from the day that her teacher [i.e. the Teacher of Righteousness] is gathered in [i.e. dies], until the end of all the men of war who followed the Man of Lies is forty years.

Period of the Wrath

-

? years⁵⁶

Both chronologies agree that there will be a 430-year period followed by a period of turmoil which ends with the restoration of the remnant of Israel.

- e) Similarities of diction: **וכן אמר הושע** — "And thus Hosea said." This construction is unusual in Rabbinic texts when referring to the books of the Prophets. However it is found frequently in the CD (6:9; 8:8; 9:2 [A]—contrast to 9:2 [B], which says, "which is *written* by the hand of Zechariah the prophet," following the formulation far more common in Rabbinic texts; 9:28 [A]).

V. Unnamed Fragment: Priestly Law

In 1913 I. Lévi⁵⁷ published a fragment of a text which mentions the "bnei Šadoq." His article included a facsimile of the fragment, a transcription of the text and a translation into French. Lévi believed that the writing was characteristic of the style of the Zadokites. He also stated that it was very reminiscent of certain lines from Ezekiel, and appeared to be part of a letter describing the liturgical practices of the priests. Finally, he believed the writing to be no later

⁵⁶ Ibid. **ובקץ ההוא יחרה אף אל בישראל כאשר אמר אין מלך ואין שר ואין שופט ואין מוכיח בצדק** - And during that period God shall be wroth against Israel, as it [Scripture] says, "There shall be no King, nor prince, nor Judge, nor one who rebukes in righteousness..."

⁵⁷ I. Levi, "Document Relatif a la 'Communauté Des Fils De Sadoc" in *REJ* 65(1913):24-31.

than the tenth century. This text was mentioned by Fitzmeyer⁵⁸, and reproduced in transliteration. Fitzmeyer believed it to be a part of a different recension of the *CD*: "Prior to the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, however, one other small fragment from the Cairo Genizah, which undoubtedly was related to the *Damascus Document*, was published by I. Lévi; it apparently belonged to some medieval copy of the same text." This fragment also shows similarities to Geniza ms. B of *Ben Sira* 51:12(insertions). In particular, it contains the words לכהן — "to officiate as priest," and בני צדוק — "the sons of Zadoq." No later writers have adopted Fitzmeyer's suggestion, nor has the text been examined further.

VI. *Tobit*

One of the more popular works of Second Temple literature was the book of *Tobit*. There are medieval recensions in both Aramaic and Hebrew. It was in use among early Christians as well as in Jewish circles in the late second Temple period⁵⁹. Evidence of the popularity of this story is the presence of 4 Aramaic manuscripts and 1 Hebrew manuscript found at Qumran. After it was reintroduced to Jewish readers in the middle ages it regained some of that popularity and was inserted into several larger collections of Midrash, including the *Bereishit Rabba* and the *Tanhuma*. The setting of the story is Assyria, following the fall and exile of the Northern Kingdom in the year 721 BCE. Tobit is reported to have been a very wealthy man, and it appears that the audience for whom this story was originally written would have known his identity. There

⁵⁸ "Prolegomenon" 14.

⁵⁹ For references to Tobit which are found in other literature of the Second Temple period, see Charles, *APOT* I:198.

are two Biblical figures named Tobiah to whom this book might refer: Zech. 6:10,⁶⁰ "Take from those who dwell in the exile—from Hēldai *and from Tobiah* and from Jedaiah, and you shall come on that day, to the House of Josiah the son of Šephaniah" or Neh. 7:61-62,⁶¹ "These are the ones who went up from Tel Melah and from TelHarsha, Karuv, Adon and Immer but they could not prove whether their clan was from Israel: the Bnei Dalia, *the Bnei Tobia* and the Bnei Nkoda: six hundred and forty and two." However, it is likely that neither of these figures is the hero of the book of Tobit.

The Scholarship

A number of introductions to the book of Tobit have been written, including those of Kautzsch, Charlesworth, Eissfeldt⁶² and Zimmerman⁶³. In addition, several studies and commentaries have been written recently on the Greek versions.⁶⁴ A critical edition of the Pešitta text⁶⁵ has been added to the

⁶⁰ לקוח מאת הגולה מחלדי ומאת טוביה ומאת ידעיה ובאת אתה ביום ההוא ובאת בית יאשיה בן צפניה אשר באו מבבל.

⁶¹ ואלה העולים מתל מלח תל ירשא כרוב אדון ואמר ולא יכלו להגיד בית אבותם וזרעם אם מישראל הם. בני—דליה בני—טוביה בני נקודא שש מאות וארבעים ושנים.

⁶² Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Oxford:Harper & Row, 1965).

⁶³ Frank Zimmerman, *The Book of Tobit* (New York:Harper & Brothers, 1958).

⁶⁴ Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) and Heinrich Gross, *Die Neue Echter Bibel: Tobit, Judit* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1987) which contains an extensive bibliography as well.

⁶⁵ *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version* Part IV, fascicle 6 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972).

text of the Syro-Hexapler published by DeLagarde.⁶⁶ In contrast, relatively few studies have been devoted to the Hebrew and Aramaic versions. The question of the Jewish versions of the book was first opened in modern times by A. Neubauer. Unlike the Hebrew versions, which are considered to be late, Neubauer's Aramaic version is considered to be an important witness in the development of the text. Neubauer suggested that it was a version of the "Chaldee" behind the Vulgate translation of St. Jerome. It shares a peculiarity of that text which is unique — the entire story is related in the third person. Thus, according to Neubauer it represents an early, divergent tradition: "The text we now publish agrees in one important point with the version of the Vulgate, in representing Tobit in the first chapters in the third person, whilst in all other old versions he speaks in the first person."⁶⁷ Neubauer noted that the text has been abbreviated, and that it is *not* the text which underlies the Hebrew version. Bickell⁶⁸ agreed with Neubauer in assigning great antiquity and authenticity to the version from which the Aramaic was taken.

Nöldeke⁶⁹ refuted the position of Neubauer and Bickell. He adopted a later date for the Aramaic based on both linguistic and structural considerations. In assigning a *terminus ante quem* of 300 C.E., he denied that this was an independent witness of the text. Instead, he treated it as a corrupt translation, pro-

⁶⁶ Antoni De Lagarde, *Vetus Testamentii Apocryphi Syriace* (Leipzig: 1861).

⁶⁷ A. Neubauer, Tobit vi.

⁶⁸ Bickell, *Zeitschrift für Kathol. Theol.* ii, 216ff, 764ff as cited in Charles, *APOT*.

⁶⁹ Nöldeke, *Monatsberichte der Berliner Academie*, 1879, as cited in Charles, *APOT* and Zimmerman, *op. cit.*

duced and preserved carelessly. Dalman⁷⁰ agreed with Nöldeke, and assigned it a date still later, in the seventh century C.E. Zimmerman⁷¹ went farther, and argued that the Aramaic version is a late translation of "negligible" value. He believed that the underlying text was a Hebrew one, which was in turn taken from the Greek. Zimmerman stated that the Greek texts themselves are two generations removed from the original Aramaic text. In his opinion, Neubauer's Aramaic is five generations removed from the original text: Aramaic > Early Hebrew > Vaticanus > Late Hebrew > Neubauer Aramaic. He also noted that Neubauer's Aramaic text is *not* descended from any known Hebrew version. While recent studies on *Tobit* ignore the medieval Aramaic altogether,⁷² Flusser has suggested that it was translated from a Syriac version. However it would be very difficult to demonstrate such a connection at this time because of the many problems with the present Syriac version.

The recent discovery and identification of 5 Qumran fragments of *Tobit* appears to have resolved the question of the original language of composition. These texts have not yet been published, although Wacholder and Abegg plan to print the Hebrew fragment of *Tobit* in fascicle 3 of their series *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew And Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*. Among the conjectures of Nöldeke was the certainty that a Semitic text would have used the Semitic place names, while Neubauer's Aramaic uses the Greek names for the various cities mentioned. Thus, in 7:1 אַחַמְתָּא = אַגְבַּתְנִים = *εκβατανοις*; and in 9:1 רְגָא = רִגְשׁ = *Ραγαίς*⁷³. The

⁷⁰ G. Dalman, *Grammatik des judisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, *Einleitung*, par. 6.

⁷¹ *op. cit.* 134ff.

⁷² Hanhart, *op. cit.* and Heinrich Gross, *op. cit.*

⁷³ See Nöldeke, *op. cit.* p37 for a complete list.

Qumran Aramaic fragment of 7:1 demonstrates the soundness of his theory. In that fragment, we do indeed read אַחַמְתָּא and not אַגְבַּתְנִיָּס, just as Nöldeke predicted. This certainly supports the contention that the Aramaic version is a derivative of the Greek.

Until Gaster⁷⁴, only the two printed Hebrew versions of Tobit were known⁷⁵: the Fagius and the Münster. The Münster version was originally printed in Constantinople in 1516. Sebastian Münster reprinted it in 1542; hence the designation "Hebrew Münster (HM)". HM represents a secondary translation from an Aramaic translation of the Sinaiticus (Greek) version. It is not directly related to the Aramaic version published by Neubauer⁷⁶, although Charles⁷⁷ claimed that both descend from a common original. This translation has been dated as early as the fifth century⁷⁸. Such a dating seems highly speculative, and no later authors have adopted this date. Charles states simply that it is of "comparatively modern date and secondary character."⁷⁹

The second version was originally printed in Constantinople in 1519, and reprinted by Fagius in 1542. It was subsequently included in Walton's *Polyglot*. It is referred to as Hebrew Fagius (HF). This version is believed to

⁷⁴ Moses Gaster, *Two Unknown Hebrew Versions of Tobit* (London: Harrison and Sons, 1897).

⁷⁵ Besides these two editions of the Hebrew, an adaptation of *Tobit* was known from the printed edition of the *Tanḥuma*. Neubauer reproduced this as text III in his edition. It is actually not a version, nor does it represent a "Hebrew" text. It is in fact a summary from the Aramaic found in the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabba*, which has been greatly abbreviated and inserted into the text of the *Tanḥuma*. The printed edition of the *Tanḥuma* cites Moshe haDarshan as its source for the story.

⁷⁶ Zimmerman, 135-6.

⁷⁷ Charles, *APOT* 1:179.

⁷⁸ Charles, *op. cit.* citing Ginsburg.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

have been translated from the Vaticanus (Greek) in the twelfth century.⁸⁰ As recently as 1958 it was believed that the HF was a "medieval product without apparently any manuscript forebears."⁸¹ However Hopkins⁸² published two fragments of this version found among the Geniza material. The first is T—S A45.25. Hopkins does not analyze this text. However, based upon a comparison with samples from Birnbaum⁸³ I believe that this is written in the Spanish Cursive style, from the latter half of the thirteenth century. The alphabet corresponds to samples 251 and 256 of Birnbaum vol. 2. The second, T—S A45.29, is written in the hand of Joseph b. Jacob haBavli (*fl.* ca. 1200)⁸⁴. This text was mentioned by A. Scheiber in 1970⁸⁵.

Gaster published two unknown Hebrew versions of *Tobit*⁸⁶. Only one of these can truly be considered a "version" ("Hebrew London"—HL). The other, "Hebrew Gaster"—HG is more properly a brief digest of the entire book. Gaster believed that his manuscript of HL (Br. Mus. Add. 11639) was copied in 1276 C.E., based upon a lunar calendar which begins with the 266th 19-year cycle of the moon (i.e. the year 5036). On folio 568b, Gaster found the date 828 (i.e. תתכ"ח) or 858 (i.e. תתנ"ח), which corresponds to either 1068 or 1098 C.E. This copy in turn was made from an original which Gaster believed "in

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Zimmerman, op. cit. p137.

⁸² Hopkins, op. cit. p96.

⁸³ Solomon Birnbaum, *The Hebrew Scripts* (London: Paleographia, 1954-57).

⁸⁴ Hopkins 106

⁸⁵ A. Scheiber, *Acta Or. Hung.* XXIII (1970), 117 as cited by Hopkins 106 note 23.

⁸⁶ Moses Gaster, *Tobit*.

every probability was a copy of the original text."⁸⁷ Gaster noted similarities as well as differences between HL and the Vulgate:

"What we are in search of is to find a single text... which should offer the same characteristics as the version of Jerome, without being a translation from the latter; having also its own points of divergence, so that the original character of that text should be established beyond doubt or cavil. At the same time it must have points in common with one or the other Greek text.

I think, now, that I have discovered such an ideal text, which comes up to all the requirements of the case..."⁸⁸

On the other hand, Gaster recognized that HG was merely a summary and translation of the Aramaic version published by Neubauer. Most significant is that the superscription to both the Aramaic and HG indicate that it was a reading for the second day of the festival of Pentecost. Gaster described the manuscript from which HG was taken as follows:

I have discovered now the exact counterpart in Hebrew to the Aramaic text of Dr. Neubauer, and what is more, have found it also in a collection of homiletic interpretations of the Pentateuch. The MS. is private property, and I was allowed many years ago to take a complete copy of this Midrash. It was then already half deteriorated by age and dampness and portions of the leaves were crumbling away at the slightest touch. I have reason to believe that we may consider the original MS. as lost since. Happily I have a complete copy of the whole work. The original was written in a Spanish hand, and belonged in all probability to the 15th century, if not earlier. The character of this Midrash is very much like that published by Buber in 1894⁸⁹ under the title "Agadischer Commentar zum Pentateuch." My MS. (I may now call it my MS., the other being as good as lost) seems to represent an older and more complete text, as it also contains homilies to the Haphtaroth and to the various festivals, which are not to be found

⁸⁷ Neubauer, *Tobit* 6.

⁸⁸ Gaster, *Tobit* 6.

⁸⁹ Solomon Buber, *Midrash Aggadah*. The obvious relationship between MS Gaster Or. 28 and the *מדרש אגדה* on the one hand, and the Aramaic text of Tobit excerpted from the *Bereishit Rabba d'Rabba* found in Br. Mus. no. 2339 on the other merits further study.

in that edited by Buber... In this MS. (Codex Or. Gaster 28), we find a homily for the second day of Pentecost..."⁹⁰

Simpson (in *APOT*) disagreed with Gaster's identification of HL as a significant witness to the book of Tobit. He assigned priority to the Vulgate, and stated that "the problem of the close interrelation of this version and the Vulgate is probably to be settled in favor of the priority of the latter and the indebtedness of the former to it in some way which is not at present clear."⁹¹

The HG received only the barest mention by Simpson, and he merely notes its relationship to the Aramaic.

Zimmerman agreed with Simpson in his conclusion that the HL is worthless in establishing the early text of Tobit. He provided evidence for the direct dependence of HL on the Vulgate, and concluded "it is clear therefore that HL is a version that probably appeared in the Middle Ages as a story, in more or less idiomatic Hebrew to be sure, to delight and entertain, but a modified translation nevertheless of the Vulgate."⁹² He considered HG to be so unimportant as to omit entirely all discussion of that text.

The Hebrew fragment of Tobit discovered at Qumran closes the discussion of the antiquity of the three medieval Hebrew recensions of Tobit (HL, Fagius, Münster). None of these three represents a copy of the Hebrew. Nor do they represent a direct line of transmission in one language.

The Manuscripts

⁹⁰ Gaster, *Tobit* 12.

⁹¹ Simpson, in *APOT* 180.

⁹² Zimmerman op. cit. 136.

There are relatively few medieval manuscripts of *Tobit*. We find only 5 prior to the XIV century.⁹³ There are now manuscripts for each of the major versions which precede the printed editions. They are as follows:

T—S A45.26	1175+	Spanish	Münster
T—S A45.29	1200+	Spanish	Fagius
T—S A45.25	1250+	Spanish	Fagius
Br. Mus. 2339	1250+	Spanish	Aramaic
London 1056	1278+	Spanish	HL
Cambridge 108.8	1300+	?	?
Gaster Or. 28 ⁹⁴	1400+	Spanish	HG (based on Aramaic)
Paris 130	1400+		Persian translation of Münster
Paris 1251/6	1500+	Italian	Münster
Paris 1396/2	1500+	Provençal	?
Ambrosiana 119/8 (111.9) supplement	1500+	Ashkenazi	?
JTS 2325/20	1500+	Italian	Münster
Parma 194/5	1500+	Ashkenazi	Münster

The published editions of the manuscripts are as follows:

T— S A45.26	Hopkins
T— S A45.29	"
T— S A45.25	"
Br. Mus. 2339	Neubauer
London 1056.III.29	Gaster
Cambridge 108.8	
Gaster Or. 28	Gaster
Paris 130	Neubauer (used for comparison to text II)
Paris 1251/6	Neubauer (used for comparison to text II)
Paris 1396/2	
Ambrosiana 119/8 (111.9) supplement	

⁹³ I have deliberately *not* included the version of *Tobit* included in Joseph Zabara's *Book of Delight* published by I. Abrahams, *JQR* (Old Series) VI (1894) 502-532. While Gaster lists this as a "version," it is clearly a poetic retelling of the story which is based on *Tobit*. However the story has been changed so drastically that it is impossible to identify *which* version Zabara knew. The differences include: the substitution of Elijah for Raphael; Tobit is sentenced to be hanged when all of the hangmen are stricken with blindness (comp. Gen. 19:11); he has left his money in the care of Peër Hazeman, in India; the angel (here Elijah) is sent away without pay. The *Book of Delight* was completed ca. 1200, which places it around the time of our earliest manuscript.

⁹⁴ = Br. Mus. Or. 9959.

Other Early Mss With No Dead Sea Scroll Parallels

I. Lives of the Prophets

The *Lives of the Prophets* is a work which relates a brief biography of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Micah, Amos, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Nathan, Ahijah, Joad, Azariah, Elijah, Elisha and Zechariah ben Jehoiada. In his introduction, D.R.A. Hare⁹⁵ mentions that it contains "legendary information not contained in the Scriptures"⁹⁶. Despite Hare's assertion that "there is no reference to it in other Jewish literature," traditions common to the *Legends* certainly exist in Rabbinic literature.⁹⁷ So, for instance, the *Mekhilta d'Rabbi Ishmael* contains the phrase, *הא בכל מקום אתה מוצא האבות והנביאים נתנו נפשם על ישראל* — "Thus you find everywhere that the patriarchs and the prophets offered their lives in behalf of Israel."⁹⁸ Traces of the influence of this work can also be found in early Christian literature.⁹⁹ Copies of the work survive in a number of languages: Syriac, Ethiopic, Latin and Armenian. All of these copies are derived from a Greek version. There is no scholarly agreement on the language of composition. Some scholars¹⁰⁰ have proposed Syriac. Others¹⁰¹ have argued that the Greek was made from a Hebrew *vorlage*. More recently, Klein¹⁰² has suggested that either Hebrew or Aramaic might have been the language of composition. Hare believed that the *Lives* was written in Greek, although written in Israel. He suggested a date of the first quarter of the first century C.E., based upon historical allusions in the text.

⁹⁵ "The Lives of the Prophets," in *PSOT* 379-384.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* 379.

⁹⁷ See below.

⁹⁸ J. Lauterbach, *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1933) I:11.

⁹⁹ The most obvious example is the genealogy of Jonah, mentioned by Hare. This same information can be found in Th Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary on *Jonah*. Allusions also exist in the *Cave of Treasures*. An adaptation and abbreviation can be found in the Syriac work *The Book of the Bee* pp69-73. (E. A. Wallis Budge, Oxford, 1886). This work was composed in the middle of thirteenth century by Solomon, the bishop of Basra.

¹⁰⁰ I. H. Hall, "The Lives of the Prophets," in *JBL* 7(1887) 38ff.

¹⁰¹ C.C. Torrey, *The Lives of the Prophets. Greek Text and Translation*. (Philadelphia, 1946); T. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden* (Leipzig, 1907), 131ff. suggests an earlier Hebrew text which the *Lives* may have used as a source.

¹⁰² S. Klein, "al hasepher Vitae Prophetarum," in *Sefer Klotzner* <ed. H. Torczyner> 209.

One Hebrew ms. exists which contains a fragment of the work. It is Paris 326 folio 157b-158a. It is written in an Ashkenazi script (Northern French—German) from the late twelfth century. The copyist mentions in another location that he lives in the city of Cologne, Germany (which he spells קולוניא). The ms. includes the martyrdom of Isaiah and of Ezekiel. The execution of Ezekiel is by dragging.¹⁰³ Isaiah is killed by being sawed in half. Although the section on Isaiah is fuller than in the Greek, it does not agree with the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*. In addition, the presence of the account of Ezekiel makes it certain that this is a version of the *Lives* and not the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*. This Hebrew fragment is reproduced by Flusser:¹⁰⁴

Menashe killed the prophet Isaiah, [Menashe] who was the father of Ammon. He commanded them to bring him forth from Jerusalem and to cut him in half with a wood—saw by the pool of Siloam. And when they began to cut him with the saw, he asked them to give him a drink, but they did not want to give [any water] to him. But God placed water into his mouth, and he died. And despite this, they did not stop cutting him...

And when Ezekiel prophesied from exile concerning the land of the Chaldees, the judges of the Law came and sentenced him to death. And there came some of the Danites and the Gadites, upon whom the signs had come via Ezekiel, for he said to them: "If you do not turn from your sins, the serpents shall devour your children and your cattle." And he also prophesied against the Danites that they would never again return to their land. But rather, because he had reproached them, they tied him to the tails of horses and dragged him over thorns and thistles, and he died. And they buried him in the field "Maulim" in the cave which of Shem and Arpachsad, in the cave of Machpelah which Abraham had purchased.

The version of the death of Ezekiel, which is different from the Greek, resembles a text in bYoma 69a:

¹⁰³ T. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden* 92 lists two other sources which report the same death for Ezekiel. One of these is the Syriac *Acts of Philip*. See Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* 83f. In both of these Ezekiel is dragged by his feet so that his head is crushed.

¹⁰⁴ D. Flusser, *Josippon* 2:153.

מנשה הרג את ישעיה הנביא שהיה אבי אמן, צוה להוציאו מירושלים ולחתכו בשנים במגירת עץ על מי שילוח. וכאשר התחילו לחתכו במגירה, שאל מהם לשתות ולא רצו ליתן לו, וימן לו הקב"ה מים בפיו ויגוע וימת ואע"פ לא נמנעו לחתכו... וכאשר התנבא יחזקאל מן הגלות בארץ כשדים, באו דייני התורה ושפטו אותו למות, ויבאו מן בני דן ומבני גד על אשר באו האותות עליהם על—יד יחזקאל כי אמר להם: אם לא תשובו מחטאיכם, יאכלו הנחשים את בניכם ואת בהמתכם. וגם נתנבא על בני דן שלא ישובו לעולם ועד לאדמתם עוד, כי אם בעבור אשר הוכיחם, קשרו אותו בזנבות הסוסים וגרדוהו על הקוצים ועל הברקנים וימות, ויקברו אותו בשדה מאולים במערת שם וארפכסד במערת המכפלה אשר קנה אברהם.

"Surely it was taught: The twenty-fifth day of Tebeth is the day of Mount Gerizim, on which no mourning is permitted. It is the day on which the Cutheans demanded the House of our God from Alexander the Macedonian so as to destroy it, and he had given them the permission, whereupon some people came and informed Simeon the Just. What did the latter do? He put on his priestly garments, robed himself in priestly garments, some of the noblemen of Israel went with him carrying fiery torches in their hands, they walked all the night, some walking on one side and others on the other side, until the dawn rose. When the dawn rose he said to them: Who are these? They answered: The Jews who rebelled against you. As he reached Antipatris, the sun having shone forth, they met. When he saw Simeon the Just, he descended from his carriage and bowed down before him. They said to him: A great king like yourself should bow down before this Jew? He answered: His image it is which wins for me in all my battles. He said to them: What have you come for? They said: Is it possible that star-worshippers should mislead you to destroy the House wherein prayers are said for you and your kingdom that it be never destroyed! He said to them: Who are these? They said to him: These are Cutheans who stand before you. He said: They are delivered into your hand. At once they perforated their heels, tied them to the tails of their horses and dragged them over thorns and thistles..."¹⁰⁵

It is also similar to the much later tale of the death of the ten scholars during the Hadrianic persecutions following the Bar Kochba rebellion of 131-135 C.E.

This work, composed some time after the First Crusade (1096-1100), contains an account of the death of Rabbi Judah ben Dama which is quite similar to the Ezekiel's death described in the Hebrew *Lives of the Prophets*:

והתניא בעשרים וחמשה [בטבת] יום הר גרזים [הוא] דלא למספד יום : ¹⁰⁵
 שבקשו כותיים את בית אלהינו מאלכסנדרוס מוקדון להחריבו ונתנו להם באו והודיעו
 את שמעון הצדיק מה עשה לבש בגדי כהונה ונתעטף בבגדי כהונה ומיקידי ישראל עמו
 הלילה הללו הולכים מצד זה והללו הולכים מצד זה עד ואבוקות של אור בידיהן וכל
 שעלה עמוד משחר כיון שעלה עמוד השחר אמר להם מי הללו אמרו לו יהודים שמרדו
 כך כיון שהגיע לאנטיפרטס זרחה חמה ופגעו זה בזה כיון שראה לשמעון הצדיק ירד
 ממרכבתו והשתחוה לפניו אמרו לו מלך גדול כמותך ישתחוה ליהודי זה אמר להם
 דמות דיוקנו של זה מנצת לפני בבית מלחמתי אמר להם למה באתם אמרו אפשר בית
 שמתפללים בו עליך ועל מלכותך שלא תחרב יתעור עובדי כוכבים להחריבו אמר להם
 מי הללו אמרו לו כותיים הללו שעומדים לפניך אמר להם הרי הם מסורין בידיכם מיד
 נקבום בעקביהם ותלאום בזנבי סוסייהם והיו מגרדין אותן על הקוצים ועל הברקנים...
 (The Babylonian Talmud, Soncino Press: Yoma, 325). The Talmudic passage is
 actually a citation from *Megillat Ta'anit*, a work which dates to the Hasmonean
 dynasty. This book contains a list of all the dates on which the Hasmoneans
 achieved military victories. Because these were celebrated as minor holidays,
 fasting on them was prohibited.

And afterwards they brought out Rabbi Juda son of Dama... immediately Caesar became angry and commanded them to attach him by the hair of his head to the tail of a horse, and he ordered him to be dragged through all the streets of Rome. And afterwards he commanded that they chop off his limbs. And Elijah of Blessed Memory came and took his limbs and buried them in a cave...¹⁰⁶

This manuscript has not been studied, nor is it mentioned in the literature on the *Lives*. Without further study, and comparison with the Syriac manuscripts, which have not been published, it is impossible to determine with certainty the language from which it was translated. However, several features of this text are unique, and might be of some help in identifying its source:

- 1) Arpachshad, the son of Shem is spelled ארפכשד — "Arpach-sad". This does not agree with either the Greek, Syriac or Masoretic spellings of the name.
- 2) The cave is called מאלים — "Maulim." Correcting for the scribe's confusion of a final mem for a samech yields an original name of "Maulis." Again, this does not agree with either the Greek or Syriac renderings of the name.
- 3) Ezekiel's persecutors are identified here as דייני תורה — "The judges of the Law" rather than "The ruler of the people Israel"¹⁰⁷ or "The chief of the Jews"¹⁰⁸. This may reflect the influence of the book of *Susanna*, or it may be an independent tradition.

II. The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Youths

The *Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Youths* is found in only one Manuscript, Br. Mus. 2797¹⁰⁹. Gaster published the text under the title

¹⁰⁶ Jellinek, "Eleh Ezkerah" in *BhM* 2:69-70: ואחריו הוציאו ר' יודא בן דמא... מיד חרה אפו של הקיסר עליו וצוה לקשרו בשערות ראשו בונב הסוס וצוה למשכו בכל רוחב של רומי ואחר כך צוה וחתכוהו איברים. ובא אלי' ז"ל ולקח האיברים וקברן במערה אחת...

¹⁰⁷ Hare, op. cit. 388.

¹⁰⁸ *Book of the Bee* 72.

¹⁰⁹ This manuscript is generally dated as fifteenth century Ashkenazi hand. The forms of the letters are somewhat odd, and do not entirely conform to any known script. However the correlation is close enough that no author has challenged this date.

"The Lost Aramaic original of Theodotian's Additions to Daniel"¹¹⁰. He believed this material to be the Aramaic texts upon which Theodotian's version was based. No scholars accepted Gaster's theory, and the version has been largely ignored. Textually this Aramaic version agrees with the Greek text called the Theodotian (Θ). Irregularities such as the defective verse 55: "Bless the Lord, O fountains..." are also found in Gaster's version (G). However, the order of the verses in G is different from both Θ and the Septuagint (LXX). The Syriac agrees with LXX. Gaster argued that the verse order in G was superior to the Greek versions and their derivatives. This was a strong factor in his identification of G as the original Aramaic. However it is far more probable that G was either copied from a defective MS, or represents a defective translation.

The version from which G was translated has also not been discussed in the literature. However, there are a number of compelling reasons to read it as an (Jewish) Aramaic translation of a Syriac original. Lagarde's Syriac version¹¹¹ agrees with LXX. However, the following points of comparison show a similarity of vocabulary and construction even with that Syriac version:

1) Verse 1 (G; v25 Θ and Syr):

G: ואזלו תלתייהון לגו אתון נורא יקידתא משבחין ומברכין ית יי וקם
עזריה לצלאה וצלי כדון ופתח פומיה ואמר

Syr: וקם אזריא ופתח פומה למברכו מצעת נורא. ופתח פומה וצלי ואמר
הכנא

¹¹⁰ M. Gaster, "The Lost Aramaic Original of Theodotian's Additions to Daniel," in *PSBA* 16(1893-94) 280-88; 312-17. Hereafter I will refer to this version as 'G'.

¹¹¹ This is the only version which has been printed in full. However, the Pešitta text of Daniel, translated from the Θ, exists in MS.

Θ: καὶ συστὰς Ἀζαριας προσήγατο οὕτως καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ
στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ πυρὸς εἶπεν

The additional phrase, *and thus did he...* is common to both G and Syr., yet does not appear in the Greek. Furthermore, the Greek *συστὰς*, which means "standing still" is rendered by both G and Syr. by the root קום.

2) Verse 8 (G; 32 Θ and Syr):

G: די מסרתא יתנא בידא דסנאין בישין ובידא דמלכין חייבין ובישין
בכל ארעתא

Syr: ושלמתן באידא דבעלדבבין עולא דרחקין מנך ולמרותא דמלכותא
דבישא מן כלהין מלכותא דארעא רשיעתא

Θ: καὶ παρέδωκας ἡμᾶς εἰς χαῖρας ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν ἀνόμων
ἐχθίστων ἀποστατῶν, καὶ Βασιλεῖ ἀδίκῳ καὶ πονηροτάτῳ
παρὰ πᾶσαν τῇν γῆν.

G reads "מלכין חייבין" while Θ is in the singular. It is possible that the translator "corrected" the text to reflect his own situation in the Diaspora. However it is more probable that the translator, reading from an unpunctuated Syriac text, read the plural "kingdoms" rather than the singular. Confusion of the singular, while impossible in the Greek, is quite simple to do when reading from the Syriac: the consonantal forms are identical, when not identified with *seyame* dots.

3) The vocabulary and constructions found in G are highly unusual. These features were another factor in Gaster's dating of this text. Gaster did not offer any detailed analysis in support of his opinion. However, close examination of the text shows a use of vocabulary, syntax and constructions which are more common in Palestinian Aramaic, particularly Targum Onkelos and Talmud Jerushalmi. However, other expressions are found only in Babylonian Aramaic. Examples include:

a) Verse 9: לית אנן יכילנא: The use of לית + the pronoun is found almost exclusively in Palestinian Jewish texts. This is also the case with יכיל.

b) Verse 14: לית לן לא... ולא: The use of לית + ל is rarely found in Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, although it is a common feature in Babylonian Jewish Aramaic. However, it is found in the Syriac, verse 33. Furthermore, while this entire extended construction is found rarely in Jewish Aramaic texts, it is found in verse 38 of the Syr: ולא אית בזבנא הנא לא רשא ולא שליטא ולא נביא ולא מדברנא ולא מדבחא ולאדבחא ולא קורבנא ולא דוכתא דנסק בסמא [ולא דבחתא] ונשכח חננא ורחמא. This corresponds to the Hebrew ובעידנא הדין לית לן לא רב ונביא ולא פחותא וסיגנן ולא: עלון וניכסין ומנחתא דלית אתר לאיתא כל אילין קדמך לאשכחא רחמין.

c) Verse 53: טיבותיא [sic]: The far more common translation of חסדו is טוביה. In Targum Onk. this form occurs only once, and

not at all in TJerushalmi or TBabli. However it is the usual form in Syriac, as in vv89-90.

Moreover, external evidence of an underlying Syriac text includes the fact that the other two additions to Daniel—*Bel and the Dragon* and *Susanna*—both originate from a translation of the Syriac. Thus it appears very likely that G or its antecedent was a translation prepared from a Syriac translation from the Θ.

III. Megillat Benei Hashmonaim

The *Megillat Benei Hashmonaim* is a work which appears to be related to I and II Maccabees¹¹². However it describes the rebellion against Antiochus IV in a very different fashion than those works. Judah plays a very minor role in this work, and dies in the first battle fought by the sons of Mattithias. Furthermore, Nicanor is killed by the high priest Johanan before the sons of Mattathias enter the story. Certain elements of the plot resemble the book of Judith. The structure of the scroll is as a liturgical work, and the justification for the observance of the feast of Hannukah with which it concludes is clearly modelled after the book of *Esther*. There is a mention of the destruction of the Temple 206 years after the establishment of the Hasmonean dynasty¹¹³. However this

¹¹² The work is known by a number of titles. The earliest clear reference is in the ספר הגלוי, edited by Harkavy in 1891. There it is called Megillat Benei Hashmonaim. It later came to be called Megillat Antiochus and Megillat Hannukah.

¹¹³ If the author of this remark followed the standard Rabbinic dating of the destruction in the year 68 C.E., then he believed that the Hasmonean dynasty was established in 138 B.C.E. Otherwise, the author claims that the Hasmonean kingdom was founded in 136 B.C.E. Both of these dates are very much at variance with the evidence from I and II Maccabees and Josephus. On the other hand, it may be that he dates the Hasmonean dynasty to John Hyrcanus, which is dated 134 BCE by II Macc. The text of MBH adds to this confusion by making "Yohanan the High Priest" the protagonist in the rebellion.

remark might be a later insertion, and does not *necessarily* mean that the work originated after 70 C.E. Indeed, the authenticity of this sentence has been considered questionable, since the next sentence states: ועד עלמא לא עדיין מנהון די בית מקדשא כהניא ולויאי וכל חכימיהון קיימו עליהון ועל בניהון ועל בני בניהון עד עלמא; "And the Priests and the Levites shall never cease from the Sanctuary; and their sages shall exist along with them, and their sons, and the sons of their sons forever." This sentence would imply that the Temple was still standing at the time that the *Megillat Benei Hashmonaim* (MBH) was written. However some versions omit this latter verse, and most authors consider it to be a late interpolation. Currently, none of the handbooks which describe the literature of the Second Temple period accept this as a work which originated during the Second Temple period.

The Scholarship:

There has been a great deal of scholarship on the question of the antiquity, authenticity, and sources of the MBH. Early scholars believed that it was a Hebrew source from the Hasmonean period. Krochmal believed that the Hebrew version of this work was the original from which the Greek translation of I Maccabees was made. Filipowsky, in his edition of the *Mivhar haPeninim*¹¹⁴ continued to believe in the priority of the MBH to I Maccabees. However he concluded that the Aramaic version preceded the Hebrew, which he demonstrated to be a later translation. Y. Beer, too followed the opinion of Filipowski.

¹¹⁴ Filipowsky, מבחר הפנינים (London, 1851) 3ff.

R. Kircheim¹¹⁵ disputed the dependence of 1 Mac. upon MA. He believed that the MA was in fact a late composition, which did not depend directly upon I Macc. He continued to believe that the original composition was Aramaic, with the Hebrew translation coming later. At the same time, Even Rashaf (?) claimed that the MBH was, as Saadya claimed, the work of Johanan the High Priest himself. His evidence was based upon the spurious work of Firkowitz, and no scholars have bothered to refute his far-fetched theories. In 1874, Y. Teprauer published another manuscript of the MBH. He returned to the opinion that it was an early work, based upon the statement in the Halakhot Gedolot¹¹⁶ that it was written by the elders of Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai along with the Megillat Ta'anit, around the year 30 BCE. Jellinek, who published several versions of the work maintained the opinion that it was a late work composed for liturgical purposes¹¹⁷.

Harkavy¹¹⁸ reviewed the opinions of his predecessors, yet he arrived at no conclusions of his own. He stated that, in the opinion of the Saadia and the Halachot Gedolot, this was an authentic work of the Second Temple period. Gaster¹¹⁹ in his study of the MBH believed that the work was composed during the Second Temple period. He concluded that MBH and I Maccabees are unrelated. He stated that MBH relies strictly upon oral traditions, and has no written antecedents. In his article, Gaster introduced a new element to the discussion: the similarity between the MBH and the Syriac translations of I and II

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 101.

¹¹⁶ Hildesheimer, הלכות גדולות. p83.

¹¹⁷ A. Jellinek, בית המדרש, v.6 4-8.

¹¹⁸ op. cit.

¹¹⁹ M. Gaster, "The Scroll of the Hasmonaeans" in International Congress of Orientalists 9 (1892).

Maccabees. He discussed several points of agreement in the orthography of proper names, which clearly reveal errors common to both the Aramaic and Syriac versions.

I. Abrahams¹²⁰ was the first to publish a manuscript of MBH from the Cairo Geniza. He noted in his introduction to this version that it is more faithful to I Macc. than the previously published editions. He was firm in the conclusion that the author could not have written the MBH with a version of I Macc. before him. Abrahams believed that the text was a late medieval insertion in the Targum to the haftara: "The scroll is, in truth, nothing but an interpolated Targum to a haftara, and must be classed with some other medieval compilations in Aramaic."¹²¹ More than 40 years passed before new evidence on the MBH was published. S. Atlas and M. Perlmann¹²² published a fragment of Saadia's introduction to his Arabic translation. The existence of this fragment seemed to prove conclusively the authenticity of the attribution of the translation to Saadia, as well as to end the earlier controversy over the *Sefer haGalui*.

M. Kadari¹²³ published a lengthy study of the MBH along with a critical text in 1962-3. He used five manuscripts of the Aramaic version: Berlin-Tübingen 8:12 (sixteenth cent., Yemenite), Gaster's base text for his edition¹²⁴

¹²⁰ I. Abrahams, "An Aramaic Text of the Scroll of Antiochus," *JQR* 11 (1900) 291-299.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 295.

¹²² S. Atlas and M. Perlmann, "Saadia on the Scroll of the Hasmonaeans," *PAAJR* XIV (1944) pp. 1 - 23.

¹²³ M. Kadari, "מגילת אנטיוכוס הארמית" in *Bar-Ilan Annual* I:81-105 (Bar-Ilan University Press: Jerusalem, 1962) and II:178-214 (Bar-Ilan University Press: Jerusalem, 1963).

¹²⁴ M. Gaster, "The Scroll of the Hasmonaeans".

(eighteenth cent., Yemenite), Paris 20 (1301, country of origin unknown); PPDM 212:2 (1390, Italian), and British Museum Harl. 5686 (1466, Italian. Printed by Filipowsky in his edition). He also used three printed editions which were taken from later mss: The first printed edition¹²⁵; Nemoy's facsimile edition¹²⁶ of Yale 51 + (1558, Italian); and Jellinek¹²⁷ (1559, place of origin unknown). He constructed a tree of the manuscripts, and postulated a single original from which the versions arose. He also included an extensive linguistic analysis of the Aramaic MBH. On the basis of this analysis, he dates the text from between 200-500 CE. He believed the text to have been composed in Israel, but in an Aramaic greatly influenced by the Western Aramaic dialect.

In 1978, S. Hopkins¹²⁸ published another nine fragments of the MBH from the Cairo Geniza. Eight of these are in Aramaic, one containing part of Saadia's introduction, and another which is followed by Saadia's Arabic translation. One fragment contains the Hebrew translation alone. The same volume holds one more fragment of Saadia's introduction. Hopkins' photographs of the Geniza material are published without a discussion of the work itself, and are accompanied by a translation of Arabic materials (where they appear) into English. Most recently, A. Vivian¹²⁹ published a fragment of an unedited

¹²⁵ Schocken, 1492.

¹²⁶ L. Nemoy, *The Scroll of Antiochus, Facsimile*. (New Haven: Yale, 1952).

¹²⁷ Jellinek, *בית המדרש* 6:4-8.

¹²⁸ S. Hopkins, *A Miscellany of Literary Pieces from the Cambridge Genizah Collections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1978).

¹²⁹ A. Vivian, "Un Manoscritto Aramaico Inedito Della *Megillat Antiochus*" in *Studi in Onore di Edda Bresciani* (Pisa: University of Pisa, 1985) 567-591.

Aramaic manuscript of the MBH, along with a facsimile of the ms and a bibliography of studies related to the work. Vivian agreed with Kadari's dating, assigning the original composition to the 2-4 century C.E.

The Manuscripts

This work appears in manuscript more than any other Hebrew or Aramaic version of apocrypha or pseudepigrapha, perhaps because it was used as part of the Hannukah liturgy. There are no fewer than 29 manuscripts prior to 1600¹³⁰, as well as numerous late manuscripts. The manuscripts are as follows:

¹³⁰ Benjamin Kennicott, *Dissertatio Generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum* (1780) mentions five manuscripts of "Maccabees" in Aramaic. Cotton, *The Five Books of Maccabees* (Oxford: University Press, 1832) mentions two of these manuscripts, and believes them to possess evidence of the Hebrew origin of II Macc. However, he had not examined them at the time of writing and relied solely on Kennicott's descriptions, which follow:

"Cod. 474. *Rom.* 64; *ibid.* A 2: 8. — *Biblia. Post Dan. Ezr. Chron.* claudunt codicem *Megilloth*, cum *Lib. Maccab.* Chaldaicè. Inter variationes in hoc codice plurimas bonasque, caeteris praelucet ea, quae hìc, at alibi nuspiam, conservatur; in *Psal.* 95,10. Citat hunc locum *Epistola ad Hebraeos* 3,10: et doctissimus *Peirce* (com. in loc. pag.68) luculenter ostendit, QUANTI interest (ad *Apostolum* rectè intelligendum et defendendum) ut ואקוט legatur ואקוט (*Διο προσωχθισα*) quae est in hoc codice lectio ipsissima. Codex hic, ex parte *rescriptus*, pertinere videtur ad initium sec. 13."

"Cod 578. *Goritia*, apud *Judaeos*; 4. — *Pent. Haph. Megill.* cum *Maccab.* Chaldaicè. A.M. 1240—A.C. 1480." — This codex is *not* mentioned by Cotten.

"Cod. 599. *Lipsiae*, bib. *Senat.* 2; fol. — *Pent. Haph. Meg. Psal. Pro. Job.* et *Maccab.* Chaldaicè. Libri 3 poetici exarantur hemisticè. Forte, seculo 14 exeunte." — This codex is *not* mentioned by Cotten.

"Cod. 614. *Hamburg.* *ibid.* 4: *Unger.* fol. (Q a 17) — *Proph.* Multa ex hoc codice excerptis Cl. *Brunsius*; sed perfecte contulit C. *Reimarus*, a I *Sam* 16,1 ad 2 *Reg.* 1, 12; ad supplendam codicis *Uffenbachiani* (sup. 180) lacunam. Ita notatur in margine, ad *Jud.* 18,30 — יהונתן בן גרשם בן משה ונקרא על שם :הונתן בן משה בן חזקיהו שגם הוא עשה פסל בהיכל: vid. sup. § 21. Codex, Germanicè scriptus, sine Masorâ, videtur ad initium sec. 13 referendus."

"Cod. 637. *Amstelod.* penes haeredes *Proops*, 4. — *Biblia* cum lib. *Maccab.* Chaldaicè. Scriptus Hispanicè, cum vocibus primis deauratis, forsan tribuendus est seculo 14 exeunti." — This codes is *not* mentioned by Cotten.

Kennicott also lists a number of Hebrew versions of "Maccabees." The first, Codex 175 is identified as "*Megillath Antiochi* (hist. *Maccab.*) Hebraicè", which is dated the end of the XIII century. The others are listed only as "hist. *Maccab.* Hebraicè", and include Cod. 302 (Paris 6), from the XIV century; Cod. 332 (Paris 40), 1301; Cod. 338 (Paris 48), begining of the XIV century;

Hebrew:

<u>Catalog</u>	<u>Date of ms</u>	<u>Hand</u>	<u>Contents of ms</u>
Har. 1861	1200+	German	(?)
N 94	1305	Spanish	Hag.
P 716.10	1350+	(?)	
(with a Persian trans)			
P 46	1350+	Spanish	Pent.
De-R 850	1469	(?)	Pent., etc
N 30	1480	(?)	Pent.
N 32	1483	(?)	Pent./Haftarot
N 2305m	1530+	Italian	Varia
P 43	(?)	(?)	Pent./Megilloth
N 174	(?)	(?)	Onkelos
Mun.117	1435	(?)	German Italian

Aramaic:

Flor. 52 ¹³¹	1200+	(?)	(?)
P 20	1301	(?)	Pent.
P 47	ca. 1350	Spanish	Pent.
De-R 414	1275-1375	(?)	(?)
(with Hebrew translation)			

Cod. 405 (Taurin. 9), Spanish, end of XIII century.

I have been unable to examine these manuscripts. Yet it seems likely in view of Kennicot's initial identification in Codex 175 of MBH as the "History of the Maccabees" that these are in fact copies of our MBH, and not Aramaic or Hebrew translations of the books of Maccabees. However, I have not included them in my comprehensive list of manuscripts.

¹³¹ Biscioni 143

BM Or. 2377	1300	+ Yemen	Hag.
(with Arabic translation)			
PPDM 212:2	1390	Italian	(?)
De-R 989	1400	(?)	(?)
De-R 951	1400+	(?)	(?)
BM Or. 2212	1400+	Yemen	Hag.
(with Arabic translation)			
P 585.7	1442	(?)	(?)
BM Harl.5686	1466	Italian	(?)
De-R 1026	1474	(?)	(?)
De-R 535	1484	(?)	(?)
N 2333.5	1500+	Yemen	Megilloth
(with Arabic & Hebrew trans)			
Berlin-Tübingen 8:12	1500+	Yemen	(?)
Yale 51+	1558	Italian	(?)
Adler 1449	1559	(?)	appears with עמק הבכאה
N 2498	1598	Yemen	Prayer Book
(with Arabic translation)			
P 75	(?)	(?)	
Torino	(?)	(?)	
(with Arabic translation)			

Other:

P 130.4	1600	Persian	
Adler 1449	(?)	Tartar-Turkish translation	
Adler 3009	(?)	Commentary (תפסיר) on Megillat	
Antiochus			

In the earlier mss, MBH appears alone, or as part of a pamphlet along with liturgy for the feast of Hannukah. By the middle of the fourteenth century, the work was most often included with Biblical texts. It appears in copies of the Pentateuch with the five Megilloth. It is frequently vocalized as if it were a

canonical text, even in the earliest manuscripts. In one manuscript¹³², the scribe even reports "I have copied here the six megilloth." There are known translations in Persian. The Arabic translation accompanies all extant versions of Yemenite origin. These versions attribute the translation to Saadia Gaon¹³³. This attribution was not reported by any of the earliest editors of the Aramaic text, who worked from Yemenite mss.

Saadia knew the work in Aramaic¹³⁴ and believed that to be the language of its composition¹³⁵. Most of the earliest manuscripts are Aramaic versions, although a Hebrew translation was available by the twelfth century. The Aramaic versions were copied in Spain and Yemen. The earliest Hebrew versions were copied in Europe. This corresponds to our knowledge from other texts: Jews in Spain and North Africa were capable of understanding Aramaic, while those in Europe were not¹³⁶. According to Gaster, both versions exist in two recensions. The Aramaic versions are classified by Gaster as Eastern and Western. The Eastern are made up of all the Yemenite Manuscripts. These versions are vocalised, and are always accompanied by the Arabic translation¹³⁷.

¹³² De-Rossi 535. Colophon reads: "I Joseph have written the Pentateuch with the Haftarot and the six (!) megillot."

¹³³ H. Hirschfeld, *Arabic Chrestomathy* (London, 1892) 1ff.

¹³⁴ Harkavy, op. cit., 160ff.

¹³⁵ See I. Abrahams, "An Aramaic text"

¹³⁶ M. Gaster, *Chronicles* and "The Scroll of the Hasmoneans," 13: "This translation was known only in Europe, and must have been made here at a time when the knowledge of Aramaic declined and the reading of the Targum began to be discontinued."

¹³⁷ J. Kafih, *Daniel, with Translation & Commentary* (Jerusalem: Dror, 1980) published an appendix which includes the Arabic translation. He writes that in Yemen it was customary until the last centuries to use the MBH as a school text for young children during Hannukah: "כי לפנים היו נוהגים ללמודה" לתינוקות בבתי הספר בימי החנוכה אלא שבמאותים וחמשים השנים האחרונות כאשר פשטה פשתה ורבתה השטחיות בכל פינות התורה וליודה בשל דבות שהזמן גרמות חדלו מלמדי התינוקות ללמודה כי רובם לא ידעו מה היא... 'For it was customary to teach it to young children in school during the days of Hanukkah. But over the

Gaster believed that Saadia knew the Eastern version, which is the only text which contains the verse cited in the ספר הגלוי. Hopkins believed that his texts from the Cairo Geniza refuted Gaster's division of the Aramaic mss into two distinct versions separated geographically, since fragments of both versions appear in the Geniza. However, without a dating of the various mss it is impossible at this time to accept Hopkins' argument, particularly since very late versions of the (European) Hebrew translation of Tobit also appear in Hopkins' volume. Thus, it is possible that both versions came to be used in the Palestinian-Egyptian Jewish community. MBH frequently appears in Yemenite prayerbooks, as part of the Haftarah portion for the fast day of the ninth of Ab, as well as the Haftarah reading for the Sabbath which falls during Hannukkah. Gaster considered the Eastern to be the most authentic recension. The Western manuscripts form the remainder of the Aramaic versions. They are less faithfully transmitted, and are often vocalized, although frequently incorrectly. The tradition of vocalizing the Aramaic versions is first recorded by Saadia Gaon in the ספר הגלוי.

MBH appears to have been used liturgically in Europe as well as in the East. Many of the Geniza fragments appear to be special liturgies for Hannukah. Other mss are titled מדרש לחנוכה. It was read in the Synagogue during the festival of Hannukah, corresponding to the reading of the book of Esther during Purim. It was frequently included in the European manuscripts in texts of the Pentateuch and Megilloth. Such texts were written for use in the

last 250 years... the teachers of young children stopped teaching it, since most of them did not know what it was..." (219). This might account for the inclusion of the Arabic text in all known Yemenite version, as well as the large number of extant Yemenite texts.

Synagogue, and would seem to indicate the liturgical use of this text in Spain and Italy.

Published editions of the various mss are as follows:

N 94	
P 716.10	
P 46	
De-R 850	
N 30	
N 32	
N 2305m	
P 43	
N 174	
Mun.117	Jellinek בית המדרש 6:1-3

Aramaic:

Flor. 52	
P 20	Kadari
P 47	
De-R 414	
BM Or. 2377	Gaster
PPDM 212:2	Kadari,
De-R 989	
De-R 951	
BM Or. 2212	Gaster
P 585.7	
BM Harl5686	Filipowsky, Kadari
De-R 1026	
De-R 535	
N 2333.5	Gaster
Berlin-Tübingen 8:12	Kadari
Yale 51 +	Nemoy, "The Scroll..."
Adler 1449	Adler, <i>Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts</i> , illustration 65.

N 2498	Gaster
P 75	Abrahams
Torino	Vivian ¹³⁸

Geniza Fragments published by Hopkins

T-S A45.9
 T-S A45.10
 T-S A45.11
 T-S A45.12
 T-S A45.13
 T-S A45.14a (with Judeo-Arabic translation)
 T-S A45.15 (with part of Saadya's introduction)
 T-S A45.17
 T-S A45.27
 T-S Ar.16.2 A Fragment of Saadya's introduction to the MBH.

Other Geniza Fragments:

תוספת תרגום לרנ"י וסמח"י	Abrahams, "An Aramaic text..."
--------------------------	--------------------------------

Conclusion:

It is clear from the manuscript evidence that books from the Second Temple period continued to circulate among the Jews in the Middle Ages. However, their survival and reappearance was not the result of one single process. *Ben Sira* and *The Book of Hagu* show that certain works continued to

¹³⁸ Angelo Vivian, "Un Manoscritto Aramaico Inedito Della *Megillat Antiochus*" in *Studi in Onore di Edda Bresciani* (Italy: Agnano Pisano e Pisa, 1985) pp567-591. This article contains a facsimile of the Torino MS. The MS has not been assigned a collection number, and has not been catalogued. It is owned by the P. Kahle University of Torino. It appears to be the concluding portion of TS A45.14a published by Hopkins.

develop, and were reworked by both sectarian and Rabbanite Jews alike. Furthermore, the presence of a citation from *The Book of Hagu* in a European manuscript of the fourteenth century demonstrates that manuscripts common to Qumran and Jewish sectarian movements were neither limited to Palestinian-Egyptian circulation, nor did they disappear because of Rabbanite suppression. Furthermore, these mss demonstrate that Second Temple books existed independently, and not just in collections like the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*. A different process seems to have preserved works like the CD and *Aramaic Levi*, which show remarkable agreement with the Qumran versions of these texts. Others, like the *Lives of the Prophets* seem to have been known among the Jews early on, but were lost, only to be rediscovered and retranslated. Finally, a work like the *Megillat bnei Hashmonaim* shows that works were written after the destruction of the Second Temple, but were deliberately written to appear as if they were much earlier.

Thus it is certain that manuscripts of a variety of Second Temple works from various sources — retranslations from Syriac, reworked versions of older texts, and possibly materials from a Qumran-like cache of manuscripts — could have been available to Moshe haDarshan. He was neither indiscriminately eclectic, nor naively accepting of whatever came his way. Quite the contrary, in his mind he reworked an extensive body of Jewish texts, and redacted them into a Jewish midrashic encyclopedia. Moreover, the survival of his sources demonstrates yet again that the disappearance of Moshe haDarshan's works cannot possibly have been the result of self-censorship by the European Jewish community. We are now left with two problems. The first is to determine how these works came into Jewish hands, and came to be treated as Jewish sources. The second is to determine how Moshe haDarshan acquired these texts in Europe, where they had been unavailable until his day.

Chapter 5

Previous Scholarship

Opinions on the relationship of Rabbinic literature to the "lost" literary corpus of the Second Temple period can be divided into three groups. One category maintains that this literature was suppressed by the Rabbis, beginning with the "council of Yavneh." Through their disapproval of this literature, it was lost to the Rabbinic tradition entirely. All that survived were isolated citations of Ben Sira. The second category believes that this literature continued to circulate within an "inner circle" of Rabbis. These Rabbis kept this literature as secret lore, and did not reveal its existence until the late middle ages. This accounts for the alleged absence of any references in early Rabbinic literature to the Second Temple corpus. The final group includes several modern scholars who believe that this material was suppressed by the early Rabbinic schools, but that it was restored to them by a discovery reported in a letter by Timothy I, the Nestorian Patriarch of Seleucia around the year 800¹. Some of these materials were subsequently resuppressed (i.e. Ben Sira and the Damascus Covenant) by the Rabbanite community, following the precedent of the council of Yavneh.

L. Ginzberg was among the earliest representatives of the opinion that this literature was entirely suppressed by the council at Yavneh. In composing

¹ The Syriac text was published by O. Braun, "Ein Brief des Katholikos Timotheos I über biblischen Studien des 9 Jahrhunderts," *Oriens Christianus*, 1 (1901), 219-313. Di Lella's translation of the relevant section reads: "We have learned from trustworthy Jews, who just recently have been instructed as converts to Christianity, that ten years ago books were found in a cave... in the vicinity of Jericho... a large number [of Jews] came and discovered books of the Old Testament as well as others written in the Hebrew Script." *Sirach*, 83.

his collection, *Legends of the Jews*², he had read the entire body of rabbinic literature available at the time, along with the collections of recently edited Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. His extensive readings and research led him to the conclusion that no verifiable traces of the lost literature of the second Temple period were to be found in Rabbinic literature of the late Classical or early Medieval periods. In summarizing his position, he stated: .."The Synagogue at the time of the Tannaim did not use any book younger than Daniel and there is not one apocalyptic writing that antedates this Biblical book," and again, "We have seen that in the entire Rabbinic literature of the first six centuries of the Common Era there is not one quotation from the now extant apocalyptic literature..."³. Based on Ginzberg's study, most modern scholars now accept the position that this literature was indeed lost to the greater Jewish community in the centuries following the destruction of the Second Temple. Thus, M. Stone⁴ writes: "It is very likely the case, then, that there is no simple or single explanation of the non-transmission of much of this literature by the Sages. Certain... factors may have led to the suppression of some of the works, but others, like Ben Sira, were known among the Sages (at least in a *florilegium*) and were positively regarded." Nickelsburg⁵ and the editors of the new edition of Schürer⁶ in their studies on the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal

² L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, (Philadelphia: JPS, 1920).

³ L. Ginzberg, "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue toward the Apocalyptic Eschatological Writings," *JBL* 41 (1922): 131ff

⁴ *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984): xxi.

⁵ George Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).

⁶ G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman <eds.>, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

books from the Second Temple period, do not directly address this question. However, in their remarks they do not acknowledge the authenticity of any of the Hebrew versions of this literature, with the exception of the Ben Sira fragments from the Cairo Genizah.

The second opinion, that these works continued to circulate within the Jewish community, was first voiced in 1242 by Matthew Paris⁷: "At this same time, Robert, bishop of Lincoln... accurately translated the 'Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs' from Greek into Latin. These had been for a long time unknown and hidden through the jealousy of the Jews, on account of the prophecies of the Saviour contained in them... and neither in the time of the blessed Jerome nor of any other holy interpreter, could the Christians gain an acquaintance with it, through the malice of the ancient Jews.." Paris explained that, at some point, the Greeks acquired this work, and translated it from the Hebrew, preserving it for the Christian community. Paris evidently believed that the Jewish community of his own era was unfamiliar with the book. However, he is equally convinced that it continued to circulate secretly for centuries, until discovered by the Greeks some time after Jerome.

A. Neubauer was similarly convinced that at least some of the works of this corpus survived in Jewish hands. In the 1870s, he discovered a text of the lost Hebrew version of the Book of *Tobit*. He wrote in his publication of this manuscript: "Accordingly, if we take into consideration the somewhat arbitrary proceedings of the Rabbi who adapted his text to the Midrash... we may venture to say that our Chaldee text in a more complete form was the original from

⁷ Matthew Paris, *Historia Anglorum*. (London, 1571): 801; as cited in Sinker, *The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, (Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1869): 1ff.

which the translation of the Vulgate was made."⁸ Neubauer believed that the Hebrew Tobit was well-known, and appeared in several versions: "[this text of the Hebrew *Tobit*] must be much older... since it is anterior to the Hebrew text published by us, which is believed to be from the fifth to the seventh century"⁹. Neubauer was joined in this belief by M. Gaster. Gaster was a scholar of folklore, Romanian literature, and a lecturer in Jewish literature at Oxford. It was his belief that a great many of the original Hebrew or Aramaic books labelled as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha had survived in Jewish hands. He went to great lengths to assemble what he believed to be the Semitic *Vorlagen* of that lost Hebrew and Aramaic literary corpus. To this end, he published Hebrew versions of *Judith*, the *Book of Biblical Antiquities*, the *Megillat Antiochus*, and others. Many of these supposed Hebrew and Aramaic originals were found in the *Sefer Zichronot* of Eliezer ben Asher Ha-Levi¹⁰. As in the case of Neubauer, Gaster does not offer any explanations of how these works remained in Jewish hands. K. Kohler also believed that this literature survived in Jewish hands. However, he went one step further than his predecessors and claimed that it did in fact influence Rabbinic literature. He maintained that traces of the "Pre-Talmudic Haggadah" are particularly evident in early Rabbinic literature, and that a close reading of the literature would reveal those traces. Following Kohler's lead, a number of scholars searched the corpus of Rabbinic literature

⁸ A. Neubauer, *Tobit* vii.

⁹ Ibid. ix.

¹⁰ Neubauer MS Cat. no. 2797. This ms. is generally referred to by Gaster's original title of *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. However it is clear that the entire manuscript constitutes a single work — a collection of Midrashim and excerpts from various minor works — which comprise a history of Creation, from its beginning through the coming of the Messiah. Consequently, I will refer to it hereafter by the title given by its compiler.

for such influences, including G. H. Box¹¹, Beer¹² and A. Yellin¹³, and published studies which claimed to reveal the use of *Jubilees*, *Ben Sira* and *Ahiqar* by the early Rabbis. These authors do not offer theories on the manner in which this literature came to influence the early Rabbinic literature, nor do they speculate on its disappearance.

S. Schechter likewise believed that certain literature circulated clandestinely in Jewish hands. Unlike other scholars, he believed that those who preserved this literature were sectarian Jews, descended from the Sadducees. In his opinion, this sect, which disappeared shortly after the destruction of the Second Temple, suddenly reappeared from obscurity in the eighth century, and drew strength from its corpus of long-hidden anti-Rabbinite literature¹⁴:

...besides the collection of the Books forming the Canon of the Old Testament, the Sect seems also to have considered certain "external writings," forming a part of the Pseudepigrapha. This can be said with certainty of the Book of Jubilees... The same may also be maintained with fair certainty of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs...¹⁵

Schechter cited his recent discoveries—the CD, the *Aramaic Levy* and the *Ben Sira* fragments—as proof for his position. These books provided evidence that the ancient Hebrew versions had survived into the twelfth century. Furthermore, the similarities between these books, the laws found in *Jubilees*, and the

¹¹ "Introduction to the Book of Sirach," in R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, I:297.

¹² B. Beer, *Buch der Jubileen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim*. (Leipzig, 1856).

¹³ Avinoam Yellin, *The Book of Ahiqar the Sage* (Jerusalem: 1938).

¹⁴ S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*.

¹⁵ *ibid*, 47.

practices of the Qaraïtes led him to believe in an unbroken tradition spanning more than 1000 years.

An entirely new position has arisen since the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is in the Dead Sea Scrolls that we find copies of the original *Tobit*, *Jubilees*, *Enoch* etc. These prove that the *Damascus Covenant*, some of the *Ben Sira* fragments and the *Aramaic Levi* from the Geniza are authentic. This is not true of the other Hebrew or Aramaic versions such as the *Tobit* and the additions to *Daniel* of Neubauer, or the *LAB* of Gaster. These were shown not to be original. Instead, they are retranslations of known versions in other languages. This is similar to some of the works attributed to Aristotle, the Greek text of which is lost, but which survive in Syriac, Hebrew or Arabic translations. In recent centuries they have been retranslated into Greek. This discovery has put to rest the question of the originality of these Hebrew and Aramaic works which reappear in the Middle Ages. The principal new questions become, first, Where did these texts which had been "lost" for centuries come from? Secondly, when and where did the remainder of these Apocryphal texts, which were regarded as Christian, and in the hands of the Christians, reenter the corpus of late medieval Jewish literature?

One theory which attempted to explain the reappearance of the literature in the Geniza was originally suggested by Otto Eissfeldt¹⁶. His article called attention to two previous finds in the area near Jericho. Both of these finds yielded significant Hebrew texts. From this hint, H. H. Rowley¹⁷ proposed a solution to the presence of Second Temple literature in the Cairo Geniza. It was

¹⁶ Otto Eissfeldt, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefunden hebräischen Handschriften," *TLZ* 74 (1949), 595-600.

¹⁷ H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952).

his belief that the letter of Timothy I, referred to above, supplies the answer to this question. As Timothy I related the discovery,

We have learned from trustworthy Jews, who just recently had been instructed as converts to Christianity, that ten years ago books were found in a cave [literally, a mountain-house] in the vicinity of Jericho. Here is the incident as they reported it. The dog of a certain Arab who was hunting, climbed into a cave in pursuit of some animal and did not return. When the master went to look for the dog, he came upon a small hollow [literally, a small house] inside the rocks, and many books were in it. The hunter then went up to Jerusalem and informed the Jews about this matter. Consequently, a large number of them came (from Jerusalem) and discovered books of the Old Testament as well as others written in the Hebrew script. Since the one who reported this incident to me was well-versed in literary matters, I asked him about various texts of our New Testament which are supposed to be drawn from the Old Testament, but which are not even mentioned in the Old Testament, neither in our Christian text nor in their Jewish text. And he told me that there are such texts, and that they can be found in those books which have been discovered (in the cave). After I heard the account from this catechumen, I went to the trouble of asking others besides him, and I received the very same story without variation.¹⁸

These authentic documents were discovered in a cave by the Jewish community, and were subsequently recopied and used by members of the Jewish community. This theory at once attempts to explain the silence of the early Rabbinic literature, and the sudden appearance of documents which substantially agree with their antecedents of nearly 1000 years earlier. This theory has been embraced and further strengthened with both literary and archaeological evidence. Writing on the discovery of the Cairo Geniza, P. Kahle¹⁹ elaborated: "Above all it is more than likely that the cave found in 800 was the same as that discovered anew under similar circumstances in 1947." Kahle based this conclusion on the absence of complete manuscripts in the majority of the caves. This led him to conclude that "most of the MSS once deposited in Qumran I were removed long

¹⁸ DiLella 82-3.

¹⁹ *The Cairo Geniza* <2nd edition>, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959): 16ff.

ago. It is very probable that this happened about the year 800."²⁰ Kahle also believed that the introduction of this new material wasa largely responsible for the rapid rise of Qaraism in the decades after their discovery: "But surely the only explanation of this success lies in the fact that the Ẕaraïtes had come into possession of old material which they studied eagerly and successfully, whereas the Rabbanite circles took little notice of it because it did not fit in with their teachings. This material would appear to have been the MS scrolls... from the cave near Jericho."²¹ Di Lella²² agreed wholly with this theory, and strengthened the archaeological evidence on the basis of the intact but empty jars discovered in cave II.

Jaquib al-Qirqisani (fl. ca. 900 C.E.) is the earliest medieval Jewish source who mentions the discovery of books in a cave. Leon Nemoy was the first to publish the complete text of Qirqisani's work, the *Book of Lights and Watch-Towers*. Nemoy regarded him as one of the greatest scholars of the Qaraite movement. His work, the *Book of Lights and Watch-Towers* included an extensive history of the various Jewish sects through his own era. In his book he included a description of a sect known as "magharians." Their name is derived from "Ma'ara"—מַעְרָה, the Hebrew word for "cave." They were called this

because their (sacred) books were found in a cave. One of them is the Alexandrian whose book is famous and (widely) known; it is the most important of the books of the Magharians. Next to it (in importance) is a small booklet entitled "The Book of Yaddua," also a fine work. As for the rest of the Magharian books, most of them are of no value and resemble mere tales.²³

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² op. cit.

²³ Leon Nemoy, "Al-Qirqisānī" 329.

Farther on, Qirqisani gives a description of the practices and beliefs of this sect:

The Magharians fix the beginnings of months by the appearance of the new moon. They adduce certain reasons in support of this (method); we shall mention them when we come to the discourse on the beginning of months and its indications. It is said that there are among them some who think that laughter is unlawful. Their interpretations of some passages in the Scriptures are altogether improbable and resemble foolish talk. Daūd ibn Marwān al-Muqammis says in one of his books that the Sadducees ascribe corporeality to God and understand all the Scriptural descriptions of Him which imply anthropomorphism in their literal sense. The Magharians are said to be opposed to this, i.e., they do not profess anthropomorphism; yet they also do not take these descriptions (of God) out of their literal meaning, but assert instead that these descriptions refer to one of the angels, namely to the one who created the world. As for Boethus who was, as we said above, the companion of Zadok, he used to say that the feast of Pentecost must fall on Sunday only, just as our coreligionists say.²⁴

Qirqisani states that in his time, ca. 937 C.E., the Magharians had disappeared along with the Sadducees:

Some of these sects have disappeared, e.g., the Magharians and the Sadducees; likewise there are left no more of the followers of Ismā'il al-'Ukbarī, and at the present time no person versed in speculation inclines towards his preaching...²⁵

In addition to Qirqisani, there were also several Muslim writers who appear to mention this sect. Shahrastāni (1076-1153) composed a history of religions titled *Kitāb al-Milal wan-Nihal*. In that book he described a sect known as the Maqāriba. DiLella, who translated and discussed this passage in his study of *Ben Sira* believed it to be a corruption of Maghariya. Shahrastāni wrote about them:

But one sect of the Maqāriba... claims that God spoke to the prophets, may peace be upon them, through the agency of an angel whom He had elected and whom He had given precedence over all creatures and had appointed viceroy over them. They say: "Every description of God in the Torah and in the rest of the Books is an account (given) on the authority of this angel... And it is stated that when Arius... says that the Messiah is God and is the most

²⁴ Ibid. 363-4.

²⁵ Nemoy, 391.

perfect one in the world, he takes this statement from the (Maqāribā); they preceded Arius by 400 years. They were men of asceticism and mortification.²⁶

As DiLella pointed out, this sect appeared to be contemporary with the residents of Qumran. However, he also noted that the doctrines do not agree with those ascribed to the Essenes by Josephus, nor is there any evidence of beliefs such as these found in the documents from Qumran and Nahal Heber.

Another Muslim writer who discussed the Magariba was al-Biruni (973-1050?), a highly regarded Muslim chronographer. He cited an earlier source, 'Abu - 'Isā al-Warrāq (fl ca. 875) on the Maqāribā. This sect seems to be much closer to the group which hid their books in the caves at Qumran:

'Abu - 'Isā al-Warrāq... reports in his *Kitāb al-Maqālāt* of a type of Jews, called the Maqāribā... who allege that feasts are not licit, save when the moon rises full on a Wednesday night, namely, the night following Tuesday's sunset, in the land of the Israelites. This is the beginning of the new year. From (the full moon) are calculated days and months; and according to it, the feasts follow on a cycle. For God the exalted One created the two major luminaries on a Wednesday. (The Maqāribā) likewise do not allow the Passover except on a Wednesday, nor do they impose the obligations and customs thereof, save upon one who dwells in the land of the Israelites.²⁷

This sect also closely resembles the sect described by Qirqisani. This identification becomes more certain when compared with Qirqisani's description of their calendrical practices:

...they say that the Bible names the two luminaries at the moment of their creation, "the large ones" [Gn 1,16]. This (creation) took place on a Wednesday, and there is no doubt that this was the first day of the month, and that they [the sun and the moon] were created at the limit of their magnitude, since He calls them the two large ones. When the moon is full, it is largest and greatest; and we know that when it is full, that day is the first day of the month.²⁸

²⁶ Di Lella 87.

²⁷ Di Lella 88.

²⁸ Di Lella 86.

It is clear from the emphasis on the full moon as the sign of the new month, and the centrality of Wednesday as well as the nearly identical names of the two sects that both of these authors are describing the same sect. That sect in turn was the same one which deposited the scrolls in the caves at Qumran.

One other source mentions the discovery of ancient manuscripts — the *Sefer Tamim* of Rabbi Moshe ben Hisdai "Tequ" (fl. ca. 1240). Unlike the earlier writers, who associated the Magarians with this discovery, Rabbi Moshe links them with Anan and claims that he and his followers forged them²⁹:

And so in the *Shiur Qoma* in which is written the *Alphabet of Rabbi Akiba*: "there is no end, nor surcease nor limit to the matter"; if this is authoritative, since it is not found in our Talmud (i.e. Babylonian), nor in the Palestinian Talmud, nor in the great Midrash collections. For there are books which the *minim* wrote to deceive everyone, such as the *Pereq Shira*. And at the end of it is written: 'anyone who contemplates this always will deserve such-and-such, and so-and-so and so-and-so agree.' And so likewise is that which is written in the *Book of the Name of the Limbs*. 'The right palm — thus is its name, and of the left — thus is its name.' And at the end, 'Everyone who knows this secret, Rabbi Ishmael said, I and Akiba agree in this matter, that in this world he will merit a good life.' And there is no reason to believe that they write this in order to strengthen their argument. For we have already heard from our Rabbis that Anan the Heretic (the *min*) and his associates wrote heretical and false books and buried them in the ground. And afterward, they were bringing them out and saying, 'thus we have found in the books of the ancient ones.'

This passage is significant in a number of respects. To begin with, all reference to the Magarians assign them to the period before the destruction of the Second Temple. No medieval author reports that they still exist. Furthermore, this

²⁹ R. Kirchheim, "The *Ketab Tamim* of Rabbi Moshe Tequ" 3:61-62: וכן בשעור קומה שכתוב במדרש א"ב דר' עקיבא "אין לדבר קץ ולא סוף ולא שעור", אמר הוא בר סמכא, כיון שלא נמצא בתלמודינו ולא בתלמוד ירושלמי ולא במדרשים הגדולים, כי יש ספרים שזייפו המינים להטעות את העולם כמו פרק שירה, וכתוב בסופו "כל מי שהוגה בו תמיד זוכה לכך וכך ופלוני ופלוני ערבים". וכן מה שכתוב בספר שם האברים. "כף הימין כך שמו ושל שמאל כך שמו". ובסוף הדברים: "כל מי שיודע רו זה אמר ר' ישמעאל אני ועקיבא ערבים בדבר שבעולם הוה הוא בחיים טובים". ואין להאמין, כי כותבים כך כדי להחזיק דבריהם. וכבר שמענו מרבותינו כי ענן המין וחביריו היו כותבין דברי מינות ושקר וטומנים בקרקע ואח"כ היו מוציאים אותם ואמרים כך מצאנו בספרים הקדמונים.

report of Rabbi Moshe states that Anan was the source of these sectarian writings. Anan ben David (fl. ca. 754-775) was revered by later Qaraites as the founder of this anti-Rabbanite movement. He lived at precisely the time that Timotheos I reported the discovery of the manuscripts hidden in caves. In fact Rabbi Moshe is the only source which links a discovery like the one mentioned in the letter of Timotheos I with sectarian Jews who lived in the late eighth century.

A new theory has been proposed recently by Joseph Dan, David Flusser and Martha Himmelfarb. These scholars argue that the non-canonical literature of the Second Temple disappeared among the Jews. In this, they agree with the first group of scholars. However, according to this view this material did not return to Jewish hands until the late middle ages. This approach was pioneered by J. Dan in his study of Medieval Jewish literature, *HaSippur haIvri b'yimei haBeynaim*,³⁰ Dan suggested three different paths by which this material entered into Jewish texts: a) directly, through Muslim sources, in Arabic b) directly from Christian sources, specifically Latin or Greek versions of the Apocrypha, and c) indirectly through the previous two sources. It was Dan's opinion that Jewish interest in Arabic, Latin and Greek literature was the result of Jews who wished to imitate both Muslim retelling of the Biblical stories and Christian court romances. According to Dan, these medieval authors were pioneers of both a new style of literature and a new method of looking to non-Jewish literature for sources and inspiration. Dan summed up his opinion by stating:

The history of the retelling of the Biblical narrative in the middle ages still requires a more comprehensive study—bibliographical, chronological, historical and literary— than that which was presented. However, there is no doubt that we have before us a collection of narratives which were composed throughout the entire middle ages, beginning from the Islamic conquests up through the

³⁰ Jerusalem: Keter Publishing, 1974.

Renaissance inclusive, the purpose of which was to fill the unique literary *geist* of those who lived during those generations, which was different from that of the earlier period...³¹

In 1981, following the publication of Dan's work, D. Flusser published the first critical edition of the *Josippon*, a medieval pseudo-history of the Second Temple period. Flusser adopted Dan's central thesis, which he had presented in his study of Medieval Jewish literature:

...there were some researchers who believed that original versions of compositions such as these [*Judith*, *Tobit*, *Jubilees* and the *Megillat Bnei Hashmonaim*] reemerged in the middle ages; a version which had been lost, and was preserved in the translations which had been produced by the Christian church. It is difficult to find evidence for the "underground" transmission of this Apocryphal material, which by-passed the Talmud and the Midrash, and was restored to life in the middle ages; although this is not impossible. It is certainly more likely that most of the material returned to Judaism from external, non-Jewish sources. So, for example, we find in the middle ages, in the tenth century, *Josippon*, which is a Hebrew literary creation of Joseph, the son of Mattithias (Josephus Flavius), of which not an echo remained in Judaism during the period of the Mishna and the Talmud, but which was returned to Judaism through contact with Christian scholars who believed in the writings of Josephus. To this day there are those who claim that the *Josippon* is the original Hebrew version of the writings of Joseph, the son of Mattithias, even though this claim is nonsense.³²

תולדותיו של הסיפור מחדש של הסיפור המקראי: 140: J. Dan, op. cit.
בימי-הביניים צריכות עדיין מחקר מקיף, ביבליוגרפיה, כרונולוגיה, היסטוריה וספרות, שטרם נעשה. אך אין ספק, כי לפנינו אוצר סיפורים, שנתחבר במשך ימי-הביניים כולם, מראשית כיבושי האיסלאם ועד תקופת הרנסנס ועד בכלל, שתכליתו היתה למלא צרכים רוחניים-סיפוריים המיוחדים לבני הדורות ההם ושונים מאלה של תקופות קודמות...

והיו אף חוקרים שסברו, כי לימי-הביניים נתגלגל הנוסח המקורי: 135: Ibid.
של חיבורים כאלה, נוסח שאבד וזכרו נשאר בתרגומים אשר אומצו על-ידי הכנסייה הנוצרית. קשה למצוא הוכחה למסורת 'תת-קרקעית' של חומר חיצוני זה, שעקפה כביכול את התלמוד והמדרש וקמה לתחייה בימי-הביניים; אם כן אין דבר זה מן הנמנע. קרוב יותר לוודאי שרוב החומר חזר אל היהדות ממקורות חיצוניים, לא-יהודיים. כך, למשל, מוצאים אנו בימי-הביניים, במאה העשירית, את ספר יוסיפון, שהוא עיבוד סיפורי עברי של כתביו של יוסף בן מתתיהו (יוספוס פלאוויוס), שלא עוררו הדים ביהדות בתקופת המשנה והתלמוד, אך חזרו ונתעוררו בספרות העברית על ידי המגע עם המשכילים הנוכריים שהיו אמונים על כתביו של יוספוס. עד היום יש טוענים כי יוסיפון הוא הנוסח העברי המקורי של כתביו של יוסף בן מתתיהו אך לטענה זו אין כל שחר.

Like Dan, Flusser believed that the author of the *Josippon* obtained his sources from western Christians. However he disagreed with Dan's opinion that the work was based directly upon the Greek Josephus, and demonstrated that it relied upon a medieval Latin paraphrase known as the *Hegessipus*:

We have said that if Josippon did know the *Wars* of Josephus, this knowledge was superficial and very poor, and certainly the book *The Jewish Wars* was not at hand while he was writing his book.³³

Flusser also agreed with Dan that the medieval Jewish community became acquainted with the Apocrypha through the Latin translation commonly known as the Vulgate. He stated with certainty that the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *Ben Sira*, 1 and 2 *Maccabees*, the *Additions to Daniel*, 4 *Ezra* and the *Additions to Esther* were all known from translations of the Latin. Flusser presented his position as known fact, without demonstrating his method in arriving in this conclusion. He also failed to discuss the evidence which directly contradicted his position, including the Syriac versions of the *Wisdom of Solomon* mentioned by Nahmanides and Azaryah dei Rossi, the *Additions to Daniel* used by Moshe haDarshan, or the Hebrew versions of *Ben Sira* known from the Geniza.

Flusser also examined a number of shorter medieval Hebrew works in his introduction. He cited these works as further proof for the late transmission of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha via Latin and Greek sources. As before, he adopted Dan's dating and treatment of them. He discussed the *Seder Olam*, the *Midrash Vayissau* and the *Life of Moses our Teacher*. Following Dan, he believed them to be examples of late medieval compositions, drawn from Greek and Latin sources. As in his discussion of the Apocryphal sources of the *Josippon*, Flusser did not adduce any proof for his dating of these materials. More-

³³ Flusser 2:131: אמרנו שאם יוסיפון הכיר רת ספר המלחמות ליוסיפוס, היתה זו ידיעה שטחית ורופפת מאוד ובוודאי שלא היה ספר מלחמות היהודים בידו בשעת כתיבת ספרו.

over, he ignored parallel texts which contradicted his conclusions both in date and in origin. For instance, Dan wrote about the *Seder Olam*,

The second composition [which was later than the *Josippon*], which included material the origin of which was from a foreign language, from the ancient period, is the composition known as the *Seder Olam*, which is preserved in the Jerahmeel ms. and also in a Hebrew ms. found in Paris³⁴. This composition includes interesting historical material, the source of which is in either Greek or Latin, and the *Josippon* mentions it explicitly... If so, the *Seder Olam* in its present form is later than *Josippon*, and at the latest from the twelfth century.³⁵

Flusser did not mention which "historical material" showed dependence upon Greek or Latin source material. More significantly, he failed to note that references found in the Talmud show that *Seder Olam* was considered a Tannaitic work already in the fifth century C.E. Similarly, he discussed the *Midrash Vayissau*, and claimed that it was younger than the *Josippon*, and drew upon Latin or Greek versions. Yet parallels to the *Midrash Vayissau* are found in the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer*³⁶ and the *Midrash on Psalms*³⁷ (a midrashic com-

³⁴ Paris ms. heb. 326.

³⁵ Flusser, 152: החיבור השני, הכולל חומר שמקורו לועזי, מן התקופה העתיקה, הוא החיבור הנקרא 'סדר עולם', שנשתמר הן בכ"י ירחמאל והן בכתב-יד עברי אחד, הנמצא בפאריס. חיבור זה כולל חומר היסטורי מעניין, שמקורו ביוונית או בלאטינית, וספר 'וסיפון נזכר בו במפורש... אם כן, בצורתו הנוכחית נכתב 'סדר עולם' זה אחרי 'וסיפון ולכל המאוחר במאה השתים-עשרה.

³⁶ See above.

³⁷ S. Buber, *Midrash Tehillim* (Vilna: Romm Press, 1881) 159-60.

ואויבי נתתה לי עורף פסוק זה מדבר ביהודה אמר ר' יהושע בן לוי מסורת אגדה יהודה הרג את עשו אימתי בשעה שמת יצחק אבינו הלכו עשו ויעקב וכל השבטים לקבור אותו שנאמר ויקברו אותו עשו ויעקב בניו (בראשית לה כט) והיו כולן במערת המכפלה יושבין ובוכין והשבטים עומדין וחולקין כבוד ליעקב ויוצאין חוץ למערה כדי שלא יהא יעקב בוכה ומתבזה לפניהם השחיל עשו עצמו ונכנס למערה ואמר עכשיו אני הורגו לאחר שמת אבי שנאמר יקרבו ימי אבל אבי ואהרגה את יעקב אחי (שם כז מא) נסתכל יהודה וראה שעשו נכנס אחריו ואמר מיד הוא הורג לאבא בפנים מיד השחיל וצף הוא בעצמו ונכנס ונמצא עשו שהיה מבקש להרוג את יעקב מיד עמד יהודה והורגו מאחריו ולמה לא הרגו מנגד פניו לפי שהיה קלסתר פניו דומה לאביו לפיכך חלק לו כבוד והרגו מאחריו והוא שיעקב אביו מברכו ירך בעורף אויבך (בראשית מט ח) ולמה מברכו בעורף שכמה וכמה נתחבט יהושע לפני הקב"ה שיתן לו את העורף ולא נתן לו שכן כתיב בי אדני מה אומר אחרי אשר הפך ישראל עורף (יהושע ז ח) אף על פי כן לא הועיל כלום לפי שנתן העורף לשבטו של יהודה שנאמר ירך בעורף אויבך (בראשית מט ח):

Ps. 18:41: *You have given me the neck of my enemies:* This verse

pilation on Psalms from the Talmudic period). Both of these sources are at least 500 years earlier than Flusser's suggested date of the eleventh century. Because of Flusser's assumptions and his failure to account for contradictory evidence it is difficult to accept his theories on the transmission of this literature.

Himmelfarb also investigated this problem, and reached conclusions similar to those of Dan and Flusser. In her first examination of the use of the Pseudepigrapha in Rabbinic texts, she wrote:

The various works of Moshe haDarshan's school show points of contact with the pseudepigrapha including the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and again Albeck makes the claim that here is direct dependence on the pseudepigrapha. He points to one parallel between Midrash Aggadah and Jubilees that is quite striking. The three hundred years that Enoch spent with the angels in Midrash Aggadah is exactly equivalent to the six jubilees he spends with them in Jubilees 4.21.

How these ancient materials [i.e. *Jubilees* and 1 *Enoch*] come to re-enter the mainstream of Jewish literary activity is a question which demands serious attention. The claim that actual texts of Jubilees and Enoch were available seems to be based on no evi-

refers to Judah. Rabbi Joshua ben Levi said: "There is a legendary tradition that Judah killed Esau. When? At the time when our father Isaac died, Esau and Jacob, along with all the tribes [i.e. the 12 sons of Jacob] went to bury him, as Scripture says, *And Esau and Jacob and his sons buried him* (Gen. 35:29). And they were all sitting and weeping in the Cave of Machpelah, and the tribes were standing and showing honor to Jacob. And they were going outside of the cave, so that Jacob would not cry and be ashamed before them. And Esau entered in the cave, and said, "now I shall kill him, since my father has died," as Scripture says, *The days of mourning for my father have arrived; now I shall kill Jacob my brother* (Gen. 27:41). Judah looked and saw that Esau had entered behind him, and he said "He is going to kill father straight away." Immediately Judah arose and killed him from behind. And why did he kill him from behind? Because the appearance of his face resembled that of his father. For this reason he had consideration for the honor of his father, and killed him from behind. And this is just as his father Jacob blessed him: *Your hand shall be upon the neck of your enemy* (Gen. 49:8). And why did he bless him with *the neck*? For how much did Joshua strive before the Holy One Blessed be He, that he should give him the neck, but He did not give it to him; for thus it is written: *By myself, O Lord! What can I say, since Israel has turned their neck* (Joshua 7:8), even though it availed him nothing, since he had given the neck to the tribe of Judah, as it says, *Your hand shall be upon the neck of your enemy* (Gen.49:8)...

dence other than certain points of contact between the midrashim and the pseudepigrapha. These claims must be discounted until better grounds are found for arguing them.³⁸

Himmelfarb suggested that the Rabbis did not have copies of these Pseudepigraphic works before them. Instead, she theorized that Moshe haDarshan borrowed from Muslim and Christian sources which had reworked versions of these texts. She believed that Moshe haDarshan was properly situated culturally and geographically to receive both traditions simultaneously:

Several approaches to the search for avenues of transmission suggest themselves. One is to compare what these midrashim seem to have received from the pseudepigrapha with what the Byzantine chronographers know. Another is to search for a possible Muslim connection. Southern France is not an unlikely place for such contact, and the Arabic literature has yet to be explored for what it can tell us about the survival of traditions known to us from the pseudepigrapha in Islam. The presence of Hebrew and Aramaic fragments of a form of the Testaments in the Cairo Genizah has not yet been adequately explained.³⁹

In this article, her earliest, Himmelfarb does not mention Dan's work on the subject. Instead, she appears to have arrived at the same conclusion independently.

A few years later, in 1984, Himmelfarb followed up on her earlier suggestion that additional research be done into this question. Although she continued to express skepticism over the possibility that certain pseudepigraphal works had survived in Jewish hands, she entertained the thought as worthy of suggestion:

...the Book of Jubilees, which leaves traces in several post-talmudic works, including R. Moses', was preserved not by European Christians but by the Ethiopic church. Thus it appears that there are grounds for supposing internal Jewish transmission of Jubilees, although the process of transmission cannot yet be described. In some instances medieval Jewish works seem to

³⁸ Martha Himmelfarb, "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature" in *SBL Conference Papers: 1978* 1:262-3.

³⁹ Ibid.

reflect knowledge not of the pseudepigraphic texts that have come down to us, but of works on which those texts drew. That is, the authors of the medieval works seem to have had access to the sources of the surviving texts.⁴⁰

and:

...I suspect that further study would point toward internal Jewish transmission as the means by which elements of the Book of Jubilees, for example, reached R. Moses.⁴¹

Despite acknowledging that authentic sources might indeed stand behind certain medieval material, Himmelfarb nevertheless set out to demonstrate Dan's hypothesis. She began with the assumption that Moshe haDarshan was responsible for the introduction of pseudepigraphic sources into Jewish literature. Because of her preliminary presumption, Himmelfarb sometimes had to look for tenuous evidence to support Dan's theory. Afterwards, she had to find a way in which this material could have reached Moshe haDarshan's hands:

But R. Moses' knowledge of the Testaments could not have come from his Christian neighbors in eleventh-century Narbonne. The Testaments seems to have been known widely among Greek-speaking Christians throughout the Middle Ages, but it was not known to Christians in Western Europe until about 1235, when Robert Grossetest, bishop of Lincoln, imported to England from the library of Michael Choniates (Acominatus) in Byzantium the single manuscript from which the Latin and all descendent vernacular versions derive.

I shall argue that the conclusion that R. Moses knew the Testaments as transmitted by Christians cannot be avoided despite the difficulties that it involves...⁴²

Indeed, at times Himmelfarb's evidence is weak, and occasionally is no more than mere speculation. She offered the following hypothesis as the way that the Greek version could have come into Moshe haDarshan's hands:

⁴⁰ Himmelfarb, "R. Moses the Preacher" 57.

⁴¹ Ibid. 78.

⁴² M. Himmelfarb, "R. Moses the Preacher and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *AJSReview* 9(1984):59.

R. Moses lived in Provence. The place closest to Provence where the Testaments is likely to have been known is southeastern Italy, which then formed part of the Byzantine Empire. Byzantine Italy contained several flourishing Jewish communities. By the mid-ninth century the town of Oria was a center of talmudic study, and after its decline, it was replaced by Bari and Otranto. The glory of Bari's reputation is indicated by the fact that the rabbis of Ibn Daud's story of the four captives came from there. Bari was also the seat of an archbishop, which suggests a certain amount of Christian learning as well, and thus possibly the availability of a manuscript of the Testaments.

There is evidence for contact between the Jews of Provence and the Jews of Lucca and Rome in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and these northern Italian communities may have served to link Byzantine Italy to Provence. Nathan b. Yehiel of Rome, the compiler of the *'Arukh*, was a student of R. Moses the Preacher, and he seems also to have studied with Moses Kalfo of Bari. Through such channels a Hebrew translation of the Testaments or of excerpts from the Testaments might have reached Narbonne, for it seems reasonable to suppose that the translation was made by a Byzantine Jew, who would have known Greek better than a Jew from Provence.⁴³

Himmelfarb herself acknowledged that this argument is more speculation than proof. Nevertheless, it formed the basis for her later treatment of this problem.

In 1994, Himmelfarb again turned her attention to the problem of the transmission of *Jubilees*. In her article "Some Echoes of *Jubilees* in Medieval Hebrew Literature,"⁴⁴ she returned to her original position on this work: "The original language of *Jubilees* was Hebrew, but like most of the literature of the Second Temple period, it was not transmitted by Jews into the Middle Ages."⁴⁵ Himmelfarb built upon the foundation she laid in her previous study on Moshe haDarshan and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. She reiterated her hypothesis that Moshe haDarshan received his material from Byzantine Greek sources in Southeastern Italy:

⁴³ Ibid. 73-4.

⁴⁴ In *Tracing the Threads* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) edited by J. C. Reeves, 115-141.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 115.

...the *Testaments* was not available in western Europe until the middle of the thirteenth century. Thus R. Moses could not have found the work in the hands of his neighbors in Provence. But the *Testaments* was undoubtedly available in the Byzantine empire. We know that there was contact between the Jews of Provence and the Jews of Lucca and Rome, and I suggested that these northern Italian communities served as a conduit between Provence and the Jewish communities in the Byzantine-ruled southeastern portion of the Italian peninsula. We have confirmation that such contact was possible in the person of Nathan b. Yehiel of Rome, the compiler of the *Arukh*, who was a student of R. Moses and seems also to have studied with Moses Kalfo of Bari, a town of Byzantine Italy that was both a center of Jewish learning and the seat of an archbishop.⁴⁶

Himmelfarb, convinced that this was indeed the method of transmission of the *Testaments*, went on to demonstrate that the same route was the most likely source of Moshe haDarshan's citations of *Jubilees* as well: "An inventory of the passages dependent on *Jubilees* in medieval Hebrew texts suggest a direction for exploration: with the exception of some of the lists, all draw on passages in *Jubilees* that were used by the Byzantine chronographers."⁴⁷ Himmelfarb recognized one problem with this theory: Moshe haDarshan reveals a better knowledge of *Jubilees* than any extant Byzantine chronicler. To solve this problem, she proposed an intermediate collection of Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal texts:

Adler argues that the Byzantine chronicles drew not on the earlier chronicles, but on collections of excerpts from ancient sources on various subjects of interest to the chronographers. There is evidence for such collections of differing opinions in the works of both Syriac and Byzantine chronographers, who sometimes cite a variety of opinions on a particular subject. Even the collections did not draw directly on the ancient Jewish works, but rather on early chronicles such as those of Julius Africanus and Panodorus.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Ibid. 116.

⁴⁷ Ibid. 117.

⁴⁸ Ibid. 117.

According to Himmelfarb, a Jew living in southeastern Italy discovered one of these collections and translated it into Hebrew. This Hebrew translation was brought to southern France, where it was adopted by Moshe haDarshan and incorporated into his anthology.

This argument is plagued with problems. To begin with, Himmelfarb offers no manuscript evidence at all to confirm the presence of either the *Testaments* or *Jubilees* in Byzantine Italy. Nor does she offer literary evidence. The basis for her argument is the fact that Bari was "the seat of an archbishop, which suggests a certain amount of Christian learning as well, and thus possibly the availability of a manuscript of the Testaments." Furthermore, having conjectured the existence of some text, for which no proof whatsoever exists, she then creates a route by which this imagined text might have travelled. Here too there exists an inconsistency: Rabbi Nathan b. Yehiel went to Provence to study. It is certainly questionable whether he brought texts with him to share with his teacher! Furthermore, Nathan b. Yehiel was from Rome, not southeastern Italy. Himmelfarb does not offer any method by which material from Byzantine Italy might have travelled to northern Italy. Finally she proposed an earlier "compilation" which was translated into Hebrew, and upon which Moshe haDarshan relied. However, there is no literary evidence for such a compendium, nor is such a work ever mentioned by either the Greek or the Syriac chroniclers.

Beyond these inconsistencies is the fact that Himmelfarb completely ignored an extensive body of evidence which renders her hypothesis unnecessary, and in certain cases contradicts it. Himmelfarb argued for the transmission of Greek texts from Byzantine Italy to northern Italy, across Europe and into southern France. While absolutely no positive evidence exists

for this mode of transmission of Greek texts, there is an extensive literature demonstrating the movement of Greek texts to Babylonia, Spain and southern France through the Syriac-speaking Christian communities of Babylonia, Persia and northern India. O'Leary, in his thorough study *How Greek Science Passed to the Arabs*, demonstrated that Greek mathematical, medical, geometrical and philosophical texts were translated between the sixth and tenth centuries into Syriac, and from that language into Arabic. Some of the secondary translations from Syriac to Arabic were done by Jews—most notably the *Almagest*, possibly translated by Sahl ibn Rabban at-Tabari⁴⁹.

Himmelfarb also presumed that Moshe haDarshan was the first Jewish author to use some form of *Jubilees* and the *Testaments*. However, as we have seen, it is certain that the *Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Midrash on Psalms* both used traditions found in *Jubilees* and the *Testament of Judah* centuries before Moshe haDarshan, in either Babylonia or Palestine. Furthermore another ancient book, the *Book of Asaph*, refers to the traditions found in *Jubilees*. This work is a medical treatise which claims to be a copy of a book of medical cures given by the angel Raphael—whose name means "God Heals"—to Noah, and from Noah to Shem. Himmelfarb recognized that the tradition cited in this work contradicted her theory.

Himmelfarb accounted for this problem by assigning an extremely late date to the *Book of Asaph*, attributing it to the same time, place and cultural milieu as the *Josippon*: "...the attribution of the *Book of Asaph* would be another instance of the willingness of the Jews in Byzantine Italy to borrow

⁴⁹ O'Leary, 158: "Another tradition represents the translation of the *al-Majisti* was made by *Sahl ibn Rabban at-Tabari*, a native of Marw and a Jew as his name *ibn Rabban* 'the rabbi's son' denotes..."

from Christians in order to reclaim what they took to be theirs."⁵⁰ Himmelfarb relied upon the research of E. Lieber⁵¹ for her date and location of composition of Asaph's work. For her part, Lieber rejected the previous scholarship of Steinschneider, Venetianer and S. Muntner who had all examined the work closely. She contradicts them with only a single sentence: "...despite assertions that the work was mentioned by others at much earlier dates, I have so far been unable to corroborate any indubitable reference before about 1200."⁵²

Lieber does not describe her rationale for rejecting references found in early sources like the *Al-Hawi*⁵³, which—according to Muntner—mentions an "Assaf the Jew" as a source. Nor did she explain why she rejected a connection between a book called the *Book of Medicine of Shem ben Noah* by Salmon b. Jeruham,⁵⁴ an early-tenth century opponent of R. Saadya Gaon, and our *Book of Asaph*, which claims to be just such a text:

1. This is the book of remedies that the ancient sages copied from the book of Shem, the son of Noah. It was handed down to Noah on Mt. Lubar, one of the mountains of Ararat, after the flood. 2. For in those days the spirits of the bastards began to attack Noah's children, to lead them astray and to cause them to err, to injure them and to strike them with illness and pains and with all kinds of disease that kill and destroy human beings. 3. Then all Noah's children went, together with their children, and related their afflictions.

⁵⁰ Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes" 135.

⁵¹ Elinor Lieber, "Asaf's *Book of Medicines*: A Hebrew Encyclopedia of Greek and Jewish Medicine, Possibly Compiled in Byzantium on An Indian Model," in *Dumbarton Oaks Symposium on Byzantine Medicine* (Dumbarton Oaks: 1983) 233-249.

⁵² Ibid. 237.

⁵³ written by "the brilliant Persian-Arabic physician Razi" around the "end of the ninth, beginning of the tenth century". S. Muntner, "The Antiquity of Asaph the Physician and His Editorship of the Earliest Hebrew Book of Medicine," in *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* XXV(1951):123.

⁵⁴ "In 920 R. Salmon, the Son of Jeroham, quotes the Book of Medicine of Shem, the Son of Noah, and it is clear that he means the book of Asaph (Steinschneider, *Jew. Lit.*, 1857, 301)" Ibid. 124.

tions to Noah their father and told him about their children's pains. 4. Noah was troubled, for he realized that it was because of human transgression and their sinful ways that they were afflicted with all kinds of sickness and disease...⁵⁵

Lieber rejected the identification of Asaph as a real medical writer from Mesopotamia, as Steinschneider, Venetianer and Muntner had believed. As proof, she mentioned another work attributed to an "Asaph the writer and historian of the Hebrews." This reference is found in a fragment of a Syriac translation of a treatise by a Greek philosopher named "Andronicus the Wise, the Philosopher and the Learned." It was first published by A. Mingana in 1917.⁵⁶ Mingana did not believe that this Asaph should be identified with the author of the *Book of Medicines*. Andronicus' work cited Asaph's description of the Zodiac, and Asaph's identification of them with Jewish rather than Pagan figures:

Asaph the writer and the historian of the Hebrews explains and teaches clearly the history of all these, but does not write and show them with Greek names, but according to the names of the sons of Jacob. As to the effects and influences of these *στοιχεῖα* he, too, enumerates them fully without adding or diminishing anything, but in simply changing in a clear language their names into those of the Patriarchs. He begins them in the Aramaic language and puts at the head Taurus, which he calls "Reuben." After it comes Aries, which they call "Simeon." After it comes Pisces, which they call "Levi." After it comes Aquarius, which they call "Issachar." After it comes Capricornus, which they call "Naphtali." After it he sketches a rider while shooting, and calls him "Gad," and he is analogous with the Kirek of the Greeks. After it comes Scorpio, which he calls "Dan." After it he mentions Libra, which he calls "Asher." After it he mentions Virgo, whom he calls "Dinah." After it (comes) Leo, which he calls "Judah." Then he sketches Cancer, which he calls "Zebulun."

⁵⁵ Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes" 129.

⁵⁶ A. Mingana, "Some Early Judaeo-Christian Documents in the John Rylands Library. Syriac Texts," in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 4(1917-18):59-118.

After it he mentions Gemini, whom he calls "Ephraim" and "Manasseh."⁵⁷

Mingana examined several possibilities in attempting to identify this "Asaph the Historian." He rejected the possibility that Asaph was a corruption of "Josephus," noting: "The quotation... is not found in Josephus, and probably Josephus did not write in Aramaic. Further, Syriac writers transcribe rightly Josephus' well-known name as *Yusiphus*."⁵⁸ Mingana also considered the possibility that this Asaph and "Asaph Judaeus" were one and the same. However he rejected this identification as well, noting that Asaph Judaeus lived in the late middle ages, while his fragment of Andronicus the Wise could not be later than the fourth century C.E. This led Mingana to propose a real historian named Asaph, "a Jewish astronomer, historian and physician... living in the centuries immediately preceding or following the Christian era."⁵⁹

In contrast to Mingana, Lieber suggested that "Asaph" really was a pseudepigraphic appellation for "Josephus." As proof, she cited several manuscripts of the *Book of Medicines* which substitute the name "Yoseph" for "Asaph." She went even further, proposing a reason that a Jewish author would choose such an obscure name for a pseudepigraphic work:

...the *Book of Medicines* was not attributed directly to Josephus, not even in his role as sage, astrologer, or healer. His name was

⁵⁷ Ibid. 89:

תשעיתיהון דהלין נהיראית ממשק אף מלף אסף ספרא מעהדנא דעבריא כד לא
הוא בשמהא דיוניא רשם ומחוא אלא על מנינא דשמהא דבני יעקוב. סעורותא דין
וכלה מעבדנותהון דילהון דסתוכיא הלין שויאית אמר אף הו כד מדם לא מוסף אומבצר
אלא אן כד משחלף שמהיהון לדאבהתא במלתא גליתא כד משרא אף הו ארמאית וסאם
ברשא תורא ומשמה דוביל [sic] ובתרה אמרא וקרין לה שמעון ובתרה הוהא וקרין לה
לוי ובתרה דולא וקרין לה איסכר ובתרה סים גדיא ולה קרין נפתלי ומן בתרה רשם
רכבא כד כשת וקרא לה גד [sic] הנון דין כירך [sic] דיוניא ומן בתרה עקרבא ולה קרא
דן מן בתרה אמר מסאתא וקרא לה אשיר ותוב אמר בתולתא וקרא לה דינא ובתרה
אדיא וקרא לה יהודא ותוב רשם סרתנא וקרא לה דבולון ובתר הנא אמר תאמא וקרא
להון אפרים ומנשא.

⁵⁸ Mingana, 86.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 87.

transformed into "Asaf," with its venerable connotations, in the Bible and elsewhere, as sage, astrologer and healer through divinatory powers.

This is an exoteric hypothesis but, in the Jewish tradition of *melit-sah*, so prevalent in the *Book of Medicines*, it may well find support in a Biblical play upon words. For Genesis 30 seems to furnish still another association between the names Yosef and Asaf—perhaps even in a "medical" context. According to verses 1—8, Rachel was barren, and her first two sons were in fact borne by her maid. Finally, however, God granted her a son of her own, upon which she said (verse 23), in the words of the Authorized Version: "God has taken away my reproach," and in a less picturesque, literal translation: "God has gathered up (*asaf*) my shame." The next verse continues: "And she called his name Joseph (*Yosef*) saying: God adds (*yosef*) to me another son." And when associated with the *Josippon*, it seems to indicate to the reader "in the know" that the past "shame" of Josephus should now also be forgiven, even though his works are still ascribed to "another son," that is, to another Yosef [i.e. Yosef ben Gorion, the reputed author of the *Josippon*].⁶⁰

She also noted another medieval Christian text, this one composed in the late middle ages in Latin by a Christian monk. This text was also attributed to an "Asaph." Based upon these three different works, Lieber suggested that a pseudepigraphal tradition grew up around Josephus in Christian circles. Among the Christians, "Christian legends representing Josephus as sage, astrologer, diviner, and even healer, were current in Europe before the tenth century and for hundreds of years thereafter."⁶¹

However, there is a Syriac source which cites both Asaph and Josephus, and distinguishes clearly between the two of them. Since these citations have not been introduced into the literature, I will reproduce them here. They are taken from the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian,⁶² which was written during the last quarter of the twelfth century in Antioch. All of the citations of Asaph

⁶⁰ Lieber 248-9.

⁶¹ Ibid. 247.

⁶² J. B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien Patriarche Jacobite D'Antioche* (Paris: 1899).

refer to the period before Abraham. The first mention does no more than state that Asaph agrees with another source, the *Chronicle of Menandros the Magus*:

The total number of years of the reign of Nimrod is 69 years according to the chronicle of Menandros the magus. And likewise in the second book of Asaph, as it says, "And the crown of kingship was transferred."⁶³

The second reference to Asaph relates the transfer of esoteric knowledge from Serug to Nahor:

Serug taught Nahor the religion of the Chaldeans and divination and to reckon the signs of the heavens, as Asaph records in his book.⁶⁴

The final references are two tables listing the lives of Adam and the subsequent generations before Abraham:

From the first book of Asaph:

In the 135th year of Mahalalel Adam died.
In the 28th year of Enoch, Seth died.
In the 13th year of Methushael, Enosh died.
In the 61st year of Lamech, Kenan died.
In the 33rd year of Lamech, Enoch was translated.
In the 34th year of Noah, Mehalalel died.
In the 365th year of Noah, Jared died. In the 60th year, Methushelach died. Asaph makes known that Methushelach perished in the waters of the flood along with the descendants of Cain.
In the 74th year of Shalach, Noah died.
In the 156th year of Shalach, Shem died.
In the 34th year of Ever, Arpachshad died.⁶⁵

From the seventh book of Asaph:

Adam was 230 years old when he fathered Seth.
Seth was 205 years old when he fathered Enosh.

⁶³ Ibid. IV.10: שניא דמלכותה דנמרוד ס"ט איך מכתבנותא דמננדרוס מגושא ואף תוב בכתבא דתרין דאסף הכות אמר. ודכלילא דמלכותא זקירא איתוהי הוא..

⁶⁴ Ibid. IV.12: סרוג דין אלף לנחור דחלתהון דכלדיא ולמקצם ולמחשבו באתותא דשמיא איך דאסף מדכר בכתבה.

⁶⁵ Ibid. 14:

מן ספרא קדמיא דאסף שנת קלה דמהללאל מית אדם. שנת כ"ח דחנוך מית שית. שנת י"ג דמתושל מית אנוש. שנת ס"א למך מית קינן. שנת ל"ג דלמך אתחטף חנוך. שנת ל"ד דנוח מית ירד. שנת ס' מית מתושלח. מודע אסף דבמיא דטופנא אבד מתושלח עם בני קינן. שנת עד דשלח מית נוח. שנת קנ"ו דשלח מית שים. שנת ל"ד דעבר מית ארפכשד.

Enosh was 190 years old when he fathered Kenan.
 Kenan was 130 [sic—170] years old when he fathered Mehalalel.
 Mehalalel was 165 years old when he fathered Jared.
 In the 40th year of Jared, the first 1000 years were completed.
 Jared was 162 years old when he fathered Enoch.
 Enoch was 160 years old when he fathered [Me]thushelach.
 Completed.⁶⁶

There is also one citation which may have come from Asaph, but is not directly attributed to him. However, Chabot believed that it was a continuation of the chronicle of Asaph, which ends on the previous page.

And it is written concerning Kenan that he discovered divination, and augury and magic and he worshipped them as gods. And during the building of the Tower [of Babel], in the 140th year he died.⁶⁷

Chabot believed that the Chronicle of Asaph was a composition of Jewish origin containing legendary material.⁶⁸ It would appear that the Asaph cited here was an early chronographer. It is impossible to determine from the nature of his citations whether he was Jewish or Christian, or a Judeo-Christian. It is also impossible to state with any certainty that this Asaph and Asaph "the writer and the Historian of the Jews" are identical. However, it is difficult to believe that there were in fact two authors from the same era with the name Asaph, who both wrote histories about the Biblical period. What is remarkable about this Asaph are his sources. In particular he seems to know the book of *Jubilees*. One statement in particular follows *Jubilees* almost word-for-word: the com-

⁶⁶ Ibid. 15:

מכתבנותא דשבע ודאסף אדם בר ר"ל שנין ילד לשית. שית בר ר"ה שנין ילד לאנוש. אנוש בר ק"צ שנין ילד לקינן. קינן בר ר"ל שנין ילד למהללאל. מהללאל בר קס"ה שנין ילד לירד. בשנת מ' לירד שלם אלפא קדמיא. ירד בר קס"ב שנין ילד לחנוך. חנוך בר ק"ס שנין ילד לתושלת. שלם

⁶⁷ Ibid. 16 (top of column 3):

כתיב מטל קינן. דהוא אשכח כלדיותא ונחש וקצם ואסתגד איך אלהא וקם בנינא דמגדלא ק"ם מית קינן.

⁶⁸ Ibid. I:xxvii.

ment concerning Nahor's instruction by Serug. This is found in Jubilees 11:6-8:

She gave birth to Nahor for him [i.e. Serug] during the first year of the week. He grew up and settled in Ur — in the one that is the Ur of the Chaldeans. His father taught him the studies of the Chaldeans: to practice divination and to augur by the signs of the sky.⁶⁹

Asaph's citation almost certainly represents a direct citation of this passage from *Jubilees*.

Thus, it appears that there was at least one authentic Asaph, who was distinct from Josephus. This Asaph was the author of a chronicle which drew upon a number of sources, including *Jubilees*. He also may have been a source for the later "Asaph Judaeus," who also cited an authentic tradition from *Jubilees*. Or he may have been the author to whom the *Book of Medicines* was attributed pseudepigraphically. Regardless, it is clear that Lieber's proposed solution linking these various figures with Josephus cannot be accepted without a great deal more evidence. This in turn weakens Himmelfarb's argument considerably. For it is evident that "Asaph the Historian of the Jews" knew *Jubilees* as a source no later than the Talmudic period, long before Moshe haDarshan.

In conclusion, there have been four theories proposed to date. The first group believed that the Rabbis successfully suppressed all extra-canonical books from the Second Temple period. Ample evidence exists to disprove this claim. The second theory advanced the idea that these texts continued to circulate among a small circle of Jews—Orthodox or sectarian—and that they emerged into the mainstream at the end of the middle ages. There is a good deal of evidence which would support this theory, including the *Ben Sira* manuscripts, the

⁶⁹ J. C. Vanderkam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Louvain: E. Peeters, 1989) I:65-6.

Book of Hagu, Asaph's citations of *Jubilees* and the Midrash Vayissau. The third group of scholars have proposed the sudden recovery of certain books from the Second Temple period following their discovery in a cave. There is also significant evidence to support this view. That evidence includes literary references as well as archeological proof. Yet this theory certainly cannot account for all of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal works which emerge in the late middle ages. Nor does it account for books which are clearly retranslations from other languages. The final theory is the modern proposal that nearly all of these works were translated back into Hebrew from Latin and Greek during the late middle ages through the Renaissance. This proposal is the weakest of the four. Considerable evidence exists to refute the arguments of those who support this view, and those who hold it readily acknowledge that it is highly speculative. Given the strengths and weaknesses of these various approaches, a solution may be proposed which will adequately explain the seemingly sudden reappearance of this corpus of literature.

Chapter 6

Proposed Solution

It is now clear that all Jews did not immediately purge their literature of all extra-canonical sources following the destruction of the Second Temple. At a minimum, *Jubilees*, *Enoch*, *Ben Sira* and *Pseudo-Philo* continued to circulate in Jewish hands. Indeed, while it seems that these books never were revered among the followers of Rabbinic Judaism, their absence from Rabbinic texts may not have been due to an effort to suppress a tradition. Rather, it may have been the continuation of the literary traditions of the Pharisees. On the other hand, it is clear that these books were held in high esteem by various Jewish sectarian movements. It is likely that some of these movements and their books survived the destruction of the Second Temple. Several non-Rabbinic sources appear to be witnesses to the corpus of the Pharisees and other sectarian movements which flourished around the time of the destruction of the Second Temple.

Josephus, who wrote his histories of the Jewish people in the years following the destruction of the Second Temple, described three major parties which existed in Israel during his lifetime:

Jewish philosophy, in fact takes three forms. The followers of the first school are called Pharisees, of the second Sadducees, of the third Essenes...¹

Among the Essenes, Josephus identifies two subdivisions. The first are those "who profess to foretell the future, being versed from their early years in holy books, various forms of purification and apothegms of prophets; and seldom, if

¹ Thackeray, *Josephus: The Jewish War* (London: Harvard University Press, 1927) 369 (=Josephus Wars II:119)

ever, do they err in their predictions."² Josephus appears to be describing works like the *Book of Hagu* (also called the *Vision of Hagu*) and *1 Enoch*, both of which are featured prominently in the literature of the sect at Qumran. Indeed, the medieval *Book of Hagu* seems to be just such a work of prognostication described both by Josephus and in the *Damascus Covenant*. The second subdivision are those who "differ[ed] from them in [their] views on marriage. They think that those who decline to marry cut off the chief function of life, the propagation of the race... in the bath the women wear a dress, the men a loin-cloth."³

The second major sect identified by Josephus are the Pharisees. He described them briefly:

...the Pharisees, who are considered the most accurate interpreters of the laws, and hold the position of the leading sect, attribute everything to Fate and to God; they hold that to act rightly or otherwise rests, indeed, for the most part with men, but that in each action Fate co-operates. Every soul, they maintain, is imperishable, but the soul of the good alone passes into another body, while the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment.⁴

Based on this description, it is not possible to identify which books, if any, were in use among the Pharisees. One clue might be the comment that they believed that "the soul of the good passes into another body." However, there are no Jewish books known from the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha or the discoveries in Qumran or Nahal Hever which describe reincarnation. Most likely, this is a reference to the doctrine of bodily resurrection, in which the soul of the righteous is restored to those who have died, as is described in the vision of Ezekiel. The final sect are the Sadducees, who

² Ibid. 385 (=Josephus *Wars* II:160).

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid. 386-7 (=Josephus *Wars* II:162-3)

do away with Fate altogether, and remove God beyond, not merely the commission, but the very sight, of evil. They maintain that man has the free choice of good or evil, and that it rests with each man's will whether he follows the one or the other. As for the persistence of the soul after death, penalties in the underworld, and rewards, they will have none of them.⁵

Again, it is impossible to determine from this description what books were regarded as canonical among the Sadducees. However, in the *Jewish Antiquities* Josephus distinguished between the literary traditions of the Pharisees and the Sadducees in the time of Hyrcanus:

For the present I wish merely to explain that the Pharisees had passed on to the people certain regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the Laws of Moses, for which reason they are rejected by the Sadducaean group, who hold that only those regulations should be considered valid which were written down (in Scripture), and that those which had been handed down by former generations need not be observed.⁶

Josephus' explanation implies that the Pharisees possessed a body of oral traditions, which were legal in nature. These were used to supplement the body of Biblical legislation. This body of oral tradition has been identified with the traditions recorded in Mishna, which was not written down until the end of the second century C.E. From Josephus' description it appears that as early as the first century B.C.E. the Pharisees relied upon oral traditions, but did not possess "holy books" as did some of the Essenes.

In contrast to Josephus, the church historian Eusebius records 8 sects among the Jews. Eusebius (ca. 260-339) was a resident of Caesaria who wrote a history of the Christianity from its beginnings up through his own time. He relied upon a number of earlier sources, including one known as "Hegesippus." According to Eusebius, this Hegessippus was a Jewish convert to Christianity

⁵ Ibid. 387 (=Josephus *Wars* II:164).

⁶ Marcus, *Jewish Antiquities* VII (London: Harvard University Press, 1933) 377 (=Josephus *Jew. Ant.* XIII:297).

who lived in the middle of the second century C.E. Eusebius quoted Hegesipus on the Jewish sects of the second Temple era:

There were various groups in the Circumcision, among the Children of Israel, all hostile to the tribe of Judah and the Christ. They were these - Essenes, Galilaeans, Hemerobaptists, Masbotheans, Samaritans, Sadducees, and Pharisees.⁷

Eusebius does not supply any additional information about these sects. While some of these groups may be identical to those listed by Josephus, it is impossible to identify all of them, or the books which they considered authoritative.

The final description of the sects which existed while the Second Temple stood is given by Michael the Syrian. In his chronicle he attributes the following passage to Josephus:

Josephus our writer [i.e. Josephus Flavius, as distinguished from Josephus Qaipha] mentions that there were seven sects among the Jews: 1) The Scribes, who were properly called Scribes. 2) Levites, who held to the traditions of the ancients. 3) the Pharisees, who acknowledge the resurrection, like the Scribes, and they say that there are angels and spirits. And they fast two days per week; they close their vases and their dishes; and they believe in fate and astrology. 4) The Sadducees, who deny resurrection, angels and spirits. They derive their name from a priest named Zadoq. 5) Those who say that a man must immerse himself every day. 6) Nazirites, who do not eat anything living. They do not accept the Law of Moses or the Prophets, but [accept] others in their place. 7) Those Jews who observe the law and the prophets and believe in one God.⁸

This passage is not found in our versions of Josephus. The various sects are not identical with the list given by Josephus Flavius, nor are they identical with the

⁷ G. A. Williamson, *Eusebius* <repr.> (London: Penguin Books, 1989) 129.

⁸ Chabot, op. cit. IV:94; א' הוי ביודיא וית הרסים דשבע מכתבנא דאיוסיף מכתבנא דשבע הרסים וית הוי ביודיא א' IV:94, op. cit. Chabot. דספרא דמתקרין ספרי קושטא ב דלויא דלביכין משלמנותא דקשישא ג דפרישא דמודין בקימתא איך ספרא ואמרין דאית מלאכא ורוחא וצימין ב בשבתא. ומדשין קסטא ופינכא. ומעלין חלקא ובית ילדא ד דודוקיא דכפרין בקימתא ובמלאכא וברוחא. וקבלו פוניא מן כהנא דשמה צדוק ה דהנן דאמרין דלא אנש לם אלא למד כליום ו דנזירא דלא אכלין מדם דאית בה נפשא. ולכתבא דמושא ודנביא לא מקבלין. אלא אחרנא חלפהון. ו דיודיא דנטרין מנוסא ונביא וחד אלהא מודין.

list in Eusebius. It is particularly interesting that two of the groups seem to adhere to a sectarian canon: the Levites, who "hold to the traditions of the ancients" and the Nazirites, who accept "other [books]." This source is silent on any non-canonical books used by the Pharisees.

From these various witnesses, as well as the absence of apocryphal and pseudepigraphal traditions in early Rabbinic literature, it would appear that the Pharisees did not use such sources. Rabbinic Judaism, which developed from this particular sect, appears to have inherited their bias against these works. Yet this exclusion was not absolute, since *Ben Sira* is cited by the Rabbis of the Tannaitic period. On the other hand several Jewish sects existed which certainly revered other books. It is difficult to believe that these groups ceased to exist along with their literature within the span of a few decades following the destruction of the Second Temple. Indeed, Asaph the writer and historian of the Jews, who lived between the third and fourth centuries C.E., is proof that Jews continued to use *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* several centuries after the destruction of the Second Temple. These sectarian books, which were written in Hebrew and Aramaic, must gradually have begun to influence Rabbinic Jews as well as the Manichaeans and Syriac-speaking Christians. It was in this way that *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* were slowly introduced into Rabbinic Jewish literature.

On the other hand, there is also strong evidence that certain books were discovered by Jews in a manner reminiscent of the discoveries of the caves of Qumran and Nahal Heber. Besides the letter of Timotheos I, cited by Eissfeldt, Rowley and Kahle, a number of other sources mention a sect of Jews who had discovered manuscripts in a cave, and regarded them as authoritative. These reports date from the tenth century, and may be based on a tradition which was earlier. These books must have included the *Damascus Covenant*, *Aramaic*

Levi, and possibly *The Book of Hagu* and sectarian versions of *Ben Sira*, as well as others which have not survived. Based upon the descriptions of the Magarians and the accusations against Anan ben David, a plausible reconstruction of events is possible. Some time during the last decades of the eighth century, documents were discovered in the desert south of Jericho. The texts which this group discovered included extra-canonical sectarian texts such as the type attributed by Josephus to the Essenes, and by Michael the Syrian to the Nazirites. Those Jews who had discovered these books then adopted them as authoritative, and resumed the practices of the long-dead "Magharians," as they came to be known in the middle ages. Some of these books were later brought to Egypt, where they were placed in the Geniza after there were no longer usable. This accounts for the fact that most of the manuscripts are in a Palestinian hand. These books also came into the hands of anti-Rabbanite sectarians living in Babylonia, including Anan ben David. Their rabbanite opponents later accused them of forging these books, burying them and then claiming to discover them. This accounts for the similarities between some Qaraite calendrical systems and the calendar at Qumran. It also explains the more detailed knowledge of the Qumran sect found in the late medieval sources, a knowledge not found in Josephus or other sources who were more their contemporaries.

The third avenue by which books of the Second Temple period entered into Rabbinic literature was retranslation. The primary language from which they were translated appears to be Syriac. Included in this group is the *Bel and the Dragon*, *Judith*, *Susanna*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, *2Maccabees*, some versions of *Ben Sira* and possibly the *Lives of the Prophets* the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Tobit*, the *Prayer of Azariah* and the *Song of the Three Youths*. Most of these books are found in the Syriac versions of the canon, but were

considered extra-canonical by Jews. Yet they are all found in Hebrew or Aramaic versions derived from the Syriac. The only exceptions are 1 *Esdras*, *Baruch*, the *Paraleipomena of Jeremiah* and the *Prayer of Manasseh*, which are found in the Syriac canon but not in any medieval Hebrew or Aramaic translations. On the other hand, interestingly enough, an Aramaic version of some of the additional passages of Esther has survived where there is no Syriac version. There is also evidence of the transfer of Jewish extra-canonical materials to the Syriac-speaking Christians during the middle ages. The most prominent example is the fragment of the *Aramaic Levi*, which was found transliterated into Syriac characters in a manuscript dating to 874. If this document was indeed one of the manuscripts discovered in the caves of the "Magharians," then it is evident that the Christians were still receiving literary materials from Jews after the ninth century.

A number of authors report that Syriac was widely known in Jewish circles⁹. Generally, the evidence cited is the figure of Daniel al-Qumisi, Nahmanides' citations of Judith and the Wisdom of Solomon, Moshe haDarshan's use of the Bel and the Dragon and Azaria dei Rossi's use of the Wisdom of Solomon. With the exception of Daniel al-Qumisi, these authors lived within the Jewish community inside the borders of Christian Europe. This fact has puzzled writers who have examined the question. There is no evidence of a Nestorian or Jacobite presence within Christian Europe, nor is there a tradition of Syriac studies within these areas. It also difficult to believe that Jews within

⁹ See S. Poznanski, "Philon dans l'ancienne littérature judéo-arabe," in *REJ* 50(1905) 10-31; H. Pinkuss, "Die syrische Uebersetzung der Proverbien" in *ZAW* 14(1894) 109-120; I. Lévi, *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (Leiden, 1904); A. Marx, "An Aramaic Fragment of the Wisdom of Solomon" in *JBL* 40(1921) 58-60; and A. Di Lella, op. cit. 107-108.

Europe would knowingly use Christian texts, given the animosity which existed between these communities. As Himmelfarb wrote:

It is much more difficult to explain how medieval Jews came to know the pseudepigrapha than the Apocrypha, which had become part of the Christian Bible and thus was widely available in Europe in the Middle Ages. The possibility that Jews borrowed pseudepigrapha from Christians cannot be ruled out, but many of the pseudepigrapha were not known to Christians of Europe...¹⁰

The question, then, is in what place and under what circumstances did Jews knowingly adopt Christian texts in Syriac, translate them into their own language, and use them as rabbinic texts? And how did these texts then travel to Christian Europe, where they were popularized by Rabbi Moshe haDarshan?

To answer these questions, it is first necessary to identify an area (or areas) where the following conditions were simultaneously present: 1) a community of Syriac-speaking Christians, 2) a Jewish community with an extensive knowledge of Aramaic which would permit them to understand without translation Syriac texts, 3) evidence of cooperation between these two communities, which would allow Jews to borrow Christian materials, and Christians to borrow Jewish texts, and 4) contact between this center and European Jewish centers of learning which would permit European Jews access to these texts.

The first condition is satisfied in a great many locations. There were large Nestorian settlements in Syria, Palestine and Babylonia. There were also communities in Northern India, and some cities inside Persia. These communities used the Pešitta as their version of Scripture. They also had extensive libraries of Greek texts which had been translated into Syriac, including philosophical, scientific, medical and astronomical works. The process of

¹⁰ Himmelfarb "R. Moses" 57.

acquisition and translation of these works from Greek into Syriac continued through the tenth century¹¹.

The second condition was also satisfied in a number of locations. Jews relied upon Aramaic in Palestine, Egypt, Babylonia and Syria. Arabic did not begin to replace Aramaic in these areas until the late ninth—early tenth centuries. It appears that by the mid-tenth century, Aramaic was in severe decline. Saadia wrote his *Book of Beliefs and Opinions* in Arabic, translated the Torah into Arabic for the benefit of the unlearned and also wrote his commentaries in that language. Thus, Aramaic had become a scholarly language for Rabbanite Jews by the time of Saadia. Around the same time the Qaraites also abandoned Aramaic for an artificial literary Hebrew (e.g. Sahl Ibn Matzliah) or Arabic (e.g. Jefet ben Ali, al-Qirqisani).

Although there were a number of cities in Palestine, Syria, Babylonia, and Persia where Syriac-speaking Christians and Aramaic-speaking Jews lived, there were only a few areas in which there is evidence of intellectual cooperation. The first city for which such evidence exists is Nisibis. Among the Jews, Nisibis was a major center of learning as early as the middle of the first century C.E. One of the founders of the legal academy in that city was Judah ben Bathyra I. The Babylonian Talmud relates that he was living in Nisibis while the Second Temple was still standing:

There was a certain Aramean who used to go up and eat the Passover sacrifices in Jerusalem. He said, "It is written, *no non-Jew shall eat of it... no uncircumcised shall eat of it* (Ex. 12:43;48). But I, I eat of the very best!" Rabbi Judah ben Bathyra said to him, "Did they give you the fat-tail?" He said to him, "no." He said to him, "(When you) go up there, say to them, 'give me the fat-tail!'" When he went up he said to them, "give me the fat-

¹¹ For a full history of the translation of Greek scientific, medical and philosophical texts from Greek into Syriac, and Syriac into Arabic see D. O'Leary, *How Greek Science Passed to the Arabs* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1942).

tail." They said to him, "that goes up for the Exalted One." They said [further] to him, "who told you this?" He said, "Rabbi Judah ben Bathyra." They said, "what is this (one) who is standing before us?" They investigated him, and found that he was an Aramean, and they killed him. They sent to Rabbi Judah ben Bathyra: "Peace to you, Rabbi Judah ben Bathyra, for you are in Nisibis, but your net is spread in Jerusalem."¹²

It is also reported in the Talmud that Judah ben Bathyra was sufficiently respected by the Palestinian rabbis that they sent for his opinion on at least one occasion:

Come and learn: Yohanan ben Bag Bag sent to Nisibis, to Rabbi Judah ben Bathyra: "I heard about you that you say that a bat Yisrael (Not a daughter of a priest or a Levite) who is engaged (to a priest) may eat from the Terumah offering." He sent to him, "And you, you do not say thus?"¹³

The academy at Nisibis continued to train scholars after the death of Judah. During the second century C.E. another scholar by the same name, Rabbi Judah ben Bathyra II, was the head of the academy. This school was recommended as a center of learning equal to the other major Jewish academic centers of the second century:

Justice, Justice shalt thou pursue (Deut. 16:20): follow after the sages to the Academy: after Rabbi Eliezer to Lod, after Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai to Beror Hayil, after Rabbi Joshua to Peqi'in, after Rabban Gamliel to Jabneh, after Rabbi Aqiba to B'nei Braq, after Rabbi Mathia to Rome, after Rabbi Hananiah ben Teradyon

¹² bPesahim 3b: פסחים ואכיל דסליק דהוה דאמא ארמא דהוה דסליק ואכיל פסחים: דאיהו דארע נפשיה ההוא ארמא דהוה דסליק ואכיל פסחים: בירושלים אמר כתיב כל בן נכר לא יאכל בו כל ערל לא יאכל בו ואנא הא קאכילנא משופרי שופרי אמר ליה רבי יהודה בן בתירא מי קא ספו לך מאליה אמר ליה לא סלקת להתם אימא להו ספו לי מאליה כי סליק אמר להו מאליה ספו לי אמרו ליה אליה לגבוה סלקא אמרו ליה מאן אמר לך הכי אמר להו רבי יהודה בן בתירא אמרו מאי האי דקמן בדקו בתריה ואשכחוהו דארמא הוא וקטלוהו שלחו ליה לרבי יהודה בן בתירא שלם לך רבי יהודה בן בתירא דאת בנציבין ומצודתך פרוסה בירושלים

¹³ bQiddushin 10b: הכהונה קתני ביאה וקתני נישאת הכי קאמר אי הני: נשואין דכהן נינהו אוכלת בתרומה תא שמע וכבר שלח יוחנן בן בג בג אצל רבי יהודה בן בתירא לנציבין שמעתי עליך שאתה אומר ארוסה בת ישראל אוכלת בתרומה שלח לו ואתה אי אתה אומר כן

to Siknin, after Rabbi Yossi to Sepporis, after Rabbi Judah ben Bathyra to Nisibis...¹⁴

This academy flourished in the third century C.E. as well. The Talmud¹⁵

reports that Rabbi Simlai son of Abba (fl 240) taught at the academy, and cited a precedent set by the court of Rabbi Judah II, grandson of Judah haNasi: היינו דכי אתא רבי יצחק בר שמואל בר מרתא ואמר דריש רבי שמלאי בנציבין שמן רבי היינו — "Indeed, when Rabbi Isaac son of Shmuel son of Marta came [to Babylonia], he said: 'Rabbi Simlai expounded [at the academy of] Nisibis, that Rabbi Judah and his court took a vote and declared it [oil purchased from non-Jews] permitted'." Indeed, Rabbi Simlai was sent by the patriarch to proclaim this innovation at the academy. Thus, Nisibis was considered one of the major seats of Babylonian Jewry of the third century.

Evidence from a Christian source shows that this academy persisted well into the sixth century. Cassiodorus had been sent by Pope Agapetus I to study models for the foundation of a Christian academy of scriptural exegesis. This academy was to be established in Rome, based on the methodology found in the East. Cassiodorus reported to Agapetus I sometime in the years between 551 and 562:

I have therefore taken pains, in conjunction with His Holiness, Pope Agapetus of the city of Rome, so that money might be collected, so that Christian scholars might be paid to give public lectures in Rome — just as there has been established in Alexandria for a long time, and now in Nisibis, the city of Syrians, scriptural

¹⁴ bSanhedrin 32b: ר' צדק צדק תרדוף הלך אחר חכמים לישיבה אחר ר' אליעזר ללוד אחר רבן יוחנן בן זכאי לברור חיל אחר רבי יהושע לפקיעין אחר רבן גמליאל ליבנא אחר רבי עקיבא לבני ברק אחר רבי מתיא לרומי אחר רבי חנניא בן תרדיון לסיכני אחר רבי יוסי לציפורי אחר רבי יהודה בן בתירה לנציבין אחר רבי יהושע לגולה אחר רבי לבית שערים אחר חכמים ללשכת הגזית:

¹⁵ bAvodah Zara 36a.

exegesis is zealously carried out [by] the Hebrews.¹⁶

Thus, the academy of Judah ben Bathyra was still an exemplary institution in the sixth century.

In addition to being a center of Jewish learning, Nisibis was also a center of Syrian Christian instruction as well. The Christian academy was founded following the great convocation of the church fathers in Nicaea in 325 C.E. It was founded by Mar Yaqub, for the purpose of teaching Greek theology among the Syriac-speaking Christians. The first Dean of the school was St. Ephraem, whose writings became the model for all subsequent religious and literary compositions in Syriac. Following the fall of Nisibis to the Persians in 363, the academy was disbanded. Ephraem emigrated to Edessa, which was a Roman border town approximately 100 miles away, and revived the school there. Edessa had been a part of Coele-Syria, and had then passed into Roman hands. It remained hellenistic in culture, and there was a wide availability of classical texts in Greek, as well as Christian scholarship in Syriac. In Edessa, the school flourished, and the scholars continued in their original mission of translating Greek works into Syriac.

However beginning around the year 435 there were a series of disturbances in Edessa between the followers of the Nestorian schism and those Christians who remained loyal to the orthodox Church. These disturbances ultimately led to the closing of the academy in 489 C.E. The Nestorian sect originated in 428 in the city of Antioch. At that time Nestorius of Antioch was

¹⁶ Cassiodorus, *De institutione divinarum literarum* as cited in P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens* (Stuttgart: 1927) I:52:

Nisus sum [ergo] cum beatissimo Agapito, papa urbis Romae, ut, — sicut apud Alexandriam multo tempore fuisse traditur institutum, nunc etiam in Nisibi, civitate Syrorum, [ab] Hebraeis sedulo fertur exponi, — collatis expensis in urbe Romana professores doctores potius acciperent christianae..."

appointed the Patriarch of the Syrian Church in Constantinople. He defended the opinion of another monk, Anastasius, who believed that Mary could not be called "the mother of God," since she was truly only mother of the human body of Jesus. As a result of this controversy, Nestorius was excommunicated. But he had many supporters, and eventually a schismatic movement bearing his name took root in a number of cities. The academy at Edessa harbored a number of Nestorians within the faculty. Following years of bitter debates, many of these schismatics were expelled and fled to Persia. Finally, around the year 489 the Emperor Zeno closed the school entirely. Those Nestorians who remained on the faculty followed those who had fled earlier, and they settled in Nisibis. In Nisibis they were within the Persian empire, and were immune from persecution and attack by the Orthodox Christians. Once again the school flourished, surviving into the period of the Islamic empire.

Kahle believed that there is evidence of cooperation between the Nestorian and the Jewish scholars of Nisibis. He wrote:

This notice of Cassiodor is of great significance for us. In the sixth century, Jews and Christians really were applying themselves to analogous studies in the same city, thus it is obvious that contact must have taken place between them.¹⁷

While he believed that such contact *must* have taken place, he could cite no direct evidence of such contact. The strongest evidence Kahle could muster was the linguistic influence evident from the punctuation of Hebrew texts by Jewish scholars.

More direct evidence of the influence of the Syrian Christians upon the Jewish community comes from the ninth century. Jacob Qirqisani's great work,

¹⁷ Kahle, op. cit. 54. "Für uns ist diese Notiz des Cassiodor von grosser Bedeutung. Wenn im 6. Jahrhunert in derselben Stadt Juden und Christen tatsächlich analogen Studien oblagen, so liegt es sehr nahe, Beziehungen zwischen beiden anzunehmen."

described above, relied upon the work an earlier Jewish writer named Dāwūd ibn Marwan al-Raqqi al-Muqammiṣ. Al-Muqammiṣ was a widely read scholar who had studied closely with the Christian bishop Nonnus of Nisibis before the death of the latter in 862:¹⁸

Nonnus was an archdeacon of the Jacobite Church at Nisibis during the first half of this century [the ninth century], the Nestorian bishop Cyprian having allowed the Monophysites to resume possession of the church of St Domitius in 767... He is mentioned by Bar-Hebraeus as bringing charges against the bishop Philoxenus, who had sided with the anti-patriarch Abraham, and was therefore deposed by a synod held at Rās'ain in 827 or 828. We know also that he was in prison at Nisibis when he wrote his work against Thomas bishop of Margā and metropolitan of Bēth Garmai, who flourished under the Nestorian catholici Abraham (837-850) and Theodosius (852-858). Besides this controversial treatise in four discourses, Nonnus was the writer of sundry letters of a similar character.¹⁹

Qirqisani described al-Muqammiṣ' relationship with his mentor, and his return to Judaism:

Dāwūd ibn Marwan al-Raqqi, known as 'al-Muqammiṣ', was a philosopher. He was at first a Jew, and was then converted to Christianity by a certain Nānā in Nisibis. This Nānā, a physician by training, was much respected by the Christians because he was an accomplished philosopher. 'Al-Muqammiṣ studied with him for many years, became acquainted with the dogmatics and esoteric teachings of Christianity, and mastered the study of philosophy. He wrote two anti-Christian books, in which he polemicized with the Christians. Those two books are well known. He also translated, from the Christians' exegetical books, a commentary on Genesis called *The Book of Creation* and a commentary on Ecclesiastes.²⁰

Qirqisani reports that al-Muqammiṣ translated two Christian Syriac commentaries for use by Jews. He does not mention the language into which these books were translated. However, Stroumsa mentions that a fragment of the

¹⁸ S. Stroumsa, *Dāwūd Ibn Marwān al-Muqammiṣ's Twenty Chapters* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989) 16.

¹⁹ Wright, *A Short History of Syriac Literature* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1966) 205-6.

²⁰ Ibid. 1.

commentary on Genesis has been identified among the Geniza fragments, T—S Ar. 52.184. Its catalog number would indicate that the language in which it now appears is Arabic. This commentary was subsequently cited by Moses ibn Ezra,²¹ the father of the famous twelfth-century biblical commentator Abraham ibn Ezra of Spain.

The final example of cooperation between Jews and Syrian Christians is Rabbenu Hai Gaon, the son of Rabbi Sherira Gaon. Joseph Ibn Aknin wrote that Rabbenu Hai Gaon, the son of Rabbi Sherira Gaon consulted the Catholicos of Baghdad for the interpretation of a particularly difficult Biblical verse:"

And Rabbenu Hai Gaon of blessed memory — Behold, we find that in his book, which he called *Alhawi*, he made use of Arabic words. And s.v. *MLA*, he says *Kamāl* (wholeness). And in the words of our Rabbis of blessed memory, the creatures were created in their fullness, that is to say in their wholeness. And *hamamla'ah* in the Arabic language is *ha'azrah*. They tell about Ali that he said: "I did not kill Atman, nor did I assist in his murder." And he also used a stanza from a love poem [as proof] for the saying of our Rabbis of blessed memory: "The *Qolav* is a type of Jewellery." And the stanza is, according to the poet:

"The jewelry of the women shall go round about, and I won't see; the jewelry shall go round about to Ramallah, but not the *Qolav*.

And he also made use of the Qoran and the Hadith. And so did R. Saadia Gaon of blessed memory before him in his Arabic commentaries. And concerning this same matter, our Rabbis of blessed memory said: "All who say a wise thing, even if they are non-Jews, shall be called wise, and one must transmit it." And in connection to this [Shmuel] haNagid relates in his book, *ha'Osher*, after he cites extensively from the commentaries of the Christians, that Rabbi Matzliah ben al-Batzaq, the judge of Scalea, took with him a letter which included the biography of Rabbenu Hai Gaon of blessed memory when he came from Baghdad, and [which included] all his praiseworthy ways. And therein it is related that one day the verse: (Ps. 141:5) "[Let a good man strike or rebuke me in kindness] but let the oil of the wicked never anoint my head" came up for discussion. And those in attendance differed over its interpretation, and Rabbenu Hai of blessed memory commanded Rabbi Matzliah to go to the Catholicos of the Christians, and to ask him what he knew concerning the interpreta-

²¹ Stroumsa, op. cit. 20.

tion of that verse. And in Rabbi Matzliah's opinion this was wrong. But when he of blessed memory saw that this appeared difficult to him [R. Matzliah], he reproved him and said, "So were not indeed our pious early ancestors, who are an example for us, asking those of other languages, and concerning the explanations among adherents of other faiths, and even shepherds and herders, as is well known. And he went to him, and he asked him. And he told him that among them, in the Syriac language, it means: 'The anointing of an evil one not up to his head...'²²

This story about Hai Gaon reveals that it was apparently customary among the Jews of Babylonia to consult with Christians. While it was common in Baghdad, it was apparently not customary outside of Babylonia, so that Rabbi Matzliah rebelled at first against the order of the Gaon. R. Matzliah was from the city of Scalea, in Southeastern Italy. Scalea is approximately 100 miles from Bari, and was also part of Byzantine Italy in the ninth and tenth centuries. If it were indeed common for Jews to translate Latin and Greek sources in Byzantine Italy, as Flusser and Himmelfarb claim, there would be no reason for R. Matzliah to have objected so strongly. Thus, R. Matzliah's strong reaction to Hai's request seems to refute the contention of Flusser and Himmelfarb that

²² A. S. Halkin, התגלות הסודות והופעת המאורות (Jerusalem: Merkaz, 1964): 493;495:

ורבינו האיי גאון ז"ל הרי אנו מוצאים שבספרו אשר קרא לו אלהאוי [המאסף] הוא מסתייע בדברי הערבים ובדרך 'מלא' הוא אומר כמאל (שלמות) ובלשון רבותינו ז"ל נבראות בריות על מליאתן כלומר בשלמותן והממלאה בלשון ערב היא העזרה; מספרים על עלי שאמר לא הרגתי את עתמאן ולא עזרתי ברצח; וגם הסתייע בבית משר אהבה למאמר רבותינו ז"ל הקולב שהוא מין תכשיט, והבית הוא דבר המשורר:

יסתובבו תכשיטי הנשים ולא אראה לרמלה תכשיט יסתובב ולא קולב

וגם הסתייע בקראן ובהדית. וכן עשה לפניו ר' סעדיה ז"ל בפירושו הערביים ומשום אותו ענין אמרו רבותינו ז"ל כל האומר דבר חכמה ואפילו באומות העולם נקרא חכם וחייבים למסרו. ובקשר עם זה הנגיד מספר בספרו העושר, אחרי שהרבה להביא מבאורי הנוצרים, שר' מצליח בן אלבצק דיין סקליא סח לו בבואו מבגדד עם אגרת שהכילה את פרשת חיי של רבינו האי גאון ז"ל ודרכיו המשובחים ובה מסופר שיום אחד נודמן בשיבה הפסוק שמן ראש אל יני ראשי ונחלקו המסובים בביאורו, וצוה רבינו האיי ז"ל את ר' מצליח שילך אל הקתוליק של הנוצרים ושאלהו מה הוא יודע בבאור הפסוק הזה ורע בעיניו וכשראהו ז"ל שקשה עליו הדבר על ר' מצליח הוכיח אותו לאמר הן האבות והקדמונים החסידים והם לנו למופת היו שואלים על הלשונות ועל הביאורים אצל בני דתות שונות אפילו רועי צאן ובקר כידוע, והלך אליו ושאלו ואמר לו שאצלם בלשון הסודית משחא דרשיעא לא עד רישיה...

translations from Greek Christian sources were common in Southern Italy in precisely this era. Furthermore, Shmuel haNagid and Joseph Ibn Aknin both cite this example because it was necessary for Jews in Spain to justify their use of non-Jewish sources with historical precedent.

Thus, it is evident that the Jewish academy in Nisibis, and later in Babylonia, shared texts with Syrian-speaking Christians. The influence between these two groups was mutual, as can be seen from the historical examples. Literary evidence also reveals that Jews and Christians shared scholarship: the Aramaic translations of Ecclesiastes and Job show that the Syriac translation of those books was used in preparing the Jewish Aramaic translation. This intellectual cooperation was unique to the communities of Baghdad and Nisibis. This, then, was the third source for the reentry of Second Temple literature into medieval Jewish texts. The final question which remains is the way in which these texts made their way from Babylonia where they were translated and into Europe.

Since Rapoport, scholars have recognized that Moshe haDarshan was the first European author to use these Second Temple works. The works of Moshe haDarshan are the earliest source in which the following Second Temple books appear: *The Book of the Giants*, *Tobit*, *Bel and the Dragon*, *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Judith*, and *Susanna*. Moshe haDarshan is also the first European to cite *Jubilees*. In addition, Moshe haDarshan included variant versions of Midrashic texts which were unavailable in Europe. All of this evidence leads to the obvious conclusion that Moshe haDarshan's literary materials must have come from somewhere other than Europe. Given the long literary tradition of cooperation and translation in Babylonia, both in Baghdad and Nisibis, along with the wide availability of Midrashic texts, it seems clear that Moshe haDarshan must have obtained his materials from there.

The fact that none of the historical sources mention that Moshe haDarshan studied outside of France led Rapoport, Epstein, Albeck and others to conclude that he must have studied in France. This conclusion has been strengthened by the fact that all references to his residence are to the city of Narbonne. However, the fact that he lived and taught in Narbonne does not in itself exclude the possibility that he studied in a Babylonian academy. Indeed, the weight of the literary evidence indicates overwhelmingly that he must have. Furthermore, there is historical evidence that students from Europe routinely studied in Baghdad, and then returned to Europe as scribes, teachers and Rabbis.

There is one additional piece of historical evidence which has not been examined in the discussion of Moshe haDarshan. Abraham Geiger, another central figure in the Wissenschaft movement of the nineteenth century, published a reference to Moshe haDarshan which he found in a manuscript of Rashi's commentaries. This addition has not been found in any other manuscript of Rashi's commentaries. The manuscript itself was dated to 1294, and on Num 7:1 it states:

Rabbi Moshe haDarshan, a native of Persia, wrote: As they say here KLT; it is written "do not read KLOT, but rather KLT" [a reference to the commentary found in Pesiqta d'Rav Kahana, which compares the completion of the Tabernacle to entry into the wedding canopy]. But they did not intend to say that it is written in defective spelling, but rather it is *plene*, with the vav being extra, corresponding to the 6 times which KLH is mentioned in *Song of Songs*²³

²³ Epstein, R. *Moshe haDarshan M'Narbonne* (Vienna: 1891) 19. במדבר ו' א'. כתב ר' משה הדרשן בן פרס מה דאומרים כלת כתיב הכי פי' אל תקרי כלות אלא כלת, ולא רצה לומר שהוא חסר אלא הוא מלא ו' כנגד ו' פעמים כלה האמורה בשיר השירים.

There have been several emendations suggested to the phrase "בן פרם" *"Ben Para[s](?)"*. In Geiger's original publication,²⁴ it was printed "בן פרם" *"Ben Param."* However, this was probably a typographical error, since Brill²⁵, and Epstein both read it as *Paras*. Brill believed that the phrase was a corruption for *"b'Pesiqta."* Epstein did not agree, and suggested that it might have been a mistaken reference to Paris rather than Narbonne. However as Epstein noted, Moshe haDarshan was never associated with Paris. Moreover, Paris was spelled פאריס (PARYS), not פרם (PRS).

This evidence ties together all of the questions regarding Moshe haDarshan, his sources, and the languages with which he was familiar. Nahmanides mentioned that Moshe haDarshan used Persian in his glosses on Scripture. Rabbi Nathan ben Jehiel also reported that he used Arabic, which would not have been unusual for a Jewish scholar of the period. From his own works we know that he used Syriac transliterated into Hebrew characters. Such a combination of languages was found only in the areas of Babylonia which had been a part of the Persian empire—specifically, Nisibis. Moreover, Moshe haDarshan had texts which had been translated from Greek into Syriac, and subsequently into Jewish Aramaic. Again, this activity took place only in the parts of Babylonia formerly within the Persian empire—only in Nisibis. Finally, we have a historical source which states that he was a native of Persia.

Moshe haDarshan must therefore have been born in Persia, possibly even Nisibis. He obviously received an education which included Midrashic exposition as well as Talmudic training. While this was not a part of the standard curriculum in the Babylonian academies of Sura and Pumbeditha, it had in earlier

²⁴ A. Geiger, *Net'ei N'emanim* (Breslau: 1847) 8n.

²⁵ Brill, *Jahrbücher* 8:114.

years this had been the hallmark of the Jewish academy of Nisibis. Again, as Cassiodorus wrote:

I have therefore taken pains, in conjunction with His Holiness, Pope Agapetus of the city of Rome, so that money might be collected, so that Christian scholars might be paid to give public lectures in Rome — just as there has been established in Alexandria for a long time, *and now in Nisibis, the city of Syrians, scriptural exegesis is zealously carried out [by] the Hebrews.*²⁶

From Persia, Moshe haDarshan must have travelled to France, where he was appointed head of the academy. Once in France, he introduced the curriculum which he had studied, which included Aggadic studies, allegorical interpretation of Scripture, Gematria (numerology); Halakhic studies in Talmud; and lexical and grammatical studies. Moshe haDarshan's influence on the curriculum rapidly advanced the standing of the academy of Narbonne, and within a generation it was considered one of the premier academies of Europe. From Narbonne, the influence and the texts of Moshe haDarshan spread south to Spain and North into Ashkenaz, where Rashi studied using his midrashic works. Although much of his literary work disappeared in the centuries following his death, his influence continues even today in the traditional Jewish academies where Rashi and Nahmanides, and the *Midrash Rabba* are taught.

²⁶ Kahle, op. cit.

Index of Biblical Citations

- Gen 1:11, 100
Gen. 6:2, 24
Gen. 6:4, 25, 96
Gen. 9:3, 21
Gen. 37:24, 23
Gen. 41:1, 21
Gen. 49:10, 21
- Ex. 12:43ff, 208
Ex. 13:2, 18
Ex. 19:15, 22
Ex. 34:7, 18
- Lev. 18:19, 22
Lev. 19:2, 97
Lev. 26:38, 18
- Num 7:1, 217
Num. 13:34, 25
Num. 23:23, 19
- Deut. 16:20, 209
Deut 21:14, 76
Deut. 28:65, 17
Deut. 30:5, 118
Deut. 33:28, 17
- 1 Sam. 15:19, 101
1 Sam. 28:14, 100
1 Sam. 28:19, 101
- Is. 23:18, 19
Is. 27:13, 18
Is. 30:20, 19
Is. 34:4, 97
Is. 66:7, 20
Is. 65:17, 97
- Jer. 4:31, 20
Jer. 31:1, 17
- Ezek. 18:4, 18
- Zech. 13:2, 21
- Ps. 8:50, 24
Ps. 32:5, 93
Ps. 91:1, 18
Ps. 104:4, 25
Ps. 119:85, 20
Ps. 141:5, 214
Ps. 146:7, 21
- Job 7:5, 25
Job 38:7, 96

Works Cited

- Abraham ben Isaac of Narbonne. Sefer HaEshkol. Halberstadt, 1768.
- Abrahams, Israel. "An Aramaic Text of the Scroll of Antiochus." JQR 11 (1900): 291-99.
- . "Josph Zabara's Book of Delight." JQR VI (1894): 502-32.
- Abravanel, Isaac. Yeshuot Meshiho. Koenigsberg: Gruber and Langrien, 1861.
- Albeck, Ch. "Aggadot Im Lichte der Pseudepigraphen." MGWJ 83 (1839): 162--9.
- . Bereishit Rabbati (Heb.). Jerusalem: Mekitze Nirdamim, 1940.
- Atlas, S. and Perlmann, M. "Saadia on the Scroll of the Hasmoneans." PAAJR XIV (1944): 1-23.
- Baer, Yitzhak. "Ha-Midrashim Ha-mezzuyafim Shel Raymundo Martini." Sefer Zikkaron L'Asher Gulak. Jerusalem: Hebrew UP, 1942. 28-48.
- Baillet, M., and J. T. and de Vaux Milik, R. Les Petites Grottes de Qumran. Oxford, 1962.
- Ballaban, Steven. Lost Midrashic Passages on Genesis From the Pugio Fidei. 1986.
- Beer, B. Buch der Jubileen und Sein Verhältniss Zu Den Midraschim. Leipzig, 1856.
- Beyer, Klaus. Die Aramäischen Texte Vom Toten Meer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
- Bezold, K. Die Schatzhöhle. repr.. Amsterdam: APA-Philo, 1981.
- Bialer. Min HaGenazim. Jerusalem: Heichal Shlomo, 1969.
- Birnbaum, Solomon. The Hebrew Scripts. London: Paleographia, 1954-57.
- The Book of Ben Sira. Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1973.
- Brill, N. Jahrbücher.
- Broshi, Magen. The Damascus Document Reconsidered. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- Buber, Solomon. Midrash Aggada on the Five Books of the Torah (Hebr.). Vienna: Abraham Fanta, 1894.
- . Midrash Tehillim. Vilna: Romm, 1881.
- . "Rabbi Moshe HaDarshan." HaMaggid 16:140; 17:148; 18:158-9 (1874).
- Budge, E. A. Wallis. The Book of the Bee. Oxford: Clarendon, 1886.
- . The Cave of Treasures. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1927.
- . Syrian Anatomy, Pathology and Therapeutics or The Book of Medicines. London, 1913.
- Chabot, J. B. Chronique de Michel le Syrien Patriarche Jacobite D'Antioche. Paris, 1899.

- Charles, R. H., ed. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- . The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Oxford, 1908.
- Chavel, Ch. Kitve Ramban. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1963.
- . The Torah Commentaries of Rabbi Moses Ben Nahman (Hebr.). Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1970.
- Chazan, Robert. Daggers of Faith. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.
- Cohen, Jeremy. The Friars and the Jews. Ithica: Cornell UP, 1982.
- Cowley, A. and Charles, R. H. "An Early Source of the Testament of the Patriarchs." JQR 19 (1906/7): 566-83.
- Dalman, G. Grammatik Des Judisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch, Einleitung. Leipzig, 1894.
- Dan, J. HaSippur HaLvri B'yemei HaBeynayim. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing, 1974.
- de Jonge, M. "Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991.
- De Lagarde, Antoni. Libri Veteris Testamentii Apocrypha Syriace e Recognitione. Leipzig, 1861.
- Di Lella, A. The Hebrew Text of Sirach. London: Mouton & Co., 1966.
- Eissfeldt, O. "Der Gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina Neu Gefunden Hebräischen Handschriften." TLZ 74 (1949): 595-600.
- . The Old Testament: An Introduction. Oxford: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Epstein, Abraham. "Bereishit Rabbati, Moses Ha-Darshan und Pugio Fidei." Magazin Für die Wissenschaft Des Judentums (1888): 1-35.
- . "Le Livre Des Jubilés; Philon et le Midrasch Tadsché." REJ 22 (1888): 1ff.
- . Miqadmaniyot HaYehudim. Vienna, 1887.
- . Rabbi Moses HaDarshan M'Narbonne. Vienna, 1891.
- Epstein, I., ed. The Babylonian Talmud. London: Soncino, 1948.
- Filipowsky. Mivhar HaPenimim. London, 1851.
- Flusser, David. Sefer Josippon. Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1981.
- Friedlander, G. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer. repr.. New York: Hermon, 1970.
- Gaster, M., prolegomenon by H. Schwartzbaum. The Chronicles of Jerahmeel. repr.. New York: Ktav, 1971.

- . "The Lost Aramaic Original of Theodotian's Additions to Daniel." PSBA 16 (1893-4): 280-88; 312-17.
- . "The Scroll of the Hasmoneans." International Congress of Orientalists 9 (1892).
- . Two Unknown Hebrew Versions of Tobit. London: Harrison and Sons, 1897.
- . "An Unknown Hebrew Version of the History of Judith." PSBA (1894):156-63.
- Geiger, Ab. Net'ei Ne'emanim. Breslau, 1847.
- Ginzberg, L. Genizah Studies in Memory of Doctor Solomon Schechter. New York: JTS, 1928.
- . The Legends of the Jews. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1920.
- . "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Toward the Apocalyptic Eschatological Writings." JBL 41 (1922).
- Greenfield, J. C. and Stone, M. E. "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza." RB 86 (1979): 214-30.
- Gross, Heinrich. Die Neue Echter Bibel: Tobit, Judit. . Echter Verlag: Würzburg, 1987.
- Halkin, A. S. Hitgalut HaSodot V'Hopha'at HaMeorot. Jerusalem: Merkaz, 1964.
- Hanhart, Robert. Text und Textgeschichte Des Buches Tobit. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
- Harkavy. Sefer HaEgron V'Sefer HaGalui. Berlin, 1891.
- Heinemann, J. "Ibbude Aggadot Kedumot B'Ruah HaZman B'Pirke Rabbi Eliezer." Jubilee Volume for Shimeon Halkin. Jerusalem: Reuven Mass, 1975. 321-43.
- Hershberg, Ch. Rabbenu Nissim B'r Yaakov M'Qairuan: Hibbur Yafeh M'haYeshua. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1934.
- Higger, M. "Pirke Rabbi Eliezer." Horeb 8:82-119;9:94-166 (1944-5).
- Hildesheimer. Halakhot Gedolot. Berlin, 1888.
- Himmelfarb, M. "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature." SBL Conference Papers (1978): 259-69
- . "R. Moses the Preacher and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." AJSReview 9.1984 (1984): 55-78.
- Hirschfeld, H. Arabic Chrestomathy. London, 1892.
- Hopkins, S. A Miscellany of Literary Pieces from the Cambridge Genizah Collections. Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1978.
- Jellinek, Adolf. Bet HaMidrash. Vienna: , 1877.

- Kadari, M. "The Aramaic Scroll of Antiochus." Bar Ilan I (1962-3): 81-105; II:178-214.
- Kahle, P. The Cairo Geniza. Oxford: Blackwell, 1959.
- . Masoreten Des Westens. Stuttgart, 1927.
- Kapah, J. Daniel, with the Targum and Commentary (Hebr.). Jerusalem: Dror, 1980.
- Kennicott, Benjamin. Dissertatio Generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum. London, 1780.
- Kirchheim, R. "The Ketab Tamim of Rabbi Moshe Tequ." Otzar Nechmad. Vienna, 1860. 3:58ff.
- Klein, S. "Al HaSefer Vitae Prophetarum." Sefer Klausner. Tel Aviv, 1937. 189-209.
- Lauterbach, J. Mekilta De-Rabbi Ishmael. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1933.
- Levi, Israel. "Document Relatif a la Communauté Des Fils De Sadoc." REJ 65 (1913): 24-31.
- . "Elements Chrétiens dans le Pirke Rabbi Eliezer." REJ 18 (1889): 83-89.
- . The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus. Leiden, 1904.
- Lieber, E. "Asaf's Book of Medicines: A Hebrew Encyclopedia of Greek and Jewish Medicine, Possibly Compiled in Byzantium on an Indian Model." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 38: Symposium on Byzantine Medicine. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1984. 233-49.
- Lieberman, S. Sheki'in. Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1940.
- Linder, Amnon. The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1987.
- Marcus, Jacob R. The Jew in the Medieval World. New York: Atheneum, 1976.
- Marcus, R. Josephus: Jewish Antiquities. London: Harvard UP, 1933.
- Martini, Raymond. Pugio Fidei. Ed. I. B. Carpzov. . Leipzig, 1681.
- Marx, A. "An Aramaic Fragment of the Wisdom of Solomon." JBL 40 (1921): 58-60.
- Milik, J. T. The Books of Enoch. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1976.
- . Revue Biblique 62 (1955): 398-406.
- Mingana, A. "Some Early Judeo-Christian Documents in the John Rylands Library." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 4 (1917): 59-118.
- Muntner, S. "The Antiquity of Asaph the Physician and His Editorship of the Earliest Hebrew Book of Medicine." Bulletin of the History of Medicine XXV (1951): 101-31.
- Nemoy, L. "Al-Qirḡisānī's Account of the Jewish Sects and Christianity." HUCA 7 (1930): 317-97.

- . The Scroll of Antiochus, Facsimile. New Haven: Yale, 1952.
- Neubauer, A. The Book of Tobit. Oxford: Clarendon, 1878.
- . "Jewish Controversy and the 'Pugio Fidei'" Expositor 7 (1888): 81-105; 179-97.
- Neubauer, Ad. and Driver, S. R. The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpreters. Oxford, 1877.
- Neuman, Ab. "Josippon and the Apocrypha." JQR 43 (1952): 1ff.
- Nicklesburg, G. Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishna. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- O'Leary, D. How Greek Science Passed to the Arabs. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1942.
- The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Pass, H. L. and Arendzen, J. "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi." JQR 12 (1900): 651-61.
- Pinkuss, H. "Die Syrische Uebersetzung der Proverbien." ZAW 14 (1894): 109-20.
- Poznanski, S. "Philon dans L'ancienne Littérature Judéo-arabe." REJ 50 (1905): 10-31.
- Quetif, Jacques and Echard, Jacques. Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum. repr.. New York, 1959. <2 vols.
- Rabinovicz, Harry M. Treasures of Judaica. New York: Yoseloff, 1971.
- Rapoport, S. L. "Toldot Rabbenu Nissim." Bikkure Ha'Itim (1829:7-79; 1830:81ff).
- Reeves, J. Jewish Lore in Manichaeon Cosmogony. Cincinnati: HUC, 1991.
- Rowley, H. H. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Blackwell, 1952.
- Sanders, James A. The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11. Oxford, 1965.
- Schechter, Solomon. Documents of Jewish Sectaries. repr.. New York: Ktav, 1970.
- . "A Fragment of the Original Text of Ecclesiasticus." Expositor (5th Series) 4 (1896): 1-15.
- Schermann, T. Propheten- und Apostellegenden. Leipzig, 1907.
- Schirmann, J. "Additional Pages from the Book of Ben Sira (Hebr.)." Tarbiz 29 (1959-60): 129-34.
- Schurer, E., et al, ed. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987.
- Sinker. The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs. Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1869.
- Slotki, J. Leviticus Rabba. London: Soncino, 1983.
- Stone, M., ed. Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. *Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

- Strack, H. and Stemberger, G. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.
- Stroumsa, S. Dawud Ibn Marwan Al-Muqammi's Twenty Chapters. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989.
- Thackery. Josephus: The Jewish War. London: Harvard UP, 1927.
- Torat Hayyim: Genesis. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1986.
- Torrey, C. C. The Lives of the Prophets. Greek Text and Translation. Philadelphia, 1946.
- Vanderkam, J. C. The Book of Jubilees. Lovanii: Peeters, 1989.
- Vivian, Angelo. "Un Manoscritto Aramaico Inedito Della Megillat Antiochus." Studi in Onore Di Edda Bresciani. Italy: Agnano Pisano e Pisa, 1985. 567-91.
- Wacholder, B. Z. and Abegg, M. A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. Washington: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1991-2.
- Wertheimer, S. A. Batei Midrashot. repr.. Jerusalem: Ktab Yad Wasepher, 1989.
- Williamson, G. A. Eusebius. repr.. London: Penguin Books, 1989.
- Wright, W. A Short History of Syriac Literature. Amsterdam: Philo, 1966.
- . Catalogue of Syriac MSS in the British Museum. Cambridge: University Press, 1901.
- Yadin, Y. The Ben Sira Scroll From Masada. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965.
- Yellin, A. The Book of Ahikar the Sage (Hebr.). Jerusalem, 1938.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. The Zadokite Fragments. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952.
- Zimmerman, Frank. The Book of Tobit. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.
- Zunz, Leopold. Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden. Berlin, 1832.

