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Were Second Temple era biblical pseudepigrapha like *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and *T. Levi* still available in Aramaic or Hebrew dress approximately a millennium later within some gaonic and postgaonic Jewish communities? If so, what were the cultural circumstances surrounding such “survival”? If not, how can one explain the numerous echoes of pseudepigraphical material within later aggadic compendia, or the appearance of works like the *Damascus Document* and *Aramaic Levi* amidst the Cairo Genizah hoard? Were tannaitic and amoraic strictures against the study and transmission of such literature deliberately flouted by conventicles of heterodox scribes? Or did works like these re-enter Jewish intellectual life after a long hiatus, due to a fortuitous manuscript discovery or a simple borrowing of intriguing material from neighboring religious communities? Is it possible to trace a continuous “paper

---

1 The following essay represents a revised and expanded version of a “cyberlecture” aired as part of an undergraduate course in “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha” offered during the spring of 1997 at the University of St. Andrews under the direction of Prof. James R. Davila. Portions have been adapted from material previously published in my *Heralds of That Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions* (NHMS 41; Leiden: Brill, 1996), especially pp. 42-48 therein and the pertinent notes. I thank E.J. Brill for graciously granting me permission to re-employ and expand that copyrighted material in this new context.

2 See m. Sanh. 10:1; j. Sanh. 10.1, 50a; b. Sanh. 100b; Qoh. Rab. 12.12(11). Note also Abraham ibn Ezra to Exod 3:22, where he recommends that “one not rely” on writings that are non-prophetic or outside of recognized tradition. He names *Sefer Zerubbabel, Sefer Eldad ha-Dani,* and *Chronicles of Moses* (this last work is singled out also in his commentary to 3:20) as examples of such writings.
trail" leading from Second Temple scribal circles down to the learned aggadists and interpreters of medieval Judaism?

A couple of concrete case studies may serve to frame this series of queries. In two recently published articles, Michael Stone demonstrates convincingly that several textual and exegetical traditions found in an eleventh-century midrashic compendium termed Bereshit Rabbati, attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan of Narbonne, are genetically related to a Hebrew fragment of the so-called Testament of Naphtali (4QTestNaph; PAM 43.237) that was found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Items of particular import include the preservation of proper names in the Hebrew texts which are garbled in the surviving Greek Testament of Naphtali (Ahiyot/Ahotay; Hannah), their common employment of distinctive vocabulary and locutions which cannot derive from the extant Greek manuscripts, and a unique midrashic explanation for the name Bilhah (although T. Naph. 1:12 also knows this midrash). To quote the author himself: "... it is possible to show that R. Moses must have had a Hebrew or Aramaic source document and that, at a number of points, his citation is closer to 4QTestNaph than it is to TPN [i.e., the Greek Testament of Naphtali]." How are we to explain this circumstance? Was R. Moshe ha-Darshan conversant with Qumran lore? Earlier studies by Albeck and Himmelfarb have suggested that this medieval exegete utilized interpretive traditions found in works like Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Life of Adam and Eve, all of which seemed to be available to him in Semitic language versions. Stone's recent discovery lends support to their suggestions and accentuates this likeli-

---


5 H. Albeck, Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1940), 17-18; M. Himmelfarb, "R. Moses the Preacher and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," AJSL Review 9 (1984) 55-78; idem, "Some Echoes of Jubilees in Medieval Hebrew Literature," Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha (SBEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 115-41. Himmelfarb nuances her position by hypothesizing that in certain 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" ("R. Moses the Preacher," 57; cf. also pp. 71-73). Stone's new Qumran fragment may be an example of such a source.
hood, but does not unfortunately solve the problem as to how R. Moshe would have acquired such singular knowledge.

Consider now a second intriguing example. The final lines of Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer §37 feature the following narrative sequence: After wrestling the angel at the Yabboq, Jacob attempts to proceed across the river, but is reminded by his opponent of his former binding vow to dedicate “a tenth of all (כל) that You grant me” to God (Gen 28:22) in the event of his safe return to his homeland. The angel also points out that the promised tithe should be exacted among Jacob’s sons, since technically they also fall under the terms of the vow. Several opinions are now provided in the text which explain how Jacob determined which one of his sons would become a “tithe” to the Lord. A solution widely attested in classical rabbinic sources, and mentioned first here, involves Jacob initially excluding from the group the four sons who enjoyed “first-born” (בראשי) status; namely, Reuben, Dan, Gad, and Joseph. Among the eight sons remaining in the group from which the tithe is to be designated, Jacob counted sequentially—i.e., in order of birth-starting with Simeon as “1.” To reach “10,” the count must move from Benjamin as “8” to Simeon again, now “9.” Levi thus occupies the tenth position in this counting scheme, and “he (Jacob) designated Levi as a tithe, holy to the Lord, as it says, ‘the tenth will be holy to the Lord’ (Lev 27:32).” After recounting R. Ishmael’s dissenting

---

6 Pirke R. El. §37 (ed. Lucia 87a): The same tradition figures in Tg. Ps-J Gen 32:25: The Lord blessed Joseph and gave him the double portion, and Jacob remained alone on the far side of the Yabboq. Then an angel in the guise of a human being attacked him, saying: ‘Did you not commit to tithing all that belongs to you? You have twelve sons and a daughter which you have yet to tithe. . . .’

7 Compare Ibn Ezra to Gen 28:22b: ‘. . . to make Levi the tenth (i.e., tithe) is the way of derash, for it is not in the Torah that a man should tithe his sons; only that he should tithe herds, flocks, and produce.’ It is obvious that Ibn Ezra is cognizant of the specific way in which the phrase “of all” has been exegeted. Radaq attributes the choice of Levi to the latter’s assiduous devotion to divine service, an interest which his brothers did not share.

8 Given their status as “first-born” and hence “holy” (Num 3:13), they are thereby exempt from being designated as “tithe.” See b. Bek. 53b, as well as the general principle enunciated in y. Sanh. 9a; Gen. Rab. 70.7.

9 Pirke R. El. §37 (ibid.): The same solution is presented in Tg. Ps-J Gen 32:25; Gen. Rab. 70.7; Pesiq. Rab Kahun. 10.6 (ed. Mandelbaum 1:167); Tanhuma, Re’eh §14; Tanhuma Buber, Re’eh §12.
opinion regarding the “first-born” and tithing obligations, the text then provides a different resolution to Jacob’s problem which is especially interesting. It states: “He began his count with Benjamin, who was (still) in the womb of his mother, and (thus) reckoned Levi as ‘holy to the Lord’ (Lev 27:32).”10 In other words, instead of beginning with Reuben and counting down to his tenth son, Zebulun, in accordance with their birth sequence, Jacob counted his sons in reverse order, beginning with his yet unborn youngest son, and wound up with Levi, his third-born, in the tenth position.11 The archangel Michael accordingly snatches Levi up to heaven and presents him to God as “Your lot and portion,”12 and Levi is there accorded signal recognition as the ancestor of the priestly clan.13

Interestingly, much of this latter version of the episode is precisely paralleled in the Second Temple era book of Jubilees.14 According to Jub. 32:2, Jacob prepared a tithe of “everything that had come with him”15 from Paddan Aram, including the human as well as the animal and inorganic goods which he had acquired during his sojourn abroad. This expansive list of offerings therefore reflects the same proof-text presupposed above by Pirqé R. El. §37 from Gen 28:22 (ךלומ מיisz תוד יל המקרא אונא והל), although the narrative setting in Jubilees is different—there is no enforcing angel, and Jacob has already successfully crossed the Yabboq.16 Jub. 32:3 then states: “And in those days

---


12 Pirqé R. El. §37 (Luria 87b): יד מלאכים ומשמעי אחר יל ומעיילו מעשה ילתמ רוחו של משמעי אחר מעשה יל ומעיילו. Note that Michael is also present in Tg. Ps-J Gen 32:25, where he is apparently identified as the angel who wrestled by the Yabboq with Jacob. Other rabbinic sources identify this angel as the “archon of Esau”; cf. Gen. Rab. 77.3.

13 Note that here is an ascension tradition coupled with Levi’s selection as priest, a motif reminiscent of T. Levi 2:2-5. For the exegetical background of Levi’s ascension tradition, see Kugel, HTR 86 (1993) 30-36.


16 Jub. 29:13. Jubilees is silent about any supernatural confrontation on that occasion,
Rachel was pregnant with her son Benjamin. And Jacob counted his sons from him upwards, and Levi fell to the lot of the Lord.”17 Astonishingly we note here a similar seemingly gratuitous statement regarding the fetal status of Benjamin, an identical reverse enumeration of sons, and the same designation of “lot” or “portion” (מַקְףַל = בָּלָם) applied to Levi—the same concatenate sequence that we observed above in the passage from Pirke R. El. §37. How can this congruence be explained? Did Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer “know” the book of Jubilees?18

Questions such as these are increasingly coming to the fore in Jewish pseudepigrapha scholarship during the final decade of the twentieth century. Much of this renewed interest stems from the publication and sustained study of a remarkable series of manuscript discoveries and recoveries over the course of the past century, the most famous of which is probably that of Qumran. Among the Qumran scrolls are the earliest attested exemplars of works like 1 Enoch and Jubilees, as well as of a host of other compositions associated with the names and careers of prominent biblical characters (e.g., Levi, Moses, David, Ezekiel). Interestingly, we can occasionally identify the possession and/or use of certain Qumran-affiliated titles by various subsequent religious communities, both Jewish and non-Jewish, even if we cannot satisfactorily reconstruct the precise means by which that community acquired it. For example, when the tenth-century Karaite polemicist Ya’qûb al-Qirqisânî in his Kitâb al-anvâr describes the Second Temple era sectarian activity of a certain Zadok,19 he presents him as an early opponent of the Rabbanites (i.e., Pharisees) and credits him with the production of “many books”

17 Ethiopic wa-ba-we’eton maqâel danâsat ye’eti râhîl benyânehâ (sic) waalî wa-x̱a’alaq‘a a’emnênu yâqob wâludâ wa-x̱a’argâ wa-x̱a’râdâ layn ba-makâfâla 2Egzi’âhber; Latin et in illo tempore Rachel in utero habente Beniamin filium suum, enumeravit Jacob ab ipso filios suos et ascendit, et ceccit Leuui in sortem Dei. Texts from Charles, Ethiopic Version 118-19. Note also R.H. Charles and C. Rabin, “Jubilees,” AOT (Sparks) 99 n. 2.

18 Or alternatively, did Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer “know” a discrete source that was also exploited by the final redactor of the book of Jubilees? This source would situate the location of Jacob’s tiehe not at Bethel (as in Jubilees) but at the Yabboq (as in Pirke R. El. and Tg. Pr.-f). Kugel offers some cogent reasons for viewing Jub. 32:3 as a later interpolation within this narrative episode; see his remarks in HTR 86 (1993) 49-51.

19 This is apparently the same Zadok vilified in ’Abot R. Natan A 5; ibid. B 10 (ed. Schechter 13b) as one of two deviant pupils of the early teacher Antigonos of Sokho, successor to Shim’on ha-Ṣaddiq as authoritative trident of halakhic traditions (cf. m. ’Abot 1:3). Qirqisânî however considerably expands the notice provided by ’Abot R. Natan, provoking suspicion that he was privy to a richer corpus of information.
wherein he challenged their interpretive positions. Qirqisānī also notes that this same Zadok derived a prohibition against the marriage of one’s niece via analogy (qiyyās) with the scriptural proscription against marriage with one’s aunt. A. Harkavy, the initial publisher and expositor of Qirqisānī’s testimony, thought it possible that Qirqisānī was here reliant upon one or more “Sadducean” books, a possibility strengthened by his contextual reference to Zadok’s authorial activity. Events were soon to prove this suspicion correct, for at the time of Harkavy’s writing (1894) neither the Cairo Genizah nor of course the Qumran hoards had come to light. The argument reported by Qirqisānī can now actually be found in the Damascus Document, a work recovered from the Genizah and published in 1910 by S. Schechter. Interestingly, there too the name of a certain Zadok is invoked as a legal authority by that text’s author. One must conclude that Qirqisānī was cognizant of at least this section of the so-called Damascus Document, portions of which have since been recovered not only from the Cairo Genizah, but also Qumran.

---


21 Qirqisānī, K. al-anwār (ed. Nemoy) 1.11.17-18: الأف سبب أحد وهو تحريف ليلة الأخ، لله استدل على ذلك بقياسهم على السنة والخالدة. The interpretative tool of qiyyās, the derivation of implicit rules by analogy or inference, is a popular technique in both Karaite and Muslim exegesis. The method corresponds to the rabbinic exegetical principle of ḥiqqēs and may indeed be ultimately borrowed from Rabbanite argumentation. See D.J. Lasker, “Islamic Influences on Karaite Origins,” Studies in Islamic and Judaic Traditions II: Papers Presented at the Institute for Islamic-Judaic Studies, Center for Judaic Studies, University of Denver (BJS 178; ed. W.M. Brinner and S.D. Ricks; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 32-33.


24 CD 5:2-5: هؤلاء أمل أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفداد السماء أيها أفداد أيها أفدا... This "Zadok" is surely identical with the ones mentioned by 'Abot R. Natan and Qirqisānī.

Prior to the recovery of the Qumran scrolls, perhaps the most significant manuscript find of the modern era was Solomon Schechter’s retrieval of the bulk of the Cairo Genizah textual archive at the close of the last century. A treasure trove of written documents that illuminates the daily life of the Jewish community of Fatimid and Ayyubid Egypt, it comprises hundreds of thousands of manuscript fragments ranging in date from the tenth to the nineteenth centuries CE. Yet as scholars soon discovered, the Genizah also preserved medieval copies of literary texts that antedated their scriveners by more than a millennium. Among the ancient documents recovered from the Genizah to date are six fragmentary manuscripts of the original Hebrew version of Ben Sira; some leaves of an Aramaic Levi apocryphon, the latter work previously known only from its Christian redaction(s) in Greek in the so-called Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; and a set of manuscript leaves representing two different copies of a sectarian manual that described the formation of a “new covenant in the land of Damascus” (6:19); i.e., the Damascus Document. Some scholars would expand this list to include a collection of pseudo-Davidic psalms and a non-biblical wisdom composition. The eventual discovery of Qumran exemplars of Ben Sira, the Aramaic Levi work, and the Damascus Document demonstrated the actual antiquity of at least those writings. There is thus tangible evidence hinting at the post-Hurban survival of sectarian communities during the succeeding centuries or, at the very least, of ideological positions or of literature associated with such groups.

How could Second Temple compositions such as the Damascus Document and Aramaic Levi eventually surface amidst the fragmentary remains of the Cairo Genizah? Explanations have tended to cluster around two options: (1) such writings were continuously transmitted among certain groups within oriental Judaism for an extended period of time; or

---


such writings “re-entered” Jewish culture via an accidental discovery of a manuscript deposit or a conscious borrowing from writings husbanded by non-Jewish circles.

One current of interpretation posits the continuous, largely subterranean, survival of Qumran-affiliated sectarian cells within classical Judaism until the Gaonic period, when this ideology re-erupted in the guise of Karaism. Proponents of this view point to the undeniable similarity in terminology and cultural critique displayed within the sectarian scrolls and Karaite literature, suggesting that the sectarian perspective persisted as a living tradition at the fringes of Tannaitic and Amoraic formulations and developments. This explanation is actually an updated version of A. Geiger’s nineteenth-century theory regarding the origins of the Karaite movement. Geiger argued then that Karaism was directly indebted to the continuing survival of Second Temple Sadducean ideology—namely its alleged antipathy to Pharisaic oral Torah—within late antique and early medieval Judaism. Modern scholars simply supplement Geiger’s hypothesis with the new evidence provided by the Qumran finds, particularly with regard to the importance of the figure of Zadok, in order to bolster this possibility.

Some support for this position might possibly come from Rabbanite polemic against the Karaite movement. A term of opprobrium frequently wielded against Karaite arguments is the appellative “Sadducee.” For example, the Andalusian chronicler Abraham ibn Daud notes in his Sefer ha-Qabbalah: “after the (Roman) destruction of the Temple, the Sadducees languished until the advent of ‘Anan, who reinvigorated them.” Here the designation “Sadducee” is apparently used to identify an actual group who maintained a tenuous presence among eastern Jewish communities from the First Roman Revolt until the eighth century CE, when ‘Anan, the putative “founder” of Karaism emerged as an articulate

29 According to J. Mann, the midrashic compilation known as Seder Eliyahu Rabbah reveals that “as late as the second half of the fifth century” [which is where Mann dates SED] there were Jews in Babylon “who opposed the Oral Law”; see the edition of M. Friedmann, Maoz 93-98 for a convenient collection of pertinent passages. Mann further speculates that such groups may have persisted “surreptitiously” until eventually emerging under the banner of Karaism. See J. Mann, “Changes in the Divine Service of the Synagogue Due to Religious Persecution,” HUCA 4 (1927) 309.
30 Note the similarity of expression to CD 5:5, with regard to the advent of Zadok. Text cited from A. Neubauer, Medieval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes (2 vols.; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970) 1.64.
spokesperson for their program.\textsuperscript{31} The force of this aspersion depends upon Second Temple and Tannaitic testimonies regarding a series of halakhic disputes with a shadowy group bearing this name. The same group occasionally is termed “Baytusi,” a designation which in the sixteenth century was brilliantly connected with the name “Essene.”\textsuperscript{32} According to rabbinic sources, the “Sadducees/Baytusin” are a religious group who are frequently at odds with the Sages with regard to two major issues: 1) the proper determination of festival dates, or, calendrical issues; and 2) the proper maintenance of ritual purity.\textsuperscript{33} Both of these topics, interestingly enough, are major foci of a number of Qumran scrolls. Some have argued that in these recorded disputes we possess historical reminiscences of dialogues between Pharisaic exegetes and Qumran adherents. Perhaps, so the argument runs, the Rabbanites perceptively recognized in the Karaite schism the latest physical renascence of their centuries-old adversary.

Other evidence also points to the possibility that “Sadducees,” or perhaps better “Zadokites,” persisted as an identifiable religious sect during late antiquity. A curious passage found in the Syriac \textit{Vita Rabbūlā},\textsuperscript{34} an early hagiographic recountal of the episcopal career of Rabbūlā (411-35 CE), the eastern church leader often credited with the establishment of orthodoxy in Edessa, identifies the names of a number of heresies which the bishop aggressively suppressed upon his arrival in that city. Among the roster of familiar labels occurs one interesting collocation—“the heresy of the ‘Audians and the Zadokites.”\textsuperscript{35} The standard lexica identify the \textit{ץדוקים} as “Sadducees,” although it is unclear (1) why “Sadducees” as a distinct Jewish party would be present as a viable community in fifth-century Edessa, or (2) why this particular Jewish sect should merit special attention from Rabbūlā—no other


\textsuperscript{32} Azariah di Rossi, \textit{Me’or ‘Enayim} (3 vols.; Vilna, 1866; reprinted, Jerusalem: Maqor, 1970) 1.90-97. See also the references supplied by Beer, \textit{Buch der Jubiläen} 9-13.

\textsuperscript{33} For a recent discussion of these issues, see Y. Sussmann, “Appendix 1: The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, \textit{Qumran Cave 4}, \textit{V: Miqra’i Ma’ase Ha-Torah} (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 187-96.

\textsuperscript{34} S. Ephraemi Syr. . \textit{Opera Selecta} (ed. J.J. Overbeck; Oxford: Clarendon, 1865) 159-209.

\textsuperscript{35} Overbeck 194.9-10: םלועהו יבצנה 794 ליבסב ותבסיי. 
Jewish group is singled out here in this way, or (3) why the Sadducees, if they are indeed the Sadducees, would be grouped with the ‘Audians, a gnostic sect known to us from other sources. I think that there are at least two possible solutions to this crux.

First, the name “Zadokite” and its related cognate derivatives (“righteous,” “righteous one,” “children of righteousness,” “righteousness,” etc.) were the standard Semitic Manichaean designations for the Manichaean religion itself and its adherents, particularly those who were numbered among the so-called “Elect.” Moreover, scholars have been accumulating an impressive amount of evidence that points to a literary nexus between the scribal circles of Second Temple Judæa, including most importantly Qumran, and subsequent Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic movements, including Manichæism. Pseudepigrapha allegedly attributed to or associated with biblical forefathers like Adam, Seth, and Enoch form an important part of this cultural transmission, especially those featuring angelophanic interviews and ascent experiences. The author of *Vita Rabbīlās* states that the ‘Audians and Zadokites “wandered astray after false visions . . . ,” an allusion perhaps to these sects’ utilization of apocryphal apocalypses of this sort. We in fact have confirming evidence that at least the ‘Audians cultivated the study of this sort of literature—Theodore bar Konai’s description of that sect provides both titles and brief quotations from their library of biblical pseudepigrapha. We also


38 Overbeck 194.12-13: “they wandered astray after false visions and were blind to the truth.”

39 Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholionum* (CSG c.scrip. syri. ser. II, t. 65-66; 2 vols.; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Caroleus Pousielgue, 1910-12) 2.319.6-320.26. Theodore states: “He [i.e., ‘Audi] accepted with the Old and the New Testaments also (certain) apocalypses (υνίκευται).” Identified by name are an apocalypse of Abraham, an apocalypse of John (now recovered from Coptic gnostic literature as the *Apocryphon of John*), a “Book of the
know that Mani was extremely interested in this type of literature, particularly writings associated with the figure of Enoch, so much so that the Qumranic Book of Giants is eventually adapted to form a part of the official Manichaean scriptural canon. However, despite the attractiveness of this particular solution to the aforementioned identity problem (i.e., Vita Rabbūlā’s Zadokites = Manichaens), there does remain a significant difficulty. The adherents of Mani have in fact already been named earlier in the list of heresies! Unless the writer of the Vita is deliberately distinguishing the Manichaean electi from their auditores (“hearers”), it seems unlikely that Manichaism would be mentioned twice in the same list.

A second possibility for interpreting the elusive “Zadokites” of Vita Rabbūlā is even more speculative than the one just outlined. I wonder if this designation might not encode a reference to a group of fifth-century Mesopotamian “descendants” of the Second Temple era Zadokites. Given their present association with the ‘Audians, along with the absence in this list of any other reference to specific Jewish movements, they

---


41 Overbeck 193.25-194.9; i.e., immediately preceding the notice about the ‘Audians and Zadokites. The Manichaens are here termed “the adherents of Mani.”

42 Both al-Jahiz (ninth-century) and Ibn Hazm (eleventh-century) refer to a Jewish sect termed Sadūqiyya; i.e., “Zadokites.” The former authority situates members of this sect in the Yemen, Syria, and Byzantine territory; for the references, see C. Adang, Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 98 n. 130. Ibn Hazm states that their name stems from “a man whose name was Zadok,” that they could be found in the region of the Yemen, and that they held that ‘Uzayr was the son of God; see S. Poznański, “Ibn Hazm über jüdische Secten,” JQR o.s. 16 (1904) 766.7-767.2 (text). Both scholars’ placement of this sect in the Yemenite sphere is highly suggestive, given that region’s reputation as a haven for both Jewish and non-Jewish sectarians. See, e.g., L. Massingham, “The Origins of the Transformation of Persian Iconography by Islamic Theology: The Shi’a School of Kuṭa and its Manichaean Connections,” A Survey of Persian Art: From Prehistoric Times to the Present (15 vols.; ed. A.U. Pope and P. Ackerman; London: Oxford University Press, 1938-39) 5.1928-36; D.J. Halperin and G.D. Newby, “Two Castrated Bulls: A Study in the Haggadah of Ka’b al-Ahbar,” JAOS 102 (1982) 631-38; Y. Erder, “The Origin of the Name Idris in the Qur’an: A Study of the Influence of Quaran Literature on Early Islam,” JNES 49 (1990) 339-50. The idea of belief in ‘Uzayr (i.e., Ezra) as the “son of God” goes back to Qur’an S. 9.30, although here Ibn Hazm limits this enigmatic charge to the “Zadokites.”

If one accepts P. Casanova’s attractive solution to this longstanding crux (a confusion between ‘Uzayr and Uziel), Ibn Hazm’s ascription of such a belief to “Zadokites” becomes more intelligible. See Casanova, “Idris et ‘Ouzair,” JA 205 (1924) 356-60, as well as the important remarks of S.M. Wasserstrom, Between Muslim and Jew: The Problem of Symbiosis under Early Islam (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995) 183 n. 67.
are apparently no longer “Jewish” in identity or orientation (at least to an outsider’s eye), but they might perhaps retain certain customs or exotic literary heirlooms from their sectarian past, textual and/or behavioral merchandise which other religious communities might borrow and exploit. One recalls in this connection the intriguing notice in the here-siologist Mārūṭa of Maipherqat that the ‘Audians prohibited laughter during their assemblies,43 a stricture reminiscent of the similar proscription against public mirth in the Qumranic Serekh ha-Yahad or Community Rule,44 as well as among the mysterious Maḥārīyya sect, a group whom we will examine in more detail below.45 It is perhaps also noteworthy that the ‘Audians resisted the Nicene strictures regarding the separation of the date of Easter from that of the Passover celebration, an attitude indicative of their close ties to Jewish observances.46 One wonders whether the ‘Audian sect did not in fact originate as a “Christianized” version of an older “Zadokite” Jewish community.47 Their peculiar pairing in this source may then preserve an ancient recognition of a derivative link between them.

It is however not necessary to postulate the persistent survival of the “Sadducee” sect in order to explain the eruption and spread of Karaism, nor is it required to explain the continued survival of Second Temple pseu-digraphical literature among later scribal circles, both Jewish and Gentile. Scholars have called attention to sporadic notices reporting the discovery of ancient manuscripts, both biblical and non-biblical, within

44 IQS 7:14-15: שמש כנסת ליהודיים ישראל עוצרים בית. The same proscription is now found in the Cave 4 fragments of the Damascus Document. Note 4Q266 10 ii 12-13; 4Q269 10 ii 1-2; and 4Q270 7 i 4, as found in Baumgarten, DJD 18 74-75; 135.
45 Qīrīsānī, K. al-anwār (ed. Nemoy) 1.42.2-3: وحنك عنهم انه كان فيهم قولوارون أن يضحكوا و “It is said that they are among them some who think that laughter is unlawful”; translation from Nemoy, HUCA 7 (1930) 363.
46 According to Epiphanius, the ‘Audians cited a διάταξις ἀποστόλων in support of their position: ὕμεις μὴ ψηφίζητε, ἀλλὰ ποιεῖτε όταν οἱ ἀδελφοί ὑμῶν οἱ ἐκ περίτωμης, μετ' αὐτῶν ἔχων κατείχε (Panarion 70.10.2). See also Theodore bar Konai, Scholion (ed. Scher) 2.319.8-11: “When the Nicene Council decreed the regulation that members of the Church would not celebrate the paschal festival with the Jews, he (continued) to follow the ancient customs, and contended that their rite was the proper one to hold,” Note too S. Lieberman, “Palestine in the Third and Fourth Centuries,” JQR n.s. 36 (1945-46) 333-34.
47 This possibility is not as far-fetched as it might seem. For an illuminating discussion of the presence of “Christianizing Jews” in the Near East during the first millennium CE, see Wasserstrom, Between Muslim and Jew 38-41.
the caves dotting the Judaean wilderness during the course of the first millennium CE. Eusebius, for example, mentions that Origen employed for his Hexapla a manuscript of the biblical book of Psalms that had been “found at Jericho in a jar during the reign of Antoninus son of Severus” (Hist. eccl. 6.16.3), a clear reference to a manuscript find in the Dead Sea region predating that of the modern Qumran discoveries. Several centuries later the Nestorian patriarch Timothy of Seleucia speaks of the recent discovery of a large number of manuscripts, both biblical and non-biblical, in a cave near Jericho. These were reportedly transported to Jerusalem for careful study, and among this find were “more than two hundred Psalms of David.” The eventual fate of this group of texts remains unknown, although one must recognize that a sizeable recovery of manuscripts from this particular location possesses important implications for explaining why non-biblical works of Second Temple provenance like the Damascus Document are present in the Cairo Genizah scant centuries later. Moreover, the


49 O. Braun, “Ein Brief des Katholikos Timotheos I über biblische Studien des 9. Jahrhunderts,” OrChr 1 (1901) 138-52; 299-313. The description of the find, as well as Timothy’s explanation for the manuscripts’ presence in the wilderness, is found on 304.11-308.15 (text). See Appendix Three below.

50 Braun 306.15-16: אֵין בָּעָל מִי מִימֵיהּ לְיַמְּלוּ יְמֵי מִימֵיהּ לְיַמְּלוּ יְמֵי מִימֵיהּ לְיַמְּלוּ יְמֵי מִימֵיהּ לְיַמְּלוּ יְמֵי מִימֵיהּ לְיַמְּלוּ יְמֵי מִימֵיהּ לְיַמְּלוּ יְמֵי מִימֵיהּ לְיַמְּלוּ יְמֵי מִימֵיהּ L. C. L. T. E. “A Hebrew (informant) told me: ‘We found ascribed to David in those manuscripts more than two hundred psalms.’”

51 Some have speculated that the manuscript hoard came into the possession of the initial Karaites emigrants to Eretz Israel; cf. M. Gil, A History of Palestine, 634-1099 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 784-86. Note especially the intriguing testimony of the thirteenth-century Rabbanite Moshe Taku: כְּבָר שָׂפָם יְמַעַר וְנָשִּׂים מַהְיָהָהוּ לְחֵיתָם אַחֶרֶת וְנָשִּׂים מַהְיָהָהוּ לְחֵיתָם אַחֶרֶת וְנָשִּׂים מַהְיָהָהוּ לְחֵיתָם אַחֶרֶת וְנָשִּׂים מַהְיָהָהוּ לְחֵיתָם אַחֶרֶת וְנָשִּׂים מַהְיָהָהוּ לְחֵיתָם אַחֶרֶת וְנָשִּׂים מַהְיָהָהוּ L. C. L. T. E. "we have learned from our teachers that 'Anan the heretic and his party used to write heretical and false treatises and hide them underground, and after a time would bring them out and say, 'Thus have we found (it attested) in ancient books!'” See S. Lieberman, “Light on the Cave Scrolls from Rabbinic Sources,” PAAJR 20 (1951) 402-3; S. Spiegel, “Le-parashat ha-polemos shel Pirko ben Baboi,” Harry Austyn Wolfson Jubilee Volume (Hebrew and English vols.; ed. S. Lieberman, et al.; Jerusalem: The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1965) 256 (Hebrew).

explicit mention of an expanded Davidic psalter ("more than two hundred") suggests one likely source for the presence in Syriac ecclesiastical tradition of five apocryphal Psalms of David—the so-called Psalms 151-155.\textsuperscript{53}

Furthermore, and perhaps most intriguingly, Karaite and Muslim heresiologists are cognizant of a Jewish sect which supposedly flourished around the turn of the era whom they termed Maghārīyya ("Cave Men"), "so called because their writings were found in a cave."\textsuperscript{54} Information about this sect can be found in four medieval writers: al-Qirqisānī, al-Bīrūnī, al-Shahristānī, and Judah Hadassi,\textsuperscript{55} who are in turn reliant upon at least two earlier, now largely lost sources—those of Dā'ūd b. Marwān al-Muqammīs, a ninth-century exegete who flirted with Christianity before returning to the Jewish fold,\textsuperscript{56} and Abū ʻĪsā al-Warrāq, an alleged "heretic" \textit{(zindiq)}\textsuperscript{57} occasionally accused of harboring Manichaean sympathies.\textsuperscript{38} Qirqisānī's description of the Maghārīyya, perhaps the fullest of those available, situates them in a pre-Christian temporal setting, between the figures of Zadok (see above)

\textsuperscript{53} In the approximately 326 lines, complete or partial, [of the 4Q fragments] which parallel the Genizah text there are less than thirty significant variants. In view of the absence of any known continuous textual tradition during the millennium which separates the medieval copy from its ancient forerunners, the reports of manuscript finds in the Dead Sea region in medieval sources will very likely gain added attention.

\textsuperscript{54} Excepting Ps 151, "the other four Psalms preserved in Syriac and associated in much of the MS tradition with Ps 151 certainly derive directly from a Hebrew text." This judgment stems from the extremely valuable study of J. Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission of the Apocryphal Psalms 151, 154 (= Syr. II) and 155 (= Syr. III)," \textit{HTR} 59 (1966) 259.

\textsuperscript{55} Qirqisānī, \textit{K al-anwār} (ed. Nemoy) 1.12.1; Arabic text also reproduced in Reeves, \textit{Heralds} 62 n. 115.

\textsuperscript{56} The references are provided in Reeves, \textit{Heralds} 61-62 n. 114.


and Jesus. His notice emphasizes their prolific literary activity, and speaks as if the bulk of their writings were still available for contemporary inspection: "One of them (i.e., of the sect) 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."\(^{59}\) Whether these statements represent the judgment of Muqammiṣ or of Qirqisānī himself remains opaque; what is clearly evident though is the continued physical existence and availability of this sectarian literature during the late first millennium CE. Two works are remarked as especially noteworthy: that of "the Alexandrian," whom Harkavy (among others) identified as Philo,\(^{60}\) and the mysterious \textit{Sefer Ṭawwābun}.\(^{61}\) Unfortunately these two writings seem to have perished, at least with regard to their aforementioned cognomens.\(^{62}\)

All of these "archaeological" notices would seem to possess some relevance for the presence of ancient "sectarian" texts in the Cairo Genizah, not to mention the eventual twentieth-century Qumran-area discoveries, although it is difficult to integrate and synthesize the various accounts into a consistent sectarian profile. However it is to be explained, it is manifestly clear that Second Temple Jewish writings of a sectarian hue remained available among certain groups of Islamicate Jewry, and hence potentially accessible to Western Jewish communities, as well as non-Jewish

\(^{58}\) Qirqisānī, \textit{K. al-anwār} (ed. Nemøy) 1.12.4:4.1-4.4:4, his book is mentioned by Philo as well as by another writer, but his name is not known. Translation is that of Nemøy, \textit{HUCA} 7 (1930) 327.


\(^{61}\) As Harkavy noted ("Qirqisānī on the Jewish Sects" 60), the title would suggest that this is a Hebrew work, although the title's meaning (Book of Yaddua? Book of Knowledge?) remains unclear. See especially the remarks of N. Golb, "Who Were the Magśliyya?" \textit{JAOS} 80 (1960) 357.

\(^{62}\) For an exemplary fresh discussion of the Maghārīyya which accents the esoteric resonances of their peculiar cognomen, see S.M. Wasserstrom, "Shaharastānī on the Magḥārīyya," \textit{Israel Oriental Studies} (forthcoming).
antiquarians, intellectuals, and religious fanatics, insofar as such writings (or oral reports of them) may have circulated in a convenient vernacular format. However, to judge from the extant manuscript evidence, the number of such texts was relatively small, especially when compared to the rich corpus of Second Temple and Roman era Jewish texts preserved and transmitted among certain Christian communities, particularly within the eastern churches. Our knowledge of the Jewish pseudepigraphic corpus would be much poorer were it not for eastern Christendom’s fascination with biblical legendry. Oftentimes recensions of pseudepigraphic works survive in several versions and linguistic traditions, attesting a lively scribal interest in the transmission and even embellishment of received wisdom.

Syriac literature is especially rich in Jewish pseudepigraphical “survivals,” a circumstance due in no small part to the sustained presence of substantial Jewish communities in Syria and Mesopotamia throughout the late antique and Islamicate periods. This same cultural sphere was also a hotbed of heterodox religious activity, both Jewish and non-Jewish, during the same timeframe. Much of this social ferment bubbles out of the dissemination of radical ways of reading and interpreting the scriptural substrate shared by Jews, Christians, gnostics, and Muslims, and there exists substantial evidence for the transmission of narrative motifs, exegetical traditions, and even entire works across formal religious boundaries. Thanks to the widespread phenomenon of “prophetization,”

---

63 The Nachleben of a composition like the Qumran Book of Giants illustrates one aspect of such vitality. The Book of Giants achieves its greatest popularity within Manichaeanism, where it comes to be ranked as one of that community’s authoritative scriptures. Interestingly, Manichaean traditions also supply us with our sole evidence for the existence in Mesopotamia of Semitic language (undoubtedly eastern Aramaic) archetypes of the “Similitudes of Enoch” (1 Enoch 37-71) and 2 Enoch—see Reeves, Heralds 191-98; idem, “An Enochic Motif in Manichaean Tradition,” Manicheaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday (ed. A. van Tongerloo and S. Giversen; Louvain: International Association of Manichaean Studies, 1991) 295-98; idem, “Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library,” Tracing the Threads 173-203, esp. 181-91.

64 For example, the two distinct Old Slavonic versions of 2 Enoch; the numerous oriental versions of 4 Ezra; Syriac and Arabic versions of 2 Apoc. Bar.; the polyglot Admoniscripten corpus. Such examples could easily be multiplied.


66 See especially Wasserstrom, Between Muslim and Jew.

67 I mean by this term the seemingly arbitrary bestowal of prophetic rank upon a number of literary characters who do not normally enjoy such status within the traditional
works associated with biblical (and some postbiblical and even nonbiblical [i.e., pagan!]) forefathers and worthies generated particular interest for the light they could shed on questions relating to cosmogony, cosmology, chronography, and eschatology, irregardless of whether their alleged authors enjoyed such status in their original narrative contexts. Adam, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Nimrod, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the sons of Jacob, Moses, David, Solomon, Baruch, Ezra, Daniel, Zerubbabel, R. Shimon b. Yohai—these figures, among others, were elevated (if need be) to the office of “prophet,” and their pronouncements, now largely if not wholly pseudepigraphical, were carefully scrutinized for their present relevance by followers of “later” prophetic figures like Mani, Muhammad, or Abū 'Isā al-Iṣṭahānī. Such intensity of interest in the “writings” of the forefathers emanating from a diverse array of Near Eastern religions and sects goes a long way, in my mind, toward explaining the remarkable survival and eventual supplementation and expansion of authentic Second Temple era Jewish writings in the Middle Ages.

Finally, to address our remaining loose ends: the two examples of what appear to be “survivals” of Jubilees and a Hebrew Testament of Naphtali in Pirqa de-Rabbi Eliezer and R. Moshe ha-Darshan, respectively. Given the probable Islamicate provenance of Pirqa R. El. and the growing documentation for the knowledge of Jubilees in medieval Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic literature, it does not seem unusual (at least to me) that Pirqa R. El. would have, and sometimes use, Jubilees as a source of aggadic lore. R. Moshe ha-Darshan presents a more difficult case. If Albeck, Himmelfarb, and Stone are justified in their suspicions that he exploited ancient pseudepigraphical literature (and I think they are), where or how did he gain access to it? Some type of literary transmission

scripts. This phenomenon however is not arbitrary. “Prophetization” is in fact closely tied (it would seem) to the process of “scripturalization” i.e., the gradual, yet formal establishment of a “sacred” corpora of scriptures.

Along with “prophetization” develops a revised definition of the credentials required for broad interreligious recognition of one’s status as “prophet.” These are preeminently twofold: an angelophany via which the divine message is imparted, and the authorship of a “book” which records the message for posterity.

At least among those religious communities for whom the office of “prophet” retained an inherent authority. Interest would naturally be taken in the preservation and transmission of writings allegedly penned by an authoritative “prophet.”

has undoubtedly taken place, a process involving textual movement generally from eastern to western sites of intellectual activity, perhaps via Byzantine Italy71 or North Africa and Andalusia72 to Provence. One should not underestimate the possible role of Arabophone literature, subsequently translated into Hebrew, in this connection; the qiṣṣa al-anbiyāʾ (“tales of the prophets”) collections were extremely popular and constitute a rich depository of all sorts of curious lore, some of which is indebted to Jewish pseudepigraphical legend.73 It has, for example, not been noticed by scholars of Second Temple era Jewish literature that the ninth-century Arabic chronicle of al-Yaʾqūbī incorporates a paraphrastic rendition of apocryphal Psalm 151 amidst its presentation of the career of David.74 Genizah documents illustrate that transcontinental travel and trade did effectively link widely separated Jewish communities.75 One might also recall the relatively rapid dissemination within occidental Jewish circles of the Sefer Yetzira, a pseudepigraphon which is almost certainly of Islamicate origin,76 or Scholem’s hypothesized “oriental

71. Himmelfarb, “R. Moses the Preacher” 73-77; idem, “Some Echoes” 115-18. Moreover, as Himmelfarb rightly notes, both Sefer Yisraḥ, a work probably produced in southern Italy during the mid-tenth century CE, and the extant writings of Shabbetai Donnolo, a Jewish physician who dwelt in the same region at the same time, display knowledge of extracanonical books and/or traditions.

72. Such, for example, seems to be the path of transmission for Sefer Nestor ha-Komer, an early Jewish polemical treatise attacking Christianity. See D.J. Lasker and S. Stroumsa, The Polemic of Nestor the Priest: Introduction, Translations and Commentary (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 1996) 1.28-29.


75. One can also cite the example of the intriguing Abū Aaron, a ninth-century wonder-working Jewish immigrant to southern Italy who hailed from a prominent family in Babylonia and who supposedly transmitted to Europe certain esoteric traditions. See G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (3d ed.; reprinted, New York: Schocken, 1961) 41, 84-85, 102; idem, Kabbalah (Jerusalem: Keter, 1974) 33; A. Sharf, The Universe of Shabbetai Donnolo (New York: Ktav, 1976) 79-80; Y. Dan, “Aaron of Baghdad,” EncJuda 2.21.

76. According to §§61 and 64 (I am using the edition of I. Gruenwald, “A Preliminary Critical Edition of Sefer Yeṣira,” IOS 1 [1971] 132-77) of Sefer Yeṣira, the existence of the book is attributed to Abraham, who experienced a vision of the “Lord of All.” He thus fits the parameters of the “prophet” as outlined above. With regard to the Islamicate
sources” underlying what becomes among European savants the *Sefer ha-Bahir*. In sum, the evidence points to an incredible vitality for the Jewish pseudopigrapha in a variety of subsequent religious and temporal contexts, even though at present we cannot precisely reconstruct how it was sustained in each and every instance.

APPENDIX ONE:
SOME SEMITIC VERSIONS OF PSALM 151

1. 11QPs* xxviii 3-14 (Ps 151 A, B):78


78 J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs*)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965) 49, 60-61, and plate XVII.
Hallelujah of David b. Jesse:

I was smaller than my brothers, the least among the sons of my father. He appointed me shepherd to his flock, and ruler over his goat-kids. My hands fashioned a flute, and my fingers a lyre, and I glorified the Lord.
I said to myself: The mountains cannot bear witness to Him, nor the hills declare (His glory);
The trees have tallied my words, and the flock my deeds.
But who can declare and who can express and who can number the deeds of the Lord?
Everything God has seen, everything He has heard and understood.
He sent His prophet to anoint me, Samuel to magnify me.
My brothers went out to meet him, handsome in form and appearance. (While) tall in height and having comely hairstyles, the Lord God did not choose them.
He sent and took me from following the flock and anointed me with the holy oil.
He appointed me to be a prince for His people, a ruler over the members of His covenant.
Beginning of the power (granted) to David, after the prophet of God anointed him:
Then I saw a Philistine blaspheming from [their ranks...].

2. MS BM Add. 14568.79

#151. This psalm is a Writing of David and is outside of the (established) reckoning. (It was uttered) after he singlehandedly fought with Goliath:

I was the youngest of my brothers: a mere child in my father’s house.
I tended the flock of my father.
My hands constructed (a musical) instrument;
My fingers tuned the lyre.
Who is the one who revealed (me) to the Lord?
(He is the Lord: He is my God).
He sent His messenger and removed me from my father’s sheep
And anointed me with the oil of anointment.
My brothers were handsome and mighty, but the Lord did not choose them.
I went out to engage the Philistine, and he cursed me by his idols.
But after I unsheathed his sword, I cut off his head
And (thus) I removed shame from the Israelites. *Finis.*

3. Elijah of Anbar:80

A thanksgiving of David:

I was the youngest of my brothers; a mere child in my father’s house.
I tended the flocks of my father.

---

I found a lion, also a bear, and I killed them; I tore them to pieces. My hands constructed (a musical) instrument; My fingers tuned the lyre. Who is the one who revealed me to my Lord? (He is my Lord; He is my God). He sent His messenger and removed me from my father’s sheep And anointed me with the oil of anointment. My brothers were handsome and mighty, but the Lord did not choose them. I went out to engage the Philistine, and he cursed me by his idols. But I unsheathed his sword and cut off his head And (thus) I removed shame from the Israelites.

4. al-Ya‘qūbī, Ta‘rīkh: 81

َٖٓاَّ لُمُي القول دار فِي أخَر الْزِبْورُ: ۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛۛ۴۱

Then David said in the last psalm:

Behold, I was the last of my brothers, and a servant in my father’s house, I was tending the sheep of my father. My hand(s) made the drum, and my fingers trimmed wind-instruments. Who is the one who spoke of me to my Lord? (He is my Lord, and He is the one who has heard of me), And He sent to me His messengers and removed me from my brother’s sheep. They were greater and more handsome than I, but my Lord did not desire them. Then He sent me to take on the soldiers of Jālūt (i.e., Goliath). When I saw him worshipping his idols, He granted me victory over him. I seized his sword and cut off his head.

Comparison of these Semitic versions of Psalm 151 demonstrates that the Arabic text cited by Yaʿqūbī exhibits a close relationship to the Syriac versions of this psalm, particularly that of the shorter rendition preserved in the British Museum manuscript. This is hardly surprising, given the recognized role of Syriac intermediaries in the transmission of Western intellectual and literary traditions to the Islamic world. There is, however, one glaring discrepancy between the Syriac and Arabic versions of Psalm 151 which suggests that the process of transmission may have been more complicated. The verse which preserves David’s mental musings while shepherding his father’s flocks reads in its Syriac forms “He is the/my Lord; He is my God,” a severe truncation of the original Hebrew wording as preserved in its Qumranic archetype. Yaʿqūbī’s version states: “He is my Lord, and He is the one who has heard of me.” Neither Syriac rendition can be the source for this latter clause in Yaʿqūbī’s text. However, God is depicted as the One who has “listened” or “heard” in both the Hebrew and Septuagint versions of Psalm 151 (αὐτὸς κύριος, αὐτὸς πάντων εἰσηκούει). Since the Septuagint has abbreviated this section of the Hebrew psalm in an almost identical manner to that of Yaʿqūbī’s text, it would appear that the version of Yaʿqūbī is indebted to the Septuagint at this point.82

Finally, it should be noted that only Psalm 151 B (Hebrew) and Yaʿqūbī’s Arabic version share the motif of David’s personal observation (“I saw . . .”) of the Philistine giant’s blasphemy. Neither the Septuagint nor the Syriac versions portray their duel using visual imagery; instead, it is described as auditory—David hears Goliath cursing him by his idols. This unique linkage of the Qumranic and Arabic renditions is quite intriguing and merits further study.

APPENDIX TWO:
AN ECHO OF THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT IN AL-SHAHRASTĀNĪ?

When Schechter published the editio princeps of the Cairo Damascus Document in 1910 under the title Fragments of a Zadokite Work, he introduced his transcription of the manuscripts with a valuable exposition and analysis of its possible sectarian affinities. Therein he suggested “that the only ancient Sect which comes here into consideration is the

82 Yaʿqūbī almost certainly is indebted to a manuscript version which has been “corrected” to accord with the Septuagint. See Adang, Muslim Writers 120.
Dosithean, for our Sect has left so many marked traces on the accounts which have come down to us about the Dosithians that we may conclude that they were in some way an offshoot from the schism which is the subject of our inquiry. Schechter went on to catalog several points where ancient testimonia about the Dosithians from Samaritan, Christian, and Muslim sources would seem to bolster such a nexus. One of these purported correspondences forms the subject of the present excursus.

Shortly after beginning his exposition of Samaritan Judaism, the twelfth-century Muslim heresiographer al-Shahrastānī provides the following information about the origin of a curious Dosithian sub-sect termed the Al fianīyya:

They (the Samaritans) affirm the prophetic stature of Moses, Aaron, and Joshua b. Nūn (peace be upon them!), but deny prophetic status to the prophets after them, except for a single prophet. For they (the Samaritans) say that the Torah announces that only one prophet will come after Moses: he will certify what is before him from the Torah, and adjudicate using its (the Torah's) verdict, and will definitely not replace it (with another Torah).

There appeared among the Samaritans a man who called himself

---


84 A lengthy extract from the Arabic chronicle of the Samaritan historian Abu'l Fath relating a number of peculiar customs of the Dositeans is contained in A.I. Silvestre de Sacy, *Chrestomathie arabe* (2d ed.; 3 vols.; Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1826-27) 1.334-36. For a convenient assemblage of Arabic language testimonia on Samaritan sects, see ibid. 1.333-45 nn. 71-76.

85 Citing as his source the *Kūb al-maqālāt* of Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq, Bīrūnī reports that the *Jewish* sect known as the Al fianīyya (الأتييني) "repudiate all of the festivals and allege that (their observance) is unauthorized without prophetic direction and retain only (observance of) the Sabbath" (*al-Āthār* [ed. Sachau] 284.23-285.1). For yet more references to this sect, see especially Wasserstrom, "Shahrastānī" (ms. p. 9 n. 30).
al-Ilfān. He pretended to be a prophet, and claimed that he was the one whom Moses had announced, and that he was the "brilliant star" mentioned in the Torah which moonlight illumines. His appearance preceded that of Christ by about one hundred years.86

Of initial interest is the peculiar self-designation for this person who claimed to fulfill the oracle of the advent of a single post-Mosaic prophet (presumably Deut 18:15-18).87 Shahhrastānī goes on to demonstrate how the name "Ilfān" ("Alfān"?) served as an eponym for his followers: "the Samaritans are divided between the Dūstāniyya (i.e., Dositheans)—these are the Alfāniyya—and the Kūstāniyya."88 In other words, al-Shahhrastānī equates the Alfāniyya with the Dositheans. The curious epithet, however, antedates the taxonomic efforts of al-Shahhrastānī; as we have already seen, the polymath al-Bīrūnī is aware of the existence of a Jewish group bearing this name, although he does not identify them as Samaritans, much less Dositheans.89 Sachau simply glossed the name "Alfāniyya" as "Millenarii" in his translation of al-Bīrūnī's brief notice about this sect.90

According to some scholars, the word "Ilfān" may be a transcription of an Aramaic nominal form derived from the stem פָּנָה "teach, instruct"—hence "Teacher" or "Guide."91 This title, if it is indeed such,

87 The explicit statements affirming the non-abrogation of the Mosaic Torah display a curious affinity with the rabbinic traditions regarding the future advent of the prophet Elijah and his pronouncements at that time. See m. Ed. 8:7 with the comments of Rambam ad loc. (רמבם) 115); also his Hilkhat melakim simlitamaleh 12.2. Note also Sifra, Beshaggga They §13 (Weiss 115d): (1) המיכילהCanon: תרח יבר רמואית with b. Sabbath. 104a; Meg. 2b; Yoma 80a; Tose. 16a; Rambam, Hilkhat yesodey ha-torah 9.1.
89 The fourteenth-century historian Abū al-Fida also equates the Alfāniyya with the Dositheans (see Silvestre de Sacy, Christomathie 1.344), but his information probably stems from al-Shahhrastānī.
91 K. Kohler, "Dositheus, the Samaritan Heresiarch, and his Relations to Jewish and
when combined with his alleged period of activity—the final century of the pre-Christian era—immediately calls to mind the figure of the sectarian מַשְׂרָה (משרָה), the so-called “Teacher of Righteousness” who plays such an important role in a number of Qumranic works. This impression is strengthened by the occurrence in this passage of yet another sobriquet employed in the Damascus Document for the “Teacher”:

כאמר אנר שם העליון איה סכת מצהלא איה פי גאנסמאוליו במשמuff ספרי.

In accordance with what Scripture says (see Amos 5:26-27): “I will exile the tabernacle of your king and the bases of your statues from my tent (to) Damascus.” The books of the Torah are the tabernacle of the king . . . and the star is the Interpreter of the Law who came to Damascus; as it is written (Num 24:17): “A star shall come forth out of Jacob and a scepter shall rise out of Israel.”

In other words, the Damascus Document also features a “teacher” designated by the epithet “star” who belongs to the same pre-Christian period of history as al-Shahrastānī’s pseudo-prophet. If the aforementioned correlations are indeed correct, it seems possible that the Muslim heresiologist’s sources may have confounded one strand of Samaritan heterodoxy with at least one additional Jewish sectarian movement; namely, the one responsible for the production of the Damascus Document, a tractate intimately linked with the scrolls discovered at Qumran.

However, there remain several problems with this proposed correlation. Aside from the dubious philological derivation of the meaning “teacher” from the word “īlāfān,” there is no other evidence that the

Christian Doctrines and Sects,” Studies, Addresses, and Personal Papers (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1931) 46; Fossum, “Sects and Movements” 301-302 n. 34; 305 n. 42. However, [בָּל] in Aramaic is not “teacher,” but “learning, doctrine.”

85 CD 7:14-20. Text is cited from the photographic plates and transcriptions provided in The Damascus Document Reconsidered (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1992) [22]-[23]; the translation is adapted from that of G. Vermes, The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English (New York: The Penguin Press, 1997) 133. The occurrence of the word “star” in the biblical text of Amos 5:26, although uncited in the lemma, undoubtedly serves as the verbal bridge to Num 24:17 and its sectarian exegesis.

Kohler enthusiastically endorsed their identity; Fossum cautiously advances this possibility. See also Schechter, Documents xxiv. This possible correlation was unnoticed by J. Bowman, “Contact between Samaritan Sects and Qumran?,” VT 7 (1957) 184-89.
Qumranic "Teacher of Righteousness" bore an Aramaic cognomen. Indeed, given the biblical resonances of the corresponding Hebrew designation (cf. Hos 10:12; Joel 2:23) along with the obvious play in the same phrase on the proper name “Ṣadoq” (cf. CD 5:5),

it is difficult to conceive why such a colorless rendering (an unqualified "teacher") would have won cross-cultural recognition. As Fossum observes, there are plausible alternative explanations for the term “Ilfân,” perhaps the best of which see in the mysterious title the garbled remains of a proper name like “Philip” or “Falfuli.”

Moreover, it is by no means certain that the “brilliant star” of Shahrastānī and the messianic “star” of Num 24:17 are the same image. Shahrastānī’s pseudo-prophet claimed “he was the brilliant star mentioned in the Torah which moonlight illuminates”; nothing is said in Balaam’s oracle about a lunar source for the star’s incandescence, nor is the star described there as “brilliant.” The phrase “brilliant star” (الکرب الین) appears to be a quotation, but it is unclear from whence the phrase derives. Muslim sources generally employ the term “Torah” in an expansive sense to embrace the entire Jewish biblical corpus, but even when we assess this larger pool of sources, no text emerges as a plausible solution for this enigmatic reference.

APPENDIX THREE
TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION OF BRAUN, OrChr 1
(1901) 304.11-308.15:

---

95 For a near comprehensive listing of such solutions, see Iser, Dosithbeans 73-74 n. 114. An evaluation of the pre-Qumranic explanations can be found in Montgomery, Samaritans 259-60.
96 Contra L. Ginzberg, An Unknown Jewish Sect (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976) 35; also Fossum, “Sects” 302 n. 34.
97 Cf. Qur’ān S. 24:35 for an almost identical phrasing.
We have learned from some trustworthy Jews who recently converted to Christianity that some manuscripts were discovered about ten years ago in a chamber within a mountain in the vicinity of Jericho. They say that a dog belonging to a certain Arab who was hunting went into a cave while pursuing an animal and did not come out. His owner went in after him and found a chamber within the mountain containing numerous manuscripts. The hunter then went to Jerusalem and informed the Jews of this (discovery). A large group came out (from Jerusalem) and went and found both biblical manuscripts as well as non-biblical Hebrew (works). Since my informant was knowledgeable about literature and a learned man, I asked him about various passages which are quoted in our New Testament as occurring in the Old Testament, but whose record is completely missing from the Old Testament, both our Christian one and their Jewish one. He informed me that they are extant and can be found in the manuscripts which
were discovered there. When I heard this from this student (of Scripture), as well as from others I asked in addition to him, and discovered that their story did not vary, I wrote about these matters to the illustrious Gabriel and also to Shubhalmaran, Metropolitan of Damascus, (to see) whether they could investigate regarding these manuscripts and see if there is contained in the Prophets the text "he shall be called a Nazarene" (Matt 2:23), or "(What) no eye has seen, nor ear heard" (1 Cor 2:9; Isa 64:3?), or "Cursed are all those hung on the tree" (Gal 3:13; Deut 21:23?), or "He has restored the boundary of Israel" (1 Kgs 14:25), as in the message of the Lord which He spoke through Jonah the prophet from Gath Hepher, or others like these which are quoted in the New Testament, but completely lacking in the Old Testament now in our possession. And I asked them that if they found these words in those manuscripts, they must by all means translate them—it is written in the Psalm beginning "Have pity on me, O God, in accordance with Your goodness" (Ps 51:1): "Sprinkle me with the hyssop of the blood of Your Cross and purify me" (Ps 51:9). This passage is not in the Septuagint, nor in the other versions, nor in the Hebrew (text). But a Hebrew (informant) told me: "We found ascribed to David in those manuscripts more than two hundred Psalms." (Therefore) I have written to them on account of these things.

I think that these manuscripts were deposited either by the prophet Jeremiah or by Baruch or by some other person who obeyed the word of God and feared him. For when the prophets learned via divine revelations (of the) captivity, pillage, and destruction destined to come upon the people due to their sins, it became as if they were firmly convinced that none of the words of God could fall to the ground. They (therefore) hid the manuscripts among the mountains and in caves and concealed them so that they would not be consumed by fire nor pillaged by despoilers. Those who concealed them died during the period of the seventy years (of Exile) or less, and when the people returned from Babylon, no one remained of those who had deposited the manuscripts. This is why Ezra and others were forced to seek out and find what (works) the Hebrews retained. That (which remained) among the Hebrews consisted of three parts. One was that (section) which after a time the seventy translators translated for the king esteemed worthy of the crown of glory; namely, Ptolemy; another was that (section) which after a time was translated by others; and the last was that which was preserved among them. If those words are found in those manuscripts which were mentioned, it is certain that they are more
reliable than those (manuscripts) preserved among the Hebrews or among us. However, what I have written about this (matter) has generated no response from them, and I have no competent envoy whom I can send. This (matter) is in my heart like a fire which burns and consumes my bones...