It was inevitable that the dramatic success of Islam in the first centuries following its advent would leave its mark on the followers of the monotheistic religions that came before it, since the new and flourishing religion declared itself to be the standardbearer of the authentic monotheism that had been neglected by both the Jews and the Christians in the course of time. It is not surprising, therefore, that both the Christianity and the Judaism of that period were compelled to take stock and reevaluate as the result of the new phenomenon with which they were confronted. Serious theological problems which had engaged the scholars of those religions for generations prior to the advent of Islam and which were thought to have been solved, surfaced once more with greater intensity. This reexamination of basic issues in each of these religions was not only the result of an internal need, but was also due to the new political order in the Middle East. Jewish and Christian scholars, who found themselves living under the new regime, were, voluntarily or otherwise, pitted against theologians of the new religion in both public assemblies (majālis) and private meetings. Written polemics against alternative religions figured prominently in the literature of the day.¹

¹ On the participation of Karaites in a majlis, see M.R. Cohen and S. Somekh, "In the Court of Ya'qūb Ibn Killis: A Fragment from the Cairo Genizah," JQR 80 (1990), pp. 283–314.
Christianity experienced a resurgence of movements having a Judeo-Christian flavor, which were thought to have disappeared from the stage of history. They believed that the Pauline version of Christianity had strayed too much from its Judeo-monotheistic foundations, even going so far as paganism.\(^2\) There are those who insist that even the Iconoclastic movement in Byzantium, which championed the cause of idol breaking, was in many ways a reaction to the challenge of Islam.\(^3\) As to the Jewish response, many sects arose during the first centuries following the Muslim conquest, particularly in the Persian and Babylonian regions. If it were not for the Karaite and Muslim sources, we would know nothing about these sects, many of which were Messianic in nature. Apparently the theological conflict among the sects in Islam, which was still in its formative stages, also had an impact on the Jewish sects.\(^4\) There is no doubt that Karaism itself, which emerged in the second half of the eighth century, is one of the important results of the cultural encounter between Judaism and Islam. There are even those who contend that this movement, which encompassed many factions in its early days, should be seen as part of the resur-


\(^3\) Crone, *ibid.*, pp. 59–70.

gence of the Judeo-Christian movements; however, this point of view is contested in the literature.\(^5\)

It is not surprising, therefore, that even during its formative stages, Karaism was involved in inter-religious polemics. In this discussion, I have chosen to follow its confrontation with the issue of whether the commandments predate the Revelation of the Torah. The following questions were part of the discussion of this problem: Did the Patriarchs who preceded Moses practice God's commandments; if they were not obligated to perform these commandments, why did God prevent them from doing so; if they were required to perform them, did they receive these commandments by revelation; is there a difference between the Torah of Moses and the Torah of the Patriarchs; if a difference exists, is it because the Patriarchs were obligated to perform only a few of the commandments or perhaps their laws were completely different from the Pentateuch. The discussion about how Karaite theology dealt with the issue of whether the commandments predate the Revelation will serve as a means of examining the new concepts which Jewish thought developed as it came face to face with Islam. The following will demonstrate that the Karaites themselves were aware of the influence that Muslim thought exerted on the nature of their discussions on this topic. The fact that they wrote in Judaeo-Arabic necessitated the use of terms borrowed from Muslim theology. Recognizing the influence of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the pseudepigraphic literature associated with it on early Karaism, I will also be examining how the Karaite

discussions integrated ideas taken from the ancient literature available to them.\textsuperscript{6}

Al-Qirqisānī offers first-hand evidence that the debate about whether the commandments predated Revelation was an integral part of the polemics between Islam and Judaism. In presenting the Ananites’ position on this question, he claims that their views were not formed on the basis of this issue, but were motivated instead by their intention to fight the claim of naskh which had been raised by the Muslim theologians.\textsuperscript{7} Thus, the principles of naskh (abrogation), along with that of falsification (tahrif),\textsuperscript{8} were central and a means by which the Islamic scholars attempted to undermine the basis of Judaism, the Pentateuch. The principle of abrogation is nullification of one revealed commandment by Divine Will and its replacement by another commandment. During a debate with a Karaite, al-Qirqisānī defines naskh as follows: “Is not the abrogation, unbinding that which was bound, making permissible that which was forbidden, or forbidding that which was bound, making permissible that which was ordered?”\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{6} The following two books are devoted to the influence of Qumran literature on Karaism: N. Wieder, \textit{The Judean Scrolls and Karaism} (London, 1962); A. Paul, \textit{Écrits de Qumran et sectes juives aux premiers siècles de l'Islam} (Paris, 1969).

\textsuperscript{7} Al-Qirqisānī, p. 440. The chapters which al-Qirqisānī devoted to the issue of whether the commandments predated the Torah were translated into French by J. Vajda, “Études sur Qirqisānī, \textit{REJ} 120 (1961), pp. 234–257.


\textsuperscript{9} Al-Qirqisānī, p. 469: \textit{אalsy אלנִגנה} וה אָ 추진 בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּיה בֵּי

I am quoting al-Qirqisānī in Hebrew transcription as is generally accepted in Judaeo-Arabic.
Naskh is found in the Qurʾān, and it stems from the change which the commandments undergo within Islam itself; but it quickly became a provocation against the notion that the Pentateuch is eternal. If God changed commandments in Islam itself, then there was nothing to prevent Him from abrogating the Torah and replacing it with the Qurʾān.\(^1\) A review of the Islamic literature devoted to these debates does indeed indicate that the question about whether the commandments predate the Revelation at Sinai was assimilated by the Muslims into their interreligious polemics about the naskh. Thus, it is not surprising that the Ananites, and the Karaites who followed them, formulated their stand on the issue of whether the commandments predated the Pentateuch within the framework of the debate about naskh. I have chosen to demonstrate the connection between these two issues from the Muslim point of view with the help of quotations from the Jewish proselyte Samauʿal al-Maghribi. In his book Iṣḥām al-Yahūd, under the heading ilzāmuḥum al-naskh, on why it is necessary for the Jews to recognize the principle of naskh, Samauʿal asks: “Was there a divine law before the revelation of the Torah or was there not?” In his opinion, loyalty to what is written in the Torah demands that the Jew answer yes, because he could not,

---

\(^1\) For the development of the principle of naskh in Islam and variations of it, see J. Burton, *Islamic Theories of Abrogation*, Edinburgh, 1990, pp. 18–31. The Muslims were aware of the Christian claims regarding the abrogation of the commandments in the Torah. See L’Église (above, n. 8), pp. 19–20, 41–42. According to Saadiah Gaon, a proponent of naskh would argue that just as it was permissible for the Law of Moses to be different from that of Abraham, so too should it be permissible for a Law that differs from that of Moses to be established. See his *Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, S. Rosenblatt, ed. (Yale Univ. Press, 1967) treatise III, p. 162. For Saadia’s answer to this assertion, see below, n. 96. Saadiah has a tendency to maintain the antiquity of the commandments and to negate naskh. Al-Qirqisānī, p. 117 pokes fun at him for associating intercalation sometimes to Adam and sometimes to Moses.
for instance, ignore the commandment handed down to Noah in Gen. 9:6.\textsuperscript{11}

Another Muslim principle, \textit{bada’}, was used by those involved in the argumentation about whether the commandments predated the Revelation.\textsuperscript{12} It is not by chance that this principle found its way into the debate on this issue; \textit{naskh} and \textit{bada’} are closely related, to the point that some could not distinguish between them. In Islam \textit{bada’}, which was mainly adopted by the Shi’\textsuperscript{a}, and some associate it with al-Mukht\textsuperscript{ar}, had a variety of meanings. Moreover, like every theological concept, it underwent changes and developments as time went on. Basically it is a transformation in the way God rules over the universe, because he altered his will. God can change his will because he is the Master of the Universe. Such changes often bring about modification in the commandments; in this way \textit{bada’} is similar to \textit{naskh}. al-Shahrast\textsuperscript{â}ni ascribed three meanings to \textit{bada’}: (1) \textit{al-bada’ fi ‘l-‘ilm}, or God changes his mind because of information of which he had no prior knowledge. al-Shahrast\textsuperscript{â}ni dismissed this meaning out of hand; (2) \textit{al-bada’ fi ‘l-irâda}, the change in the will of God; (3) the meaning closest to \textit{naskh}, \textit{al-bada’ fi ‘l-amr}, is the substitution of one commandment for another. al-Shahrast\textsuperscript{â}ni asserts that al-Mukht\textsuperscript{ar} himself did not distinguish between \textit{naskh} and \textit{bada’}. According to al-Shahrast-

\textsuperscript{11} Although Samau’el wrote his book in the 12th century, I decided to use it because it reflects Muslim arguments of the preceding centuries. The translation of the phrase quoted above is from M. Perlmann, “Ifh\textsuperscript{âm} al-Yah\textsuperscript{û}d,” \textit{PAAJR} 32 (1964), pp. 33–34. For Ibn Hazm in his \textit{al-Fasl fi ‘l-Milal}, I (Beirut, n.d.), p. 141, Gen. 9:6 is also proof for the ancient law.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Bada’} was translated as follows: a sudden change in divine will. Perlmann (above, n. 8), p. 276 n. 28. In his edition of Ifh\textsuperscript{âm} it was translated as “alteration” (above, n. 11), p. 41. Vajda (above, n. 7), p. 237, translated it into the French changement d’avis. R. Brunschvig translated it “inconstance”. See “L’argumentation d’un theologien musulman du 10\textsuperscript{e} siecle contre le Judaisme,” in \textit{Homenaje a Mill\textsuperscript{ás} Vallicrosa}, I (Barcelona, 1954), p. 234. It was translated into German as “Sinnes"änderung”. See asch-Schahrastani’s \textit{Religionspartheien und Philosophenschulen}, I, Th. Haarbr\textsuperscript{cker}, ed. and trans. (Halle, 1850), p. 166.
tani the Jews, who held that there was a connection between these two principles, rejected bada’ as well as naskh. From the range of meanings assigned to bada’ in Islam, al-Qirqisâni mentions the question of whether it was possible for God to exchange one will for another, before the first one had been performed. Al-Qirqisâni explains the Muslim principle of bada’ thus: “A group of Muslims maintains that it is possible for God to change his will, that is, that he is able to hand down an injunction and then rescind it, even before the recipient has had the opportunity to carry it out. It follows that God may abrogate an order which had to be carried out at a particular time, but before that time has elapsed.” In fact the source of al-Qirqisâni’s distinction between naskh and bada’ is the dispute in Islam over the essence of naskh. While the Mu’tazila contend that naskh is essentially the abrogation of a commandment which, from the start, was meant to remain valid for a predetermined amount of time only, its opponents maintained that this definition is in essence a denial of naskh. They believed that naskh is the abrogation of a commandment which would have endured forever if it had not been rescinded. As will be seen in the following, al-Qirqisâni accepted the mu’tazilite definition of naskh, although, according to his terminology, the abrogation of a commandment before it has been carried out is bada’, which must be unconditionally rejected.

13 For al-Shahrastâni on al-Mukhtar’s attitude towards bada’ see (above, n. 4), p. 110. For the Jews’ opinion, see ibid., p. 164.


A review of the Karaite positions regarding the issue of whether the commandments predate the Revelation reveals a wide variety of opinions. This is not surprising since pluralism is typical of early Karaism. At the same time, the discussion surrounding this issue indicates that there was common ground. The Karaites divided the commandments into two categories: rational and revealed (al-‘aqliyyat, wa-‘l-sama‘iyyat). They agreed unanimously that the rational commandments had existed from time immemorial, while the divergent opinions relate to the revealed commandments. Therefore, when Tobiah ben Moses asserts that a number of commandments existed before the revelation of the Torah, he goes out of his way to point out that he was referring to the revealed commandments, because it was self-evident that the rational commandments had existed from time immemorial. Wisdom and intelligence obligate us to perform these commandments, therefore, all of mankind since Adam was required to fulfill them. Because they were planted in our consciousness, there was no need to hand them down by prophetic revelation. “What the mind imposes as an obligation is such forever and there is no need for it to be revealed.” In contrast, we would have been unaware of the existence of the revealed, non-rational commandments had they not been given by God through prophecy. This distinction was also accepted by Rabbanite scholars and

History of the Religious Polemics between Judaism and Islam (Hebrew); Festschrift, A. Kaminka, Wien 1937, pp. 33–34. See also al-Shahrastānī (below, n. 37). For al-Qirqisānī’s opinion on naskh and bada‘, see below, p. 00–00.

16 In Tobiah ben Moses the term ma‘ẓūḥat ḥadīthah is the rational laws and ma‘ẓūḥat ḥadīthah is the revealed laws. See J. Mann, “Early Karaite Bible Commentaries”, JQR NS 15 (1924–25), p. 375, n. 71.

Saadiah Gaon wrote a special treatise on the sources of these commandments. There is no doubt that this division echoes the muʿtazilite debate on this issue; it is further evidence of the extent to which the Karaite polemic on whether the commandments predated the revelation of the Torah was influenced by the world of Muslim thought in which they lived.

After demonstrating the depth of Islamic influence on the Karaite discussion about the antiquity of the commandments, I shall describe the development of early Karaite thought on this issue.

The Ananites and Their Followers

Karaite sources dating from the tenth and eleventh centuries provide information about the Ananites’ position. According to these sources, the Ananites, and their Karaite followers maintained that “all the commandments which God handed down through Moses had already been given when Adam was created and no additions or subtractions have been made since.” This Ananite viewpoint is also found in the book of commandments authored by Levi ben Yefet: “The Torahs are ancient, as stated

---


20 Al-Qirqisānī, p. 440: "אנו דמיאי אָלָמִים אָלָמִים אָלָמִים בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּה בֶּhוֹ קנֵנִי, "לַדְּוַא יִרְוָג רַסָג לָא-תּוְרָה (New York, 1959), p. 449, n. 6. The viewpoint that Adam already fulfilled all the commandments of the Torah can be found in Targum Neofiti for Gen. 2:15.
by the Ananites, the followers of Anan.” 21 In speaking about those who maintain that the commandments predate the Revelation, Yefet ben Eli does not attribute this position to the Ananites; but he also asserts that the commandments referred to are revealed commandments only: “There are those who say that God proclaimed all the revealed commandments to Adam, in other words, all the commandments contained in the law of Moses, even those given to Ezekiel. Adam was made aware of all of the commandments so that he could take them upon himself.” 22

Yefet points out that among those who believe in the antiquity of the commandments it is possible to differentiate between two schools of thought. Both schools were united in their belief that Adam actually knew all the commandments but did not perform those whose reasons were based on events that occurred after his death. 23 Their disagreements concerned the number of commandments whose reasons were based on later events. One school asserted that only commandments whose reasons were based on later events explicitly mentioned in the Torah (’ilal manṣūṣa) were not performed by Adam and his descendants, such as the commandments concerning the Passover sacrifice (Exod. 12:23) and the sukkah (Lev. 23:44) which are based on the exodus from Egypt. According to this school, the Patriarchs performed most of the revealed commandments. When a contradiction was found in the Torah between the


ancient law and the law of Moses, this school employed tenuous interpretations to explain them. For example, they claimed that Abraham was actually circumcised at the age of 99, but he performed this commandment so late in life because he was prevented from doing so just as the children of Israel were required to abstain from circumcisions during the 40 years of their desert sojourn. Jacob was prohibited from marrying two sisters, and kept this rule; Rachel and Leah were not natural sisters, as is commonly accepted. Amram married his cousin, and not his aunt, as is written in Exod. 6:20. The other school of thought claimed that a literal reading of the Torah demonstrates that, alongside commandments whose reasons were based on later events that were explicitly stated, there are many commandments for which the Torah found it unnecessary to spell out that their reasons were based on later events (‘ilal ghair mansūsa). These commandments did not obligate Adam and his descendants.

As already mentioned, al-Qirqisānī asserts that this unreasonable point of view, adopted by the Karaite circles who claimed that all the revealed commandments predate the Revelation, stemmed from their attempt to deny the Muslim

24 According to al-Qirqisānī, p. 442, there were Karaites who asserted that Adam had even fulfilled the commandments concerning Passover and Tabernacles. From Jubilees 16:21 we learn that Abraham was the first to celebrate Tabernacles. For the historical circumstances associated with Abraham’s celebration of this holiday, according to this source, see M. Delcor, “La Fête des Huites dans le Rouleau du Temple et dans le Livre des Jubilés,” RQ 15 (1991), pp. 190–191. For the Karaite viewpoint about the postponement of the circumcision until arriving in the Land of Israel, see B.M. Levin, “Pirquoi ben Bāboi” (Hebrew), Tarbiz 2 (1931), pp. 387–388. Zucker published an extract from an anonymous Karaita work devoted to the antiquity of the commandments. There is no doubt that the Karaite author advocated the antiquity of all the commandments. He also claimed that Amram married his cousin. See TS Ar. 50.173, f. 1a. cf., Zucker (above, no. 20), p. 486; p. 489, n. 10.

25 Yefet, ibid. f. 97b: חקצו אלוליה ביתא פא אליעל. פָּלָמְתָדוֹתִי יָכוֹלָה בְּעָלָה נַעַת. עִלָּהָה אלוליה פָּקָתָהוֹת איַלוֹלָא יָכוֹלָה מְאָא לָנֵעַת מִדוּנֵהוֹת בְּעָלָה נַעַת.
In fact, Muslim polemic works contain references to questions addressed to those Jews who were likely to maintain that the commandments predated the revelation of the Torah in order to refute *naskh*. After Samau‘al al-Maghribi proved, in his opinion, that it is impossible to deny that some of the commandments existed prior to the revelation of the Torah, he asks the Jews, whether God gave those commandments to the Patriarchs gradually. If they answered that all the commandments had already been handed down to the Patriarchs, then the Revelation to Moses would lose its significance altogether and this would be considered heresy. "What say you about the Torah, did it or did it not add something to those earlier precepts? If it did not add anything it is meaningless, since it contains nothing beyond the earlier legislation and is of no import. Hence, it cannot be of divine origin but this in your religion would be tantamount to unbelief."27

Those Karaites supporting the notion that the commandments predate the Revelation did not hesitate to utilize principles of muʿtazilite thought in order to promote their viewpoint. The following example will demonstrate how they used the ‘adl principle, which was the basis for the Muʿtazilites’ other name: *ahl al-‘adl wa-l-tawhīd*.28 Some of them said: "Because God is just (‘adl), his commandments were given to mankind to allow them the chance to be rewarded; therefore, it is inconceivable that God would create a situation in which some of his creatures would have the opportunity for reward and others would not."29 The muʿtazilite ‘adl principle, which maintains that

---

26 See above n. 7.
27 *Ifḥām al-Yahūd* (above, n. 11) p. 34. As we shall see below, pp. 00-00 by attributing commandments to the Patriarchs prior to Moses, the pseudepigraphic literature in fact diminished the significance of the revelation to Moses.
29 Al-Qirgisānī, p. 442: أَلَا إِنَّهُمْ لَذَلِكَ لَلَّهُ الَّذِي لَمْ يَعْلَمَهُ وَلَاتَأْتَهُ مَثَالًا لَّهُ لَكُمْ لَيْكُمْ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مَا تُرِيدُونَ الَّذِي لَكُمْ لَيْكُمْ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مَا تُرِيدُونَ
God is just, is closely associated with free will, a principle supported by Mu'tazilite scholars. God gave man the right to choose between good and evil. Man cannot claim that he doesn't know what God meant by "good", because the commandments show him the right path. God, who judges man justly and fairly, rewards those who take the right path and punishes those who break His commandments. In light of al-Qirqisâni's statements, it is clear that those who supported the idea that the commandments predate the Revelation also believed that it was impossible for Divine Justice to have prevented the generations which preceded the Revelation from having the opportunity of being rewarded by God for righteous behavior. Because the performance of good deeds requires knowledge of the commandments, it follows that the commandments predate the Revelation. Among the Torah-based evidence used to prove these ideas was the following: God could not have punished the seven nations living in Canaan for breaking the laws of incest (Lev. 18:27–28), if they had not been obligated to perform all the commandments prior to the revelation at Mount Sinai.

In his book Osar Nehmad, Tobiah ben Moses listed five viewpoints prevalent among the Karaites on the problem of whether the commandments predated the Revelation. Due to the state of the manuscript, only the last three are decipherable. Mann claimed that the third opinion mentioned by Tobiah was

---

30 For the principles of the Mu'tazila, see al-Shahrastâni (above, n. 4), pp. 29–31. On the 'adl principle according to Saadiah, see (above, n. 10) treatise 4, pp. 180–191; H. ben Shammai, "The Classification of the Commandments and the Concept of Wisdom in Rav Saadiah's Thought" (Hebrew), Tarbiz 41 (1972), pp. 172–173. According to the Karaites, if the words of the Torah had been beyond our understanding, it would have been impossible to fulfill the commandments and Israel should therefore not be viewed as sinful for not fulfilling them. See Wieder (above, n. 6), pp. 58–59.

31 Al-Qirqisâni, pp. 463–464. Al-Qirqisâni also uses these verses (pp. 288–289) to demonstrate that the revealed commandments existed before the Revelation of the Torah. See also TS Ar. 50.173, f. 1b, Zucker (above, n. 20), pp. 486–487.
that of the Ananites; but he was mistaken. Mann’s mistake is the result of a misreading of the text. The following is his reading: “The third group says that the Torah was from the time of Adam and the Torah that is our law today, that is the one handed down by Moses, of blessed memory, but another Torah, that is other commandments have always existed in every era and the people of that generation were obliged to uphold them, and we are not commanded by them.” This reading interprets the beginning of the passage to mean that the Torah from the time of Adam is the Torah of Moses, yet it views the end of the passage to mean that the Torah of the generations preceding Moses was completely different from the Pentateuch. I read the beginning of the passage as follows: “The third group says that the Torah was from the time of Adam but it is not the Torah which we possess today.” Tobiah’s refutation of this viewpoint testifies to the correctness of my reading: “This theory is weak and has no strength. Because we know that some of the commandments that existed in those days are among those which obligate us today.” In other words, Tobiah asserts, in contrast to the above, that some of the commandments that were given to the preceding generations are also obligatory for us today. By comparing the opinion mentioned by Tobiah as the third one with that of the Ananites, it will be seen that they share the notion that the first man had a Torah that obligated him to perform commandments. Yet, while the Ananites con-

32 Mann read דינ as stemming from din, religion in Arabic.
33 Tobiah ben Moses, Osar nehmād, ms Oxford, Bodl. Opp. 26 (01.255), f. 2a, as was read by Mann (above, n. 16), p. 375: ימי התורה מיום עת אבות
34 Mann, ibid. pp. 364–365, considered this third viewpoint, mentioned by Tobiah as Anan’s viewpoint, after comparing it to the Ananite viewpoint as told by Levi ben Yefet. See above n. 21.
35 Tobiah, ibid. f. 2a. Cf. Mann, ibid. p. 375: ומ ragazzo מיום עת אבות (א) התורה מיום עת אבות (א) והיום
36 כניום יום מיום עת אבות (א) והיום
tended that Adam's Torah was in effect the Torah of Moses, the viewpoints under discussion held that each generation took upon itself a Torah that was completely different from that of the previous generation. On the surface, this outlook, in contrast to the Ananites, accepts the principle of naskh; however, according to al-Shahrastāni, anyone who maintained that commandments were given in advance to be fulfilled by one generation in effect negates naskh.  

Benjamin al-Nahāwandi and Daniel al-Qūmisī  

Benjamin proposed a different method from that of the Ananites on the issue of whether the commandments predated the Revelation, which was accepted, in part, by most of the Karaites who came after him. While the Ananites believed that all the commandments were handed down to Adam, Benjamin contended that, although many commandments were proclaimed prior to the revelation of the Torah, this transpired over the course of time and each ensuing generation received additional commandments. According to Benjamin, from Adam to Moses 102 commandments were given. Benjamin also described how those commandments were assigned over the course of time: From Noah till Abraham fourteen were given; from Abraham to Isaac 35 were given and from Jacob to Moses 29 were given. And since he claimed that from Creation until the revelation at Mount Sinai 102 commandments were given, it can be concluded that between Adam and Noah 24 were given. In a Karaite commentary on Psalms 42:2,

38 Al-Qirqisāni, p. 453. According to Saadiah it is impossible to know how many revealed commandments were given to the Patriarchs. See M. Zucker, ed., Perushei RaSaG li-Bereshit, (New York, 1984), p. 84.
39 Al-Qirqisāni, p. 455.
40 Ibid., p. 456.
41 Ibid., p. 457.
which Mann believed was apparently written in Byzantium, the
anonymous commentator follows in Benjamin’s footsteps.
"‘As the hart panteth after the water brooks ...’ and the Torah
was compared to water in several ways ... just as water flowing
little by little slowly creates channels and rivers so the Torah
came down bit by bit. Part by Adam, part by Noah, part by our
Forefather Abraham, of blessed memory, until the time of our
Master Moses, of blessed memory, it came down bit by bit." 42

Although many Karaites accepted the principle that the
commandments were added to generation by generation, they
opposed Benjamin because he attributed too many command-
ments to the Patriarchs. According to al-Qirqisānī he did so
because he read the verses allegorically (ta‘wil), and thus arrived
at preposterous conclusions. 43 Al-Qirqisānī cites the verses
which brought Benjamin to claim that the commandments
predated the Revelation. 44 An examination of them reveals that
in many cases he arrived at deductions about laws using
narrative verses, khabar in Karaite terminology. 45 For example,
from Gen. 2:24 he made a deduction about marriage and the

42 J. Mann, Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature, II, (Philadel-
phia, 1931), pp. 113–114: דנה: ידננו, ... הַתְּנִשָּׁל הָהוֹרָה בַּכֵּים: וְאִם תְּנִשָּׁל הָהוֹרָה בַּכֵּים, ..."... וְאִם תְּנִשָּׁל הָהוֹרָה בַּכֵּים: ..."...
43 Al-Qirqisānī, p. 453; p. 458.
44 Ibid., pp. 454–460.
45 Saadiah also made deductions from narrative verses with respect to
commandments prior to Moses. On the similarity between his and Benjamin’s
commentaries on Gen. 4:4 see Zucker (above, n. 38), p. 305, n. 14. According to
Yefet (above, n. 17) f. 97b–98a. Cf. Zucker (above, n. 20), p. 495, we learn about
the sacrifice of the first born from Gen. 4:4, "עֲלָה תַּרְיָקְלְה-קְהָבָר. For examples of
deducing Halakhah in this way see al-Qirqisānī, p. 605; p. 1074. According to
al-Qirqisānī, p. 350, there are commandments such as those found in Gen. 9:6
and 32:32 which were given in the narrative manner. In his She’iltot, composed
in the beginning of Gaonic period, Rav Aḥa deduced many commandments
from the narrative parts of the Torah. See S. Asaf, Tekufat ha-geonim ve-sifru-
fidelity of a woman towards her husband. From Gen. 5:22 he learned that the obligation to perform the commandments was first given to Enoch. The question must then be asked: is it possible to maintain that the commandments were added from generation to generation without accepting the naskh principle? According to the proselyte Samau’al al-Maghribi, anyone who believed that the commandments were added generation by generation was actually supporting naskh. After he proved, in his opinion, that the Torah had been handed down by adding commandments, he addressed the question of whether or not an addition prohibited what had formerly been permissible. His conclusion was that whoever accepted the commandment by commandment doctrine had to conclude that this meant that what had been permissible was prohibited and vice versa.

Samau’al offers the example of the Sabbath commandments (Exod. 20:8–11): until they were given, it had been permissible to work on the Sabbath. Thus, it can be concluded that the Torah of the Patriarchs was completely different from the Torah of Moses. This is the viewpoint of those who supported the third opinion in Tobiah ben Moses’ book; however, it is not Benjamin’s point of view. He speaks about adding commandments, not subtracting them. According to him, the Patriarch’s Torah and the Torah of Moses are one and the same, but the Patriarchs only performed part of it. In al-Qirqisâni’s opinion, the second viewpoint among the Karaites maintained that the commandments were added onto during the course of time. This process stopped with the Revelation at Mount Sinai, and the granting of the Pentateuch, which contains all the commandments. In the opinion of those supporting this viewpoint,
which must apparently be attributed to Benjamin, this was not naskh.⁴⁹ As to the position taken by Daniel al-Qūmīsī, who was one of the first Karaites to come to Palestine in the last quarter of the 9th century, the Karaites of the 10th and 11th century did not mention his discussion of this topic. Nonetheless, one of the chapters in his book, al-tawḥīd, was devoted to the question of whether the commandments predated the revelation. In the introduction to his book, which was found in the Geniza, he states: “In it there is an answer opposing all those who believe that the commandments are from the time of Adam and that Adam was obligated to perform them all.”⁵⁰ Thus it becomes clear, that he opposed the Ananites’ view on this issue. There is also a reference in al-Qīraqīsānī’s book which attests that Daniel supported the notion that the Patriarchs were not required to obey all of the commandments. In his discussion about the relationship between Judah and Tamar (Gen. 38), he defined it in the context of mut‘a marriage, in other words, a marriage of pleasure for a specified period of time, which was acceptable mainly in Shi‘ite circles. “It is possible that this type of short-term marriage was permissible in those days.”⁵¹ At the same time it seems that Daniel did not completely reject the theory that the commandments predated Revelation. In his commen-

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 441.

⁵⁰ ENA 2715, 38 cf. Zucker (above, no. 20, p. 481: y”a 7 5I p’ 1? 5 ‘15y KNX?33 llXnm DOI 1K D» Oi 13” op N?’DS rwXD5K .

⁵¹ Al-Qīraqīsānī, p. 728. See M.A. Friedman, “Tamar, a Symbol of Life: The “Killer Wife” Superstition in the Bible and Jewish Tradition,” AJR Review 15 (1990), pp. 57–61. The Karaites who believed in the antiquity of the commandments claimed that Judah was ignorant of Tamar’s identity and married her according to the law. His sin was that he did not investigate the identity of the person he was going to marry. See TS Ar. 50.173, f. 1a, cf. Zucker (above, n. 20), pp. 485–486. Friedman amended Zucker’s reading, ibid., pp. 60–61, n. 13. According to the Book of Jubilees, 41:17–28 Judah wanted to burn his daughter-in-law basing himself on the law of Abraham. (On the other hand, according to this source, Reuben had not been put to death after lying with his father’s concubine because the law had not been revealed until that time in its entirety. See Jubilees 33:15–17.)
early on Hosea 6:7 he condemns the Rabbanites for fulfilling commandments which are prohibited in the Diaspora: ‘Therefore you will die like Adam’ (Psalms 82:7) and they like Adam broke the covenant.” In other words his Rabbanite contemporaries disobeyed a covenant just as Adam did. In his commentary on Hosea 9:3–4, which includes a polemic against the Rabbanites, Daniel contends that the eating of meat was permitted only from the time of Noah, while Adam was prohibited from eating meat because there was no altar: “Anyone who eats meat in the Diaspora is defiled, as it is written, ‘and all that he eats is unclean’ (Hosea 9:4) because meat was not permitted without an altar in the days of Adam, until Noah made a sacrifice. And afterwards, it is written ‘every creeping thing that lives will be permissible for food’ (Gen. 9:3), therefore it is prohibited to eat meat in the Diaspora.” Thus, in his opinion, the prohibition against the eating of meat in Adam’s times was caused by a hindrance and does not necessarily prove that God did not command Adam and his generation about the laws of purity and uncleanliness that relate to the ritual slaughter of meat. In the same way the prohibition against eating meat in the Diaspora in his era came about as the result of the destruction of the Temple. A Karaite interpretation which was published by Mann, emphasizes that Adam and his generation were familiar with the laws of purity and uncleanli-

52 I.D.B. Markon, ed., Pitron shneim ‘asar, (Jerusalem, 1957), p. 9: 'אָבִךְ חָרָם The word ke-Adam is not in the manuscript and was suggested by the editor. Among the Rabbanites' sins mentioned in Daniel's commentary on Hosea 6:7 is the sacrifice of cattle and sheep on the 10th of Tevet. See S. Liebermann, Sheqi'in, 2nd ed., (Jerusalem, 1970), pp. 9–10.

53 According to S.B. Hoenig, “The Sectarian scrolls and Rabbinic Research”, JQR 59 (1968–69), p. 31, n. 52, Daniel is using Qumran terminology here. The covenant that Adam breached is the Torah of Moses.

54 On Genesis 9:3, see below, n. 89.

55 Daniel (above, n. 52), p. 15: 'כַּל הָעָלָל בֵּנוֹת אַדָּם כִּי לֹא אָדָם כִּי לֹא אָדָם נֶפֶשׁ בָּרִי. וְהִזֶּה כִּי לֹא אָדָם נֶפֶשׁ בָּרִי. וְהִזֶּה כִּי לֹא אָדָם נֶפֶשׁ בָּרִי. וְהִזֶּה כִּי לֹא אָדָם נֶפֶשׁ בָּרִי. וְהִזֶּה כִּי לֹא אָדָם נֶפֶשׁ בָּרִי. וְהִזֶּה כִּי לֹא אָדָم נֶפֶשׁ בָּרִי. וְהִזֶּה כִּי לֹא אָדָם נֶפֶשׁ בָּרִי. וְהִזֶּה כִּי LK
ness, but they were forbidden to slaughter animals so that their reproduction could be ensured: “Most commandments existed prior to Revelation and few were renewed and given in later generations ... and from the day when Adam was created he knew what was pure and what was unclean, as it is written, ‘of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee seven and seven, each with his mate; and of the beasts that are not clean two and two, each with his mate;’ (Gen. 7:2) but the creatures that were created along with Adam were prohibited for slaughter ... until they bore offspring and increased their numbers, then it will be permitted to slaughter and eat those animals.”

The Influence of the Pseudepigraphic Literature on the Karaites with regard to the Theory that the Commandments Predate the Pentateuch

Up to now we have seen that, despite the variety of early Karaite viewpoints on the theory that the commandments predate the Pentateuch, they have in common the belief that many of the revealed commandments were given prior to the revelation at Mount Sinai. The next question that needs to be asked is: was this outlook only the result of their confrontation with the world of Muslim thought, or did the Karaites adopt this attitude because of their familiarity with sources extant prior to the advent of Islam. It is common knowledge that only fragments of the doctrines of Anan and the early Karaites are available to us today and it is not inconceivable that some of these early conceptions were purposefully concealed because they did not conform to the positions of the later-day Karaites. Yeshu‘ah ben Judah recounts that he was deeply shocked after

56 TS 13 C 1.2, Cf. Mann (above, n. 16), pp. 372–373: For the prohibition against eating meat until the number of animals increases, see also BT Sanhedrin 59b. Saadiah (above, n. 38), p. 55.
reading what one of his brethren had written about Enoch, to whom *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, and *The Book of Jubilees* have attributed such importance in the giving of the God’s law to mankind. It seems that he is referring to a book which was written by one of his Karaite predecessors.57 We have seen that Benjamin, basing himself on Gen. 5:22, held that Enoch was the first to take upon himself the yoke of the commandments.58

Thus, the polemic on the theory that the commandments predate the Pentateuch, which began in ancient times, was also central to the argumentation between Christianity and Judaism.59 A review of the pseudepigraphic literature associated with Qumran reveals that there is a clear tendency in this literature to minimize the primacy of the revelation at Mount Sinai by attributing many commandments to the Patriarchs. This is particularly conspicuous with regard to the calendar and the holy days. The solar calendar was first revealed to Enoch but not to Moses. (*Jubilees* 4:17)60 The commandments dealing with holy days were given to the Patriarchs long before the revelation at Mount Sinai. Noah was the first person to cele-


58 See (above, n. 47). The heresiographic literature tells us that Benjamin was influenced by the theology of the “Magharian sect”. Some scholars have identified this sect as the Qumran sect. See, for example, R. de Vaux, “A propos des manuscrits de la Mer Morte,” *RB* 57 (1950), pp. 417–429. Golb, on the other hand, rules out any connection between the Qumran literature and the Magharians, who, according to him, were gnostics who flourished in Egypt. See N. Golb, “Who were the Ma'arit,” *JAOS* 80 (1960), pp. 347–359.

59 See John 7:22–23. For the relationship between the antiquity of the commandments and abrogation, see Matthew 19:1–9; Mark 10:1–9.

60 Extracts from the Book of Jubilees found in the Qumran caves. See J.C. VanderKam and J.T. Milik, “The First Jubilees Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4: a Preliminary Publication,” *JBL* 110 (1991), pp. 243–270. According to *Pirqei de-rabbi Eliezer*, Ch. 8, God revealed the secret of intercalation to Adam. Adam handed down this secret to Enoch, who give it to Noah. For the relationship between the Book of Jubilees and *Pirqei de-Rabbi Eliezer*, see below, n. 67.
brate Pentecost, which was imparted in the *Book of the First Law* (Jubilees 6:17–22). On the fifteenth of Sivan Abraham celebrated the Feast of the First Fruits of the Grain Harvest (Jubilees 15:1). The reason behind the Day of Atonement was to commemorate Jacob's mourning over Joseph, after he was shown his son's blood-soaked coat of many colors (Jubilees 34:12–18). It appears that the midrashic literature of the Sages, which portrays Adam as a heretic (*mīn*), one who denies the existence of God and Enoch as a hypocrite "sometimes a righteous person and sometimes an evil person" should be viewed within the context of the polemics against the pseudepigraphic literature, which glorified these figures.

Both Anan and Benjamin negated the idea that one commandment could be substituted for another, a principle which found expression in the *naskh*. But while the Ananites maintained that all the commandments had already been given to Adam, Benjamin contended that many of them were added as time went on. Both of them believed that the law of Adam and the Pentateuch were identical. In the Qumran literature and in the pseudepigraphic literature the concept that the body of commandments grew generation by generation, without any being subtracted, is found alongside the idea which emphasized that Torah was passed down from generation to generation. The holy day calendar in the *Book of Jubilees* is an example of a commandment which was added. As to the passing down of

61 On the antiquity of Tabernacles, see above n. 24. In VanderKam's view, the fact that Jubilees is based on Genesis to mid-Exodus while the Temple Scroll deals with the material from mid-Exodus through Deuteronomy explains the differences between these sources with respect to the holy days. See J.C. VanderKam, "The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees, in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. G.J. Brooke, (Sheffield, 1989), pp. 214–218.

commandments from generation to generation, an examination of the Damascus Covenant disclose a history of failure in performing the commandments which God bestowed upon the Patriarchs in the course of time; however, in each generation a remnant of qerî‘ê ha-Shem continued to uphold the commandments of God.\textsuperscript{64} The \textit{Book of Jubilees} points out that Abraham imparted the laws governing sacrifices to his son Isaac: “For thus I have found it written in the books of my forefathers, and in the words of Enoch and in the words of Noah” (Jubilees 21:10).\textsuperscript{65} According to the Ananites, contrary to what is written in the Bible, Abraham was not the first person to undergo circumcision; it was Shem.\textsuperscript{66} The view that the Torah of Adam and the Pentateuch were one and the same is found in \textit{Pirqei de-rabbi Eliezer}, a rabbinic work written in Palestine, apparently in the eighth century, and undoubtedly influenced by the \textit{Book of Jubilees}.\textsuperscript{67} At the time of the revelation at Mount Sinai, the Israelites said: “Even before we had heard the Torah, we had kept and performed the commandments written in the Torah”. In other words, the Pentateuch was already being adhered to a long time before the Revelation.\textsuperscript{68} al-Qirqisâni accused Benjamin of drawing conclusions about the existence of the commandments in prior generations based on the reading


\textsuperscript{65} The medical lore was given by Noah to Shem. See \textit{Jubilees} 10:12–14.

\textsuperscript{66} Al-Qirqisâni, pp. 503–504. See \textit{Pirqei de-rabbi Eliezer}, Ch. 29.

\textsuperscript{67} For the influence of the Book of Jubilees on \textit{Pirqei de-rabbi Eliezer}, see H. Albeck in the Hebrew version of L. Zunz, \textit{Ha-derashot be-Israel} (Jerusalem, 1974), pp. 136–140; the introduction to G. Friedlander, \textit{Pirqei de-rabbi Eliezer}, (New York, 1965), pp. 23–25; Zucker (above, n. 20), p. 451. n. 6 claims that the author of \textit{Pirqei de-rabbi Eliezer} was influenced by both Jubilees and Islam when he attributed the commandments to the Patriarchs.

of Biblical verses which do not clearly contain commandments. This method is characteristic of the Qumran literature. We have seen that, according to the Book of Jubilees, the commandment dealing with the celebration of the Day of Atonement is based on Jacob’s mourning over the loss of Joseph. While the Karaite circles, who believed that the commandments predated the Revelation, learned about marriage, the devotion of a man to a wife, the prohibition against sodomy and sexual relations for reasons other than procreation ('azl), from Gen. 2:24, the author of the Damascus Covenant learned about marriage between man and wife and the prohibition against divorce from the story of Creation in Gen. 1:27 and from the story of Noah’s ark (Gen. 7:9).69

To a great extent, the variety of opinions that prevailed among the early Karaites is due to their selective adoption of laws and concepts from the Qumran literature. The Karaites were well aware that the Qumran calendar, which they called Sadducee, was solar; yet they continued to determine the months of the year according to lunar observation.70 Their conclusions about the wives of the Patriarchs provide us with an example of how they dealt with the pseudepigraphic literature without blindly adopting its ideas. According to the Book of Jubilees, the Patriarchs married their sisters and their nieces. The author even knew the names of these women (Jubilees 4). It is reasonable to assume that the Karaites also knew about those marriages from Jubilees because the names of the Patriarchs’ wives were listed in the eighth century Muslim literature which

69 On making deductions about commandments from Gen. 2:24 see above, n. 46. The Zadokite Documents (above, n. 64), 4:20–5:1, pp. 17–19. Rabin (p. 17 n. 21) following L. Ginzberg, thinks that this phrase in the Damascus Covenant refers to the prohibition of polygamy. It seems that Schechter was correct in assuming that divorce is prohibited. See S. Schechter, "Reply to Dr. Buchler’s Review of Schechter’s Jewish Sectaries, JQR 4 (1913–14), pp. 455–456.

was available in the regions where the Karaites lived and
flourished.\textsuperscript{71} It is now clear that those Karaites who did not
believe that the commandments predated the Revelation viewed the Patriarchs' marriages as proof that, in those days,
people were not obligated by the laws of incest.\textsuperscript{72} This opinion
was even acceptable to some of those who believed in the
antiquity of the commandments. According to them, the com-
mandment which prohibits marrying sisters and nieces was
already known to Adam, but he was not obliged to fulfill it. Just
as with many other commandments, the Torah does not explain
the reason behind this commandment and when it began to be
obeyed.\textsuperscript{73} In contrast, the first group mentioned by Yefet ben Eli
as believers in the antiquity of the commandments rejected
what was written in the \textit{Book of Jubilees} and suggested a variety
of solutions aimed at proving that the prohibition of incest was
an obligation of the Patriarchs. There are those who assert that
God created many males and females and that Cain and Seth
married them. And there are those who claim that, just as God
created Adam and then Eve from his rib, so too he created for
Cain and Seth women from their ribs.”\textsuperscript{74} The author of \textit{Pirqei

\textsuperscript{71} See U. Rubin, “Prophets and Progenitors in the Early Shi’a,” \textit{JSAI} 1
(1979), pp. 56–59. Y. Erder, “When did the Karaites First Encounter Apoc-
ryphic Literature Akin to the Dead Sea Scrolls” (Hebrew), \textit{Cathedra} 42 (1987),
pp. 62–64.

\textsuperscript{72} Yefet's commentary on Gen. 4:17–18, (above, n. 17), f. 162b: בקדש
לאמרין קאל ואחותי לא_UNDEF 4 19 alike ילך אלוהים. According to Bereshit
Rabba 22:8, ed. Theodor-Albeck, p. 214, Cain and Abel fought about the
marriage of Abel's twin.

\textsuperscript{73} Yefet (above, n. 17), f. 96b, cf. Zucker (above, n. 20), p. 494: על
עלולו רחליה ואלישרעה. פסל רחל מוחי אלאבית אלוהים. קרעלמה זרא רחלאים
אלוהים ויהיה שיפור פסק האבות אליהם בני בניית פلوحון אלאיהם אלוהים.
On this concept see also above n. 23, 25.

\textsuperscript{74} Yefet (above, n. 17), f. 162b–163a: אולediator קאל בקודם לאמרין
אלאפתחים מנהוגים מנה. אולתק צלך כל פר שאלת גם הוא מנה התיר לאלאediator
בקודם זרא רחל מוחי אלאפתחים מנה. אולתק צלך כל פר שאלת כל פר שאלת
ジー. See also Yefet (above, n. 17), f. 97a, cf. Zucker, (above, n. 20), p. 494.
de-rabbi Eliezer, accepted what was written in the Book of Jubilees, i.e. that the Patriarchs married their sisters. It was his opinion that, because there were no other women in the world, those men were allowed to marry their sisters.  

It is well known that the Qumran literature exerted a profound influence on the Karaites who came to Palestine starting with the second half of the ninth century, but, as suggested above, the pseudepigraphic literature could already have left its mark on Anan and Benjamin in Babylonia and Persia. It is apparent that they were not the only group in their area to be influenced by this literature. Aside from the Judeo-Christian sects, the Muslim sects, particularly the Shi’ite movement, also made use of these writings. According to the Shi’a, Muhammad and ‘Ali were the offspring of the Patriarchs and the heirs to their position of universal leadership. The pseudepigraphic writings formed the basis for this viewpoint. In essence the Shiites developed the idea of the chain of prophecy, which was found in the Qur’ān of Muhammad, and which research usually attributes to the influence of Manichaeism.

75 Pirque de-Rabbi Eliezer, ch. 21. According to Saadiah (above, n. 10) treatise III, p. 168, the Patriarchs were already obligated by the laws of incest. Because of a lack of women, the Patriarchs had an excuse ('adhr) to marry their sisters and to violate those laws. Therefore, these marriages do not constitute proof of abrogation.

76 See above, n. 6.

77 above, n. 71.

78 On the influence of Qumran literature on Anan, see Wieder (above, n. 6), pp. 63–64. See also N. Wieder, “The Dead Sea Scrolls Type of Biblical Exegesis among the Karaites, in Between East and West, Essays Dedicated to the Memory of B. Horovitz, pp. 80–83.

In surveying the ideas of the early Karaites vis-a-vis the issue of whether the commandments predated the Revelation of the Torah, I have demonstrated that, for the most part, the reason behind the discussion was the struggle against the Muslim principle of *naskh*. For the purposes of this polemic the Karaites adopted terminology and principles derived from Muslim thought. Further examination of early Karaite writings has shown that their views on this issue could also have been taken from the pseudepigraphic literature associated with Qumran. Nevertheless, the basic beliefs on which this literature was found were developed in a very different time and a completely different cultural context from that of early Karaism. Apparently the pseudepigraphic literature attributed many commandments to the Patriarchs with the aim of demonstrating that the revelation at Mount Sinai was only the last link in a long chain of revelations. The Karaites, who wrote mainly in Judaeo-Arabic, adopted many laws and points of view from this literature in so far as they conformed to their own outlook and served the needs of their struggle in the world of Muslim thought. The Ananites and some Karaite circles involved in the conflict with *naskh* used those ancient texts, to prove the eternity of the Torah given to Moses at Mount Sinai by claiming that Adam and Moses were obligated to uphold the same law.

*The Viewpoint of the 10th and 11th Century Karaites*

Most Karaite scholars living in the 10th and 11th centuries dealt with the issue of the antiquity of the commandments and *naskh* differently than Anan and Benjamin had. In contrast to the early Karaites they were not afraid to admit that there was evidence of *naskh* in the Bible prior to the Revelation. According to them, however, this cannot be seen as grounds for abrogating the Pentateuch, as the Muslims maintained. A close analysis indicates that they accepted the principle of *naskh* in its narrow sense. This was such a narrow interpretation, however, that it was described by others as negating *naskh*. Nonetheless, because they had declared their acceptance of *naskh*,
they felt that they were free to claim that only some of the revealed commandments were imparted to the Patriarchs and some of them were abrogated over time. The following section will briefly present the positions of three Karaite scholars, al-Qirqisānī, Yefet ben Eli and Tobiah ben Moses on the question of the antiquity of the commandments and naskh.

Al-Qirqisānī opposed those who believed that the revealed commandments were not given to the Patriarchs through prophecy. According to him the Tustaris, a group of Karaites influenced by Abū ʿĪsā’s teachings, claimed that the commandments of Moses only obligated the people of Israel. Because they believed that the principle of ‘adl meant that it was impossible for God to neglect the human beings He created by not giving them instruction in proper conduct, the Tustaris asserted that humankind was obligated by the commandments which they had arrived at through intellectual means. Al-Qirqisānī claimed that this indicated acceptance of the Barāhima point of view, which in Muslim thought represented the absolute negation of prophecy and the position that mankind worshipped God only through their intellect.80 Al-Qirqisānī believed that, in every generation starting from Adam, people

80 Al-Qirqisānī, p. 287. On the viewpoint of the Tustaris and their calendar, see M. Gil, Ha-Tustarim, ha-mishpahah ve-ha-kat,” Tel-Aviv, 1981, pp. 61–63. For the prophetic chain in the theory of Abū ʿĪsā, see Friedlaender (above, n. 4), JQR NS 3 (1912–12), pp. 240–243. On the Barāhima as perceived by a Rabbanite polemicist see J. Mann, “An Early Theological-Polemical Work,” HUCA 12–13 (1937–38), pp. 424–425; p. 442. On the Barāhima in Islam see Strumsa (above, n. 19), pp. 229–241. The fourth viewpoint mentioned by Tobiah is similar to the Tustari viewpoint: “The fourth group says that the commandments are all from the time of Moses” ויהי את המוסמך בכולל בכל הנוסח את המוסמך ב伸び עלי ת參與. Tobiah negated this viewpoint which completely rejects the antiquity of the revealed commandments. “And this is also perverted because many commandments were in hands of the nation before Moses, may he rest in peace, such as circumcision and sacrifices and the sciatic nerve and others of a similar nature.” see Tobiah (above, n. 33), p. 2a; Cf. Mann (above, n. 16), p. 375.
knew what was permitted and forbidden for them through the revealed commandments, which were imparted to the prophets starting with Adam. These commandments were supplemented over time until Moses: “God does not abandon those who worship Him. There is no doubt that He instructed them (in what was permitted and what was prohibited) through a prophet. He did so with the first human He created — Adam. God did not abandon him to his wits when He created him but instructed him on how to worship Him, and in every thing that was expected of him, his obligations, what was prohibited and permissible. Nothing was omitted from these permitted and prohibited activities. It was possible for God to add to these commandments ... over time after Adam until He finished revealing His Torah through Moses and it became eternal for all the generations.”

According to al-Qirqisâni, the Bible provides textual proof about the revealed commandments which were imparted a long time before Moses and which obligated all of mankind. In his short commentary on Genesis al-Qirqisâni brings evidence of the prophecy given to Adam, based on Gen. 2:16. “‘And the Lord God commanded’. This is a revealed commandment, aside from the rational ones which He planted in Adam’s mind. Or it is possible that He had already made them known to him by word of mouth, as they were made known to us by Moses, of blessed memory.”

Yefet ben Eli, who also believed that some of the revealed commandments were known to the Patriarchs, stressed our inability to know exactly which commandments predated

---

81 Al-Qirqisâni, p. 438: °י ל"א דיד יכהה פה סאו ב ל א נר מ א יכרפ שך רל חל יר די אלטרתל. כרחל פעל אלחל באל קלחל אלקח ע особенно והנ אב ל סידת הי קלחל והם אמור היה התברר בגברית מא ראואר מון מלתונגי צלמריווא אמלגמח פלט ביך לה תחת אלברג אול תחת אלברגahaha והקר הין וב שיא יאלברג ... ק矶ל ב נא טימי יאלברג ... יייל חל ב נא שימ יאלברג ... יייל חל ב נא שימ יאלברג ... יייל חל ב נא שימ יאלברג ... יייל חל ב נא שימ יאלברג ... יייל חל ב נא שימ יאלברג ... יייל חל ב נא שימ יאלברג ... יייל חל ב נא שימ יאלברג ...

82 Al-Qirqisâni, pp. 288–289.

Moses. “We have no doubt that they had revealed commandments, but the Torah does not mention them because it did not need to do so, as it needed to mention the sacrifice made by Cain and Abel and the story of Noah. But we do not know which commandments they had and which they did not have, except what the Torah explicitly states they had in the past.”84

Al-Qirqisâni was even more doubtful than Yefet ben Eli about our ability to know which commandments obligated the Patriarchs. Those who believed that the Patriarchs had been given all the commandments maintained that, because Noah could distinguish between ritually pure and impure animals (Gen. 7:2) and Abel knew how to select the required sacrifice, it had to be concluded that the Patriarchs had been given those revealed commandments, even though this was not explicitly stated.85 Yefet ben Eli also arrived at conclusions about the antiquity of these commandments based on khabar.86 Al-Qirqisâni refuted this assumption based on the principle which he had previously formulated in his book, i.e. that any claim which is only possible (ja‘iz) but not explicitly binding (wajib) does not constitute incontrovertible proof.87 In that same chapter he argues against those who believe in the antiquity of the com-

---

84 Yefet (above, n. 17), f. 98a–98b, Cf., Zucker (above, n. 20), p. 495: פָּלָא נַשׁא  אָלָיוּתֵם פְּרָדִי מַסְעֵה לָלֶא חֲרֵדָה אַלַיָּרְשָׁרֵע אָרַיָּל תַּחְתָּאֵו אַלְּיָרְשָׁרְאָה נַשׁאָלְיָחֲרֶדָה אַלָיוּתֵם פְּרָדִי מַסְעֵה לָלֶא חֲרֵדָה אַלַיָּרְשָׁרֵע אָרַיָּל תַּחְתָּאֵו אַלְּיָרְשָׁרְאָה נַשׁאָלְיָחֲרֶדָה אַלָיוּתֵם פְּרָדִי מַסְעֵה לָלֶא חֲרֵדָה אַלַיָּרְשָׁרֶדָה אָרַיָּל תַּחְתָּאֵו אַלְּיָרְשָׁרְאָה נַשׁאָלְיָחֲרֶדָה אַלָיוּתֵם פְּרָדִי מַסְעֵה לָלֶא חֲרֵדָה אַלַיָּרְשָׁרֶדָה אָרַיָּל תַּחְתָּאֵו אַלְּיָרְשָׁרְאָה נַשׁאָלְיָחֲרֶדָה אַלָיוּתֵם פְּרָדִי מַסְעֵה לָלֶא חֲרֵדָה אַלַיָּרְשָׁרֶדָה אָרַיָּל תַּחְתָּאֵו אַלְּיָרְשָׁרְאָה נַשׁאָלְיָחֲרֶדָה אַלָיוּתֵם פְּרָדִי מַסְעֵה לָלֶא חֲרֵדָה אַלַיָּרְשָׁרֶדָה אָרַיָּל תַּחְתָּאֵו אַלְּיָרְשָׁרְאָה נַשׁאָלְיָחֲרֶדָה אַלָיוּתֵם פְּרָדִי מַסְעֵה L

85 Al-Qirqisâni, p. 458.

86 Above, n. 45.

87 Al-Qirqisâni, pp. 458–459. Despite this statement, al-Qirqisâni also tended to believe that these commandments were ancient. See p. 455. For the principle, see pp. 390–393. This chapter was translated by G. Vajda, “Études sur Qirqisâni,” REJ 108 (1948), pp. 78–80.
mandments because of the apparent identity between Gen. 26:5 and Neh. 9:14. Although Abraham did in fact perform many commandments, it is farfetched to use this as a basis for concluding that all of Moses’ laws were known to him.88

As previously stated, the essential innovation in the Karaites’ scholarship that is the focus of this section is their acceptance of the principle of naskh in the Bible. As an example of naskh they cited Gen. 9:3: “God, blessed be his name, had allowed all animals but did not allow them for us”.89 Another example was found in Num. 8:18, although a scholar who maintained the antiquity of the commandments claimed that this was not a proof of naskh, because the meaning of the word tahat in this instance is “with”. Al-Qirqisâni rejected this interpretation and claimed that the meaning of the word is “instead” (badal).90 Not all the ancient revealed commandments were intended to be abrogated. Hence, they divided the revealed commandments that were given to the Patriarchs into two groups: the eternal commandments and, in contrast, commandments that were given for a predetermined amount of time or to a specific person or those that were to be carried out in a particular location. These commandments were intended to be abrogated after they were fulfilled. The reason for emphasizing that the commandments were abrogated only after they were fulfilled was to reject the principle of bada’ completely. “(The Karaites) who believed that the commandments were not all ancient, accepted the abrogation of those commandments which were

88 See al-Qirqisâni, pp. 390–391. For the attempt to compare between Gen. 18:19 and Jer. 5:5, see also ibid., pp. 459–460.
89 Tobiah (above, n. 33), p. 2a. Cf., Mann (above, n. 16), p. 375. מז' הפארש החר "ה" הוש החר (sic). For other methods of interpreting this verse, see ibid. the continuation of Tobiah, and above, n. 54. Benjamin and Saadiah believed the מז' in this verse means pure, for the purpose of denying naskh. See al-Qirqisâni, pp. 455–456. Zucker (above, n. 17), pp. 448–450.
90 Al-Qirqisâni, p. 467. Samau’al al-Maghribi (above, n. 11), p. 41, also cites from this verse as proof of naskh in the Bible. This proof, however, was already rejected by Saadia (above, n. 10), III, p. 170.
not eternal and had a limited time frame. Those that were eternal or dependent on time could not be abrogated before they had been fulfilled. This is our statement and our method.”⁹¹ It appears that Yefet ben Eli, who claimed that the commandments were supplemented — as he wrote, “The commandments were supplemented until Moses’ death”⁹² — also accepted the principle of naskh in the Bible. According to him many commandments were imparted to Adam. But the Bible only tells us about the commandment mentioned in Gen. 2:17 for two reasons: first, so that we will know why Adam was expelled from the Garden of Eden; second, so we will know why this commandment was not binding on subsequent generations. In his second reason Yefet ben Eli indicates that he accepted naskh in the same way that al-Qirqisâni understood it: “We claim that Adam, may he rest in peace, had many commandments, but the Bible does not mention that God gave them to him. Of all these commandments it mentioned only one, i.e. ‘and from the tree of knowledge of good and evil you must not eat’ (Gen. 2:17). This commandment was mentioned for two

⁹¹ Al-Qirqisâni, p. 441: לְכֵן מַכְלָל בֵּית אָבִי מִצְרָאֵי. In light of what is written on p. 468, it should be read “מַכְלָל בֵּית אָבִי מִצְרָאֵי" instead of “מַכְלָל בֵּית אָבִי מִצְרָאֵי תָּרָיו. See Vajda’s translation (above, n. 7), p. 235.

⁹² Yefet (above, n. 17), f. 98b. Cf., Zucker (above, n. 20), p. 495: מַכְלָל בֵּית אָבִי מִצְרָאֵי מְשַׁמָּה מְשַׁמָּה טוּרֵי מְשַׁמָּה. In his commentary on Num. 19:3, ms Cambridge, Trinity College, 12. 110, f. 147a, he maintains that the commandments were supplemented even in Moses’ times (מְשַׁמָּה בֵּית אָבִי מִצְרָאֵי מְשַׁמָּה טוּרֵי מְשַׁמָּה). This assertion explains why he claimed that the commandments were revealed to Moses up to his death. The opposite approach is taken by the anonymous Karaite scholar (above, n. 24) f. 2b, Cf., Zucker (above, n. 20), p. 488, who maintains that all the commandments were given to Moses at Mt. Sinai as a single entity. According to Rabbi Akiva’s method, the commandments that were ostensibly given to Moses after the Revelation were also known to Moses at Sinai. See Sîfré Num. 68, 133, H.S. Horovitz, ed., p. 63; 177. See L. Finkelstein, Sîfrâ on Leviticus, (New York, 1989) I, p. 151.
reasons: first, so we would know the reason why God expelled Adam from the Garden of Eden and sentenced him to death, and to teach us that eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge was the reason for this; second, that we would know that this commandment only relates to Adam but not to any of his descendants till the end of time because they would never reach the Garden of Eden." 93 Tobiah ben Moses agreed with al-Qirqisâni and Yefet ben Eli. He also believed that some of the commandments were revealed to the Patriarchs; some of these were eternal and others musqalot, i.e. obligated one or more generations for a limited period of time. "The assertion of the fifth group is close to my belief and most of the scholars and teachers use this method. And it is that in every era, from Adam till Moses, may he rest in peace, each generation had specific commandments. The commandments that existed in Adam’s generation did not exist for Noah’s; those that existed in Noah’s times did not exist for Abraham; and those that existed for Abraham did not apply to Isaac and Jacob, and the commandments that existed in their days were not applicable in the generation of Egypt 94 and until the times of Moses, may he rest in peace. Among them there are commandments which are subtracted after that generation, and there are those that obligate two generations and more, and there are those that are eternal. There are others that were added generation by generation until the time when Moses came and the commandments were completed by him." 95

93 Yefet on Gen. 2:17, (above, n. 17), f. 99b. Compare Ben Shammai (above, n. 17), II p. 116. All the commandments were revealed to Adam and he was obligated to them because he was the first man. Among the commandments were the commandments to Adam and to Noah which were perpetual and the commandments to Abraham which were obligatory for two generations. The commandments to Isaac and Jacob were temporary and the commandments to the Israelites were temporary. See also al-Qirqisâni, p. 454.

94 Mann’s suggestion. In the text it is written "אנו".

95 Tobiah (above, n. 33), f. 2a. Cf., Mann (above, n. 16), p. 375: "ותמה עליה הנא".
As already noted, those who believed that the commandments were supplemented over time had to deal with the question put to them by the Muslim polemicists: Is this viewpoint not tantamount to an acceptance of the principle that the law of Moses differed from the commandments which predated it.\textsuperscript{96} Anyone reviewing al-Qirqisâni’s definition of \textit{naskh} could conclude that it apparently contains an acceptance of the viewpoint that one law was exchanged for another.\textsuperscript{97} As mentioned, however, he maintained that some of the commandments had been given for a predetermined and limited period of time. He therefore did not find the expiration of their validity an abrogation of law and an exchange of one law for another. This perception of the Karaites is a narrow interpretation of \textit{naskh}, taken from the \textit{Mu’tazila}. It is therefore not surprising that, like the \textit{mu’tazilite} perception of \textit{naskh}, it was frequently presented by others as a conception that negates \textit{naskh}. Saadiah Gaon cites a version in the name of the “people of our nation” who disagreed with \textit{naskh}. They divided the commandments into four categories, eternal, those given for a limited period of time, those intended to be carried out in a specific place and those associated with a specific reason. This assertion, which Saadiah brought in the name of those who negated \textit{naskh}, is in fact the selfsame Karaite viewpoint being discussed here which accepts \textit{naskh} in the Bible. Brunschvig

\textsuperscript{96} See above, n. 48. Saadiah, for example (above, n. 10), III, p. 162, did not perceive a contradiction between the law of Abraham and that of Moses, despite the addition of commandments.

\textsuperscript{97} See above, n. 9.
already suggested that Saadiah was actually referring to this Karaite viewpoint.98

While he still accepted naskh in its narrow sense, al-Qirqisânî completely rejected the principle of bada’ when he said that naskh occurs only after the fulfillment of the commandment which was intended for abrogation.99 His explicit negation of bada’ is demonstrated in his polemic with an Islamic scholar. The latter brought up the following example to prove his statement: A wise man sent a written order to his agent to carry out a transaction. Before the letter reached his agent, the wise man changed his mind and wrote a new letter in which he asked the agent not to carry out what was written in the first letter. Al-Qirqisânî maintained that the wise man, who has absolutely no knowledge of the future, cannot be compared with God, who knows everything in advance.100 In addition he rejected evidence, found in the Bible, which the supporters of bada’ used in discussing changes in God’s will. For example, with respect to the order regarding the sacrifice of Isaac and its cancellation,101 a difference exists between what is written in Ezek. 4:12 and Ezek. 4:16.102 Hence, Muslim literature records this as Biblical proof used by those who supported the principle of bada’.103

As noted, those who believed in the antiquity of Moses’ law were accused of diminishing the importance of the Revelation at Mount Sinai.104 The Karaite scholars under discussion

98 Saadiah (above, n. 10), Ch. 3 pp. 158–159. For a fifth category of commandments see ibid. Brunschvig (above, n. 12), p. 238. On the mu’tazilite definition of naskh and the criticism of it, see above notes 15 and 37.
99 See above, n. 91.
100 Al-Qirqisânî, pp. 443–444.
101 Al-Qirqisânî, pp. 444–445. See also Saadiah (above, n. 10), treatise III, p. 169.
102 Ibid., p. 447. See additional examples on pp. 445–448.
103 Ibn Ḥazm (above, n. 11), I, p. 101, maintains that God’s consent to Moses’ entreaty not to destroy the people of Israel was evidence of bada’.
104 See above, n. 27.
accepted the principle of the antiquity of the commandments in part. Nonetheless, because they maintained that some of the ancient revealed commandments were eternal, they had to answer the question: Why did God give some of the eternal commandments from time immemorial and then repeat them to Moses at Mount Sinai. Tobiah ben Moses answered thus: “There are commandments that obligate us and them equally; but some were obligatory for them for one reason and obligate us for two reasons.” Among the examples he gives is the prohibition against murder, based on Gen. 9:6: “‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed...’ But this prohibition obligates us because of what is written in Gen. 9:6 and because Moses said: ‘Thou shalt not murder’ (Exod. 20:13) and said afterwards ‘He that smiteth a man, so that he dieth, shall surely be put to death.’ (Exod. 21:12) Therefore murder was prohibited to them for one reason and for us for two reasons.”

It becomes clear, therefore, that a commandment given prior to the Revelation at Mount Sinai is assigned greater importance. Saadiah found a halakhic reason for the repetition of some of the revealed commandments. When there is a contradiction between two commandments in the Bible, the more ancient commandment takes precedence over the more recent one. Thus, if the need to perform the commandments of sacrifices and circumcision, which predated the Sabbath commandment, falls on the Sabbath, this sets aside the Sabbath. “The law of sacrifice preceded that of the Sabbath, and it would, therefore, have been improper for the Sabbath law to interfere with it, since that would have been tantamount to abrogation. Hence, while all other forms of work were forbidden, the offering of sacrifices and circumcision, which antedated the

105 Tobiah (above, n. 33), f. 2a. Cf., Mann, (above, n. 16) p. 376: נדה עלייתו ועלייתו黑白 lawful and unlawful sacrifices, which are written in the Tanakh and the Bible. Thus, when there is a contradiction between two commandments in the Bible, the more ancient commandment takes precedence over the more recent one. Thus, if the need to perform the commandments of sacrifices and circumcision, which predated the Sabbath commandment, falls on the Sabbath, this sets aside the Sabbath. "The law of sacrifice preceded that of the Sabbath, and it would, therefore, have been improper for the Sabbath law to interfere with it, since that would have been tantamount to abrogation. Hence, while all other forms of work were forbidden, the offering of sacrifices and circumcision, which antedated the
Sabbath, were not. Anan rejected the notion that it was possible to categorize the commandments according to their antiquity. He felt that anyone accepting this viewpoint would have to conclude that the Sabbath law antedates all others. This, therefore, cannot be the basis for concluding that the Passover sacrifice sets aside the Sabbath: “We do not believe that because the Passover commandment predates the Sabbath commandment it sets aside the Sabbath. And if we accepted the notion that the more ancient commandment sets aside the later one, then the Sabbath commandment is the most ancient. Al-Qirqisâni agreed with Anan. He doubted our ability to categorize the commandments according to their relative antiquity and he also suggested that the Sabbath commandment was more ancient than the others. As to the Sabbath sacrifice, he firmly established that the Sabbath law predated it.

In the Talmudic literature the issue of the repetition of ancient commandments in Moses’ law was raised in the discussion about those given to the sons of Noah. For example, the sons of Noah were commanded regarding what is written in Gen. 9:4 and Moses repeated this in Deut. 12:23. According to Yose ben Hanina every commandment given to the sons of Noah and repeated to the Israelites obligated Israel and the sons of Noah equally. The exception to this rule is the circumcision

106 Saadia, (above, n. 10), III, p. 169. See also ms Oxford Bodl MS Heb. e 45, f. 2b. 45. Cf., S. Poznanski, “The Anti-Karaite Writings of Saadiah Gaon”, JQR 10 (1898), p. 264. See also Zucker (above, n. 38), pp. 119 and 368.

107 Al-Qirqisâni, p. 466; 532.

108 Al-Qirqisâni, p. 466; 532.

109 Ibid., p. 532.
commandment which was repeated to teach us that circumcision sets aside the Sabbath.\textsuperscript{110} As for a commandment given to the sons of Noah and not repeated at Sinai, such as the prohibition against eating the sciatic nerve (Gen. 32:32), surprisingly, it does obligate the Israelites. The reason for this is that there is nothing which is permitted for the Israelites and prohibited for the gentiles.\textsuperscript{111}

Maimonides' approach to the antiquity of the commandments is entirely different from those discussed above. He did, however, accept the notion of the commandments given to the sons of Noah and even that the commandments were supplemented. Adam was given six commandments and Noah was given a seventh one (Gen. 9:4). Abraham was the first to carry out the commandment of circumcision and morning prayer. Isaac gave tithes and was the first to pray minhāh. Jacob was given the commandment of the sciatic nerve and the evening prayer. Amram was commanded to fulfill additional commandments.\textsuperscript{112} But according to Maimonides, the fact that the Patriarchs fulfilled some of the commandments does not obligate us at all. The eternal nature of the commandments and the reason behind the need to fulfill them stems solely from the Revelation of the Torah at Mount Sinai. Adopting the language of Tobiah ben Moses: we are obligated by the commandments "for one reason" and not for "two reasons".\textsuperscript{113} Maimonides repeated his opinion many times. The following is his commentary on Mishnah Hūlīn 7:6: "Pay attention to the important principle that is stated in this Mishnah. It says 'It is forbidden from Sinai'; thus, you must know that everything we are careful not to do and everything we do today, we do it solely because God commanded us through Moses and not because God commanded the prophets who came before him. An example of

\textsuperscript{110} BT, Sanhedrin, 59a–59b.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 59a.

\textsuperscript{112} Mishneh Torah, Sefer šōfētim, Hilekhōt melakhīm 9:11.

\textsuperscript{113} See above, n. 105.
this, is that we do not eat a limb severed from the living creature. This is true not because God forbade the sons of Noah to do so, but because Moses prohibited this as part of what was commanded to us at Sinai that a limb severed from the living creature remains forbidden. In addition, we do not carry out circumcision because Abraham circumcised himself and his household, but because God commanded us to do so through Moses, to carry out circumcision as Abraham, of blessed memory, did. Thus, concerning the sciatic nerve, we do not follow the prohibition given to our Forefather Jacob, but the commandment given by Moses." It is not unreasonable to assume that the foregoing is a debate with those who maintained that the most significant elements of Moses' law had already been given to the Patriarchs thereby diminishing the importance of the Revelation at Mount Sinai and of Moses as well.

As noted, the Jewish scholars who lived in the Muslim world were forced to address the question: Is naskh possible after the giving of the Torah? Those Karaite scholars who accepted the notion of naskh before the Revelation at Sinai, basing themselves on what is written in the Torah, would most certainly be expected to deal with this question. Al-Qirqisânî was willing to admit the possibility that commandments were added after the Torah was given, but absolutely rejected the notion that some commandments were subtracted. The Karaite scholars dealt with the question of whether the commandments were supplemented after the Torah was given not only because of the Muslim challenge, but also in light of the contradiction between the commandments of the Torah and a number of command-

114 Maimonides' Commentary on the Mishna (ed. Qafîh), p. 212. According to Yosé ben Hanina, the prohibition of the sciatic nerve was not repeated at Sinai. See above, n. 111.

115 See also Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Sefer ha-mada' Hilekhot 'akûm, 1:3. Ibid. Shôfetim, Hilekhot 'avel, 1:1. Ibid. Hilekhot melakhim, 8:11. Môreh nevôkhim, 2:39.

116 Al-Qirqisânî, p. 469.
ments in the Book of Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{117} Al-Qirqisānī’s solution was that the commandments in Ezekiel which contradict the Torah were intended for the Messianic era.\textsuperscript{118} According to the method of those who maintained the antiquity of the commandments, even those given to Ezekiel had already been given to Adam.\textsuperscript{119} The school of thought that believed that many commandments did not obligate Adam because the reasons behind them were based on events which occurred after his times felt that those given to Ezekiel would be obligatory when the third Temple would be built.\textsuperscript{120} In his commentary on Ezekiel, Yefet ben Eli, in the name of another scholar, makes the assumption that Moses actually received the commandments that apparently contradict the Torah. They were not revealed in the Torah, however, because God wanted to give them to Israel through Ezekiel: “God already gave (these commandments) to Moses, may he rest in peace, in general, but the Torah abridged them because God wanted to hand them down through Ezekiel in a more detailed and clear manner.”\textsuperscript{121}

The acceptance of the principle that commandments were added after the Torah was revealed differs greatly from the point of view that naskh is possible in the law of Moses. In the Geonic period the practical application of the acceptance of naskh was conversion to Islam. Therefore, Karaite scholars used many verses from the Bible to prove its everlasting nature.\textsuperscript{122}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{117} There was an argument about whether to conceal the Book of Ezekiel “for its words contradict the Torah” — BT, Shabbat 13b. It is important to note that this book was referred to extensively in the writings of the Qumran sect.
  \item \textsuperscript{118} Al-Qirqisānī, p. 470.
  \item \textsuperscript{119} See above, n. 22.
  \item \textsuperscript{120} Yefet (above, n. 17), f. 96a. Cf., Zucker (above, n. 20), p. 493.
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  \item \textsuperscript{122} Among the verses: Exod. 31:16, Lev. 23:21. See al-Qirqisānī, pp. 293–294. The polemic between al-Qirqisānī and the Muslims in which he emphasized the eternality of the Torah was published by I. Friedlaender. See in his “Qirqisānī’s Polemik gegen den Islam, ZA 26 (1912), pp. 98–99.
\end{itemize}