Dating the *Doctrina Iacobi*, an Anti-Jewish Text of Late Antiquity

Peter von Sivers, Emeritus, University of Utah, February 2022

Note: The German version of this English text consists of a single essay and deviates in minor details from what is presented here.

The Qur'ānic claim for Muḥammad's prophethood was unknown to the Christians and Jews of the nascent Islamic empire prior to the 686. Only a dirham with the line "Muḥammad, Prophet (*rasūl*) of God," minted by the governor Muṣʿab b. al-Zubayr (686-691), made the claim known beyond the circle of the elite of the Arab conquerors. Muṣʿab, the brother of ʿAbdallah b. al-Zubayr (683-692), the counter caliph residing in Mecca, was governor of Basra and Iran and had the dirham minted 686 in Bishapur, in the province of Fars. The counter caliph, with his own authority centered on the Ḥijāz, had to defend himself against two armies sent against him by the Umayyads in Damascus and was unwilling or unable to go on the offensive. He was a member of the Quraysh elite but had defected during the contentious brief reign of Muʿāwiya II b. Yazīd (683-684). He presented himself as a pious believer seeking protection in the Kaʿba, the sanctuary of the nascent but still unknown city of Mecca, and claimed the prophetic authority of the Prophet Muḥammad – an authority which the Sufyānid wing had always possessed and therefore did not have to proclaim. The Marwānid branch of the Umayyads, which eventually took over the reign from the Sufyānids and terminated the counter caliphate of Ibn al-Zubayr in 692, evidently sensed a need for the authority of Muḥammad for itself and propagated him as their prophet not only on its coins but also in the inscriptions of the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem.

So far in Islamic scholarship neither the ignorance of the Qur'ānic claim for Muḥammad's prophethood among the Christian and Jewish subjects nor the connection between

Ibn al-Zubayr's search for authority and the Bishapur dirham has become the topic of an investigation.[1] It is generally assumed in Islamic studies that Christians and Jews knew of the claim of prophethood for Muḥammad right from the start.[2] The assumed knowledge of this claim comes from only two texts, the *Doctrina Iacobi* and the *Nistarot of Rabbi Simeons b. Yohai*, both of which are believed to have been composed in the 630s or shortly thereafter. This essay is devoted to a discussion of the *Doctrina's* date, in the following essay the focus will be on the origin of the *Nistarot*. As far as the *Doctrina* is concerned, only Paul Speck and Sean Anthony have questioned the assumed verity of its composition in 634 or shortly thereafter, the former with a detailed text-critical investigation of 1997[3] and the latter somewhat hesitantly, in his book of 2020, knowing full well that the majority of colleagues in the field would take umbrage at him.[4] The *Doctrina*, so I think I can demonstrate, was composed only after 670 at the earliest and belongs into the period of the rising apocalyptic literature on the future of the Byzantine and Umayyad empires.

The *Doctrina* was probably authored by a Chalcedonian Christian justifying the forcible conversion of Jews on the order of Emperor Heraclius (610-640) in 630. The order, although issued for the whole empire, was carried out only in the Exarchate of Carthage and the Frankish kingdom. As a manual for conversion, the *Doctrina* belongs to the category of *adversos iudaeos* tracts which were composed in an increasingly fractious Christianity from the early 500s onwards, accompanied by a growing hostility towards Jews. Prior to Heraclius, however, there were apparently no forced conversions, if one follows the conclusions of Günter Stemberger, the doyen on the topic of anti-Judaism in Antiquity.[5] The forcible conversions in Carthage, on the other hand, are documented in a letter by Maximus Confessor[6] and the selection of the city was presumably not accidental: It was here that Heraclius had spent his early adulthood with his

father, the exarch also called Heraclius, and began his triumphal advance against Phocas 610 for the throne in Constantinople.

The motive for ordering forced conversions is not immediately apparent. On one hand, Heraclius had grounds for revenge after the Jewish-Christian massacres in Jerusalem during the Sasanid conquest of 614. On the other hand, after his victory over the Sasanids in 628 he pursued the ambitious policy of unifying the Chalcedonian and Miaphysite churches through the doctrine of miaenergism.[7] The prospect of unification had apocalyptical implications: Heraclius circulated the prediction, according to which he would no longer be the traditional Roman emperor but the Christian king (*basileus*) of a realm on its way toward becoming the heavenly kingdom of Jesus. The Messiah would return soon to Jerusalem for his Second Coming, at which occasion the imperial crown would be turned over to him.[8] Upon his arrival, of course, all confessional differences would disappear and the Jews would overcome their blindness, as Paul states in Roman 11:25-26, making forced baptisms unnecessary. Did Heraclius perhaps want to hasten the Second Coming with his forced baptisms?[9] Whatever the emperor hoped for from the forced baptisms, however, ended in bitter disappointment a few years later. The final victory of the Arabs in 640 over his army in Syria pulled the rug from under his apocalyptic propaganda.[10]

In view of this propaganda, one wonders why the apocalypse about the imminent disintegration of the Roman empire in which the *Doctrina Iacobi* is embedded should have been composed already in 634 or shortly thereafter. A new, pessimistic counter apocalypse by a Chalcedonian should have appeared so soon, replacing Heraclius' apotheosis and the prospects of brilliant future of the empire with the horrors of an immediate end? Such a replacement is, of course, possible, given the rapid change of events in the 630s, but the question is nevertheless important for my analysis in this essay which assumes a silence of apocalyptic speculations

among all confessions during the early period of the Arab empire. As already mentioned above, during 634-686 nobody quite knew how long the Arab conquests would last, whether the conquests would conclude with the creation of a permanent empire, and which number one would have to give this empire, following the four Danielic empires Assyria-Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece-Diadochi, und Rome-Byzantium.

The *Doctrina*[11] features a detailed debate among several unconverted Jews and one forcibly converted Jew on Christian theology,[12] as well as the apocalyptic events accompanying the soon to arrive or already completed end of Rome -- no final decision is made in the text. The Jew Justus, who converts gradually under the persuasive power of the forcibly converted Jacob, turns in V:1 away from his opinion that Rome still exists and assumes that the empire has been replaced – according to the Daniel Apocalypse – by ten "toparchies" or kingdoms. Jacob avoids an agreement with this assumption but concurs with Justus that the Deceiver or "Hermolaos," as the Antichrist is called in the text, is already on his way with his attempt to create chaos.

At the end of the *Doctrina*, Justus cites a letter from his brother Abraham in Palestine according to which a prophet had appeared at the time when the Arabs had killed the Byzantine commander of the garrison at Caesarea, to the joy of the Jews. This prophet announced the coming of the "'Anointed' (*hyleimmenos*) und Christ" (V:16).[13] Abraham writes that he had asked an old scholar who exclaimed with a great groan that this prophet was a deceiver because prophets would not come with fire and sword. One could also not believe his assertion that he possessed the keys to Paradise. In the middle of the present chaos one would have to fear that Hermolaos had appeared instead of Christ. Abraham writes further that he had asked others who had met the prophet and was told that there was nothing true about him except the shedding of blood. Shortly after the discussion of Abraham's letter the *Doctrina* has Jacob depart from

Carthage on business (July 13, 634[14]) and leaves the reader with an apparent allusion to the Prophet Muḥammad, allegedly still alive in this year, as well as the seemingly contemporary testimonies about events in Palestine.

All those in Islamic studies who consider Jacob's departure date of July 13, 634 or a date shortly thereafter as the year of the *Doctrina*'s composition, however, overlook one of the many passages concerning the moribund Roman empire. This passage states that in the past the borders of the empire extended "to Egypt and Africa and beyond Africa." (III:10). In the Slavic version of the text one finds furthermore the addition "to the ocean."[15] Without much effort one recognizes that the passage speaks of Egypt (including Cyrenaica und Tripolitania) and the Exarchate in the west, which comprised Byzacena (today's Tunisia) and Mauretania prima (today's northern Algeria). Most of Mauretania secunda (northern Morocco) and southern Spain were lost to the Visigoths in 624. Only the port city of Ceuta in northern Morocco, near the Atlantic Ocean, remained of Mauretania secunda. In the year 647, invading Arabs defeated an army of Byzacena near Sufetula (today Sbeitla) and in 670 Arabs founded the garrison city of Kairoaun (both in central Tunisia). After 670, Byzacena consisted only of a coastal strip of land between Thyna (today a suburb of Sfax) and Carthage, as well as land west of Carthage. In 698, finally, Byzantium lost Carthage and the rump Exarchate altogether to the Arabs. From this enumeration of the lost western provinces of the Byzantine empire it is evident that the *Doctrina* was composed between 670 and 698. It thus forms part of the apocalyptic literature beginning towards the end of the 600s and cannot have originated already during the forced conversions under Heraclius and the Arab conquest of Syria in 634.

References

1 Suleiman Mourad proposes that the dirham was minted in Persia in order to facilitate the conversion of the Zoroastrians to Islam, apparently thinking that proselytization was on the agenda of the Zubayrids. See Suleiman A. Mourad, "The *Shahada* and the Creation of an Islamic Identity," in John Tolan, ed., *Geneses: A Comparative Study of the Historiographies of the Rise of Christianity, Rabbinic Judaism, and Islam* (Milton Park, Abingdon: Taylor and Francis, 2019), 218-239, here 229.

2 The first non-Arab who had an inkling of the Arabs' faith (but not of Muḥammad's prophethood) was the East-Syriac patriarch Ishoʿyahb III (580-659). Around 637-640 he commented approvingly on their anti-theopaschite stance concerning Jesus' crucifixion (denial of Jesus' crucifixion as God). The East Syriac Christians (later called "Nestorians') attributed theopaschism polemically to the Miaphysite and Chalcedonian Christians. On the polemic see my essay "Tritheismus, Teopaschitismus und Doppelqnōmā," in Markus Groß and Robert M. Kerr, eds., *Die Entstehung einer Weltreligion VI: Vom umayyadischen Christentum zurm abbasidischen Islam*, Inârah, 10 (Berlin and Tübingen: Schiler and Mücke, 2021), 734-762, here 738-740.

3 Paul Speck, "Die *Doctrina Iacobi nuper baptizati*," in Speck, *Varia VI. Beiträge zum Thema Byzantinische Feindseligkeit gegen die Juden im frühen siebten Jahrhundert nebst einer Untersuchung zu Anastasios dem Perser,* Poikila Byzantina, 15 (Bonn: Dr. Rudolph Habelt, 1997), 267-439.

4 Sean W. Anthony, *Muḥammad and the Empires of Faith: The Making of the Prophet of Islam* (Berkeley, Calif., und Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2020), 55-56. Anthony is less hesitant in his earlier article: "Muḥammad, the Keys to Paradise, and the *Doctrina Iacobi*: A Late Antique Puzzle," *Der Islam*, 91 (2014), 243–265. There (262) he dates the *Doctrina* tentatively to ca. 670, on the grounds of its discussion of topics of the Islamic Tradition, especially Muḥammad's "keys to Paradise."

5 Günter Stemberger, "Zwangstaufen von Juden vom 4. Bis 7. Jahrhundert," in Clemens Thoma, Günter Stemberger, and Johann Maier, eds., *Judentum – Ausblicke und Einsichten: Festgabe für Kurt Schubert zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Judentum und Umwelt, 43 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1993), 81-114.

6 Maximus Confessor, **"**La fin inédite d'une lettre de saint Maxime: Un baptême forcé de juifs et samaritains à Carthage en 632," ed. Robert Devreesse, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 17 (1937), 25-35. English translation Andrew Jacobs: "*Letter* 8 (End) (On the Forced Conversion of Jews and Samaritans),"http://andrewjacobs.org/translations/maximos.html, accessed 10-22-2021. Concerning the date (632) of the letter see Strickler, "'The Wolves of Arabia:' A

Reconsideration of Maximus the Confessor's *Epistola 8*," *Byzantion,* 86 (2016), 419-439.

7 See most recently Nadine Viermann, *Heraklius, der schwitzende Kaiser: Die oströmische Monarchie in der ausgehenden Spätantike*, Millennium Studien-Millennial Studies, 89 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2121), 283-300; and Oleksandr Kashchuk, "The Promotion of Miaenergism as a Challenge to Identity of Non-Chalcedonian Christianity," *Vox Patrum*, 38 (2018), 257-283, here 268-270. The doctrines of miaenergism and later, miatheletism, were devised to water down the Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures (human and divine) of Jesus with the notion of one energy and later, one will, to win over the Miaphysites with their doctrine of a single human-divine nature of Jesus.

8 Gerrit J. Reinink, "Die Entstehung der syrischen Alexanderlegende als politisch-religiöse Propagandaschrift für Haraklios' Kirchenpolitik," in Carl Laga, Joseph A. Munitz, and Lucas van Rompay, eds., *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History, Offered to Professor Albert van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday*, Orientalia Lovaniensa Analecta, 18 (Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek and Peeters, 1985), 263-281.

9 Christian Boudignon, "'Le temps du saint baptême n'est pas encore venu': Nouvelles considérations sur la *Doctrina Jacobi*," in Sébastien Morlet, Olivier Munnich, and Bernard Pouderon, eds., *Les dialogues "Adversvs Ivdaeos": Permanences et mutations d'une tradition polémique* (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2013), 237–56, here 254.

10 Paul Magdalino, "'All Israel Will Be Saved?' The Forced Baptism of the Jews and Imperial Eschatology," in John Tolan, Nicholas de Lange, Laurence Foschia, and Capucine Nemo-Pekelman, eds., *Jews in Early Christian Law: Byzantium and the Latin West, 6th-11th Centuries*, Religion and Law in Medieval Christian and Muslim Societies, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 231-243, here 237 und 239-240.

11 The first critical edition is Nathanael Bonwetsch, ed., *Doctrina Iacobi nuper baptizati*, Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, Neue Folge, 12:3 (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1910). A new critical edition and French translation is "Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati," Gilbert Dagron and Vincent Déroche, eds. and trs., in *Travaux et Mémoires*, 11 (Paris: de Boccard, 1991), 71-219. An English translation can be found under the title *Teaching of Jacob Newly Baptized*, Andrew S. Jacobs, tr., http://andrewjacobs.org/translations/doctrina.html, accessed 10-19-2021. Andrew Jacobs' (in places paraphrased) slightly abbreviated text follows the Roman and Arabic pagination of Dragon und Déroche, indicated here also in parentheses.

12 The approach is generic Nicaean, without touching on Christological controversies (natures of Jesus, post-Chalcedonian confessionalism, miaenergism, or miatheletism).

13 In other places, the *Doctrina* identifies Hermolaos with Satan or the Devil: I:5, III:9, IV:3, IV:5, and V:4. "Hermolaos," appears as "Armilos" in Jewish apocalypses, such as the Sefer Zerubabel, and is presumably derived from the name "Romulus" (475-476) for the last emperor of West Rome, which the Jews considered as their arch enemy. By avoiding the common Christian term "Antichrist," the *Doctrina* presumably seeks to make itself more attractive to the

Jews it seeks to convert. On the name see David Berger, "Three Typological Themes in Jewish Messianism: Messiah Son of Joseph, Rabbinic Calculations, and the Figure of Armilus," *The Journal of the Association of Jewish Studies,* 10 (1985), 141-164, here 152-162. See also Robert Mirică, "The Figure of Hermolaos: The Oriental Identity of an Occidental Demon?" in Luminiţa Diaconu and Brîndușa Elena Grigoriu, eds., *Orient and Occident: Construction des identités en Europe médiévale*, Mediaevalia*,* 5 (Bucarest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2015), 29-42.

13 "Christ" is evidently employed as a name here, disregarding the fact that it also means "anointed." Is the expression *hyleimmenos* added to make the name "Christ" less objectionable for Jews subjected to conversion?

14 Speck wonders whether the author included a departure date, as well as the subsequent Christian doxology, to make the *Doctrina* (playfully?) look like the end of a saint's *vita*: Jacob is depicted in the text as an initially shady trader who changes step by step into a pious Christian. See Speck, "Die *Doctrina*," 436.

15 Dagron und Déroche, 168.

The *Nistarot* or *Secrets of Rabbi Simeons b. Yoḥai and Their Date of Composition*

Peter von Sivers, Emeritus, University of Utah, February 2022

The assumption that the late antique Near East was shaking from apocalyptic fever during the Islamic conquests is a widely shared conviction in current scholarly discussions.[1] Upon closer investigation, however, it is not at all clear whether there is sufficient textual confirmation for this assumption, especially for the half-century from the Arab conquest in 634 to the second intra-Arab war or *fitna* of 683-692. To begin with, the only substantial evidence that is usually cited as a testimony is the *Nistarot* or *Secrets of Rabbi Simeons b. Yoḥai*, which "predict" the history of the Umayyad empire from the conquests to the disintegration of the Marwānid dynasty in 750 under the onslaught of the ʿAbbasid revolution, with later additions reaching as far as the Crusades:[2] According to the *Nistarot*, God raised a prophet and his army liberated Palestine for

the Jews. All other known apocalypses, whether Jewish or Christian, date to a time after 683 and are far less detailed about conquerors and conquests.[3]

My reasoning concerning a post-683 dating of the *Nistarot* follows a text-critical line. There is at present a general agreement in scholarship from Crone-Cook (1977) to Shoemaker (2021) that the *Nistarot* contain a fragment that originated in the early days of the Arab conquest of Syria.[4] Robert Hoyland is one of the few who expresses himself a bit more cautiously by referring to an "apparently" earlier apocalyptic core within the *Nistarot*, contemporary with the Arab conquests. But a few lines later he describes this core still as the "original version" of the *Nistarot* and thus leaves the *comunis opinio* intact.[5]

Simon b. Yoḥai was a Tannaitic rabbi of the second century and his name is evidently borrowed to provide the later apocalypse with his authority. In it, he is described as a sage who spent 13 years in a cave to escape the persecutions of Caesar, the king of Edom (Rome).[6] After 40 days and nights of praying and fasting God answered the sage's prayers and unveiled the secrets of the End, as well as further "hidden things" (34). When he learned that the realm of Ishmael was arriving he was frightened by the prospect of this realm following the already horrible Edom. But the angel Metraton (7) calmed Simon and explained to him that God brought about the realm of the Ishmaelites only for the purpose of liberating the Jews from Edom: God will raise a prophet and the Ishmaelites will restore the land energetically (for the Jews) against the sons of Esau (Romans). But Simon still wondered from where it was known that the Ishmaelites were the liberators. Metatron answered Simon with a quote from Isaiah where in 21:7 a watchman is mentioned who has the mission of carefully watching two riders one on a donkey and the other on a camel. (Isaiah is alluding to the transmission of a message concerning the victory of the alliance of the Medes (messenger on the donkey) and the Achaemenid Persians

(messenger on the camel) over the Neo-Babylonians in 539 BCE.) Metatron added to the Isaiah quote that it was necessary for a correct understanding to be aware of the order of precedence between the riders in the verse: The rider on the donkey (the Messiah) enters the kingdom ahead of the rider on the camel (the Arab prophet), as the armies of the latter are in the process of liberating the kingdom of Israel from the sons of Esau (35).(8)

In his reader of 2005, John Reeves asserts that in the literature of late Antiquity prior to Islam the watchman verse in Isaiah 21:7 was not read typologically and was given such a meaning only by Muslim apologists.(9) Reeves is, however, not entirely correct.: A Christian reading of the donkey rider as Jesus and the camel rider as the devil appears in the *Commentary on Isaiah* by Jerome (347-420).(10) As far as the Muslim typological reading of the verse is concerned, in an article of 1991 Suleiman Bashear cites the traditionist Muḥammad b. Kaʿb al-Qurāaẓī (d. 108-120 AH/726-737) as the earliest source.(11) Thus, it is only after the beginning of Traditionist Islam around 700 that a Jewish scholar could learn of the typology of Muḥammad as the camel rider and prophet. In a later article, Reeves corrects his earlier thesis of 2005, according to which an original core of the *Nistarot* can be dated to the early Arab conquests. In this article, dated to 2011, he speaks more generally of the *Nistarot* as a text composed of "smaller complexes of apocalyptic traditions from the middle of the seventh to the middle of the eighth centuries."(12) But he still does not take the last step of describing the *Nistarot* as a counterpart to the beginning Islamic Tradition about the apocalypse at the end of the seventh century and not a text from the time of the early conquests.(13)

Conclusions can now be drawn from the above analyses of the *Doctrina Iacobi* and the *Nistarot*. (1) Between 634 and 683 little was known about the Qur'ān and early Islam outside the circle of the Arab and converted Christian and Jewish religious scholars, as well as the political

elite. (2) During this time, Arab and converted Christian and Jewish scholars worked more or less closely with the emirs ʿUthmān, ʿUmar and Muʿāwiya on the composition of the Qur'ān. (3) Only in the war of 683 to 692 when the elite broke apart and the hostile camps resorted to the proclamation of theological positions to win the war Christians and Jews outside the elite also began to take religious positions. (4) They used what they learned from the Qur'ānic scholars for the defense of their own faiths. The Byzantine author of the *Doctrina,* hostile to the conquering Arabs, declared the prophet to be false. The Jewish author of the *Nistarot* remained faithful to the Rabbinic-Jewish pro-Umayyad stance, with subsequent anti-Umayyad interpolations from writers under the ʿAbbasids. And finally (5), there is no surprise in encountering a Jewish author who accepts an Arab prophet: After all, the Babylonian Talmud speaks of up to seven prophets sent to the non-Jewish peoples of the world.(14)

References

[1] A recent example is Costa, José, "Early Islam as a Messianic Movement: A Non-Issue?" in Carlos A., Segovia, ed., *Remapping Emergent Islam: Texts, Social Settings, and Ideological Trajectories* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2020), 45-81, here 50; see also.Robert G. Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish, and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam* (Princeton, N.J.: Darwin Press, 1997), 26-31.

[2] Bernard Lewis, "An Apocalyptic Vision of Islamic History," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* 13 (1950), 26-31. Possibly the only exception are the eighth-century *Pirqe Mashiaḥ*, of which unidentified elements have been dated to the seventh century. See John C. Reeves, "Pirqe Mashiaḥ," https://www.academia.edu/5768425/Pirqe_Mashiah, accessed 2-2020. This text is an extract from John C. Reeves, ed. and tr., *Trajectories in Near Eastern Apocalyptic: A Postrabbinic Jewish Apocalypse Reader* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 149-171. See also Spurling, Helen, "A Revival in Jewish Apocalyptic? Change and Continuity in the Seventh-Eighth Centuries with Special Reference to Pirqe Mashiah, in Amirav, H., Grypeou, E. and Stroumsa, G.G., eds., *Apocalypticism and Eschatology in Late Antiquity: Encounters in the Abrahamic Religions, 6th-8th Centuries,* Late Antique History and Religion, 17 (Leuven and Bristol, Ct.: Peeters and Departement Oosterse Studies, 2017), 163-186. In this article Spurling references her dissertation, which I have not seen: *Pirqe Mashiah: A Translation, Commentary and Introduction*, Ph.D. Dissertation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[3] Hoyland, *Seeing*, 257-321.

[4] Patricia Crone and Michael Cook, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 4; and Stephen J. Shoemaker, *A Prophet Has Appeared: The Rise of Islam Through Christian and Jewish Eyes* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2021), 51-53.

[5] Hoyland**,** *Seeing,* 308-309.

[6] My summary and the pagination, in parentheses, follows Reeves, *Trajectories*, https://www.academia.edu/5768249/Nistarot_Rabbi_Shimon_b_Yohai, accessed 2-21-2020. The phrase "persecutions of Caesar" alludes perhaps to Heraclius' campaign of forced conversions.

[7] Metatron is an arch angel in the Talmud and Jewish mysticism. See Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); and Reeves, "Metatron as Apocalyptic Persona," https://www.academia.edu/5689021/Metatron_as_Apocalyptic_Persona, accessed 2-21-2020; *Trajectories*, 179-186.

[8] The verse is a bit more complex than it appears in my summary. The Masoretic edition of the Hebrew Bible reads "For thus did my Lord say to me: 'Go, station the watchman. Let him report what he sees. And should he see chariotry of a team/pair of horses/riders, chariotry of asses, chariotry of camels, he must pay careful attention, a lot of attention.'" See John C. Reeves, "Introductory Essay to Trajectories in Near Eastern Apocalyptic," 1-29, here 8, https://www.academia.edu/5765058/Introductory_Essay_to_Trajectories_in_Near_Eastern_Apocalyptic, accessed 2-20-2020. This online text is excerpted from Reeves, *Trajectories*, 1-29.

[9] Ibid., 11.

[10] Jerome, *Commentary on Isaiah: Including St. Jerome's Translation of Origen's Homilies 1-9 on Isaiah*, Ancient Christian Writers, 68, tr. Thomas P. Scheck (New York: The Newman Press, 2015), VII:24; the most recent Latin edition is ist Jerôme, *Commentaires de Jerôme sur le prophète Isaïe*, ed. Roger Gryson und Paul-Augustin Deproost (Freiburg: Herder, 1993-1999). Siehe auch Jean-Louis Déclais, *Un récit musulman sur Isaïe* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2001), 149-150.

[11] Suleiman Bashear, "Riding Beasts of Divine Missions: An Examination of the Ass and Camel Traditions," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 37 (1991), 37-75, here 43.

[12] John C. Reeves, "The Muslim Appropriation of a Biblical Text: The Messianic Dimension of Isaiah 21:6-9," in Kenneth G. Holum and Hayim Lapin, eds.., *Shaping the Middle East: Jews, Christians, and Muslims in an Age of Transition, 400-800 C.E.* (Lanham, Md.: University of Maryland Press, 2011), 211-222, here 215-218. See also Andrew A. Macintosh, *Isaiah XXI: A Palimpsest* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 31-33.

[13] In the course of the first half of the eighth century, the apocalypse seems to have become a common topos, as is visible in the exchange of letters between ʿUmar II (717-720) und Leo III (717-741). The correspondence is found in the work of the Armenian chronicler Ghevond (Łevond, late eighth century). See Arthur Jeffery, "Ghevond's Text of the Correspondence between 'Umar II and Leo III," *The Harvard Theological Review*, 37 (1944), 269-332, here 278.

[14] Stefan Schreiner, "'Der Vater aller Propheten': Mose als Prophet und die Prophetie des Mose in jüdischer, christlicher und islamischer Tradition," in Klaus von Stoch und Tuba Işik, eds., *Prophetie in Islam und Christentum* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2013), 13-34, here 24.