

Ismā'īl Qazvīnī: A Twelfth/Eighteenth-Century Jewish Convert to Imāmī Šī'ism and His Critique of Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Four Kingdoms (Daniel 2:31–45)*

Dennis Halft OP

Ismā'īl Qazvīnī was a twelfth/eighteenth century Jewish convert to Imāmī (Twelver) Šī'ī Islam who became a polemicist against his former religion. Following his conversion at an unspecified age, he composed, in Yazd in central Iran, what appears to be his only known work, the Persian anti-Jewish tract *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* ("Tidings of the Prophets"), in which he challenges Jewish interpretations of the Hebrew Bible.¹ *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* was written at the request of some of his Šī'ī co-religionists. The earliest known manuscript, Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349, is dated in the colophon Dū l-Ḥijja 1179/[May 1766].²

* The research for this publication was supported by the I-CORE Program of the Planning and Budgeting Committee and The Israel Science Foundation (grant No. 1754/12). Previous versions of this article were presented at the colloquium "Jewish-Muslim Polemics in the Middle Ages and Beyond" held in June 2015 in New York, jointly convened by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, and also at the international conference of the *Biblia Arabica* project "Christianity and Judaism in the Language of Islam" held in March 2016 at Uppsala University in Uppsala, Sweden. I wish to thank Etan Kohlberg, Vera Basch Moreen, Julia Rubanovich, Rebecca Toueg, and the anonymous reviewer for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this publication, as well as Mahdi M. and Sohrab Y. for their help in acquiring reproductions of some of the manuscripts consulted for this study.

1 In the Appendix of this publication, I offer a first edition of sections of Chapter One of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* that are related to the medieval Jewish exegesis of the four kingdoms in Daniel 2:31–45. I am currently preparing a critical edition of Ismā'īl Qazvīnī's entire work.

2 See Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349, 51 fols. (defective at the beginning and between fols. 49v and 50r, with a seal impression on fol. 51v by the copyist Ni'mat Allāh ibn Mīrzā Murād al-Kāšānī). Numerous corrections, emendations, and insertions suggest that the manuscript contains a revision of a previous version, presumably by the author. On the front page is a marginal note by a certain Abū l-Ḥasan, in which the date of the copy is erroneously indicated as being 1139/[1726–27]. The same misreading of the date appears in the manuscript catalog of the Kitābhāna-yi Āyat Allāh Mar'ašī in Qum (see Ḥusaynī, *Fihrist-i Kitābhāna-yi (...) Mar'ašī*, vol. 9, 124–25) and was adopted by later reference works to the effect that Qum, Mar'ašī,

This unpublished polemical treatise is a rare source on Iranian Jewry and Šī'i-Jewish interaction during the mid-eighteenth century, when local tribes struggled for power following the assassination of Nādir Šāh (d. 1160/1747) and the collapse of his empire. *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* is extant in eleven manuscripts, dated between the second half of the eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries, all of which are preserved in libraries in Iran and Iraq.³

Biographical information on the author is scant. In *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī recounts that he discovered “the truth of Islam” (*ḥaqqīyyat-i dīn-i Islām*) as a young man while studying the books of the biblical prophets.⁴ When Āgā Buzurg al-Ṭihṙānī (d. 1389/1970) compiled an entry to *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* in his Šī'i bibliographical survey *al-Ḍarī'a ilā taṣānīf al-š'ra*, he mistakenly assumed Ismā'īl Qazvīnī to be the father of a certain 'Abbās ibn Ismā'īl ibn 'Alī ibn Ma'sūm Qazvīnī who died after 1311/1893–94.⁵ Ismā'īl Qazvīnī, however, had been active about a hundred years before the time of 'Abbās ibn Ismā'īl. Nevertheless, Āgā Buzurg's assumption has remained unchallenged and appears in standard reference works today.⁶

On the contrary, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī is the father of the well-known Imāmī polemicist Ḥājjī Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī, who in Ramaḍān 1211/March 1797 completed his Persian refutation of Judaism *Maḥḍar al-šuhūd fi radd al-yahūd* (“The Court for Refuting the Jews”).⁷ The large number of extant copies of this text – two dozen manuscripts – suggests a certain popularity of *Maḥḍar al-šuhūd* among

Ms 3349 is sometimes listed as an independent work by a different author. See, e.g. DINĀ, vol. 2, 175, no. 33580; FANḤĀ, vol. 4, 944.

3 For reference works mentioning and partly describing the extant manuscripts of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*, see Ḍarī'a, vol. 2, 354–55, no. 1426; Mu'jam, vol. 1, 496–97, no. 2181; DINĀ, vol. 2, 175; FANḤĀ, vol. 4, 944.

4 See Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, 57 fols., completed in Šawwāl 1186/[January 1773], fol. 2r:2; Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 14043, 77 fols., completed in 1192/[1778–79], fol. 2r:7–8. For a description of the last-mentioned manuscript, see Ḥusaynī, *Fihrist-i Kitābhāna-yi (...) Mar'ašī*, vol. 35, 515–16, no. 474.

A similar statement is found in the accounts of other Jewish converts to Islam, such as that of the fourteenth-century Muslim polemicist Sa'īd ibn Ḥasan al-Iskandarī. See Halft, “Sa'īd b. Ḥasan al-Iskandarī,” English section: 277; Arabic section: 314.

5 See Ḍarī'a, vol. 2, 354–55, no. 1426, and 48–49, no. 198; Ṭabaqāt a'lām al-šī'a, vol. 10, 136, no. 271. For the *terminus post quem* for 'Abbās Qazvīnī's death, see Ḥusaynī, *Tarājīm al-rījāl*, vol. 1, 261, no. 460. 'Abbās Qazvīnī is the author of *Asrār al-šalāt*, first printed in 1294/[1877–78]. He had received a “license to transmit” (*ijāzat al-rivāya*) by Sayyid 'Alī Baḥr al-'Ulūm (d. 1298/1880–81). See Ḍarī'a, vol. 2, 48–49, no. 198.

6 See A'yān al-šī'a, vol. 3, 376, 392; Munzavī, *Fihrist-i nuṣṣahā*, vol. 2, 894; Mawsū'at, vol. 4, 257; Mu'jam, vol. 1, 496–97, no. 2181; DINĀ, vol. 2, 175; FANḤĀ, vol. 4, 944.

7 On *Maḥḍar al-šuhūd*, see Tsadik, “Religious Disputations of Imāmī Shī'īs.”

Šī'i Muslims in Qājār Iran.⁸ In his polemical work, Hājji Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī explicitly refers to his father as the author of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* and depicts him as “the most learned [Jewish] scholar of his time/his people” (*a'lam az jamr-i 'ulamā'-i 'aṣr-i ḥud/tā'ifa-yi ḥud*).⁹

Moreover, *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* served Hājji Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī as a source for the compilation of his *Maḥḍar al-ṣuhūd*. He relied heavily, for example, on his father's Persian adaptation of the medieval Jewish Aramaic tract *Nebu'at ha-yeled* (“The Prophecy of the Child”), also known as *Vahy-i kudak*, and incorporated entire passages into his polemical treatise, without identifying his source.¹⁰ Besides these two anti-Jewish works by father and son, I am unaware of any other contemporary work that provides additional information about Ismā'il Qazvīnī.

The Anti-Jewish Tract *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*

Although early modern Šī'i refutations of Judaism in Persian and Arabic have attracted increasing scholarly attention over the past two decades, *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* has not been studied until now.¹¹ Its doctrinal intention is to prove

8 For reference works listing numerous copies of *Maḥḍar al-ṣuhūd*, see Ḍarī'a, vol. 20, 152, no. 2353; Mu'jam, vol. 5, 59, no. 10498; DINĀ, vol. 9, 186–87.

9 See Najaf, Madrasa-yi Āyat Allāh Burūjirdī, Ms 107, 104 fols. (own foliation), fol. 59r:4 (digital scans of the manuscript are available in the digital library of Majma'-i Ḍaḥā'ir-i Islāmī in Qum); Qum, Markaz-i Iḥyā'-i Mirāth-i Islāmī, Ms 1839/1, fols. 1–82, completed in Ṣafar 1213/[July 1798], fol. 51r:9; Tehran, Majlis, Ms 2082, 208 pp. (paginated), completed in Ṣawwāl 1213/[March 1799], p. 119:2–3.

10 Compare Chapter Two of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* (see Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fols. 13v:11–24r:10; Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349, fols. 11r:10–20r:1; Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 14043, fols. 16v:10–28v:11) to *Maḥḍar al-ṣuhūd*, Chapter Three, Section Six (see Najaf, Madrasa-yi Āyat Allāh Burūjirdī, Ms 107, fols. 58r:11–65v:8; Qum, Markaz-i Iḥyā'-i Mirāth-i Islāmī, Ms 1839/1, fols. 49v:17–55r:18; Tehran, Majlis, Ms 2082, pp. 116:6–128:10). On the Persian version of *Nebu'at ha-yeled*, see Ḍarī'a, vol. 25, 59–61, no. 326; Tsadik, “Nineteenth Century Šī'i Anti-Christian Polemics.”

11 For previous studies on Šī'i-Jewish polemics, see Moreen, “The Problems of Conversion among Iranian Jews”; eadem, “Salmān-i Fārisī and the Jews”; eadem, “*Risāla-yi Ṣawā'iq al-Yahūd*”; eadem, “Polemical Use of the Qur'ān”; eadem, “A Šī'i-Jewish ‘Debate’”; eadem, “A Seventeenth-Century Iranian Rabbi's Polemical Remarks”; Yehudah ben El'azar, *Duties of Judah*; Tsadik, “Religious Disputations of Imāmī Šī'īs”; idem, *Between Foreigners and Šī'īs*, 15–32; Pourjavady and Schmidtke, “Muslim Polemics against Judaism and Christianity”; idem, “Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī al-Burūjirdī al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī”; Moreen and Yeroushalmi, “The Intellectual Parameters.”

that the biblical prophecy regarding the kingdom of God was fulfilled by the advent of Islam and the coming of its Prophet Muḥammad. In support of his argument, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī drew extensively on the Hebrew Bible, in particular the Book of Daniel.¹²

Anbā' al-anbiyā' contains twelve chapters (*faṣl*), each of which opens with a biblical citation in Persian and/or in Hebrew written in Perso-Arabic script, accompanied by an interlinear, word-for-word translation into Persian.¹³ Following his translation, the author adduced his interpretation of the biblical text (in which he relied upon Jewish and Muslim sources), introduced by the words “the translator says” (*mutarjim gūyad*).

In Chapters One through Five, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī discussed Nebuchadnezzar's vision of a great statue made of four metals – gold, silver, bronze, and iron – and Daniel's interpretation of the statue in Daniel 2:31–45 (*faṣl 1: dar namāyiš-i šanam*), the mysterious sayings of the child Naḥman from *Nebu'at ha-yeled* (*faṣl 2: dar guzāriš-i vaḥy-i kūdak*), Daniel's dream of the four beasts in Daniel 7:1–28 (*faṣl 3: dar namāyiš-i čahār ḥayavān*), Daniel's vision of the ram, the goat, and the little horn in Daniel 8:1–27 (*faṣl 4: dar namāyiš-i ġūč va buz ki ḥaḍrat-i Dāniyāl dīda*), and Daniel's prophecy of seventy weeks until the coming of a messiah in Daniel 9:1–3, 20–27 (*faṣl 5: dar namāyiš-i haftād hafta-yi ḥaḍrat-i Dāniyāl*).

In Chapters Six through Twelve of the polemical tract, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī's interpretation of the four kingdoms is reinforced by identifying Muḥammad with the promised Messiah of the House of Israel. In evidence of the veracity of the mission of Muḥammad, the author references God's answer to Habakkuk's prayer in Habakkuk 2:2–4 (*faṣl 6: dar guzāriš-i vaḥy-i Habaqūq-i payġambar*), the well-known verse referring to Mt. Paran in Habakkuk 3:3, 6 (*faṣl 7: dar vaḥy-i dīgar az Habaqūq*),¹⁴ God's speech to the nations in Isaiah 45:20–23 (*faṣl 8: dar vaḥy-i ḥaḍrat-i Ša'yā-yi nabīyy*), the announcement of a special servant in Isaiah 42:1–4, 19–21 (*faṣl 9: nīz dar vaḥy-i ḥaḍrat-i Ša'yā*), God's salvation of all nations in Isaiah 51:4–6 (*faṣl 10: aydan dar vaḥy-i ḥaḍrat-i Ša'yā*), the epilogue in Isaiah 59:21 (*faṣl 11: nīz dar vaḥy-i ḥaḍrat-i Ša'yā*), and the announcement of

12 On the corpus of Daniel literature in the Muslim tradition, see Bobzin, “Zur islamischen Danielrezeption”; idem, “Bemerkungen zu Daniel”; DiTommaso, *Book of Daniel*, 171–77, 471–84.

13 For the author's table of contents, see Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fols. 3v:12–5r:1; Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349, fols. 2r:6–3r:8; Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 14043, fols. 4r:5–5v:5.

14 However, a similar verse in Deuteronomy 33:2 which is invoked by most Muslim authors on the Hebrew Bible is not quoted by Ismā'īl Qazvīnī.

a prophet like Moses in Deuteronomy 18:15–19 (*fašl* 12: *dar vahy-i haḍrat-i Mūsā čunānča dar ašl-i Tawrāt nivišta šuda*).¹⁵

Ismā'īl Qazvīnī's Sources

Although *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* reflects the characteristically Muslim perspective on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible, the range of Jewish and Muslim religious texts on which the author relied is comparatively wide. It is clear that Ismā'īl Qazvīnī relied on several works in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Persian, some of which were available to him in printed editions imported from Europe and the Ottoman Empire.¹⁶ While he explicitly mentions some of his sources, others still remain to be identified. *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* thus gives us an idea of the type of texts that circulated among Iranian Jewry during the eighteenth century, some of which transcended the linguistic and religious boundaries of Jewish communities through converts to Islam.

As previously mentioned, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī drew heavily on the Jewish Aramaic tract *Nebu'at ha-yeled*, in which the coming of a messiah is announced. In Chapter Two of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*, the author references various sayings of the child Naḥman and interprets them as referring to the coming of Muḥammad and his family (*ahl-i bayt*).¹⁷ The passages are quoted in a Perso-Arabic transcription of the original Aramaic and translated into Persian. Ismā'īl Qazvīnī's source can be identified as the Hebrew book *Nagid u-mešaweh* ("Leader and

15 In the various chapters of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*, the following biblical verses appear in the original Hebrew transcribed in Perso-Arabic script, given here in order of appearance: Daniel 2:40–45 (*fašl* 1); Isaiah 28:10–13 (*fašl* 2); Daniel 7:10, 18, 25–27 (*fašl* 3); Daniel 8:13–14 (*fašl* 4); Daniel 9:24 (*fašl* 5); Habakkuk 2:2–4 (*fašl* 6); Habakkuk 3:3, 6 (*fašl* 7); Isaiah 45:23 (*fašl* 8); Isaiah 42:1–4, 19–21 (*fašl* 9); Isaiah 51:4–6 (*fašl* 10); Deuteronomy 18:15, 18–19; 34:10 (*fašl* 12). On the transcription of the Hebrew into Perso-Arabic script as found in Šī'ī polemics, see Halft, "Hebrew Bible Quotations."

16 In his Judeo-Persian philosophical work *Ḥobot Yehudah* ("Duties of Judah"), the seventeenth-century author Rabbi Yehudah ben El'azar also drew on sources in Persian, Hebrew, Aramaic, and even Arabic. See his *Duties of Judah*, English section: ii, xxi; Hebrew section: 11, 23.

17 Among the descendants of the imāms, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī explicitly mentions two sons of Imām Ḥasan (Qāsim, 'Abd Allāh) and three sons of Imām Ḥusayn (Imām Zayn al-'Ābidīn, 'Umar, 'Alī Ašḡar). He also mentions 'Alī Akbar, another son of Imām Ḥusayn, but, in contrast to Šī'ī tradition, he is identified by Ismā'īl Qazvīnī as 'Alī Ašḡar. See Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fols. 23v:11–24r:2; Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349, fol. 19v (margin); Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 14043, fol. 28r:8–28v:1.

Commander”) by the seventeenth-century kabbalist Ya‘aqob ben Ḥayyim Şemaḥ, printed in Constantinople in 5486/[1725–26], in which *Neḅu‘at ha-yeled* is included in the appendix.¹⁸ In *Anbā’ al-anbiyā’*, Ismā‘īl Qazvīnī explicitly refers to the Hebrew book: “Nearly fifty years ago from now, a tract by the Jews entitled *Nagid u-meṣaweh* was brought to the printing press to produce a model [...] and this book circulates among the Jews.”¹⁹ Thus, there is evidence from the earliest dated manuscript of *Anbā’ al-anbiyā’* that a printed copy of *Nagid u-meṣaweh* was available in Yazd by 1766.

More than thirty years later, in 1797, when Ḥājji Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī compiled his *Maḥḍar al-ṣuhūd*, he drew on his father’s *Anbā’ al-anbiyā’*, but he most likely also had independent access to a copy of the Constantinople print of *Nagid u-meṣaweh*. In *Maḥḍar al-ṣuhūd*, he reproduced two additional sayings of the child Naḥman that do not appear in Ismā‘īl Qazvīnī’s *Anbā’ al-anbiyā’*.²⁰ Thus, it is likely that Ḥājji Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī was familiar with Hebrew and/or Aramaic to some extent.

Another Hebrew book explicitly mentioned by Ismā‘īl Qazvīnī, and which he may have accessed as a printed edition, is David Qimḥi’s Hebrew dictionary *Sefer haš-šorašim* (“Book of the Roots”).²¹ In *Anbā’ al-anbiyā’*, our Jewish convert to Islam repeatedly references the Hebrew expression *qaw lāqāw*, which appears in Isaiah 28:10 and 13 as well as in the sayings of the child Naḥman. In Chapter Two of his polemical treatise, Ismā‘īl Qazvīnī draws on Qimḥi’s explanation of *qaw lāqāw*. He states that “in the section *qawah* of the dictionary *Kitāb-i šarāšim*, it says that the expression *qaw lāqāw* is to be understood as

18 See the printed edition Şemaḥ, *Nagid u-meṣaweh*, Appendix (unpaginated). The first publication of *Nagid u-meṣaweh*, printed in Amsterdam in 5472/[1711–12], does not contain *Neḅu‘at ha-yeled*. For details, see Tsadik, “Nineteenth Century Shi‘i Anti-Christian Polemics,” 13.

19 In Qum, Mar‘ašī, Ms 3349, fol. 12v:4–8, the original Persian reads as follows:

قريب به پنجاه سال قبل از این یکی از کتابهای بنی اسرائیل را که آن را کتاب ناگید و مَصَوِّه می گویند به
 قالب خانه بردند که آن را قالب نمایند، [...] و آن کتاب در میان بنی اسرائیل متداول است.

20 In Najaf, Madrasa-yi Āyat Allāh Burūjirdī, Ms 107, fols. 60v:2 and 61v:7, Ḥājji Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī’s transcription of the two Aramaic passages reads as follows (the original Aramaic is indicated in square brackets according to the printed text in Şemaḥ, *Nagid u-meṣaweh*, Appendix):

אַיָא אַמְתָּא מַרְעָרַע בְּרִיאָתָא עֲבִידָא הַדְּמָדָתָא בִּיד בִּן אַמְתָּא בְּעַלְמָא דְנָשָׂא וְגַרְדִּין
 [אתיא אומתא אומתא מזועזע ברייתא עבדא הדמדתא ביד בני אמתא בעלמא דנשא
 וחַרְדִּין גַּרְשָׁא גִבְרִין חַלְשָׁא וְהַלְמִין קִישָׁא].

21 See Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fol. 20v:12; Qum, Mar‘ašī, Ms 3349, fol. 17r:11; Qum, Mar‘ašī, Ms 14043, fol. 25r:7.

follows: “The prophets are commanding, command upon command.”²² Although *qaw lāqāw* literally means “line by line,” Qimḥi takes the expression to be similar in meaning to the preceding phrase *ṣaw lāṣāw* (Isaiah 28:10, 13), and translates both as “precept upon precept.” Based on this explanation, Ismā’īl Qazvīnī interprets *qaw lāqāw* as an annunciation of the Prophet Muḥammad, whom he designates as “the sign of command, measure, and law” (*niṣān-i farmān va andāza va šarī‘at*).²³ The *Sefer haš-šorašim* was printed repeatedly in Rome, Naples, Constantinople, Salonica, Venice, and elsewhere from the second half of the fifteenth century onwards.²⁴ It is thus not unlikely that Ismā’īl Qazvīnī had access to one of the printed copies of Qimḥi’s dictionary in Yazd, which had circulated in the Jewish community.

Moreover, Ismā’īl Qazvīnī explicitly refers in *Anbā’ al-anbiyā’* to the account of Jewish history *Ta’rīḥ-i Yūsifūn* (“The History of Josippon”). This is probably *Sefer Josippon* (“The Book of Josippon”), a tenth-century compilation in Hebrew that was particularly popular among Jewish communities in the Middle East.²⁵ He paraphrases a passage from “the end of the third chapter” (*āḥir-i faṣl-i siyyum*) of *Ta’rīḥ-i Yūsifūn*, in which the beginning of the fourth kingdom – as announced by Daniel – is equated with the establishment of the Hasmonean dynasty.²⁶ The length of the Hasmonean reign is calculated

22 In Qum, Mar’ašī, Ms 3349, fol. 17r:11–14, Ismā’īl Qazvīnī’s Persian adaptation reads as follows (the original Hebrew passage is indicated in square brackets according to the printed edition, Qimḥi, *Sefer haš-šorašim*, col. 435):

مترجم گوید که: در کتاب شاراشیم که از کتابهای لغة است در فصل قوه [קוה] گفته است که معنی قو لاقاو [קו לקו] آن است که “فرمان دهند پیغمبران، فرمان بعد فرمان” [וכן קו לקו، בנין אחר בנין، כלומר יצוו להם הנביאים מצוה אחר מצוה ויבנו להם בנין אחר בנין، כי המצוה והחוקה כמו הבנין].

23 See Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fol. 19v:12; Qum, Mar’ašī, Ms 3349, fol. 16v:1; Qum, Mar’ašī, Ms 14043, fol. 24v:1.

24 For details, see Kogel, “*Le’azim* in David Kimhi’s *Sefer ha-shorashim*,” 184–86.

25 See Dönitz, *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon*, 103–22; Vollandt, “Ancient Jewish Historiography in Arabic Garb.”

26 In Qum, Mar’ašī, Ms 3349, fol. 24r:5–8, Ismā’īl Qazvīnī’s paraphrase reads as follows:

در تاریخ یوسفون در آخر فصل سیم گفته که ابتدای پادشاهی ملکوت چهارم با ابتدای پادشاهی هشموناتیم که یکی از پادشاهان بنی اسرائیل بود موافق بود، و از ابتدای پادشاهی هشموناتیم تا خراب شدن بیت المقدس در مرتبه ثانیه دوپست و شش سال گذشته بود.

as “206 years” until the destruction of the Second Temple.²⁷ It remains unclear whether Ismā'īl Qazvīnī had immediate access to the *Sefer Josippon* and, if so, on which Hebrew, (Judeo-)Arabic or, perhaps, Judeo-Persian version he relied.²⁸

Besides Jewish sources, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī made use of a Muslim historiographical work as a source in his composition of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*. He explicitly mentions the Persian universal history *Rawḍat al-ṣafā' fī sīrat al-anbiyā' wa-l-mulūk wa-l-ḥulafā'* (“Garden of Purity concerning the Biography of Prophets, Kings, and Caliphs”) by the Timūrid historian Muḥammad ibn Ḥwāndšāh ibn Maḥmūd Mīrḥwānd (d. 903/1498).²⁹ Ismā'īl Qazvīnī paraphrases a passage from this work in which the story of the rebuilding of the Ka'ba in Mecca is told.³⁰ According to the account (which first appeared in Ibn Iṣḥāq's *Sīra*), the 35-year-old Muḥammad, who was not yet aware of his mission, was entrusted by the Qurayš to put the Black Stone of the Ka'ba back in place. The choice of Muḥammad is interpreted by Ismā'īl Qazvīnī, in line with Muslim tradition, as the annunciation of his prophethood. Since *Rawḍat al-ṣafā'* was not yet printed when Ismā'īl Qazvīnī composed *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*, he must have accessed the historiographical work in manuscript form.³¹

27 This (unhistorical) calculation is not unknown in Jewish tradition. See Atlas and Perlmann, “Saadia on the Scroll of the Hasmonaeans,” 10–11; Kasher, “The Historical Background of *Megillath Antiochus*,” 223–24.

28 I was unable to identify the above-mentioned paraphrase in the available editions of the Hebrew (see Josippon [Josef ben Gorion], *Sefer Josippon*) and (Judeo-)Arabic versions (see *The Arabic Josippon*) of the *Sefer Josippon*, as well as in a Judeo-Persian translation of the work as preserved in Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Klau Library, Ms 2191, 373 fols. (unfoliated), completed in Av 5686/[August 1926] (a microfilm of the manuscript is available in Jerusalem, National Library of Israel, C1N 2191; I thank Ofir Haim for drawing my attention to the Judeo-Persian version of the *Sefer Josippon*). For a description of this manuscript, see Spicehandler, “A Descriptive List of Judeo-Persian Manuscripts,” 130.

Fragments of a Hebrew version that circulated among Iranian Jews are preserved in New York, Jewish Theological Seminary, Ms 8618.4, fols. 50v–37r (foliated backwards), presumably dating from the nineteenth century (not seen by me). For a description of this manuscript, see Moreen, *Catalog of Judeo-Persian Manuscripts*, 398.

29 See Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fol. 17r:5; Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349, fol.14r:2; Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 14043, fol. 20v:9. On Mīrḥwānd and his work, see Beveridge and Manz, “Mīrḥwānd.”

30 Compare, for instance, Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349, fol. 14r:2–3, with the printed edition Mīrḥwānd, *Rawḍat al-ṣafā'*, vol. 2, 41.

31 On printed editions of the work, dating from the thirteenth/nineteenth century, see Darī'a, vol. 11, 296–97.

The Four Kingdoms in the Book of Daniel

As a Jewish convert to Šī‘ī Islam, Ismā‘īl Qazvīnī had access to internal Jewish debates on philology, exegesis, and theology. In *Anbā’ al-anbiyā’*, he identified differences between the arguments of Jewish scholars and reinterpreted them in favor of Islam in order to authenticate the claim to superiority over Judaism (and other religions). A particularly interesting example of this strategy is his discussion of the various interpretations of the four kingdoms in Daniel 2:31–45. These earthly kingdoms are identified by Abraham ibn Ezra (1089–1164) and other medieval Jewish exegetes with several successive empires.

Ibn Ezra’s commentary on Daniel is extant in two different recensions of the text, written during his travels through Italy and France.³² The long commentary was included in various editions of the *Miqra’ot Gedolot* (“Great Scriptures”).³³ It is known that Jewish readers in the early modern Ottoman Empire had a renewed interest in Ibn Ezra’s commentaries on the Bible.³⁴ Such an interest may also have existed among the Jewish communities in Iran. Although it is uncertain how Ismā‘īl Qazvīnī accessed Ibn Ezra’s commentary on Daniel, it is likely that he had access to a printed copy of the *Miqra’ot Gedolot* in Yazd. It is beyond doubt that Ismā‘īl Qazvīnī was well-informed about the different Jewish interpretations of the dream-visions in the book of Daniel.

In the long reception history of the four-kingdom schema, Jewish scholars traditionally identified the first three kingdoms with the empires of Babylon, Persia/Media, and Greece. Ismā‘īl Qazvīnī summarizes this argument as follows:

The translator says: For that reason, the Jewish scholars agree that the first kingdom represents Nebuchadnezzar, his son, and his grandson, who ruled for seventy years. The second kingdom represents the kings of the Zoroastrians, of whom the first ones were Dārāb I and Cyrus, and

32 The short version was completed in Rome or Lucca before 1145. The long commentary was written in Rouen ten years later. For an edition of the short version, see Ibn Ezra, *The Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (I thank Saskia Dönitz for making the edition available to me). For the long commentary, see Sela and Freudenthal, “Abraham Ibn Ezra’s Scholarly Writings,” 18, 21, 26, no. 7, 43–44, no. 51.

33 The *Miqra’ot Gedolot* are large editions of the biblical text in Hebrew with the Aramaic translation (Onkelos) and various rabbinic commentaries that were frequently printed in Venice in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and which circulated among Jews in Europe and the Middle East. See Levy, “Rabbinic Bibles,” 66–67, 69, 79, n. 2.

34 See Schmidtke and Adang, “Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde’s (d. 968/1561) Polemical Tract,” 81.

the last one Dārāb the Last. They ruled as kings for fifty-four years, in which they had conquered the whole earth. The third kingdom represents Alexander the Greek, who had [also] conquered the whole earth. His reign and the reign of his four successors, who had divided the land among them, endured for a hundred-eighty years.³⁵

The identity of the fourth kingdom, however, was controversial among Jewish scholars. Ismā'īl Qazvīnī presents three different interpretations. Regarding the first group of Jewish scholars who identified the fourth kingdom with Rome, he states that “one group agrees upon the Romans, who after the end of the rule of Alexander appeared, as they argue on the basis of their own history books.”³⁶

With the advent of Arab-Muslim rule, medieval Jewish exegetes such as Sa'adya Gaon (880–942), Abraham bar Ḥiyya (d. ca. 1136), and Abraham ibn Daud (ca. 1110–80) revised the traditional schema and included the so-called kingdom of Ishmael into the prophecy of the four kingdoms.³⁷ Ismā'īl Qazvīnī presents the interpretation of this second group of Jewish scholars as corresponding to a combination of the Romans (i.e. Byzantium/Christianity) and the Qedarites (i.e. the Arabs/Muslims) under the category of the fourth kingdom: “Another group agrees that they are to be identified with the Romans *and* the Qedarites [my italics].”³⁸

In contrast to other Jewish scholars, Ibn Ezra went even further in his interpretation of the four kingdoms. In his commentary on Daniel 2:39, he subsumed the Romans (Kittim) under the Greeks, leaving room for Arab-Muslim rule as a distinct fourth kingdom.³⁹ This interpretation was known to Ismā'īl Qazvīnī. He described Ibn Ezra's position as follows: “One of their scholars called Ibn Ezra rejected their arguments. He said that the fourth kingdom represents the kingdom of the Qedarites alone and maintained that the Romans are part of the [kingdom of the] Greeks.”⁴⁰

35 See below, Appendix, section 2.

36 See below, Appendix, section 5.

37 See Cohen, *A Critical Edition*, 237–40; Roth, *Jews, Visigoths, and Muslims*, 206–08; Alfonso, *Islamic Culture Through Jewish Eyes*, 98–101; Wechsler, “Four Empires.” See also van Bakkum, “Four Kingdoms Will Rule,” 112–17.

The historian Elyahū Capsali (ca. 1485–1555) identified the fourth kingdom with Ottoman rule. See Jacobs, *Islamische Geschichte in jüdischen Chroniken*, 142.

38 See below, Appendix, section 5.

39 Based on Targum Onkelos to Numbers 24:24, Ibn Ezra identified Kittim with Aram, and both Kittim and Aram with Greece. For details, see Dönitz, *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon*, 148–50.

40 See below, Appendix, section 5.

Ismā'īl Qazvīnī disagreed with Ibn Ezra's interpretation. He further distinguishes between the Arabs before the advent of Islam (*ʿArabān piš az payğambar*) and Muslims (*Qaydāriyya*). By quoting from *Nebu'at ha-yeled*, he identifies the "clay" (*ḥāsāp*) and the "loam" (*ṭinā*) with the pre-Islamic Arabs, from whom the Prophet Muḥammad was descended.⁴¹ Since the Arabs were contemporaries of the Byzantine Empire (i.e. the Romans represented in Daniel by the "iron") and both the "clay" and the "iron" are part of the same kingdom (Daniel 2:41), he classifies them together as the fourth kingdom.⁴² Ismā'īl Qazvīnī concludes:

The fourth kingdom represents the Romans and the Arabs before the Prophet [Muḥammad], not the Qedarites who are at the beginning of Islam, as Ibn Ezra said. It became also clear that Ibn Ezra's argument that the Romans are part of the [kingdom of the] Greeks is false. Instead, it became clear from Daniel that the Greeks represent the third kingdom.⁴³

To summarize, while Babylon is identified by Ismā'īl Qazvīnī with the first kingdom, Persia and Media are classified together as the second kingdom. Greece is identified with the third kingdom, and Rome and the pre-Islamic Arabs are classified as the fourth.

Finally, God's kingdom "that shall never be destroyed" (Daniel 2:44) is identified by Ismā'īl Qazvīnī with "the kingdom of Islam" (*malakūt-i Islām*).⁴⁴ Just as "a stone [...] crushed the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver, and the gold" (Daniel 2:45), Islam will prevail over all earthly kingdoms, representing the advent of eternal divine rule through the Prophet Muḥammad.⁴⁵

41 See below, Appendix, section 6.

42 A similar argument already appears in the Daniel commentary of the tenth-century Karaite exegete Yefet ben 'Eli. See his *Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, English section: 12–13; Arabic section: 28–30. For other Karaite commentaries on Daniel, see Shaked, "Two Judaeo-Iranian Contributions."

43 See below, Appendix, section 6.

44 See Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fol. 3v:9–11; Qum, Mar'aši, Ms 3349, fol. 2r:3–6; Qum, Mar'aši, Ms 14043, fol. 4r:1–5.

45 See Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fol. 11v:5–11; Qum, Mar'aši, Ms 3349, fol. 9r:7–12; Qum, Mar'aši, Ms 14043, fols. 13v:5–14r:1.

Twelver Šī'ī Reception of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*

As we have seen, in *Anbā' al-anbiyā'* Ismā'īl Qazvīnī drew upon a series of Jewish sources that had previously been hardly accessible or inaccessible to native Muslim readership. Through his discussion of the different positions in a Persian polemical work, Jewish debates on theology were no longer beyond the reach of Imāmī scholars. It is thus not surprising that Jewish religious texts and arguments, such as Ismā'īl Qazvīnī's interpretation of the kingdoms in Daniel, transcended the religious boundaries and emerged in later Šī'ī polemical works against Judaism (and Christianity). Šī'ī scholars drew explicitly on his authority as a Jew who had accepted Islam.

Among the Imāmī polemicists who incorporated Ismā'īl Qazvīnī's presentation of the positions of Ibn Ezra and other Jewish exegetes on the four kingdoms into their own works is Mullā 'Alī ibn Mawlā Jamšīd Nūrī Māzandarānī Iṣfahānī (d. 1246/1831).⁴⁶ In his Persian polemical tract *Ḥujjat al-Islām* ("Proof of Islam"), otherwise known as *Burhān al-milla* ("Proof of the Religion"), Mullā 'Alī Nūrī quotes verbatim from *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*.⁴⁷ This work, dedicated to the Qājār ruler Faṭḥ 'Alī Šāh (r. 1212/1797–1250/1834), was completed in 1232/1817 as a reply to the Anglican missionary Henry Martyn (1781–1812). The extant two dozen manuscripts suggest that Mullā 'Alī Nūrī's polemic circulated widely in Iran and India.⁴⁸ The following instance in the text, in which the author directly refers to Ismā'īl Qazvīnī, suggests that Mullā 'Alī Nūrī had immediate access to *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*:

One of the Jewish scholars who had accepted Islam with dignity and who carefully extracted the complete truth of Islam from the books of the prophets [...], said as follows: [...].⁴⁹

The example of Ismā'īl Qazvīnī and his polemical treatise shows that Jewish converts to Islam were important cross-cultural intermediaries and go-betweens, who played a significant role in interreligious exchanges. Through

46 On Nūrī, see Aminrazavi, "Mullā 'Alī Nūrī."

47 See below, Appendix, sections 2 and 5 (passages in bold).

48 For the extant manuscripts of the work, see *Ḍarī'a*, vol. 6, 257, no. 1408; *Mu'jam*, vol. 3, 73–74, no. 5080; *DINĀ*, vol. 4, 498–99; *FANḤĀ*, vol. 12, 596–98.

49 In Nūrī, *Ḥujjat al-Islām*, 55, the original Persian reads as follows:

و بعضی از علمای یهود که به شرف قبول اسلام فلز آمده بود و از کُتب انبیا به اهتمام تمام حقیقت اسلام را استنباط و استخراج نمود [...] گفت که [...].

the composition of *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*, Ismā'īl Qazvīnī made the internal Jewish debate on the interpretation of the four kingdoms in the Book of Daniel accessible in a Persian translation to his Šī'ī co-religionists and thus expanded their traditional set of polemical themes, motifs, and arguments against Judaism.

The present study hopes to encourage further research on the dissemination of Jewish texts in early modern Iran, either in printed or in manuscript form, and in particular on the biblical and exegetical material that crossed the cultural-religious boundaries of Jewish communities and thus enriched the intellectual encounters between Jews and Šī'ī Muslims.

Appendix

In what follows I offer a first edition of the beginning of Chapter One of Ismā'īl Qazvīnī's *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*, as found in the earliest known manuscript, Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349, fols. 4r:1–8r:1.⁵⁰ It was collated with the corresponding passages in Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052, fols. 5r:1–9v:9, and Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 14043, fols. 5v:5–11v:5, as indicated by the annotations in the apparatus. The orthographical peculiarities of the time have been modernized. The following sigla have been used in the edition:

س	Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349
أ	Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052
م	Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 14043
–	words/passages that do not appear
+	additional words/passages
< >	conjectural additions by the editor
{ }	biblical quotations
bold	passages that agree with Mullā 'Alī Nūrī's <i>Ḥujjat al-Islām</i> , according to the edition by Ḥāmid Nājī Işfahānī

50 I wish to thank Hassan Ansari and Reza Pourjavady for their help in reading some difficult passages in the text.

[1] فصل اول⁵¹ در نمایش صنم: در فصل دوم⁵² کتاب دانیال مذکور است به زبان عبری که ما حصّل مضمون آن⁵³ آن است⁵⁴ که: {در سال دوم پادشاهی بخت النصر در شبی از شبها خوابی دید و آن خواب را فراموش کرد. و به سبب آن خواب احوال او متغیّر شد و علماء و منجمین را طلبید و گفت که: من علامتی در خواب دیده‌ام و فراموش کرده‌ام. می‌خواهم که آن علامت را با تعبیر آن به من بگوئید. ایشان به زبان اَرَمِیّت در جواب گفتند که: پادشاه در عالم بزید⁵⁵ خواب خود را به بندگان خود بگو تا تعبیر آن را بیان کنند.⁵⁶ بخت النصر در جواب گفت که: من خواب خود را فراموش کرده‌ام. اگر چنانچه آن⁵⁷ خواب را به من خبر ندهید و تعبیر آن را نگوئید، خانه‌های شما را مزبله قرار می‌دهم و شما را پاره پاره می‌کنم. و هر گاه آن خواب را به من خبر دهید، نسبت به شما احسان بسیار خواهم کرد و چند مرتبه میان او و ایشان گفت و شنید شد.⁵⁸ بالاخره⁵⁹ گفتند که: ای پادشاه، چنین کاری از انسان نمی‌آید⁶⁰ و در روی زمین هیچ کس چنین⁶¹ کاری نمی‌تواند کرد. و بعد از آن⁶² بخت النصر از این سخنان در غضب شد،⁶³ امر به قتل تمام علماءی بابل کرد.⁶⁴ چون طلب دانیال و اصحاب او که از جمله اسرای بنی اسرائیل بودند،⁶⁵ کردند که ایشان را نیز به قتل رسانند، دانیال از

51 فصل اول: -، م.

52 فصل دوم: +، از، م.

53 مضمون آن: مضمونش، م.

54 آن است: این است، ا م.

55 پادشاه در عالم بزید: -، م.

56 کنند: کنیم، ا.

57 آن: -، ا.

58 شد: واقع شد، ا م.

59 بالاخره: در آخر جواب، ا م.

60 ای پادشاه چنین کاری از انسان نمی‌آید: ای پادشاه از انسان چنین کاری بر نمی‌آید، ا؛ ای

پادشاه از انسان این کار بر نمی‌آید، م.

61 چنین: این، ا م.

62 و بعد از آن: -، ا م.

63 در غضب شد: +، و، ا م.

64 کرد: فرمود، ا م؛ +، و، م.

65 بودند: + و در سلک علماء و عقلاء شمرده می‌شدند، ا.

اَرِيكَ جَلَادِ پَرَسِيدِ كِه بَاعْثِ قَتْلِ مَا وَ اَيْنِ جَمَاعَتِ چِيَسْتِ؟ جَلَادِ قِصَّةِ ايشان⁶⁶ را نقل كَرْد. دانيال گفْت: ⁶⁷تَعْجِيلِ دَرِ قَتْلِ ايشان نَكُنْ ⁶⁸تا من به نزد پادشاه روم، چون ⁶⁹به نزد پادشاه رفت، از او مهلت طلبيد در قتل ايشان و وعده كَرْد كه خواب را و تعبير آن را ⁷⁰خبر دهد. پادشاه او را مهلت داد. آنگاه دانيال به خانۀ خود مراجعت نمود و با اصحاب خود قصه را نقل نمود ⁷¹و ⁷²با يَكديگر اتّفاق نمودند كه بر ⁷³درگاه الهی تَضَرَّع و زاری نمايند تا خدای تعالی آن خواب را ⁷⁴بر ايشان كَشْف كند. ⁷⁵چون شب شد. خدای تعالی ⁷⁶آن خواب را بر ايشان كَشْف كَرْد. ⁷⁷بعد از آن ⁷⁸دانيال بعد از حمد و ثنای ⁷⁹الهی به شکرانۀ اين نعمت اَرِيكَ جَلَادِ را ⁸⁰بر آن ⁸¹مَطَّلَع گردانيد. ⁸²اَرِيكَ به تعجيل دانيال را ⁸³به نزد پادشاه

-
- 66 ايشان: -، م.
67 گفْت: فرمود كه، ا م.
68 تعجيل در قتل ايشان نكن: در قتل ايشان تعجيل مكن، ا م.
69 چون: + دانيال، ا م.
70 و تعبير آن را: ا م؛ -، ي.
71 و با اصحاب خود قصه را نقل نمود: و قصه را با اصحاب خود نقل كَرْد، ا م.
72 و: ايشان، ا م.
73 بز: م؛ در، ا ي.
74 خواب را: مشكل را، ا م.
75 كَشْف كند: حلّ كند، ا م.
76 خدای تعالی: حضرت باری عَزَّ اسْمه تاويل، ا م.
77 كَرْد: نمود، ا م.
78 بعد از آن: پس، ا م.
79 و ثنای: و شكر، م.
80 اَرِيكَ جَلَادِ را: + طلبيد، م.
81 بر آن، م؛ بر اين، ا ي.
82 گردانيد: ساخت، ا م.
83 به تعجيل دانيال را: دانيال را به تعجيل، ا م.

رسانید و به پادشاه گفت که بر دانیال خواب و تعبیر آن کشف شده.⁸⁴ پادشاه⁸⁵ با دانیال⁸⁶ گفت که آیا تو خواب مرا می دانی و تعبیر آن را می گوئی؟ دانیال گفت که این سر را هیچ کس از بنی آدم⁸⁷ نمی تواند گفت. اما⁸⁸ خدای تعالی⁸⁹ می داند و می خواهد که در این خواب ترا⁹⁰ خبر دهد از اموری که بعد از این خواهد شد.⁹¹ تو ای پادشاه در خواب دیدی که صنم بزرگی⁹² در برابر تو ایستاده بود که سر آن صنم طلا بود، و سینه و بازوی آن نقره بود، و شکم و رانش مس بود، و ساق پای او از آهن بود، و پاهای او بعضی از آهن بود و بعضی از سفال بود. بعد از آن دیدی که سنگی به خودی خود از کوه بریده شد و به آن صنم خرده شد و زده شد بر پاهای او که از آهن و سفال بود و خرد کرد، تمامی آهن و سفال و مس و نقره و طلا را، و باد آنها را مثل کود⁹³ خرمن تابستانی متفرق ساخته و⁹⁴ اثری از آنها باقی نماند. و آن سنگ مثل کوه عظیمی⁹⁵ شد و تمام روی زمین از آن پر شد. این است خواب تو و تعبیر آن چنین است:⁹⁶ ای پادشاه که پادشاه پادشاهان⁹⁷ که خدای⁹⁸ آسمان است پادشاهی

-
- 84 به نزد پادشاه رسانید و به پادشاه گفت که بر دانیال خواب و تعبیر آن کشف شده: نزد پادشاه آورد بعرض پادشاه رسانید که دانیال آمده که حکایت خواب را با تعبیر آن بیان سازد، اُ؛ بنزد شاه آورد و بعرض پادشاه رسانید دانیال آمده که حکایت خواب را با تعبیر آن بیان سازد، م.
- 85 پادشاه: + او را نزد خود طلبید و، اُ م.
- 86 دانیال: او، اُ م.
- 87 این سر را هیچ کس از بنی آدم: هیچ کس از بنی آدم این سر را، اُ؛ این سر را از بنی آدم هیچ کس، م.
- 88 اما: مگر، اُ م.
- 89 خدای تعالی: + که او، اُ.
- 90 ترا: -، اُ م.
- 91 خواهد شد: واقع خواهد شد، اُ م.
- 92 بزرگی: بزرگ، اُ م.
- 93 کود: کرد، اُ م.
- 94 و: -، اُ.
- 95 عظیمی: عظیم، م.
- 96 خواب تو و تعبیر آن چنین است: تعبیر خواب تو، م.
- 97 پادشاهان: + است، م.
- 98 خدای: + زمین و، اُ م.

و حسن و قوت و عزّت به تو داد،⁹⁹ و مسلط کرد ترا بر ساکنان¹⁰⁰ زمین از بنی آدم و حیوانات صحرا و مرغان هوا. توئی، آن سر که در صنم طلا بود. و بعد از تو بر خیزد¹⁰¹ پادشاه دیگر که از تو پست تر باشد، و پادشاه سیم که به مس تشبیه شده، مسلط بر تمام روی زمین شود¹⁰²}.¹⁰³

[2] مترجم گوید: بدانکه علمای یهود اتفاق دارند¹⁰⁴ که مراد از ملکوت اول بخت النصر و پسر او، و پسر پسر او است¹⁰⁵ که ایام پادشاهی ایشان به هفتاد سال کشید. و مراد از ملکوت دوم پادشاهان مجوسند که اول ایشان داراب اول و کورش بودند¹⁰⁶ و آخر ایشان داراب آخر بود.¹⁰⁷ و ایام پادشاهی ایشان به پنجاه و چهار سال کشید، که تمام روی زمین را مسخر نموده بودند. و مراد از ملکوت سیم اسکندر یونانی است که تمام روی زمین را مسخر نموده بود، که ایام پادشاهی او¹⁰⁸ و چهار پادشاه بعد¹⁰⁹ او که زمین را در میان خود قسمت نموده بودند صد¹¹⁰ و هشتاد سال شد.¹¹¹ و کتاب دانیال با قول¹¹² ایشان موافق است.

99 داد: داده است، م.

100 ساکنان: + روی، أ.

101 و بعد از تو بر خیزد: و بر خیزد بعد از تو، م.

102 مسلط بر تمام روی زمین شود: بر تمام روی زمین مسلط شود، أ؛ بر تمام روی زمین مسلط خواهد شد، م.

103 سفر دانیال ۲: ۱-۳۹.

104 اتفاق دارند: متفقند، أ م.

105 است: -، م.

106 و کورش بودند: -، م.

107 بود: -، م.

108 او: -، م.

109 بعد: + از، م.

110 صد: یکصد، أ.

111 نوری، حجة الاسلام، ۵۵: "و نیز كافة علمای یهود را اتفاق بر این است که مراد از ملکوت اول بخت نصر و پسر او، و پسر پسر او است که مدت پادشاهی ایشان به هفتاد سال کشید. و مراد از ملکوت دوم پادشاهان مجوسند که اول ایشان داراب آخر بود که مدت پادشاهی ایشان به پنجاه و چهار سال کشید، که تمام روی زمین را مسخر نموده بودند. و مراد از ملکوت سیم اسکندر یونانی است که تمام روی زمین را مسخر نموده بود، و ایام پادشاهی او و چهار پادشاه بعد از او که زمین را در میان خود قسمت کرده بودند صد و هشتاد سال کشید."

112 قول: اقوال، م.

[3] و حضرت دانیال در صفت ملکوت چهارم گفته و الفاظ او این است: {مَلَكًا رِبْعِيًّا تَهْوُ تَقِيْفًا كِبْرًا كُلُّ قَابِلِ دِي پَرزَلَا مَدَقِّ وَحَاشِلِ كَلَا وَكَبْرًا دِي مَرَاعِ كُلِّ اِيلِيْنِ تَدِيْقِ¹¹³ وَتَرَعِ وَدِي حَزِيْنَا رَجَلِيًّا وَاصْبَعَاتَا مِيْنَهْنِ حَسَفِ دِي پَهَارِ وَمِيْنَهْنِ پَرزَلِ مَلَكُو پَلِيْكَا تَهْوُ وَمِنْ نَصْبَتَا دِي پَرزَلَا تَهْوُ بَاهُ كُلِّ قَابِلِ دِي حَزِيْنَا پَرزَلَا مَعَارَبَ بِحَسَفِ طِيْنَا. وَاصْبَعَتْ رَجَلِيًّا مِيْنَهْنِ پَرزَلِ وَمِيْنَهْنِ حَسَفِ مِنْ قَصَتْ مَلَكُو تَهْوُ تَقِيْفًا وَمِيْنَه تَهْوُ تِيْرَا. وَدِي حَزِيْنَا پَرزَلَا مَعَارَبَ بِحَسَفِ طِيْنَا مِتْعَارِيْنِ لَهْوْنِ يَزْعِ اَنَاشَا وَلَا لَهْوْنِ دَابِيْنِ دَنَا عِيْمِ دَنَا هِكِدِ پَرزَلَا¹¹⁴ مِتْعَارَبَ عِيْمِ حَسَفَا¹¹⁵.

[4] (ترجمه: «پادشاهی چهارم باشد قوی مثل آهن، همچنانکه آهن خورد می کند و می تراشد هر چیز را، و مثل آهن که می شکند همه اینان را خرد کند و بشکند. و آنچه دیدی که پاهای او وانگشتان او¹¹⁶ بعضی از آنها سفال کوزه‌گری و بعضی از آنها آهن بود: پادشاهی در دو صنف باشد. و از قوت آهن باشد با آن، همچنانکه دیدی که آهن بر هم زده شده بود به سفال گلی. وانگشتان پاهای او بعضی از آنها آهن بود و بعضی از آنها سفال بود: از بعضی پادشاهی باشد قوی و از بعضی باشد ضعیف. و آنچه دیدی آهن را بر هم زده شده و مخلوط شده¹¹⁷ به سفال گلی: مخلوط شده‌گان باشند فرزند آدم و نباشند با هم آمیخته شده‌گان یکی به یکی، همچنین که آهن مخلوط نشود به سفال.»

[5] مترجم گوید که: چون¹¹⁸ ملکوت چهارم از سخن¹¹⁹ پیغمبران معین نشده است، و مثل آن سه ملکوت تصریح نشده است،¹²⁰ لذا علمای یهود در تعیین آن خلاف کرده‌اند و سه فرقه شده‌اند:¹²¹ فرقه‌ای¹²² بر

113 تَدِيْقِ: دَقِيْقِ، م.

114 أ: -، م.

115 سفر دانیال ۴: ۴۳-۴۰: ۲ {وَمَلَكُو رِبْعِيَّةَا تَهْوَا تَهْوَا تَقِيْفَا كِبْرًا كُلُّ قَابِلِ دِي پَرزَلَا مَدَقِّ وَحَاشِلِ كَلَا وَكَبْرًا دِي مَرَاعِ كُلِّ اِيلِيْنِ تَدِيْقِ وَتَرَعِ وَدِي حَزِيْنَا رَجَلِيًّا وَاصْبَعَاتَا مِيْنَهْنِ حَسَفِ دِي پَهَارِ وَمِيْنَهْنِ پَرزَلِ مَلَكُو پَلِيْكَا تَهْوُ وَمِنْ نَصْبَتَا دِي پَرزَلَا تَهْوُ بَاهُ كُلِّ قَابِلِ دِي حَزِيْنَا پَرزَلَا مَعَارَبَ بِحَسَفِ طِيْنَا. وَاصْبَعَتْ رَجَلِيًّا مِيْنَهْنِ پَرزَلِ وَمِيْنَهْنِ حَسَفِ مِنْ قَصَتْ مَلَكُو تَهْوُ تَقِيْفًا وَمِيْنَه تَهْوُ تِيْرَا. وَدِي حَزِيْنَا پَرزَلَا مَعَارَبَ بِحَسَفِ طِيْنَا مِتْعَارِيْنِ لَهْوْنِ يَزْعِ اَنَاشَا وَلَا لَهْوْنِ دَابِيْنِ دَنَا عِيْمِ دَنَا هِكِدِ پَرزَلَا مِتْعَارَبَ عِيْمِ حَسَفَا.

116 او: -، أ.

117 و مخلوط شده: -، أ م.

118 مترجم گوید که چون: -، أ.

119 سخن: سخنان، أ م.

120 نشده است: نیافته، أ م.

121 شده‌اند: شدند، م.

122 فرقه‌ای: و فرقه، أ م.

آند که قیاصره‌اند که بعد از آن قضای¹²³ پادشاهی اسکندر به هم رسیده‌اند،¹²⁴ و از کُتب تاریخ خود ادلهٔ چند برپا کرده‌اند. و طائفةٔ دیگر برآند که مراد از ایشان قیاصره و قیداریهٔ اند. و یکی از علمای ایشان که او را ابن عزرا¹²⁵ می‌گویند، ادلهٔ ایشان را رد کرده و گفته که مراد از ملکوت چهارم ملکوت قیداریه است به تنهایی، و قیاصره را از جملهٔ اسکندریه قرار داده¹²⁶.¹²⁷ اما نظر بصفاتی که حضرت دانیال از برای ملکوت چهارم گفته است، با انضمام وحی کودک سخن ابن عزرا¹²⁸ مردود است به دو وجه.

[6] (وجه) اول آنکه از¹²⁹ وحی کودک که إن شاء الله بعد از این مذکور خواهد شد در آنجا که گفته وهُوا حَسَفَ طَيْبًا دَامَلَطًا،¹³⁰ یعنی این محمد باشد از سفال و¹³¹ گل بیرون آمده. معلوم می‌شود که مراد

123 آن قضای: -، م.

124 رسیده‌اند: رسیدند، م.

125 ابن عزرا: ابن عدرا، م.

126 داده: داده‌اند، ا؛ داده است، م.

127 نوری، حجة الاسلام، ۵۵: ”و چون ملکوت چهارم از سخنان پیغمبران تعیین و تصریح نیافته چون آن ملکوت‌های سه‌گانه از صریح عبارات پیغمبران مراد معین نبود، علمای یهود در تعیین مراد از آن اختلاف نموده، سه فرقه شده‌اند: [۱]: فرقه‌ای از ایشان برآند که قیاصره‌اند که بعد از انقضای دور پادشاهی اسکندر به هم رسیده‌اند، و از کُتب تواریخ خود اقامهٔ ادله‌ای چند نموده، بر این رأی می‌باشند. [۲]: و فرقهٔ دیگر برآند که مراد قیاصره و قیداریه‌اند، و مقصود ایشان از قیداریهٔ ملکوت اسلام است که به حقیقت و حقیقت ملکوت پنجم او را نام است. [۳]: و مخالف این دو فرقه یکی از علمای ایشان است که او را ابن عزرا نام است، مخالفت ورزیده ادلهٔ هر دو طائفه را رد نموده، فرید در رأی گردیده، گفت که مراد از ملکوت چهارم ملکوت قیداریه به تنهایی است، و قیاصره را در جملهٔ ملکوت سیم ملکوت اسکندریه معین ساخته است.“

128 ابن عزرا: ابن عدرا، م.

129 از: -، م.

130 نبوات الیلد (ضمح، نگیرد و مضاوه، نسپفح): وهوی حסף سینا داملوتا.

131 سفال و: -، م.

از سفال و گِل که در این مقام مذکور است عربانند¹³² که پیش از پیغمبر بوده‌اند. و هر گاه معلوم شد که مراد از سفال و گِل که حضرت دانیال آن را به پادشاه ضعیف تعبیر نموده¹³³ عربان پیش از پیغمبرند، پس باید که این قیصره باشند¹³⁴ چون با عربان معاصر بوده‌اند، چه حضرت دانیال ملکوت چهارم را به آهن و سفال تشبیه کرده. پس از قول کودک و حضرت دانیال معلوم می‌شود که مراد از آهن قیصره باشند. و مراد از ملکوت چهارم قیصره و عربان پیش از پیغمبر باشند،¹³⁵ نه قیداریه که اول اسلام اند چنانچه ابن عُرزا گفته. و ایضاً معلوم شد بطلان قول ابن عُرزا¹³⁶ که قیصره را جزء ملکوت اسکندریه می‌داند، چه از قول دانیال معلوم شده که اسکندریه¹³⁷ ملکوت سیم اند. و از قول کودک و دانیال نیز در اینجا قیصره¹³⁸ چهارم معین شد. پس هر دو قول ابن عُرزا¹³⁹ مردود است. [7] وجه دویم آنکه حضرت دانیال در صفت ملکوت چهارم گفته است که آهن و سفال با یکدیگر¹⁴⁰ مخلوط شوند.¹⁴¹ اما با هم آمیخته نشوند، یعنی میان ایشان تزویج واقع نشود، چنانچه علمای یهود نیز به این معنی تصریح کرده‌اند و آنچه ثابت شده از آثار آن است که میان ایشان تزویج نمی‌شد¹⁴² زیرا¹⁴³ هر یک مذهبی داشتند¹⁴⁴ و غرض ایشان پادشاهی و سلطنت بود، نه اقامت دین و مذهب. پس بعد از آنکه

-
- 132 مراد از سفال و گِل که در این مقام مذکور است عربانند: مراد از سفال و گِل عربانند که در این مقام مذکور شده، م.
- 133 تعبیر نموده: تفسیر نموده، ا. م.
- 134 پس باید که این قیصره باشند: پس باید که آهن قیصره باشد، م.
- 135 باشند: باشد، م.
- 136 ابن عُرزا: ابن عذرا، م.
- 137 اسکندریه: + از، ا. م.
- 138 قیصره: + از ملکوت، ا.
- 139 ابن عُرزا: ابن عذرا، م.
- 140 با یکدیگر: با هم، م.
- 141 شوند: کردند، م.
- 142 نمی‌شد: واقع نمی‌شد، ا. م.
- 143 زیرا: زیرا که، ا. م.
- 144 داشتند: داشته‌اند، م.

مسلط می شدند،¹⁴⁵ به مملکتی با ایشان مخلوط می شدند.¹⁴⁶ اما چون در مذهب موافق ایشان نبودند،¹⁴⁷ میانشان تزویج واقع نمی شد. بخلاف قیداریه که غرض ایشان احیای¹⁴⁸ دین و مذهب بود و هر گاه مسلط بر مملکتی می شدند، ایشان را داخل اسلام می کردند و¹⁴⁹ میان ایشان تزویج واقع می شد. پس چون این صفت بر قیداریه صدق ندارد و بر قیاصره صدق دارد، باید که مراد از ملکوت چهارم عربان پیش از پیغمبر و قیاصره به تنهائی باشند، و قیداریه از ملکوت پنجم باشند. [...]

Manuscripts

- Ḥājji Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī. *Maḥḍar al-šuhūd fī radd al-yahūd*: Najaf, Madrasa-yi Āyat Allāh Burūjirdī, Ms 107.
- Ḥājji Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī. *Maḥḍar al-šuhūd fī radd al-yahūd*: Qum, Markaz-i Iḥyā'-i Mirāth-i Islāmī, Ms 1839/1.
- Ḥājji Bābā Qazvīnī Yazdī. *Maḥḍar al-šuhūd fī radd al-yahūd*: Tehran, Majlis, Ms 2082.
- Ismā'īl Qazvīnī. *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*: Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds, Ms 23052.
- Ismā'īl Qazvīnī. *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*: Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 3349.
- Ismā'īl Qazvīnī. *Anbā' al-anbiyā'*: Qum, Mar'ašī, Ms 14043.
- Josippon (Josef ben Gorion). *Sefer Josippon*: Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Klau Library, Ms 2191.

Bibliography

- Alfonso, Esperanza. *Islamic Culture Through Jewish Eyes. Al-Andalus from the Tenth to Twelfth Century*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Aminrazavi, Mehdi. "Mullā 'Alī Nūrī." In *An Anthology of Philosophy in Persia, vol. 5: From the School of Shiraz to the Twentieth Century*, edited by Seyyed Hossein Nasr and Mehdi Aminrazavi, 419–20. London: I.B. Tauris, 2015 (with an English translation of a section from Mullā 'Alī Nūrī's *Sharḥ asrār al-āyāt* by Latimah-Parvin Peerwani, 421–38).

145 می شدند: می شوند، م.

146 می شدند: می شوند، م.

147 در مذهب موافق ایشان نبودند: در مذهب مخالف ایشان بودند، أ م.

148 احیای: اقامت، أ م.

149 و: در، أ م.

- The Arabic Josippon* [in Hebrew], 2 vols. Edited, translated and supplied with an introduction by Shulamit Sela. Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 2009.
- Atlas, Samuel and Moshe Perlmann. "Saadia on the Scroll of the Hasmonaeans." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 14 (1944), 1–23.
- A'yān al-š'ā = Muḥsin al-Amīn. *A'yān al-š'ā*. Edited by Ḥasan al-Amīn in 11 vols. Bayrūt: Dār al-Ta'āruf, 1403/[1983].
- van Bekkum, Wout Jac. "Four Kingdoms Will Rule: Echoes of Apocalypticism and Political Reality in Late Antiquity and Medieval Judaism." In *Endzeiten. Eschatologie in den monotheistischen Weltreligionen*, edited by Wolfram Brandes and Felicitas Schmieder, 101–18. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.
- Beveridge, Annette S. and Beatrice F. Manz. "Mirkh^wānd." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, edited by Peri J. Bearman et al., vol. 7, 126–27. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Bobzin, Hartmut. "Zur islamischen Danielrezeption." In *Europa, Tausendjähriges Reich und Neue Welt. Zwei Jahrtausende Geschichte und Utopie in der Rezeption des Danielbuches*, edited by Mariano Delgado, Klaus Koch, and Edgar Marsch, 159–75. Freiburg i. Üe.: Universitätsverlag, 2003.
- Bobzin, Hartmut. "Bemerkungen zu Daniel in der islamischen Tradition." In *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam. Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst*, edited by Katharina Bracht and David S. du Toit, 167–78. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007.
- Cohen, Gerson D. *A Critical Edition with a Translation and Notes of the Book of Tradition (Sefer ha-qabbalah) by Abraham ibn Daud*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1967.
- Ḍarī'a = Āġā Buzurg al-Ṭihirānī. *Al-Ḍarī'a ilā taṣānīf al-š'ā*, 26 vols. Bayrūt: Dār al-Aḍwā', 1403–06/[1983–86].
- DINĀ = Muṣṭafā Dirāyatī. *Fihristvāra-yi dastnivištā-yi Īrān (Dinā)*, 12 vols. Tihirān: Kitābhāna, Mūzi va Markaz-i Asnād-i Majlis-i Šūrā-yi Islāmī, 1389 Sh/[2010].
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Dönitz, Saskia. *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Ibn Ezra, Abraham. *The Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [in Hebrew]. Edited by Aharon Mondshine. M.A. thesis submitted at Bar-Ilan University, 1977.
- FANḤĀ = Muṣṭafā Dirāyatī. *Fihristgān: Nuṣṣahā-yi ḥaṭṭī-i Īrān (Fanḥā)*, vol. 1-. Tihirān: Sāzmān-i Asnād va Kitābhāna-yi Millī-i Jumhūrī-i Islāmī-i Īrān, 1390 Sh–/[2012–].
- Halft, Dennis. "Hebrew Bible Quotations in Arabic Transcription in Safavid Iran of the 11th/17th Century: Sayyed Aḥmad 'Alavī's Persian Refutations of Christianity." *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World*, 1 (2013), 235–52.
- Halft, Dennis. "Sa'īd b. Ḥasan al-Iskandarī: A Jewish Convert to Islam. *Editio princeps* of the Later Recension (732/1331) of His Biblical 'Testimonies' to the Prophet

- Muḥammad." *Mélanges de l'Institut dominicain d'études orientales*, 30 (2014), 267–320.
- Ḥusaynī, Aḥmad. *Fihrist-i Kitābhāna-yi 'Umūmī-i Ḥaḍrat-i Āyat Allāh al-'uẓmā Najafī Mar'aṣī*, vol. 1. Qum: Mihr-i Ustuvār, 1354 Sh–/[1975–76–].
- Ḥusaynī, Aḥmad. *Tarājim al-rijāl. Majmū'at tarājim a'lām, aktharuhum maḡmūrūn, tunšaru mawādduhā l-ta'rīḥiyya li-awwal marra*, 2 vols. Qum: Maktabat al-Mar'aṣī, 1414/[1993–94].
- Jacobs, Martin. *Islamische Geschichte in jüdischen Chroniken. Hebräische Historiographie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Josippon (Josef ben Gorion). *Sefer Josippon* [in Hebrew], 2 vols. Edited and supplied with an introduction by David Flusser. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1978–80.
- Kasher, Aryeh. "The Historical Background of *Megillath Antiochus*." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 48 (1981), 207–30.
- Kogel, Judith. "Le'azim in David Kimhi's *Sefer ha-shorashim*: Scribes and Printers through Space and Time." In *The Late Medieval Hebrew Book in the Western Mediterranean: Hebrew Manuscripts and Incunabula in Context*, edited by Javier del Barco, 182–200. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Levy, B. Barry. "Rabbinic Bibles, *Mikra'ot Gedolot*, and Other Great Books." *Tradition*, 25 (1991), 65–81.
- Mawsū'at = *Mawsū'at mu'allifi l-imāmiyya*, vol. 1-. Edited by Majma' al-Fikr al-Islāmī, Qism al-Mawsū'a. Qum: Majma' al-Fikr al-Islāmī, 1420–/[1999– or 2000–].
- Mirḥ'ānd, Muḥammad ibn Ḥ'wāndšāh ibn Maḥmūd. *Rawḍat al-ṣafā' fi sirat al-anbiyā' wa-l-mulūk wa-l-ḥulafā'*, 7 vols. Bamba'ī, 1261–63/[1845–47].
- Moreen, Vera B. "The Problems of Conversion among Iranian Jews in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In *Studies in Islamic and Judaic Traditions II: Papers Presented at the Institute for Islamic-Judaic Studies, Center for Judaic Studies, University of Denver*, edited by William M. Brinner and Stephen D. Ricks, 157–68. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989 (an earlier version of the article was published in *Iranian Studies*, 19 [1986], 215–28).
- Moreen, Vera B. "Salmān-i Fārisī and the Jews: An Anti-Jewish Shī'ī Ḥadīth from the Seventeenth Century?" In *Irano-Judaica II: Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture throughout the Ages*, edited by Shaul Shaked and Amnon Netzer, 144–57. Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 1990.
- Moreen, Vera B. "Risāla-yi Ṣawā'iq al-Yahūd [The Treatise Lightning Bolts against the Jews] by Muḥammad Bāqir b. Muḥammad Taqī al-Majlisī (d. 1699)." *Die Welt des Islams*, 32 (1992), 177–95.
- Moreen, Vera B. "Polemical Use of the Qur'ān in Two Judeo-Persian Texts." In *Irano-Judaica IV: Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture throughout the Ages*, edited by Shaul Shaked and Amnon Netzer, 203–13. Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 1999.

- Moreen, Vera B. "A Shī'ī-Jewish 'Debate' (*Munāẓara*) in the Eighteenth Century." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 119 (1999), 570–89.
- Moreen, Vera B. "A Seventeenth-Century Iranian Rabbi's Polemical Remarks on Jews, Christians, and Muslims." In *Safavid Iran and Her Neighbors*, edited by Michel Mazzaoui, 157–68. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2003.
- Moreen, Vera B. *Catalog of Judeo-Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Moreen, Vera B. and Yeroushalmi, David. "The Intellectual Parameters of the Judeo-Persian Treatise *Hovot Rifa'el* by El'azar Hayim b. Molla Eliyahu (Nineteenth Century)." In *The Jews of Iran: The History, Religion, and Culture of a Community in the Islamic World*, edited by Houman M. Sarshar, 58–74. London: I.B. Tauris, 2014.
- Mu'jam = *Mu'jam al-turāth al-kalāmī. Mu'jam yatanāwalu dīkr asmā' al-mu'allafāt al-kalāmīyya (al-maḥṭūṭāt wa-l-maṭbū'āt) 'abra l-qurūn wa-l-maktabāt allatī tatawaf-faru fihā nusaḥuhā*, 5 vols. Edited by al-Lajna al-'Ilmiyya fī Mu'assasat al-Imām al-Šādiq. Qum: Intiṣārāt Tawḥīd, 1423/[2002].
- Munzavī, Aḥmad. *Fihrist-i nuṣṣahā-yi ḥaṭṭī-i fārsī*, 6 vols. Tih-rān: Mu'assasa-yi Farhangī-i Mīntaqa'ī, 1348–53 Sh/[1969–74].
- Nūrī, Mullā 'Alī. *Hujjat al-Islām (Burhān al-milla): Kitābī dar naqd-i guftār-i Hanrī Mārtīn masīhī dar ta'arruḍ bar Islām*. Edited by Ḥāmid Nāji Iṣfahānī. Tih-rān: Markaz-i Pizhūhišī-i Mirāth-i Maktūb, 1390 Sh/[2011–12].
- Pourjavady, Reza and Sabine Schmidtke. "Muslim Polemics against Judaism and Christianity in 18th Century Iran: The Literary Sources of Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī's (1144/1732–1216/1801) *Rādd-i Shubuhāt al-Kuffār*." *Studia Iranica*, 35 (2006), 69–94.
- Pourjavady, Reza and Sabine Schmidtke. "Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī al-Burūjirdī al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī's (d. 1212/1797) Debate with the Jews of Dhu l-Kifl. A Survey of its Transmission, with Critical Editions of its Arabic and Persian Versions." In *Contacts and Controversies between Muslims, Jews and Christians in the Ottoman Empire and Pre-Modern Iran*, edited by Camilla Adang and Sabine Schmidtke, 335–96. Würzburg: Ergon, 2010 (A Persian version: idem, *Munāẓara-yi Baḥr al-'Ulūm Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Burūjirdī Ṭabāṭabā'ī bā yahūdīyān-i Zū l-Kifl* [1212 h.q.]. Tih-rān: Markaz-i Pizhūhišī-i Mirāth-i Maktūb, 1390 Sh/[2011]).
- Qimḥi, Dawid. *Sefer ha-š-šorašim (...) Thesavrvs lingvae sanctae sive dictionarium hebrevm*. Venice: Marqo Anṭoni'o Yustīni'an, 5307/[1546–47].
- Roth, Norman. *Jews, Visigoths, and Muslims in Medieval Spain: Cooperation and Conflict*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Schmidtke, Sabine and Camilla Adang. "Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde's (d. 968/1561) Polemical Tract Against Judaism." *Al-Qanṭara*, 29 (2008), 79–113. Corrigendum, i–iv (online edition).

- Sela, Shlomo and Gad Freudenthal. "Abraham Ibn Ezra's Scholarly Writings. A Chronological Listing." *Aleph*, 6 (2006), 13–55.
- Şemah, Ya'aqob ben Ḥayyim. *Naḡid u-meṣaweḥ*. Constantinople: Yonah ben Ya'aqob, 5486/[1725–26].
- Shaked, Shaul. "Two Judaeo-Iranian Contributions: 2. Fragments of Two Karaite Commentaries on Daniel in Judaeo-Persian." In *Irano-Judaica: Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture throughout the Ages*, edited by Shaul Shaked, 304–22. Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 1982.
- Spicehandler, Ezra. "A Descriptive List of Judeo-Persian Manuscripts at the Klau Library of the Hebrew Union College." *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore*, 8 (1968), 114–36.
- Ṭabaqāt a'lām al-šī'a = Āġā Buzurg al-Ṭihṛānī. *Ṭabaqāt a'lām al-šī'a. Al-Qarn al-ḥādī 'ašar*. Edited by 'Alī N. Munzavī. Bayrūt: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1395/[1975].
- Tsadik, Daniel. "Nineteenth Century Shi'i Anti-Christian Polemics and the Jewish Aramaic *Nevuat Ha-Yeled* [*The Prophecy of the Child*]." *Iranian Studies*, 37 (2004), 5–15.
- Tsadik, Daniel. "Religious Disputations of Imāmī Shi'īs Against Judaism in the Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." *Studia Iranica*, 34 (2005), 95–134.
- Tsadik, Daniel. *Between Foreigners and Shi'īs: Nineteenth-Century Iran and its Jewish Minority*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Vollandt, Ronny. "Ancient Jewish Historiography in Arabic Garb: *Sefer Josippon* between Southern Italy and Coptic Cairo." *Zutot*, 11 (2014), 70–80.
- Wechsler, Michael G. "Four Empires IV. Judaism C. Medieval Judaism." In *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*, edited by Hans-Josef Klauck et al., vol. 9, cols 522–25. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Yefet ben 'Eli. *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel by Jepheth ibn Ali the Karaite*. Edited and translated by David S. Margoliouth. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.
- Yehudah ben El'azar. *Duties of Judah* [in Hebrew]. Edited, translated and supplied with an introduction by Amnon Netzer. Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 1995.