

Medieval Rabbinic Conceptions of the Messianic Age: The View of the Tosafists

EPHRAIM KANARFOGEL

I

The Tosafists, who flourished in northern France and Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, devoted the bulk of their studies to a critical reading of the talmudic corpus, and to the reconciliation and explication of divergent talmudic and rabbinic texts.¹ These aims, coupled with the fact that the Tosafists were not exposed to any philosophical systems or training, make it difficult to identify, with any precision, the religious conceptions that they themselves espoused, even in regard to fundamental issues of thought and belief.²

I wish to thank my friend and colleague Professor Charles Raffel for several helpful comments and suggestions.

¹ See my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, Detroit 1992, pp. 69–73. Even the study of Bible by Tosafists was accomplished, for the most part, through the prism of the talmudic corpus. See *ibid.*, pp. 79–85.

² See E. E. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, Jerusalem 1980, II, pp. 713–715. On the relative absence of philosophical study and orientation in medieval Ashkenaz (and the concomitant tendency to take *aggadah* literally), see, e.g., B. Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, Cambridge, Mass. 1982, pp. 49–51, 57–58, 64–65; A. Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, Jerusalem 1981, p. 424; J. Davis, 'Philosophy, Dogma, and Exegesis in Medieval Ashkenazic Judaism: The Evidence of *Sefer Hadrat Kodesh*', *AJS Review*, 18 (1993), pp. 209–213; D. Ruderman, *Jewish Thought and Scientific Study in Early Modern Europe*, New Haven 1995, pp. 45–47, 55–59; and D. Berger, 'Judaism and General Culture in Medieval and Early Modern Times', J. Schacter (ed.), *Judaism's Encounter with Other Cultures*, Northvale 1997, pp. 95–100, 115–122. I have recently argued, however, that more than a few Tosafists were familiar with mystical teachings and magical practices, while also embracing aspects of asceticism and *perishut*. See my 'Peering Through the Lattices': *Mystical, Magical and Pietistic Dimensions in the Tosafist Period*, Detroit 2000.

This study will assess Tosafist views on the nature of the messianic era. In a variety of texts, both exegetical and self-contained, Tosafists portray the messianic age as a combination of natural and miraculous developments. The Tosafist view stands in marked contrast to Maimonides' approach to the messianic era in his *Mishneh Torah*, but is no less cohesive or systematic. Indeed, we shall see that Tosafists adumbrate an important aspect of Abravanel's critique of Maimonides' view, although we cannot be certain that all of these Tosafists were actually aware of Maimonides' position.

The position taken by the Tosafists in this area of Jewish thought, given their non-philosophical orientation and their tendency to interpret aggadah literally, is not surprising. Our ability, however, to trace the position consistently throughout the Tosafist oeuvre, while encountering efforts at manipulating rabbinic texts to conform to a unified larger view, is rather unexpected. Contemporary scholars who have looked horns over the question of whether various liturgical texts, *piyyutim* and ritual performances reflect vengeance against gentiles as a defining characteristic of Ashkenazic messianism, appear to agree, nonetheless, that no significant evidence can be gleaned from the rabbinic or halakhic literature of Ashkenaz. Yisrael Yuval has written that Gerson Cohen's assessment, that Ashkenazic Jewry failed to develop a messianic ideology (*mishnah meshihit*), stems from the fact that Cohen looked for evidence for messianic beliefs only within the intellectual literature of Ashkenazic Jewry.³ Yuval's critic, Ezra Fleischer, conjectures that *Hakhmei Ashkenaz*, if queried about their messianic beliefs, would maintain that there are a variety of positions and approaches reflected in talmudic and midrashic literature, none of which is more authoritative or compelling than the other.⁴

We will see that Tosafists did, in fact, make certain suggestive choices regarding talmudic and midrashic texts which deal with the messianic era. A proper appreciation of the Tosafist approach will also help to place into sharper focus the (intermediate) positions of Ramah, Radaḳ

³ Y. Yuval, 'Ha-Naḳam ve-ha-Ḳelalah, ha-Dam ve-ha-'Alilah', *Zion*, 58 (1992–1993), pp. 59–60. Yuval's reference is to G. Cohen, 'Messianic Postures of Ashkenazim and Sephardim', M. Kreutzberger (ed.), *Studies of the Leo Baeck Institute*, New York 1967, pp. 117–158.

⁴ E. Fleischer, 'Yahasei Nozerim-Yehudim Bimei ha-Benayim bi-Re'i 'Aḳum', *Zion*, 59 (1994), p. 276. The index entry for משיחיות in Urbach's *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* refers the reader to the entry for מחשבי הקץ (which contains only three listings). See also *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, I, p. 272.

and Nahmanides on the miraculous dimension of the messianic age. Let us begin by reviewing briefly a portion of the Maimonidean conception (as well as Abravanel's critique). This will serve, in turn, as an excellent backdrop against which to present the approach of Maimonides' Ashkenazic counterparts, the Tosafists.

II

Although modern scholarship has debated the issue of whether Maimonides considered the messianic age to be restorative or utopian, or both, all analyses concur that the non-miraculous, naturalistic character of the messianic age is fundamental to Maimonides' presentation. During the messianic era, the workings of the world will continue to be guided solely by natural law, even as the Messiah will achieve far-reaching political and military victories, which would allow the Jewish nation to exist in complete security and to pursue undisturbed Torah study and contemplation of the Divine.⁵

One need look no further than the manner in which Maimonides embraces and then champions the view enunciated by the Amora Samuel, *אין בין העולם הזה לימות המשיח אלא שעבוד מלכות בלבד*, in order to see the correctness of this observation. Toward the beginning of *Mishneh Torah*, in *Hilkhot Teshuvah* (9:2), Maimonides paraphrases the statement of Samuel and then cites it, while giving it additional weight: *אבל ימות המשיח הוא העולם הזה ועולם כמנהגו הולך, אלא שהמלכות תחזור לישראל. וכבר אמרו חכמים הראשונים אין בין העולם הזה לימות המשיח אלא שעבוד מלכות בלבד*. Similarly,

⁵ See, e.g., G. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, New York 1971, pp. 24–32; I. Twersky, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides*, New Haven 1980, pp. 66–68, 145–146, 450–451, 476–477; A. Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History*, Berkeley 1993, pp. 133–155; D. Hartman, 'Maimonides' Approach to Messianism and its Contemporary Implications', *Da'at*, 2–3 (1978–1979), pp. 5–33; J. L. Kraemer, 'On Maimonides' Messianic Posture', I. Twersky (ed.), *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature*, II, Cambridge, Mass. 1984, pp. 109–142; A. Botwinick, 'Maimonides' Messianic Age', *Judaism*, 33 (1984), pp. 418–425; J. Goldin, 'Of Midrash and the Messianic Theme', B. Eichler and J. Tigay (eds.), *Studies in Midrash and Related Literature*, Philadelphia 1988, pp. 372–373; Y. Blidstein, 'Ekronei Mediniyyim be-Mishnat ha-Rambam', Ramat Gan 1983, pp. 105–113, 245–254; A. Ravitzky, "'Kefi Koah ha-Adam": Yemot ha-Mashiah be-Mishnat ha-Rambam', *Al Da'at ha-Ma'om*, Jerusalem 1991, pp. 74–104 (= "To the Utmost of Human Capacity": Maimonides on the Days of the Messiah', J. L. Kraemer [ed.], *Perspectives on Maimonides*, Oxford 1991, pp. 221–256); and D. Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi ba-Hagut ha-Yehudit Bimei ha-Benayim*, Ramat Gan 1997, pp. 69–111. In the ensuing discussion of *H. Melakhim*, chapters 11 and 12, I will be following the textual analyses of Ravitzky in particular.

Maimonides writes at the very end of *Mishneh Torah*, in the last chapter of *Hilkhot Melakhim* (12:1–2): אל יעלה על הלב שבימות המשיח יבטל דבר ממנהגו: אמרו חכמים אין בין של עולם או יהיה שם חידוש במעשה בראשית. אלא עולם כמנהגו נוהג... אמרו חכמים אין בין ה. העולם הזה לימות המשיח אלא שעבוד מלכותו בלבד. In both instances, Maimonides attributes these concepts not to the individual scholar who enunciated them, but to the seemingly more numerous and therefore more authoritative חכמים, despite the fact that there is another Amoraic view (found in *Berakhot* 34b and several parallel passages) which disagrees with Samuel's position concerning the nature of ימות המשיח.⁶

From Maimonides' acceptance of Samuel's view flows a series of details and formulations which constitute the Maimonidean schema of ימות המשיח in chapters eleven and twelve of *Hilkhot Melakhim*. The Messiah need not perform any miraculous acts (including resurrection of the dead) to demonstrate his authenticity (ואל יעלה על דעתך שהמלך המשיח צריך) לעשות אותות ומופתים ומחדש דברים בעולם או מהיה מתים וכי 11:3, 12:1).⁷ At the

⁶ See also Maimonides' introduction to *Perek Helek* (*Mishnah 'im Perush Rambam: Seder Nezikin*, ed. J. Kafih, Jerusalem 1964, p. 139). R. Joseph Karo, in his *Kesef Mishneh* to *H. Teshuvah* 9:2, refers readers to his comment to *H. Teshuvah*, 8:7. There, Karo notes that Rambam's formulation (in 8:7), about the prophetic depictions of the physical rewards which would be experienced in the messianic era, appears to reflect a statement of R. Hiyya Bar Abba that the Talmud presumes (*Shabbat* 63a) to be in opposition to Samuel. Karo does not resolve this problem, although it should be noted that Rambam attributes this view as well to אמרו חכמים כל הנביאים לא ניבאו אלא לימות המשיח חכמים. See also *Haggahot Maimuniyyot* ad loc.; M. M. Kasher, *Ha-Teḳufah ha-Gedolah*, Jerusalem 1968, pp. 71–72, 350–352; and below, nn. 12–13.

⁷ Maimonides' discussion of the messianic era in his introduction to *Perek Helek* accords with this and most aspects of the material in *Mishneh Torah*. In his *Ḥaḳdamah le-Perek Helek*, Maimonides also points out that it will be easier, through natural means, to earn a livelihood during the messianic age, freeing people to engage in greater Torah study and contemplation. See M. Saperstein, *Decoding the Rabbis*, Cambridge, Mass. 1980, p. 15; *Mishneh Torah, H. Teshuvah* 8:1; and below, n. 9.

In his *Iggeret Teiman*, Maimonides writes that the Messiah will perform certain signs or miraculous acts, which will serve to validate his genuineness. See *Iggeret ha-Rambam*, ed. Y. Shailat, Jerusalem 1987, I, pp. 157–159, and the editor's notes ad loc. This may have been an accommodation by Maimonides, however, as part of his goal to comfort the Yemenite community in the face of false messianic claims. Yemenite Jewry may have believed, or may have been told (or may even have experienced, through some occult practices) that a messianic figure must perform miracles in order to buttress his claim. Whether or not Maimonides' method of argumentation in his letters is less rigorously halakhic than his style in *Mishneh Torah* (see, e.g., H. Soloveitchik, 'Maimonides' *Iggeret Ha-Shemad: Law and Rhetoric*', Leo Landman (ed.), *Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein Memorial Volume*, New York 1980, pp. 281–319, and D. Hartman, 'Iggeretha-Shemad le-Rabbenu Mosheh b. Maimon: Aspaklaryah le-Murkavut ha-Pesikah ha-Hilkhatit', *Meḥkerei Yerushalayim be-Mahshevet Yisra'el*, 2, n. 3, [1982–1983], pp. 362–403), Maimonides would have had no difficulty in adjusting his characterization of the messianic mandate in an epistle such as *Iggeret Teiman*, in order to be more effective in his presentation. Cf. *Iggeret ha-Rambam*, ed. Shailat, I, pp. 350, 359 (מאמר על תחיית המתים).

same time, Maimonides emphasizes that the Messiah will build the third Temple (וּבִנְיָהוּ הַמִּקְדָּשׁ; 11:1, 11:4), clearly rejecting the midrashic notion (to which we shall return) that the third Temple will be sent down, ready-built, from Heaven.⁸

Maimonides argues that the verses in Isaiah 11, which seem to suggest that there will be a fundamental change in the relationships between predator and prey during the messianic era (תָּר זָאֵב עִם כֶּבֶשׂ תֹּמֵר עִם גֹּדִי יִרְבֵּץ) (וכי), are to be interpreted allegorically (משל וחידה). These verses are meant to suggest that the downtrodden position of the Jewish nation relative to other nations of the world, symbolized in biblical imagery by the hierarchy within the animal kingdom, will no longer obtain during the messianic era. The political and temporal changes to be brought about by the Messiah (through overtly natural means) will cause the entire world to return to true religious observances and moral behavior (חֲזוֹרָה כְּכֹלֵם לְדַת הָאֱמָת; 12:1).

For Maimonides, the Messiah will be identified and confirmed solely by his ability to achieve certain crucial goals, including the return of the Jewish people to pervasive Torah study and observance, the waging of war on behalf of the Almighty, the restoration of the Temple, and the ingathering of the exiles. If a messianic candidate such as Bar Kokhba dies while in the midst of achieving these goals, he is a failed messiah, not a false one (11:3). In this instance as well, the determination concerning the Messiah will occur through natural means.⁹

Perhaps as a corollary of his approach, Maimonides devotes much more space to the spiritual achievements of the Messiah on behalf of the Jewish people than he does to the Messiah's military conquests and to other physical challenges of the day (referred to in rabbinic literature as חבלי משיח). Maimonides mentions briefly the war of Gog and Magog, which would occur, according to the words of the Prophets, at the beginning of the messianic era. Without describing the specific role of the Messiah in this war at all, Maimonides proceeds to offer a much

⁸ See below, nn. 29–30.

⁹ Cf. Blidstein, *‘Ekrnot Mediniyyim*, pp. 43–45. Rabad asserts (in his gloss to *Mishneh Torah*, ad loc.) that Bar Kokhba was rejected (and put to death) by the rabbis because of his inability to judge guilt and innocence by ‘sense of smell’, a requirement recorded in a passage in *Sanhedrin* 93b. Cf. Radbaz's comment, ad loc.; *Kesef Mishneh to H. Melakhim* 11:1; and R. Margalio, *Margalio ha-Yam le-Massekhet Sanhedrin*, Jerusalem 1977, II, p. 144, par. 14. In his introduction to *Perek Helek*, Maimonides suggests that the true Messiah (who has achieved the various goals) may die, and will be succeeded by his son and grandson. See Saperstein (above, n. 7), p. 246, n. 105, and below, n. 57.

lengthier discussion of the role of (Elijah) the Prophet, whose coming would precede this war and whose role would be to restore peace and harmony within the Jewish people, especially in regard to issues of lineage. The Messiah will also involve himself in determining proper lineage after he achieves the ingathering of all Jews (12:2–3). Maimonides' omission of any reference to *משיח בן יוסף* may also be a function of his general approach to the messianic age. Rabbinic and midrashic references to this messiah are replete with descriptions of fantastic military feats and miraculous phenomena, which are inimical to Maimonides' approach.¹⁰

In his treatise *Yeshu'ot Meshiho*, Don Isaac Abravanel takes strong exception to the Maimonidean conception of the messianic age just outlined.¹¹ Abravanel expresses two basic objections. First, Maimonides has given much greater weight to the position of Samuel than the Talmud itself does. Without mentioning any specifics, Abravanel alludes to the fact that while Samuel's view is cited six times within the talmudic corpus, the talmudic *sugyot* appear to reject or minimize it, by citing and analyzing conflicting views, in four of those instances. By identifying Samuel's position as the view of *חכמינו*, Maimonides has assigned it undue weight.

Moreover, there are many phenomena associated with the messianic age, by both biblical and talmudic texts, which are clearly miraculous. Included in these are some of the very phenomena which Maimonides insists will occur naturally, such as the tranquility and dedication that will envelop the Jewish people, allowing them to devote much time to study and contemplation, and the extensive and unprecedented military

¹⁰ See, e.g., D. Berger, 'Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism: Messiah son of Joseph, Rabbinic Calculations and the Figure of Armilus', *AJS Review*, 10 (1985), pp. 141–164, and A. Ravitzky, 'Kefi Koah ha-Adam', p. 95, n. 53 (see above, n. 5). On the changeable role of this messianic figure according to Sa'adyah Gaon, see, e.g., J. Sarachek, *The Doctrine of the Messiah in Medieval Jewish Literature*, New York 1932, p. 43, and D. Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi*, pp. 35, 45. There is only one talmudic reference to Messiah son of Joseph (*Sukkah* 52a), and it is cryptic at best. Cf. the lengthy eschatological responsum of R. Hai, which includes significant material on Messiah b. Joseph, in *Ozar ha-Geonim le-Massekhet Sukkah*, I, ed. B. M. Lewin, Haifa 1934, pp. 72–76, and in Abraham b. Azriel, 'Arugat ha-Bosem, I, ed. E. E. Urbach, Jerusalem 1939, pp. 256–263. See also Schwartz, pp. 39–41.

¹¹ *Yeshu'ot Meshiho*, Bnei Brak 1993, pp. 157–159 ('Iyyun 3, chap. 7). *Yeshu'ot Meshiho* was one of three works written by Abravanel dealing with messianism; the others are *Ma'ayenei ha-Yeshu'ah* and *Mashmia' Yeshu'ah*. For an overview and analysis of Abravanel's teachings, see Sarachek, pp. 225–299; Schwartz, pp. 230–242; B. Netanyahu, *Don Isaac Abravanel, Statesman and Philosopher*, Philadelphia 1968, pp. 77–78, 205–242; and E. Lawac, "'Inheritance of the Fathers": Aspects of Isaac Abarbanel's Science Toward Tradition', Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1993, pp. 238–360.

and political victories which the Messiah will achieve, as well as the recognition of the Almighty by other nations. According to Abravanel, these, and other more explicitly miraculous phenomena that are part of the messianic era, cannot occur through natural law.

Abravanel suggests that Samuel held that there were to be two phases within the messianic age. The first phase, in which the people of Israel will live securely in their land while dominating other nations, will consist of both natural and miraculous aspects and events. But even the miraculous events will not exceed those that occurred during the days of Moses and the exodus from Egypt. Abravanel cites Micah (7:16), כימי זאתך מארץ מצרים אראנו נפלאות, to support his contention.

This is the connotation of the phrase עולם הזה in Samuel's statement. Only natural or miraculous phenomena that have already occurred (or that could have occurred) in this world will happen during the first phase of the messianic era. Included in this phase will be the gathering together of the Jewish people, reminiscent of the way that Moses took the entire Jewish people out of Egypt, and other kinds of miraculous acts and states that accompanied the Jewish people during the period of the biblical kings and prophets, which caused other nations to respect and fear them. It is this phase, and this phase alone, which Samuel is describing. There will then be a second phase of the messianic era, however, more correctly called עולם התחייה or עולם הבא, in which completely unprecedented miraculous events, especially תחיית המתים, will be accomplished.

Abravanel asserts, against Maimonides' interpretation, that Samuel never intended to suggest that any aspect of the messianic age would be free from miracles, or that any of Isaiah's prophetic descriptions of that era should be interpreted allegorically (כי לא עלה על לבו [של שמואל] שבימות). The fact that Samuel did not include miracles such as Resurrection in his evaluation of the messianic era was only because he limited himself to the first phase. Indeed, the limited nature of Samuel's characterization of the messianic era is perhaps what led the talmudic *sugyot* to portray his position as something of a דעת יחיד, a minority position.¹²

¹² Cf. Sarachek, pp. 283–285; Schwartz, pp. 239–420; and Lawee, pp. 307–310. On Maimonides' general intention in *Mishneh Torah* to 'speak with an anonymous-collective voice', see I. Twersky, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides* (above, n. 5), pp. 99–102; and cf. Lawee, p. 355, n. 232.

III

Abravanel does not cite any post-talmudic interpreters or rabbinic figures in his passage. Consider, however, the following passage in *Ketav Tamim*, a polemical treatise of Jewish thought written by the thirteenth-century Tosafist, R. Moses b. Ḥisdai Taḳu: 'Even for Samuel, who said that there is no difference between this world and the days of the Messiah other than *שעבוד מלכות*, it is only at the beginning of the redemptive process that nothing new will occur except that we will emerge from *שעבוד מלכות*. But we will then become familiar with and experience *רוח הקודש*, the fire falling [from heaven] on the sacrifices, and the closeness of the Holy Presence in the pillar of fire and the cloud, just as it had been during the exodus from Egypt. After a time, with the intensification of our redemption and enlightenment, [we will see] the resurrection of the dead, and the descent of the [third] Temple which Ezekiel the Prophet apprehended'.¹³

R. Moses also discusses the appearance of the righteous when they are resurrected in the days of the Messiah. Those people who are alive during the messianic age in the sixth millennium, and those who are resurrected at that time, will have normal bodily functions. As the sixth millennium ends, however, the righteous people who were resurrected (and who are still alive) will be given special angel-like forms. They will enter the seventh millennium on a higher spiritual plane, even closer to the Divine Presence, and will have no need for food or drink, or for any physical pleasures and activities, a state of existence that will continue into *עולם הבא*.¹⁴

¹³ See *Ketav Tamim*, ed. R. Kirchheim in *Ozar Neḥmad*, ed. I. Blumenfeld (1860), p. 89 (= *Ketav Tamim*, ms. Paris H 711, fol. 40b; reproduced in the facsimile edition published by Mercas Dinur, Jerusalem 1980, p. 80): 'כמו שאמרו רבותינו כל מה שנתבאו חכמים לא שנבא אלא לימות המשיח. ואפי' לשמואל דאמר אין בין עולם הזה לימות המשיח אלא שעבוד מלכות, אפשר שבתחלת גאולתנו לא יתחדש כלום, רק שצא משיעבוד מלכות, אך נהיה רגילין ולומדים ברוח הקודש ובנפילת אש על הקרבתו ובקריבת שכנתו בעמדת אש וענין כמו שהיה כבר בידידת מצרים כדכתיב' כיום צאתך ממצרים אראנו ונפלאות. ולאחר ימים מתוספת גאולתנו. ואורע בתחיית המתים ובידידת בית המקדש שראה יחזקאל הנביא

¹⁴ *Ketav Tamim*, *ibid.*, p. 90 (=ms. Paris, fols. 41a-b; facsimile ed., pp. 81-82). R. Moses subsequently criticizes Maimonides' view, as he perceived it, concerning corporeal existence in *עולם הבא*. On the question of whether R. Moses' attacks on Rambam's eschatology and philosophy were part of a larger Ashkenazic involvement in the Maimonidean controversy of the 1230s, or whether R. Moses was writing independently, see E. E. Urbach, 'Heḳam shel Ḥakhmei Asbkenaz ba-Pulmus 'al ha-Rambam ve'al Sefarav', *Zion*, 12 (1947), pp. 149-159; J. Dan's introduction to the facsimile edition of *Ketav Tamim* (see the above note), pp. 25-27; *idem*, 'Ashkenazi Hasidism and the Maimonidean Controversy', *Maimonidean Studies*, 3 (1992-1993), pp. 40-47; and below, n. 17.

R. Moses Taḳu interprets Samuel's statement and formulates a larger eschatological view along the same lines that Abravanel does in his *Yeshu'ot Meshiho*. Miracles can occur in the early phases of the messianic era, but they will only be of the type that the Jews experienced during the exodus from Egypt and on subsequent occasions, such as the dedication of the *Mishkan*. As the messianic era progresses and deepens, however, the third Temple will descend from Heaven and תחיית המתים will take place. These are unprecedented miracles, as is the transformation of the righteous into unique, quasi-angelic body forms, which will also occur only in a later phase.¹⁵

On Abravanel's use of earlier sources without attribution, see, e.g., E. Lawee, 'Inheritance of the Fathers' (above, n. 11) pp. 2-3, 476-478, and cf. 132-133. After noting the tendency of Franco-German scholars to read rabbinic texts literally and identifying R. Moses Taku as one who 'championed the literalist position with special fervor', Lawee concludes that 'Abarbanel, for his part, was aware of the literal exegesis of the "Ashkenazim" but he was not inclined to imitate it'. Although outright borrowing cannot be conclusively demonstrated in this instance, the complexity and subtlety of the Ashkenazic position (see also below) might have made it more attractive to Abravanel.

¹⁵ This later phase may also include the profound changes within the animal kingdom (including their inability to harm human beings) that emerge from a non-allegorical reading of Isaiah 11, although the neutralizing of (vicious) animals also occurred at the time of the exodus from Egypt. Cf. R. Yosef Kara's commentary to Isaiah 11:6 (and cf. ms. JTS Lutzki 778, fol. 50v), and Hosea 2:17; A. Grossman, *Hakhmei Zarefat ha-Rishonim*, Jerusalem 1995, pp. 282-283, 287-288, n. 112 (= 'Galut u-Ge'ulah be-Mishnat shel R. Yosef Kara', R. Bonfil et al. (ed.), *Tarbut ve-Hevrah be-Toledot Yisra'el Bimei ha-Benayim*, Jerusalem 1989, pp. 292, 300, n. 88; and M. M. Kasher, *Ha-Teḳufah ha-Gedolah*, Jerusalem 1969, pp. 76-77. See also R. Joseph b. Nathan Official (a northern French polemicist), *Sefer Yosef ha-Mekanne*, ed. J. Rosenthal, Jerusalem 1970, p. 5. Joseph's discussion of Isaiah 11 is taken, however, directly from the paraphrase of Se'adyah's *Emunot ve-De'ot*. Cf. *Sefer Yosef ha-Mekanne*, p. 3, n. 1; D. Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi*, pp. 42-43; and below, nn. 34 and 51.

Like Abravanel, R. Moses Taḳu is also forced to explain why the Talmud, b. *Pesahim* 68a (and elsewhere) appears to be unaware that Samuel considered the messianic era to be divided into different phases, with unprecedented miraculous events to occur in the later phase. Instead, the Talmud suggests that according to Samuel, the various (supernatural) changes concerning the light of the sun and the moon alluded to by verses in Isaiah must be referred to the period of *'olan ha-ba*. R. Moses suggests that the Talmud does not offer his solution (לאתיר לשתתלכסו ארנו) because Samuel himself was uncertain as to the precise timing of this particular phenomenon (לא פסיקא ליה מתי יתיר דבר זה).

The passages from *Ketav Tamim* that we have just discussed are cited together (with minor variations) by Abraham b. 'Azriel (a student of the German Pietist R. Eleazar of Worms) in his liturgical commentary and compendium, *'Arugat ha-Bosem* (composed c. 1235). See *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, ed. E. Urbach, Jerusalem 1947, II, pp. 254-255. (R. Abraham also responds to R. Moses Taḳu's critique of Maimonides in regard to resurrection and corporeality; see the above note.) On R. Abraham's frequent citation of *Ketav Tamim*, see Dan's introduction to the facsimile edition, p. 9. Cf. Y. N. Epstein, *Mehkarim be-Sifrut ha-Talmud u-Vilshonot Shemiyot*, ed. E. Z. Melammed, Jerusalem 1983, I, pp. 295-302; and below, n. 37.

R. Moses Taḳu composed responsa and talmudic interpretations as well as *Tosafot*, and was an active rabbinic scholar in Regensburg and its environs.¹⁶ On the other hand, R. Moses's familiarity with certain philosophical teachings, and the strident manner in which he critiqued them (and aspects of *ḥasidut Ashkenaz* as well), are rather unusual in Tosafist circles.¹⁷ Nonetheless, we find conceptions of the messianic era in the writings of other Tosafists which are quite similar to those expressed by R. Moses.

R. Isaac b. Abraham (Rizba), a leading northern French Tosafist at the end of the twelfth century, is cited by a student as espousing the view that the messianic age will have a dual structure: 'Thus I have received from my teacher R. Isaac b. Abraham, that there are two epochs within the messianic age. The first is before the resurrection of the dead and the second follows the resurrection. The Messiah will appear at the end of the fifth millennium, and the days of the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead will come in the sixth millennium. The days of the Messiah that are after the resurrection will last until the end of the sixth millennium. The righteous who return to life will arise as though they have been awakened, they will live and they will not die'.¹⁸ Like the

¹⁶ See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, I, pp. 420–425; I. Ta-Shma, 'Le-Toledot ha-Yehudim be-Polin ba-Me'ot ha-Yod Bet / ha-Yod Gimmel', *Zion*, 53 (1988), pp. 362–363, and *Zion*, 54 (1989), p. 205; and Dan, in the above note.

¹⁷ See above, nn. 2, 14. Cf. my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, pp. 75–76; my 'The *'Aliyah* of "Three Hundred Rabbis" in 1211: Tosafist Attitudes Toward Settling in the Land of Israel', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 76 (1986), pp. 204–205, 212–213, n. 68; E. Reiner, *'Aliyyah va-'Aliyyah la-Regel le-Erez Yisra'el, 1099–1517*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1988, pp. 86–88; and my *'Peering Through the Lattices'*, p. 160, n. 69, and p. 211, n. 45. Interestingly, *Sefer Ḥasidim*, ed. J. Wistinetzki, Frankfurt 1924, p. 378 (sec. 1543), qualifies the statement of Samuel in similar fashion: ואשר אמר שמואל אין בין העולם הזה וכו' וזה לשאינם צדיקים אבל לצדיקים גמורים כל מיני הנאות במתניהם. ד"א קודם בריאת העולם החדש אבל לאחר שיברא השמים החדשים והארץ החדשה אין מלאך המות ומלאכי תהלה נהפכו לרחמים ומלאכים מרחיבים את הלכות לששון ולשמחה... ולא ישכח אדם דברי תורה וכו'. Cf. above, n. 15, and below, n. 33.

On the degree to which R. Moses Taḳu is representative of mainstream Ashkenazic interpretational traditions, see also Septimus (above, n. 2), p. 79; Saperstein (above, n. 7), pp. 7–9; J. Davis, 'Philosophy, Dogma and Exegesis in Medieval Ashkenazic Judaism', (above, n. 2) pp. 212–213; and Epstein (above, n. 15).

¹⁸ See ms. Darmstadt Cod. Or. 25/3, fol. 13v: כך מקובלני מפי מורי רבי יצחק בן אברהם כי יש ב' פעמים ימות המשיח האחת קודם תחיית המתים ואחת לאחר תחיית המתים כי המלך המשיח יגלה... בתכלית אלף החמישי ובאלף השישי יהיו ימות המשיח ותחיית המתים... וימות המשיח שלאחר תחיית המתים יתנהגו עד תכלית אלף השישי... והצדיקים שנתחיו יעלו כנעורים ולא יגועו... On this passage, cf. H. Breslau, 'Juden und Mongolen, 1241', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, 1 (1887), pp. 99–102; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, I, p. 270, n. 4; and Y. Yuval, 'Liḳṭot 1240: Tiḳṭot Yehudiyot, Pahad Nozerim', *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Div. B, Jerusalem 1994, pp. 113–120. On fol. 17r of the Darmstadt manuscript, Rizba offers

formulation of R. Moses Taku, this passage stresses that there will be distinct phases within the messianic era. The resurrection of the dead, a most unusual miracle, will occur only during the second phase.

With this sense of the Tosafist approach to the messianic era, we can better understand a cryptic formulation in the standard *Tosafot* to tractate *Shabbat*, on one of the *sugyot* in which Samuel's statement appears.¹⁹ In analyzing Samuel's claim that there are to be no physical or natural differences between this world and the messianic age, *Tosafot* remarks that at this time (in this world), 'there is no Jerusalem, nor is there the Temple. During the days of the Messiah, however, everything will be built (יהיה הכל בנוי)'.²⁰

As we shall see shortly, the notion that the Temple will descend from heaven fully built, in what is obviously a miraculous occurrence, appears consistently within Tosafist texts and writings. This event, and the resurrection of the dead, are two of the most striking miracles of the messianic age, as R. Moses Taḳu had also indicated. Thus, the *Tosafot* gloss in *Shabbat* wonders how Samuel could characterize the messianic

an interpretation of the talmudic notion (*Bava Batra* 74b–75a) that Gabriel will hunt Leviathan. Both formulations of Rizba are recorded as part of a larger treatise entitled *דרשות של המלך המשיח* (beginning on fol. 13v), which was compiled apparently by R. Moses of Coucy. Cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, I, p. 468–469, and below, nn. 21, 27, 36. This treatise is followed in the manuscript by other eschatological material.

Ms. Cambridge Add. 1022/1 contains a lengthy *hishuv ha-ḥez* formulation which cites written interpretations in the name of ר' יצחק בן אברהם / ר' רבי'א (fols. 150r, 152r, 153v). Although there are some differences in detail, the time frames for the messianic era outlined by Rizba both here and in ms. Darmstadt are compatible. See my *Peering Through the Lattices*, pp. 206–207, n. 37. The treatise in ms. Darmstadt, and a parallel formulation in ms. Firkovitch 764, also insist that the Messiah will not come as long as the land of Israel is in the hands of non-Jews. See Yuval, p. 114, (above, n.3) and A. Grossman, 'Zikato shel ha-Maharam mi-Rothienburg el Erez Yisra'el', *Cathedra*, 84 (1997), pp. 81–82. Nonetheless, Yuval's contention that the Tosafist 'aliyah of 1210–1211 was motivated primarily by messianic impulses denies the significant halakhic and rabbinic considerations that were involved, in which Rizba also played a part. See my 'The 'Aliyah of "Three Hundred Rabbis" in 1211' (above, n. 17), pp. 191–215 (for Rizba, see pp. 198–199), and I. Ta-Shma, 'Al Odor Yaḥasam shel Ḳadmonei Ashkenaz le-'Erekh ha-'Aliyah le-Yisra'el', *Shalem*, 6 (1992), pp. 315–318.

¹⁹ See *Tosafot Shabbat* 63a, s.v. 'ein bein; ms. Vatican Borgiana 3, fol. 82; and ms. JTS Rab. 731, fol. 47v. The printed talmudic text here has the reading שעבוד גליות (rather than שעבוד מלכות), a common variant which does not impact upon our discussion.

²⁰ Ritva, ad loc., paraphrases the thrust of *Tosafot's* challenge to Samuel as follows: פי' לומר שלא יתבטל כלום מסדרו של עולם. אבל דאי שיבנה בית המקדש ותחזור שכינה למקומו ותרכבה החכמה והתורה. The order of the world will certainly change to some extent during the messianic age. Ritva (to *Sukkah* 41a) also espouses Rashi's view, that the third Temple will descend miraculously from Heaven: ואין לנו לפרש בזה אלא כמו שפירשי' שבני בית המקדש ירד בנוי מן השמים. The order of the world will certainly change to some extent during the messianic age. Ritva (to *Sukkah* 41a) also espouses Rashi's view, that the third Temple will descend miraculously from Heaven: ואין לנו לפרש בזה אלא כמו שפירשי' שבני בית המקדש ירד בנוי מן השמים. (see below, n. 22). Cf. Ritva to *Ta'anit* 30a, s.v. kol ha-okhel basar ve-shoteh yayin.

era in a manner which does not recognize in any way the inclusion of these significant miracles.

Moreover, the *Tosafot Shabbat* text is so confident in its view, that it resolves the quandary regarding Samuel's statement by asserting that Samuel's formulation was imprecise: *האי אין בין לאו דוקא*. There are additional aspects of the messianic era which Samuel did not include, despite the sweeping tone of his statement. What is most significant here is that the author of this Tosafist comment presumes that Samuel can be made to agree with his own particular view, just as Maimonides, Abravanel and R. Moses of Taḳu did. Somewhat uncharacteristically, *Tosafot* does not take Samuel's position to where it leads, or test it against other views. Rather, *Tosafot* conflates the statement in accordance with its own beliefs.²¹

In his commentary to parallel *sugyot* in tractates *Sukkah* and *Rosh ha-Shanah*, Rashi bases a difficult talmudic assumption, that the (third) Temple could actually be built on the first day of Passover (which explains the imposition of a certain rabbinic decree in regard to the 'omer sacrifice), on the fact that the third Temple will not be built by human hands. It will be built by the Almighty and will descend, fully constructed, from heaven (מקדש העוֹלָם שֶׁאֵינוֹ מִצִּיּוֹן מִצִּיּוֹן בְּנִי וּמְשׁוֹכֵלֵל הוּא יִבָּא מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם).²² This can occur even on the first day of the Passover festival, since it does not entail any human violation of Jewish law. Without citing any midrashic or other rabbinic sources, Rashi (in tractate *Sukkah*) maintains that this idea is implicit in a verse in the Song of the Sea (*Shirat ha-Yam*, which is often interpreted with futuristic intent), 'the Temple of the Lord will be established by Your hands (מִקְדֶּשׁ ה' כִּנְנוּ יְדֵיךָ)'.²³

One might argue that Rashi put forward this unusual (yet effective) interpretation mostly as a means of resolving a problem of talmudic exegesis, but that he himself did not necessarily endorse the concept. This possibility is significantly diminished, however, if not eliminated altogether, by noting the comment of Rashi to the first part of Jeremiah

²¹ As noted by a gloss to *Shabbat* 63a (and to the other relevant *sugyot* as well), *Tosafot* does discuss in less than a handful of instances whether the talmudic expression *האי אין בין* means that there are absolutely no other differences between the items or constructs being compared, or whether another difference or two, not germane to the talmudic *sugya* at hand, may still exist. The small number of these instances aside, the *Tosafot Shabbat* comment concerning Samuel's *האי אין בין* is the only one made in an aggadic context. Indeed, while the other *Tosafot* texts refer to one or more of the other instances, none of them refer to *Tosafot Shabbat* (just as *Tosafot Shabbat* itself does not refer to them). Moreover, the formulation in *Tosafot Shabbat* is by far the most striking and unequivocal, further suggesting that it represents a deeply held view. See also ms. Darmstadt Cod. Or. 25/3, fol. 16v: *לשמואל דאמר אין בין וכי ציל דשמואל מירי בימות המשח קדם תחית המחים*.

31:3, עוד אבנך תבנית בתולת ישראל, Rashi's comment reads: בניינים שנים היו לך על ידי אדם, לכך חרב. עוד אבנך אני בעצמי בנין שלישי ותבנית לעולם.²³ In this instance, since other exegetical options were certainly available, Rashi's adoption of this notion suggests that he subscribed to it.²⁴ There is little reason, if

²² Rashi, *Sukkah* 41a, s.v. 'i nami, and *Rosh ha-Shanah* 30a, s.v. la zerikha. Rashi informs us in his commentary to *Rosh ha-Shanah* 4b, s.v. בויר קטיב, that he completed the commentaries to both *Yoma* and *Sukkah* before the commentary to *Rosh ha-Shanah*. This perhaps explains why Rashi's formulation in *Sukkah* regarding the descent of the third Temple is lengthier than the one in *Rosh ha-Shanah*. On the order of Rashi's talmudic commentaries, cf. Y. Frankel, *Darko shel Rashi be-Ferusho la-Talmud ha-Bavli*², Jerusalem 1980, pp. 273–284. This development may account, in turn, for the fact that *Tosafot* (below, n. 26) and Ritva (above, n. 20), who both adopt Rashi's approach, discuss this issue (and cite Rashi) only in connection with the *sugya* in *Sukkah*.

²³ Cf. A. Grossman, 'Galut u-Ge'ulah be-Mishnato shel Rashi', Y. Berukhi (ed.), *Mi-Shi'bud li-Ge'ulah: Mi-Pesah 'ad Shavu'ot (Mikdash le-'Illui Nishmat Segen Moshe Beeri)*, Merkaz Shapira 1996, pp. 262–263, and below, n. 33. See also Rashi's commentary to Psalms 78:69 (He built his Temple like the heavens, like the earth He established it forever) where he writes (cf. *Parshan-data*, ed. I. Maarsen, Jerusalem 1936, pp. 78–79): Just as heaven and earth were created by the Almighty with His two hands (based on Isaiah 48:13), He will also build the Temple with His two hands as the verse states, בנתו ידך. Rashi offers an alternate explanation to this verse, that just as heaven and earth are immutable, so too the Temple is the only place that the Divine presence will reside. The second interpretation does not, however, vitiate the first. See also below, n. 30.

²⁴ A passage in the standard edition of Rashi's commentary to Ezekiel (43:11, s.v. *ve-yishmeru*) appears, *prima facie*, to contradict the other Rashi passages just discussed. The verse in Ezekiel states that 'they will preserve all of its forms and its rules and they will do them'. Rashi's commentary reads: ילמדו ענייני המדות מפיך שידעו לעשותם לעת הקץ. (They [the people] will learn the issue of the measurements from your [Ezekiel's] mouth in order that they will know what to do at the time of the end [of days, when it is time to build the third Temple]). According to this Rashi passage, the third Temple will be built by human hands (ostensibly under the guidance of the Messiah). See Radaḳ (below, n. 53), and cf. S. Zevin, 'Mikdash he-'Atid le-Or ha-Halakhah', *Maḥanayim*, 96 (1965), p. 14, who attempts to resolve the 'contradiction' between the Rashi passages in *Sukkah* and *Rosh ha-Shanah*, and this Rashi passage. (Rabbi Zevin also cites a passage in Maimonides' introduction to his commentary to the Mishnah in which Rambam suggests that the sole purpose of the tractate *Middot* is to serve as a guide for how to build the next Temple accurately, in accordance with Divine specifications. Cf. above, n. 8.)

It should be noted, however, that this passage is not included in the critical edition of this section of Rashi's commentary to Ezekiel that was prepared by Abraham Levy (*Rashi's Commentary on Ezekiel 40–48*, Philadelphia 1931, p. 89). Levy indicates that this passage is found in only two of the eleven manuscripts of Rashi's commentary which he consulted. (These two manuscripts are, in any case, not the most accurate ones from which to reconstruct Rashi's authentic commentary to Ezekiel; see Levy, pp. 42–43, 61–64). Moreover, the next several lines in the standard Rashi text (as well as the line before) were added by a student or colleague of Rashi, since they are headed by the word מצאתי; see Levy, pp. 5–7, 16. In fact, these lines are very similar to one of a series of brief responsa which Rashi directed to the rabbis of Auxerre, who had asked him for his interpretation of verses in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. See *Teshuvot Rashi*, ed. I. Efenbein, New York 1943, I, pp. 1–6, responsa 1–13, and Levy, pp. 34–35. In responsum 12, the rabbis of Auxerre asked how it was that the people were given actual instructions by

any, to doubt that Rashi, when composing his talmudic commentary, also believed that the third Temple would actually descend from heaven.²⁵

Unnamed Tosafists (to tractate *Sukkah*) cite Rashi's interpretation approvingly.²⁶ Moreover, *Tosafot* to tractate *Shevu'ot* cites a passage in *Midrash Tanḥuma*, which bases this notion on the verse in the Song of the Sea that had been mentioned by Rashi.²⁷ Neither extant version of *Midrash Tanḥuma* on the *Shirat ha-Yam* contains this tradition, although it is not unusual for Ashkenazic rabbinic scholars to cite and to preserve versions of *midrashim* which were available to them, including

Ezekiel concerning the building of the Temple (as per Ezekiel 43:10–11), since no building ever occurred in his day. Rashi answers that had the people not sinned in exile, they might have built the Second Temple immediately (and triumphantly) upon their return, without having to wait for the permission of Cyrus and so on. In his responsum, Rashi clearly interprets Ezekiel 43:11 as referring to the Second Temple, not the third; cf. Rashi to Ezekiel 41:10, and Grossman, in the above note. As such, the passage in question in the standard Rashi text to Ezekiel 43:11 was not, in all likelihood, composed by Rashi (and is therefore absent from almost all of the manuscripts of Rashi's commentary to Ezekiel), since according to it, this verse refers to the third Temple. (Rashi to Isaiah 11:3 cites the rabbinic view [above, n. 9] that the Messiah should be able to use his sense of smell to determine guilt and innocence. See also below, n. 36, regarding Messiah ben Joseph.)

²⁵ Cf. D. Berger, 'Gishato ha-Razionalistit shel ha-Rambam la-Teḳufah ha-Meshiḥit', *Maimonidean Studies*, 2 (1991) [Hebrew section], pp. 7–8. Berger also maintains that Meiri's rejection of Rashi's approach in favor of an even more unusual interpretation (that the highest rabbinic court would err, out of their intense desire to see the Temple built, and allow it to be built on the festival) was a function of Meiri's rationalism which meant (as in the case of Maimonides) that the Temple falling fully built from Heaven was an impossibility. Although this explanation of Meiri's motivation is most plausible, note that Meiri does not follow Maimonides' rationalistic conception of the messianic age in all respects; see D. Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi*, pp. 169–172.

²⁶ See *Tosafot Sukkah* 41a, s.v. 'i nami, and *Tosafot ha-Rosh*, ad loc. *Tosafot*'s assertion, that Rashi's interpretation is the only viable way to explain the talmudic passage at hand (ואלא על כרחיך צריך לחלק כמו שפירש בקתור), reflects the difficulty which Rashi himself had with the assumption made by the Talmud, that the third Temple might actually appear on the first day of Passover. There is no hesitation in regard to the notion that the third Temple would descend from heaven. Cf. above, nn. 20, 22, and see below.

²⁷ See *Tosafot Shevu'ot* 15b, s.v. 'ein; *Tosafot ha-Rosh*, ad loc.; ms. Vatican 168, fol. 43b; ms. Parma (Palatina) 325, fol. 8r; ms. Bodl. 428, fol. 24a (ובכן מפורש במדרש'י תנחומא) and (ואלא על כרחיך צריך לחלק כמו שפירש בקתור) ms. Darmstadt Cod. Or. 25/3, fol. 17 בני מן השמים שנא מקדש) 17 (ה'ונו) and cf. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, I, p. 293, n. 106. It should be noted that all of the *Tosafot* texts mentioned in this discussion originated in northern France. Indeed, both *Tosafot Shabbat* and *Sukkah* consist of forms of *Tosafot Sens* (שאנץ), although *Tosafot Shabbat* may have been edited finally by R. Eliezer of Touque. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, II, 601–602, 611–612. Cf. R. Samson's own statement about the miraculous nature of ימיטת המשיח in *Kitab 'al Rasa'il*, ed. Y. Brill, Paris 1871, pp. 135–136. *Tosafot Shevu'ot*, on the other hand, was edited by R. Eliezer of Touque, with little, if any, material from *Tosafot Sens* included. See Urbach, II, pp. 659–660.

Midrash Tanhuma, that are currently non-extant.²⁸ In addition, the idea of a divinely constructed third Temple (and an expanded Jerusalem) is found in other extant *Tanhuma* passages,²⁹ and in a passage in the *Pesikta*.³⁰

R. Eliezer b. Nathan (Raban), the leading German Tosafist of the mid-twelfth century, also adopts this concept in his commentary to tractate *Rosh ha-Shanah* (on the basis of an additional talmudic proof-text),³¹ as do R. Moses Taku,³² and the Torah commentary attributed to

²⁸ See, e.g., Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, I, p. 373, n. 69, 395; II, pp. 712-714; *Arugat ha-Bosem*, IV, ed. E. E. Urbach, Jerusalem 1963, pp. 168-175 (and esp. p. 170, regarding *Midrash Tanhuma*); I. Ta-Shma, *Minhag Ashkenaz ha-Qadmon*, Jerusalem 1992, p. 143, n. 5, 285, n. 1; idem, 'Sifriyatam shel Hakhmei Ashkenaz Benei ha-Me'ah ha-Yod Alef / ha-Yod Bet, *Qiryat Sefer*, 60 (1985), pp. 302-303; and C. Milikowsky, 'Mahadurot ve-Tippusei Tekst be-Sifrut Hazal', *Qiryat Sefer*, 61 (1986), p. 170.

²⁹ *Midrash Tanhuma*, Warsaw 1878, *Parashat Noah*, s.v. צא מן ההיכה, sec. 13 (end): אמרו ישראל לפני הקב"ה רבש"ע לא כבר נבנית ירושלים וחרבה. אמר להם עיי ונוטחים חרבה וגליתם מתוכה אבל לעתיד לבא אני בונה אותה. ואני הוורס אותה שנא' כי בונה ה' ציון נראה בבבזיו כי שמחתי ה' בפעליך במעשי ידיך ארנון. במעשיידיך ארנון זה; ויביאו את המשכן אל משה, sec. 13: *Tanhuma, Parashat Zav*, sec. 13: וכן אחת מוצא לעוה"ב; *Tanhuma, Parashat Zav*, sec. 13: ובנין בית המקדש, שיבנה במהרה בימינו. וכן אחת מוצא לעוה"ב; *Tanhuma, Parashat Zav*, sec. 13: ובנין בית המקדש, שיבנה במהרה בימינו. ומעלה עד שעולה לשמים; and *Arugat ha-Bosem*, I, pp. 245-248.

³⁰ *Pesikta Rabbati* (standard editions), chap. 29 (=ed. Meir Ish-Shalom [repr. Tel Aviv 1963], *Pesikta Rabbati*, 28, 134-135): בונה אותה שני' בונה ירושלים ה' נדחי ישראל יכנס ושוב לא יחרב מקדש ה' כוננו ירך; וכשבא [הקב"ה] לבנות בית המקדש כביכול בשתי ידיו וכו' מקדש ה' כוננו ירך; and *Nazir* 32b, according to *Perush ha-Rosh*, ad loc. (Note, however, that the Talmud [*Ketubot* 5a] interprets the verse ה' כוננו ירך as referring to the Second Temple, which will be built through the actions of the righteous. These actions can also be referred to as the actions of the Almighty. See Rashi, ad loc., s.v. *hakhi ka-amar*; *Tosafot*, s.v. *de-'ilu ba-shamayim u-va-arez*; *Shittah Mekubbezet*, s.v. *ve-'ilu be-ma'aseh yedeihem shel zaddikim*; *Parshan-data* (above, n. 23), n. 24; and *Mekhilta 'im Be'ur Mirkevot ha-Mishneh*, Lemberg 1905, fol. 61b, n. 5.)

³¹ *Sefer Raban*, repr. Jerusalem 1975, tractate *Rosh ha-Shanah*, fol. 177b: מהרה יבנה כל' לפי שהקב"ה בעצמו יבנה ואחריו כל בני ישראל וכו'... ואני עתיד לבנותה באש רתיב וכו' (מתי לעתיד לבא גריכין ואזה... לכשיבא משה רבינו עמהם) and *Niddah* 70b; *Sefer Raban*, followed by Rashi's comment to tractate *Sukkah*, in his *Arugat ha-Bosem*. See *Arugat ha-Bosem*, II, ed. E. E. Urbach (above, n. 15), p. 265.

³² See above, at n. 13. Note also the view of *Tosafot Pesahim* 114b, s.v. *ehad zekher le-pesah*, that Moses and Aaron will be alive when the third Temple is built, and will be available to provide guidance: וכשיבנה משה ואהרן יהא עמו וליא למיטעי. (My thanks to Rabbi Michael Brody for this reference.) Cf. *Tosafot ha-Rosh li-Pesahim*, ad loc., ed. A. Shoshana, Jerusalem 1997, pp. 998-999; *Yoma* 5b... לכשיבאו אהרן ובניו; *Sefer Raban* (above, n. 15), n. 13; *Sefer Raban*, followed by Rashi's comment to tractate *Sukkah*, in his *Arugat ha-Bosem*. See *Arugat ha-Bosem*, II, ed. E. E. Urbach (above, n. 15), p. 265.

R. Eleazar of Worms.³³ As far as I can tell, there are no medieval Ashkenazic rabbinic authorities who suggest that the third Temple will be built by human hands, despite the fact that there are a number of midrashic sources which record and support this view.³⁴

Tosafot texts consider the coming of משיח בן יוסף as an absolute certainty. A *baraita* ('*Eruvin* 43a–b) indicates that one who vows to be a *nazir* on the day that the Messiah (son of David) arrives is permitted to drink wine on Sabbaths and festivals (when the Messiah cannot come according to rabbinic tradition), but he may not do so on weekdays. In discussing the application of this *baraita*, *Tosafot* raises a basic issue which the *baraita* did not consider. משיח בן יוסף must come prior to the coming of משיח בן דוד. As such, as long as משיח בן יוסף has not yet arrived, there is no chance that the person in question will have violated his vow, and he should be able to drink wine on weekdays as well. *Tosafot Rabbenu Perez* adds that Messiah ben Joseph will arrive a long time, some forty years, before the Messiah ben David.³⁵ These *Tosafot* texts assume, as a foregone conclusion, that the arrival of משיח בן יוסף is part of the redemptive process, despite the minimal reference to this messiah in the Talmud itself.³⁶ R. Moses Taḳu, in his *Ketav Tamim*, also elaborates

³³ See *Perush ha-Rokeaḥ 'al ha-Torah*, II, ed. Chaim Konyevsky, Bnei Brak 1980, p. 81: מקור ראשון ושני, ועשר בני אדם ותריכו בני אדם. אבל מקורו [שלישי] בונה ירושלים ו'ה' סידר הקדוש בגוי. [The author of this commentary was not R. Eleazar of Worms, but was a member of R. Judah he-Hasid's Pietist circle; see J. Dan in *Ḳiryat Sefer*, 59 (1984), p. 644.] Cf. *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Ḥasid*, ed. Y. S. Lange, Jerusalem 1975, p. 88.

³⁴ For these midrashic sources, see, e.g., *Sefer ha-Mizvot le-Rasag*, ed. Y. F. Perlow, 'aseh 13; *Kasher, Torah Shelema*, 14 (*Beshalah*), note to entry 211 (end); and cf. *Kasher, Ha-Tekufah ha-Gedolah*, pp. 121–125. The phrase in the introduction to the northern French polemical handbook, *Sefer Yosef ha-Mekanne*, ed. Rosenthal, II, p. 5, שיבנה הבית, is taken directly from the Hebrew paraphrase of Se'adyah's *Emunot ve-De'ot*. See above, n. 15, and cf. also n. 24.

³⁵ See *Tosafot 'Eruvin* 43b, s.v. *ve-asur*, and *Tosafot Rabbenu Perez 'al Massekhet 'Eruvin*, ed. S. Wilman, Bnei Brak 1980, loc. cit., s.v. *ha-lo ata Eliyyahu be-Shabbata*. Cf. *Hekhalot Rabbati*, chap. 39, *Battei Midrashot*, ed. S. A. Wertheimer, Jerusalem 1950, I, pp. 130–131, and *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, ed. C. B. Chavel, Jerusalem 1963, I, p. 291.

³⁶ See also *Tosafot Bava Mezi'a* 114b, s.v. *mahu* (end); *Tosafot ha-Rosh li-Yevamot* 61a, s.v. *mi-magga' u-mi-massa*; ms. Darmstadt Cod. Or. 25f3, fol. 14r; *Perushim u-Fesakim le-Rabbenu Avigdor (Zarefat)* [of Vienna], Jerusalem 1996, pp. 449–450 (*pesak* 490); and M. L. Katzenellenbogen, 'Perush ha-Hosh'anut le-R. Eleazar mi-Germaiza Ba'al ha-Rokeaḥ', *Sefer Zikaron le-R. Shiloh Raphael*, ed. Y. Movshowitz, Jerusalem 1998, p. 67. Cf. Rashi's commentary to Isaiah 24:18 (*Parshan-data*, ed. I. Maarsen, Jerusalem 1933, p. 63: הנמלט מהרוב משיח בן דוד והנמלט ממשילכד בפתח מלחמה; ונגזר; Zechariah 12:10, and 13:9 (*Parshan-data*, ed. I. Maarsen, Amsterdam 1930, pp. 103–104); Daniel 9:26; and *Sukkah* 52a, s.v. *ve-safdah ha-'arez*. In regard to Messiah ben Joseph, Rashi and the Tosafists are certainly much closer to the approach of R. Hai Gaon than they are to that of R. Se'adyah; see above, n. 10.

on the appearance, unusual role and ultimate death of this messianic figure.³⁷

The consistent, overall approach of the Tosafists to the messianic age that we have encountered differs almost point by point with the approach taken by Maimonides in *Mishneh Torah* (and in his introduction to *Perek Helek*),³⁸ while it shares much in common with the view of Abravanel. To be sure, Maimonides (and Abravanel) wrote extensively on eschatology and messianism in other works and contexts, and it is difficult to characterize the Maimonidean view solely in accordance with the material in *Mishneh Torah*. At the same time, the Tosafist approach is not without subtleties of its own. Chief among them is the fact that the natural order will continue to operate during the messianic era, even as some fundamental changes will occur, including the return of miracles that had been effected during the biblical period as well as completely unprecedented miracles.³⁹ In a word, the messianic age, according to the Tosafists, will consist of both naturalistic and apocalyptic elements.⁴⁰

This complex sequence of developments can sustain, on the one hand, the concept of the vengeful messiah (המשיח הנוקם) that Yisrael Yuval has

³⁷ See *Ketav Tamim*, ms. Paris H711, fols. 38a, 45a–46b (facsimile ed. [above, n. 13], pp. 75, 89–92), and cf. *‘Arugat ha-Bosem*, I, ed. Urbach, pp. 263–268.

³⁸ Ashkenazic rabbinic scholars (including composers of *Tosafot* texts) writing after 1230 may have been aware, on some level, of the Maimonidean position, even though they do not mention it. R. Moses Taḳu (and R. Abraham b. Azriel) refer to various eschatological teachings of Maimonides by name; see above, n. 14. R. Isaac b. Abraham (d.1210), on the other hand, was probably unaware of Maimonides' views when he offered his formulation. See now E. Kanarfogel and M. Sokolow, 'Rashi ve-ha-Rambam Nifgashim ba-Genizah ha-Ḳahirit: Hafnayah el Sefer "Mishneh Torah" be-Mikhtav me'et Ehad mi-Ba'alei ha-Tosafot', *Tarbiz*, 67 (1998), pp. 411–416 and cf. below, n. 46.

³⁹ This dichotomy is also implicit in *Tosafot 'Avodah Zarah 5a*, s.v. עתידה אשה שתלך בכל יום לימות המשיח שמא ילך נוף חדש וגשמות חדשות יהיו גשמות שבטוף: והא דאמר (שבת ל:) עתידה אשה שתלך בכל יום לימות המשיח שמא ילך נוף חדש וגשמות חדשות יהיו H. H. Ben-Sasson has noted within the biblical commentaries of the northern French *pashtan*, R. Eliezer of Beaugency, the depiction of a (non-miraculous) political initiative in the messianic age, in which Israel would become the arbiter of national tensions. See Ben-Sasson, 'Yif 'Am Yisra'el le-Da'at Benei ha-Me'ah ha-Yod Bet', E. S. Rosenthal (ed.) *Perakim, Yearbook of Schocken Institute for Jewish Research*, 2 (1969–1971), pp. 212–217. Because the Ashkenazic model of the messianic age preserves the non-miraculous dimension as well as the miraculous, R. Eliezer of Beaugency's program need not be seen as completely exceptional. Cf. A. Grossman (above, n. 15).

⁴⁰ A multi-phased approach, similar to the models developed by the Tosafists, can be also seen in the writings of two philosophers who composed their works before Abravanel, the fifteenth-century Spanish philosopher, Abraham Bibago, and a late-fourteenth-century Provençal thinker, R. Solomon b. Abraham Peni'el (author of *Or 'Enayim*). See D. Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi*, pp. 196–197, 216–220, 245, and cf. E. Lawee (above, n. 11), p. 495, n. 54, regarding Abravanel's use of Bibago's writings.

identified on the basis of medieval Ashkenazic liturgical texts.⁴¹ On the other hand, it is possible that the quietistic messianic posture in Ashkenaz, described by Gerson Cohen, reflects the fact that Tosafists and Ashkenazic rabbinic thinkers insisted that naturalistic structures would continue to function in the messianic period, certainly through the early phases. For their part, the Jewish populace (including its leaders) could not anticipate or envision any immediate changes in the way that they would live as human beings. The Messiah, however, would be able to unleash a series of (miraculous) military initiatives that might include especially vengeful attacks against those who had oppressed the Jewish nation.⁴²

IV

With the views of Maimonides and the Tosafists representing almost polar opposites, it is instructive to look anew at the views of several major halakhists or rabbinic thinkers who were active in Spain and Provence during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (and were familiar with

⁴¹ See Yuval, 'Ha-Nalcam ve-ha-Ḳelalah' (above, n. 3), pp. 55–59. One of the objections that has been raised regarding Yuval's overarching thesis is that the vengeance at the end of days attested to in Ashkenazic sources belongs to the Lord, not to the Jewish people. See, e.g., D. Berger, 'From Crusades to Blood Libels to Expulsions: Some New Approaches to Medieval Anti-Semitism', *Second Annual Lecture of the Victor J. Selmanowitz Chair of Jewish History* (March 16, 1997; published by the Touro College Graduate School of Jewish Studies), pp. 16–22. Nonetheless, a number of Ashkenazic liturgical texts, such as the various early versions of שְׁפוֹךְ הַמָּתוֹךְ that appear in connection with the Passover Seder, assign part of this vengeance to the Messiah.

⁴² Note also Avraham Grossman's nuanced presentation (in response to Yuval's article) of the two levels or phases that will be operant during the messianic era in regard to the non-Jewish population, according to early Ashkenazic authorities. While there will be conflagrations at first in which many enemies will be destroyed, a later phase of the redemptive process will see the remaining non-Jews recognize the Almighty and become part of the Jewish people, as a result of the stunning defeat of those who had attacked Jerusalem. This scenario was expressed most clearly by R. Moses b. Ḳalonymus (first half of the tenth century), and by Rashi (second half of the eleventh century), although other pre-Crusade rabbinic scholars also discuss the presence of these two motifs in the messianic period. See Grossman, "'Ha-Ge'ulah ha-Megayyeret" be-Mishnatam shel Ḥakhmei Ashkenaz', *Zion*, 59 (1994), pp. 325–342. For additional evidence from early Ashkenaz concerning the travails and miraculous dimensions of the messianic era, see ms. Parma 541, fol. 267a, sec. 77 [טעמי גו ומגו, by R. Neḥemyah (b. Makhir?); cf. my *Peering Through the Lattices*, p. 203, nn. 31–32], and Grossman, *Ḥakhmei Zarfat ha-Rishonim*, pp. 515–516. According to R. Meshullam b. Moses of Magenza (d.1095), even Elijah the Prophet would perform certain miracles in heralding the coming of the Messiah.

the Maimonidean position). These figures include R. David Kimḥi (Radaḳ, c.1160–1235), who was probably unaware of the approach of the Tosafists,⁴³ R. Meir ha-Levi Abulafia (Ramah, 1165–1244), who might have been aware of their approach (in its earliest form),⁴⁴ and R. Moses b. Naḥman (Ramban, 1194–1270), who was almost certainly aware of it.⁴⁵

Ramah interprets Samuel's statement in a manner that is similar, but not identical, to the Tosafists. By saying *אין בין העולם הזה לימות המשיח אלא שיעבוד מלכות בלבד* (לפי צורך השעה והמקום) as needed (לפי צורך השעה והמקום). Rather, his intention was to stress that the usual workings of the world would not completely change (שאין מנהגו של עולם משתנה לגמרי), and that no unprecedented miracles would occur. Any miracles that had already occurred, however, could be repeated. This would allow for the return of *רוח הקודש*, and for certain Exodus-like miracles, such as the splitting, drying up, or redirecting of several major rivers which would aid those who wished to reach the Land of Israel, a series of phenomena that are described at the end of Isaiah 11 in connection with the messianic age.⁴⁶

To this point, Ramah's approach sounds like that of R. Moses Taḳu.⁴⁷ Indeed, Ramah also maintains that the miracle of Resurrection will occur during *ימות המשיח*, even according to Samuel, but this part of Ramah's argument reveals a significant difference between it and the Tosafist approach. Ramah includes the miracle of Resurrection in *ימות המשיח* not by arguing that there are to be different phases or segments of the messianic age (as R. Moses Taḳu and Riḅba did), of which Samuel was describing only one, but by noting that forms of bodily resurrection had already

⁴³ See F. Talmage, *David Kimḥi, The Man and the Commentaries*, Cambridge, Mass. 1975, pp. 9–14, 72–73.

⁴⁴ See B. Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, p. 31, and below, n. 46.

⁴⁵ See, e.g., Septimus, "'Open Rebuke and Concealed Love": Nahmanides and the Andalusian Tradition', I. Twersky (ed.), *Rabbi Moses Nahmanides (Ramban): Explorations in His Religious and Literary Viruosity*, Cambridge, Mass. 1983, pp. 30–34, and my 'On the Assessment of R. Moses b. Naḥman (Nahmanides) and His Literary Oeuvre', *Jewish Book Annual*, 54 (1996–1997), pp. 66–80.

⁴⁶ See *Kitab 'al Rasa'il*, p. 63; and cf. *Yad Ramah, Sanhedrin* 91b (fol. 163); and Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshibi*, pp. 103–104. Ramah expressed this view in a response to Aaron b. Meshullam of Lunel, written in 1202 or 1203, during the so-called 'resurrection phase' of the Maimonidean controversy. Ramah submitted a copy of his correspondence with Aaron to the scholars of northern France to whom he addressed his next letter. One of the addressees of that letter was the Tosafist R. Isaac b. Abraham (Riḅba). See Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, pp. 48–52.

⁴⁷ Cf. Septimus, p. 143, n. 86.

occurred at various points in time. Ramah lists examples from the period of the First Temple (the revival of the son of the Shunamite women), from after the destruction of the First Temple (by Ezekiel, according to some of the Tannaitic views recorded in *Sanhedrin* 92b), and even from the period after the destruction of the Second Temple (when R. Zeira revived Rabbah [*Megillah* 7b], and similarly, when R. Ḥaninah bar Ḥamma revived a servant who had been killed, in the days of R. Judah the Prince and the emperor Antoninus [*Avodah Zarah* 10b]).

For Ramah then, as opposed to the Tosafists, none of the miracles that will occur during the messianic age can be characterized as unprecedented. Unprecedented miraculous phenomena, such as the marked changes in the brightness of the sun and the moon alluded to by verses in Isaiah, will occur only in 'olam ha-ba'.⁴⁸ Interestingly, Ramah does not discuss the construction of the third Temple. On this issue, he would perhaps agree with Maimonides' claim that the Messiah (and his followers) will actually build the Temple, rather than with the Tosafist position, which holds that the third Temple will appear during the messianic era through what is obviously an unprecedented miracle.⁴⁹ On the whole, however, Ramah's view is much closer to the Tosafist approach than it is to that of Maimonides.⁵⁰

Radaḳ and Ramban embrace a more intermediate view, at least in regard to the changed relationship between predators and prey that would be part of the overall world harmony associated with the messianic era, as described in Isaiah 11. In attempting to identify the nature of these changes, Radaḳ entertains several possibilities. The first is that the various predators listed would return to their pre-flood

⁴⁸ Cf. above, n. 15.

⁴⁹ In this regard, note Ramah's reaction to Rashi's conception of *ירושלים של מעלה*, in *Yad Ramah, Sanhedrin* 97b (fol. 169), and see Septimus, pp. 76-77.

⁵⁰ Cf. Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi*, pp. 94-95. We have already seen (above, n. 20) that Ritva (d.c. 1330) also followed the approach of Rashi and the Tosafists regarding *ימות המשיח*. Rashba (d.c. 1310), on the other hand, is closer to the Maimonidean view. In light of the *מִימְרָא* of Samuel, Rashba, in his commentary to talmudic *aggadot*, defines the messianic era as 'an epoch in which no new phenomena will occur, more than are currently operant' (שבאותו זמן אין דבר מתחדש יותר מן הגורג עתה [נ"א יותר מן הנהוג בעולם הזה]). In another passage in his commentary, Rashba writes that when the Almighty returns his people [to the Land of Israel] and the Temple is built (He builds the Temple?) (בשוב ה' (יתברך שבות עם ויבנה הבית), needed rainfall will fall uneventfully, without any frightening thunder and lightening, just as it did during the days of the prior Temple(s). Earlier in this passage, however, Rashba pointed out that the different rainfall patterns during and after the days of the Temple do not constitute a fundamental change in the order of Creation. See Schwartz, p. 162.

behavior, when it may be assumed that they were herbivores. (Had they been carnivorous, Radaḳ notes, there would have been havoc in Noah's ark.) The second approach is that these verses should be interpreted allegorically (כל זה משל), as a symbol of the peace that will (ultimately) obtain during the messianic age. Although this is clearly the view of Maimonides (in his *Mishneh Torah*), as well as ibn Ezra (in his comment to Isaiah 11:6 – דרך משל מהשלום שיהיה בימיו), Radaḳ does not mention either of them. The third approach, which Radaḳ characterizes as the (most) correct one (הנכון), is that the nature of the animals will not change at all (טבע החיות לא תתחלף). They will still be carnivorous. But there was a promise made in the Torah, as part of the blessings which the Jewish people might merit from the Almighty if they observed His statutes, that wild animals would do no damage in the Land of Israel (Leviticus 26:6 – והשבתי חיה רעה מן הארץ). The messianic era, in which all will know the Lord (and do His will, as suggested in Isaiah 11:9), will see the actualization of this promise. Predators will still stalk their animal prey, but they will do no harm to humans in the Land of Israel.⁵¹

Radaḳ apparently wished to preserve the naturalistic character of the messianic era, but not to the same extent as Maimonides. He was unprepared to accept Maimonides' allegorical interpretation of Isaiah 11. On the other hand, Radaḳ also rejects the first view, for reasons that are less clear. Perhaps he felt that while the pre-flood period is also part of natural history, returning to this state represents a greater, more jarring change than the Jewish people meriting a promise which the Almighty had offered for the future, and had included originally as part of the nature of the Land of Israel.⁵² At the same time, Radaḳ is not adverse to suggesting that the messianic era will see extraordinary human longevity, with people living for between three and five hundred years, as did the early generations at the beginning of Creation.⁵³

Nahmanides, in his biblical commentary to Leviticus 26:6, interprets

⁵¹ See Radaḳ's commentary to Isaiah 11:6, and cf. *Emunot ve-De'ot le-R. Se'adyah Gaon*, 8:8, and above, n. 15. Radaḳ explicitly associates Isaiah 11 with the messianic era in his comment to Isaiah 11:1.

⁵² Cf. M. Saperstein, *Decoding the Rabbis*, (above, n. 7) pp. 107–109.

⁵³ See Radaḳ's commentary to Isaiah 65:17–19, 22, and esp. to 65:20 כמו שזו הדורות בריאת העולם היו החיים ההם בכלל או ביחידים ולעיתים לבאיהם בכלל ישראל. Cf. Radaḳ and Ramban to Genesis 5:4. Radaḳ partially links this approach to ibn Ezra and *Ḥazal*. Radaḳ also describes, in his commentary to Ezekiel 47:12, an abundance of fruits that will be miraculously produced by the trees throughout the entire year, beyond their defined growing seasons (וזו יהיה על דרך מופת). Cf. F. Talmage, *David Kimḥi: The Man and His Commentaries* (above, n. 43) pp. 154–155.

Isaiah 11 in line with the first view mentioned by Radaḳ.⁵⁴ 'When the Jews in the Land of Israel fulfill the precepts, there will be a return of the state of the world prior to the sin of Adam, and no animals will harm man'. Furthermore, this is what will occur in the messianic age, as described by Isaiah. When the Land of Israel is complete (על השלמות), under the Messiah's leadership, the natural order will return to its earlier state at the time of Creation (טבע הראשון).⁵⁵ The predators will stop preying on others, in accordance with their original nature.⁵⁶ In short,

In other respects, however, Radaḳ conforms to the Maimonidean view. In his commentary to Zechariah 4:6, Radaḳ interprets the claim in the verse, that the spirit of the Almighty will be in evidence rather than human strength (לא בחיל ולא בכח כי אם ברוחי אמר ה' צבאות), to mean that the Temple will not be built by the might of man, but by the spirit and will of the Lord (לא בכח האדם אלא ברוחו האלוהי וברצונו). For Radaḳ, however (as for most commentators), this verse refers to the building of the Second Temple; cf. his commentary to Zechariah 2:14, and Talmage, *David Kimḥi*, p. 154, n. 177. Indeed, unlike Rashi (above, n. 23), Radaḳ interprets the rebuilding to be done by the Almighty at the time of the final redemption (Jeremiah 31:3; עורר אבנך ונבנית) as a metaphor for His bringing the Jewish people together, not as an indication that He will build the third Temple. Radaḳ mentions Messiah ben Joseph in his commentary to Zechariah 2:3, but only in an alternate interpretation which he cites in the name of חז"ל, and in his commentary to Zechariah 13:7, citing Ibn Ezra. See also Radaḳ's smooth, understated depiction (in his commentary to Isaiah 4:2) of the various stages of Messiah ben David's accomplishments and conquests. On Radaḳ's relationship to Maimonides and rationalism, as well as his understanding of miracles, see Talmage, *David Kimḥi*, pp. 23-27, 39-42.

⁵⁴ For the possible influence of Radaḳ on Ramban, see my 'On the Assessment of R. Moses b. Naḥman and His Literary Oeuvre' (above, n. 45), p. 79, n. 50.

⁵⁵ Ramban notes that there are two Tannaitic views on this issue (in *Torat Kohanim*), and that he sides with the view of R. Simeon. For other midrashic versions of this motif, see B. Z. Benedikt, *Assufat Ma'amarim*, Jerusalem 1994, p. 154, and cf. Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshiḥi*, p. 104. Rabad, in his gloss to *H. Melakhim* 1:1, also cites this interpretation of Leviticus 26:6 (against Maimonides), without elaboration. It should be noted that there are possible kabbalistic considerations here and, to be sure, Ramban's conception of *teva* is different from that of medieval Jewish philosophers and rationalists. See the next note; above, n. 9; the studies discussed in R. Chazan, *Barcelona and Beyond*, Berkeley 1992, pp. 189-193; and D. Berger, 'Miracles and the Natural Order in Naḥmanides', *Rabbi Moses Naḥmanides* (above, n. 45), pp. 107-128.

⁵⁶ Ramban describes this phenomenon in his commentary to Genesis 9:5. Allowing man to kill animals for food is what caused animals to become predators as well. The *sod* approach to this issue suggests that both man and the animals were able, at the time of their creation, to satiate themselves solely from the produce of the trees and the earth. See also Ramban's commentary to Deuteronomy 30:6, in which he writes that during the messianic era, man will also return to his state before the sin of Adam. He will always choose the good way, and will never succumb to his evil inclination. Cf. M. Nehorai, 'Erez Yisra'el be-Toratam shel ha-Rambam ve-ha-Ramban', M. Hallamish and A. Ravitzky (eds.), *Erez Yisra'el be-Hagut ha-Yehudit Bimei ha-Benayim*, Jerusalem 1991, pp. 124-125; C. Henoch, *Ha-Ramban ke-Hoḳer ve-khi-Mekubbal*, Jerusalem 1978, pp. 441-442, 445-446; and B. Safran, 'R. Azriel and Naḥmanides: Two Views of the Fall of Man', *Rabbi Moses Naḥmanides* (above, n. 45), pp. 75-106.

Ramban's position is that the messianic age will bring man back to the beginning of Creation, and to the natural state which was active then.⁵⁷

To be sure, the views of Ramaḥ and Ramban on the messianic era are intertwined with their positions on other aspects of eschatology and Jewish thought.⁵⁸ We do not as yet have before us, in organized form, the composite or even the range of Tosafist views in these areas. Nonetheless, this study suggests that it is possible, by bringing together sources from both the byways and the recesses of Tosafist literature and by isolating the points in common, to uncover the cohesive views of the Tosafists on issues of belief and dogma.⁵⁹ These views can be further illuminated (and can, in turn, shed light on the views of others), if we compare and contrast them with the larger corpus of medieval rabbinic thought.

⁵⁷ In his account of the Disputation at Barcelona in 1263, Ramban asserted (in the name of *ba'alei ha-peshat*) that the Messiah would be born relatively close to the messianic era, live for many years, and transfer his kingship to his son (against the aggadic notion that he would be born when the Second Temple was destroyed and would live forever). Ramban cites the statement of Samuel as the basis for this (non-miraculous) approach. Ramban also cites the passage from Maimonides' *H. Melakhim* (that had been misrepresented by Pablo Christiani) which states that the Messiah would build the Temple and gather the exiles. See *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, I, p. 315, secs. 73–74, and cf. R. Chazan, *Barcelona and Beyond*, pp. 87–90. Needless to say, polemical considerations and implications were paramount to Nahmanides at this point, although his use of Samuel here does necessarily contradict the position which he took in his biblical commentaries. Cf., however, Nahmanides' understanding of Samuel's formulation in his *Sha'ar ha-Gemul* (*Kitvei ha-Ramban*, II, 300–301). On Ramban's approach to aggadah in light of the Barcelona disputation, cf. my 'On the Assessment of R. Moses b. Nahman', pp. 71–73, and the literature cited. In his sermon *Torat ha-Shem Temimah*, which is presumed to have been delivered shortly after the Barcelona disputation (see, e.g., J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, Ithaca 1982, p. 121, although cf. R. Chazan, 'In the Wake of the Barcelona Disputation', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 61 [1990], pp. 185–201), Ramban characterizes the relationship between wild animals and human beings during the messianic age in terms almost identical to those found in his Torah commentary. See *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, I, pp. 154–155. Cf. B. Netanyahu, *Don Isaac Abravanel* (above, n. 11), p. 323, n. 174.

⁵⁸ See e.g., Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition*, esp. 109–115 (and cf. J. Cohen's review in *AJS*, 9 [1984], pp. 121–122). Note that Ramban, in *Sha'ar ha-Gemul* (*Kitvei ha-Ramban*, II, p. 306), locates Resurrection at the end of the days of the Messiah, as a bridge to 'olam ba-ba, placing him once again somewhere between the views of the Tosafists and Maimonides. The major influence on this aspect of Ramban's eschatological conception, however, appears to have been Se'adyah Gaon. Cf. Schwartz, *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi*, pp. 44, 105, 108, and above, n. 12. For Nahmanides' view regarding בְּיָמֵינוּ, cf. above, n. 35.

⁵⁹ For Rashi, see, e.g., E. Touitou, 'Bein Parshanut le-Etikah: Hashkafat ha-'Olam shel ha-Torah lefi Perush Rashi', S. Japhet (ed.), *Ha-Mikra bi-Re'i Mefarshav*, Jerusalem 1994, pp. 312–334, and cf. the studies of Avraham Grossman, above, nn. 15, 23, 42.

ME'AH SHE'ARIM

STUDIES
IN MEDIEVAL JEWISH SPIRITUAL LIFE
IN MEMORY OF
ISADORE TWERSKY

EDITED BY

EZRA FLEISCHER, GERALD BLIDSTEIN
CARMİ HOROWITZ, BERNARD SEPTIMUS