1. I added a slight qualification, although I’m not sure it’s necessary.

2. This well-known article from Sanhedrin doesn’t discern between a spoken or written statement, but determines that the entire Torah is from God and that Moses added nothing of his own accord; but just to be sure I added a footnote to emphasize this.

3. I added two sources from the Talmud and a note that cites a study on the topic.

4. It cannot be said that the early rabbis were entirely apathetic to the lack of intellectual unity or to the lack of narrative continuity. The harmonistic interpretive method is characteristic of traditional interpretation, and has been developed and refined through the generations, also in order to contend with all sorts of inconsistencies and contradictions in the biblical writings and in interpretive traditions tied to the Bible. However, in contrast to modern interpreters, the rabbis were not especially interested in contending with these phenomena and certainly did not see them as real problems that must be solved, but rather mostly as an opening for midrash.

a. Clear examples are the traditions that tell of the possibility of the hiding of biblical books that include cases of inconsistencies and contradictions. The starting point of these traditions is that the books are in harmony and that what appears to be an inconsistency or contradiction can be explained satisfactorily by a harmonistic interpretation.

b. Regarding the complicated attitude of the sages of the generations, from the ancient period until modern traditional rabbinic research, to ways of contending with inconsistencies and contradictions in the scriptures, see in detail . . .

5. Saadia Gaon’s comments that I quoted are contradictory. It is not possible, of course, to know whether there is a harmonistic explanation in Saadia Gaon’s interpretations that haven’t reached us.

6. I am not sure that this comment is justified. Traditions on the writing of the Torah do not consider the question of whether it is possible to write the long Torah in one day.

7. The background of his comments is the view of critical Bible scholars, with whom he debates, that the Torah comprises various sources. From his remarks we learn that the combination of the ancient legal sources with each other into the Torah we have did not obscure their independence. Further, it turns out that this act of combining the sources was not a mere stitching together of one ancient source to another, but that often the ancient sources were disassembled and integrated into new and different contexts. I will note that in various places Hoffmann hints that the combination of ancient sources that make up the Torah one with another was not done by Moses, but that Moses’s words are included in these sources that were added and developed after his time. For more detail on Hoffmann’s position and on the paradoxical aspect of his debate with critical Bible research, see recently . . .

8. There are many rabbinic sayings devoted to the giving of the Ten Commandments. To the best of my knowledge, there is no saying that speaks of the time they were written.

9. Another saying that somewhat touches on the question of the writing of the Torah by Moses is found in the Talmud Yerushalmi, in a collection of midrash on Job: “Moses wrote the five books of the Pentateuch and then went back [*hazar*] and wrote the portion of Balak and Balaam, and wrote the Book of Job.” This saying teaches that Moses wrote the Balak portion at a late stage, after he wrote the Torah. The saying is known in a different version in the list of authors in the Bavli: “Moses wrote his book and the portion of Balaam and Job”. The list of authors in the Bavli is not a Tannaitic baraita as was thought, but a late Babylonian source, based mostly on Tannaitic and Amoraic sayings. It seems that even the sentence that enumerates the books Moses wrote is based on an earlier saying that was included in the collection of traditions and midrash on Job. The formulation of the sentences in the Bavli as well as in the Yerushalmi demonstrate a late development. Back to the matter at hand, the verbs חזר וכתב (wrote and went back) seem to be meant to clarify why the Balak and Balam portion was mentioned by itself, although it is included in the statement “Moses wrote the five books of the Torah.” It seems, then, that the Yerushalmi does not reflect a solid tradition according to which the Torah was written in two stages, but a more specific solution. In any case, this saying in the Yerushalmi influenced Jewish tradition only in the modern period.

10. The combination ‘The Balak and Balam portion’ is awkward – ‘the Balam portion’ reflects the content while the ‘Balak portion’ reflects the Torah’s division into portions. . . . It seems that this combination reflects a clarification by the sugya’s editors, who sought to reinforce its connection to the sayings that follow – the identification of Elihu with Balam and the quotation of the verse “From Aram has Balak brought me.”

11. I will also note traditions that touch on Ezra’s contribution to writing the Torah that are mentioned sparsely in the early rabbinic literature and much more so from the Middle Ages onward. These traditions connect Ezra’s name to the change of spelling, the addition of qeri and ketiv, cantillation and nikkud, scribal corrections and the number of letters provided in the Torah. In the thirteenth century it was even suggested that the Torah was lost during the Exile and that Ezra renewed it, but that he did not change one word that Moses wrote (Elazar ben Matatya, Interpretation to Ibn Ezra’s Interpretation to Genesis 12:6; this tradition is quite common in Christian interpretation, following the book of 4 Ezra that is included in the Vulgate). These traditions, while interesting in themselves, do not shed light on the time of the writing of the Torah by Moses.

12. I do not see the connection between the Muslim debate and Saadia’s statements.

13. Other interpreters of the Bible from the Renaissance did not deal with the question of the time of the writing of the Torah, and so I do not find it relevant to mention that Abrabanel is a Renassaince interpreter.

14. In my opinion, research devoted to the *mudawwin* in Karaite interpretation is based on a methodological error. I added a note at the beginning that all of the Karaite material that deals with the writing and composition of the biblical books should be reexamined and that I therefore chose not to include the Karaite material in the discussion.

15. I note that from Ibn Ezra’s interpretation of Genesis 36 and Exodus 21:1 we learn that other sages that preceded him identified verses in the Torah that were added to it after Moses’s time. Additional verses in the Torah that are later than Moses were identified by Rabbi Moshe Zaltman (comments unjustly attributed to his father, R. Judah ha-Hasid). The position of these interpreters on the question of the timing of the writing of the Torah by Moses cannot be reconstructed.

16. According to Ibn Ezra, Moses transmitted to the people the commandments from the Ten Commandments until the end of the Book of Covenant. Later, after Moses transmitted the commandments orally, he wrote them down.

17. “From the Book of Genesis until the Book of Leviticus,” It is difficult to know whether he meant by the beginning of the book of Leviticus or by the end of it.

18. I wish to thank the readers for their comments. I learned much from them, and they helped me to be more precise. The following is my response.