

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF YOSIPPON AS COMPARED
TO JOSEPHUS AND OTHER SOURCES WITH A DISCUSSION OF
THE LITERARY PROBLEM OF ITS COMPOSITION AND
STYLE

Submitted as partial fulfillment for the requirements leading to
a Rabbinical degree.

February 1, 1937

Alexander David Goode

Microfilmed.

A. Donath

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
II. Outline of the Contents of Yosippon	5
III. The Analysis of Yosippon and His Sources	11
IV. The Language of Yosippon	55
V. The Literary Style of Yosippon	60
VI. The Date of the Composition of Yosippon	65
VII. Where Yosippon was Written	69
VIII. Origin of the Title	71
IX. Use of Yosippon in Medieval Jewish Literature	73
X. The Editions of Yosippon	74
Bibliography	

I. Introduction

The work most often referred to in medieval literature as Yosippon or Joseph ben Gorion, its supposed author, was widely read by the Jews during the Middle Ages. In it they found entrancing legends, heroic exploits, apocryphal tales, and what was accepted as history in those days, all incorporated in a single volume by a writer of some skill. It is a compilation reworked by the author who writes in a clear, almost Biblical Hebrew to give his version of Jewish history till the fall of the second Temple in the year 70 C.E. Mixed with the details of Jewish history are reports of other peoples, especially the Greeks and Romans. Because of its almost instantaneous popularity since it was composed, most probably at the end of the ninth century, when manuscripts of the work were sought from afar, it has come down to the present day in a large number of editions. It has the flavor of the work of pseudo-epigraphic writers who, mixing fact and fancy in their books, ascribed them to ancient authors; e.g. Seder Olam Zutta, History of Rabbi Joshua, Boraitha d. R. Eliezer. Relished by the Jews of the Medieval period as much as the traditional tales of the haggadah, the Yosippon yet has less of the spirit of the ancient haggadah and more of the character of the writings of Josephus and the Apocrypha. It is not, however, Josephus nor a translation of him because the unknown author introduces much matter strange to Josephus. Neither is it a translation of the Arabic work known as the Arabic II Maccabees;

Stories

1. Zunz, L. - Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, Second edition, Frankfort a. M., 1892, p.158
2. Printed in Walton's Polyglot Bible. See note 118 below.

3

nor of the Arabic Josippus; nor of the Latin version of Josephus, although several interesting parallels exist⁴ between Yosippon and these works. The fluent Hebrew is characteristic of the work of a compiler and adapter of other sources. And in fact the Yosippon is hardly more than a paraphrase of certain parts of Josephus and the Apocrypha yet the author weaves his sources together, adding other materials not found in the above-mentioned works, in a manner which stamps his work a coherent unit.

5

In addition to the many Hebrew editions⁵ translations

-
3. See Wellhausen, J. -Der Arabische Josippus, in Abhandlungen der Koniglichen Ges. der Wiss. zu Gottingen, Phil.-Hist. Klass. - New Series I,4,1897. At the suggestion of K. Trieber, Wellhausen examined the text of the Arabic Josippus of which he gives a resume in German with notes, as well as cross-references to the Breithaupt edition of Yosippon and to the so-called II Arabic Maccabees printed in the London Polyglot Bible.
 4. Neubauer, A. - M.J.C. I, p.xii, states Yosippon is a compilation of these works. This view, together with the view of Graetz, that Yosippon is based on an Arabic source will be seen to be untenable in the light of the evidence which will be presented below.
 5. See chapter X below in which the main Hebrew editions and manuscripts are listed. The Berditschev edition begun by Baron Guinzburg in 1896 and published after his death by A. Kahana in 1913 has been used as the basis of this study. It has been supplemented extensively by the Breithaupt's Gotha, 1707,1710, edition, known as the Vulgata, which has his Latin translation and copious notes.

reference?

6

exist in several languages.

The Yosippon was enlarged, perhaps because of its wide use in literature, by the insertion of local stories and legends so that later editions differ as to text and content.

7

The uncritical mind of the Middle Ages accepted the entertaining

6. The following translations are worthy of mention: -

An Ethiopic translation of Yosippon is described by L. Goldschmidt in his Catalogue of the Ethiopic MSS at Frankfurt, 1897, p.5 ff. (cited in a note by A. Neubauer in J.Q.R. o.s. XI, p.699). Budge, History of Alexander the Great, Cambridge, 1889, translates part of the Yosippon corresponding with an Ethiopic translation of the 17th century.

Zeitlin, Josephus on Jesus, p.26, describes a Russian MS of Yosippon which he examined in Leningrad. It is Leningrad MS 262.

Wellhausen, J., op.cit. p.1 summarizes and analyzes the Arabic version which he calls Josippus. He used Paris MS Catalog de Slane, ed. Zotenberg no. 1906. It is dated August 1342 and bears the title "History of the Hebrews, Titled Book of the Maccabees, written by Josippus, also called Joseph ben Gorion". cf. Vogelstein-Rieger, Geschichte der Juden in Rom, Supplement B, page 485, in vol. I, Berlin, 1896 (hereafter indicated by V-R).

An Arabic writer living in Spain, ibn Hazm (d. 1063) knew of an Arabic version based on the Hebrew of a Yemenite (in Leyden MS, catal. no. 1982; cited in J.Q.R. o.s. XI, p.356).

In the eleventh century appeared the Arabic translation of Zechariah ben Said al Yemeni al-Israili, Steinschneider, Cat. Bodl. 1547, 2250; cf. also Jüd. Zeitschrift IX, p.159. Also V-R, p.200.

An English translation published in London 1688 has as its title, "Wars of the Jews."

For other translations and compilations see article in J.E. vol. VII, p.260.

7. Zeitlin, "The Slavonic Josephus" in J.Q.R. n.s. XX, p.39

mixture of fable and fact, of fancy and history, as an authentic historical source. It was first doubted as an authentic source by Scaliger who wrote in his "Elenchus Trihaeresii Nicolai Serarii"⁸ his views as to the unworthiness of Yosippon as a historical work. Since Scaliger the value of Yosippon as history has been correctly proved to be small. Nevertheless its medieval popularity and its influence make it a work well worth preserving, especially since it is an example of medieval literary methods and use of ancient sources. As pure literature it still has value for the modern reader. For the student of the history of history there is ample reward in comparing the Yosippon with its somewhat more trustworthy sources.

8. J.E. VII, p.259

Yosippon is far from being historically reliable. He paints a fabulous picture of legendary wars and conquests, of the Seleucid kingdom, of the Macedonians, of its kings, of the Roman Senate and its 320 members, of the King of Rome, Augustus, and his general Antonius. Even as exaggerated is his account of Jewish history of which he has no conception. Thus the Pharisees are called the party of Hyrcanus II and it was that group which opened the gates to Pompey. Yosippon makes Eleazar High Priest under Hyrcanus II. He magnifies the extent of the Hasmonean Kingdom which covered according to him, all Syria, and which held dominion over all neighboring nations. He has a high regard for the Hasmonean dynasty and shows no trace of the Talmud's criticism of that royal family. However, in defense of Yosippon as a historian, it must be admitted that where he follows a source still known to history, such as Josephus, he is at least as accurate as his source.

II. Outline of the Contents of Yosippon

I. Like the medieval Jewish chronicles, Yosippon begins with the genealogy of Genesis X, telling how mankind began with Adam and how mankind came to be grouped as individual nations.⁹
II. The next section contains details of ancient Roman history, its fables and myths, interwoven with notices on the Babylonian empire.¹⁰ In this section the Yosippon agrees with well known sources on Roman mythology.¹¹ In this section are introduced four biblical characters whose relationship with the history of Rome is patterned after the manner of a Roman chronicle called the Graphia Aureae Urbis Romae.¹² They are as follows: Zefo b. Eliphaz, referred to in Genesis XXXVI: 11,15; uzi, perhaps the same as uz in Genesis X: 23; Zir, the son of Hadadezer, who is mentioned in II Samuel VIII: 3; and finally David, for fear of whom, Romulus is declared to have constructed a wall around Rome.¹³

-
9. Breithaupt's Vulgata edition of Yosippon will be indicated hereafter by the abbreviation B. Guinzburg's edition, based on the Mantua editio princeps will be indicated by M.
10. B. pp. 1-8 ; M. pp. 3-5
11. B. pp. 9-22; M. pp. 5-9
B. is divided arbitrarily into six books and 97 chapters. Book I of B. ends with this section.
12. V-R, op. cit. vol. I, p.188, note 4 refers the reader to the Chronologia Dynastiarum Romanorum in Joh. Henr. Alstedii Thesaurus Chronologiae, 1628, pp. 210-212.
13. V-R, op. cit. p.188; B. pp. 10,11,19,20.

see remarks
to note 26)

III. Yosippon's description of the Persian conquest of Babylonia is by way of introduction to the history of the Jews under the Persians, described in the following section.

IV. The narrative of the history of the Jews in Babylon is composed of a number of individual legends taken from the Apocrypha. They are: Daniel and Habbakuk in the Den of Lions, Daniel and the Priests of Bel, Daniel and the Dragon; Zerubbabel's Wisdom, the Rebuilding of the Temple, and the finding of the Sacred Fire for the Altar, are the subjects of additional legends.

V. Next is related the history of Cyrus, Cambyses, Mordecai and Esther, Darius, and Alexander's visit to Jerusalem on his way to wage war with Darius.

VI. A long narrative, generally considered to be not a genuine part of Yosippon, follows. It is the legend of Alexander's birth, life, and adventures which is to be traced to the ancient work which bears the title Pseudo-Callisthenes.

- 14. B. p. 23-28; M. p.9-12
- 15. B. p. 28-90; M. p.12-34
- 16,17,18. B. pp. 25-46
- 19. B. p. 47-56
- 20. B. p. 57-60
- 21. B. p. 60-63. Cp. II Macc. I: 22 ff.
- 22. B. p. 64-71
- 23. B. p. 72-84
- 24. B. p. 85-90
- 25. B. p. 90
- 26. B. p. 90; B. Book II consists of pp. 23-90; cp. Jos. Ant. XI,8,1 ff.
- 27. B. p. 90-152; M. p.34-57; cf V-R, p.189, note 5. Cf. J. Zacher, Pseudocallisthenes, 1867, p.7; G.L.Romheld, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kritik der Alexandersagen I, Hersfeld 1873, p.6 ff. See below note 85 ff.

*This is in B, Lib I, c.V -
XXII (pp 23-71) & Lib II, c.I -
VIII*

*For the other editions
Bk I (covering B
pp 1-90) consists
of 5 chapters*

58

VII. A brief account of the successors of Alexander follows. ²⁸

Some of the items here parallel Eusebius' Chronography ²⁹ from the 125th to the 190th Olympiad.

VIII. Yosippon's account of Jewish history proper begins with ³⁰ the story of Heliodorus' attempt to loot the Temple at Jerusalem.

It is on the whole an account of the Hasmonean dynasty which ends ³¹ with the death of Simon. It is based on II Greek Maccabees.

28. B. p. 153-167; M. p. 57-61; Book III of B. comprises pp. 90-167.
29. See Beilage, Der Canon des Eusebius im sogenannten Josef b. Gorion. See also V-R, op. cit. p. 486. See below note 117.
30. B. p. 168-172; M. 62 118-121
31. It is interesting to note that the editio princeps p. 42c cites as a source the Sefer Ha-Hasmonai. L. Ginzberg in J.E. I, p. 637 article "Antiochus, Scroll off" (Megillat Antiochus) identifies this Book of the Hasmoneans with the pseudepigraph Megillat Antiochus quoted by Saadiah as "Kitab Bene Hashmonai" (cf Malter, Saadiah, p. 355, p. 173; also J. Mann, J.Q.R. n.s. XI, p. 425). It is not the same as the "Megillat Bet Hashmonai" supposedly quoted in Halakot Gedolot (c. 750). It is a late work written in Babylonia which draws upon I Maccabees, the Talmud, and Megillat Taanith. The book was held in high regard. In Italy in the 13th century it was read in the synagogues on Hanukkah. It was placed often with the other five megillot in the Italian Torah scrolls. It is still used in the liturgy of Yemen. If this is the work which Yosippon used it would limit the Yosippon to a date after this work of the 7-8th century, perhaps not long before Saadiah. Zeitlin, Josephus on Jesus, p. 84 wrongly identifies the Sefer HaHasmonai mentioned in Yosippon with the Megillat Bet Hasmonai referred to in Halakot Gedolot. His statement, furthermore, that the Megillat Bet Hasmonai used Yosippon as a source and not vice versa, is to be questioned. He is interested in dating the Yosippon in the sixth century or earlier and hence hazards such an insubstantial identification of the Sefer HaHasmonai with the Megillat Bet Hashmonai. Yosippon's own statement that he used the Sefer Ha-Hasmonai cannot well be contradicted, unless of course, the reference was added by a glossator. However, there is no indication here of such an addition.

58 Bk. of Ordinary ed. covers pp. 2, 153-197! 7B

See V-R, p. 486: Beilage 3: See Canon etc. as should our quotation read).

The story of the translation of the Septuagint by the seventy Jewish scholars under Eleazar, agreeing for the most part with the Letter of Aristeas and Josephus, follows the incident of Heliodorus.³² Then follow the numerous details of the Maccabean history, based on the account in Maccabees and Josephus.³³ As an example of the close relationship between this part of Yosippon and Josephus Antiquities it is to be observed that Chapter 28, page 257 of Breithaupt's edition of Yosippon opens with almost the same words Josephus uses in Ant. XIII,8,2 to tell of the beginning of the war of Antiochus Sidetes against Hyrcanus I. Both Yosippon and Josephus give the account of that war, of the subsequent joint attack of the former enemies on Arsaces, the Parthian king, and of the tragic end of Antiochus.³⁴

The final section begins with Herod's reign and ends with the revolt of the Jews against Rome which led to the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E.³⁵ As will be indicated, the writer of Yosippon used the Latin paraphrase of Josephus' Jewish War, Hegesippus, for his recital of the events occurring during the war between the Jews and Romans.

-
32. B. p. 172-176; M. p.63-65; Here ends Book IV of B.
 33. B. p.176-562; M. p.65-121; B. Book V. B. p.251-468 parallels Ant. XIII,1,4 to Ant. XVI,6. Many details in which Yosippon and Josephus agree will be cited in the chapter analyzing the sources of Yosippon.
 34. Trieber, K. - Zur Kritik des Gorionides in Nachrichten der Konigl. Ges. der Wiss. zu Göttingen, 1895, p. 401.
 35. B. p. 562-886; M. p. 121 - 271.

III of ordinary ends on p. 1777 B

Ordinary Bk IV ends with B p. 389

In addition to the above noted contents of Yosippon there are four main sections which seem to interrupt the continuity to be observed in Yosippon. These have therefore been termed insertions which were not part of the original Yosippon. One of these interpolations tells of Hannibal's war with Rome³⁶, another of Caesar's birth,³⁷ the third about the seduction of the Roman matron Paulina,³⁸ and the last, declared a genuine part by some authorities, relates the scene of the crowning of Vespasian³⁹ as emperor.

The unity of the book as it now stands has been questioned by Konrad Trieber.⁴⁰ He would date the work in the fifth century when it was no more than an account of the history of the Jews during the period of the Second Temple which ended with the dedication of Herod's Temple. He therefore excludes as ungenuine the long account of Alexander's travels, the history of the Diadoche, the genealogy that opens the work, the references to Roman mythology, the entire account of Jewish history after Herod, all of which according to Trieber, was added to the original Yosippon by a writer who used Hegesippus as his exclusive source.

-
- 36. B. p.221-226; M. p. 77-79. The fact that this account does not occur in Josephus is the principal reason for terming it interpolated. It may be taken from Livius.
 - 37. B. p.349-358; M. p. 118-125. It is not in Josephus either. It is, however, mentioned as in Yosippon by R. Isaac b. Samuel. Cf. Zunz, op. cit. p. 161, note a.
 - 38. B. p. 529; M. p. 181. Singularly enough this passage occurs also in Josephus Ant. XVIII,3,4 and hence may be original.
 - 39. B. p.667-673. Not to be found in Josephus, however.
 - 40. Trieber, op. cit. p. 401

The extreme views of Trieber are hardly supported by the evidence which will be adduced from Yosippon. The language, style, sources, references to historical events and conditions, and knowledge of geography which are to be found in Yosippon all point to a planned continuity and inherent unity of the work. The study of these aspects of Yosippon, together with the question of date and place of composition are the subject of examination in the following pages. The next chapter will analyze the sources used by Yosippon and in the course of that analysis it will become clear that Yosippon is a unified, coherent narrative.

Chapter Three: The Analysis of Yosippon and His Sources

A. The Section on Genealogy

Yosippon opens with a genealogical list, based on Genesis X, which is found in all editions except that of Sebastian Munster (Basel 1541) who regarded it as not genuine in Yosippon. Therefore his edition omits what corresponds to the first two chapters of Breithaupt's edition of the Yosippon. Yet the Yosippon was known to have contained this section as early as the eleventh century, for it is found in a Ms. ascribed to Jerahmeel ben Shelomoh.⁴¹ It was known as part of Yosippon in the twelfth century when it is referred to by Abraham ibn Ezra⁴² and David Kimchi⁴³. A Genizah book-list mentions a Yosippon MS by its opening words "Adam begat Shesh", just as in our present Yosippon.⁴⁴ A Karaite writer, Abul Faraj Furkan ibn Asad, of Jerusalem, mentions in his shorter commentary on the Pentateuch (to Genesis X), written in 1054, the book of Joseph b. Gorion which speaks of the sons of Noah.⁴⁴ This section is also

-
120. 41. J.Q.R., o.s. XI, p.364 ff. This Jerahmeel, a native of Magna Graecia (South Italy) states that he collected passages from the work of Joseph b. Gorion and from other works on the history of the Jews and put them in one MS. This MS is Bodleian MS Heb. d. 11, 388 leaves. cf. Neubauer, Monatss. 1887, p.504 ff. The extracts from Yosippon which end on fol. 197 are equivalent to the material in B. 311 ff. Following this is an addition cited in M.J.C. I, p.190.
42. Comm. on Psalm 110:5.
43. Sefer Hashoroshim, s.v. יְהוֹשֻׁעַ and chapter 67 to the end.
44. Cited in Mann, J. -Texts and Studies I, p.668, note 79; II, p.35, note 64.

referred to in the Sefer Hayashar as well as in Nachmanides' Commentary on Chronicles.^{44a} The fact that the genealogy is thus seen to be present in a number of different MSS. as early as the eleventh century would point strongly to its being an integral part of the Yosippon. Therefore Munster's contention, although supported by the fact that the Arabic Josippus also lacks the genealogy, must be set aside.

Where did Yosippon obtain his genealogy? Most probably from the Bible whose list he adapted to his own purpose. Certainly not from Josephus Ant. I,6,1 for there the descendants of Gomer are identified as the Ashkenazim but Yosippon (B.p.1) calls them the Franks.⁴⁵

2

44a. cf Zunz, G.V. , p. 161, note a.

45. This restriction of the Ashkenazim to the Franks of France would seem to date the passage after the ninth century when the Germanic tribes dissolved their confederacy. The French monarchy was founded by the Franks, a Germanic tribe living on the Rhine. They are referred to again in B. pp.354,519, and 547.

B. The Section on Roman Ancient History.

Before beginning the history of Rome, Yosippon describes the divisions of mankind and the lands which each race inhabits. In giving his list of the races of the world the author shows a knowledge of geography which is surprising in a writer of his time which was not later than early in the tenth century. It may be that he derives part of his knowledge of distant lands and peoples from the Letter to the Chazars (953).⁴⁶ It is to be noted that several place-names bear Italian spellings. Thus Yosippon mentions "Danisci" (דנישני), Danes who inhabit Dinemarca (דינמרקא)⁴⁷ (B. p.8). Yosippon knows of Ireland, England, Saxons, and Scots.

46. V-R, op. cit. p.187, note 5. B. p.3 names ten peoples as in the letter to the Chazars (cf Carmoly, Itinéraires, p.49):

כניני	in both.	כניני	(Benjamin of Tudela I, 96, II, 46)
פציני or פציני	equals	כניני	(?)
אליקנוס	"	אורי	
כנילני	in both	אורי	
רובני	equals	סאורי	
טורקי	"	חרקא	
כוז	"	אורי	
זכוק	"	זאנור	
אונורי	"	אונור	
טילסין	"	תירוש	

; these people live along the river .ה:תל. or .אטל the Volga. cf. Gratz, Ges. vol. II, p.187, 330 and M.J.C. p.590 where we read:

עד נהר אחל שהיו שם נורי. כוזרי.

The letter to the Chazars was written by Hisdai ibn Shaprut in 953. See Mann, J. op. cit. I, p.17, 18, note 26

47. M p.93; B. p.547; M p.97; M. p.112 - B. p.728; M p.27 - B.p.573 As to the reference to the Scots see Egesippus V: 15

doubtful rather 945/6 see text studies II, 1457 all this, taken from V-R, needs new must rec. verification

for the year 945/6 see text studies

ditto

The Italian rendering of place names in Yosippon and his familiarity with Italian geography point to Italy as the home of Yosippon's composer. He may even have lived in Rome. He uses the Italian "sci" which he renders by ש instead of the more correct פ as in his spelling Scythen (B. I, 11) . ש'פ as also Scipio and Scythopolis (B III, 15-17). Furthermore Yosippon knows the environs of Sorrento well enough to describe a naptha source nearby (B I, 4).

Yosippon writes of ancient Roman history and mythology in such a manner as to suggest that he used similar Christian works which were written in Rome about the same time (940). These are the *Die Mirabilia* and the *Graphia aureae urbis Romae*, already referred to. Trieber, in accordance with his singular theory that most of Yosippon is not original declares the sections on Roman ancient history and mythology to be the work of another writer. He declares the section to be not earlier than the eleventh century.

48. Italian geography is described in the following passages: B. 6-9; 12; 17-19; 22, 156, 159, 223, 323, 353, 391, 667-672. He names such places as: Albano (12), Benevent (12) Campagna (7, 9, 14), Canusium (222), Capua (158) Otranto (391), Po (6), Porto (10), Romagna (20), Messina (157), Sorrento (19), Syracus (156), Tarento (498), Tessino (6), Trani (869), Venusia (222), Napoli (19, 20), Tiber (22, 8, 9). This list is given in Zunz, op. cit. p. 159, note a.
49. Benjamin of Tudela, according to Trieber, op. cit. p. 400, describes the same phenomenon.
50. Guedemann, *-Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur*, vol. II, pp. 41-42 so states.
51. Trieber, op. cit. p. 400. See above note 41.

Likewise the references to Goths, Franks, and Berbers are taken⁵² by Trieber to be later additions to Yosippon. Still his contention is hardly liable of substantiation since the people mentioned could very well have been known by Yosippon at the beginning of the tenth century.

In relating his tales from Roman mythology Yosippon tells of the rape of the Sabine women (M.p.4), of the adventures of Zefo, the son of Eliphaz, who finally settles in the Campagna valley and rules over Italy for fifty years (M p.5-6).^{52a} Latinus succeeds him and seizes the great aqueduct which Aeneas, king of Africa, built to bring to his wife the water of her native land for which she pined⁵³ (Mp7). Then follow other Roman kings till the time of Romulus who is a contemporary of David and in fear of whom he builds a wall 45 miles long around his city (M.8). The Romans abolish the kingdom with the death of Tarchinus who is slain because of his scandalous affair with a Roman matron and Rome thenceforth is ruled by the Senate composed of 320 members (M.p.9). He mentions a mythical war

52. Trieber, op. cit. p. 409.

52a. R. Bechai cites this account from Yosippon as does David Kimchi. cf. Zunz, op. cit. p.161, note a

53. Yosippon gives here a garbled version of the material found in Virgil's Aeneid Book VII. cf B p.11, note 9; p.15, note 9,10. In the opinion of Wellhausen, op. cit. p.48, Yosippon obtained his knowledge of Roman mythology from a late Latin chronographer and colored it with Jewish fantasies such as the traditional view that Rome is a descendant of Edom. In the commentary which is attributed to Rashi, on I Chronicles XI, 17, the story of Aeneas aqueduct is quoted from Yosippon. cf. B. p.15, note 10.

between Rome and Babylon, 205 years after the end of the kingdom during which the course of the River Tiber is changed as protection against the ships of the enemy. He speaks familiarly of the topography of the city of Rome. When the Romans heard that Nebuchadrezzar had captured Jerusalem they sent him gifts (M 9). With this statement Yosippon completes the transition to the Babylonian Empire and begins the account of Babylonian history which leads up to his version of the stories of Daniel and Zerubabel.

C. The Section on Daniel.

Yosippon finds it expedient to incorporate in his history of the Second Temple the legends associated with its rebuilding. Thus Daniel is regarded as an important figure by Yosippon for he was a prominent figure at the court of the Persian rulers who made the rebuilding of the Temple possible. Furthermore it is the method of Yosippon to relate incidents which though widely separate in locale and type still occurred at the same time. Thus he wrote that Romulus was a contemporary of David. Likewise he recounts some apocryphal legends associated with Daniel because he places Daniel in the time of Cyrus, in whose first year the Temple was rebuilt, as also related in the account in Ezra, (M. p.16). The four legends associated with Daniel are as follows: 1. Daniel's interpretation of Belshazzar's warning (Daniel IV:25) which leads to his prominent position at court;⁵⁴ 2. the apocryphal tale of Daniel being fed by Habbakuk when he was incarcerated in the lions' den;⁵⁵ 3. Daniel's victory over the priests of Bel, likewise taken from the Apocrypha;⁵⁶ 4. Daniel slays a dragon by a clever device, also based on the Apocrypha, not so much the Greek version, however, as the Latin,⁵⁷

54. M.p.10 ff. B pp25-32. cp. Ant. X,11,7 which has a longer version.

55. B.33-37; M 13 f. Cf. Charles edition of the Apocrypha, Daniel I,652.

56. B 40-42; M 17. Daniel discomfits the priests of Bel by sprinkling flour on the floor of their Temple so that their footprints in the morning prove that they and not the idol have consumed the sacrifices offered to the idol.

57. The dragon is called "tanin" in Yosippon. Daniel slays the dragon which had demanded human sacrifices by feeding it a ball of pitch, fat, and hair in which was concealed sharp spikes. This detail is not in the Greek account of the Apocrypha.

which seems more probable in the light of the fact that Yosippon also depended heavily upon the Latin Hegesippus. The legends of Bel and the Dragon were already present in the eleventh century when Jerahmeel composed his manuscript containing among other matter extracts from Yosippon. Jerahmeel himself writes that besides translating into Hebrew the Aramaic "Song of the Three Children" ⁵⁸ he used Theodotion and "Yosippon be-Yisrael" as his ⁵⁹ source for the story of Bel and the Dragon. The same legend occurs also in the midrashic collections, to which, however, it ⁶⁰ may have been added from Yosippon. Raymund Martini refers to the legend in his Pugio Fidei (ed. Voisin p.742) which he declares he obtained from the now non-extant Genesis Rabbah Major which Neubauer has identified with the Genesis Rabbah de Rabbah, an ⁶¹ extract of which he published in his Book of Tobit (p.39); Martini called it "the great Bereshith Rabbah of R. Moses had- ⁶² Darshon", who lived in Narbonne about 1075 according to Neubauer. ⁶³

58. See Gaster, in P.S.B.A., 1894,95 and Perles, J., in Gratz Jubilee 1887, p.22 ff. cited in Neubauer, J.Q.R.o.s. XI,p.366.
59. On fol. 113 of Jerahmeel's MS; in M.J.C. I, p.xx
60. It is found in the Warsaw edition of Genesis Rabbah to Gen. 28:12 in Section 68, paragraph 20, p.148. However, in the critical Theodor's edition, p.790, the legend, in a much truncated form is presented as a late addition to the midrash. cf. jer. Nedarim III,7d; jer Shev. III,4d. See Neubauer, The Book of Tobit, 1878, Oxford.
61. Tobit, p.viii
62. ibid. p.xix; cf. also M.J.C., xxi
63. ibid.

64

Delitzsch relates that Raymundus Martini quoted this fragment of the Bel legend from an old Hebrew midrash in the 13th century. The fact that Martini knew a Semitic version of the legend which occurs also in other Hebrew midrashic sources would point perhaps to a Semitic original preceding the account in the Apocrypha. This Gaster believes to have found in an Aramaic form in the Chronicles⁶⁵ of Jerahmeel which he dates as early as the tenth century. Although the legend occurs in Theodotion's translation of the Bible and Apocrypha (Greek) Gaster sees in the use of Hebraisms and its occurrence in the midrash evidence that the story is ancient and was written originally in Hebrew. Furthermore, the fact that Yosippon has the legend indicates a Hebrew or Aramaic source for the Yosippon has some details not to be found in the Greek LXX or in Theodotion. Jerahmeel and Yosippon agree, thus, that the dragon died because of eating a ball of pitch in which were concealed spikes, a detail which disagrees with the Greek account. These legends are in the oldest known MSS of Yosippon and hence may be regarded as an integral part of it. Furthermore, continues Gaster, Jerahmeel had another source in addition to Yosippon for his version of the legends, as can readily be seen from the fact that Jerahmeel gives two versions,⁶⁶ one as in Yosippon and the other from another source. The Yosippon extracts cited by Jerahmeel are entirely different from the Aramaic

64. Delitzsch, - De Habacuci Prophetarum vita, Leipzig 1842, pp.32,33 cited by Gaster, "The Unknown Aramaic Original of Theodotion's Additions to the Book of Daniel", in P.S.B.A., 1894, p.282
65. Gaster, op. cit. pp.280, 312; 1895, p.75 ff.
66. ibid. p.290

an
hand
have
used
of Gaster's tr.
of Jerahmeel

*with
the
original
as usual
more
likely
probably*

texts of the additions to Daniel which he cites. His source then must have been an Aramaic original used by Theodotion whose version differs considerably from the LXX as regards the Bel and Dragon legends.⁶⁷ Yosippon may depend on this unknown Semitic original rather than upon a Greek source such as the Apocrypha. The fact that the Arabic Josippus does not contain the legends may indicate that the legends found their way into Yosippon from the Midrash or other Semitic sources.⁶⁸ The presence of the legends in Yosippon in the eleventh century is attested by Jerahmeel so that in any case the legends, if not original in Yosippon, became part of it not long after its appearance.

D. The Zerubabel Account.

Zerubabel is introduced as Daniel's successor chosen by Daniel himself whose desire to retire because of the infirmities of advanced age can be granted only on the condition that he give Darius an advisor as wise as he. The youth Daniel selects is Zerubabel b. Shaaltiel b. Jochonia of the "Adath ha-Golah". Daniel then retires to Shushan where he dies. Zerubabel's wisdom is tested in a trial of wits with two of the counsellors of

-
67. Gaster, op. cit. 1895, p.75. Theodotion lived in the third century C.E. during the time of Commodus. Gaster sees a possible identification of Theodotion with the Todos who is mentioned in the Talmud.
68. See below note 291.
69. M. pp.19-20

Darius on the subject of the strongest thing in the world. His argument proving that woman is stronger than the power of wine or of a king is declared superior to that of his opponents. Here Yosippon takes the opportunity to display his rhetorical gifts. His language is a model of lucidity and simplicity. Each point is clearly developed and presented convincingly. His tendency to moralize is apparent in an anti-climactic statement that even above the power of woman is the value of truth.⁷⁰ Yosippon's source here may be the Apocrypha. It is lacking in the Arabic Josippus. At this point some confusion is apparent in the text of Yosippon. Zerubabel is described as demanding for his reward for winning the contest the rebuilding of the Temple. Darius sends to Cyrus of Media, who is his son-in-law, to aid in the project. Cyrus offers aid to all those who wish to return. Darius dies and is succeeded by Cyrus who in his first year as king of the joint kingdoms restores the Temple. Those Jews who return to Palestine are led by Ezra, Nehemiah, Mordecai, Joshua, and Zerubabel (M p.25). Yet the account of the return had been previously related after the story of Daniel in the den of lions (M p.16,17). In the earlier narrative the exiles are led by Ezra, Ahikim, Joshua, and Mordecai. The earlier account also relates the enmity of Sanballat, which is lacking in the second account. The confusion is no doubt the result of the copyists' method of fixing the text, for he used several MSS to enable him to fill

70. M, p.20-24; B. p.47 ff. The legend is also found in Josephus Ant. XI,3,1 ff. There is a variant in III Esdras ch. III, IV.

lacunae and finding two varying accounts of the return to
71
Palestine he incorporated both.

E. The Temple.

When the Temple is rebuilt by the returned exiles there is no sacred fire with which to kindle the flame on the altar where the sacrifices are to be offered. An old priest remembers that Jeremiah had concealed the sacred fire in a well. Water from the well is sprinkled on the altar and bursts into flame. This flame lasts throughout the period of the II Temple until the second exile. The ark, however, is not restored because Jeremiah had hidden it in a cave and it will be returned only when he will
72
return to earth with the prophet Elijah (M p.26,27).

-
71. Kahana in the introduction to D. Guinzberg's edition, p.8, note 1, tells of the task of the first printers and copyists who had to be both critics and editors. It was necessary to separate the glosses from the genuine passages but still some were overlooked. See M. pp.103, 223. On p. 10 there are two accounts of Romulus. See also pp.121, 112. Lacunae are seen on p. 6 where the letter one would expect is missing, and on p.230 where Strabo's statement is lacking. Mosconi, in his preface to Yosippon, published in Ozar Tov, 1878, I, p.17023 tells of the difficulty of the early copyist in determining the text.
72. Cp. II Macc I ff. B. p.59 ff. The account in II Maccabees of the finding of the fire is clearer than Yosippon's version. Perhaps Yosippon did not fully comprehend the Greek and somewhat confused the story. The tale of Jeremiah hiding the ark is also taken from the same source. It occurs nowhere else in Jewish sources. It is interesting to note also that the stories are not original in Maccabees itself but is part of an epistle added to the beginning of the apocryphal work. Although lacking in the Arabic the stories seem an integral part of Yosippon since they contribute to the account of the rebuilding of the Temple.

F. Esther.

The exploits of Cyrus are next narrated. Yosippon cites as his sources the Book of the Medes and Persians, and the Roman Archives. Yosippon then gives his version of the story of Esther. It differs somewhat from that of the Bible. Thus, Haman hates all Jews because of what Saul had done to his ancestors, the Amalekites. He plots against Mordecai because the conspirators whom Mordecai had discovered to the king were his own aides. Then, Yosippon adds the apocryphal dream of Mordecai (in M. column 54), the prayer of Mordecai, and the prayer of Esther. The Esther account in Yosippon while a condensation of the familiar story adds details from the Latin and Greek versions.

G. Alexander.

The legend that Alexander the Great visited Jerusalem, intending to erect his statue in the Temple, but was dissuaded in a dream by the High Priest, is the next story in Yosippon. The account here is much like that given by Josephus in the Antiquities. The

73. B. p.72; M. p.28 ff. cf. Jos. Ant. XI, 6, 1 ff. which is closer to the account in the Bible. Yosippon agrees with Josephus in calling Haman an Amalekite. However, Yosippon follows either the LXX or Latin Vulgate account of Esther.
74. See I Samuel XV:8; Esther IX:6; XII:6
75. In Latin Vulgate ch. 14, 1 ff. for Esther. Chapter X for the dream, taken from the Greek. Chapter XIII of Latin Vulgate for Mordecai's prayer.
76. B. p. 84 ff. M. p.32 ff
77. Ant. XI,8,4. Some differences are evident. Thus Josephus names the High Priest as Jaddua but Yosippon calls him Ananias (Hannaniah). The name is not given in the editio princeps.

This
I looked
into his
intention
as to
make
the city
viz. destroy it

Jews show their gratitude to Alexander for sparing the Temple by naming all children born that year after him. The High Priest advises him to wage war against Darius for he is the .ק'ןןן. ד'פף .of the prophecy of Daniel, which will destroy the Persian kingdom. Alexander grants the request of⁷⁸ Sanballat to build a Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim for his son-in-law Manasseh. Yosippon tells that the Temple existed⁷⁹ till Hyrcanus, who conquered Edom, destroyed it. The story⁸⁰ of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem occurs also in the Talmud⁸¹ and in the Megillat Taanith. However, it is purely legendary since Alexander never went to Jerusalem but remained at Tyre while his general Parmenio went, as Josephus informs us. The story of Alexander's visit arose as the result of a mistake in the Talmud which confuses John Hyrcanus (128 B.C.E.) and Alexander Janneaus, his son, who is in turn confused with Alexander⁸² the Great.

-
78. This could not be the Sanballat of Nehemiah's time. Either there were two men of this name or it is a mistake.
79. of Ant. XIII, 9, 1 and War I, 2, 6
80. Yoma 69a
81. M.T. IX. The Talmud passage is taken from the scholium of M.T. The Talmud, however, gives as the date of the Day of Gerizim, on which one is not to fast, the 25th of Tsveth. M.T. gives the 21st of Kislev. cf. also Seder Ha Dorot. cf. Graetz, Ges. III, note 1, p. 469.
82. The account in M.T. III and Gen. R. 61, p. 129 which tells of Alexander dying in the Holy of Holies after being warned by Gabiah b. Pessisah (Cossem) cannot apply to Alexander but refers alone to Ptolemy Philopater, the Heliodorus of the story in II Maccabees. cf. Sanh. 91a. cp. also Pseudo-Callisthenes, Codex C, I, 30 ff.

One would expect that Yosippon's account of Jewish history, especially of the period of the Second Temple, in connection with which he introduces the Alexander legend, would be continued after the legend. Instead there is interposed here a large section dealing with the parentage and life of Alexander. Many scholars have characterized the section as interpolated in Yosippon. The first⁸³ to remark that the passage is spurious was Azariah dei Rossi.⁸⁴ Breithaupt follows Azariah dei Rossi in declaring it an insertion. The insertion is composed of two sections, one being the legend that Alexander's father was the Egyptian magician Nectanebus and the second long section dealing with his life and exploits till his death. The interpolation goes back to the ancient Greek work⁸⁵ called Pseudo-Callisthenes. The interpolator used for his purpose, however, the Latin translation of Archpresbyter Leo, which is called Historia Alexandri magni, regis Macedonias, de proeliis, written⁸⁶ about 950, or a generation or two after Yosippon was composed.

83. Meor Enayim, Mantua 1574, II, 19, fol. 86b.

84. See Breithaupt's Preface, note 91 ff.

85. The Greek work is now lost. It goes back to the third century and was written in Alexandria.

86. See I. Levy, Kovetz al Yad, Berlin 1886, "Toldot Alexander". Leo went to Constantina at the behest of the Dukes of Campania, John and Marinus (941-965), and brought back many Greek MSS among them the Alexander legends of Pseudo-Callisthenes which, as Leo himself declares in his introduction to the Historia de Proeliis, he translated into Latin. See below p. 65. Yosippon could not have inserted the legends of Alexander since they first became known in Europe about fifty years after his work was completed. As indicated in the chapter on the date of Yosippon it was written c. 900.

A large amount of evidence is at hand which corroborates the contention that the Alexander account is interpolated in Yosippon. Thus the Arabic Josippus and the editio princeps⁸⁷ lack the Nectanebus part of the Alexander legend. The manuscript described by Wellhausen contains the rest of the legend but in a different script, indicating it was added by a later hand.⁸⁸ The second half of the Alexander Romance agrees with the Greek account found in the Leyden MS 93 of the 15th century (Palermo ?)^{88a} I. Levy has shown the close connection between Yosippon and the Toldot Alexander and on the basis of internal and external evidence declares that the Alexander account in Yosippon was added from the Toldot Alexander which⁸⁹ is a Hebrew translation of the Arabic version of Leo's Historia.

-
87. It is entirely lacking in the Oxford Arabic Yosippon, for Neubauer so wrote to Levy, op. cit. p.xii; nor is it in the Paris MS 1280. The Nectanebus legend according to J. Gagnier, cited in Wellhausen, op. cit. p.49, Josippon ex Hebraeo Latine vertit (Oxon. 1706) pp39-94, comes from a late Latin redaction of the Gesta Alexandrii, Bodl. See also V-R, op. cit. p.189, note 5. cp. Julius Zacher, Pseudo-Callisthenes 1867, p.7; G.L.Romheld, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kritik der Alexandersagen I, Hersfeld 1873, p.6 ff.
88. Wellhausen, op. cit. p.45 f.
- 88a. V-R, op. cit. p.189. Cf. also Beilage 2: Die Quellen des Alexanderromans im Sogenannten Josef b. Gorion. The legends are ancient and as found in Yosippon are close to the original Pseudo-Callisthenes. An interpolator adds a Jewish reference to the descendants of Jonadab ben Rechab of II Kings X:15 and Jeremiah XXXV:6. It is p.24d of the editio princeps and on p. 125 of B.
89. Levy, op. cit. p.v ff.

Levy argues that the germane part of the role of Alexander in Yosippon is that dealing with his visit to Jerusalem and then going on to fight Darius. The Nectanebus legend of his birth and early years is added. The London MS 145 of the Toldot Alexander according to its Introduction was written by Samuel ibn Tibbon in the 12th century. The separate existence of the Toldot Alexander which is so similar to the account in Yosippon would point strongly to the circumstance that the Toldot is the basis of the passage in Yosippon which was added after the tenth century work of Leo became popular in a Hebrew translation. It is highly improbable that the several MSS of the Toldot were⁹⁰ taken from Yosippon. Furthermore, comparison of the Yosippon

90. Levy, I. op. cit. p. xiii mentions several such MSS. Immanuel b. Jacob Bonfilio of Turasu, Baal Shesh Kenafayim wrote a Hebrew version of the Historia de Proeliis: it is MS Paris no. 750; Turin A. VII.6 in Peyron's Catalogue no. CCXVIII. The Paris MS. was copied by Hayim, grandson of Joseph b. Daniel b. Elijah b. Azriel Minici. The Turin MS. was written by Leon Judah Joshua Yazia dei Rossi to Zechariah Benjamin Panzi Yazia. Immanuel b. Jacob Bonfilio translated it word for word from the Historia de Proeliis of Archpresbyter Leo. He added to his copy sections from the writings of Alharizi as well as chapter 18 of Yosippon and other parts of Yosippon.

However, the Parma MS. 1087, 2 is based on the Alexander account in Yosippon. It may also be possible that the various MS. of the Toldot Alexander derive either from Yosippon or from the same source used for the account in Yosippon.

lio / Tarascon

No name!
RHS =
70 2421
3' 11' 7' 13'
/ 11/5

G.
Finzi

with the extant manuscripts of the Toldot reveals that
the source of the latter is not Yosippon.⁹¹ For the
latter opens with the account of Nectaneus who is por-
trayed as the seducer of Olympias, wife of Phillip of
Macedon, and thus the real father of Alexander the Great.
In Yosippon, of course, the Alexander account opens with
the trip to Jerusalem and since this is lacking in the
Toldot it would tend to prove that Yosippon is not the
source of the Toldot else the story of the trip would
have been extracted also along with the following tale.

rather weak

The existence of an entire literature about Alexander
minimizes the possibility that Yosippon was the first to
translate Leo's Historia or to use a translation of it.
He did not have the Greek original for Leo discovered it
some time after Yosippon was composed. Had Yosippon used

91. I. Levy, op. cit. p.11 shows that contrary to Azariah
dei Rossi's statement in Meor Eynaim 19,234, ed. Cassel
that Samuel ibn Tibbon's copy of the Toldot Alexander
was an exact copy of Yosippon, the Toldot is not taken
from Yosippon. The MS, London 145, is the same as
Yosippon for the first 8 pages but differs thereafter
although having the same content in general. Paris
MS. 671 also differs from the London MS except in the
last section of both. Both the London and Paris MSS
have sections not found in the Historia de Proeliis,
probably from an Arabic source, according to Levy.
See V-R, op. cit. p.483 for comparison of Yosippon
and his sources on the Alexander legends. V-R, p.189,
note 5 shows that Yosippon agrees with the Cod. Leyden
No.93, Cod. Paris No. 1685; Cod. Paris Supplement No. 113
on the passage which deals with the Well of Eternal Life,
lacking in Leo's Historia. cp. Levy, R.E.J. II, 293 ff.
All agree on Alexander's air journey. cp. jer. A.Z. III,
1,24c; Num. R. 13; Pirke d. R. Eliezer 11.

92

an Hebrew source it could readily be observed. The fact remains that the interpolation cannot precede Leo's Historia de Proeliis. It is not in the Arabic. Neither is it in the Yosippon compilation which Neubauer ascribes to Jerahmeel.^{92a} Most likely the four MSS used by Mosconi did not all have the Alexander account but finding it in one of the manuscripts he used Mosconi added it into his own copy which became the basis of the editio princeps.⁹³ He may even have taken it over from Samuel ibn Tibbon's Toldot Alexander under the mistaken conviction that that work was identical with the version in Yosippon. The interpolation may have been taken from Tibbon's work by an earlier copyist also. There are a number of close parallels in the Alexander accounts in both the Yosippon and the Toldot Alexander.⁹⁴ This could very well be since Tibbon lived long enough after the time of Yosippon and

-
92. Yosippon did not know the Talmud. The Talmudic phrases and references which Zunz cites as evidence of Yosippon's acquaintance with the Talmud are not part of the original Yosippon but were added by a later copyist. cp. Zunz, G.V. 2nd ed. p.160, note a.
- 92a. M.J.C. p.XIX; cf. also Levy, R.E.J. 28:147.
93. Mosconi wrote about 1350. Jacob Bonfilio who translated Leo's Historia de Proeliis wrote about 1340-1356. Samuel ibn Tibbon of Lunel wrote his copy about 1199-1204. cf. R.E.J. III, p.238-275, art. by I. Levy. For an extract of the text of the Historia de Proeliis see R.E.J., III, p.263. It is Paris MS. Lat. Novv. Acq. 174
94. See Kovetz II, p.57, note 10; p.77, note 5 ff.

Leo to have used an Arabic translation of Leo's work.

The inclusion of the Alexander legends in such a work as the popular Yosippon is easy to understand in the light of the fact that the Jews of the Middle Ages were familiar with Alexander from a variety of sources,

95. A clue tending to corroborate the theory that Tibbon's work came to be added to Yosippon is found in the following circumstances: Judah Ha Dassi in Eshkol Hakofer, p.60,1,2 (1148) speaks of pygmies in much the same manner as the legend of Alexander who is said to have encountered pygmies (pitheces) in India, is related by Samuel ibn Tibbon in his Toldot Alexander (in Kovetz II, p.76, note 5) but which detail is not found in Leo's Historia de Proeliis. Yosippon has the same detail almost word for word (M p.49; B. p.122). Yosippon has this account as added by some copyist from Tibbon's manuscript for if Yosippon originally had the Alexander account as in the Historia de Proeliis, like it, he would not have any reference to the dwarfs. In addition the parallels between the work of Samuel ibn Tibbon and Yosippon are few, thus pointing more to a casual interpolator at work in Yosippon than to complete dependence of Yosippon upon Samuel ibn Tibbon, in which case one would expect complete similarity of language detail, which is far from being the case.

Compare J.Q.R. VI, n.s. p.354-355, Hurwitz, "Pygmy Legends". See also the Letters of Prester John, published by Neubauer, Kovetz al Yad IV, 12-68 and Eisenstein, Ozar Midrashim II, 467-73, N.Y. 1916.

Latin, Hebrew, and Arabic. They already knew of him from
⁹⁶
the Talmud and Midrash. The Hebrew works incorporating
legends about Alexander, based on Arabic works are Harizi's
Musare Ha-philosofim; a work named Sod Ha Sodot; and the
⁹⁷
Sefer Toldot Alexander. The work having a Latin source
⁹⁸
is that of Jacob Bonfilio who translated Leo's Historia de
Proeliis used also by the interpolator of Yosippon.

The legends begin with the tale of Nectanebus' seducing
⁹⁹
Olympia and becoming Alexander's father. He is a magician
who turns himself into a serpent to gain access to her.
Plutarch also speaks of a serpent found with Olympias.

-
96. The account in Yoma 69a where Alexander meets the High Priest has already been mentioned. The Canaanites, Egyptians, and Africans contend with the Jews before Alexander in Sanh. 91a; M.T. III; Gen. R. 61. Alexander converses with the "zikne negev" (gymnosophists) in Tamid 32a; cf. Ber. R. 33; Tanhuma ch. 6; jer. B.M. II, 8c. Alexander's encounter with the Amazons is found in Lev. R. #27.

L. Donath, Die Alexandersage in Talmud und Midrash, Fulda 1873, presents the theory that the Alexander legends cited above were originated by the Jews about the time of Apion as apologetic literature in defense of their equality as citizens with the Greeks in Palestine and Egypt. These legends were incorporated in Pseudo-Callisthenes, written about the third century and then spread into the Arab-Persian literature. cf. Weismann, Alexanderlied, for this literature, Donath points out a number of Jewish additions in the Pseudo-Callisthenes itself. Codex C I, 30 ff., II, 24, 28, 43 are clearly Jewish, even mentioning Isaiah VI. cp. Contra Apionem VI; IV, 29 may be based on Numbers Rabbah #19 which speaks of the nations being destroyed in the Arnon Valley. The Koran, ch. XVIII, incorporates a Jewish source in describing as a Messiah a person called Du'l-Karnaim, which is the title used in connection with Alexander.

97. Levi, I. R.E.J. III, 238-275; Zunz, op. cit. p.160, note 2 e.
98. ibid.
99. M. p.35

Nectanebus is killed by Alexander. Alexander masters the
steed Bucephalus, ¹⁰⁰ succeeds his father who is killed by
¹⁰¹ Pausanias, ¹⁰² and begins his conquest of the world. He
¹⁰³ conquers Darius. He journeys to India and on the way
encounters fabulous creatures, monsters, and natural wonders. ¹⁰⁴
He conquers ¹⁰⁵ Parus, king of India. He has a contest of wits
with the Indian sages. ¹⁰⁶ He writes to Aristotle about all the
wonders he has seen. ¹⁰⁷ He has an intrigue with Queen Candici, ¹⁰⁸
encounters the Amazons, and visits Atlanta, city of the Sun. ¹⁰⁹
He dies at 32 and is buried in Alexandria. ¹¹⁰

The narrative, although highly reminiscent of the life of Alexander given by Plutarch, is yet obviously quite different in all respects. It is extremely improbable that the account in Yosippon and the other Alexander works are based on the essay of Plutarch.

-
100. M. p.41
101. M. p.44
102. M. p.46
103. M. p.47
104. M. p.49
105. M. p.51
106. M. p.52
107. M. p.54
108. M. p.56
109. M. p.57
110. M. p.57

H. Alexander's Successors.

The section which begins with a brief account of the success-
 111
 ors of Alexander contains also short notices on the legend of
 112
 the translation of the LXX by Eleazar and the seventy elders,
 113
 on the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus, on the conquest
 114 115
 of Samaria by Hyrcanus, on the campaign of Pompey in Palestine
 and his role in Roman history. The same details but in fuller form
 are repeated in the pages following this section in Yosippon. The
 patent confusion of the text at this point, especially in the later
 editions, indicates a later hand or the difficulty of the printer-
 editor in determining the correct text from the manuscripts he had.
 The author of Yosippon is not guilty of repetition or wordiness for
 he tells his tale briefly but adequately in simple and almost class-
 116
 ical language. The section cannot be attributed to Yosippon. In
 fact it is lacking in the Arabic Yosippon. The section follows the
 writings of Eusebius, especially his Chronography covering the period
 117
 from the 125th to the 190th Olympiad.

111. M. p.57,58
 112. Ant. XII,2 ff; B. p.153. In connection with Ptolemy it is stated
 that Pharaoh's Tower in Alexandria was still standing in the
 time of the author. B. p.155; cf. Hegesippus IV, 17
 113. M. p.59; cp. Ant XII,3,3
 114. M. p.59; B. 159; Ant. XV,11
 115. M. p.60; B. 160 ff.
 116. cf. Trieber, op. cit. p.382
 117. B. p.156-165. See Beilage:- Der Canon des Eusebius in
 Sogenannten Josef b. Gorion. See also V-R p.486, supplement
 3 for details showing the use of Eusebius in this section.
 Trieber, op. cit. p.390, wrongly states that the source here
 is Panodorus. Zunz, op. cit. p.161, note a, lists the internal
 evidence which proves the section to be a later addition.

I. Yosippon's Sources for the History of the Maccabees.

Yosippon begins the most important part of his narrative, that of the history of the Jewish kingdom till its destruction in 70 C.E., with the story of an attempted
118
sack of the Temple by Heliodorus. The incident is based on the report in the Second Book of Maccabees, III, 7 ff.
119
A somewhat different account is given by Josephus.

The Letter of Aristeas is Yosippon's source for his version of the translation of the Bible to form the LXX
120
by Eleazar and the 70 elders of the Jews. Yosippon agrees with the Letter of Aristeas in so many details that there can be no question of his dependence on that work. Zunz also
121
indicated the close connection between the two works.

-
118. M. p.61; B. p.168. The so-called Arabic II Maccabees whose 59 chapters correspond to Yosippon M. p.65-165 is nothing but the Arabic translation of Yosippon. Steinschneider, Geschichtslit. der Juden I, p.31, states it is part of Zechariah b. Said's translation of the Yosippon made in the 11th century. Wellhausen, op. cit. did not know this but considered the II Arabic Macc. a separate work. The work is found complete in the Beirut edition. The Arabic text with a Latin translation is in Walton's Polyglot Bible. An English translation is in Cotton, H., Five Books of the Maccabees, Oxford 1882. Since the Arabic translation is earlier than the extant manuscripts and printed editions it is valuable in determining the genuine parts of Yosippon. See above note 6.
119. Ant. XII,5,3. Antiochus stripped the Temple.
120. Letter of Aristeas in Charles ed. of the Apocrypha. op. Ant. XII,2; Philo: Moses II,5; M.Sofrim I,9,10; Meg.8b-9b. B. p.172; M. p.63. As previously stated this incident is related twice in the printed editions of Yosippon.
121. G.V. p.160, note c.

122

The account of the persecution of Antiochus is based more on I and II Maccabees than on Josephus. Yosippon (B.178) gives the same statement about a portent in the heavens upon the sack of Jerusalem by Antiochus as is found in II Maccabees V,2.
 123
 Yosippon also uses the same term for the Jews, "Hasidim". He agrees with the account in Maccabees about the details of the Maccabean revolt: 1. The speech of Eleazar before Felix;
 124
 2. the martyrdom of Hannah and her seven sons; 3. the leadership of Mattathias;
 125
 4. the campaign of Judas Maccabi against Appolonius, Nicanor. However, Yosippon relates the sad death of Antiochus out of order according to the sequence in I Maccabees.
 126
 127
 128
 128a
 The celebration of Hanukkah is then described as in I Macc. IV. Then follow the details of the campaign against Lysias and Antiochus Eupator, of the victory at Bettar and the peace with Lysias. Here the history of Yosippon is broken by two interpolations, one of which refers to Daniel VII,7 and the other telling of Hannibal's war on Rome.

Philiz

*2
Beth
Yus*

-
122. cf. I Macc VII; Ant. XII,5 ff.
 123. M. p.64; I Macc. II,42; cf. Psalm 116,149; I Macc VII:12 - Psalm 79:2,3 ; II Macc XIV:6; War I,1; Ant. XII,7
 124. M. p.65; B. p.180; I Macc VI; War I,1. Yosippon's Hebrew diction and rhetoric in this speech of Eleazar is a model of clarity, written in smoothly flowing prose patterned closely upon the Biblical style and idiom.
 125. B. p.182; II Macc. VII. This is also well written.
 126. B. p.193; I Macc II; Ant. XII, 6 ff. War I,1; compare also Hegesippus (Eg. hereafter) I,1 ed. Weber.
 127. I Macc. III
 128. I Macc. VI
 128a. cp. M.T. IX; A.Z. 43a; Ant. VII,7,7 ("Fauta"). II Macc X,1-8 I Macc. IV,36 (Dedication of the Altar). Pesikta R.5a,ed. Fried. calls it Hanukas Ha Cohanim. cf. Sabb. 21b; M. Sof. XX.8
 129. M. p.76,77; B. p.221-226

Photo

The Maccabean history is resumed with the account
of the treaty between Judas Maccabeus and Rome. Judas
conquers Palestine. Eleazar is slain at the battle of Better.
The renegade High Priest Alcimus induces Demetrius to attack
Judea. The victory over Nicanor becomes a festival observed
annually thereafter. Judas is slain in the battle with
Bacchides. Jonathan succeeds him. Simon, who succeeds
Jonathan, is assassinated by Ptolemy, his son-in-law. Thus
far does Yosippon follow the account in I and II Maccabees. For
the succeeding events of the history of the Hasmonean dynasty
Yosippon shows a greater dependence upon Josephus than upon
any other extant source known to Jewish history.

-
130. B. p.226; M. p.78; cf. I Macc. VIII
131. B. p.228; M. p.79; cf. ~~II~~ Macc. XII; cp. Ant. XII,8,1 ff.
132. M. p.81; I Macc. VI and II Macc. XI.5 have "Beth Zur";
Ant. XII,9,1 ff. has Beth Zechariah; War I,1 has Beth
Zura and Beth Zecharias. Yosippon's use of "Better",
contrary to the opinion of Zunz, G.V. p.160, note a,
is not proof of his use of a Talmudic source. A
later copyist may have used the Talmudic spelling.
133. M. p.82; B. p.237; II Macc. XIV; cp. Ant. XII,10
134. M. p.84; B. p.241; I Macc. VII,26 ff. cp. M.T. on 13th
of Adar which dates it 1 day before Purim.
135. M. p.84; B. p.244; I Macc. IX,1; cp. Ant. XII,11,1 ff.
136. M. p.85; B. p.247; I Macc. XII; cp. Ant. XIII,1,1 ff.
137. M. p.86; B. p.249; I Macc. XIV; cp. Ant. XIII,6,1 ff.
Yosippon himself cites as his source the Sefer Ha -
Hasmonim and the Book of the Roman Kings.

J. Yosippon's Use of Josephus.

Yosippon gives the history of the Hasmonean dynasty and the reign of Herod till the outbreak of the war against Rome in the same sequence which is found in Josephus' Antiquities XIII to XX. A number of resemblances prove that Yosippon used Josephus, and as will be made evident, he used a Latin translation of Josephus. Both call Antiochus by the term "Pius". Yosippon names . . . פִּיּוּסְטָאִיִּלְלִי and . . . מַלְכִּיּוֹסֵפִּי in the form found only in the Latin translation of Josephus. Yosippon's statement (B. p.309): . . . מַלְכִּיּוֹסֵפִּי יָדְעָה עֵתִיּוֹת is a mistaken translation of Latin Ant. XIII,24: "quae proponerat futuris praesentia". Likewise his interpretation of the death of Antony (B. p.338) is a misunderstanding of the Latin Josephus Ant. XIV.10: "M. Antonius cecedit in congressione multos prostravit." The word . . . מַלְכִּיּוֹסֵפִּי (B. p.309) is to be identified with the phrase "duas ei tradens legiones" of Latin Ant. XIV.13. The words (B.p.394) מַלְכִּיּוֹסֵפִּי וְסִילוֹ is a misreading of Latin Josephus Ant. XIV,26: "conveniebant etiam cum eo Silo et Ventidius per Delium compulsi".

However, though Yosippon seems to have made errors in using Josephus there are indications that he used a more correct copy of Josephus than is now extant. Yosippon (B. p.333,401) agreeing with

138. B. pp.251-468
139. B. p.259; Ant. XIII,2,1
140. B. p.283; ~~Latin Jos.~~ Ant. XIII,19 cited in V-R,p.190, note 8.
141. B. p.295; ~~Latin~~ Ant. XIII,22
142. In V-R p.190, note 8.
143. ~~ibid.~~

Josephus' statement in Ant. XIV,16,4 that the Temple was seized by Pompey and Sosius on the same fast day 27 years apart seems to be more correct than the present copies of Josephus. For, in Ant. XIV,16,4 Josephus states that Sosius took Jerusalem in the third month on the fast day but in Ant. XIV,4,3 he calls it a feast day.¹⁴⁴ Yosippon's reading that it was a fast day, namely the 17th day of the fourth month is correct. Yosippon could only have known this from an early copy of Josephus which was more correct than the present texts.

Yosippon's use of such a more correct copy of Josephus is supported by the following evidence: Josephus' states in Ant. XIII,8,2 that Antiochus Epiphanes (Pius) attacked Jerusalem in his fourth year, the first year of the reign of Hyrcanus, in the 162nd olympiad. This is a patent error since it is known from coins of the period that the fourth year of Antiochus was 136-135 B.C.E. whereas the 162nd Olympiad was 132 to 128. Hence

144. Wellhausen, op. cit. p.48, believes the words "fast day" and "feast day" refer only to the Sabbath as does Reinach in the French translation of Josephus (ad loc) who cites the statements of Strabo XVI,2,40 and Dio Cassius XXXVII,16 but in a note to Ant. XIV,16,4 Reinach acknowledges that the third month could not refer to the duration of the siege since it lasted five months according to War I,18,2. Furthermore Josephus consistently makes clear the difference between the Sabbath which he calls the "seventh day of rest" and the other fast and feast days. The reading "fast day" is to be preferred, especially since Yosippon corroborates Josephus in this detail. See Trisler, op. cit. p.402.

also M p. 87!

Yosippon's statement is accurate for he says that Pius attacked Jerusalem in the fourth year of the reign of Hyrcanus, 133-132 B.C.E. The original correct reading of Josephus was twisted into its present erroneous form by reversing the order of the numerals one and four.

Yosippon agrees also with Josephus in the following details: 1. The followers of Hyrcanus opened the gates of Jerusalem to Pompey; 2. the three Greek leaders who led in scaling the walls of the Temple were Cornelius Faustus, son of Sulla, Furius, and Fabius; 3. the story of the priests in the Temple continuing to perform their duties in connection with the daily sacrifices even though they were being slain, corroborated according to Yosippon and Josephus by Nicolas of Damascus, Strabo, and Titus Livius. Both Yosippon (B. p.267) and Josephus (Ant. XIII,9,2) agree regarding the letter from the Roman Senate in 133 B.C.E. to Hyrcanus. Both join together the two decrees of Julius Caesar (B. p.371 ff. = Ant. XIV,10,2 & 6). The intervening passage in Ant. XIV,10,3-5 is of doubtful authenticity. Yosippon shows no knowledge of their contents either. He quotes Josephus in shortened form, even ending the paragraph in almost identical words used in Ant. XIV,10,26. Yosippon further refers to Josephus by name a number of times.

145. cf. Zeitlin, in J.Q.R. XX, p.37-38

146. In Trieber, op. cit. p.402 ff; Ant. XIV,16,4; B. p.333; War I,7,4

146a. B. p.250,309,334,337,373,443,446,452,466

Differences, however, are also to be found, such as is the case where Josephus Ant. XIV,12,3 mentions a letter as being sent to Hyrcanus II after the battle of Phillipi by Antonius alone, but Yosippon states that the letter was sent jointly by Octavian and Antonius (B. p.379 ff.)

That Yosippon used a Latin Josephus is indicated by the Latinized forms of the proper names: Annibal, Asdrubal, Antipater, Augustus, Scipio (B. III, ch. 15). As Scaliger already noticed Antiochus Sidetes is not called Eusebes but Pius (B. IV, ch.3). Soaenus is not called the "Iturian" but the "Tyrian" as in the old Latin translation of Josephus. The name Zarah for Izates occurs only in the Latin work Hegesippus. 147

147. Cited in Wellhausen, op. cit. p.45. See also the list in Zunz, G.V. p.156, note e. Still, Greek endings of words and names may also be observed, e.g. M.28d

	מ'ס'נא = B.156	מ'ס'נא
29a	ק'ר'ט'נא = B.157	ק'ר'ט'נא
29d	ק'ר'ט'נא = B.163	ק'ר'ט'נא
30a	ק'ר'ט'נא = B.165	ק'ר'ט'נא

and . תלל - "strap", a Greek word of the Byzantine period. However, such Graecized forms as are found are those usually found in Hebrew literature, having been taken over into the language. Thus Alexandros (Jannaeus) and Agrippas and Neron are the usual Hebrew rendering from the Greek. Other Greek traces are present but do not necessarily point to a Greek source since Greek forms are often preserved in the Latin but never is the reverse the case. Thus Trieber, op. cit. p.397, note 5, points out such Greek endings still retained in the Latin Hegesippus. The Hasmonaeans are always referred to by their Greek names, e.g. Alexander, not Jannai; Alexandra, not Salome; Menelaus, not Onias; Alcimus, not Elyakim; and Phasaël, not Phaselus.

Herod is called an Ashkelonite (M. p.117), a usage which is duplicated in Julius Africanus, Epistle to Aristides, IV. However, Justin Martyr, in Dialogue with Trypho, 52 also so refers to Herod.

In addition to the internal evidence that Yosippon used Josephus in a Latin translation we have a statement in the Yosippon itself (B. pp.350-354), which if not genuine is at least made on sufficient authority, that he used 'ס'פ'ו'ש' ב'ר' י'ס' and not 'ס'פ'ו'ש' ב'ר' י'ס' Yosippon knew not only Josephus' Antiquities, and the Hegesippus' version of the Jewish War, but also the Contra Apionem (B.p.466).

In the course of the following summary of events described by Yosippon, the parallels with Josephus are indicated in the notes. The account based on Josephus resumes with the accession of John Hyrcanus to the throne. He besieges Ptolemy, slayer of his brother and father, who also holds his mother captive. He defeats Antiochus Pius and then becomes his ally. John next conquers the surrounding nations whom he converts to Judaism; and he destroys the temple on Mt. Gerizim. His conquests are recognized by Rome. While officiating in the Temple on Yom Kippur he hears a "Bath-Kol" which proclaims the victory of his sons Antigonus and Aristobolos over Antiochus. He is estranged from

148. M. p.86; B. p.251; cp. Ant. XIII,8

149. M. p. 87; B. 260; Ant. XVII,8,2

150. M. p.89; Sp. Ant. XIII,10

151. M. p.90; cp. Ant. XIII,10,3; cp. Sota 33a and parallels.

the Pharisees after he is accused at a banquet by them of
not being fit to officiate as High Priest because his mother
152
had been a captive of war. His rule lasts 31 years. Before
his death he dreams that his hated son, Alexander, will rule
153
after him. Such is the actuality for after slaying his
154
brother Antigonus Aristobolus who succeeded his father dies
155
within a year and Alexander assumes the throne. He wars
against Latira, son of Cleopatra of Egypt, and against Hartoum,
156
king of Arabia. He massacres the Pharisees when they pelt him
with citrons in the Temple as he officiated as High Priest on
157
Succot. As a result of his cruel treatment of the Pharisees
he is nicknamed "the Thracian" for the Thracians had an evil
158
reputation in antiquity as a cruel nation. Before his death,
however, he counsels his wife Alexandra, who rules after him, to
159
make peace with the Pharisees.

The Pharisees return to power, forcing the Sadducean army
160
leaders to leave Jerusalem and settle in the provinces. On
her death Aristobolus, her younger son, conspires to seize the
161
throne. In the resultant civil war between his party and that

-
152. M. p.91; cp. Ant. XIII,11,5; Ber. 29a; Kidd. 66a
153. M. p.92; cp. Ant. XIII,11,7
154. M. 93,94; cp. Ant. XIII,12,3
155. M. p.95
156. M. 95 ff. cp. Ant. XIII,12,4 ff; XIII,13
157. M. 99; Ant. XIII,13,5; cp. Succah IV,9; Koh. R. VII,24; Ber. R.91
158. M. p.100; Ant. XIII,14,2
159. M. p.101; cp. Ant. XIII,15,5; Contrast Sota 22b.
160. M. p.102; Ant. XIII,16
161. M. p. 103

Arctus
5571

of his brother Hyrcanus a compromise is reached whereby the former is acknowledged as king and the latter is content with the office of High Priest.¹⁶² Antipater becomes the advisor of Hyrcanus and spurs him on to revolt and seek the throne also.¹⁶³ Aristobolus is beseiged in Jerusalem by the rebels. Honi, the rain-maker is killed by the besiegers.¹⁶⁴ The Temple sacrifices are supplied by the beseigers but when they refuse to accomodate the defenders any further a famine results as punishment.¹⁶⁵ Pompey is appealed to by both parties; he secretly decides to aid Hyrcanus but outwardly declares for Aristobolus.¹⁶⁶ Pompey leaves Damascus for Judea.¹⁶⁷ When Aristobolus is ordered by him to send all the Temple treasures to Rome, a request which the priests in the Temple refuse to fulfill, Pompey attacks the city and Temple.¹⁶⁸ When he captures the Temple he spares it, however, and makes Hyrcanus king. Thus Judea becomes the subject of Rome. When Pompey's general, Scaurus, Hyrcanus, and Antipater attack the Nabatean king Hartos (Aretas) in Sela (Petra), Alexander, son of Aristobolus, who had escaped to Egypt from Pompey, seizes Jerusalem and is attacked by Scaurus.¹⁶⁹ Aristobolus escapes from Rome but is defeated in his attempt to retake Jerusalem.¹⁷⁰

162. M. p.105; Ant. XIV,1 ff

163. M. p.106

164. M. p.107; Ant. XIV,2,1; cp. Taan. 19a; M.T. Adar 20; Taan.23a

165. M. p. 108; Ant. XIV,2,2; cp. Sota 49b

166. M. p.109; Ant. XIV,2,3

167. M. p.111; Ant. XIV,4,1

168. M. p.112; Ant. XIV,4,2-3

169. M. p.114; Ant. XIV,5

170. M. p.115; Ant. XIV,6

Yosippon repeats the story of Alexander's attempt to capture
 Jerusalem. He is forced to flee and Hyrcanus rules. Crassus
 sacks the Temple. The Caesar insertion follows. The Jews
 aid Caesar. Hyrcanus is confirmed as king; he appoints
 Antipater as his aide and makes Antipater's son, Herod, the
 governor of Galilee. Herod is tried but permitted to escape
 after his unauthorized killing of the bandit leader Hezekias.
 Caesar returns to Hyrcanus the lands which Pompey had taken
 from him. Caesar is slain and Judea pays tribute to Cassius.
 Antipater is poisoned. Antony succeeds Caesar and grants the
 request of Hyrcanus that he free all Hebrew slaves. Antony
 becomes enamoured of Cleopatra. He jails the Jewish nobles
 who slander Herod. Phasaelus, brother of Herod, is slain
 when Antigonus, another son of Aristobolus, revolts. Herod
 goes to Rome and succeeds in winning the kingdom for himself.
 On his return to Palestine he conquers all but Jerusalem. With
 the aid of the Roman army Herod takes Jerusalem and has Antigonus
 executed. Herod honors Hillel and Shammai because they favored

-
171. M. p.116; Gavinius was the general of the garrison in Jerusalem and he, Hyrcanus, and Antipater aided the king of Egypt.
 172. M. p.117; Ant. XIV, 7
 173. M. p. 118-119; See note 37 above.
 174. M. p.119; Ant. XIV, 7, 4; XIV, 8, 1 ff.
 175. M. p.120; Ant. XIV, 9
 176. M. p.121-123; Ant. XIV, 9, 3 ff. cf. B.B. 3b-4a
 177. M. p.124; Ant. XIV, 10
 178. M. p.125; Ant. XIV, 11
 179. M. p.127; Ant. XIV, 12
 180. M. p.128; Ant. XIV, 13
 181. M. p.132; Ant. XIV, 14
 182. M. p.133; Ant. XIV, 15
 183. M. p.136; Ant. XIV, 16. Yosippon dates it in 181st Olympiad but Ant. XIV, 16, 4 has 185th Ol. See above note 144.

him. Herod seizes all the wealth in the land and becomes
¹⁸⁴
wealthy. He invites Hyrcanus to return from his Babylonian
¹⁸⁵
exile and when the latter does so he has him slain. Herod is
induced by his wife, Mariamne, to make Aristobolus, their son,
¹⁸⁶
High Priest. His wife and sister-in-law hate him for having
killed Hyrcanus, their father, but their attempt to escape to
Egypt is betrayed. Herod has Aristobolus drowned at Jericho
¹⁸⁷
because he fears his popularity. Antony wins kingdoms for
Cleopatra. She becomes Herod's enemy when he refuses to submit
¹⁸⁸
to her advances. Antony goes into battle against Octavian in
¹⁸⁹
the 87th (187th ?) Olympiad. In the same year a terrible
earthquake gives the Arabs an opportunity to make war on Judea
¹⁹⁰
but they are defeated and their capital, Sela, captured. Herod
is called before Octavian to explain why he sided with Antony
against him. He leaves orders to have his wife slain if anything
¹⁹¹
should happen to him but he returns safely. As a result of the
¹⁹²
intrigue of his sister Salome, he kills Mariamne. He regrets
¹⁹³ ¹⁹⁴
his rash deed. A famine devastates the land. He builds Caesarea
¹⁹⁵
and repairs Samaria. The legend of Menahem's prophecy is told.
¹⁹⁶ ¹⁹⁷
Herod rebuilds the Temple. He is reconciled to his sons.

184. M. p.136; Ant. XV,1. The Hillel reference is a gloss.
185. M. p.138,139; Ant. XV,2
186. M. p.140 ff. Ant. XV,3,9
187. M. p.142; Ant. XV,3,3
188. M. p.143; Ant. XV,4
189. M. p.143,144; Ant. XV,5. The date is impossible. It was the
7th year of Herod.
190. M. p.146; Ant. XV,6. Both Yosippon and Josephus refer to
Octavian as Augustus.
191. M. p. 147; Ant. XV,6
192. M. p. 148; Ant. XV,7; cp. B.B. 3b-4a
193. M. p. 151; Ant. XV,8
194. M. p. 152; Ant. XV,9
195. M. p. 153; Ant. XV,10
196. M. pp 154-158; Ant. XV,11; cp. B.B. 3b-4a
197. M. p. 158; Ant. XVI,1-6

Mother

*2. Her
brother*

K. Yosippon's Use of Hegesippus.

With the telling of Herod's accusation of his sons and temporary reconciliation, Yosippon seems to leave off the use of the Antiquities of Josephus as his source and to turn instead to the Latin reworking of Josephus' War which bears the title Hegessippus. Breithaupt points out many parallels with Hegessippus in Yosippon. Zunz, following Rapoport, holds that Yosippon depended largely upon Hegesippus for the history after Herod's trip to Rome; ¹⁹⁸ e.g. $\eta\kappa\sigma\iota\pi\pi\omicron$ in B. p.728 equals Eg. V,15; B. p.574, that Joseph ben Gorion was appointed to ¹⁹⁹ Galilee, agrees with Eg. III,3,2. Other parallels in language

198. Zunz, G.V. p.157, note c; cp. Eg I,38 ff; B. p.469; cp. Speech of Archelaus B. p.477 with Eg. I,40.

199. On the basis of Eg. III,3,2 the Yosippon came to be attributed to Joseph b. Gorion, for Hegesippus did not know that Josephus was named Joseph ben Mattathias, and mistakenly calls him in this passage, "Josephum Gorione". The following parallel passages are cited from Zunz, p.157, note c: -

Breithaupt page	543	=	Eg. II,9
	605	=	III,16
	608	=	III,17
	686	=	V,2
	743	=	V,16
	777	=	V,22
	795	=	V,23
	847	=	V,41
	878	=	V,53

The work known as Hegesippus is an anonymous free Latin translation c. 367-374 A.D. of the De Bello Judaico of Josephus but whose 5th and last book comprises books 5-7 of Josephus. Since it was transmitted among the works of Ambrosius, bishop of Milan, its authorship in some MSS. is ascribed to him.

and spelling of the names of historical personages have
 200
 been pointed out by Vogelstein-Rieger. Yosippon and
 Hegesippus both lack the account of Menahem, the son of
 Judas of Galilee and his rebellion against Eliezer, the
 son of Ananias, which is found in Josephus' "War". Both
 lack also the reference to the Parthians in King Agrippa's
 201
 speech in the same work. Both have passages which contra-
 202
 dict Josephus. Thus Ant. XVIII,5,2 states that John, the
 Baptist, was killed by Herod Antipas to prevent a revolt
 but Yosippon and Hegesippus agree that John was slain for

200. V-R, op.cit. p.191, note 2 gives the following:-

Breithaupt p.	Egisippus	Josephus	
487 בִּירְנִיקִי	I,42	Berenice	War I,18 Berenike
489 מִלְחָמוֹס	I,42	Malthaces	(Ant XVII,12 Malthace
490 אֶרְוֹדִיפִּילֹס			War I,18. Malthace
499 Antipater in Caesarea	I,44	same	War I,20; Ant XVII,7
515 אֶכִּיָּאבֶס	I,45	Achiabes	War I,21; Ant.XVII,9 Achiabes
519 גֵּרְמָנִיקוֹס	I,46	Germanique et Galli	
521 אֶמִּיטִיֹר דַּרְיוֹס	II,1	Immitior Dario	
522 Antipater	II,1	Antipater	War II,4 Antipatros
530 אִסִּידִיס .. אַנּוּבִיס	II,4	Isidis ..Anubis	
543 Fieber	II,9	same	
571 5000 foot soldiers	II,15	same	War IV,40 4,000
635 חֲבָרִיּוֹס	IV,4	thabyrius	War IV,6 Hitaburion-oros
635 23 רִיט	IV,4	same	War IV,6 26 stadia
650 13,000 slain	IV,15	same	War IV,25 15,000
650 לִגָּרִים	IV,16	Ligarim	War IV,26 Betarin.
664 מוֹנִיכִיּוֹנִים	IV,29	Municionum	War IV,40 Mutianus
678 כַּסִּי יוֹבִיס	IV,33	Casii Jovis	templum
720 Castor and 9 others	V,13	same	War V,23 10
728 Scotia	V,15	Scotia	
763 יָבֶנּוּס	V,20	Jabenus	War V,30 Adiabenus
821 אֶרְשִׁימוֹן	V,30	Arsimon	War VI,7 Simon
837 פּוּדֵנְס	V,37	Pudens	War VI,7 Poude .

201. Cited from Zeitlin, J.Q.R. XX,n.s. p.30

202. ibid.

Handwritten notes:
 487, what
 489, what
 490, what
 499, what
 515, what
 519, what
 521, what
 522, what
 530, what
 543, what
 571, what
 635, what
 635, what
 650, what
 650, what
 664, what
 678, what
 720, what
 728, what
 763, what
 821, what
 837, what
 201, what
 202, what

reproving Herod because he took his brother's wife, as in Mark VI:17-27; Matthew XIV: 4-10; and Luke III:19. Where Yosippon follows Hegesippus he takes over the same errors, historical and geographical, adding some of his own, such as where he makes of Gofna (Eg. V,33; . יושן B.p.829) the land of Goshen, . יושן. 203 Hegesippus I,40 twice confuses the Jordan and the Euphrates and Yosippon takes over 204 the same error (B. p474).

The account in Yosippon continues with the following: Antipater is favored by his father Herod over his brothers 205 Alexander and Aristobolus. The brothers conspire against Antipater. Herod imprisons them but Archelaus, the father-in- 206 law of Alexander, brings about a reconciliation. Iuribelus conducts an intrigue of his own leading to the imprisonment 207 of Alexander and Aristobolus. At a trial in Berytus they are condemned to death. Turo, a soldier who cries out against the 208 mockery of the trial is slain with the two condemned sons.

-
203. Pointed out by Trieber, op. cit. p.395. For a detailed study of Yosippon's dependence on Hegesippus, see I.B.Levinsohn, Theudah be-Israel, p.44, referred to in Zunz, op. cit. p.157, note c.
 204. Eg. I,40,5 states Pherorahs received an annual tribute of 100 talents from the land beyond the Euphrates: "praeter eam regionem, quae ultra Euphraten sita reddituum copias multiplicabat". Josephus in War I,24,5 is correct in naming the area as across the Jordan. Yosippon reads . מעבר לנהר פרת . Cited in Trieber, op. cit. p.396, note 1. Cp. Wellhausen, op. cit. p.50.
 205. M. p.160. cp. War I,25 ff. Ant XVI ; Eg. I,41
 206. M. p. 161
 207. M. p. 163 cp. War I, XXVI,1 which calls him Eurycles.
 208. M. p. 164; cp. War I,27; Eg. I,42

Herod marries off the children of the dead sons among his
councillors and the family of Antipater. The family of
Herod is described. Antipater and Pheroras conspire against
the children and plot to slay Herod himself but the plot is
revealed and Pheroras slain while Antipater escapes for the
time being since he is on the way to Rome on a mission. On
his return, however, he is seized and imprisoned. Herod's
final illness falls upon him but he keeps live long enough to
have Antipater executed, five days before his own death. He
ruled 37 years states Yosippon, agreeing with Josephus War I,
33,8. His order to slay the servants and officers so as to
cause the people to mourn is not obeyed. At the funeral
Archelaus is acclaimed king. He massacres a crowd who assembled
in the Temple to mourn for those whom Herod had slain. He goes
to Rome to oppose his rival for the throne, Antipas. After a
reign of nine years, marked by cruelty, he is banished to Vienne,
in Gaul, where he dies. His brother, Antipas, rules.

-
209. M. p.165; cp. War I,28; Eg. I,42
210. M. p.166
211. M. p.167; cp. War I,29,30; Ant. XVII ; Eg. I,43
212. M. p.169; cp. War I,31,32; Eg. I,44
213. cp. War I,33; Eg. I,45
214. cp. War I end. M. p.178; Ant. XVII,8; Eg. I,46
215. M. p.179; War II,1; Ant. XVII,9; Eg. II,1
216. War II,2; II,6; Eg. II,2
217. M. p.180; War II,7; Eg. II,2
218. M. p.181

Tiberius succeeds Augustus and sends Pilate as procurator
219
to Judea. Here Yosippon gives the legend of Paulina as
related in Antiquities XVIII,3. Antipas is exiled to Spain
220
and his tetrarchy given to Agrippa. Gaius succeeds Tiberius
and arouses the hatred of the Jews when he seeks to place his
221
statue in the Temple. The Pharisees oppose the disciples of
222
"Ben Joseph", to be identified with Jesus. Philo's embassy

219. M. p.181; Ant. XVIII,2 ff;3. War II,9; Eg. II,4

220. M. p.182; Ant. XVIII,5; War II,9,5-6

221. M. p.182; Ant. XVIII,6; War II,10; Eg. II,5

222. This reference to Jesus is not the same as that inserted in Ant. XVIII,3,3. According to Zeitlin it is based on the medieval Hebrew work, Toldot Jesu; cf. Zeitlin, Josephus on Jesus, p.26. The Vatican MS. of Yosippon has a different version of the Jesus passage, in which Gaius, the Roman emperor is confused with Jesus. See S. Krauss, Das Leben Jesu, Berlin 1912. ibn Hazm (d. 1063) saw a Yosippon which already contained the passage. He wrote that Yusuf ibn Quorion makes little mention of Joseph ben Miriam. cf. A. Neubauer, J.Q.R. XI, o.s.356. This item and the following are to be found in Klausner, Life of Jesus, p.52. S. Krauss, op. cit. dates the Toldot Jesu as early as the fifth century. His statement that the Toldot used an early version of Yosippon will not stand in the light of the fact that Yosippon is not earlier than the 9th century. The reverse is undoubtedly the case. Yosippon used the Toldot Jesu or Hegesippus for the Jesus passage. There is much material on Jesus and his followers in Hegesippus. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. II,23 quotes Heges. especially as to James. On Hegesippus as a source for Christian legends see S. Krauss, op. cit. pp.238-241. Eusebius who lived in the fourth century knew Hegesippus but Origen who lived in the century preceding did not know it hence it is inferred that the Hegesippus was written in the period between these two churchmen of the third and fourth century C.E.

223
to Gaius is also mentioned. Claudius succeeds Gaius and
224
Agrippa II succeeds his father Agrippa I. During Nero's
reign Eleazar the bandit and the Sacini (Sicarii) terrify
225
the people of Judea, just before the revolt against the rule
of the Romans. Florus, the procurator, cruelly seeks to keep
order, refusing Berenice's plea for lenient treatment of the
226
people. Eleazar, son of the High Priest, Ananias, leads the
revolt against Rome. Agrippa (M. p.188,189) seeks to prevent
227
the revolt by a stirring speech, vividly retold by Yosippon.
The Pharisees and elders also counsel peace but in vain (Mp.189).
The Zealots seize the city (M. p.190). The Jews in Antioch and
228
Damascus are massacred. The renegade Jew, Simon, slays himself. 229
230
Nero sends Cestius Gallus to put down the revolt (M p.193).
231
He is defeated. Yosippon here adds a list of the High Priests
of the Hasmonean line which he seems to have drawn up himself on
the basis of the history he has related (M.p.193-194). Vespasian

-
223. M. p.183; Ant. XVIII,8
224. M. p.184; Ant. XIX, 2 ff.
225. Ant. XX,1-10
226. M. p.185; War II,15 ff; Eg. II,8
227. cp. War II,16,4
228. M. p.190; War II,20; Eg. II,16
229. cp. War II,18,4; M. p.192
230. cp. War II,18,9 ff.
231. M. p.194; War II,19,7

is called to put down the revolt. Joseph b. Gorion (not Joseph
 b. Matthias) is appointed over Galilee and his experiences
 there recounted. He finally is captured by the Romans.
 John of Gischala is called John the Killer by Yosippon. He
 is the rival of Simeon, the Bandit. ²³⁵ Vespasian becomes emperor
 and frees Joseph b. Gorion in Alexandria. The three factions,
 led respectively by Simeon, John, and Eleazar fight for supremacy.
 A lamentation supposedly by Joseph b. Gorion is inserted in M. pp.
 218-221. ^{236a} The details of the final siege of Jerusalem by Titus
 with the accompanying internecine strife are compressed in a few
 graphic pages (M. p.222-230). Josephus pleads for peace in a
 long speech before the walls of Jerusalem. ²³⁷ The book ends with
 the details incident to the fall of Jerusalem ²³⁸ and the end of

2d
 122
 rebel

-
232. M. p.196; War II,20
 233. M. pp.196-211; War II,20 to III,8; Eg. II,16 - III,16
 234. M. p.212; War ~~III~~ IV; Eg. IV
 235. M. p.214-216; War IV, till 10. Eg. IV, 1-26
 236. M. p.217; War V; Eg. V,1 ff.
 236a. This elegy is lacking in the Arabic Josippus, in Zechariah
 ibn Said's translation, and in the editio princeps.
 237. M. p.230-239; cp. War V,9; Eg. V,16
 238. M. pp.240-271

the revolt, and the enumeration of the slain and the
disposition of the defeated zealots taken captive. ²³⁹

The last words relate that Josephus went to Rome and built
a synagogue and school there.

L. Other Sources of Yosippon.

That Yosippon used the Greek Church fathers has been
asserted by some scholars on the basis of certain details
found in Yosippon which correspond to items in the Greek
patristics. Thus although Jewish tradition regards Herod
as an Idumean, Yosippon (B. p.316), like Nicolas of Damascus,
whom Josephus quotes, states that he was of those who came with
the exiles returning from Babylon. According to Josephus, in
Ant. XIV,1,3, Nicolas, who was the secretary of Herod wished
to flatter him and hence described Antipater, Herod's father,
as coming with Ezra and Nehemiah. But previously (M.p.117)
Yosippon had called Antipater an Ashkelonite, following in
this detail the Christian sources. ²⁴⁰ Another detail tending to

239. cp. War VI,9 ff. Eg. V,49-50. Breithaupt has an additional
chapter telling of the disposition of the captives by Titus.
The city of Bari is mentioned there. The addition must be old since
the same city is referred to in the Pesikta Rabbati, ch. 28,135b
and in the Ahimaz Chronicle, in M.J.C. II,p.125, where it is
coupled with Otranto and Tarrento. cf. R.E.J. 33,p.40, W.Bacher,
Notes Critiques sur La Pesikta Rabbati. cf. also J.Q.R. IV, p.623
240. It is in Justinus, Dialogue with Tryphon 52. Also in Julius
Africanus, I,258, note 4 by H.Gelzer, Leipzig 1880, cited in
R.E.J. vol 45,p.45. Also in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. I,7,11. See
Trieber, op. cit. p.387, note 3; also Zeitlin, J.Q.R. XX,n.s. p.34

show an affinity with a Christian source is that of the manner in which Phasaël, brother of Herod, dies. According to Yosippon he was killed in battle but Josephus avers he was a suicide (Ant XIV,13,10). Yosippon's source for this item is the "Chronography" of Julius Africanus in the extant "Fragments" XVII,1. In the same manner Yosippon, like Julius Africanus, Chronography XVII,3 states that Cleopatra killed herself.

According to Zeitlin, Yosippon knew a Tannaitic source. He bases his theory on the following circumstances. Yosippon's reason for the festival of Hanukkah is given as the victory of Mattathias, agreeing with the statement in Megilla 11a:

השמונא' ובני'ו. וסתת'ה כהן גדול as against Ant. XII,7,6

where it is Judas Maccabeus who dedicates the Temple after his victory over the Syrians. Then, the festival lasts eight days because of the miracle of fire which occurred on the 25th of Elul (not Kislev) as related in II Maccabees. The Talmud in Sabb. 21b speaks of the miracle of oil (naphtha in II Maccabees) but Soferim XX,8 agrees with Yosippon. In addition, the statement that John Hyrcanus was High Priest for 40 years has a tannaitic parallel in Ber. 29a, Yoma 9a. Josephus Ant XII,10,7 writes that it was 21 years. Yosippon agrees with the Midrash that

241. See Zeitlin, J.Q.R. XX,n.s. p.30

242. Also in Plutarch, Antony 86

243. Zeitlin, J.Q.R. XX,p.34 ff.

Simon, the prince, and Ishmael, the High Priest (end of War) were killed by Titus, as in Tos. Sotah XIII, 4 and jer. Sotah 244
IX. Yosippon, however, shows no knowledge of either the Talmud or other Tannaitic works. He seems to have confined his use of Hebrew sources to the Bible and Books of the Maccabees, if indeed he had those in Hebrew, perhaps the Megillat Antiochus version. The few resemblances to Tannaitic material may well be added by copyists more familiar with the Talmud than Yosippon. In the absence of convincing evidence that Yosippon actually quotes such sources it is necessary to assume that he did not use any such sources. Yosippon, in fact, is so free of Talmudic knowledge that one may well conjecture that perhaps its author was a Karaite! The following chapter on the language of Yosippon will make clear his conscious effort to imitate the style of the Bible, especially in the narrative portions.

244. But other late midrashim state they were killed by Hadrian, which is more probable since the title "prince" can be only the term "Nasi" of the Jabneh period and after; cf. A.R.N. I, 38, ed. Schechter; and S. Krauss, Asarah Harugey Malchus, in Ha Schiloah, 1925.

Chapter IV. The Language of Yosippon

A special study of the Hebrew vocabulary of Yosippon²⁴⁵ was published by Fraenkel in which he demonstrates that the author of Yosippon tried to pattern his style on that of the Bible but by his usage of certain late terms and expressions, Yosippon reveals a knowledge of medieval Hebrew. Wherever possible, however, Yosippon uses a biblical phrase or idiom. The following phrases taken from B. pp.193-202 illustrate this usage: -

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Ex. 17.14 | מחה חמחה את זכר יהודה |
| 2. Isaiah 34.2 | כצאן לטבח יוכל |
| 3. II Sam 16.7 | כלב האריה אשר לא יסם |
| 4. Esther 7.5 | מי הוא זה ואי זה הוא אשר מלאו לבו |
| 5. Deut. 17.1 | על כן מצאתי את כל הרעות האלה |
| 6. Psalm 47.4 | מדבר עמים תחתינו ולאומים תחת רגלינו |
| 7. Genesis 39.1 | הלך בדרך כל הארץ |
| 8. Esther 3.12 | בכל מדינה ומדינה ובכל עם ועם |
| 9. Esther 7.5 | מלאו לבו |
| 10. II Samuel 9.8 | הכלב הסת הזו |

245. Fraenkel, *Die Sprache des Josippon* in *Z.d.M.G.*, vol. 50:p.418 ff.

V-R, op. cit. p.194, note 2 add the following:-

B. p.254,216	דיק	II Kings 25.1
414,329	פנן	Ezek. 27.17. See Redak ad loc.
12,25	ולם	Psalm 139.16
12	אם הדרך	Ezek. 21.26

The above words according to V-R are rarely found in Hebrew literature and not at all after the tenth century.

Zunz also collected a number of words used by Yosippon which are not pure early Hebrew but of the later type which is ²⁴⁶ closer to the Mishnaic Hebrew than to any other type:- Among them are the following words:-

אֵייר	B.125;	זול	450
אֵילן	134;	משוחררים	607
אלמן	449;	סדרי בראשית	565
בשכיל	746;	פיים	53
ביתר	216;	רים	229
הלואי	493;	שכינה	686
התראה	753;	שינוי	793
הוראה	710;	חתיית המהים	799

247

Yosippon uses a number of late phrases, among them such as:-

גונב דעת הבריות	B.511
הנהרנים על ייחוד שמו	606
כלם חכמים כלם נכונים	792
משה רבינו עליו השלום	731
ישתבח לנצח	738
ערב בקר וצהרים	77
כי הוא מרבה לסלוח	428
עד מתי תאריך אפיך לעוזרי רצונך	792
מיחה משונה	868

246. Zunz, op. cit. p.156, note c.

247. ibid.

He uses also characteristic ancient rabbinic expressions such
²⁴⁸
as the following:

אנושי (616)	כחירה (615)	הנהגה (309)	הסכמה (173)
הצמחה (732)	השארונה (789)	השמדה (736)	חומר (782)
מספר מונבל (90) טבע	(615)	מלשין (511)	נאמנות (443)
קוטב (311)	ספרד (221)	שלמות (455)	ואם האמרו (425)
האלה שמו	הבורא (738)	דעך	ידוע הוא לכל בעלי דעך (797)

Yosippon used a Latin source and in his reworking of the source
²⁴⁹
he shows he had difficulty with the language. Thus Yosippon
tells that Jochanan was strangled (B.p.868) because he mistrans-
lated the Latin word "usque" in the passage in Hegesippus V,49:

"Johannesperpetuis vinculis innodatus, usque ad mortem
magis trahens spiritum vitae, quam ullam voluptatem vivendi
expertus, securim evasit." He also used Italian to give the

²⁵⁰
names of countries, rivers, and cities. He mentions Lombardi,
Sclavi, Turci, Anglesi, Danisci, Danimarca, Russi, Alemagna,
Campagna, Toscana, Ungheri, Crovati, Slovaci, Bretonia nella Loira,
Sena, Ticino, the River Po, Sorrento, Napoli, Albano, Benevento,
Porto, and Bari. Contrary to Zunz's statement, Yosippon did not
²⁵¹

use Arabic.

²⁵²
Fraenkel adds to the list of rabbinic phrases given by Zunz

-
248. *ibid.* p.156, note d; V-R p.194 note 4 declares that most of the
phrases are later additions.
249. *ibid.* note e.
250. Trieber, *op. cit.* p.398; *cp.* V-R, p.192, note 2-5
251. V-R, p.192, note 7
252. *op. cit.* p.418 ff.

the following: כיוהר נפל בהרהור; לאין שיעור ;

ובסבת זה החולי ממה לבסוף ; אכזריות

often. Fraenkel points out that Yosippon uses several words in a very peculiar sense. Thus the verb סלה is often used in the meaning to lay low the enemy. It is so used only in one place in the Bible, in Lamentations I,15. He uses 'צע also in the same sense:

קכי אלף נכורי מקדון הציע במלחמה

The word סור is used to express the meaning "to die"; e.g.

לסנור את יוסו. The word חזה usually applied only to the breast of an animal is used by Yosippon in speaking of a human:

e.g. "he beat his breast" . ויך את חזהו בשני אנרופים .

The word for "gird" he uses as "seize" ויאזור את שררת אחימל

To express the genitive Yosippon uses the construct state or של ;

e.g. B.p.281 וישא את הדם אל הרפא של המלך

or cf. ופן אשר לזהב as in the Bible: e.g. אשר ל' or

Ant. XIV,3,1; ואת מקל אשר לתמר ; נן אשר לזהב

cf. Ant. XIII,13,5. It is the opinion of Fraenkel that the author

of Yosippon tried to imitate the style of the Bible wherever

possible but where he could not he shows the use of terms which

are more characteristic of post-Biblical usage. Some of his

figures of speech, thus, are surprisingly original and of genuine

literary merit: e.g. 1. ויטבע את עצמו בתוך עמק המלחמה

2. מלחמה צמחו כביחה

3. וילחם הכחור בלבו ובקרנו יוחר מן המלחמה

אשר נלחם על העיר

4. כאשר יפיל הקוצר את אלומותיו ואת עמרי קצירו

5. op. Matthew 24.2: ולא אעזב בו אכן על אכן

Yosippon's language is by no means Talmudic in character despite the presence of late rabbinic terms. The use of תר' for ב'ת (B,p.216) it is true is found in the Talmud but it²⁵³ is the sole such example. The several passages cited by Zunz are not indicative of any use of the Talmud by Yosippon since they are interpolations which are lacking in the editio princeps.

Yosippon's use of a number of philosophical terms may show²⁵⁴ that he had some knowledge of Hebrew philosophy. They occur in the editio princeps in the following passages:

17a. ספירה

17b-19a להזיל כחות הכוכבים

18b נסיוני המזלות

18b חכמה הטבעי

20c חכמת החזיון

20c המוסרי

32d (B 186) הקומה

51 d (B 311) קוטב

253. Zunz, op. cit. p.160, note a; V-R, op. cit p.194

254. V-R, op. cit. p.194, note 4

Chapter V. The Style of Yosippon

The author of Yosippon, although not a great master Hebrew stylist, yet has such excellent facility in the use of the language to make his style dramatic and graphic. He is no mere translator, apishly copying phrase by phrase but he takes the material he found in his sources and condenses in a few words the thought of a paragraph. He is thus more of a paraphraser than a translator. He does not hesitate to express in his narrative his personal opinion, especially in a moral sense. He was a deeply religious man as apparent from his occasional expressions censuring the evil deeds of a character. His tendency to moralize is seen in his manner of placing fine sentiments in the mouths of his favorite personages. He was also a philosophically inclined man who shared the interest of his age in historical writings. He is gifted with a good style, uses attractive rhetoric, rich in philosophic meditations, sentiments, and well chosen imagery. Later additions of less gifted writers have detracted from the purity of style and continuity of events which the author of Yosippon originally set down. He not only gives a fine reproduction of his sources but often adds items from his own knowledge or from other sources to round out a complete account.

In relating the occurrence of an event he clearly depicts the role of all persons involved in the situation and relates the details in almost dramatic, climactic fashion. He shows sympathy for the sad lot of the Jews under the Hasmonean and Herodian rulers and reveals a genuine understanding of the motivations of the historical personages whom he makes to live again their brief day in his pages.

In several long speeches he has the opportunity to show his literary ability at its best. The contest between Zerubabel and the king's counsellors is well written as is the account of Antipater's speech of defense against his father, Herod, who brought him to trial before ²⁵⁵Octavian, of Agrippa's plea to the Jews not to revolt, of the plea for peace made by Josephus, of the lament of Joseph b. Gorion when the Temple is ²⁵⁶destroyed, of Hannah and her seven sons, and of the speech of Eleazar before Felix. The description of the crowning of the emperor, although apparently of the same style as that of Yosippon is not found in the editio princeps or early MSS. of ²⁵⁷Yosippon and seems to be a later interpolation. A German translation of the passage is given by Vogelstein-Rieger, History of the Jews in Rome, page 196 following. Certain

255. B. p.508; cp. Eg. I,44,p.110

256. In editio princeps 131 d; not in Vulgata

257. cf. R.E.J. vol. 34, p.238, article by S.Krauss. Also lacking in the Vatican MS; in Paris MS., in J.T.S. MS., in oldest Venice edition, Mantua edition, English Yosippon, and Slavonic Yosippon.

passages might be declared interpolated on the basis of a comparison with the style of the rest of Yosippon but such a comparison would be fraught with uncertainty and the possibility of error hence only such passages are branded as unoriginal only when additional information clearly shows them to be not a part of the original Yosippon. 258

The author of Yosippon like the other pseudo-epigraphic writers of his time sought to give a connected and entertaining account of their conception of history. Like them

258. cf. Zunz, op. cit. p.161a; p.162, note a. The later editions were much expanded. David Kimchi showed that the last chapter was added by Abraham ibn Daud. See D. Kimchi on Zechariah XI.14 and also Sefer Ha-Shoroshim, s.v. הנל .

Zunz lists the following interpolated passages:

1. B. p.65-68 - interrupts the continuity.
2. B. p.330 - repetition of explanation of ירמיה' .
3. B. p.154-165 - mentions Christians, Ben Sirach, etc.
4. B.p.335 - from חסלכ' הנו'ם till ו'אמר עזר'א .
5. B. p.346 - Value of "mina".
6. B. p.350-352
7. B. p.886-892 . Last two chapters. The Lament that follows is rhymed and is not found in the Mantua edition. The last chapter was added by R. Abraham b. David author of the סדר'א כדכ' כ'ה ש' as pointed out by David Kimchi. Zunz does not hazard an opinion as to the genuineness of the section telling about the travels of Alexander the Great. The mention near the end of the Mantua edition of the Jews in Spain is a Spanish interpolation added in the 12th century. Also added is the reference to Menahem b. Seruk, B. p.807. Josephus, War V, ch. 37 and Hegesippus V,25 have the correct name Mannean, the son of Lazarus.

*clumsily
expressed
see Zunz*

he began with Adam and carried his narrative to what he considered the logical terminus, namely the end of the Jewish state, which fell when its Temple was destroyed. He had in mind to give the sequence of events leading up to that calamity and throughout his narrative he is careful to introduce material, albeit legendary and inaccurate historically which contributes to his narrative. He tells what he considers to be the essential details and makes no attempt to pad his narrative. Events follow in rapid succession all leading up to the final climax, to the ultimate catastrophe. Hence when a large section containing many details which have no bearing on his purpose, which is to give a connected account of the history of the second Temple, is encountered it seems safe to conclude that Yosippon did not write it, especially when this conjecture is supported by internal and external evidence. Yosippon was too fine a writer and stylist to impede his story with a long digression. He epitomizes the material he saw before him in his sources and weaves it skilfully into the fabric of his narrative.

There yet remains the question as to the date and place of composition together with the problem of authorship, the last named problem, of necessity, because of lack of

information, still remaining unsolved till the present day.

The problems of date and place of composition are more readily solved for as shall be immediately demonstrated Yosippen was composed in all likelihood in South Italy near the beginning of the tenth century.

Chapter VI. The Date of the Composition of Yosippon.

The date of Yosippon is fixed either in the ninth or the tenth century by the majority of authorities who have treated the problem. The determining of the date is based upon such considerations as its use in literature, in the works of authors whose dates are known, as when the work is first referred to in literature and first becomes read, and as its contents can be dated when they refer to known events and conditions of the time of the author. Thus Scaliger thought he had found a reference to the Albanian King Aventinus and hence concluded that Yosippon was a late work written in Ger-
259
many. Yosippon offers enough internal evidence to point to the period following the dissolution of the Germanic Confederation of Tribes in the 9th century. For through Yosippon's acquaintance with such peoples as the Danes, Franks, Ireland, Burgundy, Turks, and the like one may obtain a clue as to his date. The reference to the coronation of an emperor (B.p.667) usually identified with that of Otto in 962, and the reference to the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome, to the Pope, Bishops, and churchmen, are questionable, for Yosippon according to recent information, brought to light from the Genizah by J. Mann in his Texts and

259. Trieber, op. cit.p.399; cf. Breithaupt's Preface.

Studies, was already existent in 952, ten years before the
coronation of Otto. ²⁶⁰ A letter, published also by J. Mann,
written about 952 by the Italian community of Bari to Hisdai
ibn Shaprut of Cordova, in Spain, tells that a messenger of
his who had been sent to Italy to procure a copy of Joseph b.
Gorion, which had taken nine months to copy, had been robbed
of several letters and books, including the Yosippon. ²⁶¹ The
Yosippon is also mentioned in a commentary to the Pentateuch,
(on Genesis X) by Abul Faraj Furkan ibn Asad, a Karaite who
lived in Jerusalem. It was written in 1054. ²⁶² An Arabic author
living in Spain, by name ibn Hazm (d. 1063) knew the Arabic
version of Zechariah ibn Said. ²⁶³ Dunash ibn Tamim, in his
commentary to the Sefer Yesirah, about the middle of the tenth
century refers to Yosippon. ²⁶⁴ Nathan of Rome also refers to it
in his Aruch. ²⁶⁵ Benjamin of Tudela also seems to have known

260. Mann, J. -Texts and Studies, I, 15-16

V-R, op. cit. p. 193, note 6, believe the account of
the Emperor's coronation to be authentic since the author
of Yosippon used the Vita Alexandrii of Arch Presbyter Leo
(about 950) and the Chazar Letter of c. 955. But in the
light of the letter cited by Mann, at best the emperor
referred to, if the passage is genuine, could not be Otto.
It may have been Charlemagne, in 800.

261. Mann, op. cit. I, p. 14-16

262. Mann, op. cit. II, p. 35, note 64

263. In Leyden MS Catal. No. 1982, quoted in J.Q.R. XI, o.s.p. 356

264. J.Q.R. XI, o.s. p. 356 ff; cf. Journal Asiat. 1850, p. 18, n. 2.

See Dunash's Commentary, ed. Grossberg, p. 37; cp. Dukes,
Beitrage, p. 99. See also Steinschneider, Cat. Bodl. 1548.

265. V-R, op. cit. p. 193, note 7

cf. Aruch, s.v. . יצא ., ed. Kohut VIII, 15

266
Yosippon. Rapoport believed that Gershom b. Judah (d. 1040)
used Yosippon but Vogelstein-Rieger question this. 267 Saadia who
died in 942 knew and used Yosippon, according to Malter who states
that Saadia, in his 'Amanat', in the Hebrew translation of ibn 268
Tibbon (Emunot ve-Deot, end of chapter 8), refers to Yosippon.
The Kitab al Amanat was written after 934 and before 940. 269 Zunz
also at one time believed that Saadia knew of Yosippon but later, 270
following Rapoport, he declared his former opinion as wholly wrong.
According to Rapoport the Paitan Kalir knew of Yosippon, since he
makes the same mistake in spelling "Jotopata 271 יוֹטוֹפָטָה in his
poem 272 יוֹטוֹפָטָה חֲכָלֶת הַשֶּׁרֶן as does Yosippon. He
would place Ka ir in the ninth century, so that Yosippon would be
dated earlier in the century. Zunz agreed with Rapoport on this
point. 272 But Kalir is already mentioned as an ancient poet at the
beginning of the tenth century and hence it is hardly likely that
he used Yosippon; perhaps the reverse is the case. 273 According to

*weber
reformat*

266. B. p.10, on Sorrento
267. V-R, p.193, note 7 states his source is Maccabees in a later Hebrew version. cf. Rapoport, Bikkure Ha-Ittim X, 44, no 43.
268. Malter, H. - Saadia Gaon, Phila. 1921, p.51, note 84.
269. ibid. p.118-119.
270. ibid. p.51, note 84. cf. Rapoport, Kalir, note 7; see the collection יוֹטוֹפָטָה חֲכָלֶת הַשֶּׁרֶן, Warsaw, 1904, p.30. cf. Zunz, p.159, note d.
271. Rapoport, Kalir, in Bikkure Ha-Ittim X, 102, no 7. cf. Zunz, p.159, note d.
272. So also Weiss, Dor Dor ve-Dorshov, IV, p.224, note 5. cf. Gratz Ges. der Juden V, 3rd edition p.235, note 2 and p.295. cf. Zunz, G.V. 1st edition, p.151, note e.
273. Harkavy, Studien, V, 50 ff; 109 ff. cited in V-R, op. cit. p.193, note 7. Weiss, op. cit. dates Kalir at the end of the 9th century since he was already known in the time of Natronai Gaon.

*orig
ined
and
77th
C.*

Mosconi, Samuel Ha-Nagid (about 1060) made an abridgement of
274
Yosippon.

There is enough evidence, therefore, to indicate that by
the middle of the tenth century Yosippon was widely known. Hence
it is certain that it was composed sometime earlier in that
274a
century, perhaps even at the end of the ninth century.

-
274. Steinschneider, Die Geschichtsliteratur der Juden, F.a.M.
1905, pp.28-33, shows Mosconi confuses Samuel Ha-Nagid and
Joseph ibn Zaddik. He rightly brands Mosconi as an unreliable
source. Mosconi's preface is found in Ozar Tov, 1878, I,
p.17-23.
- 274a. The singular view of Trieber and Zeitlin that Yosippon may be
as early as the 5th century is not borne out by present
information regarding Yosippon's time of composition.

Chapter VII. Where Was Yosippon Written?

The earlier view that Yosippon was written in Germany has now been discarded. Most students of Yosippon place it in Italy because of the frequent occurrence in it of Italian place names,²⁷⁵ because of the presence of the extracts from Roman mythology,²⁷⁶ and because of the apparent wide acquaintance of Yosippon with Italian geography.²⁷⁷ Then, too, the Yosippon was first known in Italy, as evident from the letter of the Bari community to Hisdai ibn Shaprut. Then, the sources of Yosippon, Egesippus and Josephus were known together²⁷⁸ only in Italy. Italian Jews discovered the Yosippon. And there the necessary knowledge of Latin, and perhaps Greek, was to be found. Jewish literature in Europe began in Italy about the time of Yosippon, in the ninth century, and the Yosippon could very well have been an expression of the flowering of interest in Jewish letters in Italy.

The view of some scholars that the author of Yosippon lived in Rome is based on the fact that in Rome appeared the two works of Roman ancient history which Yosippon may have used,²⁷⁹ namely, the Mirabilia Romae and the Graphia aureae urbis Romae.

275. See above note 48.

276. See above p.13. Zunz, op. cit. p.159, note b. cites these passages: B. 9-22, 114, 156-165, 221-226, 349-358, 529, 667-673.

277. B. pp.6-9, 12, 170-19, 22, 156, 159, 223, 323, 353, 391, 667-672. See V-R, p.192, notes 2-5.

278. cf. Zunz, op. cit. p.159, note d.

279. V-R, p.193, note 2; cf. Zunz, p.158, note d.

Then, the writer of Yosippon knows many details of the surroundings of Rome. He mentions the Tiber (B.p.22), an island in the Tiber, the Capitolio (13), the churches of St. Peter and Paul (?) (12).²⁸⁰

However, these references are questionable and it seems more probable that Yosippon was not written in Rome but in South Italy where Greek was spoken till late and where the Arab translators of Yosippon would find the work.²⁸¹ During the same period as Yosippon the Jews of South Italy turned their attention to profane literature, both apocryphal and historical.

282

Fraenkel believes the author of Yosippon to have been a doctor. He bases his conjecture on the fact that Yosippon (B. p.281) relates that the blood of Aristobolous was taken to the physician, whereas Josephus knew nothing of this detail in his account.²⁸³ Perhaps the copy of Josephus used by the author of Yosippon had this detail; most probably he invented the item.

280. V-R, p.188, note 5. Yosippon has *שןלפכפ. שןלפכפ* but the "ש" is the equivalent of the Italian "sci" which was originally spelled in Hebrew by the "samech". Hence these words may easily be a corrupt spelling of San Paulus and San Petrus.

281. Fraenkel, op. cit. p.421
cf. Ascoli's, List of Jewish Tombs.

282. Fraenkel, op. cit. p.421

283. Ant. XIII, 11, 3; War I, 3, 6

Chapter VIII. Origin of the Title.

The title of the work is derived from its supposed author "Joseph ben Gorion". The use of this name is lacking in the Arabic translations and in the first edition. Joseph b. Gorion is quoted but not named as the author except in glosses to the Arabic MS. described by Wellhausen. The name is found in the Vulgata and in the compilation ascribed to Jerahmeel. The Paris MS. used by Wellhausen has the title: "History of the Hebrews, Titled Book of the Maccabees, written by Josippus, also called Joseph b. Gorion."²⁸⁴ The title is the result of a confusion between Joseph ben Gorion and Joseph ben Matthias in Hegesippus III,3,2 where the governor^{285x} appointed for Galilee is named "Josephum Gorione". The word

284. Wellhausen, op. cit. p.1,p.126, Paragraph 42.

285. Zunz, op. cit. p.157. For the true Joseph b. Gorion see War II,20,3; IV,3,9. He was slain by the zealots, War IV,6,1 because of his democratic viewpoint and out-spokenness. The statement in B. p.350-351 is late, added either by the printer or a later copyist. The statement is that the writer is Joseph b. Gorion. Similar statements are to be found in the Constantinople edition but not in the editio princeps. cf. B. p.65,250. The statement on p.250 refers to II Maccabees and not to Joseph b. Gorion. Yosippon quotes Josephus whom he calls Joseph Ha-Kohen in the following passages: B. p.250, 309,334,337,373,443,446,452,466.

The passage on M. p.10 as to the task of a good historian occurs also in the editio princeps, in the Vulgata, and in Jerahmeel. The author of Yosippon considered himself to be a careful historian and according to the standard of his day his opinion of himself is well founded. He uses his sources accurately but not critically. Thus when his history is not in conformance with the facts it is because his sources have the unhistorical material.

Yosippon, added to the text by later glossators, is simply Joseph with the Greek ending "on". The title וְיִסְיִפּוֹן , Giuseppe, is an Italian gloss. Perhaps Jerahmeel b. Solomon was the first to call it Yosippon, for in the earlier sources it is usually referred to as Joseph b. Gorion. He also refers to Josephus as "the great Joseph" or the "gentile Joseph" of which the Yosippon or Yosippon Minor $\text{וְיִסְיִפּוֹן הַקָּטָן}$, was an abridgement.²⁸⁶ According to Trieber the title was "History of Jerusalem" as referred to in the Mantua edition, p.133a, or as a MS. reads: "History and Wars of the Jews". The Hebrew-Persian dictionary of Solomon b. Samuel (14th century, calls it "History of the Second Temple".²⁸⁷

Mosconi's explanation of the title and author of Yosippon is completely erroneous. He relates that Gorion had two sons, the older called Josephus, the younger וְיִסְיִפּוֹן - וְיִסְיִפּוֹן (once וְיִסְיִפּוֹן). The former called himself "Yosippon" and wrote in Hebrew which was translated into Greek by Strabo as "Yosippon". The Latin translation is called וְיִסְיִפּוֹן and was made by Pope Gregory (590 -604). This is also called Josephus minor as apart from an original Latin work named Josephus major. It is apparent that Mosconi invented this explanation of the title. He refers to Book VI of Yosippon as Wars,²⁸⁸ וְיִסְיִפּוֹן .

286. J.E. art "Joseph b. Gorion"; cf. Wolf, "Bibl. Hebr. I, 521; Neubauer, M.J.C. I, xx

287. cf. Bacher in Stade's "Zeitschrift" XVI, 242; Same in R.E.J. vol. 37, p.143 ff. cf. Fraenkel - Monatss. xliii, 523

288. See B. p.351; Steinschneider, Die Ges.lit. der Juden, p.28 ff.

Chapter IX. Use of Yosippon in Medieval Jewish Literature

A book as popular as Yosippon could be expected to be referred to often in the literature of the period. It forms an integral part of Jerahmeel's compilation. R. Nathan refers to him in the Aruch. R. Samuel b. Meir mentions him as the Sefer Yosippon (Pes. 119a). Ibn Ezra on Psalm 120 cites Joseph ben Gorion. Judah HaDassi, R. Isaac b. Samuel (Tosafot A.Z. 10b) and R. Abraham Halevi in the "Divre Malche Yisroel" refer to Yosippon. The Sefer HaYashar has several passages from the Yosippon. ²⁸⁹ Rashi (c.1050) quotes him often. ²⁹⁰ R. Eleazar ²⁹¹ Kalir may have used it. As indicated passim these writers are helpful in determining the authenticity of doubtful passages. David Kimchi also knew Yosippon.

-
289. Cited in Zunz, op. cit. p.159, note e; p.164, note h. op. Sefer Hayashar, p.11a, 17b, 60a, 62a etc. with Yosippon pp. 2-7, 9, 10, 11, 17 etc.
290. cf. Rashi on II Kings 20.13; Ezekiel 27.17; Daniel V.1; VI, 29; VII, 6; VIII, 11, 21, 22; XI, 2, 17; Ber. 43a; Yoma 23a; B.B. 3b
291. Rashi (on Dan. V.1; XI, 2) knew pp.24 & 71.
Saadiah (on Dan. VI.23) knew p.34 ff., p.574
R. Samuel knew p.85
Rashi also knew pp.88, 166, 193, 329, 460.

Chapter X. The Editions of Yosippon.

292

The Yosippon is extant in 4 MSS. of the original Hebrew.

Two are in the Vatican, one in Turin (Peyron 93), and one in Paris (1308). All these agree with the editio princeps printed at Mantua by Abraham Conat, 1476 ~~and~~ 1479. Fragments are also found in the Bodleian Library: #793, ff. 218 b to 246.
2585, ff. 104-106
d.64, ff. 118-120
2.30, f. 56

293

There are two recensions. The first is based on the editio princeps of Mantua which has a preface by the printer, Abraham Conat. Sebastian Munster printed a poor edition with a Latin translation at Basel in 1541. His edition omits the first three chapters of the Breithaupt edition. It is wrongly attributed to the second or Constantinople recension. The Berditschev edition, begun by D. Guinzburg and completed by A. Kahana with an introduction by the latter which appeared in 1913 is based on the editio princeps.

The second recension is based on the Constantinople edition, divided into 97 chapters and six books, which appeared in 1510 with an introduction by Tam ibn Yahya b. David which is based on the preface of Judah Leon b. Moses Mosconi (b.1328) who made a copy of the Yosippon on the basis of four MSS. about the middle

292. cf. A. Neubauer, J.Q.R. o.s. XI, p.355 ff.

293. cf. Steinschneider, Ges. Lit. der Juden, I, p.28 ff.

294
of the fourteenth century. A Venice edition appeared in 1544.

Others are as follows:

6. Cracow, 1589
7. Frankfort a. M., 1689
8. Gotha 1707 and 1710 by F. Breithaupt, with Munster's Preface,
a Latin translation and copious notes.
9. Amsterdam, 1723 with Breithaupt's Latin translation.
10. Prague, 1784
11. Livorno, 1794
12. Zolk., 1808
13. Vilna, 1819
14. Sidilkow, 1836
15. Calcutta, 1841
16. Warsaw, 1845
17. Jitomir, 1851
18. Lemberg, 1855
19. Warsaw, 1871.

zind
A large number of translations and compilations have also
295
appeared.

Of all the editions the Berditschev, used as the basis of this
study, is probably the best extant, based as it is on the Mantua
296
edition which used the copy of Judah Leon Mosconi. In 1896

D. Chwolson compared the Mantua edition with the Arabic version
297
and declared it authentic. Its value is diminished somewhat

-
- 1873
etc.
294. Published in Ozar Tov I, Berlin 1878, p.17-23 and by Goldblum
(not Goldberg as Steinschneider, op. cit. p.29, note 2 states)
in Ha-Melitz, vol. 28.
 295. See Steinschneider, Hebr. Bibl. XI, 62; J.E. VII, p.260; Steins.
Ges. Lit. der Juden I, p.30; Steins. Die Hebr. Uebersetz. d.
Mitt. p.898; Cata. Bodl. p.1550 ff.
 296. See Kahana's Introduction to it, p.9, note 8.
 297. ibid. p.12

because of lacunae and corrupt readings which are corrected
in the Vulgata. ²⁹⁸ The Jerahmeel MS. Bodl. 2797, translated
by Gaster as "The Chronicles of Jerahmeel" is equivalent to
the editio princeps. ²⁹⁹ It does not contain the Alexander
³⁰⁰ interpolation.

Conclusion.

Yosippon, usually ascribed to Joseph b. Gorion by
medieval writers, is the work of an anonymous author who
lived in South Italy, perhaps Sicily, about the year 900 C.E.
The work is patterned after the writings of the world-chronicles,
beginning with Adam and ending with the destruction of the II
Temple. It depends mainly upon the Books of the Maccabees,
Josephus, and Hegesippus and partly upon the writings of
some of the Church Fathers, and the Apochrypha, and perhaps
works on Roman Mythology. The unity of the work is broken by
several interpolations, the largest of which is that taken from
the Toldot Alexander. Although no longer valuable as accurate
history it is still read for its literary attributes.

298. Guinzburg's edition, begun in 1896 (see R.E.J. v.31, 283,
note 1) and published posthumously by A. Kahana 17 years
later, deviates somewhat from the Mantua edition. For a
list of the differences see Poznanski, S., in Z.f.H.B.,
1913, pp. 109 ff.

299. *ibid.*

300. cf. Levy, I, - R.E.J. 28, p. 148

Bibliography

A. Texts of Yosippon and Its Sources

1. Yosippon, edition Kahana, Berditschev, 1913
2. Yosippon, edition Breithaupt, Gotha, 1710
3. Charles - Apocrypha
4. Cotton, H. - The Five Books of the Maccabees, Oxford, 1832
5. Levy, I. - "Toldot Alexander" in Kovetz al Yad, vol. II, Berlin
6. Neubauer, A. - Medieval Jewish Chronicles
7. Reinach - Josephus
8. Thackeray - Josephus
9. Whiston - Josephus
10. Weber, C.F. - Hegesippus, Marburg, 1864
11. Wellhausen - Das Arabische Josippus, 1897, Gottingen

B. General Works

1. Encyclopedia Judaica, article "Josippon"
2. Jewish Encyclopedia, article by W. Bacher, "Joseph b. Gorion"

C. Special Articles

1. Bacher, W. R.E.J. 33, p.40; vol. 37, p.145
2. Donath, L. Die Alexandersage in Talmud und Midrash, Fulda 1873
3. Fraenkel "Die Sprache des Josippon" in ZdMG, vol. 50, p.418
4. Gaster P.S.B.A., 1894, "The Unknown Aramaic Original of Theodotion's Additions to the Book of Daniel".
5. Hurwitz "Pygmy Legends" in J.Q.R. VI, n.s. p.354
6. Levy, I. R.E.J. vol. 28:147; 3:238-275
7. Neubauer, A. J.Q.R., o.s. XI, p.356
8. roznanski Zeitschrift fur Bibliographie, 1916, p.109 ff.
9. Trieber, K. Zur Kritik des Gorionides, Gottingen, 1895
10. Zeitlin "The Slavonic Josephus" in J.Q.R. xx, n.s.
"The Christ Passage in Josephus" in J.Q.R. xviii, ns.

D. Authors Who Discuss the Yosippon

1. Budge History of Alexander the Great, Cambridge, 1889
2. Graetz, H. Geschichte der Juden
3. Guedemann Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur, vol. II.
4. Klausner Life of Jesus
5. Malter, H. Life and Works of Saadiah Gaon, J.P.S., 1921
6. Mann, J. Texts and Studies
7. Neubauer, A. The Book of Tobit, 1878, Oxford
8. Steinschneider, M. - Die Geschichtsliteratur der Juden, F.a.M., 1905
Judische Zeitschrift, vol. IX
Die Hebr. Uebersetz. d. Mitt. p.898
Cata. Bodl.
9. Vogelstein-Rieger - Geschichte der Juden in Rom, vol. I, Berlin, 1896
10. Zunz, L. Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden, F.a.M., 1892