

26
37

THE JOSIPPON.

A GRADUATION THESIS.

BY

MARTIN A. MEYER.

APRIL. 1901.

Mic. 5/79

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

REFERENCES.

PREFACE.

I. JEWISH HISTORIOGRAPHY, 70 - 1040, A.C.E.

II. THE JOSIPPON IN GENERAL.

III. THE TRANSMISSION OF THE JOSIPPON.

IV. THE TRADITIONAL VIEW OF THE JOSIPPON.

V. THE CRITICAL VIEW OF THE JOSIPPON.

VI. THE DATE & COUNTRY AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE JOSIPPON.

CONCLUSION.

REFERENCES.

- 1.- Aruch of R. Nathan of Rome.
- 2.- Aruch of Qimchi.
- 3.- Azaria dei Rossi, Meor⁸ Anayim, ed. by D. Cassell,
Wilna, 1866.
- 4.- Bacher, Revue des Etudes Juives, XXXVII, p. 145, ff.
- 5.- Breithaupt, J., edition of the V. text of the Josippon,
with Latin translation, introduction, and notes
containing a reprint of the introduction of Muens-
ter: Gotha, 1707.
- 6.- Carmoly, Annalen, I, p. 149, ff.
- 7.- Chwolson, Sammelband, 1897, p. 5, ff.
- 8.- Commentaries of Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Qimchi, etc. al.

9.-Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der Juedischen Poesie, 1836,

p.37,ff.

10.- Dukes, Ehrens^apulen, p.7.

11.- Ersch und Gruber, Joseph Gorionides, II, 23. p.184.

Encyclopedia Britannica.

13.- Fraenkel, S., Zeitschrift des Deutschen Morgenlaend-

ischen Gesellschaft, L, p.418, ff.

14.- Fuerst, Biblia Judaica, II, 111, ff.

Gaster, The Chronicles of Jerahmeel.

16.- Graetz, Geschichte der Juden, V, ^{II}p.251.319.

Guedemann, Gechichte der Juden in Italien,

18.- Harnack, Geschichte der Alt-Christlichen Literatur

vol.I, p. 311, ff.

19.- Jellinek, A., Beth Hammidrash, vol.I.

20.- Josippon, Hebrew text, Lemberg, 1869.

21.- Josephus, Flavius, The Works of, Translated into
English by Wm. Whiston, M.A.

22.- Kitto, Biblical Encyclopedia, s.v. Josephus.

23.- London Jewish Chronicle, 1894.

24.- Magazin Berliner, כסיו תרמ"ח, 1878.p.017.

Milman's Gibbon's Rome.II.p.6. note.

26.- Neubauer, A. Jewish Quarterly Review, XI.p.335, ff.

27.- Rappaport, S.L., ספר חסד, 1828.p.34.n.9.

1829.p.102.n.7.

28.- Scaliger, Jos., Erancheus Trihaeresius.

29.- Schuerer, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I, p.123.

30.- Steinschneider, ^{MS}Catalog^z Bodleiana, 1547-52.

Juedische Literatur in Ersch u.

Grueber, II., 27, 391. ff.

31.- Treiber, Konrad, Zur Kritik des Gorionides, Goettingen²

Gelehrte Nachrichten, Philologisch-Historische

Klasse, 1895. Heft 4. p. 381, ff.

32.- Voegelstien^h u. Rieger, Geschichte der Juden in Rom,

p. 186. ff.

33.- Weiss, I.H., Juedische Tradition, IV. p. 224. n. 5.

34.- Winter u. Wuensche, Juedische Literatur, III. p. 292. 309.

35.- Wolff, ^{STERN}Biblia Hebraica, I, p. 508. ff.

36.- Wellhausen, J., Der Arabische Josippus, Goettingen²

Abhandlungen, Philologisch-historische

Klasse, Neue Folge. Band I, no. 4, 1897.

37.- Zacuto, A., Sefer Juchsin, Warsaw, 1876.

38.- Zedner, Catalogue of the British Museum. p. 344, ff.

39.- Zunz, L., Asher, Benjamin of Tudela, II.

Gottesdienstliche Vorträge^{II}. p. 154. ff.

Synagoge Poesie.

Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaft des Judenthums

1822. p. 300. ff.

ABBREVIATIONS.

B. Breithaupt's edition.

G.D.V. Zunz's Gottesdienstliche Vortraege.

G.G.N. Goettingen Gelehrte Nachrichten.

J.Q.R. Jewish Quarterly Review.

R.E.J. Revue des Etudes Juives.

V. The ordinary Hebrew text of the Josippon, the Vulgata.

V. & R. Voegelstein u. Rieger, Geschichte etc.

Z.W.J. Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaft des Judenthums.

All other abbreviations used are self evident and such as

are in ordinary usage.

PREFACE.

Besides the great mass of scientific and religious literature which is the Jews' noblest heritage from his past, there exists, too, a popular Jewish literature, of which the JOSIPPON is not the least worthy example. There were books in the Ghetto over which the Jewish boys and girls pored in much the same way as does the modern child over his fairy books and tales of adventure. A study of such a work - one of the constructive factors in the life of every Jewish child - would need no further apology than this.

The Josippon is valuable to us for other reasons than this. It was the connecting link between the Ghetto

and the world. The numerous translations and versions which are noted below, testify to the great popularity of the book among the Gentiles. Its influence must have been great in breaking down prejudices against the Jew, by spreading knowledge of the history and life of the Jew.

BUT it is not to be understood that the Josippon is but a child's book or an apologetic work sent out by the Jew to his Gentile neighbors. It was originally an historical work of evident seriousness and loftiness. As such, it was constantly appealed to by Jewish scholars in all centuries as an authoritative and authentic work.

The excellence and ease of the work soon recommended it to the popular mind both among the Jews and the Gentiles.

Furthermore, I have chosen the Josippon as the

subject for treatment in my thesis, as I believe that it offers a splendid opportunity for illustrating the validity of critical processes on grounds where we need not feel ourselves hampered by theological prejudices. It is possible to argue here dispassionately and therefore the best results are attainable.

In submitting this thesis to the Faculty of the Hebrew Union College, I believe that I am cognizant of its defects and shortcomings, which are not few. I have suffered greatly in the preparation of this thesis through the absence of all the first and, in many cases, of the more important secondary sources. I have endeavored to lend a scientific tone to the thesis by constant references and citations but the limitations of my knowledge and the

inadequacy of my apparatus are sufficient to show the hollowness of such pretensions.

The only merit I dare claim in this thesis is that of originality in the presentation of the subject matter. I have done little else than to gather facts and theories from many varied and widely scattered sources and to arrange the materials, thus collected, systematically. A few of the references in the body of the thesis are my own, also.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my thanks to such members of the Faculty as have assisted me with their helpful suggestions and with the loan of reference books.

JEWISH HISTORIOGRAPHY.

70 A.C.E. - 1040 A.C.E.

LACK THEREOF. REASONS. SOURCES. JOSEPHUS. HISTORIOGRAPH--

ICAL NOTICES IN THE RABBINICAL AND GAONIC LITERATURES.

PSEUDEPIGRADICAL WORKS. HISTORICAL WORKS.

2

JEWISH HISTORIOGRAPHY.

70 A.C.E. - 1040 A.C.E.

From the Destruction of Jerusalem to the Close of the
Period of the Gaonim.

The art of historiography for its own sake, was not cultivated among the Jews after the destruction of their Temple, for many centuries. The disintegration of their national unity and the shock consequent thereto dazed the people and robbed them of their senses. Their energies were absorbed by the efforts to reconstruct Judaism on a non-national basis, and the dialectical discussions to that end. A proper appreciation of the value of contemporary historical records - at no time, too keen among the Jews - together with a regard for other interests of practical life was lost.

Too much stress can not be laid upon the effect of the loss of a national political life in this matter of keeping historical records. Despised and persecuted as he was for centuries, and scattered as his people was, the Jew was too miserable to realize that he had a past that was worthy of attention, and the awful misery of the present did not suggest perpetuation in writing. The universalistic- i.e. non-national trend given to the faith by the Rabbis of the reconstruction period suggested that Israel must look in other directions than the past. Religion and not politics was to be made the basis of the new Israel. All of these influences and suggestions must be reckoned with in answering the question of the almost total disappearance of the historian's art among the Jews of this period.

A flourishing historiography must have been

cut down by the war, which meant death, not only to political interests, but, what is more important to us, to all higher cultural elements among the Jews. Flavius Josephus (Vita 65) and Eusebius (Ecclesiastical History) mention Jewish historians, whose works were more or less widely known. We shall merely mention Flavius Josephus (38-100) in passing, as an adequate treatment is impossible in the narrow limits of this sketch. Further, as the predominant influences in Josephus' work was the Graeco-Roman, it must remain a question whether to assign him a place among Jewish historians. Constant reference to his work in the following pages will acquaint us better with the contents and character of his books.

For a period of a thousand years, for the most part, we are compelled to satisfy ourselves in our search for historical sources, with stray notices embodied in

other works and a few straggling books, and even these not of a purely historical character. Passages are found in the Mishna,¹ the two Talmuds,² the Midrashim, Tosefta, Mechilta, Sifri, Sifre, and Boraitha which contain references to historical events, but, in a foreign context, and garbled, as we may suppose them to be, they are not very satisfactory. *A lost work ably mentioned in Talmud. (Jer. 82^b; Mid. 46^b; Sab. 88^a etc.).*

From the early part of this period, we have the book of TOBIT³ which reechoes the conditions of the time of the Hadrianic wars. Parts of the Haggada of Pesach⁴ come from this time - but we must notice here, as we shall be compelled to do again, that this is not an his-

1.- e.g. Aboth: Para III, 5: Sanh. I, 5: etc.

2.- e.g. Jerushalmi, Sotah IX, 11: Maaser Sheni V, 8: etc. Babil, Kid. 66^a: Berachot 29^a: 48^a: etc.

3.- cf. Zunz G.D.V., p. 132.

4.- cf. Zunz op. cit. p. 133.

torical work ~~per se~~, but composed primarily for liturgical ^{purposes} reasons. The MEGILLAT TAANIT ^{dates} from this same period and is characterized by Zunz (op.cit.) as "halachic-haggadic". It is a list of the days of the year on which it is not permitted to fast because of some fortunate occurrence on that day in the history of the Jews. Its contents are historical with a large admixture of legend. We must not forget that here too the historical matter is but subservient to the halachic purpose of the book. To the end of the second century, also, is ascribed the MEGILLAT JUCHSIN¹, whose contents may have already been known to Flavius Josephus,² as he speaks of the genealogies which were so carefully kept

1.- not to be confused with the SEFER JUCHSIN of Abraham Zacuto, 1504.

2.- cf. Vita 1: Contra Apionem I,7.

by the noble and priestly families of the Jews. The SEFER ADAM and some Greek apochrypha, DE VITA ET MORTE PROPHETARUM, having some historical value, date from the first half of the third century.

Collections of legends - having more or less historical worth, - were made throughout this period, even as late as 1030 by one R. Nissim.¹ Rashi² refers to these collections as ספר הגלגל. The works of the Gaonim also contain occasional notices of interest to the historian.

Pseudepigraphic works grow frequent during the later part of this period, which are attributed to

1.- חבור יפה מיהושוע.

2.- cf. Sanh. 31.^b

the rabbis and other prominent Jews of the earlier centuries. The MEGILLAT ANTIOCHUS, the SEDER OLAM ZUTA, the MAASE DERBBI JOSHUA ben LEVI, the JOSIPPON and many others may be mentioned in this connection. These books all contain much valuable historical matter, but this is intermingled with a great amount of legendary, fanciful matter.

Beginning with the last quarter of the ninth century, we find a constantly growing number of historical works. It must be noted that a corresponding activity was manifested in the Christian world at the same time and, as is usual, found a reflex in the Jewish world. Here again, we must call attention to the fact that this historical activity was not caused by any purely scientific interest. Sherira Gaon's Letter is apologetic and polemical, to prove the continuity of the traditional authority, with a view to confuting the Karaites; sim-

7

ilarly, the Seder Olam Zuta tries to prove the legitimacy of the Babylonian Exilarchate. The JOSIPPON - we may believe - as is set forth in later prefaces (e.g. that of Leon Mosconi ¹ (fl.1270) and that of Tam ben Daud ibn Jachya ²) to console the Jews in their misery by showing them the great wonders the Lord had performed for His people in the past and, implicitly, holding forth hope for similar deliverances in the present and the future.

As coming from the first half of the ninth century, we may mention that interesting little book, known as the Book of Eldad Haddani; the SEDER TANNAIM and AMORAIM, 885 (circa); ^{Further} a lost historical work of Nathan ben Isaac Habbabli, 956 (circa); the above mentioned

1. - Found in the Magazin Berliner, אבן שן, 1878, p.017.

2. - Found in almost all the editions of the Hebrew text of the Vulgata, beginning with the Constantinople ed., 1510.

8

LETTER of SHERIRA GAON (986), written in answer to a question asked by Jacob ben Nissim of Kairuan, in regard to the origin of the Mishna. At the end of the tenth century, we place the SEDER OLAM ZUTA, which carries the tale of man from Adam to the end of the fifth century, A.C.E. It endeavors to prove that the Exilarch is of Davidic descent. It shows the strong influences of the Arabic chronicles. To the earlier part of the tenth or to the latter part of the ninth century, we ascribe the composition of the **JOSEIPPON**. The following centuries are richer in this literature.

These later Hebrew chronicles are characterized by a bald attempt to imitate the Biblical style, by being Pseudepigraphic, by the intermingling of fact and fancy. New facts they do not offer. Their style is pedantic and full of words and phrases that bear the

9

stamp of a later period.

We shall endeavor to treat the JOSIPPON -
which the best scholarship has assigned to this period
as stated above, - as the typical book of its age.

JOSIPPON IN GENERAL.

TITLES. EXPLANATIONS OF THE NAME. MAJOR AND MINOR

JOSIPPON. LIBRARY OF THE JOSIPPON. CONTENTS OF THE

JOSIPPON. COMPARED WITH FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS.

THE JOSIPPON.

The Josippon' (Hebrew יוסיפון², 198, 351, etc.)

is a chronicle written in Hebrew by the so called JOSEPH

1. - The author refers to the book as ספר יוסף בן גוריון^a. It is variously called ספר יוספון בן גוריון^b, (283); יברי הימים וקרבנות^c; (Mantua ed. fol. 133), דברי ירושלים יוספון ליהודים^d; (Vat. ms. 498), דברי הימים בני^e; יוספון לעבריים^f by Azaria dei Rossi to distinguish it from the יוספון לרומיים^g or the Greek Josephus: also יוספון אשכנזי^h and יוספון לישראלⁱ, דברי

a. - 65.250.276.309.etc. I cite according to the pagination of the Breithaupt ed., Gotha, 1707; and sometimes, according to the Peraqim of the Vulgata.
b. - cf. V. & R., p. 186, n. 5.

c. - ibid. - but Neubauer (J. Q. R. XI, 356) says that the title is a marginal gloss made by Jean Baptista, a converted Jew, sixteenth century.

d. - Suggested by Bacher (R. E. J. XXXVII, 146), since in a Hebrew-Persian dictionary by Salmon ben Samuel (1339), s. v. יוסף reference is made to a history of Alexander by that name. The דברי חלבי ישראל of Abraham Daud does not contain any Alexander legends and therefore cannot be the book referred to, while the Josippon contains a large number of them.

e. - cf. Meor Anayim, p. 37, 134.

f. - ibid. p. 52. 129. 184.

11

BEN GORION יוֹסֵפִין בֶּן גּוֹרִיוֹן 65.198.etc. or יוֹסֵפִין בֶּן גּוֹרִיוֹן

283), who assures us that he is that JOSEPH whom Titus and Vespasian lead into exile(65); that he is of priest-ly descent (65.157.198.250.351⁴.574.807.828.829.830.836. etc.); that he was an eye witness of and participant in the final struggles of the Jews with the Romans under Titus(67 et passim in peraqim 68-73, etc.); that he was the author of various books whose titles suggest the well known works of Flavius Josephus:²- all tending to

g.- dei Rossi, p. 15. חֲזָקֵי לֵב 15.

h.- cf. Wolff, Bibl. Hebr., p. 508 ff.

2.- this name is sometimes referred more particularly to the sixth book of the work(65 etc.), which is sometimes also called מלחמות יי, "Wars of the Lord"(ibid.).

1.- From this citation and on the author refers to himself merely as יוֹסֵף הַכֹּהֵן, "Joseph, the Priest".

2.- תוֹחַתוֹת וְחֲרִיבוֹת 1, an apology for the Jews(466):

produce the impression that he is Flavius Josephus, the son of Matthias, the Jewish governor of Galilee during the war, the friend of Titus, and the author of the Antiquities, the Wars, and the Contra Apionem.

The name JOSIPPON is in itself interesting and worthy of attention. The author tells us (874)¹ that when Joseph ben Gorion was appointed military governor of Galilee, he was called JOSIPPON as a title of honor.²

2. The "Wisdom of Joseph" (452): 3. A large Roman history (66): 4. A book on Jewish customs, etc. for Romans (452): 5. Certain books of wisdom among the Greeks and Romans:^a 6. The book under discussion.

a. - 4&5 may refer to the same work under different names

1. - cf. however p. 351. כה אמר יוסף בן גוריון והוא יוספון.
ולקטן השם והוא הנקרא יוספוס בן גוריון
which I take to mean that the name is to be interpreted as a diminutive. The words ולקטן השם are awkward in the context and it may be are the insert of some late harmonizer, who knew the explanation of Jerachmeel, et al.

Their form of the name is that of a diminutive,
 when explained on Hebrew ground, as was pointed out by
 Jerachmeel,¹ Leon Mosconi,² and Tam ben Daud ibn Jachya.²
 Mosconi compares the forms ירמיה and ירמיה' to ירמיה and
 ירמיה' in II Sam. III, 2 and XIII, 20. and Tam ibn Jachya
 calls further attention to ירמיה', Dt. XXXII, 20. They also
 add that it is a title of honor. Wellhausen³ calls atten-
 tion to the fact that in Arabic the vowel i is short
 in this word, pointing to a Latin original, rather than to the
 Greek Ιωσηπος. Gaster,⁴ however, holds that the name is

2.- cf. Skinner, Isaiah XL-LXVI, p. 46, Cambridge Bible.

1.- cf. V. & R., p. 186.

2.- cf. op. cit.

3.- cf. Well. Der Arabische Josippus, p. 44. Well. holds that the Arabic was made from the Hebrew version.

4.- cf. Gaster, Chronicles of Jerachmeel. Introduction.

a Byzantine form of Josephus, which is the best alternative explanation to that offered on Hebrew ground.

The Josippon, as we possess it, may not be the original, as Leon Mosconi (op. cit.) speaks of a MAJOR and MINOR JOSIPPON, which latter he holds to be our present text. We know that abridgements of the work were made by Abraham ben David of Geronta (12 century, cf. Mosconi op. cit.): by Samuel Hannagid of Cordova (first half of the 11 century, cf. ibid.)~~%%~~ by Sebastian Muenter (Worms, 1529)~~%%~~ by Sebastian Lepusculus (Basle, 1559): etc. These abstracts sometimes passed for the book itself, and it may be that Mosconi's statement refers to the earlier compendiums. His statement is borne out by Jerachmeel (12 century, cf. Gaster, op. cit.)~~%%~~ by Eleazar ben Asher Hallevi (1325)~~%%~~ by Abraham Zacuto in 1. - cf. Neubauer, op. cit., where he refers us to MS.d11

his Sefer Juchsin¹ (16 century) and by Azaria dei Rossi² a

(16 century). In the Zemach David of David Ganz³ (16 cent- ✓

ury), we are told that the Christians have a more com-

plete version of the book. Whether the references are

to the larger work of Flavius Josephus or to a Hebrew

work from which our Josippon was made is difficult to

determine. The constant use of the phrase, "And Joseph

ben Gorion says" (90.261.275.351.etc.) may be taken as

an indication that the work is an abstract. Further,

if we accept the explanation that the name Josippon de-

notes a diminutive, it may be that the name itself con-

of the Bodleian.

1.- cf. Warsaw ed. 1876 p. 13², 24².

2.- cf. op. cit., p. 246, 234.

3.- cf. Wolff, op. cit.

tains a subtle hint that the book is a "Little Josephus".

More definite proofs are lacking on this point.

The library of the author of the Josippon appears to have been quite extensive, though it is a question whether he knew the works he cites or merely quoted them from others. e.g. He mentions Nikolaus of Damascus. Did he possess the works of this author or did he only quote him from Flavius Josephus (cf. Ant.XII,3.2.) ?

Nikolaus of Damascus(67.261.315.335.etc.); Strabo of Cappadocia (67.283.335.347.); Titus Livius of Rome(68.309.335.); Togetha of Jerusalem(68.283.); Porophus of Rome (68.); History of Alexander the Great by the Egyptian Magi(90.); Philo (535.536. cf. Ant.XVIII,8.1.); Wenan ben 1.- cf. Azaria dei Rossi (op. cit.p.154.234.) mentions seeing such a work in Hebrew in his day.(16 century).

ben Enos (131.132.); Books of the Greeks, Persians, Medes, and Macedonians (250); Alekander's letters to Aristotle (131.); Acts of the Kings of Rome (250.); Aristteas (173); Cicero, Pompey's Lieutenant (335.); the Leap Year Tables of Julius Caesar (165.); etc. are among the many authors and books cited by this indefatigable writer. He may be compared to Flavius Josephus for the large number of books cited. Some of these works may be identified while others have disappeared from the field of our knowledge.

The narrative of the JOSIPPON, variously divided,¹ carries one through history from Adam to the destruction

1.- In B., the work is divided into six books containing 201 chapters; in the Vulgata, into the same number of books containing 97 chapters. In the Editio Princeps (Mantua, 1480), the book and chapter divisions, as well as all reference thereto (cf. infra) are lacking. The division into books must have been early as Mosconi (op.cit.) refers to

7

of the Second Temple by the Romans under Titus. The greater part of the book is devoted to Jewish history, though extended references are made to general history. The earliest part of Jewish history, i.e. the pre-exilic Biblical history, is not treated as fully as the importance of it deserves (cf. infra.). The history from the return from the Exile to the Hasmonean Revolution is briefly sketched but from that point and on, Jewish history is treated with a fullness of detail and vividness that is fascinating.

The author begins - like the author of the canonical book of Chronicles - with the genealogy of Adam, which he follows up through the Epigoni of Noah (p.1-10); the tales of the building of the Tower of Babel, the Confusion of Tongues, etc. In B. and V. the book divisions differ. e.g. in V. book I = p. 1-91 of B. ; in B., book I = p. 1 - 71.

of Tongues, and the Scattering of the Peoples (cf. Gen.V., X.,XI.); are the parts borrowed from the Bible story. By the introduction of Zepho, son of Eliphaz, son of Esau (cf. Gen. XXXVI,11 & 15) as the ancestor of the Kings of the Kittim, one of whose descendants founds Rome; of Uzi (cf.Gen. X.23); of a son of Hadadezer (cf. II SAM. VIII,3); and of David with whom the Romans conclude a treaty through fear of his prowess and build their walls up, the author bridges over the gap between Biblical and Roman history and proceeds to relate to us the legends of early Rome in a rather garbled form (p.11-22~~3~~). This is followed by a graphic account of the fall of Babylon, at the hands of Cyrus and Darius(1). After this begins the fuller account of Jewish history. The tales of the Return of the Jews from the Babylonian Exile (23-28), of Daniel (25-46~~8~~),

19

of Zerubabel (47-56) ~~the~~ the building of the Second Temple of the Holy Fire (60-63), and of the secreted Altar(63)- a strange mingling of canonical and apochryphal sources - follow this. A few notices of Cyrus and Cambyses (64-72) lead up to the Esther story, which is also embellished from extraneous sources. With one of his characteristic leaps, the author introduces us to the conflict between Alexander and Darius (84-90); treats of the former's relations with the Jews (86-89) and then describes his campaigns at some length, which accounts he prefaces with some legends about his ancestry, birth and early life (90-152# Bk. II of V. ~~1~~). Then follows a short review of

1.- Strangely enough, the author inserts in this narrative, ~~mm~~ one Jewish notice(125); that the Makares are the descendants of Jonadab ben Rechab(cf. II Kings X,15; Jer.XXXV,6)

his successors (153-167), always with more or less reference to Roman history. The author now takes up his main theme, which he interrupts in but four places. The assault on the Temple by Heliodorus (168-172), the Translation of the Bible by the Seventy (172-176), the Maccabean Revolution (176-250 circa), the rise and fall of the Hasmoneans and the rise of the Herodians (250-540), the last war till the final catastrophe (540-886) follow one another in rapid succession. There follows a supplement (886-892) containing an elegy by Joseph, the Priest, and the expression of some general Messianic hopes. The only interruptions in these narratives (168-886) are four snatches from Roman history G (221-226; 349-358; 529; 667-673).

The author of the JOSIPPON covers the same

ground as does Flavius Josephus in Antiquities I, 2, 1; 4, 3;

5; 6; X 10; XI 1, 1; 2; 3; 6; 8; XII 2; 6; and in the seven

books of his Jewish Wars. Besides much is found in the

Josippon of which there is no hint in Josephus (e.g.

the account of Alexander's campaigns), or of which the merest

mention is made in Josephus (e.g. Titus' speech to the

Jews, p. 848; cf. Wars. III 4, 5). This additional information

was drawn from the works which he cites (cf. supra);

from the mass of Jewish tradition (e.g., p. 690, cf. Gittin

57, 6) and from his own fancy (e.g., the speeches in the

work, p. 87, 848, etc. 8)

TRANSMISSION OF THE JOSIPPON.

CITATIONS IN JEWISH LITERATURE FROM THE TENTH TO THE

FOURTEENTH CENTURY. MANUSCRIPTS. PRINTED EDITIONS.

TRANSLATIONS AND VERSIONS.

TRANSMISSION OF THE JOSIPPON.

I have stated above that the best scholarship has assigned this book to the end of the Gaonic period. From that time and on, we have an almost perfect chain of citations of the work, of manuscripts, and printed editions, as well as of versions and translations. Therefore, before discussing the different views as to the origin, date and authorship of the book, I wish to devote a few pages to tracing the transmission of the Josippon in Jewish and other literatures.

It is a matter of grave importance in the critique of the Josippon, as to the first reference to the Josippon in Jewish literature. I follow Neubauer (op. cit.) in assigning to Dunash ibn Tamim (900-960), the

first authenticated reference to the book. The reference
(cf. p. 624) in the commentary of Saadja on Danl. IX,27
has been proven to ^{be} later by Rappaport as he shows that
the commentary is not the work of Saadja Gaon (892-942)
but of an unknown exegete of Narbonne(?). The question
of the date of Eleazar Qalir (who has reminiscences of
Josippon language²) is more complex. Gaster³ puts him
in the seventh century; Weiss⁴, in the time of Nitronai
Gaon (d.869); and Rappaport⁵, in the time of Sherira
Gaon (920-1000). Thus following Neubauer, the dating
of Qalir according to Rappaport fits in nicely and we
note Qalir as the second reference to our book in Jew-
ish literature. Rabbenu Gershom (960-1028) is the next
to cite the book.

1.- cf. ספר הענינים, 1828, p.342.

2.- cf. ibid., 1829, p.102,n.7.

3.- cf. op .cit.

4.- cf. Juedische Tradition, IV,224,n.5.

5.- cf. op .cit., 1829.

In the eleventh century, we have Rashi¹ (1040-1105), Bechai² (first half of the century), Jerachmeel,³ Rabbi Nathan of Rome,⁴ Samuel Hannagid of Cordova,⁵ and Moses ibn Ezra who cite this book: Also, one Jacob^B ben Reuben, a Karaite (1010-1030), who cites *Tosippon*, on *Danl. VII*⁶

In the twelfth century, we find Samuel ben Meir⁶ (1100-1160), and Isaac ben Samuel⁷ (d. 1200, circa) - both descendants of Rashi - Abraham ibn Ezra⁸ (1098-1167), Abraham Levita ben Dior⁹ (1161), Jehuda Haddassi,¹⁰ the

- 1.- cf. II Kings XX, 13: Exek. XXVII, 17: Danl. V, 1: VI, 29: VII, 6: VIII, 11, 21, 22: XI, 2, 17: Hag. II, 6: Zec. IX, 14: Isa. XXI, 4: XXXIX, 2: Berachot 43^R: Joma' 23^R: B. Bathra 3^B.
- 2.- cf. Gen. L, 8.
- 3.- cf. Gaster, op. cit.
- 4.- In his Aruch, s.v. *yaw*.
- 5.- cf. Introd. of Mosconi, cited above.
- 6.- cf. Pesachim 119^A.
- 7.- cf. Tosafot Aboda Zara 10^B.
- 8.- cf. Psalms CXX, 5.
- 9.- cf. Sefer Haqqabalah.
- 10.- cf. I Chron. XI, 17.

Karaite, Abraham ben Daud Hallevi of Geronta¹, and an unknown commentator of Chronicles in the Rheinfels who knew the Josippon.

In the thirteenth century, David Qimchi² (1160-1235), Moses Nachman³ (1195-1270), Chizkiah ben Manoach (1260), Leon Mosconi⁴ (1270), and the ~~Sefer Nitzachon~~⁵ refer to this work. References increase in number from this time on so that hardly a decade can be mentioned in the succeeding centuries in which we cannot trace the book in Jewish literature.

The earliest reference to the Josippon in non-

1.- cf. Dibrai Ma'chal Jisroel.

2.- cf. Hag. II, 7, 10; Zec. XI, 14; Lexicon, s.v. גרמא וזאב.

3.- cf. Gen. I, 9.

4.- cf. op. cit.

5.- p. 96.

Jewish literature is made by ibn Hazm¹ (Spain, d. 1063).

The earliest Ms.^{is} ~~are~~ the Turin Ms., 1325. Three other complete Mss. are found - two in the Vatican, dating from the middle of the fifteenth century, and one in Paris, 1472, which has the excellent introduction of Mosconi², to which reference has been so often made. There are also some fragments of Josippon Mss. in the Bodleian, the longest of which is an account of the fall of Jerusalem, 1461.

Printed editions began to appear by the end of the fifteenth century. The Hebrew text has been published in almost innumerable editions, most of which are merely reprints and offer few, if any, variants.

- 1.- cf. Chwolson, Sammelband, 1897, שו"ת ופליגא, p. 5ff.
- 2.- cf. V. & B., p. 186.

MANTUA, 1480, fol., was the first print and is known as the EDITIO PRINCEPS. It was provided with an introduction by Abraham Konath. The CONSTANTINOPLE, 1510, edition, provided with an introduction by Tam ben Daud ibn Jachya, is generally known as the VULGATA and is the text most frequently printed. The most significant variants in the text are found between these two editions (Cf. infra). Among the most important prints of the Hebrew text, alone, we may mention a book of excerpts, published by Peter Schaeffer, Worms, 1529: the Venice edition, 1541: an edition by David Kyberi Argentorati, 1550: the Cracow editions of 1589 and 1595: an edition in Frankfort on the Main, 1689: the 1723 Amsterdam edition: an edition in Prague in 1784: in 1794, two prints in Leghorn and Wengrow, respectively: in Zolkiew, 1805: in Wilna, 1819: in Calcutta,

29

1841: in Lemberg, 1855; 1869: in Warsaw, 1860: and many more too numerous to mention.

The book has been translated into many languages. The first translation was made into Arabic in the eleventh century by Sa'id al Jemeni; and again in 1223, by Zekkaria ibn Sa'id. The Arabic may be found in the Paris (1645) and the London (1657) polyglots. From the Arabic was made an Ethiopic version. Wellhausen (op. cit.) mentions an Abyssinian translation. In the fourteenth century, a Persian version was made. (cf. Neubauer, op. cit.).

In Basle, 1541, Sebastian Muenster printed the Hebrew text of M., with a Latin translation and introduction. At the same city, in 1559, Sebastian Lepusculus printed in Latin an abstract of Muenster's work.

In 1603, Johann Drusius edited a Latin version of the Josippon. In 1706, at Oxford, appeared the book of Johann Gagnier, containing the Hebrew text, with Latin translation and introduction. In 1707, Joseph Breithaupt issued a new edition of V. at Gotha with a Latin translation, introduction and notes. Other Latin versions appeared in Gotha and Leipzig in 1710.

The Josippon enjoyed a most extraordinary popularity in England. The discussions anent the divorce proceedings of Henry VIII. and the constant reference to the Levitical laws of Levirate aroused an interest in Jewish customs and history. To satisfy this demand, in 1558, Peter Morwyn made the first English version of the Josippon from Muenster's work. Edition followed edition, in 1561, 1567, and 1575. In 1579, John Wallie

and Thomas Adams revised and annotated this version. Their edition was reprinted in 1593 and 1808. James Stafford issued the book as a Royalist tract in 1652 and again in 1684. Another version was made and published in London in 1701. The last Stafford print was illustrated.

The earliest version in any modern language was made in German in 1530. Another translation into this tongue was made by George Wolff in Magdeburg in 1561. A German translation in Hebrew type was issued in Amsterdam in 1707. Jewish German translations have been frequent. The first was made by Michael Adam in Zurich, 1548.¹ Moses ben Bezalel issued another version in Prague, 1607.

1.- Known as the Kether Kehunah and the Sheerith Jisroel (vols. 1&2).- Issued very frequently, as it has been very popular with the Jews in this form.

32

In 1661, at Amsterdam, Abraham ben Mordechai edited another version and, the same year, a similar work appeared at Prague. The Amsterdam edition was re-issued in 1723, 1743, and 1771. This last edition was illustrated. Another version was made by Seligman Reis in Frankfort on the Main, 1692. and reprinted in 1708. In 1771, in Furth, and in 1779, in ^{Frank} Dyrenfurth, other Jewish German versions appeared. A Jiddish version was printed in Lemberg in 1882.

^{yon} Spaniolli versions were printed in Constantinople, 1743, and later in Salonica in 1863.

The first French version was made in 1613.

TRADITIONAL VIEW OF THE JOSIPPON.

TRADITIONAL VIEW STATED. RECONCILIATIONS OF DIVERGENT

NAMES. IDENTIFICATIONS.. CORRESPONDENCES WITH FLAVIUS

JOSEPHUS. HIS LIFE. HIS WORK. STYLISTIC ARGUMENT.

TRADITIONAL RATING OF THE BOOK.

36

THE TRADITIONAL VIEW OF THE JOSIPPON.

The traditional view of the authorship of the Josippon has been held - explicitly or implicitly - by all Jewish writers from the tenth century down almost to our own day. [~~Even so late a production as the~~ ~~מבשר צדיק~~ of Ben ~~Jacob~~ Jacob (1880) holds to the traditional view of the matter.] Many Christians shared this view, of whom the most important was the above named Sebastian Muenster.

The Traditionalists hold that the JOSIPPON was written by FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, in HEBREW, previous to his writing his BELLUM JUDAEICUM in GREEK. (cf. ^{his} Preface). They hold that JOSEPH BEN GORION is one and the same as FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, who wrote a book in Greek on the Wars

of the Jews, and that this book has been transmitted in its original Hebrew, through the centuries, mutilated and interpolated¹ by careless and unscrupulous writers. For substantiation of their claim they argue as follows.

The name GORION is not unknown in the early Jewish sources. Josephus mentions one Joseph ben Gorion (cf. Wars, II, 20, 3) as one of the military commanders of Jerusalem, who had as his special charge the repair of the city walls. In Midrash Rabba to Esther, chap. 3, we find גוריון² mentioned and a Midrash² of that name is included in the collection made by Adolph Jellinek, בית המדרש, vol. I. In Taanith 20^a and Gittin 56^b, we find a Nikodemon ben Gorion mentioned. We also find in the

1.- cf. dei Rossi, op.cit., p. 134.

2.- A reworking of Midrash Rabba to Esther.

Palestinian Talmud, Erubin 4,3 that a family named Gorion lived in Rome. Therefore that a family of more or less prominence lived in the times of Josephus is well established, not only by the testimony of Josephus himself, but also by that of contemporaries and successors.

The difficulty that Flavius Josephus never calls himself the son of Gorion but always refers to his father as Matthias (cf. Vita 2), is glossed over in various ways. Peter Morwyn (cf. supra) was little troubled by this crux. He says in his Epistle to the Reader in his first English edition "Although he name himselfe in this ,BEN GORION, that is the sonne of GORION, and in the other, the sonne of MATTHIAS; whiche is a thing so common in the Jewes genealogies, that men nede not seke farre for the lyke". The Sefer Juchsin² ingeniously calls

1. - Quoted in the London Jewish Chronicle. 1894.

the author JOSEPH BEN MATTHIAS BEN GORION. Sebastian
Muenster, in his preface,¹ has a very clever and what
would seem to be a very acceptable explanation of the diffi-
culty. He calls to mind that a descendant of David is
known as BEN DAVID, no matter what his immediate father's
name might be. From this Muenster infers that, whenever
there was a distinguished ancestor in a Jewish family,
all the descendants were known as his children. Flavius
Josephus tells us that he was of Hasmonean descent,² and
therefore his great eponymous ancestor was Matthias.
Hence, in the JOSIPPON, he speaks of himself as BEN GORION,

2.- cf. Wolff, op. cit.

1.- Reprinted in B.

2.- cf. Ant. XVI, 7, 1: Vita 1.

referring to his own father; while in his GREEK works, he calls himself the son of Matthias, but to be understood in the sense here explained. Other identifications of still less value have been attempted. Jacob Attignius¹ identifies Joseph ben Gorion with Joseph of Arimathea,² but this would lead only to more difficult complications. Rabbi Jair Chayim Bacharach (17 century)³ identifies the author of the Josippon with the Joseph Hakkohen of Rabbinical literature,⁴ as does also one ^{R.} Joseph Saul ^{Nathan sghn} Hallevi.⁵ Bacher⁶ goes so far as to identify the above named Nikodem ben Gorion and Joseph ben Gorion. Leon Mosconi⁷

1.- cf. Wolff, op. cit.

2.- cf. St. Mat. XXVIII, 57.

3.- cf. J.Q.R., III, p. 512.

4.- cf. Zebachim 100^a.

5.- cf. Haskama in the Lemberg (1869) ed. of the Josippon.

6.- cf. R.E.J., XXXVII, p. 155 ff.

7.- cf. op. cit.

thinks that our author is the Joseph mentioned in Midrash Ezra and Midrash Dibrai Hayyamim.

The author of the Josippon tells us that he is of priestly descent¹ and this agrees with the account that Josephus^{gives us} of himself.¹ The author tells us, too, that he was that Joseph taken captive by Titus and Vespasian,² for verification of which fact the traditionalist sends us to consult Josephus.² He tells us that he was commander of Galilee and participated in the last war.³ He protests again and again that he was an eye witness of the events that he describes. Josephus tells us that he wrote

a book in the language of his own country,⁴ which is none

1.- cf 65.198 et passim and Vita § 1.

2.- cf. 65 ff. and Vita 76: Wars II, 8, 9.

3.- cf. Wars II, 20 et seq. and III passim and p. 574 to the end, passim.

other than Hebrew. And did not Josephus's education and² position fit for such a work? In short an almost complete correspondence is found between Joseph ben Gorion and Joseph ben Matthias as regards life, character and work. The divergence of name is explained as above. Any further discrepancies are attributed to bad transmission of the text and to interpolations - a dangerous weapon for the traditionalist to wield.

The purity of his style³ is emphasized and brought in evidence of its^{the book's} authenticity. Only an author

4.- cf. Preface to Wars: and Eusebius Eccl.Hist., 3, 9.

1.- cf. Haskama cited above.

2.- cf. Vita 2.

3.- cf. Gaster, op. cit.; Trieber, G.G.N., 1895, no. 4, p.

409; Graetz, Geschichte V, p. 319; et al. but cf. infra.

who lived when Hebrew was yet a spoken language could have used it with such fluency ; and did not the sacred tongue only fall into disuse after the war? This was the first book composed in Hebrew after the close of the Canon. Attention is further called to the accuracy of his descriptions of battering rams, chariots and other war paraphanelia², long since fallen into disuse if the critics date the book in the end of the Gaonic period. Only a contemporary could have so intimate a knowledge of technical matters.

The book was rated very high among the Jews for its historical worth, for its language and for the loftiness of its stone. Abraham Konath gives expression

1.- cf. Haskama quoted above.

2.- cf. 591. 592. 593. 599. 720. etc.

to this opinion in the following extravagant words.

"This honored book was composed by a man almost divine,
a sturdy warrior, a priest of the Most High God. ----In
his book he excels all others who lived after King Solo-
mon of blessed memory."

The burden of the proof rests with the critics.

1.- Quoted by Muenster in his Preface. cf. B.

THE CRITICAL VIEW OF THE JOSIPPON.

HISTORY OF JOSIPPON—CRITICISM. CRITICAL VIEW STATED.

ARGUMENTS THEREFOR. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE. INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

DISCREPANCIES IN THE BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES. SUSPICIOUS

^SPROTEOTATIONS. CONTRADICTIONS WITH JOSEPHUS. MISREADINGS

OF JOSEPHUS. MISQUOTATIONS OF JOSEPHUS. DIFFERENCES IN

METHOD. JOSIPPON IS A TRANSLATION. THE AUTHOR USED LATE

SOURCES. LATE PEOPLES, PLACES, EVENTS AND CUSTOMS ARE RE-

FERRED TO. AUTHOR EXPRESSED LATE IDEAS. USED LATE LAN-

GUAGE. IMPURE STYLE. UNRELIABILTY^I IN MATTERS OF FACT.

SUBSTITUTION OF JOSEPH BEN GORION FOR JOSEPH BEN MATTHIAS.

SUMMING UP.

CRITICAL VIEW.

The view as stated in the preceding section was held by all scholars among the Jews and Christians for centuries. Protected by transmission in the sacred tongue, and hallowed by a quasi sanctity, the book was handed down among the Jews for centuries, unquestioned as to its authenticity. In the early centuries, Christian scholarship devoted little or no attention to Jewish studies, much less to this chronicle, which could be duplicated a half dozen times in Christian sources. In the fifteenth century, began the Renaissance of Jewish studies and the

1.- cf. supra.

2.- cf. Abraham Konath, supra.

interest aroused then, has continued to this day.

The difficulty of the identification, made by the traditionalist, was first felt by Gilbert Genebrardus (1537-1597) who pointed out that many things were of a later date in the Josippon than the traditionalist view would permit, and that parallel passages in the works of Flavius Josephus differed occasionally from the Josippon. A whole galaxy of Christian scholars² became interested in the question and the material was well gone over in the following centuries.

The first Jew to enter into these studies was Azaria dei Rossi (1514-1578) in his epoch making work,

1.- cf. Wolff, op. cit.

2.- cf. ibid. Joh. Drusius, Jos. Scaliger, Isaac Casaubon, Jos. Gagnier, Jos. Bœnigne, Joh. Buxtorff, et. al.

E

Meor Anayim. In this book, he showed that a distinction

must be made between יוסיפון לרומיים and יוסיפון ליהודים¹

that the work contains many statements that have been fal-

sified² that there are variant editions.³ But dei Rossi

did not reject the identification made by tradition and

referred to the works of Flavius Josephus as those of

Joseph ben Gorion.⁴ He preferred the Greek Josephus to

the Hebrew as he thought that the former was tampered

with less.⁵ Dei Rossi was on the point of making an im-

portant discovery but the force of tradition made him

1.- cf. חצרת לבסוף, p.15, et passim.

2.- cf. Meor Anayim, p.234.134.

3.- ibid. e.g.-Alexander legends (90 ff) and description of the coronation ceremonies (665 ff) are found in V. but not in BM

4.- cf. חצרת לבסוף, p.15.

5.- cf. Meor Anayim, p.37.

untrue to his best scholarship. This appears to be characteristic of his bent of mind for we are told "Strong as he was in removing obstructive rubbish, his power of reconstruction was small". Critical studies were not cultivated among the Jews during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and so the work of dei Rossi lay unnoticed.

The great Renaissance of Jewish Science among the Jews in the early part of the last century brought the questions concerned with this book- as well as many other similar problems- to the fore once again. Zunz, Rappaport, Carmoly, Geiger and many others whose names are well known in the history of modern Jewish studies, gave more or less attention to this book. Since then there has not been a lack of Christian and Jewish scholars

to keep the questions involved alive. There is no writer on Mediaeval literature of ~~the~~ Jews who has not treated the subject of the Josippon more or less extensively.

Briefly stated the critical view of the date, authorship, and country of the Josippon is as follows.

This book was not written by Flavius Josephus, the son of the priest, Matthias, in the first Christian century, but by the so-called Joseph ben Gorion at the close of the Gaonic period. It is not an original Hebrew production but a mosaic of other works which have been translated into Hebrew. It is not a Palestinian production but the work of some Mediaeval Italian Jew.

The critic argues as follows.

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS carefully discriminates between himself and Joseph ben Gorion (cf. Wars, II, 20, 3)

who could not have been a priest as Josephus always adds the title when speaking of such (ibid. et passim).

Josephus never mentions a name Gorion in connection with his family but tells that his father was MATTHIAS,¹ and as if to preclude any doubts on this point, he gives us his genealogy as far back as Jonathan^{the Maccabean}. Josephus does not mention a brother BONIN as does Josippon but one Matthias.²

Josephus tells us that Gorion was slain during the ~~siege~~ ^{siege}

while Josippon informs us that his father Gorion lived

twenty months after the fall of Jerusalem.³ Further, when

Josephus tells us in the preface to the Wars⁴ that he wrote

1.- cf. Vita, 1: Wars II, 20, 4.

2.- cf. 867. 870. 887. and Vita 2.

3.- Wars IV, 6, 1. cf. 867.

4.- cf. Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. 3, 9., where he tells us that Josephus wrote a history in the language of his fatherland.

a book in "the language of our country" he cannot mean Hebrew as in his day the people no longer spoke Hebrew but an Aramaic dialect.

Another striking fact, though not a conclusive argument, is the fact that the Rabbinical, Gaonic and Patristic literatures are absolutely silent with reference to a Hebrew Josephus, though works of a similar character are referred to. In the Talmud,² e.g. Seder O-lam is referred to. We must recollect in this connection that the first reference to the book in Jewish literature is found in the tenth century, and in non-Jewish literature in the eleventh century (cf. supra). But we need

1.- cf. Wars VI, 2.1. where Josephus refers to the language of the country as Hebrew. He uses the word in the same loose sense as do the N.T. writers.

2.- cf. *Jeb.* 82^b; *Mid.* 46^b; *Sab.* 98^a, etc.

no external evidence. The book speaks for itself and the chain of evidence that is woven to prove that the work is late from the text of the book itself, is difficult to break through.

Besides the discrepancies mentioned above between the life of Josephus and the life of the author of the Josippon, which are in themselves insurmountable difficulties, the author betrays his identity on various occasions. It is suspicious that the author should be constantly endeavoring to identify himself with the real Josephus. Sometimes, too, he forgets his assumed role and quotes from Josephus as if from a strange author,² which mingling Zunz (G.D.V., p.158) assures us is charac-

1.- cf. 65.157.257. 350.352.367.673.751.

2.- cf. 250. 309.337.334.373.446.452.466.510.524.,etc.

teristic of the younger pseudepigraphic writers. e.g.

Boraita of R. Eliezer. Writing as he does in the third person, the author occasionally slips into the third person (676). His self praise is immoderate (677) and unbecoming so temperate and modest a writer as Josephus.

Who does not feel the artificiality of the harmonies suggested above, between the names Joseph ben Matthias and Joseph ben Gorion? We dare not tinker with problems when a remedy suggests itself which is rational and offers a satisfactory explanation of all the difficulties of the case. A harmony is at best a testimonium paupertatis.

Further, if Josephus translated the book from Hebrew into Greek, we have a perfect right to expect that the two works should agree, even in the minutest

details. And any errors arising from a misunderstanding of the text should point to a Hebrew original.

We have already mentioned the discrepancies between their statements as to their lives and their families. ^{Further,} Gorionides tells us that Herod is of Jewish descent while Josephus rejects Nikolaus's sycophantic statements for the more correct ones of his Idumean origin. Gorionides omits all mention of Joseph ben Matthias as military commander of Galilee.² Josephus tells us that Pompey took Jerusalem on the fast day of the third month, while Gorionides says, on the seventeenth day of the fourth month on the day of the fast.³ Josephus tells us that

1.- 316. cf. Ant. XIV, 1.3.

2.- 574. cf. Wars II, 20.4

3.- Ant. XIV, 4.3. cf. p. 333. Similarly, p. 401 and Ant XIV, 16.4. with regard to the capture of Jerusalem by Sossius.

Marcus Tullius Cicero was one of the consuls when Pompey captured Jerusalem, and Josippon tells that he was a lieutenant in the army.¹ In the Josippon, we are told that the blood of Aristobulus was sent to be examined, while Josephus omits all mention of such a circumstance.² Menahem ben Saruq (910-970) is substituted in the Josippon for the scribe Mani ben Eliezer.³ According to ben Gorion the whole Bible was translated by the Seventy under Ptolemy Philadelphus, while Josephus tells us that only the Pentateuch was done at that time.⁴ According to Wars IV,

1.5.,⁵ EBUTIUS is killed in battle. According to the Josippon, (632) BUTIO⁵ is killed while fleeing for his life.

- 1.- Ant.XIV,4.1. cf.p.333.
- 2.- p.281. cf. Ant.XIII,11.3 and Wars I,3.6.
- 3.- p.807. cf. Wars,V,13.7.
- 4.- p.173.175. cf. Pref. to Ant. 3.

The table sent by the High Priest Eleazar to Ptolemy Philadelphus is engraved with the river Meander according to Josephus, but according to our author, with the river of Egypt.¹ According to Josephus, the High Priest who met Alexander the Great was Jaddua, while according to the Josippon, his name was Hannanya.² A reference to Breithaupt's³ valuable notes will furnish many similar cases of contradictions, of which I have cited but a few typical ones.

Not only does the author of the Josippon contradict the statements of the works of Josephus, but in many cases also he misreads his original so that his trans-

5.- Such variation in the names is too frequent to mention.

1.- Ant.XII,2.9. cf.p.176.

2.- Ant.XI.8.5. cf.p.86.

lations are absurd. e.g. - p.335, we read שחיתים גרים ואנשי אודוס

which is a misreading of וסדרבוס וטוביאוס וקרקיאוס

"Gaius Antonius et Marcus Tullius Cicero" (Ant.XIV,4.3),

by which the author made two person, five. Similarly, we

find קיליאולוס αὐλῶρα Τελλήν (Ant.XIII,15.4) rendered

את קיליקוס ואת אולן ואת פילן, p.297. These errors

would seem to point to the fact that the Hebrew is ^{not} an original but a translation. (cf. infra).

The author of the Josippon occasionally mis-quotes Josephus. Josephus tells us (Ant.XIV,3.1.) that the inscription on the Golden Vine seen by him in Rome was "Gift of Alexander the King of the Jews." but that the report was that Aristobulus had sent it to Pompey.

Our author therefore corrects the inscription to read "Gift of Aristobulus/etc.", without giving us any notice that he has done so. It is a clear case of misquotation.

Nor must we omit mention of the difference in method of treatment of historical incidents. The Josippon is filled with legends. Mere facts mentioned by Josephus are worked up into long tales. Speeches, objectively noted by Josephus, are elaborated into long addresses in a most rhetorical manner. It seems that the divergences between the Josippon and Josephus are too great to be explained as falsifications or accidents.

I mentioned above that the Josippon showed traces of being translated. The following facts will bear out the statement more fully. p.158, בן שירן is found which points to the Latin original as in the Hebrew sources, we find the name written בן שירא (cf. Sanh.100^b)

בן שירא (443.729.816) is evidently the equivalent of

1.- cf. Wars VI,4.5 and 848. See also 565.686.694.708.714. et

"magnanimi"; הגאנותי לו נפשו (505), of "concredere vit-
 am"; חבריו רע; (670), of "libertates"; שטרי החפשות
 טוב (229), of "socii amique"; זקן כלב (98) of "barbam
 caninam"; יאביס; (20.678) of "Templum Jovis"; "Anti-
 ochus Pius" (260) is rendered פיאוס and not
 ; Johannis----- perpetuis vinculis innodatus us-
 que ad mortem magis trahens spiritum vitare etc." is ren-
 dered והוא אסור בכלי ברזל ויהי מקץ ז' ימים וימת
 ב חנק ומיתה משונה (868)

We also learn that the author of the Josippon
 used late sources. 1.- The greater part of the book is
 based upon the work of Hegesippus "De Bello Judaico et
 Excidio Urbis Hierosolomytanae", which was rendered into
 Latin from the Greek Josephus by St. Ambrosius of Milan
 (fourth century). It was early ascribed, by some confus-

ion to a Bishop Hegesippus(second century), who was a
 converted Jew. Some critics(Delitzsch, Rappaport, Stein-
 s Schneider et al.) hold that the author of the Josippon
 merely translated Hegesippus into Hebrew but this posi-
 tion seems to be untenable, as it is very evident that
 the author used other sources also. Trieber (op. cit.)
 claims that from p.466 and on the basis of the work is
 Hegesippus, as these pages are filled with the antitheses
 and other rhetorical devices of Heg. The speeches are
 faithfully preserved from Heg. and similar errors in
 History and Geography are found in both. e.g., p.829
 x j w i a, Heg., Goshna. Hegh confuses the Jordan and the
 Euphrates. cf. p.474. In Heg.3.3, in the account of the
 land for military purposes, Joseph ben Matthias is omit-
 ted and Joseph is made to be the Joseph who was appointed

governor of Galilee. cf. p. 574, ff. Heg. says that Herod was buried 200 stadia ^f from where he died. Josippon says (519.520) that Herodion is 200 stadia from Jerusalem. (cf. Ant. XVII, 8.3). The text of the Josippon is an evident

misunderstanding of the text of Heg. Zunz (G.D.V.)

points out further the following passages in which Josippon copies Heg. 605(3.16): 608(3.17): 688(5.2): 743(5.

16): 777(5.22): 795(5.23): 847(5.41): 878(5.53). Voßgel-

stein and Rieger (op. cit.) point out that in the following passages, the Josippon agrees with Heg. against Josephus.

487(1.43): 489(1.42): 499(1.44): 515(1.45): 519(.146): 521

(2.1): 522(2.1): 530(2.4): 543(2.9): 571(2.15): 635(4.15):

650(4.15): 664(4.29): 678(4.33): 720(5.13): 728(5.15):

821(5.30): 837(5.37): 2.-SYNKELLOS (seventh century)

was also used by the author of the Josippon as the follow-

ing argument will show. The author knew Greek and we may infer from this that he used a Greek source. e.g. איארון,

Σεραρ: זקידיון, Νικωδημων: אנטיוכוס, Αντιπατρος (tho

in the other parts of the book אנטיוכוס is used): קסטוביון,

καπτωλιωρ: יודון, Ροδωρ (the Greek accusative form): פפון,

Φαρος (acc.): לטיון, Λατινωρ (gen. plur.): ארמיאקין,

Αρμεριακωρ (gen. pl.): סיבסטיון, Σεβαστηρ (acc.): etc.

etc. (cf Trieber, op. cit.). The author did not use

Africanus as his source as A. assigns 300 years to the

Ptolemies, while the Josippon assigns only 295. Nor did

he use Eusebius as E. did not mention Cornelius Gallus

nor the duration of the rule of the Ptolemies. Synkellos,

alone of the Greek chronographers agrees with the Josippon

in matters of fact. The part of the Josippon for which

Synkellos is the source is the history of the Diadochi.

3. - The Apocryphal tales are borrowed from the Latin version. e.g. Alexander's generals are called "his family," (p.166, cf. I Mac.I,6) and see above on ben Sirach.

4. - The tales of Zepho and Nektanebus are cribbed from the "De Rebus Alexandri" of the eighth century. The author may also have used the De Vita Alexandri and the De Proeliis Alexandri of Leo Presbyter(d.965). Gagnier found a Greek history of Alexander in the Bodleian, with a Latin translation, which was an almost literal rendering of the narrative of the Josippon, p.90-152. 5. - Book III, chapters 1 & 2 are from the Chronicle of Hieronymus as quoted by Eusebius (cf. Wolff, op. cit.) 6. - The contents of the Voelkertafel, p.3, may be borrowed from the Chazar letter (955). The names in them are almost alike. These are absolutely similar (אונגר) אונגרי, (טורקא) טורקי, בולגר, (בוגר) בוגרי

and ^במִיָּה: while the other names can be easily identified.

7.- The John the Baptist story shows Christian influences

(533). The Christians were the first to state that Herod

was the son of Antipater, the Ashkalonite (Justin. Dial.

contra Tryphon 52. cf.p.163). We may mention here incid-

entally that the Josippon was very popular with the Chris-

tians at all times, it being their chief source of infor-

mation besides Josephus , concerning Jewish history, etc.

8.- We also find traces of the influence of the prayer book

on the language of the Josippon. e.g. 428.606.733.756.etc.

9.- The author used the Haggada freely.e.g. p.216. מִיָּה,

(cf. Gittin 57^a) and not Bethsuron as in II Mac.XI,5.

690. The tale of the blood of Zechariah. cf. Gittin 57^b .

131. The ocean flood that encircles one third of the earth

cf. Midrash Rabba to Bereshith 23, end. p.187.784.- The

according to the Arabic notation.

The author of the Josippon refers to peoples, cities, and places under their late names or which were not known till late. e.g. Franks, 354.519.547: Toscana, 4: Angles, 547: Po, 6: Danes, 547: Ireland, 547: Burgundy, 547.772: Turkomanni, 92: Brahmins, 128: Barbary, 221: Sestia, 728.753: Ancona, 391: Campagna di Roma, 7: Romagna, 20: Sorrento, 19: Trani, 869: Tessino, 6: Candia, 163: Otranto, 391: Lombardy, 6: Bretons, 2: Seine, 2: France, 2. etac . etc.

The author refers to late events. e.g. 221.-

The Goths are in Spain. 7.- Tarsus fell into the hands of the Arabs (790 A.C.E.). 165.- Caesar made a calendar for the Greeks and the CHRISTIANS. 330.- The balsam industry in Egypt. 807.- He refers to Mtenahem ben Saruq

(tenth century). 351.- He mentions Hegesippus(fourth century). 667.ff.2 He minutely describes the coronation ceremonies of a mediaeval emperor, with full attendance of Pope, Bishops, Electors, etc. 97.- "For then the Greeks were idolaters". Points to a time when the Greeks were no longer considered such.

The author was acquainted with ideas that came into the western world late. e.g. 725.- Josephus spoke Hebrew. as did also Titus.p.831. 847. p.871.- The stars are not made of fire. 125.- The mystical mountains behind which live the lost tribes of the Jews. 800.- Transmigration of souls and various other metaphysical niceties

1.- It may be that the Sefer Eldad Haddani is the source of this idea.

about "Souls".789.799.882. The explanations of many words

like נְשָׁמָה 630: נְשָׁמָה 329: נְשָׁמָה 272: נְשָׁמָה 709: נְשָׁמָה

349: נְשָׁמָה 757: used for the future world. 221.673.828.

The apocalyptic interpretations of Daniel.

We are told that the language and the style of the Josippon are Biblical, which opinion is held also by some of the critics.(cf. supra). Exception has been taken to this statement by Sigmund Fraenkel(Z.D.M.G. ,L.p.418,ff) as well as by others. 1.- The author's style is not

Biblical but is crowded with Biblical words and phrases.

e.g.p.216.254.- נְשָׁמָה ,cf.II Kings XXV.1: p. 329.414. נְשָׁמָה .cf.

Ezek.XXVII,17: p.12, - נְשָׁמָה ,cf. Psalms CXXXIX,16: p.12.-

נְשָׁמָה תמחה את זכר יחודה.- p.193. cf. Ezek.XXI,26: נְשָׁמָה חסד

cf.Exod.XVII,14: p.194.- נְשָׁמָה יובל סבה,cf.Isaiah XXXIV,2:

LIII,7: p.202.- לבן, אשר חלאו לבן, cf. Esthr.

VII,5: p.217.- יי הוא הנלחם עמהם, cf. Exod. XIV, 25: etc.

The author has a decided fondness for unusual expressions of Biblical language. cf. above and p. 281.- יירחפו את רגלי הנער.

p.281.282.- על בן גת הפכה בידו את האבן.

He uses Old Testament words in a sense which is peculiar

to himself. e.g. סלה, LMN. I, 15: Targum, rather = Rashi,

read: Vulgate, Despisit Gorionides, lay low (of corpses)

in both active and passive senses. e.g. p.277.- וסלה מהם

מיהודה סלה פגרים לבנים ארצה.- p.323. פגרים לבנים חתים

y, Psalms CXXXIX, 8. spread out (of a camp): Gorionides,

kill off (of an enemy): p.35, בלחמה ב, קב אלבי מקדון הציץ בלחמה ב,

39,2, הוצעו בלחמה ההוא מ' אלף גויות

סגר, Gen. XIX, 6. close (of a door and sometimes, of the

womb): Gorioides, end one's life: p.41, b. 70, 71, 86

51.b. η η η η η .

מן, Exod. XXIX, 26. breast piece of an animal: Gorionides.

breast: (of a man):: p.281. ~ אֶפְרוֹחַ יָדָיו וְשׁוֹן תַּאֲרָתוֹ.

738, Job XXXVIII, 3: gird: Gorionides, in a figurative

sense, as "והוא נשאר אחרי שגרת אביו" He succeeded his brother

as ruler" (Literally, "He girded himself with the rule

of his brother").

The author uses only the most unusual and striking figures

ures. o.g. p.203.- עמק המלחה

cf. II Sam. XI, 15: p. 255. — ויתגבר מלחמה ויכחם הבחור

בלבו ובקרבבו יותר מן המלחמה אשר נלחם על העיר

1.- All references of the type 35,b are to the E.P.

which I was unable to place in B.

91

כאשר יפיל הקוצר את אלוהותו ואת עתו קצרו. - p. 208.

The author's syntax is faulty, too. He confuses the construct state of classical Hebrew and the ש of Mishnaic

Hebrew in his genitives. e.g. p. 281. - וישא הדק הרוכא של המלך.

It is known that ש (= אשר) is used in the O.T. with proper nouns but never with common nouns as does Gorion-

ides. e.g. p. 54, אשר לזהב, 78, גפן אשר לזהב, p.

48, אשר לתורב, b. He does not use the waw consecutive as do the classical writers. e.g. p. 531. - והתורה...

p. 722. - לשונות וקחו (cf. Driver's Tenses, § 112).

Further the author uses a large number of New Hebrew

words and phrases. e.g. 125. אור : 134. אילן : 449. אלמן,

(harbor) : 746. בשביל : 216. ביתר : 493. הלואי : 753. התראה :

סדרי בראשית : 565. משוחררים : 607. זול : 450. הוראה : 710.

: תה"ת המתימ. 799 : שנוי. 793 : ריס, 229 : פייס. 53.

: הנהרגים על ייחוד שמו. 606 : גונב לעת הבריות. 511.

כלם. 792 : חשה רבינו עליו השלום. 731 : ישתבח לנצח. 738.

כי הוא. 428 : ערב בקר וצהרית. 77 : חכמים כלם גבונים.

יעד מתי תאריך אפיך לעוברי רצונך. 792 : מרבה לפלוח

etc.: מית/חשונה. 866.

The author also uses ^שmany words and phrases which are found

only in the later Rabbinical literature. e.g. אנושי. 616.

: הצמחה. 732 : הסכמה. 473. 797. 173 : הנהגה. 309 : בחירה. 618. 615.

. 738. 615. 520. 90 : חומר. 782. 799 : השמדה. 736 : השארות. 789.

חלשנות. 511 : מלשמונה. 615 : טבע. 741. 751. 782. 797. 798. 801.

: קפריאוס. 335. 748 : ספרד. 221 : קוטב. 311 : נאמנות. 443.

. 425 : שלמות. 455 : רפואיי. 512 : צדקניות. 747 : קסר. 675.

ידוע לכל בעלי. 797 : הבורא יתעלה שמו. 738 : ואם תאמרו. 426.

בתיאור. 359.390: חכמת נפש. 882: חלבוט רביעית. 801: דעת.

The author uses words and phrases which are characteristic of the philosophical literature. e.g. 17, a: פפירה:

17, b. 19, a: בחור הכוכבים. 18, b: להניח.

18, b: חכמת החזון. 20, c: חכמת הטבע. 188 (B): חכמת החזון.

The peculiarities of style and diction make it impossible for the book to have been written in the first Christian century. We should at least have expected the book to

have exhibited the more characteristic traits of the

New Hebrew literature if Josephus were the author. The

above facts are sufficient, too, to disprove that the author

wrote in a classical style, using the best Hebrew. A

false tradition is responsible for the growth of this

particular fiction, which eluded some of the best critical

minds which have concerned themselves with the Josippon.

Nor are the author's descriptions as accurate and as original as the traditionalist would have us believe.

It has been shown that they were culled from Vegetius,

IV, 14 & 15: from Josephus, Wars III, 5: and from De Re Mi-

litari, as well as from the fertile imagination of the

author. Their accuracy vanishes, too, when we examine them

carefully. e.g. The ram is so heavy that wherever it rests

it causes deep depression in the Ground. (cf. p. 591 etc).

Furthermore, the author of the Josippon errs

in statement of fact, which is not the case with Flavius

Josephus, whose reliability in such matters is well known.

e.g. p. 321. - The Goths were in Spain in the time of Han-

1. - cf. Wolff, op. cit.

nibal. p.367.- Shammai was Hillel's disciple. p.850.-

Titus is represented as referring to Abraham as אברהם.

p.851.- Jephtha is referred to as אפרתה. p.156.- A-

ristotle founded a mint in Rome. p.352.- Olympiads and

years are confused. (e.g. From Olymp.134 to Olymp.185 is

51 years!) His chronology is hopelessly confused. Joseph,

who was 52 years old at the birth of Caesar was only 87

years old at the fall of Jerusalem(p.751). p.881.- Titus

put Ishmael ben Elisha to death. p.176.- Ptolemaeus and

אבן are differentiated. p.153.- Ptolemy Lagi and Antig-

onus are identified. p.166.- Augustus, the son of Seleu-

cus, the son of Perdiccas. p.162.- Octavius and Augus-

tus are differentiated. p.474.- The Jordan and the Eu-

phrates are confused. p.156.- The author says he saw

Julius Caesar. p.157.- He says that he was a contempor-
 ary of Joshua ben Sirach(second century,B.C.). It is hard-
 ly credible to what an extent the author has confused facts.
 His chronology (156.351. etc.) is hopelessly entangled.
 He dates by אימפרקאוס and all attempts to decipher his
 riddle have been unsuccessful.

We have but to explain how the name Joseph ben
 Gorion was made the name of the author and chief actor of

1.- p. 156.- אימפרקאוס is the name of the ruler of Egypt.
 p.157.- אימפרקאוס is a title, a corruption probably, of
 Emperor. p.351.- אימפרקאוס is the name of a Law from
 the promulgation of which the author dates events. But the
 other references prove that the author had in mind a per-
 iod of some kind. Breithaupt's guess that reference is
 made to the Olympiad is helpful but inadequate.

the War with the Romans. In Hegesippus, which work we have shown above to be the chief source of the Josippon, Joseph ben Matthias is not mentioned as military governor of Galilee. Joseph ben Gorion is mentioned in the immediately preceding context, as the governor of Jerusalem. The text of Heg.3.3 (loc.cit.) reads "ex quibus Josephus in Galileam descendens". As only one Joseph was mentioned in the context, the reference in this passage can be to him only. This mistake once made, the substitution of Joseph ben Gorion for the authentic Josephus continued till we have the present state of the text. But we must note here that in the second half of the book reference is made merely to one Joseph, the priest. (cf. supra) And we must also note that all the passages in which Joseph

ben Gorion is mentioned as author of the book are lacking in the E.P. However, even in the E.P., Joseph ben Gorion already occupied the center of the scene of action.

And now to sum up. 1.- We have shown that the Josippon was unknown till the tenth century. 2.- We have shown that Joseph ben Gorion was not Joseph ben Matthias, better known as Flavius Josephus. 3.- We have shown that the Josippon contradicts Josephus in statements of facts. 4.- We have shown that the author of the Josippon used late sources, and was acquainted with late peoples, events places, and ideas. 5.- We have shown that the language of the author is not Biblical and that his style is not pure but that the book is filled with late words and phrases and that the style is corrupt. 6.- We have shown that

THE DESCRIPTIONS are not original and not exact enough to warrant the conclusion that they were written by a contemporary. 7.- We have shown that the Josippon is a translation and not an original . 8.- We have shown that the author of the Josippon is unreliable as an historian. 9.- We have explained the confusion of the names of Joseph ben Gorion and Joseph ben Mattias.

What is left for the traditionalist to base his tradition upon but an empty tradition ?

80.
THE AUTHORSHIP, COUNTRY AND DATE OF THE JOSIPPON.

A CONSTRUCTIVE STUDY IN CRITICISM. THE AUTHOR OF THE
JOSIPPON. HIS DATE AND COUNTRY. VARIOUS THEORIES ON THESE
POINTS. THE PRESENT STATE OF THE TEXT OF THE JOSIPPON.
INTERPOLATIONS. ACCEPTED VIEW OF THE COUNTRY AND DATE
OF THE JOSIPPON. THE AUTHOR'S HOME. PROOFS. DATE OF
THE WRITING OF THE JOSIPPON. ARGUMENT. APPRECIATION
OF THE JOSIPPON. CONCLUSION.

THE AUTHORSHIP, COUNTRY AND DATE OF THE JOSIPPON.

The criticism in the preceding chapter, has been entirely destructive. I believe that I have shown therein the invalidity of the traditional view, - that Flāvus Josephus did not write the Josippon in Hebrew. But negative results, while of value, are not the end of criticism. We are now confronted with the questions arising directly from our destructive work. And to the answering of these questions, we devote this section of our thesis. Who wrote ^{the} ~~ant~~ Josippon? Where and when was it written, if not, as the traditionalist would have us believe? The constructive task is by far the most difficult.

The author of the Josippon must remain a mystery for the present, at least. As Trieber says, "Men wrote in those days for the glory of God and not for their own glorification". Pseudonyms were the easiest and safest way by which one could hide his identity. Nevertheless, we are able to fix the date and country of the author with a great degree of exactness. On the establishment of these points, there has been a great display of erudition and many theories have been proposed, all of which are worthy of our attention. I shall state a few of the most important .

Graetz (~~Tarikh~~) (Geschichte V, p. 251) holds that the book was originally the Arabic Maccabee book (Tarich al Makkaba'in, Jussuf ibn Gorgon) which was later

reworked and translated into Hebrew by an Italian Jew of the first half of the ninth century. He holds that Dunash ibn Tamim (cf. supra) did not know the Hebrew but ~~the~~ older Arabic book. The later studies of Wellhausen (op. cit.) show that the Arabic^o was made from the Hebrew and not vice versa. TRIEBER (op.cit.) holds that the original Josippon , based largely on the work of Hegesippus (cf. supra) is a product of the fifth century. Much of the interpolated matter is from the tenth century. Trieber carried the interpolation theory to the extreme of absurdity. He proves conclusively in his paper that the author of the Josippon used sources of the eighth century, but the parts of the work based on this he rejects as interpolated, with no further warrant

for such rejection. STEINSCHNEIDER, in his article on "Juedische Literatur", maintains that the Josippon is the work of a North Italian Jew of the ninth century who rendered Hegesippus "De Bello Judaico" ~~into~~ into Hebrew. We have already shown that other sources besides Hegesippus were used in the preparation of the work. That the author ~~was~~ not a North Italian will be proven below. GASTER, in a private letter addressed to the writer in answer to questions on these points, informed me that he held the Josippon to ^{be} genuine, i.e. an original Hebrew production, which had been written in Palestine in the third post Christian century. As we have shown that the author uses sources of a later date than the third century and that the Josippon is a translation into Hebrew, the position here stated

85

is untenable. WEISS puts the book in the early half of the ninth century, before Qalir whom he considers a contemporary of Nitronai Gaon. But Weiss dat^es Qalir too early, as we have shown above. CHWOLSON, followed by NEUBAUER, puts the book in Italy in the beginning of the tenth century. VOGELSTEIN and RIEGER think that the author was a Roman of the last half of the tenth century. DUKES thinks that the author was a contemporary of Saadja Gaon. ZUNZ held in his Zeitschrift, 1822\$ that the author was a South Frenchman because of the frequent mention of France (2.354.519.547.722. etc.) and the direct reference to Amboise, Tours, and Chinon (p.18). Zunz abandoned this view later, as it was shown that the "Amboise" passage was an interpolation and that the predominant in-

fluences in the work were not French but Italian. In Asher's Benjamin of Tudela, Zunz held that the Josippon was the Hebrew version of Josephus. This position was rendered untenable by the whole array of facts marshalled in the preceding section. In his Gottesdienstliche Vortraege, Zunz holds that the author is a South Italian Jew, who lived in Rome, in the century 850 - 950 A.C.E. This view of the matter has been generally accepted and I shall therefore try to reproduce his arguments, supplementing them by notices from other sources.

Before developing the argument, I wish to say a few words on the text of the Josippon. It would be difficult to imagine any text in a worse state of preservation than that of the Josippon. Careless copyists, sleepy

scribes, lacunae, glosses, interpolations and the whole array of text-corrupting forces have gathered themselves in this one book and have managed to get the text into a hopelessly mangled condition. That a new text of the Josippon, based on a careful study of the early mss. and prints, is very necessary is self evident to the most casual reader of the book. In the present state of the text, much of the force of argument is invalidated by the uncertainty of the written word.

In dating the book, this matter of interpolations is of great importance. I therefore wish to say a few words on that point. As I have not had access to the sources, I have not been able to pass judgment on what might be considered interpolated. The Middle Ages hand-

led a book freely- especially, a pseudepigraphic work- and we must hold it as a foregone conclusion that interpolations have been made in the JOsippon.

We may cite the variants between V. and M. as proof of the existence of interpolations, taking M. as the more original, though we are told that even M. shows traces of having been tampered with. e.g. The V. is a third as long again as M. because of interpolations. We cite here only a few of the more important variants between the two editions. The passages giving the date of the birth of Gorionides (352), mentioning Menahem ben Saruq (807), describing the coronation ceremonies (687, ff.), the Qinah (886, ff.), some parts of the Alexander legends and the headings of the various books as well as all re-

89

ferences to such divisions and to Joseph ben Gorion as author of the book are lacking in M.

Contradictions within the work itself point to a probable meddling with the text. e.g. The varying references to Herod's ancestry. p.165 and 361: the distance of Herodion from Jerusalem. p.389 and 519: the explanation of the name Jericho. p.329 and 330. etc.

The interpolation theory has been carried to the extreme of absurdity by some critics. We must disagree with Trieber, e.g., who declares all interpolated which is not taken from Hegesippus or not the author's own. So subjective have most critics been in this matter of interpolations, that it has been impossible for me to accomplish anything in this matter, lacking as I did the

sources. Each critic has rejected what did not suit his theory and all contradict one another so that definite results are impossible for the bewildered student. I have but indicated the problem.

That the Josippon was written by a South Italian Jew, who lived in Rome in the century, 850 - 950, A.C.E., is proven by the following facts, and argument.

1.- We have shown above that the author of the Josippon knew and used both Greek and Latin sources and was well acquainted with Arabic. Of all Mediterranean lands, the only one where the knowledge of these three tongues together could be found, was Magna Graeca. As the Arabs did not settle in Italy till the beginning of the ninth century, we must allow a period of some years duration

91

in which Arabic culture and influence could spread and make themselves felt. 2.- That the author was an Italian is further proven by the following. a.- He refers constantly to Italian towns and localities. (cf. supra et infra). b.- In the spelling of proper names, the author shows that he knew only the Italian pronunciation. e.g. Tur-טורקי, 3. Sclavi: סקלבי, 8. Lombardi: לומברדי, 6. p. ci: 4. אנגליסי, Anglesi: 547.4. Danesci: 5. דנ'שני, 4. Toscana: תושקנא, 4. Alemagna: אלמניא, 5. Russi: רוסי, 5. Sena: ס'נא, 2. Crovati: קראיוטי, 8. Unger: אונגרי, 3. Napoli: נאפולי, 19. Sorrento: סורנטו, 19. Po: פואו, 16. Otranto: אוטרנטא, 391. Porto: פורטו, 10. Annibale: 678. Guialianus: גויליאנוס, 819. Giovis: גוב'ס, 678. Scythopolis: שטיפוליס, 224. Scythen: שטיס, 69.

Scipio: 12. פבליוס, Paulus: 137. קנדבליס, Kandales: 603.

Paulinus: 629. פבלינוס, Valerianus: 6. בשריוס, Vitellius: 544. שרשן, Xerxes: 821. אלעס, Alexas: 522.

Apollinis: etc. etc. c.- He mentions occas-

ionally, an Italian word. e.g. p.149.- אמירלדא, emeraldo.

d.- He refers to coins which were used in Italy. e.g.

p.364.136. e.- He shows some knowledge of local legends.

e.g. p.12. The golden coffin. p.20. The naphtha on the

sea between Naples and Sorrento. f.- The Josippon is

based largely on Hegesippus, which is an Italian produc-

tion. g.- Furthermore, the Josippon is first quoted

by Italian authors.(cf. supra). Gaster may be correct

in general, that the use of a book does not prove its

fatherland but in those days of slow communication, the

first quotation of a book is ^{an argument} in favor of that place as its home. 3.- That the author was an inhabitant of Rome is shown a.- by his familiarity with Roman localities and Roman history. e.g.p. 9 - 22: 114: 156 - 165: 221 - 226: 349 - 358: 529: 667 - 673: 323: 391: etc. b.- At about the same time there appeared in Rome the "Graphia Aureae Urbis Romae", which most likely urged our author to his task. Nor must we omit mention of the psychological value of the associations of Rome for ^{the} mind of the historian. 4.- That there was a literary activity among the Jews, early in Italy, is proven by the reference found in a letter of Alcuin to Charlemagne, with regard to a disputation in Pavia between the Jew Julius and Peter of Pisa (cf. Guedemann's Kulturgeschichte, p.12).

94

The ninth century contains not a few Italian names and works well known in Jewish literature (cf. Zunz, G.D.V. p.375). Therefore the production of the Josippon at this time would not be anomalous.

The date of the Josippon can not be fixed with the same exactness as can the country of the author. The first reference to the book, we have seen was made by Dunash ibn Tamim (d.980) which makes 950 the very latest date at which the book could have been written, though that would allow but a few years for the book to reach Spain the home of Tamim before his death. The Arabic invasion of Italy which took place in the beginning of the ninth century ^{(cf supra) allowing for} and the reference to the Siege of Tarsis (p.6.7) which took place 790 A.C.E. make the middle of the ninth

century the terminus a quo. That references are made in the book to peoples, and events later than the middle of the tenth century is true but these are in all probability, interpolations. The book in all essentials as we have it seems to have been composed in the century from 850 - 950 A.C.E.

CONCLUSION.

In closing, I wish to add a few words of appreciation of the book as a whole. Unhistorical and unreliable as the Josippon may be, impure as ~~are~~ its style and language, nevertheless, the author of the Josippon is an artist. The ease with which he writes, the interest which he arouses, the dramatic portrayal of the events of Jewish history and the remarkable welding of popular legend with dry historical fact give the book the charm which suffices to explain its popularity with Jew and Gentile. Josephus was regarded as a traitor by the Jews and his works have therefore been very unpopular among them. In the early centuries, translations of

Josephus were made into the modern tongues. But these were for the most part in cumbersome volumes, which were costly, and the too scholarly aspect of his work failed to attract the people.

The Josippon accomplished a great work for the Jew. It was practically the only book for centuries in the hands of the non-Jew which related the post Biblical history of the Jew. "It was the link between the Bible and the Ghetto" says the London Jewish Chronicle. It first brought into the mind of the Gentile the thought that Jews as the heirs of this history were not a race to be despised for they had a past which could vie with that of any people in point of brilliancy. This book was ^{the} great factor ⁱⁿ of the popular emancipation of the Jew.

I think that I have proven my thesis.-- that
the Josippon is not the Hebrew production of Flavius Jo-
sephus but the work of a South Italian Jew of the cen-
tury from 850 - 950 A.C.E. which the author compiled
from various sources and rendered into Hebrew.