

Beyond Flusser: The Text of Latin *Antiquities* 13 and *Sefer Yosippon*

David B. Levenson

1 *Sefer Yosippon* and the Latin Josephus Tradition

The identification of the main sources of *Sefer Yosippon*'s account of events from the end of the Maccabean period (Chapter 27) through the capture of Masada (Chapter 89), which concludes the work, is not a matter of scholarly controversy.¹ With only a few exceptions, the narrative from the rule of John Hyrcanus (Chapter 27) through Herod's Rebuilding of the Temple

* This chapter has its origins in my contribution to the joint paper Carson Bay and I presented at the International Conference, "From Josephus to Josippon and Beyond." Carson has remained an invaluable and constant conversation partner as the project has widened its scope considerably. I would also like to thank Carson and the other organizers of the conference, Jan Willem van Henten and Michael Avioz, for putting together an international and interdisciplinary conference at the height of a pandemic and for their work as the editors of this volume. For seven years I have had the good fortune to be in regular contact with the members of the University of Bern's *Lege Josephum* team, led by Gerlinde Hubner-Rebenich, Katharina Heyden, and René Bloch. In addition to Carson, I thank my Bern colleagues Anthony Ellis, Judith Mania, Lena Tröger, Sara Moscone, and Patricia Berchtel for their willingness to share their expertise and resources so generously on so many occasions. The shape and content of this chapter owes much to the workshop at Bern on *Sefer Yosippon* and its Latin sources where I benefitted immensely from the papers and ongoing conversation with Carson, René, Yonatan Binyam, Saskia Dönitz, Peter Lehnardt, and Tessa Rajak. As is the case with all my work on the Latin Josephus, I thank Randolf Lukas, Richard Pollard, and Thomas Martin for their regular (and in Tom's case, daily) discussions about a host of specific textual problems. I also am grateful to Kamila Kavka for helping me decipher a Czech manuscript catalogue. Finally, I thank my student Ashleigh Witherington for her enormous assistance in sharing the work of the collation of so many manuscripts as well as for her insightful comments on the full range of interpretive problems arising from these texts.

1 Abbreviations: *L AJ* = Latin *Antiquities*; *LBJ* = Latin *Bellum*; Flusser = *Sefer Yosippon* (2 vols); Blatt = *The Latin Josephus* I; Niese = *Flavii Iosephi Opera*; a.c. = *ante correctionem*; p.c. = *post correctionem*; s.l. = *supra lineam*. *Yosippon* is cited by the chapter and line number in Flusser's edition (e.g. sY 35, 17). For the Levenson-Martin manuscript groups and sigla (e.g. grC), see below p. 220. Blatt's sigla are used for individual mss, and an abbreviated shelfmark is used for the six manuscripts not listed in Blatt. "Cassinense group" refers to a group of eight *DEH* mss identified in Ussani, "De ignoto codice," four of which (including ms Pi, which Ussani had not seen) have *L AJ* 1–16 together with *DEH*. "Unique variant" in a group or

(Chapter 50) relies, for its often significantly embellished adaptation of its source, on the Latin translation of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*,² commissioned by Cassiodorus in the second half of the sixth century.³ After Chapter 50, *Yosippon's* main source becomes the fourth-century Christian historical work, for convenience referred to in this chapter as the *De excidio Hierosolymitano*,⁴ one of several titles found in the extensive manuscript tradition of that work.⁵

subgroup refers to a reading found in all (or almost all) members of a group and in no other groups.

- 2 The use of *AJ* as a main source ends with *SY* 50, corresponding to the end of *AJ* 15, but material from *AJ* 16 appears in a few places in *SY* 51 (Flusser notes *AJ* 16.124–125 and 128 in his commentary on *SY* 51, 29–32, and *AJ* 16.253 at *SY* 51, 90–94). For a careful identification of *SY's* use of *AJ* and *DEH* in each passage, see the notes in volume one of Flusser's edition; for overviews, see S. Dönitz, "Historiography among Byzantine Jews," 956–960, and "Sefer Yosippon (*Josippon*)," 383–385. The Latin *Antiquities* is also a source for Alexander the Great's encounter with the High Priest in Jerusalem (*SY* 10; *AJ* 11.311–347; see the notes in Flusser 1.54–60 and the discussion in Dönitz, *Überlieferung und Rezeption*, 75–80). For *AJ's* paraphrase of the *Letter of Aristeas* as a source for *Yosippon's* story of the origin of the Greek translation of the Bible (*SY* 12; *AJ* 12.2–118), see Flusser, 1.64–66, Dönitz, *Überlieferung*, 76 ("auf Josephus beruht, aber stark bearbeitet ist."), and Wasserstein and Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, 195–196 (an ultimate, but not direct source). For the complex question of the sources and content of the story in various versions of *Sefer Yosippon*, see Veltri, *Gegenwart der Tradition*, 122–143, and Wasserstein and Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, 192–217. For material from *AJ* 18 in the account of the embassy to Gaius, see n. 16. References in *SY* to deeds of great figures written in multiple sources including the book of Yosef ben Gurion appear as early as *SY* 8, 8–10 ("the book of Yosef the Priest, that is Yosef ben Gurion, who was exiled from Jerusalem in the days of Vespasian and Titus his son") with three more references before *AJ* becomes *SY's* main source in Chapter 27 (*SY* 16, 41: death of Mattithias [at *SY* 16, 40 Flusser notes the use of *AJ* 12.276 as a supplement to 1 Macc]; *SY* 26, 3: Death of Judah; *SY* 26, 31: Death of Simon).
- 3 For the context of the Cassiodoran translation of the *Antiquities* and review of the scholarship discussing it, see Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations," 322–327. The circumstances of the translation are treated by Carlo Maria Mazzucchi as part of his important recent study of Cimelio 1, the sixth- or seventh-century papyrus containing *AJ* 5:334–10.204 (Blatt manuscript A), "Natura e storia del Giuseppe Flavio Ambrosiano," 271–318. For additional bibliography, see Leoni, "Translations and Adaptations of Josephus's Writings," 481–483.
- 4 Material from *DEH* as well as material ultimately deriving from Jerome's *Chronicon*, usually in the form of short phrases, is also introduced sporadically in earlier chapters. In the passages analyzed in this chapter, for example, Flusser notes material from *DEH* at *SY* 27, lines 11, 22, 34, 38, 41, and 43 (*DEH* 1.1.7); *SY* 28, 28 (*DEH* 1.1.8); *SY* 29, 6–7 and 27–29 (*DEH* 1.1.9); *SY* 31, 18 (*DEH* 1.1.5); *SY* 31, 84 (*DEH* 1.1.8). Information ultimately deriving from Jerome's *Chronicon* is introduced at *SY* 27, 2 (*Chron.* 228f [Helm]). Flusser cites only a few cases of *SY* using *LAJ* to supplement the Latin text of 1 Macc.
- 5 For a comprehensive study, including a full bibliography, of the early manuscripts and reception of this work, see R.M. Pollard, "The *De Excidio* of 'Hegesippus' and the Reception of Josephus," 65–100. For an up-to-date detailed discussion of all the major "introductory"

While some of the earliest manuscripts attribute the history to Josephus,⁶ the ascription to “(H)egesippus” eventually predominates in the manuscript tradition and also becomes the basis for the name “Pseudo-Hegesippus,” the most common designation for the author in scholarly literature.⁷ This work, an heir to both Classical and Christian historiography,⁸ to a large degree represents a free translation of the Greek text of Josephus’ *Jewish War*, but in many places completely reworks its main source by dramatic elaboration, theological reflections, and the introduction of material from other sources (including the *Antiquities*). For much of its reception history, it, like *Yosippon*, was regarded as the work of Josephus,⁹ even though both books clearly refer to Josephus as a source and not the author.¹⁰

While the fact that the Latin *Antiquities* (*LAJ*) and the *De excidio* (*DEH*) were *Sefer Yosippon*’s primary sources for the final two-thirds of the work is not in dispute, the question of the precise textual form of each to which *Yosippon*’s author had access is more problematic. This, of course, is of obvious importance for any analysis that requires a close comparison of *Yosippon*’s Hebrew

questions relating to the *De excidio*, including an extensive list of manuscripts, see the introduction and first chapter of Carson Bay’s *Biblical Heroes and Classical Culture*, 1–69.

6 For the predominance of the tradition that Josephus was the author of *DEH* from the fifth up to the ninth century, see Pollard, “The *De Excidio* of ‘Hegesippus’ and the Reception of Josephus,” 76–77, 85, and passim. See Bay, 18–19, for the question of Ambrose as the actual author.

7 The variety of names for both author and title, including attributions to Josephus and/or Hegesippus, is illustrated by the group of *DEH* manuscripts identified by Ussani, designated here the “Cassinense group” (“Un ignoto codice cassinese”), which Flusser correctly identified as related to *SY*’s source (see Appendix 5, which presents new evidence supporting Flusser’s hypothesis). Manuscripts B, La, MC Compact. VIII, and Vat. Lat. 1987 provide evidence of attribution of the work to Josephus with *Historiarum Iosep(p)i Liber* at the end of Book 3 or beginning of Book 4 (Compact. VIII has it at both places); La, V, Plut. 89sup.15, and Plut. 67.17 have *Liber Historiarum Egesippi* (V: *Eruditissimi*; La: *Hyst[]sippi*) *Hierusolimitani Excidi(i)* (V: *Hierusolimitanae Subversionis*) *a beato Ambrosio ex Greco sermone in Latinum translatus decenter* at the end of the manuscript. Four manuscripts from this group have a title at the beginning: V: *Egesippi uiri sanctissimi et egregii historiographi apostolorum quoque temporibus proximi Romanorum bellorum adversus Iudeos et Hierusolimitani Excidii sive Captivitatis Iudaicae liber primus*; Plut. 89sup.15: *Egisippi viri illustris de Bello Iudaico liber incipit et primo proemium*; Vat. lat. 1987: *Liber Egesippi apostolorum discipuli disertissimi de excidio Iherusolime a Romanis*; Plut. 67.17: *Incipit Egesippi discipuli apostolorum de bello Iudaico ex Greco in Latinum per sanctum Ambrosium tractus liber primus*.

8 See Bay, *Biblical Heroes and Classical Culture*, passim.

9 For a survey of the tradition that Josephus was the author of *SY*, an assumption reinforced by the printed editions prior to Flusser’s critical edition, see Flusser, 2.69–79; Flusser provides an overview in “*Josippon*, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 387–390.

10 A parallel noted by Flusser (2.127). See n. 15 on citations of “the book of Yosef ben Gurion” by the author of *Yosippon*.

text with its Latin source, a crucial component of both literary- and rhetorical-critical approaches, which focus on how and why *Yosippon* modified its sources, and of textual criticism, which seeks to establish the earliest text or to track the history of the variety of forms of the manuscript tradition.¹¹

1.1 *David Flusser's Hypothesis*

As in many areas of *Yosippon* scholarship, the question of the specific form of the Latin Josephus text used by *Yosippon* begins and, for this question, also ends with David Flusser's magisterial two-volume edition, published in 1978 (text and commentary) and 1980 (introduction and critical apparatus).¹² Its extensive introduction in the second volume and succinct but thorough notes accompanying the critical text in the first illuminate many details in the text and carefully provide, often line by line, the specific references in *Yosippon's* sources for each passage. The introduction presents Flusser's most detailed discussion of a wide range of topics on which he had been working for decades and puts on full display his astounding erudition. The treatment there of *Yosippon's* use of Josephus fully develops his hypothesis about the specific Latin Josephus manuscript tradition to which *Sefer Yosippon's* source belongs. As far as I am aware, Flusser first announced this hypothesis in his introductory article on *Yosippon*, published in 1953,¹³ and then supported it with specific evidence in his important and still valuable 1959 review of Franz Blatt's edition of Books 1–5 of the Latin translation of the *Antiquities*, a work which included a ninety-two page annotated catalogue of 171 manuscripts and twenty extracts and fragments, and upon which Flusser relied heavily for his knowledge of the *LAJ* manuscript tradition.¹⁴

According to Flusser's hypothesis, the author of *Sefer Yosippon* used a single manuscript comprised of *Antiquities* 1–16 and the *De excidio* that belonged to a specific manuscript group not properly identified by Blatt. This hypothesis is based on the following points:

-
- 11 For the immensely complicated questions connected to the texts and redactions of *SY*, see Dönitz, *Überlieferung*, and her up-to-date discussion in Chapter 7 of this volume.
 - 12 A slightly revised reprint appeared in 1980/81.
 - 13 "The Author of the Book of Josiphon."
 - 14 "Review of Franz Blatt." Flusser's 1974 article, "Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon," provides a useful summary of his views but often without the supporting evidence provided in his review of Blatt and in the Introduction to his edition. His chapter, "Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus," is a summary of the German article with less documentation. It should be noted that the German article, the fullest presentation of Flusser's views accessible to those who do not read Modern Hebrew, is marred by several typographical errors in its citation of the key manuscripts (Vat. lat. 1989 instead of 1998; the first "ten"¹⁰ books of *AJ* instead of "sixteen" for Harley 3691; and the siglum *ho* instead of *hr* for that manuscript).

1. The author repeatedly refers to one of his sources as a single book of “Yosef ben Gurion,” which he not only names, but even claims to cite verbatim at a number of points.¹⁵
2. There is no decisive evidence for the use of *Antiquities* 17–20¹⁶ or the Latin translation of the *Jewish War*.¹⁷

-
- 15 *SY* cites Josephus as a source 33 times, calling him Yosef ben Gurion, the name of a commander mentioned in *DEH* 3:3.2 (*SY* 65, 2, 5; cf. 89, 10), whom *SY* mistakenly identified with the historian. Fourteen of these citations refer to his book (ספר יוסף בן גוריון) and thirteen are direct quotations introduced by וידבר or ויאמר. Several comments in the voice of the author go beyond mere citation: a description of gathering information from the book of Yosef ben Gurion, which is praised as inferior only to the Bible and the books of wisdom produced by King Solomon and the sages (*SY* 35, 4–8); a comment that he wrote out only a few of the letters from the Romans he found in the book of Yosef ben Gurion (*SY* 40, 9–10; cf. 40, 44–45 [only in ms 7; see Dönitz in this volume, pp. 187–188, with bibliography for this much discussed passage]); a statement, after the description of the Temple drawn from *AJ* 15:380–425, that Yosef ben Gurion also wrote about the building of Herod’s Temple in his *Book of the Wars* (presumably *DEH*) and in his *Book of Wisdom* (based on the false assumption that Josephus actually carried out his plan to write about the reasons for Jewish religious practices [*AJ* 1.25, 3:143; 15:371; cf. *SY* 49]), and that he wrote many books including a book of polemics attacking and defeating those who slandered the Jewish people (clearly referring to the *Contra Apionem*; cf. Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 13). This last statement, appearing at *SY* 50, 112–117, is the final explicit reference to Yosef ben Gurion’s book as one of his sources. The fact that it appears just before *DEH* takes over as *SY*’s main source raises the question of why there are no references to the book of Yosef ben Gurion in Chapters 51–89, where *SY* is closely following the *DEH* (*SY* does, however, at *SY* 73, 1 and 79, 59, attribute to “Yosef” material that appears in *DEH* as statements of the author).
- 16 The embassy to Gaius in *SY* 58 presents a problem for Flusser’s hypothesis, since *SY*’s story is clearly closer to the story in *AJ* 18:257–260 than to the parallels in *DEH* or the *BJ* (note the presence of Apion only in the *AJ*). Flusser recognizes this but argues that the *AJ* version reached *SY* through an unknown medieval Christian source, which included an abridged version of the story in Josephus, which *SY* elaborated on the basis of Jewish traditions. Flusser might well be correct, but, on the other hand, *SY*’s interest in the elaborated material could be why it shortens and departs from the story in *AJ*. See Dönitz, *Überlieferung*, 53–55 for discussion of this passage and the introduction of anti-Christian features into the later *SY* manuscript tradition.
- 17 Flusser is vague about *SY*’s use of the Latin translation of the *BJ*, saying that while there are no parallels that represent an absolutely clear use of *BJ*, there is some reason to suppose that the author had read the *BJ*, perhaps before beginning work on the book, or, that if he did have it while engaged in the writing of *SY*, he would have only glanced at it. In any case, according to Flusser, it “was certainly ... not on his work desk (על שולחן עבודתו) at the moment he was writing his book” (2.130; cf. 2.131). For an example of this ambivalence while interpreting the text, see his note on *SY* 33, 27: “The author, therefore, took the name Eucærus from the Latin translation of the *Antiquities* or from those Latin manuscripts of the *War* in which this name was found” (see below, pp. 248–250, for discussion of the name Eucærus in this passage). Only a very close comparison of *SY*, *LBJ*, and *DEH* would be able to detect places where a word or phrase from *LBJ* might have been introduced to

3. Blatt mentions four Italian mss, which he dates to the 10th (Naples V F 34 = B), 11th (Florence Plut. 66.1 = La; Vat. Lat. 1998 = V), and 13th (Pisa 20 = Pi) century that have the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* as well as a fifteenth century ms that has *AJ* 1–16, *BJ*, and *DEH*.¹⁸
4. No other manuscripts include both the *Antiquities* and *DEH*.¹⁹
5. Two manuscripts from this group that he was able to examine, Naples V F 34 (Blatt's siglum B) and Florence Plut. 66.1 (Blatt's siglum La), share readings against the rest of the *AJ* manuscript tradition that point to a distinctive textual tradition not reflected in Blatt's stemma.²⁰
6. Variants in the *Antiquities* (the name *Mallius* in *AJ* 13.360 instead of *Manlius*) and in *DEH* (the word *cythara* in 5.22.1 instead of *cera*), found in both of these manuscripts, differ from the rest of the manuscript tradition but correspond to readings in the Hebrew text of *Sefer Yosippon*.

Flusser was well aware that his hypothesis was based on an extremely limited textual base because he did not have access to a wide range of variants in the manuscript traditions of either the *Antiquities* or the *De excidio*. He regretted

supplement the main source, in the same way as *DEH* occasionally provides a word or brief phrase in passages otherwise following *LAJ*. An example of this might be in *SY* 53, 93, where the failure of Pheroras' wife to kill herself by jumping off a roof is attributed to God in *SY* and *LBJ* 1.593 (כִּי מוֹהַאֲלֵהִים; *Dei providentia*) but not in *DEH* or *LAJ*.

18 See below for correction of dates and format for several of these mss.

19 Flusser did not notice that Munich Clm 15841 (Blatt siglum Sa) has *AJ* 1–20, *BJ*, and *DEH*. However, both its *LAJ* and *DEH* texts are from quite different manuscript traditions from those with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*, which Flusser argues are from the same group as *SY*'s Latin Josephus source. In any case, arguments from format become irrelevant once it is possible to analyze the manuscripts themselves, something Flusser had not had the opportunity to do.

20 Flusser, 2.125n380 refers to his review of Blatt, 462n23, where he cited five variant readings from *AJ* 11.313–338 where B and La agree against the 1524 Basel edition: omission of *exercitum* (313), *uxore vs uxore simul* (316), *ne vs ut nequamquam* (318), *uelle aiebat vs uolebat* (322), *genti vs gentibus* (326 [Flusser accidentally prints 320]). On the basis of a collation of 99 manuscripts for *AJ* 11.311–347, one of the test passages used to establish the Levenson-Martin groups, the following should be noted: the omission of *simul* is found only in grG mss (reaching the 1524 Basel edition by means of ms Werd, used by the 1524 Cologne mss, the 1524 Basel edition's main source), with the result that here mss B and La agree with the rest of the tradition against grG. However, the omission of *exercitum* and the readings *ne*, *uolebat*, and *gentibus* are found not only in B and La but in all grC manuscripts and nowhere else in the ms tradition. What Flusser missed in the variants he cited was that in B *uolebat* is a correction of *uelle aiebat*, *gentibus* is a correction of *genti*, and two or three words are erased after *ne*. In two of these cases the original text of B corresponds to the earlier (correct) reading and has been corrected on the basis of a ms with characteristic grC readings. In any case, these variants provide clear evidence that B is from a grC subgroup different from La and represents an earlier stage of the grC tradition (for a full discussion, see below, pp. 226–229).

that there was no critical edition with textual variants of the books of the *Antiquities* relevant to the material in *Yosippon* and that, while Ussani's critical edition of the *De excidio* was available, the manuscripts and variants listed in his critical apparatus were selected to reconstruct the original text and not to provide data representing the full variety of the manuscript tradition. The importance of textual variants in identifying *Yosippon*'s source and in analyzing how *Yosippon* used it is succinctly stated in the following passage from his introduction.

All four Latin Manuscripts [B La V Pi] are related to each other, not only in format, since they comprise the first sixteen books of the *Antiquities* and Hegesippus, but also in their text. In order to determine what the Latin text of the main source of *Yosippon* was, it would, of course, be desirable to know the textual variants of those four Latin manuscripts, something which would indeed be suitable for demonstrating that a large part of the anomalies in *Sefer Yosippon* are based on errors which happened to be in the Latin text that was in his possession.

In addition to this, the comparison of the four Latin manuscripts comprising the same format would make an important contribution to the history of the development of the text of the *Antiquities* and of Hegesippus. Until now there exists only the critical edition of Hegesippus and of the five first books of Josephus' *Antiquities* in Latin. Consequently, there does not yet exist a critical edition of the Latin translation of those books of the *Jewish Antiquities* that discuss the Second Temple Period and which were *Yosippon*'s guiding light, and so I have used the best edition of the Latin Josephus, which was published by Frobenius at Basel in 1524.²¹ Together with this edition, for the sake of checking the words of *Yosippon* and comparing the manuscripts of that group to which belonged the "Book of Yosef ben Gurion" used by *Sefer Yosippon*, I have

21 It is clear from this passage and an examination of the citations in his commentary for the passages discussed in this chapter that the Latin text of the *Antiquities* that Flusser relies on and from which he frequently cites words and phrases comes almost exclusively from the 1524 Basel edition. Flusser's high evaluation of this edition (also found at 2.76–77n235) clearly echoes Niese's judgement that it is "*editio ... omnium et nitidissima et optima*" (*Flavii Josephi Opera*, 1.lxx). For the mss on which the 1524 Basel edition ultimately depended, see Levenson and Martin, "Early Printed Editions," 801–812; Ammann, *Josephus Frobenianus*, 51–70 provides a superb detailed study of this edition and the context in which it was produced. Oddly enough, in the sections I analyzed for this project, Flusser only cites two variants from mss B and La: the names *Iaddo* at *SY* 29, 5 (*AJ* 13.256) and the above-mentioned *Mallius* at *SY* 29, 15 (*AJ* 13.260).

received copies of an extract from the Latin *Antiquities* and an extract from Hegesippus in the Naples ms (B) and the Florence ms (La).

FLUSSER, 2.125–126

2 Manuscript Groups in Latin *Antiquities* 13

Unfortunately, there is still no critical edition for any of the parts of the *Antiquities* with material parallel to *Sefer Yosippon* (i.e. *AJ* 10–16).²² One of the primary aims of this chapter, therefore, is to advance the discussion of the identification of *Yosippon's LAJ* text by providing a detailed analysis of textual variants from a large number of manuscripts for an extended section of *LAJ* 13 which has close parallels in *Yosippon* (*AJ* 13.228–322; 395–397 // *SY* 27–31; 33). The purpose of this analysis is not to establish the earliest possible text of the Latin translation of *Antiquities* 13 but to determine what form of the text might have been read by the author of *Sefer Yosippon*. In this context, the reason for identifying manuscript groups, therefore, is to provide a tool for taking into account as wide a variety of textual traditions as possible for comparison with the Hebrew text. Because this represents the first comprehensive analysis of all the variants from an extended passage in this section of the *Antiquities*, it is important to report the evidence for identifying groups as fully as possible and not just to present the conclusions in a summary form that cannot be checked and refined. Particular attention will be given to the group which includes the manuscripts Flusser thought best represented the *LAJ* text used by *Sefer Yosippon* (= Levenson/Martin Group C) and the group that consistently has the earliest text (grG). Not surprisingly, given the fact that Flusser's analysis is based on only two of the 98 manuscripts collated and analyzed for this chapter, his well-known hypothesis will have to be substantially modified to account for the data reported here.

The identification of manuscript groups for *LAJ* 13 in this chapter is based solely on the analysis of all textual variants from a large number of manuscripts. Clearly other factors in establishing the relationship among manuscripts such as paleography, marginalia, illustrations, manuscript format, and provenance have crucial roles to play. However, hundreds and sometimes thousands of data points represented by textual variants provide a uniquely valuable way of determining the relationship among Latin texts.

²² Randolph Lukas' recently published critical edition, extensive introduction, and commentary for *AJ* 6–7, *Josephus Latinus*, *Antiquitates Judaicae Buch 6 und 7*, marks a major milestone in the study of the Latin text of the *Antiquities*.

The classification of manuscript groups in this chapter is based on all variants from the following:

1. The nicknames for the Seleucid rulers Antiochus VIII (Grippus) and Demetrius III (Acerus) in 13.269, 271, 365, 376, and in the Table of Contents for *AJ* 13 (98 manuscripts);²³
2. A list of names of cities under Jewish control in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (*AJ* 13.395–397; *SY* 33; 92 mss);
3. The extensive narrative comprising 95 Niese sections of the lengthy reign of John Hyrcanus (*AJ* 13.228–300; *SY* 27–30; 48 mss), where *Yosippon* begins to use *LAJ* as its major source, and the short tragic reign of Aristobulus I (*AJ* 13.301–322; *SY* 31; 48 mss for 301–313 and 66 mss for 314–322).

2.1 *The LAJ Manuscript Tradition for AJ 13: An Overview*

The following table lists the manuscripts belonging to each group based solely on the variants in the passages collated for this project. This classification is, therefore, not necessarily relevant for other sections of *LAJ*. Manuscripts are designated using Blatt's sigla and, in the case of six manuscripts not in his comprehensive catalogue, abbreviations of the shelfmarks are used (e.g. Plut18sin10). These sigla with the list of all manuscripts collated for this study can be found in Appendix 1. The sigla designating the groups were first introduced by Thomas Martin and me for our chapter on the ancient Latin translations of Josephus in *A Companion to Josephus* (2016) and expanded for our detailed analysis of a passage in *AJ* 6 published in *Medievalia et Humanistica* (2021).²⁴

23 Our earlier classification of manuscript groups in *LAJ* 13 (Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations," 328) was based solely on the different forms of these names in 61 manuscripts.

24 Not all groups listed in these two studies appear here; some are omitted because they do not include any or a sufficient number of manuscripts with *AJ* 13. There has also been a small change in the designation of grC subgroups 3–5. The relationship of our groups to the families identified by Blatt is discussed in detail in Levenson and Martin, "A Revised Classification." Many, but by no means all differences can be accounted for by Blatt assigning each manuscript to only one family, when in fact different sections of a manuscript can have different affinities. A new group (grP) is introduced here to account for the data from *AJ* 13. Because they are so frequently cited, Blatt's sigla for his manuscript families are included in the manuscript list in Appendix 1, where they can be compared to the results of the analysis in this chapter. In his analysis of the manuscript groups in the introduction to his new critical edition of Books 6 and 7, Lukas, while using his own sigla, provides a reference for each group correlating his sigla to ours. Lukas does not include the manuscripts from our groups H and J, which are generally less relevant for establishing the earliest text.

While not attempting to mark all manuscript relations within a group or subgroup, obvious connections are indicated by brackets. It should be noted that for six manuscripts (Cb ld h Ca Mir Fl) the group classification is based solely on the list of the names of the Seleucid rulers.

TABLE 1 Manuscript groups

Group	Sub-group	Manuscripts
C	C.1	B Vi
	C.2	[C La] Pt v
	C.3	[V ¹ V ²] ^a Pi
	C.4a	[M l Vt Ve Cr Ne ^{a.c.}] pat Sr par
	C.4b	Ne ^{p.c.} pa Plut18sin10 Fl
	Unclassified grC	[Ptr O]
E		Cl Nv al
G		St [D Werd Best7010 r GKS1571] [Lau Tr Ml]
H		El Ha Br c Mn Si H R Rem re Cor Cp Cb Pa
J		Alb li Du vl mz Ca ld Cov Mir [d n] [U Mk Ly]
L	L.1	Sa b Sch t
	L.2	Adm Cn Lamp Sec Vn z [Pd PragXXIII.D121]
M		Aus [Vat (vt rg Madr10270)]
N		[L Bo] [Pal u] ve No
P		Prs cf p Crem1
Unclassified		[Ba G] ^b w pg ^c hr ^d Pr Cb ^e h ^f ld ^g

a V¹ = Vat. lat. 1998, 1r–167r (AJ 1–20); V² = Vat. lat. 1998, 168r–219v (AJ 16:368–394 [end of LAJ 16]; DEH). V² presumably had the format AJ 1–16 + DEH (see below, pp. 231–233); AJ 13 is only extant in V¹. Simple citations of V, therefore, will refer to this manuscript.

b Closely associated with grN.

c Closely associated with grG.

d Contains a large number of grC readings.

e Only collated for list of Seleucid rulers where it has grH and grJ readings identical to ld, d, and n.

f Only collated for list of Seleucid rulers where it has grH and grJ readings identical to Pa.

g Only collated for list of Seleucid rulers where it has grH and grJ readings identical to Cb, d, and n.

2.2 *Establishing Manuscript Groups E, H, J, L, M, N, P*

The following comments on each manuscript group have two aims. The first is to comment briefly on some features of the primary evidence for establishing

the groups and the second is to report the provisional conclusions derived from this study about the relationship of individual manuscripts within a group to one another and about the relationships between groups. These brief reports are to be read in tandem with Appendix 2, which provides a list of all unique variants for each group except for grP, for which group only a sample of the 190 unique variants is reported, and grC.4b, which includes only the corrected text of Ne and its two copies pa and Plut.18sin10.²⁵ Because of their importance for this chapter, Groups C and G will be discussed in the next section and will include (1) comprehensive lists of manuscript variants establishing the distinctive character of the Group C and Group G manuscript traditions; and (2) comprehensive lists of readings found only in Groups C and G or in Groups C, G, and one other group.

Group E. There are 31 unique variants shared only by all grE manuscripts collated (al, Cl, Nv).²⁶ For the passages collated here, grE often agrees only with grN,²⁷ or only with grM.²⁸ In cases where grE, grN, and grM have similar readings against the rest of the manuscript tradition, grN usually has the earliest reading and grM the latest.²⁹ No unique grE variants represent the earliest text, but two readings found in all grG and all grE mss and nowhere else are clearly the earliest reading: *fratres eius* (αὐτοῦ) for *fratres* (13.320) and *se mores* (ἔθνη) for *seniores* (13.397). Lacunae at both 13.298 (6 words) and 13.396 (5 words) in Groups E, L.2, N, P and mss B, G, and w indicate a clear connection among these manuscripts and groups.³⁰

Group H. Only manuscripts El, Mn, and H (out of 15 mss) are collated for 13.228–322. There are 4 distinctive variants shared only by all grH manuscripts

25 All manuscripts from each group were collated for the list of names of Seleucid rulers and all but six manuscripts for the names of cities possessed by Jews in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. For some groups only a relatively small selection of the total were collated for AJ 13.228–322. These are listed in the discussion of each group in this section.

26 Levenson Martin, “Revised Classification,” 95–100, and unpublished collations from AJ 9, 11, 18, 19, 20 and from BJ identified a significantly larger number of grE mss. A number of these do not include AJ 13 (most have the format AJ 1–12 + BJ + AJ 18–20). Others belong with different groups for AJ 13 (Prs with grP; R and H with grH).

27 E.g. *muro* for *muros* (13.239); omission of *a* (13.264); *fraterna* for *fraternae* (13.314); omission of *caedes* (13.314); *magnam* for *maga* (13.397).

28 E.g. *Adoreon* for *Abora* (357; cf. grP *et adoreon et*), *Grippa* for *Grippus* (13.365), *prouidi* for *pudoris* (13.319), *melior* for *melius* (13.243), *leticia* for *licentia* (13.273), *Maresennos* for *Marissenos* (13.275), *constanter eueniret* for *constat euenisse* (13.283).

29 *Omagenis* (grN) and *Omagenes* in grE and grM for *Timagenis* (earlier)/*Timagenes* (hr *Homagenis* is influenced by grN); *Eliodorus* or *et Eliodorus* (grN) vs. *et Liodorus* (grE) for *et Diodorus* (260); *Crispus* (grN grE grP grL) vs *Erispus* (grM) for *Grippus* (see below for all variants).

30 Ms vl (grJ) is also among the manuscripts with a lacuna at 13.298.

collated. The reason that there is such a low number of unique variants for grH is because it shares a large number of secondary variants with other groups, predominantly with groups J and the combination grJ + grM. This indicates that it represents an early version of a widespread textual tradition that includes a high percentage of secondary readings. This group is therefore identified primarily through the specific pattern of secondary variants shared within the group and especially the lack of distinctive variants characterizing each of the other groups. Because grH includes so many widely shared secondary readings not found in grC or grG, all readings from grH manuscript El are included in the Latin text of *AJ* 13.228–322 in Appendix 3 in order to represent the earliest layer of a widespread secondary textual tradition.

Group J. Only manuscripts Alb, li, and vl (out of 14 ms) are collated for 13.228–322. Cb, Mir, Cov, and Mir are collated only for the names of Seleucid rulers.³¹ There are 29 unique readings.

Group L. Only Sa and b (out of 4 mss) are collated from grL.1, and only Adm and Cn (out of 8 mss) from grL.2 are collated for 13.228–322. Pd, Prague XXIII.D.121, and Vn are collated for 13.301–322. There are 27 unique readings for these grL manuscripts, 22 additional unique readings for only grL.1 manuscripts, and 7 additional unique readings for grL.2. The unique grL.2 reading *Rinocorura* at 13.395 is probably the earliest reading because it is the only reading in the *LAJ* manuscript tradition that corresponds precisely to the Greek text.³² Group L.2 manuscripts Pd (“Codex Gigas”) and Prague XXIII.D.121 form a distinctive subgroup within grL.2 characterized by simplification of the Latin, omissions, and paraphrasing. Within grL.1, Sa usually has the earliest readings.³³ In a few places it shares readings with only grC and grG, and in one place it shares a reading with a unique grC reading (where it is corrected to the reading in all other manuscripts).³⁴ For the clear connection between grL.2 and groups E, N, P and mss Ba, G, and w, see the notes on grE above. Group L.1 has had an important impact on the dissemination of the Latin *Antiquities* tradition because manuscript b (or a direct copy of it) was used as the exemplar for the *AJ* text in the 1470 Augsburg *editio princeps*, which in turn influenced all later early editions of the Latin *Antiquities*.³⁵

31 These manuscripts, which were collated in preparation for our chapter on “Ancient Latin Translations,” were unavailable for the present project.

32 For this reading all grL.2 mss were collated.

33 See below, p. 244.

34 At *AJ* 13.291, *principatum* (grC) is the original reading in Sa, which has *magistratum* (all other groups) above it.

35 See Levenson and Martin, *Early Editions*, pp. 771–777.

Group M. Only mss Vat and Aus (out of 4 mss) were collated for 13.228–313. There are 12 unique readings. Manuscripts vt, rg, and Madrid 10270 are closely related to Vat, but share consistently later readings. Aus shares occasional readings with other groups, predominantly grE. Group M has a significant number of readings found elsewhere only in Groups H and J, and also a number of readings found elsewhere only in grE or in grE and grN. In the cases of similar readings with grN and grE, grM consistently has a later reading (see above comments on grE).

Group N (+ Ba, G, hr, w). Manuscripts L, Bo, ve, and No were collated for 13.228–313 and all mss in the group for 13.314–322, 13.395–397, and the names of Selucid rulers. There are 17 unique variants. Within grN, L/Bo and Pal/u make up clear subgroups. Unclassified manuscript Ba shares 12 readings with one or more grN manuscripts that are not found elsewhere, and it generally agrees with grN against other groups.³⁶ Manuscripts Ba and G (uncorrected text) are closely related to each other and to grN, sharing 5 variants with grN found nowhere else in the manuscript tradition. Almost all readings shared by Ba and G are also found in grN, although in a number of places Ba and G have an earlier reading than that in grN. This indicates that these two manuscripts reflect an earlier stage in the tradition from which grN developed. This is not surprising, since the ninth-century Ba is more than a century older than the next oldest manuscripts containing *AJ* 13, which come from the early eleventh century. There is also a clear connection between grN and unclassified manuscripts hr and w, although not as strong as the connection between Ba-G and grN. Manuscript hr, which has a large number of grC readings, is influenced by several other traditions, of which grN is the most prominent.

Group P. This group, consisting of manuscripts cf, p, Prs, and Cremona 1, constitutes a distinct group only for *AJ* 13 in the passages we have collated.³⁷ There are 190 unique variants (only a small sample is listed in Appendix 2), only one of which might possibly have the earliest text.³⁸ Many of the unique

36 Manuscripts B, G, hr, and w are listed with unique grN manuscripts in Appendix 2.

37 In passages from *AJ* 6 and 9 we have collated, cf (which only has *AJ* 1–14) and p are closely related and, in passages from *AJ* 18–20, Prs and Pl or Prs and p are closely related. For the complex manuscript Prs (BnF 8959), see Levenson and Martin, “A Revised Classification,” 95–99 (where Prs is in grE) and “A Critical Edition,” 70 (where it is connected with Pl [*AJ* 18] and p [*AJ* 20]). For a detailed description of the manuscript with bibliography, see Judith Mania’s entry in the online *Lege Josephum* Manuscript Database <https://legejosephum.ch/en/manuscripts/5f201d8ac7b2212b9070ef42>.

38 The unique grP reading *inuasit* is much closer to the Greek εἰσῆλθε than *possidebat* in grE or *possedit* in all other manuscripts. The tendency of unique grP readings to be secondary synonyms, however, raises the possibility that the close relationship with the Greek might be accidental.

variants in grP represent an attempt to improve the style of the text through substitution of synonyms and additions of one or two words, especially participles and other adjectival phrases. In a number of places where grP agrees with other traditions, a connection with grC can be recognized, and to a much larger extent with groups N, E, and L. In one place only grC and grP appear to have preserved the earliest reading.³⁹

2.3 *Manuscript Group C*

Group C is the largest and most complex of the manuscript groups. It is easily identified by 68 unique readings shared by all manuscripts in the group. It is also the most directly relevant group to Flusser's analysis of *Yosippon's* Latin sources for chapters 27–89, because all four of the manuscripts Flusser identifies as members of the same group as *Yosippon's LAJ* and *DEH* source belong to this group. In addition, manuscript hr, which Flusser mentions as related because it includes *LAJ* 1–16 and *DEH* (in addition to *BJ*), has a high percentage of grC readings.

The 22 manuscripts of grC can be divided into four groups and two unclassified manuscripts: C.1 (B Vi); C.2 (C La Pt v); C.3 (V¹⁴⁰ Pi); C.4 (4a: M I Vt Ve Cr Sr par pat Ne^{a.c}; 4b: Ne^{p.c} pa Pluti8sin10 Fl⁴¹); unclassified (Ptr O).⁴² The division into subgroups is based on the large number of common secondary variants shared only by members of each of the subgroups grC.2–grC.4 (see Appendix 2). Subgroup C.4 is divided into two additional subgroups because of the distinctive variants and extensive corrections in ms Ne, whose uncorrected text (when it can be determined) fits closely with grC.4a manuscripts. Group 4b consists of the corrected text of Ne and the texts of manuscripts pa and Pluti8sin10, which derive from it. Manuscript Ptr and its probable copy O do not fit neatly into a single subgroup, since they sometimes share readings with grC.1–2, but more often with grC.3–4. With the exception of one distinctive

39 *Antonia* (13.307) corresponds to the Greek better than *Antoniana*, which is found in all other manuscripts except Ml, where the reading *Anthonia* is best explained as accidental. For other examples of readings only in grP and grC, see 13.245 (*advertens* for *animaduerstens*), 13.250 (*amicitiam* for *amicitias*), 13.229 (*properante* for *properantem*), 310 (*passionis* for *passiones*). For the clear connection of groups E, L.2, N, P and mss B, G, and w established by the two common lacunae found in all these, see the comments on grE above.

40 On the basis of the collation of the last page of *AJ* 16, V² can also be classified with grC.3.

41 Fl was unavailable for this project and was only collated for the names of the Seleucid rulers (Case Study 1).

42 Here, as in the other *LAJ* passages collated (see, for example, Levenson and Martin, "A Revised Classification"), the 12th/13th-century ms O follows the 11th/12th-century Ptr closely and is probably a direct copy of that manuscript (Blatt, 61). For this project, O is particularly valuable, because it almost certainly has preserved the text of Ptr 13.314–333, which has been lost and is replaced by a blank folio page in the extant manuscript.

variant shared by B and Vi, grC.1 is recognized by the presence of the 68 grC variants shared only by all grC manuscripts and the absence of the distinctive variants characterizing other subgroups.

Although Flusser, on the basis of the common format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*,⁴³ insisted that Blatt had erred in not placing B, La, Pi, and V in the same part of the stemma, in fact these four related manuscripts clearly belong to three different subgroups. Flusser was, however, fully justified in pointing out Blatt's failure to connect B more directly to the groups in which the three other manuscripts are found. Because Flusser's analysis was based only on the information in Blatt's catalogue for V and Pi and on a small sample of the same passages for B and La, a fuller and more accurate description of all four manuscripts will be presented here in the context of the discussion of Groups C.1–3. Flusser's errors do not invalidate his hypothesis, but they unnecessarily complicate the task of evaluating its strengths.

2.3.1 Group C.1: Naples V F 34 (B) and BnF 5048 (Vi)

The text of ms B, like manuscripts C, La, and Vi, written in Beneventan script, represents the earliest form of the grC textual tradition.

Following Blatt (27–28), Flusser dates B (*AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*) to the end of the 10th century and evidently interprets Blatt's citation of the book list from Benevento in Zazo, "L'inventario dei libri antichi," to mean the manuscript originated there.⁴⁴ The manuscript, currently in the National Library of Naples, has a 15th century ex-libris indicating it was in the Benevento "Chapter Library" and it is listed in the 1447 library catalogue as "*liber Iosephi continens expositionem ueteris testamenti qui alio nomine dicitur liber antiquitatum.*"⁴⁵ It is uncertain whether the manuscript was written at Benevento⁴⁶ or at Naples.⁴⁷ While Blatt (27) dates the manuscript to the end of the 10th century, he allows that from f. 20 (= *AJ* 1.251), it is "perhaps later." Lowe, Brown, and Newton⁴⁸ all date the manuscript to the 11th century. It should be noted that they also date ms C to the early 11th century, and since that manuscript appears to be derived from B, B also must be from the beginning of the century. The manuscript has a number

43 Flusser had not seen mss V and Pi, and he had only collated a small selection from B and La.

44 Flusser, 2.124; "Die lateinische Josephus," 128. Blatt does not explicitly say the manuscript was produced at Benevento.

45 Mallet and Thibaut, "*Les manuscrits en bénéventaine*," 1.17. The *DEH* is not in the catalogue itself, but is mentioned in the notes of Luigi Theuli, who revised the catalogue in 1447.

46 Newton, *The Scriptorium and Library at Monte Cassino*, 124n35277; cf. 124n35.

47 Cavallo, "Trasmissione," 382; Brown, *Terra Sancti Benedicti*, 681: "Probably copied at Naples (palaeography)?"

48 Lowe, *The Beneventan Script*, 2nd ed. prepared and enlarged by Brown, 2.99; Brown, *Terra Sancti Benedicti*, 681; Newton, *The Scriptorium and Library at Monte Cassino*, 277.

of missing pages, including the last three folios of *AJ* 16 (= 16.379b to 16.394),⁴⁹ which have been cut out, and the end of *DEH* (from 5.40.1 [408r; Ussani, 383, 7]).

The precedence of B in the grC tradition is based on two primary pieces of evidence: (1) For seven variants, the uncorrected text of B has the earliest reading, which has been corrected to a unique (and secondary) grC reading; (2) the insertion of material from BJ 1.82–84, written in what appears to be a hand different from the surrounding text, appears to be added to B and then subsequently is found in all grC manuscripts written in the same hand as the rest of that section of those manuscripts.⁵⁰

2.3.1.1 *Manuscript B as Representative of Earliest grC Textual Form: Evidence from the Uncorrected Text*

There are six places where B has the earliest reading, which is corrected to a unique grC variant, which then becomes the reading in all subsequent grC manuscripts:⁵¹

269. **Grippi*] grC *Agrippa* (small *a* added at the beginning and final *i* changed into *a*); 278. *cogere*] grC *cogere cepit* (*cepit* added in the margin); *a*] grC *ut a* (*ut* added above the line); *recedere*] grC *recederet* (abbreviated *t* attached to final *e* in B); 295. *contristabatur*] grC *contristabantur* (*n* added above the line in B and La); 307. *occiderent*] grC *non occiderent* (*non* added above the line in B)

Blatt had already noted, on the basis of evidence from *Antiquities* 5, that ms B had frequent corrections from what he called the “Cassinesis-group (C, La, Pt, v;”⁵² in fact, these corrections are found in all grC manuscripts and not just these).⁵³ Whether these corrections derive from another grC manuscript or are the emendations of a scribe followed by later grC manuscripts, it is clear that the uncorrected text of ms B preserves an earlier form of the grC tradition than any other extant manuscript from that group.⁵⁴

49 16.395–404 are missing in all *LAJ* manuscripts.

50 Ptr is missing the section with this addition, but its text can be reconstructed from its copy, ms O.

51 Cf. also the correction of *laudatque* (*LAJ* 13.245) to the grC variant *laudantque* (*n* added above line), which is also found in grL.1 grP (note grC.4 variants *laudansque* (Ve Cr), *laudanque* (M), and *laudantes* (Ne)).

52 Levenson and Martin grC.2

53 For a similar phenomenon in *LAJ* 11, see above n. 20, and in *AJ* 6, Lukas, *Josephus Latinus*, XC–XCI.

54 Cf. Lukas, *Josephus Latinus*, XC–XCI. There are three cases I have noted in the passages collated for this project where the underlying text is appropriately corrected: the clearly erroneous uncorrected *emistque* (-q;) (*LAJ* 13.240) and *propterque* (-q;)(13.243)

TABLE 2 Synopsis of the material surrounding the lacuna in grG ms St and grC manuscript B

Group G text: Brussels II 1179 (St)	Group C text: Naples V F 34 (B)
(315) Quo facto, clamor uidentium fusum sanguinem eleuatus est dum existimarent hoc puerum sponte fecisse.	Quo facto, <i>ululatus autem continuo sublatus est, qui puerum tamquam de industria sanguinem libas<s>e conspexerant</i> (BJ 1.82b).
Clamorem uero cum Aristobolus audisset causamque requisisset tacentibus amplius minabatur, discere uolens clamoris causam.	Clamorem uero cum Aristobolus audisset causamque requisisset tacentibus amplius conabatur, discere uolens clamoris causam.
	<i>Atque ille cum lacrimis opplesset oculos, et quantum poterat ingemisset, haec locutus est: Sperandum certe non erat, ut maximum Dei lumen facta mea nefaria laterent, nam cito me ultrix cognatae caedis iustitia persequitur</i> (BJ 1.83b–84a).
	[Lacuna in grC continues through LAJ 13.320]

2.3.1.2 *Manuscript B as Representative of the Earliest grC Textual Form: Evidence from the Lacuna at LAJ 13.315–20*

The most dramatic example of a unique grC textual feature in the sections collated for this project is the existence of a large lacuna extending from 13.315c–20. In seven grC manuscripts, beginning with manuscripts B, V, and Pi, this is marked by a large gap in the text.⁵⁵ In all 22 grC manuscripts collated for this section, the content of the beginning of the omitted material is supplied from the parallel passage in the *War* (BJ 1.83b–184a–84). In addition to this material, a sentence from *LBJ* 1.82 replaces part of *LAJ* 13.315. Table 2 provides a synopsis of the material surrounding the lacuna in grG ms St and grC

are corrected to *emisit quae* and *propter quae* and the erroneous reading *transeat* is corrected to *transeant* (13.262). The only other clear error found in no other *LAJ* manuscript is *munima* for *munimina* (13.237), for which C, La, and Pt have *munim̄* and v *munimen*.

55 Group C.1 mss B and Vi, grC.2 ms C, grC.3 mss Pi and V, and gr4 mss O and par. Since O is probably a copy of Ptr, in which a folio page where the lacuna would have been located is missing, it is likely that Ptr had a large blank space corresponding to that in O.

manuscript B illustrating the difference between the Group C text and all other manuscripts.⁵⁶ The insertion from the Latin *War* is italicized.

Here again ms B provides evidence of a grC text earlier than that of any other grC manuscript, because the inserted material from *LBJ* 1.82–84 appears to be written in a closely related but different Beneventan hand from the rest of this section of the manuscript.⁵⁷ The underlying text of Naples V F 34, therefore, would preserve a stage of the grC tradition after the missing text had become unreadable and was represented by a large blank space, but before the introduction of the supplement from *LBJ*. At some point a scribe would have filled in the lacuna in such a manuscript with the passage from *LBJ*. While this process could have happened earlier in another manuscript, which could then have been the ultimate source of the added material in ms B, the simplest hypothesis is that the inserted material was first introduced into ms B, which then became the ultimate source for at least this section of the *LAJ* text in all subsequent grC manuscripts.

The late-11th century **BnF** 5048 (Vi), also written in Beneventan script, is included in grC.1 because (1) only Vi and B share the distinctive reading *azicico* for *a Cizico* (C.2–4: *azici*) and (2) in all but ten places it follows the corrected text of ms B,⁵⁸ and with only two exceptions, has none of the 157 unique variants characterizing the other grC subgroups.⁵⁹ These ten differences in the texts of the two manuscripts indicate that Vi used at least one other manuscript, but the use of an earlier now lost grC.1 manuscript is ruled out by the presence of all the corrected readings and the insertion from *BJ* 1 in the same hand as the scribe of that section of the manuscript. While the insertion of the

56 A full English synopsis of *LAJ* 13.314–322 comparing St and B texts together with an analysis of the entire passage focusing on its significance for the Latin *Antiquities* manuscript tradition and for the relation of *Yosippon* to that tradition is presented in Case Study 4 below (“The Death of Aristobulus 1”). A Latin text of the passage in St and B can be found in Appendix 3, pp. 311–313.

57 I thank Ashleigh Witherington for pointing out a change in the scribal hand.

58 *torquebat* (13.231), omission of *impetum* (13.233), *tyrannidem* (13.235), *qua* (13.237), *principatu* (13.278) *quam* (13.292), *sententia* (13.295), *amare* (13.303), *Antigono* (13.308), *uero stadiis* (13.312), *Antigoni* (13.314). In all cases but *torquebat* and omission of *impetum*, Vi has the earlier reading found in almost all other manuscripts. The omission of *impetum* and *quam* are found in grC.3–4 and ms Ptr. Among other grC mss, *amare* (vs the distinctive grC variant *amari*) is found in Ptr, Ve, Ne, and, among other grC mss, *Antigono* (vs the distinctive grC variant *Antigonus*) is found also in Ptr, Ve, and Ne.

59 Vi agrees with only grC.3–4 and ms Ptr against the rest of the *LAJ* manuscript tradition at 13.233 (omission of *impetum*) and at 13.292 (*quam* vs *qua*).

material from the *War* is derived from ms B, Vi adds, in a different Beneventan hand, the corresponding section from *DEH* 1.8–9.⁶⁰

2.3.2 Group C.2: Monte Cassino 124 (C); BML Plut. 66.1 (La); Bas. s. Pietri A 37 (Pt); Vat. lat. 1998 (V¹ and V²)

Flusser follows Blatt in dating ms C (*AJ* 1–20) to the 10th CE⁶¹ and in ascribing an “unknown” origin to the eleventh-century La (*AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*).⁶² Lowe, followed by all recent scholarship I have seen, dates both C and La to the first half of the 11th century, when he says both were written at Monte Cassino.⁶³ An eleventh-century date eliminates Blatt’s suggestion⁶⁴ that Monte Cassino 124 (C) is probably the Josephus manuscript Duke John III of Naples (928–968)

60 Vi also adds, after the *DEH* insertion, a sentence not found elsewhere, which serves as a transition to the point at which the text is resumed after the lacuna: *Qui antequam nascerentur patri eius a Deo reuelatum est quod impius et prophanus futurus esset.*

61 Blatt, 31; Flusser, 2.124.

62 Blatt, 32 (end of 10th century); Flusser, 2.124. Martin and I have also erred in previous publications by relying on Blatt’s dating of both B and C to the 10th century.

63 Lowe, *The Beneventan Script*, 220, declares La “doubtless of Cassinese origin;” cf. 71: “the script [of La] is unmistakably Cassinese of the early 11th century.” For bibliography, see Lowe and Brown, *Beneventan Script 2nd ed.*, 42–43; 69. In his introduction to his edition, Flusser follows Blatt in saying the provenance of C is unknown, but he cites Lowe’s connection of the manuscript to Monte Cassino in his 1953 article, “The Author of the Book of Josiphon,” 2.122n64.

64 Blatt, 31, incorrectly cites Lowe as identifying Monte Cassino 124 (rather than MC 123) with the manuscript commissioned by Duke John; see the next note. In his review of Blatt, 462n22, in his “Der lateinische Josephus,” 130, and in the Introduction to his edition, 2.124, Flusser points out that Blatt’s identification of Monte Cassino 124 with the Josephus volume ordered by the Duke is only a conjecture, but if correct, it would eliminate it as a possible source for *Yosippon*. In his “Der lateinische Josephus,” he returns to his suggestion in “The Author of the Book of Josiphon,” and speculates that, if it is not to be identified with Monte Cassino 124, *Yosippon* might indeed have used the book in Duke John’s library as his source. In his introduction to his edition, 2.124, and in “Der lateinische Josephus,” 129–130, Flusser points out that even if the Josephus volume the Duke ordered copied for his library was not used by *Yosippon*, copies of Josephus’ works could be found in Naples already in the 9th century when Sergius I donated three “codices” of Josephus to the episcopal library in Naples. Sergius’ donation is recorded in the *Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum*, ed. G. Waitz *MGH Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum Saec. VI–IX*, 434 (*dedit etiam in eiusdem episcopi bibliothecam tres Flabii Iosephi codices*). Unfortunately, there is no basis for identifying Sergius’ donation with any extant Josephus manuscripts.

ordered to be made for the library he enhanced after the death of his learned wife Theodora.⁶⁵

For the present study, it is important to correct Flusser's failure to recognize the close connection between manuscripts C and La, which are both part of Levenson-Martin grC.2, which, like Blatt's family β , also includes the 12/13th century Bas. s. Pietri A37 (Pt) and the 15th century Vat. lat 1995 (v). Blatt's stemma indicates that v is to be connected with manuscripts C and La, but in this passage it is, in fact, closer to ms Pt.⁶⁶ As can be seen in Appendix 2, grC.2 can be identified by 39 unique readings, a number of them quite striking (e.g. *citius* for *Hyrceanus*; *ad deum si iram* for *ad mensuram*; *Startoris* for *Stratonis*). Appendix 2 also provides the data for the relationship of the manuscripts to one another with five agreements of Pt/v vs C/La (e.g. C/La share the error *regineam* for *reginam*), three agreements of C/Pt/v vs La (e.g. C/Pt/v share the errors *artea* for *argentea* and *principi* for *principis*), and no agreements of Pt/v/La vs C. This suggests that both La and Pt depend on C. Both manuscripts, however, have used at least one source other than C, since in each case listed in Appendix 2, when all four do not agree, either Pt/v or C/La has a reading found elsewhere, in most cases the reading found in the vast majority of manuscripts, which makes it difficult to identify the source with a specific manuscript or group.

C's dependence on B is suggested by the fact that all the corrections in B as well as the insertion of the material from *BJ* 1 at the beginning of the lacuna appear as part of the text in C written in the same hand as the surrounding text. The almost identical format of the lacuna in C and B, not found elsewhere (blank lines in the second part of one column and continuing for the entire next column) also suggests C's dependence on the earlier manuscript B.

65 Lowe, *The Beneventan Script*, 82–83, provides the Latin text from Bamberg Hsc. Hist. 3 (formerly E III 14), 193r (Prologue to Leo Archipresbyter's *Nativitas et Victoria Alexandri Magni Regis*) describing Duke John III's interest in promoting the collection and translation of Latin manuscripts. Manuscripts of Josephus and Livy (*Ioseppum vero et Titum Livium*) are mentioned among the texts of historians. Lowe, *Scriptura Beneventana*, 130, pl. 48 (cf. *Beneventan Script*, 2nd ed., 69) identified these as Monte Cassino 123, a 10th century *BJ* manuscript (*BJ* 1.11b–3.402a), and Prague, Czech National Library VII.A.16/9, four folios from Livy (3.35.7–40.4). Following Lowe, Newton, *Scriptorium*, 177 identifies Monte Cassino 123, a 10th century *BJ* manuscript, as the Josephus text ordered by Duke John, but errs in stating it has survived “complete,” since it begins at *BJ* 1.11b and ends with 3.402a (Lowe dates the ms to the second half of the 10th century, *Beneventan Script*, 2nd ed., 69).

66 This is clear from the five agreements of Pt/v vs C/La listed in Appendix 2, with only agreements of Pt vs C/La/v (*malitiam* vs *malitia* and *tradidisset* vs *tradisset*).

2.3.3 Group C.3: Vat. lat. 1998 (V¹ and V²) and Pisa 20 (Pi)

According to the most recent scholarship, **Vat. lat. 1998** is of Roman origin and can be dated between the end of the 11th and beginning of the 12th century.⁶⁷ The most significant mistake Flusser makes in his description of the four manuscripts which he identifies with the tradition used by *Yosippon* is his inaccurate account of the format of this manuscript. Beginning with his review of Blatt, he consistently describes it as including *AJ* 1–16 and *DEH* and asserts that the information that it contains *AJ* 1–20 in Blatt's catalogue must be a careless mistake.⁶⁸ In fact, ms V does include *AJ* 1–20. However, the story is more complicated, because the manuscript has two parts: (1) *AJ* 1–20 (here designated V¹); and (2) a fragment of a manuscript consisting of the last page of *AJ* 16 followed by the *DEH* (here designated V²).⁶⁹ This is clear from the fact that *AJ* 20 ends on 167r (*Flavii Iosephi Antiquitatis Iudaicae Liber XX Explicit*), 167v is blank, and the next folio page (168) has the end of *AJ* 16⁷⁰ on the recto side and the beginning of *DEH* on the verso side.⁷¹ Vat. lat. 1998, as it came to be constructed, then, has evidence for both a manuscript with *AJ* 1–20 and an additional manuscript with *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*. Both *LAJ* manuscripts, however, are clearly from the same group. A comparison of the variants at the end of *AJ* 16 in the first part of the manuscript (V¹; 136v) with those on the recto side of the folio page containing the beginning of *DEH* on the verso side (V²; 168r–v) reveals that the last page of *AJ* 16 belonging with *DEH* is very close to the uncorrected text of the last page of *LAJ* 16 in the manuscript with all twenty books.⁷² Furthermore, the similar paleography and illuminations of the first letter in the *AJ* and *DEH* books

67 Bilotta, *I libri dei papi*, 86–87.

68 Flusser, 2.125n378; “Review of Blatt,” 461m9.

69 Since *AJ* 13 is only extant in V¹, all citations from *AJ* except the last page of *AJ* 16 will simply be cited as v.

70 *AJ* 16.368–394. All Latin *AJ* mss end at 16.394.

71 Flusser misunderstood Blatt's note about the end of the *Antiquities* and beginning of Pseudo-Hegesippus: “... f. 167r prohibemur. f. 168r interfici vero (*Antiquitates* XVI 368), fff. 168v–219v the Latin Hegesippus.” It is easy to see how Flusser overlooked the word *prohibemur*, which marks the last word of *AJ* 20, and took *AJ* XVI 368 to mean the end of the *Antiquities* in the entire manuscript rather than what is in fact the first word of the last page of an otherwise lost manuscript with *AJ* 1–16. Given this reading of Blatt, Flusser was confused by his description of the contents of the manuscript as “*Antiquitates* 1–XX. Hegesippus 1–v,” and assumed it was a mistake.

72 Unfortunately, the manuscript has a large number of corrections, which are very difficult to read in the poor quality microfilm that is the only version of the text available at present. Examining the manuscript carefully over several days at the Vatican Library, I was able to clarify almost all the readings in the passages from *AJ* 13 collated for this project, but I was still unable to read about 15% of the text of 168r (cf. Nogara, *Codices Vaticini Latini*, 3: “*Quae in f. 168 leguntur, atramento valde evanido exarata sunt*”).

provide clear evidence that both the complete and fragmentary manuscript were produced at approximately the same time and place.⁷³

The variants in the last page of *LAJ* 16 in both *V*¹ and *V*² are closely related to the variants in the 13th-century (2nd half) **Pisa, Biblioteca Cathariniana ms 20** (Pi), which is one of the manuscripts with *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* mentioned (but not seen) by Flusser.⁷⁴ This is not surprising, because the *Antiquities* text of Pi is exceptionally close to the text of *V* throughout the sections collated for this chapter (see list of common variants in Appendix 2). An important clue to the relationship of these two manuscripts can be found in the margin of Pi, where at 16.369 the reading “*uel mutauer(u)nt*” appears (in what seems to be the same or a contemporaneous hand)⁷⁵ as a comment on the reading “*nuntiauer(u)nt*” found in the text. Since, of the selection of manuscripts collated for *V*², the variant *nuntiauerunt* is found only in Pi and *V*² and *mutauerunt* is found only in the *V*¹ *LAJ* 16, it appears that Pi had access to both versions of the ending of *LAJ* 16 in Vat. lat. 1998. This strongly suggests that for the *Antiquities*, Pi depends primarily on the *LAJ* 1–16 + *DEH* manuscript of which only one page from *LAJ* remains (*V*²). This is supported by a comparison of the ending of *LAJ* 16 in both manuscripts found in Vat. 1998. Pi and the two manuscripts in *V* consistently agree against the rest of the manuscripts collated for this passage, and Pi almost always agrees with *V*² against the text in *V*¹. The close connection of Pi and the *DEH* text in Vat. 1998 (*V*²) is confirmed by the many distinctive readings in a short section of each collated in connection with this project.⁷⁶ What this means for the text of the *Antiquities* is that Pi, from the second half of the 13th century, is a witness to at least as early a version of the text as that in the 11th/12th-century Vat. lat. 1998. Further study is required to determine if the Pi *DEH* text is a copy of the *DEH* text in Vat. lat. 1998, but that would be the most likely model at this stage of research.

Group C.3 is clearly identified by the close relationship between *V* and Pi in all the passages we have collated. The data presented here correspond closely with Blatt’s stemma, which locates the two manuscripts together as one branch of family γ and not, as Flusser argues on the basis of the format alone (since he had not seen either manuscript), part of a subgroup with B and La.

73 For the distinctive initial letters of this manuscript, making it possible to establish the date and place of origin, see Bilotta, *I libri dei Papi*, 86–87.

74 Pisa, Biblioteca Cathariniana, ms. 20. Description with dating at Manus Online (the brief text at the end of the manuscript is not from an omitted part of the manuscript, as the description tentatively suggests, but is an extract from the *Regesta* of Innocent III [5.155; PL 214. 1168C]).

75 According to the Manus Online description, the marginal notes are contemporary with the manuscript.

76 *DEH* 1.1.8–1.8.

For the sections of *LAJ* discussed in this chapter, Appendix 2 lists the 26 unique variants shared by only these two manuscripts as well as the 41 unique variants shared by Groups C.3 and C.4. Evidence that the text of Pi was influenced both by a manuscript like V² and one like V¹, just as was the case in *AJ* 16, can also be found in a corrected reading. At 13.257, the grC.3–4 reading *Mariso* (for *Marisso*) is corrected to *Matriso*, the reading in V¹. As in *AJ* 16, this suggests that the uncorrected text of Pi depends on the lost *LAJ* text of V², and the correction on V¹. The common format of Pi and V² (*AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*) also supports the idea that V² was Pi's primary source, which was supplemented or corrected by V¹.

The fact that Vat. lat. 1998 preserves evidence from two manuscripts does not present a problem for Flusser's hypothesis. In fact, to some degree it strengthens it by eliminating the potential problem of a manuscript comprising *AJ* 1–20 + *DEH*.

The sources of grC.3 are difficult to establish, but the general trajectory from grC.1 through grC.3 and then into grC.4 is clear. Because grC.3 does not have the multiple distinctive variants of grC.2, one of its main sources must ultimately derive from grC.1 and not grC.2. There are, however, four variants that indicate some connection between grC.3 and manuscript La alone, one of which is a common omission of eight words by haplography.⁷⁷ While this might indicate a common source, it is also possible that La had a direct, though minor, influence on the grC.3 manuscript tradition. In any case, evidence from the form of the lacuna at 13.315–320 in Pi, V, La, and B clearly indicates that grC.3 does not depend on ms La for this section, because, like B and C, manuscripts Pi and V have large blank spaces indicating the lacuna, while La has a continuous text with no indication of a lacuna. Comparison of the *DEH* texts in Pt/V, B, and La might clarify the relationship of La to grC.3. An initial probe collating B, La, Pi, and V for *DEH* 1.1.8–1.9 (Ussani, 7–14), however, provided clear evidence of a close relationship between Pi and V, but no tendency of Pi/V to agree with B against La or La against B.

2.3.4 Unclassified Manuscript Harley 3691

In addition to manuscripts B, La, Pi, and V, Flusser mentions Harley 3691 (hr), a 15th-century Italian manuscript now in the British Library.⁷⁸ Based solely

77 At 13.291, the words *sacerdotii et tantum sufficiat tibi populi regere principitum* are omitted by La and grC.3. The only other examples of La and grC.3 agreeing against the rest of the manuscript tradition are the readings *prostratus* for *protractus* at 13.234 (where Laa.c. agrees with grC.3 + Ptr, par, and hr), *plene* for *poenae* at 13.294 (where La agrees with grC.3–4), and *mortem* for *morte* at 13.312 (where La agrees with grC.3–4 Ptr, and hr).

78 "Review of Blatt," 461; Flusser 2.125; "Der lateinische Josephus," 128 (the mistaken information that it includes the first ten books of *AJ* and that Blatt's siglum for it is "ho" is found only in this article).

on Blatt's description, he reports only that it was written in 1457 and includes *AJ* 1–16, *BJ*, and *DEH*.⁷⁹ While noting the format of the manuscript, thereby implying some connection to the manuscripts including *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*, he does not comment on how hr might be related to B, La, Pi, and V. The place of Harley 3691 in the Latin *Antiquities* 13 manuscript tradition and possible connections to *Yosippon* will be discussed in some detail at various points in this chapter. Here it is important to provide an accurate description of the manuscript, since all descriptions of its unique format, including Blatt's, are misleading or incomplete.⁸⁰ A colophon at the end of the *War* and before the *DEH* states that Julian of Viterbo wrote it for Guido de Gonzaga in 1457 (222v). According to Watson, on the basis of the "Mantuan" decoration and the fact that Guido de Gonzaga (d. 1483) was bishop of Mantua, the manuscript was probably written in that city.⁸¹ While beginning with *AJ* 1–16 and ending with *DEH*, the text of the *War*, in fact, includes only 1.552–2.373 and 5.366–7.455, with 5.366b seamlessly and without any notice following 373a.⁸²

There are, of course, parallels to an edition with *AJ* 1–16 (B, La, Pi, V),⁸³ as discussed in the previous section in this chapter, as well as to the format

79 Flusser ("Review of Blatt," 462) correctly points out the discrepancy between Blatt's catalogue (Blatt, 41–42), where hr is classified among "late contaminated manuscripts (variants from the Italian and the Northern groups)," and Blatt's stemma, where it is classified with family α . Blatt's inconsistency reflects the combination of a significant component of the manuscript deriving from an earlier source (part of Blatt's "Southern" or "Italian" group), combined with readings from other groups with a high percentage of secondary readings.

80 Blatt: "Antiquities I–XVI. Bellum Iudaicum I 552–VII. Hegesippus I–V" (not noting the omission from 2.373–5.366); British Library Digital Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscript: "Josephus, Hegesippus, Historia (1–222v) and Five Books of Commentaries on the Acts of the Church (ff. 223–296)" (confusing Pseudo-Hegesippus, the author of the *DEH*, with the second-century church historian Hegesippus quoted by Eusebius, a mistake deriving from *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3:52: "1. Flavii Josephi, Iudaicae Antiquitatis, libri 18, Latine, at imperfecti, et praecipue in fine; ubi excerpta dantur potius quam verba Historici. Conclusio a fine Belli Iudaici sumpta est. 2. Hegesippi, Commentariorum Actorum Ecclesiasticorum, libri 5."

81 Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts*, 1138.

82 Skipping from the middle of Agrippa's speech in *BJ* 2 to a passage at the beginning of Josephus' speech in *BJ* 5 (196v). The excerpt begins at 1.552, the accession of Antipater, because that is the point at which *AJ* 17 begins, which is replaced in the manuscript by the *BJ* parallel.

83 See n. 102 for a reference to an *LAJ* volume with Books 1–16 in the Stavelot Abbey library catalogue. Manuscript Cr also appears to have originally had only *AJ* 1–16, since *AJ* 17–20 are added in a later hand. The format *AJ* 17–20 in a number of manuscripts provides additional evidence for the format *AJ* 1–16.

AJ + *BJ* + *DEH* (Clm 15841)⁸⁴ and *AJ* + large extracts from *BJ* (mss Ne, pa, Vt, Ptr),⁸⁵ but almost everything else about the manuscript is eccentric:

1. The *War* excerpts are divided into two unequal books, the first designated Book 17 with three chapters covering *BJ* 1.552–2.116, and the second called Book 18 with ten chapters covering *BJ* 2.117–373 + 5.366–7.455.
2. The excerpts from the *War* are introduced with the comment that no more from the “*stilus Iosephi*” is found after Book 16 and that what follows are diverse translations (referring to *BJ* and *DEH*) up through Book 22 (i.e. *AJ* 1–16 + Books 17–18 [= *BJ* extracts] + Egesippus 1–4 [= *DEH* 1–5]).
3. The colophon in all capital letters, which precedes the information mentioned above about the scribe and date in the same script as the text of the manuscript, says that it is the end of *AJ* Book 12 (sic)⁸⁶ “and no more is found” (222V).
4. *DEH* is divided into four instead of five books (Book 2 = *DEH* 2–3),⁸⁷ but the colophon (without a reference to the date or scribe)⁸⁸ runs: EGESIPPI HISTORIE LIBER QUINTUS EXPLICIT.⁸⁹

While there are a number of mistakes and puzzling secondary unique readings in Harley 3691, the *Antiquities* text in the passages we have collated also clearly reflects early manuscript traditions. For example, in passages from *AJ* 6 and

84 Unlike hr, Clm 15841 (Sa) has *AJ* 1–20 and *BJ* 1–7.

85 Ne, pa, Vt have *AJ* 1–20 and *BJ* 1.1–351 + 4.325–7.455 (= *LBJ* Books 5–7), numbered as Books 21–24. (Ptr ends at *BJ* 5.391a [mid Bk 23]). For connection of *LBJ* texts in Ne, Vt, and Ptr, see Bader, *Josephus Latinus*, 35–36.

86 There are a large number of early manuscripts comprised of only *AJ* 1–12. This colophon, as bewildering as it is, indicates that the scribe clearly knew at least one of these manuscripts and perhaps used it together with the manuscript containing *AJ* 1–16.

87 The only other possible examples of a division of *DEH* into four books I have found are in abbey library book lists: “de Bello Iudaico, libri iiii” (Stavelot Catalogue of 1105 CE, found at the end of first volume of the “Stavelot Bible” (BL Add. 28106, 228v); “de bello Iudaico libri vii ... Item in tertio [volumine] libri iiii” (St. Gallen no. 16; Lehmann *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, 1.81, lines 12–13); “Josephi de antiquitate Iudaica libros xii in volumine i. Item libros iiii in volumine uno” (St. Gallen no. 17; Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, 1.84, lines 19–21). None of these is indisputably a *DEH* manuscript, and the last entry seems to refer to *AJ*. There are also manuscripts with *AJ* 17–20 (e.g. a, f, Ga) as well as *AJ* 1–12 + 17–20 (S, Vo). It is possible that a four-book division of the *DEH* or a catalogue entry (mistakenly) listing four books was influenced by the words, *Quattuor libros*, which begin the work (in context actually referring to *Reigns* 1–4 [Samuel and Kings]). I thank Richard Pollard for pointing out the references in the St. Gallen catalogues. For a four-book division in *LBJ* mss, see n. 85.

88 According to Watson, *Catalogue*, 138, *DEH* is by the same hand as in the earlier part of the manuscript.

89 Like the colophon at 222v, this one also suggests use of more than one manuscript.

AJ 9,⁹⁰ the text is very close to the 6th/7th century papyrus Cimelio 1, which was produced at most a century after the Cassiodoran translation was made. In the passages collated from *AJ* 13 for this chapter, the hr text has 53 variants found elsewhere only in grC: 20 with all grC mss; 16 with grC.3–4; 11 with grC.4; 3 with grC.3; 2 with grC.1–3; 1 with grC.2 + grC.4. However, there is a much larger number of readings in hr that are not shared with unique grC readings. These are distributed among multiple groups, with only one group (grN) having as many as four cases of a unique group reading shared with hr.⁹¹

Finally, although its closeness to grC and its *AJ* 1–16 format point to some connection with the manuscripts Flusser suggest belong to the same group as *Yosippon*'s *AJ* source, the fact that hr clearly belongs with grC.4 (with generally later variants) is puzzling, because the other manuscripts with *AJ* 1–16 and *DEH* are either with grC.1 (B); grC.2 (La), or grC.3 (Pi V). More significantly, the *DEH* text of hr, in all the places I have checked, clearly belongs to a textual tradition quite different from the Cassinese group. It does not have the large lacuna in *DEH* 1.41 and the transposition of 2.8–2.9 to 5.53, by far the most striking characteristics of all manuscripts in this group. This difference is also seen in the text of *DEH* 1.1.8–1.9, for which B, La, Pi, V, and hr were collated for this project. In addition, at 5.22.1, hr has *cera* rather than *cythara*, the sole textual criterion Flusser used to identify the *DEH* text in B and La with *Yosippon*'s source.⁹² There is, however, one passage where a possible connection of hr to the source of *Yosippon* must be considered. At 13.396, hr and *Yosippon* both omit the series of names Samaria, Mount Carmel, and Mount Tabor (*Ithaburium*).⁹³

2.3.5 Variants Found Only in Group C

The most obvious feature of Group C is the enormous number of readings which differ from all other manuscripts. Only Group P, which consistently replaces and expands individual words and phrases, and the related grL.2 manuscripts Pd (“Codex Gigas”) and Prag XXIII.D.121, which significantly modify the tradition by frequent omissions, paraphrasing, and simplification of the language, have more unique variants.

The following list of unique Group C variants found in all grC manuscripts provides the evidence for the distinctiveness of this manuscript tradition and a resource for evaluating its connection to *Sefer Yosippon* and to any other

90 For the text of hr in *AJ* 6.356–360 and 6.362b, see “A Revised Classification,” 93.

91 See below, p. 278 for an example of hr combining elements from its grC source with its source related to grN.

92 See Appendix 5, p. 316–317.

93 For discussion, see below, p. 254–255.

medieval literature making use of this section of the Latin *Antiquities*. Lists of all unique variants for grC.2, grC.3, grC.4a, and grC.3–4a can be found in Appendix 2. Here the focus is on the distinctive character of the earliest extant layer of the Group C manuscript tradition as it first appears in the uncorrected text of Naples V F 34. The list can also be a tool for reconstructing the prehistory of the Group C tradition, making it easier to imagine how it might have appeared several generations before *Sefer Yosippon* was composed.

In order to include all the data from Group C.1, variants that appear in Groups C.1–2 and C.1–3 are also included in addition to all variants shared by all Group C manuscripts. The list also includes variants from other grC subgroups when they are clear variations of the readings listed for the above groups. The lemmata give the reading in grG ms St. In a few cases, one or two manuscripts from another group are also cited. Variants from hr are cited when they agree with grC manuscripts.

2.3.5.1 *Proper Names*⁹⁴

230] ***Dagon**] nandagon grC.1–2; inan dagon grC.3; mandagon Vt Ve Cr; mamdagon M; madagon Ne; magadon Ptr O. 235. **Zenonem**] Cenonem. 255. ***Medaba**] Minadabam grC.1 Ptr; Minadam grC.2; Nadabam grC.3–4; Nabadam hr. 255. ***ac Garizin gentemque**] nargariz ingentemque grC.1–3 Ptr; narzari ingentemque grC.4a; nazarinque ingente grC.4b; nagariz gentemque hr. 260. ***Manlio**] Mallio (- Ne^{p.c.} Plut18sim10). 261. **Zora uel**] Zorobabel grC.1 grC3–4 Ptr; Zoarobabel grC.2. 267. **Seleuci**] Seleucii grC.1–2. 269. ***Grippi**] Agrippa (- B^{a.c.}). 270. **Cizico**] Zicico grC.1; Zici C.2–4. 271. ***Graspi patris**] Grasbi patris. 285. **Heliopolitana**] Hieropolotana grC (- Pi); Metropolitana Pi. 287. **Celchiam**] Chelciam. 314. **Antigoni**] Antigonus grC.1–2 (- Vi v; Pt Antigonus corr. to Antigoni). 322. **Antigonum**] Antiochum grC (- Pt v l pa Plut18sim10; C M Ne Antigonum over erasure). ***Hyrcano**] Hyrcani 396. ***Azotum**] Azoton C.1 C.3–4a (- O pat) Ptr; Azotan M l; Azaton pat; ***Marissam**] Marissimam; **Ithabirium**] Ithabirum grC. 397. ***Lembaoronem**] Baoro C.1 C.2 (- Pt); Baora C.3 (V: Boara; Ptr/O Bocora [derived from Beneventan ms with Baora]) C.4 Pt; Borane hr; ***Mega**] Nemega; ***Aulonem**] Oculonem [Beneventan “a” read as “oc”] grC (- M l; B: prob Ocolonem, but could be Aulonem); occulonem hr.

94 Asterisk (*) indicates that the reading will be discussed later in this chapter.

2.3.5.2 *Omissions*

229. *sui* hr. 236. *anno* hr. 240. *uero*. 250. *est*. 254. **eas* hr. 260. **Lucii* hr. 262. *illa* hr. 297. **has*. 303. *non* (- B^{a.c.}). 306. *fratris interitum*] *fratrem*. 315a. *clamor...fecisse* (replaced by *LBJ* 1.82b) hr. 315b–320. **homines ... multum* (replaced by *LBJ* 1.83b–84a).

2.3.5.3 *Words or Expressions*

231. *torquebat*] *torquebatur* (*torquebat* Vi La V). *remitteret*] *remittere* grC.1–2; 234. *obsidendi*] *obsedendi*. 236. *sui*] *suo*. 237. *inopiam*] *inopia*. *qua*] *quam*. *propter*] *pro* grC.1–2 Ptr. 239. *incursiones*] *curSIONES*. *moliebantur*] *moliebatur* + L. 242. *sacrificium*] *ad sacrificium*. 246. *ciuitatum*] *ciuitatum* grC.1–2. 255. **sexto mense*] *intra septem menses* hr (B: *intra* s.l.). 256. *ducentos*] *ducenti*. 259. *quo*] *cum quo*. 267. *deberet*] *deberent* hr. 265. *uacuum habuerint*] *uacuauerit* grC.1–2. 268. *tentus*] *temptus* grC.1–2, grC.4 (Ve *tempus*); *tempus* grC.3 (- Ve). 278. *quos Ptolomeus*] *eos*. 278. *populatione*] *copulatione* hr. *cogere*] *cogere* cepit (- B^{a.c.}) hr. A] *ut a* (- B^{a.c.}) hr. *recedere*] *recederet* (- B^{a.c.}) hr. 281. *contentus*] *contemptus*. 288. *male*] *mali*. 289. *uelle*] *uel*. 291. *Te*] *et*. *magistratum*] *principatum* hr. 292. *contra quem*] *contra quae/contraque*. 292. *irritatus*] *iratus*. 293. *qua*] *quia* grC.1–3 hr. *multari*] *multati*. 295. *contristabatur*] *contristabantur* (- B^{a.c.} La) hr. 295. *incitator ... irae*] *incitata ... ira*. 297. *disseremus*] *disserimus* grC.1–3 Cr. 300. *domini*] *domino*. 303. *amare*] *amari*. 307. *occiderent*] *non occiderent* grC (- B^{a.c.}). *autem Antigonom*] *autem Antigonus* grC.1–3. 308. *Antigono*] *Antigonus* (*Antigono* Vi Ne Ptr; *Antigorum* Ve). *inquit tuus*] *tuus inquit* hr. 308. *armis*] *armatis*. 311. *praedicendi*] *praecinendi* hr. 312. *uero stadiis*] *stadiis uero* (- Vi Ptr) hr. 313. **uatem*] *autem* grC.1 grC.2; *per* grC.3; *autem* *per* grC.4^a Ptr hr. 314. **autem*] *et eum* 315. **minabatur*] *conabatur*; 315. **[lacuna]* additions from *BJ* 1.82b (+hr) and 1.83 (end)–184^a; **dimisit*] *permisit* hr.

2.3.6 Group C and the Identification of the Earliest Readings

Although the primary purpose of this chapter is not to determine the earliest variants for each reading, it is helpful for the purpose of analyzing the development of the Latin *Antiquities* manuscript tradition to get a general sense of how far each group departs from the earliest recoverable text. The determination of the earliest text starts with a comparison with the Greek, but in the many cases

when the Greek text does not provide clear evidence, it is necessary to judge each variant individually. Given the limited aims of this project, I have relied primarily on the relationship to the Greek in trying to identify what constitutes the earliest text. On the basis of this criterion, it is clear that **the variants found only in grC represent a text that is farther from the earliest text than any other group aside from grP**. For these variants found only in grC, there are, based on the Greek Vorlage, only three probable cases of the preservation of the earliest reading, *conabatur* instead of *minabatur* at 13.315,⁹⁵ *promisit* instead of *dimisit* at 13.322,⁹⁶ and *Azoton* rather than *Azotum* at 13.395.⁹⁷ This situation changes dramatically, however, when turning to variants found in grC and one or two other groups, where there are a number of cases of grC readings preserving the earliest reading. This is especially true of variants found only in both Group C and Group G.⁹⁸

2.4 *Group G*

Group G consists of nine manuscripts identified by 20 readings found only in each of these manuscripts. Brussels II 1179, written by the scribe Goderan in the latter part of the 11th century at the Benedictine Abbey of St. Remacle of Stavelot,⁹⁹ is the oldest member of this group and has the highest percentage of earliest readings. Aside from St, there are two identifiable subgroups, Werd, D, r, Best1070, and GKS1571, on the one hand, and Lau, Tr, Ml, on the other. However, there are relatively few unique variants for these subgroups, because the differences from St sometimes reflect the influence from other groups. Manuscript Werd is important in the history of the Latin Josephus tradition in that it was one of the manuscripts used by the 1524 Cologne edition and, through it, by the 1524 Basel edition. It was also one of the main manuscripts Niese used for the “Lat” readings in his apparatus (occasionally cited

95 See below, p. 273–274.

96 See below, p. 274.

97 See below, p. 252.

98 Outside of readings shared only by grC and grG manuscripts, I have been able to find only one case of only grC and one other group sharing what appears to be the earliest reading. At 13.307 all grC and all grP manuscripts read *Antonia*, and all other manuscripts (with the exception of *Anthonia* in Ml) have *Antoniana* (*in turri quae Antonia dicebatur; ἐν τῇ βάρει μετονομασθείσῃ δὲ Ἀντωνίᾳ*).

99 Goderan is most famous for having written together with the monk Ernesto the magnificent two-volume Stavelot Bible from 1093–1097 (Add MS 28106/28107; see the online British Library digitized manuscripts for detailed description and bibliography). Goderan wrote an elegant colophon for both the Stavelot Bible and ms St (256r).

as “Berol”).¹⁰⁰ Each of the unique grG readings will be listed below and will be classified as either being a clearly earliest reading (7 cases), probable secondary reading (7 cases), clear secondary reading (2 cases), or reading for which the earliest reading is uncertain (4 cases). Group G also shares with other groups, especially grC, a number of earliest readings (see below). There are, however, several important exceptions to St providing the earliest grG readings. In two places the uncorrected text of St corresponds to the unique and clearly secondary grC text (13.254; 13.397),¹⁰¹ with the corrections following the readings in other grG manuscripts, which are also found in almost all other manuscripts. In another place (13.265), the unique grG reading is found in the uncorrected text with the grC.3 or grC.4 reading above the line.¹⁰² Because it appears to be closest to the grG archetype, St is the base for the Latin text of *AJ* 13.228–322 in Appendix 3.

Unclassified manuscript pg has a clear connection with grG, with which it shares 8 out of the 20 unique grG readings, 11 out of the 20 readings shared only by grC and grG, and 4 out of the 7 readings shared only by groups C, G, and L (see below, pp. 241–244). In addition, at 13.397 only grG, grE, and mss t and

100 For a detailed description of the manuscript with bibliography, see Anaïs Jacquier’s entry in the online *Lege Josephum* Manuscript Database: <https://legejosephum.ch/en/manuscripts/5d773a3bc7b2213be168b7d2>.

101 Omission of *eas* (13.254; see below p. 264) and *promisisset* for *non promississent* (13.397; see below, pp. 258–259).

102 Catalogues of the abbey libraries at Lobbes and Stavelot might help explain the connection of ms St and grC. The Stavelot Abbey library catalogue from 1105 (a relatively short time after the writing of St in the late 11th century) lists the following: “Egesippus. Josephus ex integro nouus. Josephi antiquitatum libri sedecim in uno uolumine. Josephi belli iudici libri quatuor in i uol.” (Add ms 28106, 228v [end of vol. 1 of the “Stavelot Bible”]). It is generally thought that the last two entries refer to ms St (e.g. Gottlieb, *Über mittelalterliche Bibliotheken*, 288; Gessler, “Les Catalogues des Bibliothèques monastiques,” 94; Blatt, 82–83; Leibl, *Die illustrierten Flavius-Josephus-Handschriften*, 178–180; Gaspar and Lyna, *Les principaux manuscrits à peintures*, 67). However, this cannot be right, because the manuscript has one volume instead of two, has *AJ* 1–20 and not *AJ* 1–16, and all seven books of *BJ* and not four (see n. 87 for *LBJ* text in four books). More likely St is the “Josephus ex integro nouus,” which would have been recently written when the catalogue appeared in 1105. The *Antiquities* volume with 16 books might well be a grC manuscript, since that format is only found in grC and in the closely related manuscript hr. This might account for several grC readings influencing St (see below, p. 258). It is possible that the exemplar for St was the one-volume manuscript with the complete *Antiquities* and *War* that is listed in the catalogue of the close-by Lobbes Abbey library, written in 1049 (BL Royal MS 6 A V, quoted in Warichez, *L’abbaye de Lobbes*, 280). The fact that it has the same format as St and that St was written by the monk and master scribe Goderan, who worked at both Lobbes and Stavelot, provides some basis for this admittedly speculative suggestion.

pg have the earliest reading *se mores* instead of the clearly secondary reading *seniores* found in all other manuscripts.¹⁰³

2.4.1 Readings only in Group G

2.4.1.1 *Clearly Earliest Reading*

269. **Gryppi**] τοῦ Γρυποῦ. grG B^{a,c}; Grippe pg; Agrippa grC (B^{p,c}); Crippi grH (-Cb Pa) cf Ba G w; Crispi grE grN (No: Crispino) grL hr Aus; Erippi grJ Prs Pa h Cb; Erispi grM (- Aus); Cypri p; Cippi Cremi

304. **Antigonus cum**] τοῦ δὲ Ἀντιγόνου ποτὲ. grG; cum Antigonus all other mss

317. **meum**] τοῦμον. grG pg; omitted by all other mss

320. **fratribus et humiliorem multum**] μετριότητα. grG pg; omitted by all other mss

396. **Hitaburium**] Ἰταβύριον. grG ve; (H)itabirum grC (par Tabirum); (H)itabirium grE grH grN (- ve) Pa G w Sa pg Pr; It(h)abirium grL (- Sa) grP (p bitabrium) Ba (erasure btw b and r); T(h)abirium grJ (n Ithabirium); T(h)abiricum grM (Aus bithabericum); omit hr

397. **Medaba**]¹⁰⁴ Μήδαβα. grG pg; Midabalam G re; Midabalem all other mss

Lembaoronem] Λεμβὰ Ορωναί (μαγελ-). grG (Ml Lembada.Oronem); Lemboronee pg; Baoro grC.1-2 (- Pt); Baora grC3-4 (V Boara; Ptr O Bocora); Baoronee grL (Pd PragXXIII.D.121 Bagronee) grN grP Ba; Baorenee grE grH (-Br) grJ (- U Ly Mk) grM (Baoreuce Aus) Pr G; Baorene U Ly Mk; Barone hr; Barronee w; orenee Br. Earliest reading probably Lembaoronee (p.256)

2.4.1.2 *Probably Secondary Reading*

234. **semper Iudaei**] Iudaei semper grG Mn

239] **laboris**] no Greek. grG Adm; labores all others

246. **Ioppe**] Ἰόππης. Ioppen grG (- Lau; Ioppem Ml)

265. **uacuum habuerit** grG (St corr. to uacauerit)] εὐσχολήση. uacua-
erit grC.1-2 (Pt euacuaerit [e added?]); uacauerat Vt p; necauerit No;
uacauerit all other mss

¹⁰³ See below, p. 259.

¹⁰⁴ *Medaba* is the earliest reading in the extant manuscript tradition. *Midaba*, the reading before *lem* from the next word was attached to it at a very early stage, could also have been the earliest reading (see below for discussion).

265. **uero**] τε. grG (- Ml); autem Ml; et pg; omitted by all other mss
 265. **iusserunt**] no Greek. grG; omitted by all other mss
 397. **Mega**] μαγελ-. grG; mag(eton zora) pg; Nemega grC; Maga grH grJ grL
 grM grP Ba G w; Magnam grE grN; Magam hr

2.4.1.3 *Earliest Reading Cannot Be Determined*

260. **campo**] ἐν Κομιτίῳ.¹⁰⁵ grG pg; templo Lau; campum all other mss
 291. **et**] no Greek. grG Ba pg; omitted by all other mss
 314. **arbitror**] οἶμαι. grG; ut arbitror all other mss
 292] **irritatus est**] παρωξύνθη. grG pg; iratus grC; omit hr; irritatus all
 other mss.

2.4.1.4 *Clearly Secondary Reading*

291. **uiuere**] no Greek. grG; esse pg; et p; omitted by all other mss
 est] εἶναι. grG Ba cf; esse all other mss

2.5 *Variants Shared Only by Group C and Group G*

2.5.1 *Clearly the Earliest Reading*

236. **principatus**] ἀρχῆς. grC grG hr pg; omitted by all other mss
 239. **altam ... latissimam**] βαθείαν καὶ πολλήν τὸ εὔρος. grC.1–3 grG;
 altamque ... latissimam grC.4 (- Cr); latam ... altissimam all other mss.
 255. **Samogan**] Σαμόγαν. grC.1–2 grG V L; Samogam all other mss.
 267. **abhorrentes**] ἀπεχθανομένων. grC grG; ab(h)orrent et all other mss.
 269. **Gryppi**] Γρυποῦ. B^{a.c.} grG; Grippe pg; Agrippa grC (B^{p.c.}); Crippi grH
 (- Cb Pa) cf Ba G w; Crispi grE grN (No Crispino) grL hr Aus; Erippi grJ
 Prs Pa h Cb; Erispi grM (- Aus); Cypri p; Cippi Cremi
 289. **iuste uiuere omniaque agere**] αὐτὸν βουλόμενον εἶναι δίκαιον καὶ
 πάντα ποιοῦντα. grC grG hr pg; iuste omnia agere all other mss
 286. **testatur et**] μαρτυρεῖ καὶ. grC grG hr; testatur grP; testatus est all
 others

¹⁰⁵ Niese prints Brissonius' conjecture Κομιτίῳ. The Greek mss have κομπιω, κομπω, κοππω. Niese gives *campo* for the Latin. Of the Latin manuscripts he lists in his preface, this would have been found only in Werd. He was probably also influenced by the reading in the 1524 Basel edition (which follows the 1524 Cologne edition, which used Werd as one of its sources). See above for Niese's praise of the 1524 Basel as "*editio ... omnium et nitidissima et optima*" (*Flavii Iosephi Opera*, 1.lxx). On the basis of the Greek, *campo* has a good claim to be the earliest reading.

302. **ornauit**] ἤξιου. grC.1–2 grG pg; ordinauit all other mss
 309. **ut ei armorum demonstraret**] ἐπιδείξων αὐτῷ τὰ ὄπλα αὐτῷ. grC grG hr; ut ei pg; ut armorum demonstraret all other mss
 314. **sceleris**] ὑπὸ τοῦ μύσους. grG grC pg; celeri all other mss
 321. **cum mox genitus fuisset odio patris despectus erat et usque ad mortem**] συνέβη γεννηθέντι εὐθύς μισηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ. grC grG hr pg; omitted by all other mss

2.5.2 Earliest Reading Cannot Be Determined

241. (exalabant) **animam**] ἀπέθνησκον. grC (- Vt Cr) grG (- Ml r) hr pg; animas grL.1 Ml; animum Vt; animi Cr (corr. to animas); omitted by all other mss
 260. **Februarias**] Φεβρουαρίων. grC.1–2 grG pg; Februarius grC.3–4; Februarii Mn H grJ Sa hr ve No al (fbrii); febr b Adm Bo Cl Nv grM Aus; Feb Ba L El; Februariarum Ptr; (Cr -ias or -ius corr. to -iarum); Februario mense grP
 263. **sunt ablata**] ἀφαιρεθέντα. grC grG; ablata sunt all other mss
 286. **istis**] τοῦτοις. grC grG hr pg; is grN (ve eis; No his); his all other mss
 288. **uel**] καὶ. grG grC.1, grC.3–4 hr; et all other mss
 322. **suos filios**] τῶν παίδων. grG (- Ml r) grC hr; filios grP pg; filios suos all other mss.

2.5.3 Clearly Secondary Reading

263. **ut et**] καὶ τὴν χώραν διατιμήσονται. grC grG pg; et (prouinciam aestiment) all other mss (**earliest reading**).
 302. **puniret atque consumeret**] καὶ λιμῷ διαφθεῖραι. grC grG hr; inopique grP; **penuriaque consumeret** all other mss (**earliest reading**).
Table of Contents AJ 13; Seuerus grC grG] Εὐκαίρος/Ἄκαιρος. Eucerus all other mss (**earliest reading**).
 397. **cum promississet**] οὐχ ὑποσχομένων. grC St^{a-c}; cum promississent pg; cum non permisissent grH; cum promississet grM; all other mss non promississent (**earliest reading**).¹⁰⁶

106 Niese prints ὑποσχομένων, which is found only in Greek ms P, apparently also depending on the Latin of Naples V F 34 (*LAJ* ms B), which he reports inaccurately as *cum promississent* (instead of *cum promississet*). Naber, Marcus, and Nodé read οὐχ ὑποσχομένων, which is found in all mss aside from P. In the Latin manuscript tradition, only pg would support the reading ὑποσχομένων (see below, p. 258).

2.6 *Readings Shared by Only Group C, Group G, and Group L*

2.6.1 Clearly the Earliest Reading

238. **tria** (tecta)] τριωρόφους. grC grG grL hr pg Bo; tres all other mss
 251. **ibi**] αὐτόθι. grC grG Sa hr; ubi all other mss
 293. **ualde**] μάλιστα. grC.1–3 grG grL.1 pg; uel de grC.4 (Ve u de) hr; omitted by all other mss

2.6.2 Earliest Reading Cannot Be Determined

237. **conclisit**] ἐνέκλεισε. grC.1–2 grG Sa; inclusit grE grH grJ grL (- Sa) grN grP Ba grM pg; concludit grC.3–4 (Ne: conclusit, but s over erasure) Ptr hr
 278. **qui cum**] ὅς. grG grC grL; omitted by hr; qui dum all other mss
 314. **fraternae caedis**] ἀδελφοκτονίας. grG grC grL pg; fraternae Ba G w; fraterna grE grN Ba G w; fraternae necis grH grJ grM grP

2.6.3 Clearly Secondary Reading

395. **Rinocora**] ῥινοκόρουρα. grG (- Werd Best7010 GKS1571) grC.1–4a (- M l Vt) grL.1 Ly; Rinocoram C.4b M l Vt hr GKS1571 Rinocoro grH (Br Rinocero) grJ grN grP (Prs: arynocoro) Ba G Werd Best7010 Aus Cp Pr; Rinocoron grE; Rinocoro grM (- Aus); Rinocorura grL.2 (Pd: Rinocoruram; PragXXIII.D121 Rinocoruca) (cf. ῥινοκόρουρα, the reading in almost all Grk mss); Ronocoruram w (transposed to after Cilicum)

2.7 *Readings Shared by Only Group C, Group G, and Group P*

2.7.1 Clearly Earliest Reading

242. **dierum**] ἡμερῶν. grC grG grP; diebus all other mss

2.7.2 Clearly Secondary Reading

262. **quatenus**] ἴνα τε. grC grG grP pg; et quatenus all other mss

2.8 *Summary of Analysis of Unique Readings in Group C, Group G, Groups C + G, and Groups C+G+L.1*

1. Of the 20 readings found only in all grG mss and nowhere else in the manuscript tradition, 7 clearly have the earliest reading, 2 are clearly secondary, and the rest are uncertain.

2. Next to grP, grC has by far the largest number of unique readings. In addition to the unique readings in all grC mss (68), each of the four subgroups has a large number of unique readings in each and in combination with one other subgroup (e.g. grC₁₋₂; grC_{3,4}). Only three of the unique grC variants probably preserve the earliest reading.
3. A clear connection between grC and grG can be established by the 23 readings shared only by these two groups. Of these, 12 clearly preserve the earliest reading, and 4 clearly are secondary. For 6 it is impossible to determine which reading is earlier. The clearly secondary shared readings are particularly important in that they cannot be explained by grG and grC having independent access to the earliest reading.
4. In addition to the shared readings in grG and grC, there are also several examples of readings shared only by grC, grG, and grL₁. Of these, 3 are clearly earliest and 1 clearly secondary. For readings shared by grC, grG, and grP, one is clearly the earliest reading and one is clearly secondary.
5. In the passages collated for this chapter, aside from grG and grC no other single group or ms has a clearly earliest reading found only in that group.¹⁰⁷
6. Within grG, St, with only three exceptions, has the earliest reading.
7. Within grC, the uncorrected text of B is closest to grG and consistently has the earliest readings.
8. Within grL₁, Sa is closest to grC and grG.

The data from the *unique variants* for grG, grC, grG+grC can be explained by the followed hypothesis. A manuscript very close to the grG archetype was the source of the grG and grC archetypes. This manuscript had all the readings shared only by grC and grG. The grC manuscript with the earliest readings, Naples V F 34, already exhibits the introduction of the distinctive grC features, such as a large number of misreadings (especially incorrectly divided proper names) and omissions, which did not influence any other manuscript group but which developed even more distinctive variants that can be found in the various grC subgroups.

3 Case Studies

The following four case studies provide a detailed analysis of a large number of variants with the twin aims of discussing in a narrative context the evidence

¹⁰⁷ A possible exception is the reading *inuasit* (13.314) in grP (see above, n. 38).

for the identification of manuscript groups and of comparing the *AJ* 13 manuscript tradition to *Sefer Yosippon*. The first case study focuses on the identification of manuscript groups by presenting the evidence of all the variants from 98 manuscripts for the names of three Seleucid rulers. Only one variant is compared to *Yosippon*. The rest of the case studies present and analyze variants as they appear in three passages: *AJ* 13.395–397 (a list of cities controlled by Jews during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus; 92 mss); *AJ* 13.254–260 (cities conquered by John Hyrcanus and the embassy he sent to Rome; 48 mss); *AJ* 13.313c–322 (the Death of Aristobulus I; 66 mss). In each of these passages the identification of the groups and a comparison of the *AJ* 13 readings with readings in *Yosippon* are presented in a short commentary.

3.1 Case Study 1: Variants in the Nicknames for the Seleucid Rulers Antiochus VIII (Grippus) and Demetrius III (Acerus/Eucherus)

The following table reports variants from the largest number of manuscripts I have been able to collate for any section of *AJ* 13. It also provides a succinct guide to how manuscript groups can be identified with confidence by taking into account both readings appearing in only one group and the distinctive pattern of variants for each group.

TABLE 3 Names of Seleucid rulers

	Γρυποῦ (13.269)	Γρυποῦ πατρός (13.271)	Γρυπός (13.365)	Ἄκαιρον (13.370)	Ἐκαιρον (13.376)	Ἐΰκαιρος/ Ἄκαιρος (AJ 13 TOC)
Group C.1–4a	agrippa	grasbi patris	grippus	acerus	eucherum	seuerus
					B ^a Vi C La Pt v V Pi ^b Ptr O M I Vt Cr Sr par pat Ve	
Group C4b	agrippa	grasbi patris	grippus	eucherus	eucherum	seuerus
					Ne pa Pluti8simio Fl	
Group E	crispi	crispi patris	grippa	acerus	eucerum	eucus
					Nv Cl al	
Group G	grippi	graspi patris	grippus	acerus	eucerum	seuerus
					St Lau Werd D Tr r MI ^c Best7010 ^d GKS 1571	

a grippi corr. to Agrippa

b quia cerus instead of qui acerus

c encerum; no TOC

d a certis for acerus

TABLE 3 Names of Seleucid rulers (*cont.*)

	Γρυποῦ (13.269)	Γρυποῦ πατρός (13.271)	Γρυπός (13.365)	Ἄκαιρον (13.370)	Ἄκαιρον (13.376)	Εὔκαιρος/ Ἄκαιρος (AJ 13 TOC)
Group H	crippi	graspi patris	grippus	eucherus	eucherum	eucherus
		El Ha Cor H Cp At Mn Re Rem R re c Br ^e				
Group J	erippi	gaspi patris	grippus	eucherus	eucherum	eucerus
		Alb li Cov Mir U Du Mir Ca Ly Mk vlf mz				
Group L	crispi	crispi patris	crispus	ceraunus	eucrum	
		Sa Sch Adm Lamp Cn Vn Sec z b t Pd ^g PragXXIII.D121 ^h				
Group M	erispi	crispi patris	grippa	eucerus	eucerum	eucerus
		Vat vt rg ⁱ Madrid10270				
Group N	crispi	crispi patris	grippus	acerus	eucerum	eucerus
		L Bo ve No Pal u				
Group P	crippi	craspi patris	grippus	ceruus	seuerum	chapter missing in TOC
		cf pj Prs ^k Crem ^l				
<i>Not Classified</i>						
Cb ld d n	erippi	graspi patris	grippus	eucherus	eucherum	eucherus
Pa h	erippi	craspi patris	grippus	eucherus	eucherum	eucherus
hr	crispi	crispi patris	agrippus	auccerus	aucherum	euthen
G w	crippi	graspi patris	grippus	acerus	eucherum	eucherus
Ba	crippi	graspi patris	grippus	cerus	eucrum	chapter missing from TOC
pg	grippe	graspi patris	agrippus	acerus	eucerum	
Aus	crispi	crispi patris	grippa	eucerus	eucerum	eucerus
Pr	omitted	graspi patris ^m	grippus	eucerus	eucerum	

e cycerus

f iaspi patris

g omits crispi patris

h iaspi patris

i cuterus; eucenum; no TOC

j cypri; ceros; no TOC for AJ 13

k eryppi

l craspi patris corr. to crispi patris; grippus; ceru(us) corr. to acerus; seuer(um) corr. to heucerum; heucerum in the unnumbered chapter title added to TOC in margin

m graspi patris

3.1.1 Variant Patterns That Do Not Correspond to an Established Group
 The data from these names are not sufficient to classify twelve manuscripts into a single established group. The relationship of these manuscripts to established groups will have to rely on further evidence, some of which can be provided by variants from other passages we have collated for *AJ* 13. For example, **Cb**, **ld**, **d**, and **n** agree fully with each other, having the same combinations of grJ and grH readings. **Pa** and **h** agree fully with each other, having the same combination of grJ and grH readings, but different from the combination of readings in **Cb**, **ld**, **d**, and **n**. Elsewhere in the passages collated for *AJ* 13, **d**, **n**, and **Pa** exhibit variants from both grJ and grH, but grJ readings clearly predominate in the very closely related manuscripts **n** and **d** and grH readings in **Pa**. For the purpose of the analysis here, I have, therefore, classified **n** and **d** with grJ (rather than create a grJ.2) and **Pa** with grH (rather than create a grH.2), noting when these manuscripts differ from their respective groups.

3.1.2 Relationships among Groups

Although a full consideration of the relationships among groups is beyond the scope of this study, clear connections can be observed in the case of a number of groups and manuscripts, e.g. grC and grG; Groups E, M, N (with connections between E and N, and E and M); Aus and grM and grE; pg and grG; hr and grN; Ba and grH and grP. The direction of the development of the first reading can be easily reconstructed: *Grippi* (grG) to either (1) *Agrippa* (grC);¹⁰⁸ or to (2) *Crippi* (grH grP mss Ba G w); *Crippi* to either (1) *Erippi* (grJ) or (2) *Crispi* (grE grN grL; *Crispi* (grE grN grL) to *Erispi* (grM).

3.1.3 Seleucid Ruler Names and *Sefer Yosippon*

Unfortunately, of these names, only *Eucherus* appears in the *Sefer Yosippon* textual tradition.¹⁰⁹ In many *LAJ* manuscripts, *Eucherus* appears in both 13.370 and 13.376. In others, the earliest reading *Acerus* is found in 13.370 instead of *Euc(h)erus* (grC grG grE grN). If it was clear that the name *Eucerus* in *Yosippon* was influenced by its appearance in 13.370, it would be possible to eliminate those manuscripts that have *Acerus*. In fact, however, the name appears in the context of 13.376, as can be seen by a comparison of the Hebrew and Latin texts:

108 Note that the original reading *Grippi* in grC ms B has been corrected to *Agrippa*.

109 Flusser's apparatus does not record the omission of the name in several manuscripts. The omission of the other names is a result of *Yosippon* omitting the digression in *AJ* 13.267–273 describing the battles between Hellenistic rulers, reporting only that “in those days the kings of Macedonia were fighting, brother against brother” (SY 29, 27; cf. 13.272: *diu cum fratre bella commisit*).

And they rebelled against King Alexander, and they went to King Demetrius, King of Macedonia, who is called Eucerus, and they brought him against Alexander for war, and Demetrius came and encamped at Shechem, and Demetrius had an army of 40,000 Macedonian warriors and 3,000 horsemen.¹¹⁰

Yosippon (FLUSSER, *SY* 33, 26–29 [p. 1.134])

AJ 13.376–377 (parallel to *BJ* 1.92–93¹¹¹ and *DEH* 1.10 [Ussani, 14–15]) is clearly a source for *Yosippon* at this point:

Then they sent to Demetrius Eucerus to ask him to be an ally. When, with a very great army, he reached those who had summoned him, he encamped around the city of Shechem ... He (Demetrius) had 3,000 horsemen and 40,000 foot soldiers.¹¹²

AJ 13.376–377

While clearly parallel to the passage in 13.376, the phrase “who was called Eucerus” is reminiscent of the previous mention of Demetrius in 370 (*Demetrius qui Acerus [or Eucerus] dicebatur*). This would raise the possibility that *Yosippon* was reading an *LAJ* ms with *Eucerus* in both places, thus eliminating Groups C, G, E, N and mss G, w, hr, and pg. However, even if it *Yosippon* took the phrase “who was called” from 13.370, it might still have read *Acerus*, but he chose to use the name as it appeared in 13.376. The question is further complicated by the fact that the reference to Demetrius’ nickname in *BJ* 1.92, as in *Yosippon*, occurs in the context of the appeal to Demetrius and not in the context of Demetrius being made king in Damascus as in *AJ* 13.370.¹¹³ This might then suggest that *Yosippon* was also influenced by the account in *BJ*.¹¹⁴

110 ויפשעו במלך אלכסנדר וילכו אל מלך דמיתריאוס מלך מקדון הנקרא איאוקירוס ויביאוהו על אלכסנדר למלחמה, ויבא דדיתריאוס ויחן בשכם ויהי לדמיתריאוס חיל ארבעים אלף גיבורי מקדון ושלישת אלפים פרשים.

111 Note that the Latin *BJ* 1.93 agrees with *AJ* 13.377 in having 40,000 foot soldiers rather than 14,000, as in the Greek text.

112 *Tunc ad Demetrium Eucerum destinauerunt ut eum auxiliatorem rogarent. Qui maximo cum exercitu dum peruenisset ad eos qui eum inuitauerant circa Sycimam ciuitatem castra metatus est ... Cui (i.e. Demetrio) equites fuerunt tria milia pedites uero quadraginta milia* (ms St).

113 The formulation “was called” in *SY* is closer to *AJ* than *BJ*, which has “whose nickname was” (*cui cognomentum Acaero fuit*).

114 Flusser (2.134 on 33,27) suggests that *SY* either took the name *Eucerus* from *AJ* 13.376 or from one of the *BJ* mss that had *Eucerus* at 1.92. He does not specify which *BJ* manuscripts have *Eucerus*, perhaps depending only on the marginal note “Alias Eucero” in the 1524

The use of at least the *Antiquities*, however, is clear from the word for encamped (*castra metatus est*/יחן in *L AJ* vs *uenisset* in *LBJ*).¹¹⁵

While the use of Eucerus in *Yosippon* is striking and raises some interesting questions about *Yosippon*'s use of *LBJ* in addition to *L AJ*, unfortunately it cannot be relied upon to identify the use of a particular *L AJ* manuscript group.

3.2 Case Study 2: List of Cities under Jewish Control in the Time of Alexander Jannaeus (*AJ* 13.395–397)

The second passage for which all available manuscripts have been collated¹¹⁶ is the list in 13.395–397 of Syrian, Idumean, and Phoenician cities the Jews possessed in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. Unlike the list of the names of Seleucid rulers, however, where only one name is found in *Yosippon*, in this passage *Yosippon* includes 23 of the 28 names found in *L AJ*.

Sefer Yosippon 33, 55–63
(Flusser 1.136–137)

Brussels, Roy. Bibl. II 1179 (St)¹¹⁷

At that time the Jews went down against the land of Syria and ruled it and all the land of Edom and all the land of Moab and Ammon and all the land of Philistia and all the land of Arabia up to Sela Midbar (*Petra deserti* in Isa. 16:1).

395 Now at this time the Jews possessed the cities of the Syrians, Idumeans, and Phoenicians:

Basel edition. Ne and its copy pa are the only manuscripts I know of with the reading *Euc(h)erus* in *LBJ* 1.92. See Bader, *Josephus Latinus*, 178, who correctly notes that Thomas Martin and I did not know of the reading in *LBJ* 1.92 (as opposed to *AJ* 13.376 and the *AJ* 13 TOC) when we wrote our article on the nicknames of Demetrius III.

115 *DEH* does not mention Demetrius' nickname, but at one point has language closer to *SY* than the other sources: "they called forth King Demetrius to war to assist them against Alexander" (*Demetrium regem sibi auxilium futurum aduersus Alexandrum in bellum excitauerunt* / ויביאוהו על אלכסנדר למלחמה). See above, n. 155, for places where *SY* introduces language from *DEH* into his main source *L AJ*.

116 The discrepancy in the number of manuscripts collated for the names of the Seleucid rulers (98) and for 13.395–397 (92) is because, when collating the latter passage, I no longer had access to 6 manuscripts, 4 of which I had collated at the British Library and for which images were not available.

117 See Appendix 4 for a text with all variants from the manuscripts collated. The city names in the English translation follow the Latin form of the name in ms St, but are generally given in the nominative, with some exceptions when the nominative form might not be certain or less helpful in explaining variants. The translation of the Hebrew text generally presents the names in a series without using "and" for every appearance of the conjunction *vav*.

These are the names of the cities which King Alexander did not destroy when he took them. And those on the sea-coast were **Strato's Tower, Apollonia, Ashdod, Gaza, Anthedon, Raphia, Rinocora, and Hebron, Maresha**, which belongs to Edom,¹¹⁸ and **Scythopolis** which belongs to Syria, **Gadera, Gaulan, Seleucia and Gabala**, which belongs to Moab, **Heshbon, Medaba, Bahoron, Megan, Ein Zora, Cilicus, Aulan and Pella.**

These are the cities which Alexander did not destroy because they entered a covenant with him, and they circumcised the flesh of their foreskins, and they remained in their cities. And the rest of the cities of Syria the King destroyed.

by the sea: **Strato's Tower, Apollonia, Joppa, Jamnia, Azotus, Gaza, Anthedon, Raphia, Rinocora;**
 396 in the interior through Idumea: **Abora, Marissa and all Idumea, Samaria, Mount Carmel and Mount Itaburium, Scythopolis, Gadara, Gaulanitis, Seleucia, Gabala**
 397 **Moabitis, Sebon, Medaba, Lembaoronem, Mega, and Onzora, Cilicum, Aulon, Pellente.**

He destroyed this city, because its inhabitants had not promised to take up the ancestral customs of the Jews. Also they overthrew the rest of the cities of Syria.

3.2.1 *AJ* 13.395–397 and *Sefer Yosippon*

The following table presents a succinct overview of the relationship between the names in the Latin text and its Greek source and between the names in the Hebrew text and its Latin source. As an initial reference, the names are given as they appear in grG manuscript St and in Flusser's edition (with the many emendations he proposes indicated by an asterisk). Variants for the names in each language are, of course, of the greatest importance for this study and will be listed and briefly discussed in the commentary following table 4, which focuses on the examples most relevant for understanding the *LAJ* textual tradition and its relationship to *Sefer Yosippon*. Since Flusser's apparatus is not comprehensive, additional variants are listed when relevant.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ For the reading "which belongs to Edom," omitted by Flusser, see p. 254.

¹¹⁹ Unfortunately, I did not have access to several important SY manuscripts, so I was not always able to list readings from these not included in Flusser's apparatus.

TABLE 4 Greek, Latin, and Hebrew city names (* = emendation by Flusser)

Greek	Latin	Hebrew	Greek	Latin	Hebrew
Στράτωνος πύργον	Stratonis Turrim	מגדל סתרתון	Σκυθόπολις	Scytopolim	שיטופולי
Ἀπολλωνίαν	Apolloniam	אפולוניא	Γάδαρα	Gadaram	גדירה
Ἰόππη	Ioppem		Γαυλανίτιδας	Gaulanitidem	גאולן
Ἰάμνειαν	Iamniam		Σελεύκειαν	Seleuciam	סיליאוכיא*
Ἄζωτον	Azotum/ Azoton	אשדוד	Γάβαλα	Gabala	גבלה
Γάζαν	Gazam	עזה	Μωαβίτιδας	Moabitidem	אשר למואב
Ἀνθηδόνα	Antidonem	אנטידונס*	Ἡσεβών/ Ἴεσ(σ)εβών	Sebon	חשבון
Ῥάφειαν	Rafiam	רפיס*	Μήδαβα	Medaba	מידבא
Ῥινοκόρουρα	Rinocora	רינקורה*	Λεμβά	Lembaoronem	בחורון
Ἄδωρα	Aboram	חברון	Ορωναι - μαγελ-	Mega	מיגן
Μάρισσαν	Marissam	מרשה	εθων Ζόαρα	Et Onzora	עין זורה
Σαμάρειαν	Samariam		Κιλίκων	Cilicum	קיליקוס*
Καρμήλιον	Carmelum		αὐλώνα	Aulonem	אולן
Ἴταβύριον	Itaburium		Πέλλαν	Pellente	פילן

3.2.2 Commentary

Apolloniam (Ἀπολλωνίαν; ואפולוניא) all mss except Appollonium grC.3-4a; **Antoniam** grC.4b

Yosippon cannot depend on a manuscript in grC.3-4, which would include grC.3 mss V and Pi, which have the format *AJ* 1-16 + *DEH*.

Azotum (Ἄζωτον; ואשדוד) Azoton C.1 C.3-4a (-O pat M l) Ptr; Azotan M l; **Azaton pat**; **Azotam rg**

While the grC.1 and grC.3-4a reading *Azoton* is probably the earliest reading because of its closeness to the Greek, *Yosippon*'s use of the biblical name makes it impossible to determine the reading in its Latin source.

Raphiam (Ῥάφεια; ורפיס) [all mss except grJ, which has *Raphia*

Flusser prints his conjecture ורפיס¹²⁰ but comments that “perhaps ורפיס should be read,” which must be certainly correct, since the sameḥ here, as often elsewhere, is a misreading of final mem. Flusser’s conjecture can be supported by the appearance of the place name in *SY* 32, 73, where ורפיס is found in all *SY* mss I have seen. The proposed final mem representing the accusative form of the name would correspond to all *L AJ* mss except those in grJ.

Rinocora (Ῥινοκόρυρα; ורינוקורה) [grG (-Werd Best7010 GKS1571) grC.1-4a (-M I Vt) grL.1 pg Ly; Rinocoram C.4b M I Vt hr GKS1571; Rinocoro grH (Br Rinocero) grJ (- Ly) grN grP (Prs: Arynocoro) Ba G Werd Best7010 Aus Cp Pr; Rinocoron grE; Rincoro grM (-Aus); Rinocorura grL.2 (Pd: Rinocoruram; PragXXIII.D121: Rinocoruca) (cf. Ῥινοκόρυρα, the reading in almost all Grk mss); Ronocoruram w (transposed to after Cilicum)

Only grL.2 manuscripts have the reading *Rinocorura*, which is closest to the Greek (note also *Ronocoruram* in ms w, which shares a number of distinctive readings with grL.1 manuscripts). Of greatest significance for our analysis, Groups C, G, and L.1 have the same reading as *Yosippon*, which Flusser appropriately emends from ודינוקורה.¹²¹ This provides clear evidence for a connection of one of these groups to *Yosippon*’s *L AJ* source.¹²²

Omission of in mediterraneis uero per Idumeam

Both *Sefer Yosippon* and Groups E, L.2, N, and P and mss Ba, G, and w omit the geographical notice *in mediterraneis uero per Idumeam*. (The same groups and manuscripts also omit the words *populares uero non eis obsequabantur* in

120 Variants cited in Flusser’s apparatus: ורפיס (Roth 24, Yerah Bod 2797, Jer. 8° 41820); ורפיס (Urb. 52). Not cited in Flusser’s apparatus: ורפיס (Budapest 355) as well as variants from non-Recension A mss Vat 408 (ודאפיס) and Borg 1 (רפאים).

121 ודינוקורה appears in Redaction B ms Vat. ebr. 408, although it could be reading a resh for a dalet.

122 Flusser does not cite this reading, which is attributed to Naples 34 V F in Niese’s apparatus, but prints *Rhinocorura*, which also happens to be found in the grL.2 (and probably earliest) reading *Rinocorura*, corresponding to the Greek Ῥινοκορούρα (or Ῥινοκοροούρα). The 1524 Basel edition, which is Flusser’s usual source of the *L AJ* readings in the passages discussed in this chapter, has the puzzling *Rhinocoluram*, which it adopted from the 1524 Cologne edition. (Niese cites a variant Ῥινοκoλoύρα with “F(?)” following it. This would refer to BML Plut. 69.20, but that manuscript actually reads Ῥινοκοροούρα). Perhaps Flusser emended the Latin text based on the Basel 1524 reading (note Flusser prints Rh), on Niese’s apparent emendation *Rinocoruram* (found only in Pd) which he would not have known), or on the Greek text itself.

13.298, but in that passage these words are reflected in *Yosippon's* Hebrew text.) This common omission of what might be considered non-essential information might well be coincidental. However, the fact that the reading *Baoronee* in Groups N, L, P and mss Ba, G, and w best corresponds to *Yosippon's* source (see below) is worth noting and suggests the value of exploring other connections between readings in *Yosippon* and variants in these groups.

Aboram (Ἀδωρα; ואת חברון)] Abora grC.2; Aboran Ly Mk U; omit w

In 13.257 *Aboram* (v.l. *Adoreon*; see p. 266) is transliterated as חברה, while here the biblical name חברון is used.

Marissam (Μάρισσα; ואת מרשה)] Marissimam C.1 C.3 C.4a; Marissima C.2; Marisam C.4b; Maresam grP; Marissa Alb; Marissan Ly Mk U; Marissiam Aus
In grC.1–4a, *Marissima(m)* appears in this passage instead of a form of *Marissa(m)* or *Maresa*. In 13.257 all grC mss have *Marisso* together with Groups G, J, and N. *Yosippon* has the biblical מרשה in both passages, making it impossible to determine which form of the Latin appeared in its source. For other cases of using biblical names, see *Azotum*, *Gazam*, *Sebon*, and *Aboram* in Table 4 above.

The reading אשר לאדום מרשה (“which belongs to Edom”), which Flusser rejects in favor of מרשה, is probably the original reading because (1) it corresponds to *Aboram Marissam omnemque Idumaeum*; (2) the same phrase is also found in the account of Hyrcanus’ capturing the city (SY 33); (3) it would make a reasonable four-part division of the cities corresponding to the introduction of the list in *Yosippon*: on the coast, followed by three areas each demarcated with ל אשר (“which belong to”): to Idumaea, to Syria, and to Moab; (4) it appears in two other mss, Vat. Ebr 52 and Vat. Borg. 1, in addition to Jerusalem oct. 41280, which is the only ms cited for this variant in Flusser’s apparatus; (5) it could have easily been omitted by a scribe who, seeing ואת מרשה אשר לארם מרשה, confused אדום with ארם and eliminated the former as a redundancy.

Omission of Samariam, Carmelum montem, et Itaburium montem and Ioppem, Iamniam

Yosippon shares with ms hr the omission of the sequence *Samariam, Carmelum montem, et Itaburium montem*, an omission found nowhere else in the LAJ manuscript tradition. This is particularly intriguing because hr, like mss B, La, V, and Pi, includes AJ 1–16 together with DEH. In addition, the grC tradition clearly provided a major source for the *Antiquities* in ms hr. However, ms hr has

the closest connections to grC.4, making it a somewhat unlikely witness to the earliest layer of grC tradition. Of course, the common omission might be accidental, and *Yosippon* also omits *Ioppe* and *Iamnia*, which are found in all Latin manuscripts. Nevertheless, the case for a relationship between hr and *Yosippon* would be considerably strengthened if other distinctive connections emerge.

Gabala Moabitidem (Γάββαλα Μωαβίτιδα; גבבלה אשר למואב] Gabela Moabitidem Aus; Gabala Moabitiden Ly Mk U

Yosippon takes *Moabitidem* as an adjective modifying *Gabala*. Of the manuscripts that have punctuation marks separating the cities (almost all), grG ms St and grM mss Vat and rg are the only ones I have seen that do not have a punctuation mark separating the two words and thus possibly reading *Moabitidem* as an adjective describing *Gabala*.

Medaba (Μήδαβα; מידבא] grG pg; Midabalam G re; Midabalem all other mss Group G and the closely related ms pg read *Medaba* here and at 13.255, where several different variants appear (see p. 264). Here all groups except grG read *Midabalem*, which transfers the first syllable of the next word to the end of *Medaba* (*medabalembaaronem*). It should be noted that *Midabalem* is clearly intended to be read as one word, because virtually all the manuscripts have clear punctuation marks separating the words and not just spaces. *Yosippon* uses the biblical form מִדְבָּא, whose first syllable could be pronounced as ī or ē (as the Masoretic tradition vocalizes it).

Lembaoronem (Λεμβῶ Ορωναιμαγγελ[εθων, Λεμβῶ Ορωναι μαιτα λ[αιθωνα, Λεμβῶ Ορωναι αίματαιλ[αιθωνα]; בְּהוֹרֵן] grG (Ml Lembada.Oronem); Lemboronee pg; Baoro C.1 C.2 (- Pt); Baora C.3–4 (V: Boara; Ptr O: Bocora) Pt; Baoronex grL (Pd PragXIII.D121: Bagronee) grN grP Ba; Baorenee grE grH (Br: orenee) grJ (- Ly Mk U) grM (Aus: Baoreuce) G Pr; Baorene Ly Mk U; Borane hr; Barronee w

The Greek text for the next two (or three) words is uncertain. Niese lists a number of variants (three are cited here). For the Latin he gives *oronemegaeton* (for the word after *Lemba* and including *Mega* and *et on[zora]*). This reproduces the grC reading from Naples V F 34, but without the incorrect word division marked in all grC manuscripts. As we have seen, in all manuscripts outside of grG and the closely related pg, *Lem* is attached to the previous word, yielding for the next word the variants *Baoro*, *Baora*, *Baoronee* (often spelled *Baoronee*; cf. the Greek variant Ορωναι αίματαιλ- [αι = e]), *Baorenee*, *Barrone*, and *Borane*. All grC mss have the ending of the word (-ne) attached to the next word

(= *Nemega*). Based on the Greek and Latin variants, *Lembaoronee* is probably the earliest reading.

In any case, *Yosippon's* reading (בְּחֹרֶוֶן) would correspond best to *Baoronee* (Groups N, L, P, and ms Ba). However, with the proper word division of the reading in the source of the grC archetype (*Baorone|mega*), grC might have preserved evidence of a reading not in the extant manuscript tradition but equally close to that in *Yosippon*.¹²³

Mega (μαγελα-; מֵיגַן) grG; **Nemega** grC; **Maga** grH grJ grL grM grP Ba G w Cp Pr; **Magam** hr; **Magnam** grE grN; pg mag(eton zora)

The uncertainty of the Greek text makes it impossible to determine if the next word was originally a separate word or part of the previous word in the Greek manuscript tradition. What is clear is that it is a separate word in *Yosippon* and the entire LAJ manuscript tradition (with the exception of ms pg). It is also clear that *Yosippon* depends on the form *Mega* and not *Nemega* (grC) or a form beginning with *Ma-*. It is possible, however, that *Yosippon* was using the source of the grC archetype, which, like grG, would have read *Mega*, with the *ne* belonging to the previous word. The origin of the final nun is not clear. Perhaps it was influenced by forms such as אֹלֶן and פִּילֶן, which follow it.¹²⁴

Aulonem (αὐλώνα; אֹיֶל) Oculonem grC (M I Aulonem; B? [hard to distinguish oc from a])

All groups except for group C have the reading corresponding to that in *Yosippon*. Groups C's *Oculonem* (hr *Occulonem*) derives from a misreading of Beneventan *a* as *oc*. The reading in Naples V F 34 (B) could possibly (but not likely) be read as *Aulonem*. If so, this would be one more example of ms B agreeing with an earlier reading in that manuscript against all the other grC manuscripts.

123 Because Flusser depended only on the 1524 Basel edition, which ultimately depended here on grG ms Werd, he only knew the reading *Lembaoronem* (1.136n60). He had therefore to assume that sy's Latin source had the corrupted reading *Baoronem*, which it understood to be the accusative of *Baoron*. The LAJ manuscript tradition clearly supports Flusser's conjecture, but also makes it clear that sy could not have been reading a grC mss which had *baoro nemega* with the two words clearly demarcated.

124 It could also represent the accusative case, but while *Magam* (hr) and *Magnam* (grE grN) are found in the extant manuscript tradition, *Megam* is not.

Pellante (Πέλλαν; פִּילָן] grC.2 grH grJ grM grP B No Ba G; Pellantem grC.3 grC.4b grE grL Vi w pg; Pellente grG (- Lau Ml) grC.4 grN (-ve No); Pellentem Lau Ml hr ve

Yosippon depends on a Latin source with either *Pellante* or *Pellantem*.

Hanc (i.e. Pellante[m]) etiam destruxit, cum non promisissent habitantes in ea patrios Iudaeorum se mores suscipere. Alias quoque Syriae ciuitates euerterunt

destruxit] destruxerunt grL

non promisissent] grG (St^{p.c.}) grE grL (- Sa Sch Pd PragXXIII.D121) grN grP hr Ba Aus;

promisissent pg;

promisisset grC St^{a.c.};

non permisissent grH Vat Pr Sa Sch G;

non permisisset Madr10270 vt; **uero permisisset** rg

ea patrios] patria grC.4b

se mores] (ἔθη)] grG grE pg t; **seniores** all other mss

Hanc ... euerterunt] omit grJ; **has omnes ciuitates Alexander pugnando Iudeis subiecit** Pd Prag.XXIII.D121

ταύτην δὲ κατέσκαψεν οὐχ ὑποσχομένων τῶν ἐνοικούντων ἐς τὰ πάτρια τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθη μεταβαλεῖσθαι, ἄλλας τε πόλεις πρωτεοῦσας τῆς Συρίας ἃ ἦσαν κατεστραμμένοι.

δὲ] om. P Niese. κατέσκαψεν] κατέσκαψαν F VW Naber Marcus. οὐχ] **omitted by P Niese**¹²⁵ ἐς τὰ] ἐς P Niese. μεταβαλεῖσθαι] P Niese Naber Marcus; μεταβαλέσθαι LAMVW Nodet. ἃ ἦσαν] ἦσαν P Niese. κατεστραμμένοι] κατεστραμμένοι P Niese

אלה הערים אשר לא הרס אלכסנדר כי באו בברית עמו וימולו את בשר
ערלתם וישבו בעריהם, ויתר ערי ארם הרס המלך.

Both the Greek and Latin textual tradition are exceedingly complex for the final sentence of this passage and present a number of significant problems that cannot be addressed here. The following comments are focused on

125 Niese's apparatus incorrectly reports that Naples V F 34 reads *cum promisissent* (*cum* *promisissent* cod. Neap alique, *cum non permisissent alii* cod Lat). B and all other grC manuscripts have the singular *cum permisisset*.

understanding the relationship of Groups G and C and on the text *Yosippon* might have been reading.

destruxit] Singular and plural forms appear here in both the Greek and the Latin textual traditions (κατέσκαψεν/κατέσκαψαν; *destruxit/destruxerunt*).¹²⁶ *Yosippon* is clearly reading a Latin text with the singular (הרס אלכסנדר).

cum non promississet] This reading corresponds exactly to οὐχ ὑποσχόμενων, providing a close translation of the Greek (“He destroyed the city, because its inhabitants had not promised that they would adopt the ancestral customs of the Jews”). Niese prints ὑποσχόμενων (i.e. without οὐχ) found only in P, but he is not followed by any subsequent editors. The grC reading *cum promississet* is clearly secondary, since it does not correspond to the plural ὑποσχόμενων, and makes little sense in the context. Presumably it is concessive (“he destroyed the city, although he had promised ...”), but the rest of the sentence does not make clear what he promised. The reading *cum promississet* (only in pg), however, does make sense (as does ὑποσχόμενων without οὐχ), even if it is probably not the earliest reading: “He destroyed this city, even though its inhabitants promised to adopt the ancestral customs of the Jews.”

Of particular note is the fact that the uncorrected reading in St has *cum promississet*, the same reading as in the unique grC reading, which is corrected to *non promississet*, the reading of all the other grG manuscripts (as well as of a number of other manuscripts). Similarly, at 13.254, the uncorrected text of St omits *eas* as do all the grC mss, with *eas* added above the line. On the other hand, at 13.265 the uncorrected text of St has the uniquely grG reading *uacuum habuerit* with the unique grC.3–4 reading *uacauerit* above the line. It seems then that a grC manuscript was available to both the original scribe and to a corrector.¹²⁷ Whether this has any connection to the clear relationship between grG and grC, established above on the basis of multiple readings found only in these two groups, requires a full analysis of the textual affinities

126 Both Marcus and Villeneuve (et al.) cite the Latin in their apparatus as supporting the singular reading. Since Niese does not cite Lat in his apparatus, it is unclear what source they are using. (Villeneuve could depend on Marcus). Although *destruxerunt* in grL is probably a secondary reading, it should still be noted in future editions.

127 All corrections I have seen are in a hand very close to that of the main text. The corrections are generally above the line, although the *non* in 13.397 is in the margin immediately after the text, perhaps because it is inserted after the last word in a line.

of the corrections in St.¹²⁸ At the very least it provides a case of grC and grG manuscripts in close proximity to one another.¹²⁹

Yosippon changes his source to produce a different but clear text: “These are the cities which Alexander did not destroy because they entered a covenant with him, and they circumcised the flesh of their foreskins, and they remained in their cities; and the rest of the cities of Syria the king destroyed.” In effect, it is as if *Yosippon* is reading *non* before *destruxit* instead of before *promississent*. While not offering direct evidence, *Yosippon*’s text provides some support for the reading *cum non promississent*,¹³⁰ since it nowhere suggests the idea that Alexander destroyed a city, *even though* (concessive *cum*) the inhabitants adopted Jewish customs.

se mores] All manuscripts except those in grG and grE and ms pg and grL ms t have the reading *seniores*, easily explained as reading *m* as *ni*. This produces a highly problematic text, with the relationship between *patrios* and *seniores* obscure.¹³¹ Here *Yosippon* is almost certainly reading a manuscript with *se mores*. In any case, there is no evidence for the reading *seniores* in *Yosippon*.¹³²

Hanc ... euerterunt] This entire section is omitted by all grJ manuscripts. It is also omitted by the Lübeck edition, which is based on the grJ manuscript tradition, and therefore is also missing from the 1514 Paris and 1519 Paris editions, based on the Lübeck edition. This accounts for its absence in the 1524 Basel edition, Flusser’s primary source for the Latin *Antiquities*, which sometimes modified the 1524 Cologne edition using the text from one of these editions.¹³³

128 The reading in pg (*cum promississent*), which, unlike the reading in grC and the uncorrected text of St, is fully comprehensible, introduces another possible connection between an early form of the grC and grG manuscript tradition because pg has a large number of grG readings.

129 See above, n. 102, for the possibility that the scribe Goderan’s main exemplar for St was the *AJ/BJ* text mentioned in the Lobbes monastery library catalogue of 1049 and for the possibility that the *AJ* 1–16 manuscript at Stavelot was from grC.

130 Groups G, E, N, P L (-Sa, Sch) and mss Ba w. The readings with *non promississent* and *non promississet* are clearly secondary since they do not correspond to the Greek οὐχ ὑποσχόμενων. These readings might have been influenced by the Latin of a similar passage in the reign of John Hyrcanus (13 257): *permisit* (ἐπέτρεψεν) *eis prouinciam habitare si circumcideretur legibusque Iudaicis uteretur*. A simple misreading of *promississent* as *permisissent* is also possible, since the only difference between them in most manuscripts is an abbreviation mark attached to the p. *Yosippon* does not have a word corresponding to either *promississe(n)t* or *permisisse(n)t*.

131 The three manuscripts of subgroup C.4b have made the text smoother by reading *patria* instead of *patrios*.

132 The reading *seniores* in the 9th-century ms Ba means that this puzzling variant is already in the manuscript tradition by the time SY was written.

133 Levenson and Martin, *The Early Printed Editions*, 806–807.

3.2.3 Summary and Conclusions for Case Study 2

1. The earliest text of this passage is found in grG, with the following exceptions:
 - a. *Rinocorura* in grL.1 is probably the earliest reading because it reproduces the Greek;
 - b. *Mega* in grG and in the source of grC variant *Nemega* is probably secondary because all Greek mss and all other Latin manuscript groups have a name beginning with the syllable *ma*;
 - c. *Pellante(m)* rather than *Pellente(m)* in grG grN grC.4 hr corresponds better to the Greek Πέλλαν;
 - d. *Azoton* in grC.1 and grC.3–4a is closer to the Greek Ἀζωτον than *Azotum*, found in almost all other manuscripts;
 - e. *promisisset* in the uncorrected text of grG ms St in 13.397, which agrees with grC, is later than *non promisissent* in all other manuscripts.
2. Only group G has *Lembaoronem* (with the original first syllable), and only grG, grE, and ms t have preserved the original reading *se mores*.
3. Two lacunae provide important evidence for the establishment and connection of groups:
 - a. The omission of *in mediterraneis uero per Idumeam* by all manuscripts from Groups E, L.2, N, and P and manuscripts Ba, G, and w indicates a clear connection, which is confirmed by the same manuscripts omitting *populares uero non eis obsequabantur* in 13.298;
 - b. the omission of 13.397b (*hanc ... euerterunt*) by all nine manuscripts in grJ is a significant marker for that group.
4. The obviously secondary readings in all almost all grC mss—*Baora/Baoro, Nemega, Oculonem*—clearly derive from earlier readings in the source of the grC archetype: *Baorone, Mega, Aulonem*, of which *Baorone* and *Mega* are connected to grG (grG *Lembaoronem*) becomes *Baoronem* after the first syllable is attached to *Midaba* and the last to *Mega*.
5. This passage provides potentially useful information about *Yosippon's* Latin source for the following readings:
 - a. רינוקורה *Rinocora* (grC grG grL.1) rather than *Rinocoro* (grH grJ grN grP), *Rinocoron* (grE), *Rinocorura* (grL.2), or *Rincoro* (grM).
 - b. בחורון *Baoronee* (grL grN grP Ba) rather than *Lembaoronem* (grG), *Baorene(e)* (grE grH grJ grM G), *Baoro* (grC), *Barronee* (w), *Barrone* (hr), *Lemboronee* (pg).

- c. מֵיגָן *Mega* (grG) rather than *Nemega* (grC), *Maga* (grH grJ grL grM grP Ba G w), *Magnam* (grE grN), *Magam* (hr).
- d. אוֹלוֹן *Aulonem* in all mss except grC (*Oculonem*) hr (*Occulonem*).
- e. פִּילֵן *Pellante(m)* (grC.1–3 C.4b grE grH grJ grL grM grP Ba G w pg) rather than *Pellente(m)* (grC.4 grG grN hr).
- f. Omission of *in mediterraneis uero per Idumeam*: sy and grE, grL.2, grN, grP, Ba G w.
- g. Omission of *Samariam, Carmelum montem, et Ithaburium montem*: sy and hr.
- h. כִּי באוּ בברית עמו וימולו את בשר ערלתם (“because they entered into a covenant with them and they circumcised the flesh of their foreskin”) corresponds to the reading *se mores* in grG, grE, ms pg, and grL ms t better than to the obscure reference to *patrios ... seniores* in the other groups and manuscripts.

3.3 Case Study 3: *Hyrcanus’ Conquests and Embassy to Rome*

A concentration of variants in the account of Hyrcanus’ successes in conquering a number of cities and in renewing the alliance with Rome makes this passage particularly useful in evaluating the relationship of *Yosippon* to the *LAJ* textual tradition and especially its relationship to grC manuscripts, the family to which the manuscripts that Flusser identified as related to the source for *Yosippon* belong. As a guide to the narrative context in which the variants appear and as an illustration of how closely *Yosippon* follows the Latin *Antiquities*, an English synopsis is provided. Readings discussed in a brief commentary following the synopsis are in bold. A Latin text based on ms St with variants from B and El can be found in Appendix 3 (pp. 303–304).

Sefer Yosippon 29, 1–19

And Hyrcanus saw that Antiochus was dead, and he ceased going against Arsaces. And he directed his attention to Aram Zoba,

Antiquities 13.254–260

²⁵⁴ When Hyrcanus learned of the death of Antiochus, he immediately prepared an expedition against the cities of Syria, thinking that he would find **them** unprepared and bereft of fighters and defenders, which actually happened.

and he came to **Medaba**, and he besieged it for **six months**. And God gave it into his hand, and he subjected it to forced labor. And he turned from there and went to **Shamgan** and captured it and all its neighboring areas. And he returned and came to Shechem and he struck it because it did not open up for him.

And he struck **Mt. Gerazim** and destroyed the temple that Sanbalat made for Manasseh his son-in-law, the brother of **Iddo**, the chief of the priests.

And Hyrcanus destroyed it 200 years after its construction. And King Hyrcanus overturned it down to its foundations, and he struck the Cutheans who were on the mountain of Samaria.

And he set out and went to the land of Edom. And he struck **Abora Maresha**, which belong(s) to Edom. And he subdued the pride of Edom and subjected them to forced labor until the Exile,

²⁵⁵ For he captured **Medaba in the sixth month**, after his army had endured much hardship. After this he also captured **Samoga** and the cities near it and also even **Sycima**

and **Garizin** and the nation of the Cutheans, ²⁵⁶ which possessed a temple built according to the likeness of the Jerusalem temple that Sanaballat, their leader, built at the command of Alexander, for the sake of his son-in-law Manasses, the brother of the chief of the priests **Iaddus**, just as we have related previously.¹³⁴

So it happened that this temple was demolished 200 years later.

²⁵⁷ So when Hyrcanus had subdued the cities of Idumea, **Abora along with Marissa**, and all the Idumeans,

¹³⁴ Cf. *AJ* 13:281.

for the King bound and tied them and enchained them with chains of circumcision and circumcised the flesh of their foreskins.¹³⁵

And from that day forward they were circumcised and were keeping the observance of the Torah of the Jews¹³⁶ until the Exile. And thus the king did to all the nations that he conquered.

And it came to pass when the LORD made his way prosper, that he sent messengers to Rome to renew the covenant with the leaders of the Romans.

And these are the words of the covenant which the Roman leaders renewed for Hyrcanus, king of Judah:

Fannius, son of Marcus, and **Lucius and Mallius, sons of Mentinus**, Gaius Sempronius, son of Falernus, and the rest of the leaders of the Romans and the Elder¹³⁷ who is with us, to Hyrcanus, King of Judah, Peace.

he permitted them to inhabit the province if they would be circumcised and observe Jewish laws.

258 And they, from longing for their native land, endured **circumcision** and the other parts of the Jews' way of life. And for this reason, from that time they began to be Jews.

259 When this was accomplished, the chief of the priests Hyrcanus, wishing to renew the alliance with the Romans, sent an embassy to them.

And when the senate had taken up what he had written, it arranged an alliance of friendship in the following manner:

260 "The consul Fannius, the son of Marcus, has ordered all the senate to convene in the Campus on the eighth day before the Ides of February, with **Lucius Manlius, the son of Lucius Mentinus**, and Gaius Sempronius, the son of Falerna present, for this matter ...":

135 Cf. *SY* 10, 71–72; *AJ* 13, 319.

136 All mss except Rothschild 24 have תורת יהודה; on the basis of the reading ״ (without תורת) in Rothschild 24, Flusser emends the text to ״ תורת. The Latin *legibusque Iudaicis* (cf. *conuersationem Iudaeorum*), however, confirms the reading reported by Flusser for all Hebrew manuscripts except Rothschild 24.

137 In his note on *SY* 29, 16, Flusser cites *SY* 2, 133, for the author's belief that the Romans chose a single Elder to rule with 320 counselors. He also suggests that here *Yosippon* might have been influenced by 1 Macc. 8:16.

3.3.1 Commentary

254. *eas* (ἀὐτὰς)] omitted grC; added above St

One of two places the original reading in St agrees with a unique grC variant and is corrected to the reading found in all other manuscripts.¹³⁸ Based on the Greek text, the grC omission of *eas* is obviously secondary.

255. *Medaba* (Μήδαβαν; מִדְבָּתָה)] grG (- Lau Tr Ml) grM grP; *Medabam* grL grE (- al); *Minadabam* grC.1 Ptr; *Minadam* grC.2; *Nadabam* grC.3–4; *Midaba* grH grN (L *nādabam* to *nāmidabam*) grJ Ba; *Medebam* al; *Nabadam* hr; *Bedaba* Lau Tr Ml

The place name *Medaba* is found in five places in LAJ and exhibits a variety of forms in the various groups and even within the same manuscript.¹³⁹ See p. 255 for discussion of the name in 13.397. Here *Medaba* is found in Groups G, M, and P, with the closely related forms *Medabam* and *Medebam* in Groups L and M. *Bedaba* is a clear indication of the distinct grG subgroup Lau Tr Ml. The grC subgroups present a typical case of grC.2 and grC.3 independently deriving from grC.1. Manuscript hr, as is often the case, has the reading in grC.3–4.

Yosippon's reading here, as at 13.397, probably derives from the biblical form (מִדְבָּתָה) and not from the Latin variant *Midaba* or *Medaba* (the Masoretic tradition vocalizes the Hebrew with ē in the first syllable).

sexto mense (ἕκτῳ μηνί; ששה חודשים)] intra septem menses grC.1 (B intra s.l.) grC.3–4 hr; intra menses septem grC.2

All grC mss have *intra septem menses*. The uncorrected reading in ms B (*septem menses*) would mean “for seven months” rather than within seven months.

Yosippon was most probably reading a text with *sexto mense* rather than *intra septem menses* (or *septem menses*), since “six months” is closer to “in the sixth month” than “within seven months.” The uncorrected variant in B (“for seven months”) could clearly not be the reading in *Yosippon's* source.

Samogan (Σαμόγαν; שמוגן)] grG grC.1–2 V L; *Samogam* (often spelled *Samogā*) in all other manuscripts

The reading in *Yosippon* clearly corresponds to the earliest reading, found only in grG grC.1–2 grC.3 ms V and grN ms L. Flusser evidently did not know

138 See pp. 258–259 for the discussion of the other reading, *promisisset* (grC) corrected to *non promisissent* (13.397). At 13.265, a unique grC.3–4 reading (*uacauerit*) corrects a unique grG reading (*uacuum habuerit*).

139 E.g. St has *Midaba* (cor. to *Medaba*) at AJ 13.11, *Minadaba* at 13.19, *Medaba* at 13.355 and 13.397, and *Midaba* at 14.18; B has *Nabatha*, *Nabatham*, *Minadabam*, *Midabalem* (incorrect word division), and *Midabalybias* (another incorrect word division) in the same passages.

(or notice in B or La) this reading, since he prints *Samogam* in his commentary, which is found in the 1524 Basel edition as well as in the vast majority of mss.

256. ac **Garizin gentemque** (καὶ Γαριζεῖν τό τε [Κουθαίωv] γένος; הַר גַּרִיזִים; cf. וַיְהִי אֵת הַכּוּתִים in the continuation of the story)] grG (- Ml) grJ (- li) w; nargariz ingentemque grC.1–3 (Vi nagariz in gentemque) Ptr; narzari ingentemque grC.4a (M narzani ingentemque); nazarinque ingente grC.4b; agarizin gentemque grN Ba G; garizim gentemque grL; et argarizim gentemque grE; ac Garizim gentemque grH grM li; et Garizim gentemque grP pg Ml; nagariz gentemque hr

The different variants correspond well to the established groups, with the reading in grG and grJ being closest to the Greek. Influence from the parallel passage in *BJ* 1.63 probably accounts for *ac Garizin* becoming *Argarizin* in grE (see below for another possible example of a grE reading being influenced by *BJ* 1.63).

Just as in 13.397, an incorrect word division in the grC archetype has given rise to names found only in all grC manuscripts: *argarizin gentemque* becomes *nargariz ingentemque* in grC.1–3, which then is corrupted to *narzari ingentemque* in grC.4 grC.4a. The initial n might derive from the last letter of the previous word *Syciman*, although the spelling with *n* rather than *m* or a line over the *a* is found only in Ba. Appearance in that 9th-century text does indicate that the variant with *n* is early. In any case, this is clear evidence that the source of the grC archetype had the reading *Argarizin*.

The reading הַר גַּרִיזִים in *Yosippon* almost certainly derives from the biblical form rather than from a secondary variant in either grE or in the source of grC.1–3. הַר גַּרִיזִים translating *Garizin* or *Garizim* is also found in in *SY* 10, 56, based on *AJ* 11.340.

(*fratrem*) **Iaddi** (Ἰαδδῆς; Ἰαδδῆς Ἰαδδῆς); [עִידוֹ] grG grH grJ grM; **Iaddo** grC grL w; **Ieddo** grE grN pg Ba G; **Iadi** hr; **Iaddonis** grP

In addition to this passage, the name of the high priest who met Alexander the Great occurs five times in *AJ* 11 (302, 306, 322, 326, and 347), where there are variants in both the Greek and Latin manuscript tradition, e.g. Ἰαδδῆς, Ἰωαδδῆς; *Iaddus*, *Ioaddas*, *Ioideas*, *Ioaddus*, *Iaadus*). In most manuscripts the name is not spelled the same way in the different passages.¹⁴⁰ In the Greek Bible, this name, in its various spellings (Ἰαδδῆς, Ἰωαδδῆς, and Ἰωαδδῆς), corresponds to the High Priest יְדוּעַ in Neh 12:11 (11 Esd 22:11), while Ἰωαδδῆς and Ἰωαδδῆς are also found as variants for Ἰωδδῆς, which corresponds to יוֹדֵעַ, the grandfather of יְדוּעַ, who is also mentioned in Neh 12:11.

140 E.g. *Iaddus* (11.302, 11.322), *Iaddo* (11.306), *Ioadas* (11.326), *Iaadus* (11.347) in B; *Iaddus*, *Ioadas* (11.326) in St.

It is noteworthy that *Yosippon* names the High Priest עֵדוּ in the story of Alexander in *SY* 10 (*AJ* 11) and עֵדוּ in the reference to that story here in *SY* 29 (*AJ* 13).¹⁴¹ This corresponds to the name עֵדוּא, a different priest, who is mentioned in the same list in *Neh* 12. Flusser suggests that *Yosippon* used this name because it is closer to *Iaddo*, a variant found in both manuscripts B and La, which, according to him, were in the same group as *SY*'s source. For the present project this would also seem to be evidence for the use of a grC ms, since the reading is found in all grC manuscripts. However, the same variant is also found in all grL mss and ms w.¹⁴² Furthermore, the Hebrew עֵדוּ could just as easily reflect the reading *Ieddo* in grN, grE, and mss Ba and G.¹⁴³

257. *Abora cum Marisso* (Ἄδωρα καὶ Μάρισσον; חברה מרשה) [*abora cum*] *aboracum* grL grH; *adoreon* grE grM; *adoreon et* grP; *Marisso*] grC.1–2 grG (- Ml) grJ grN; *Marissam* grL (b *Marissum* corr. to *Marissam*); *maresan* grE grM grP; *Mariso* grC.3–4 (V *Matriso*; Pi *mariso* corr. to *matriso*)¹⁴⁴ Ptr hr No; *Mariso* cepit Ml

Abora cum Marisso, the reading in all mss except Groups L, E, M, and P, is a possible, but odd translation of the Greek. The reading *Aboracum Marissam/Marissum* in grL (grH has *Aboracum Marisso*) could either be an attempt to correct the text or an earlier reading with *aboracum* later read as two words, which would require the ablative form for *Marissum*. The reading *Adoreon* in grE, grM, and grP is closer to the Greek, and grP's *adoreon et maresan* corresponds exactly to the Greek. However, the specific spellings *Adoreon* and *Maresan* and the fact that grE elsewhere appears to be influenced by a *BJ* reading for this passage (see *Argarizin* above) make it somewhat more likely that this is a secondary correction, based on *LBJ* 1.63, of an awkward reading.

Yosippon is clearly reading a text with *Abora* and not *Adora* or *Adoreon*. Here חברה transliterates the Latin, while in 13.396 the biblical name חברון is used for *Abora*. The lack of the connective is probably accidental and not related to the same phenomenon in grE and grM. The spelling מרשה, as in 13.396, derives from the biblical spelling and not necessarily from a form without an i.¹⁴⁵

141 In *SY* 10, the high priest's name appears as עֵדוּ in a passage parallel to 322 (the brother of Iddo) and as חוניה in three mss in a passage parallel to 11.326 (cf. Onias, Iaddus' son, in 11.347; the other *SY* mss do not give the high priest's name).

142 *Iaddonis* in grP is an attempt to improve the text by declining the indeclinable form *Iaddo*. grC.2 mss C and Pt make it a (possessive) dative by changing *principis* to *principi*.

143 The name *Iaddo* for the high priest is attested as early as the ninth century, where it is found in the large manuscript group D at 11.306 (a group not relevant for *AJ* 13, since most of its mss have only *AJ* 1–12), which includes several 9th-century manuscripts. The reading *Ieddo* at 13.255 is found in the ninth-century ms Ba.

144 See above, p. 233.

145 2 Chr 11:8; 14:8–9; 20:37. 1 Chr 2:42; 4:21 (Josh 15:44 has מראשה).

260. **Fannius Marci filius consul omnem senatum octauo Idus Februarias in campo iussit conuenire praesente Lucio Manlio, Lucii Mentini filio, et Gaio Sempronio Falernae filio;**

Φάννιος Μάρκου υἱὸς στρατηγὸς βουλὴν ἤγαγεν πρὸ ὀκτῶ εἰδῶν Φεβρουαρίων ἐν Κομητίῳ¹⁴⁶ παρόντος Λουκίου Μαννίου Λουκίου υἱοῦ Μεντῖνα καὶ Γαίου Σεμπρωνίου Πενναίου¹⁴⁷ υἱοῦ Φαλέρνα; גיוס מנטינוס בני מנטיאוס ומליאוס ולוקיאוס ומרקוס בן פניאוס סמפרוניאוס בן פלרנוס

omnem senatum] senatum omne grC.2; **Februarias]** grC.1–2 grG pg; **Februarii]** grJ Mn H Sa hr ve No al; febr b Adm Bo Cl Nv grM; Feb Ba L El; **Februariarum]** Ptr; **Februarius]** grC.3–4; **Februario mense]** grP; **campo]** grG (- Lau); **campum]** all other mss except Lau (templo); **Manlio]** Mallio grC (- Ne^{p.c.} Plut8sin10); **manlicio]** grP; **Lucii]** Luci grN pg Ba G w; **omitted]** grC; **Mentini]** Mentinii grL; **Lucii Mentini]** lumentini grP

In both his 1959 review of Blatt and the introduction to his edition, Flusser utilizes the variant *Mallio* for *Manlio* to prove that *Yosippon* was reading a manuscript belonging to the group represented by the manuscripts with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*. This was based on *Mallio* in mss B and La (the only two manuscripts he had seen from the group) and *Manlio* in the 1524 Basel edition.¹⁴⁸ Here Flusser is clearly correct. The reading is in fact found in 20 grC manuscripts and nowhere else in the *LAJ* manuscript tradition. Furthermore, Flusser’s argument can be made even stronger by noting that *Yosippon* also follows grC by omitting *Lucii*, which is missing only in this group (*SY*: Lucius and Mallius, the sons of Mentinus; grC: Lucius Mallius, the son of Mentinus). Given the limited resources with which he was working, it is quite impressive that Flusser was able to identify the only unambiguous example of *Yosippon* using a manuscript related to grC that we have found in this part of the *Antiquities*.

3.3.2 Summary and Conclusions for Case Study 3

1. Five place names in this passage have multiple variants that make it possible to clearly identify specific manuscript groups and subgroups: *Samogan* (grC grG), *Medaba* (grC.1, grC.2, grC.3–4), *ac Garizin gentemque* (grC.1–3, grC.4, grE, grL, grN, grP), *Abora* (grL, grP), *Marissa* (grC.3, grL).
2. Because *Yosippon* uses the biblical names for *Medaba*, *Garizin*, and *Marissa*, it is not possible to determine which name would have been in its Latin source. *Yosippon* was clearly using a source with *Abora* and not

146 Note that Κομητίῳ is a conjecture and that the Greek mss have κομπῖω, κομπῶ, κοππῶ (see above, p. 105).

147 v.l. Γναίου.

148 Niese cites the reading *Mallio* in B (“cod. Neapol.”) in his editio maior and introduces it into his text in his editio minor.

- Adoreon* (grM, grN, grP). *Samogan* (vs *Samogam*) is found only in grC and grG manuscripts, indicating a connection between one of these groups and *Yosippon*, which has שמגן.
3. *Yosippon*'s ששה חודשים is more easily derived from the reading *sexto mense* than from *intra septem menses* or *septem menses* in grC.
 4. *Yosippon*'s בליאוס, as Flusser noted, corresponds to the variant *Mallius* (vs *Manlius*). Flusser's discovery of this reading in mss B and La and not in the 1524 Basel edition was one of the two textual bases for his argument that *Yosippon*'s Latin source belonged to the group of mss with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*. That the variant *Mallius* is a distinct marker for the group to which B, La, V, and Pi belong can now be confirmed, since it is found in 20 grC manuscripts and nowhere else. The omission of the next word *Lucii* in all grC manuscripts, *Yosippon*, and nowhere else provides further evidence supporting this element of Flusser's hypothesis. The appearance of *Manlio Lucii* in ms hr indicates that it is here using a source other than a grC manuscript.
 5. Flusser suggested that the Biblical name עידו for the High Priest who met Alexander is chosen because it is close to the reading *Iaddo* in the group to which B and La belong. While it is true this is the universal reading in grC mss (vs *Iaddi*), *Iaddo* is also found in all grL manuscripts and ms w and is implied by *Iaddonis* in grP. The name עידו could also just as easily be derived from the variant *Ieddo* in Groups E and N and manuscripts B, G, and pg.

3.4 Case Study 4: *The Death of Aristobulus* (*AJ* 13.314–322)

The fourth case study analyzes the tragic story of the death of Aristobulus, beginning at the point he becomes sick with grief and guilt over his role in the murder of his brother Antigonus. The distinctiveness of the text found in all Group C manuscripts offers a striking example of how far the form of the text in that group can depart from the rest of the *LAJ* manuscript tradition. This makes it particularly useful for evaluating possible links of the grC manuscripts B, La, V, and Pi to *Yosippon*, whose extended narrative at this point follows its *LAJ* source closely. The variants in this passage also add significant support to the evidence presented in the first two selections that, in this part of the *Antiquities*, Group G has preserved the earliest form of the tradition. In addition to the clear examples of secondary variants in grC manuscripts and of earliest readings in Group G, the variants in this passage also include two places where grC alone probably has the earliest reading and also a full clause

shared by grC and grG, which has disappeared from the rest of the manuscript tradition and which has parallels with *Yosippon*. This connection between grC and grG, which has been demonstrated at many points already in this chapter, is an important key to understanding the early development of the tradition and is of particular importance for reconstructing the form of the text used by *Sefer Yosippon*.

3.4.1 Unique Group C and Group G Variants

The most important variant in this passage found only in all 22 grC manuscripts collated is a large lacuna from 13.315c–320, which has already been discussed in connection with the precedence of ms B in the grC manuscript tradition. There it was shown that the insertion of material from the Latin *War* to fill in part of the lacuna that is found in all grC manuscripts probably derives from ms B, where the insertion appears to be an addition to the manuscript. In this case study, the other distinctive connections between grC and grG and their importance for reconstructing *Yosippon's LAJ* source will be discussed with the help of English synopses comparing grG ms St and grC manuscript B and comparing the *LAJ* text with *Yosippon*. In the comparison below, aside from the lacuna, places where the grC and grG texts differ are indicated by *italics*. A passage where grG and grC agree against the rest of the tradition is indicated by **bold italics**, and readings only in grG are printed in **bold**. The commentary following the synopsis focuses on selected passages most relevant for understanding the grC and grG manuscript traditions and their relationship to the Latin text used by *Sefer Yosippon*. The complete Latin text of the passage in St with variants from B and El can be found in Appendix 3 (pp. 311–313).

Group G: Brussels II 1179 (ms St)

Therefore, this disturbed *the prophet*.
³¹⁴ *But* remorse for a brother's ***murder*** and weeping took hold of *Aristobulus*, and also illness spread through his mind because of grief for his crime and kept up the intolerable suffering due to the rotting away of his innards. He also vomited an abundance of blood.

Group C: Naples V F 34 (ms B)

But, therefore, this disturbed *Aristobulus* ³¹⁴ and remorse for a brother's ***murder*** and weeping took hold of *him*, and also illness spread through his mind because of grief for his crime and kept up the intolerable suffering due to the rotting away of his innards. He also vomited an abundance of blood.

While some boy was carrying it, he slipped in the place in which stains of the blood of Antigonus were still remaining, I believe by the disposition of God's providence.

315a When this happened,

315b *a cry went up from those seeing the blood poured out, since they thought that the boy had done this of his own accord.*

315c But when Aristobulus heard the cry and asked the cause, he *threatened* more insistently those who were silent, wanting to learn the cause of the cry.

For people are suspicious about those things that are held in silence and always think that they are worse.

316 *But when they revealed the truth to him as he was coercing and threatening [them],*

his mind was confounded, struck by his conscience, and groaning from the depths of his chest and with tears, he spoke, "Am I really able to escape the notice of God for such impious and cruel deeds, so that I might not be consumed by swift punishment for the crime of a brother's murder?"

While some boy was carrying it, he slipped in the place in which stains of the blood of Antigonus¹⁴⁹ were still remaining, as I believe by the disposition of God's providence.

315a When this happened,

[BJ 1.82b in place of 315b] *wailing immediately arose [from those] who had seen the boy pour out the blood as if on purpose.*

315c But when Aristobulus heard the cry and asked the cause, when they were silent, he *exerted himself* more insistently, wanting to learn the cause of the cry.

[BJ 1.83 end] *And when he filled his eyes with tears and groaned as much as he could, he said this: [BJ 1.84] "It should certainly not have been expected that my wicked deeds should escape the great eye of God, for avenging justice quickly pursues me for the murder of my kinsman.*

149 Reading *Antigoni* for the erroneous *Antigonus* found in mss B, C, La, and Pt^{a-c}.

317 How long, shameless body, do you hold back my soul from approaching the shades of my brother and mother? Why do you not quickly return it, but instead little by little I make my blood a libation to the murdered.

318 After he had said these things, he died in the first year of his reign. He was also called Philhellene, that is lover of the Greeks. Indeed, he benefitted his homeland much. For he subdued the Itureans and attached most of their province to the Jews and compelled the ones living in it to be circumcised according to the laws of the Jews, if they wanted to remain in the province.¹⁵⁰

319 Moreover, he was of a very temperate nature and of innate decency, according to the testimony Strabo presents in the name of Timagenes, saying the following: "This man was temperate and exceedingly beneficial to the Jews; for he acquired a province for them and joined part of the people of the Itureans to them by the bond of circumcision."

150 Cf. AJ 13,257 and 397.

³²⁰ When Aristobulus died, his wife Salome, who had the name Alexandra among the Greeks, freeing his brothers, whom Aristobulus held in bonds, as was mentioned earlier, appointed as king Janneus, who also was called Alexander, being greater in age **than his brothers and much more humble.**

³²¹ *As soon as he had been born, he was demeaned by his father's hatred, and up to his death* he never came before the countenance of his father. The cause of this hatred is said to have been the following:

³²² Since Hyrcanus loved *his* elder *sons* Antigonus and Aristobolus, when God appeared to him in his sleep, and he (Hyrcanus) asked him which of his sons would become his successor, upon God showing him the face of that one, having become depressed because this one would become the heir of all of his possessions, he *sent him away from birth* to be brought up in Galilee. But God in no way lied *to Hyrcanus*. For after the death of Aristobolus, that one took up the reign.

³²¹ *As soon as he had been born, he was demeaned by his father's hatred, and up to his death* he never came before the countenance of his father. The cause of this hatred is said to have been the following:

³²² Since Hyrcanus loved *his* elder *sons* Antiochus and Aristobolus, when God appeared to him in his sleep, and he (Hyrcanus) asked him which of his sons would become his successor, upon God showing him the face of that one, having become depressed because this one would become the heir to all of his possessions, he *let him from birth* be brought up in Galilee. But God in no way lied. For after the death of Aristobolus, that one took up the reign *of Hyrcanus*.

3.4.2 Other Unique Group C Variants

13.313 (end)–314 (beg). **Igitur uatem hoc perturbauit (314) Aristobolum autem** (τὸν μὲν οὖν μάντιν τοῦτο διετάρραξεν. (314) Ἀριστόβουλον δὲ). **igitur]** ita hr; **uatem]** autem grC.1 grC.2; per grC.3; autem per grC.4a Ptr hr; **uatem hoc]** Antigoni mors grC.4b (over erasure in Ne); **perturbauit]** turbauit grC.3–4 Ptr; **autem]** et eum grC hr

The text in this sentence is changed significantly by the grC archetype's misreading of *uatem* as *autem* at the end of 13.313. This led to four distinct variations that correspond to grC subgroups:

grG. Igitur uatem hoc perturbauit. (314) Aristobolum autem fraternae caedis paenitentia fletusque possedit ...

τὸν μὲν οὖν μάντιν τοῦτο διετάραξεν. (314) Ἀριστόβουλον δὲ τῆς ἀδελφοκτονίας εὐθύς εἰσήλθε μετάνοια ...

grC.1–2. Igitur autem hoc perturbauit (314) Aristobolum et eum fraternae caedis paenitentia fletusque possedit ...

grC.3. Igitur per hoc turbauit (314) Aristobolum et eum fraternae caedis paenitentia fletusque possedit ...

grC.4a. Igitur autem per hoc turbauit (314) Aristobolum et eum fraternae caedis paenitentia fletusque possedit ...

grC.4b. Igitur Antigoni mors¹⁵¹ turbauit (314) Aristobolum et eum fraternae caedis paenitentia fletusque possedit ...

314. Antigoni (Ἀντιγόνου)] Antigonus B C La Pt (corr. to Antigoni); Antigonis Pi O. in loco in quo maculae sanguinis adhuc Antigoni permanebant εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον, οὗ σφαγέντος Ἀντιγόνου σπίλους ἔτι τοῦ αἵματος ἐκεῖνου συνέβαινε εἶναι

The clear error in B is reproduced in grC.2 manuscripts C, La, and Pt^{a.c.} (La and Pt both probably depending on C).¹⁵² The correction in grC.2 ms Pt might reflect an additional source in that manuscript, if it is not simply an obvious grammatical correction. The puzzling variant *Antigonis* in Pi is probably another attempt to correct the error in B.¹⁵³ The appearance of the same variant in O almost certainly depends on Ptr, in which the folio page where this passage occurs is replaced by a blank page. A connection between Ptr and grC.3 is found elsewhere, but, however that connection is to be explained (both Ptr and V, the earliest grC.3 manuscript, are dated to late 11th or early 12th century), it is an indication of a source, reflected in Ptr and grC.3–4, that introduces new elements into the grC manuscript tradition, sometimes (although not here) bringing in earlier readings to correct readings in Groups C.1 and C.2. This source might also account for the readings in grC.1 ms Vi (late 11th century) not found in B.

315. minabatur (ἐπετεινετο)] conabatur grC.1–2 grC.4b Vt l O hr; conabantur grC.3–4a (-Vt l O pat); conabatur pat; mirabantur w

151 *Antigoni* in Ne is written over an erasure (presumably *autem hoc*) and *mors* is extended into the margin. Mss pa and Plut. 18simo (not listed by Blatt), derived from Ne, have *Antigoni mors* as the original reading in the text.

152 See above, p. 230.

153 See above, p. 233, on grC.3's dependence on grC.1 rather than grC.2.

causamque requisisset tacentibus amplius **minabatur/conabatur**,
discere uolens clamoris causam ... Ut uero cogenti et interminanti;
Ἀριστόβουλος τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπύθετο, καὶ μὴ λεγόντων ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπετείνετο
μαθεῖν... ὡς δὲ ἀπειλοῦντος καὶ βιαζομένου).

While either *minabatur* or *conabatur* could be the earliest reading (*conabantur* is clearly secondary), the grC reading *conabatur* (exerted himself) seems a better fit for ἐπετείνετο (being intent on) than *minabatur* (threatened). With the reading *conabatur*, *tacentibus* would best be construed as an ablative absolute corresponding to the genitive absolute μὴ λεγόντων. Perhaps *minabatur* (found in all mss except w, which has *mirabantur*) is an attempt to simplify the text by taking *tacentibus* as the object of *minabatur*, influenced by the following *interminanti*.

321. ad faciem (εἰς ὄψιν)] ante faciem grC.3–4.

A clearly secondary reading in grC.3–4.

322. Antigonum (Ἀντίγονον)] Antiochum grC.1 (Vi corr. to Antigonum) grC.3 La; Antigonum over erasure C M Ne

With the readings in the erasures almost certainly correcting *Antiochum*, there remain only five grC manuscripts with the correct reading. Four of these are either direct copies or dependent on other mss, with the result that only grC.2 ms Pt would be a possible independent witness for the reading *Antigonum*, and this could easily be a scribe's correction of an obvious error rather than evidence of *Antigonum* in the manuscript's Vorlage.

322. dimisit (εἶασεν)] permisit grC.

genitum in Galilea nutrirī **demisit/permisit**; γενόμενον εἶασεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ τρέφεσθαι.

The grC reading *permisit* is closer to the Greek εἶασεν. The possibility that *dimisit*, found in all non-grC manuscripts except grG ms Werd (*iussit*), is the earliest reading cannot be excluded, since both *dimitto* and εἶω can mean “let go.” See below for discussion of these readings in the context of *Yosippon*.

322. Hyrcano (Ἵρκανόν)] Hyrcani grC.

The grC reading *Hyrcani* is clearly secondary. All manuscript groups except for grC correspond to the Greek in having “he by no means lied to Hyrcanus” as the end of one sentence and “That one took up the rule after the death of Aristobulus” as the beginning of another: *nequaquam mentitus est Hyrcano namque Hyrcani regnum post Aristobuli finem iste suscepit*. (οὐ διεψεύσατο τὸν

Ἵρκανόν. τὴν δὲ βασιλείαν μετὰ τὴν Ἀριστοβούλου τελευτὴν οὗτος παραλαβών). Group C manuscripts end one sentence with “he by no means lied” and begin another with “That one took up the rule of Hyrcanus after the death of Aristobulus.”

3.4.3 Unique Group G Variants

314. arbitror (οἶμαι)] grG; ut arbitror in all other manuscripts.

The earliest reading is unclear. For example, the *LAJ* text in grG ms St provides a number of different translations for parenthetical οἶμαι, for example, *ut reor* (6.59), *reor* (6.41), *ut arbitror* (6.63, 11.39), and *arbitror* (8.409).

317. meum [sanguinem] (τοῦ μόν [αἷμα]]) grG pg; omitted in all other manuscripts (lacuna in grC).

grG clearly has the earliest reading, because “my blood” in grG corresponds to the Greek better than “the blood” in the rest of the manuscript tradition. It is impossible to know what reading would have been in the source of the grC archetype, which would not have had a lacuna.

fratribus et humiliorem multum (καὶ μετριότητα)] grG pg; omitted in all other groups (lacuna in grC).

grG clearly has the earliest reading, since *et humiliorem* corresponds to the Greek. There is no word corresponding to *fratribus* in the Greek, although it is clearly implied. It is impossible to know what reading would have been in the source of the grC archetype, which would not have had a lacuna.

3.4.4 Unique Variants Shared by Group C and Group G

314. sceleris (ὑπὸ τοῦ μύσους)] grG grC pg; celeri grE grH grJ grL grM grN Ba G w hr; omit grP

Groups C and G clearly have the earliest reading.

321. cum mox genitus fuisset odio patris despectus erat et usque ad mortem (συνέβη γεννηθέντι εὐθύς μισηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ)] grG grC pg; omit grE grH grJ grL grM grN grP Ba G w hr.

Here, most significantly, immediately after the lacuna, grC preserves an entire clause also found in grG, but nowhere else in the manuscript tradition. See below for the discussion of the connection of this phrase to the text in *Yosippon*.

322. suos filios] τῶν παίδων. grG (- Ml r) grC; filios suos grE grH grJ grL grN grM L Ba G w Ml r; filios grP pg

This transposition is significant only in so far as it provides another example of grC agreeing with grG against the rest of the manuscript tradition.

3.4.5 Groups C and G and *Sefer Yosippon*

3.4.5.1 *The Lacuna in Group C and Sefer Yosippon*

As can be seen from the synopsis below, *Yosippon* includes a number of details from the story that are missing in all grC manuscripts due to the lacuna. It is clear, therefore, that its sole LAJ source could not have been a grC manuscript.

Sefer Yosippon 31, lines 80–92¹⁵⁴

LAJ 13.316–319 (St)

The king asked again forcefully, as kings do, and said: “Tell me [the reason for] the sound of the people’s cry. And if you do not tell me, you shall surely die!” And they answered and said to the king what had been done, that the blood had been spilled upon the blood of his brother.

316 When they revealed the truth to him as he was coercing and threatening (them),

And the king groaned and cried out and said, “Blessed be the Righteous Judge, the True Judge, and blessed be the Avenger of innocent blood, in that the blood of the wicked was spilled upon the blood of the righteous one who was killed.”

his mind was confounded, struck by his conscience, and groaning from the depths of his chest and with tears, he said “Am I really able to escape the notice of God for such impious and cruel deeds, so that I might not be consumed by swift punishment for the crime of a brother’s murder?”

154 Trans. Bowman, 124, with some modifications. See 13.286.

And the king said to his body,
 “How long, O wicked body, will you
 imprison my soul and not allow it
 to leave and go to the souls of my
 people? Rather cast out my blood,
 and pour it outside, sacrificing it
 to give it to the demons who are
 with Satan to lap it up, for they have
 incited me and driven me in this
 affair to do such things and to kill my
 brother.¹⁵⁵

As he was speaking these words he
 ended his life, died, and was gath-
 ered to his people.

The days that he reigned were one
 full year. All Judah wept for him
 exceedingly, for the Jews loved him
 because he was beneficent and
 victorious. For he vanquished a great
 nation called the Itureans. And he
 circumcised the flesh of their fore-
 skins and he subdued them under
 the yoke of Judah. And the Greeks
 called him Aristobulus Philelleni,
 that is lover of the Greeks.¹⁵⁶

317 How long, shameless body, do you
 hold back my soul from approach-
 ing the shades of my brother and
 mother? Why do you not quickly
 return it, but instead little by little
 I make my blood a libation to the
 murdered.

318 After he had said these things, he
 died in the first year of his reign. He
 was called Philhellene, that is lover
 of the Greeks. Indeed, he benefitted
 his homeland much. For he subdued
 the Itureans and attached most
 of their province to the Jews and
 compelled the ones living in it to be
 circumcised according to the laws of
 the Jews, if they wanted to remain in
 the province.¹⁵⁷

319 Moreover he was of a very tem-
 perate nature and of innate decency,
 according to the testimony Strabo
 presents in the name of Timagenes,

155 This sentence depends on *DEH* 1.8 (Ussani, 12; cf. Flusser’s note on *SY* 31, 84): “Let the daemon not be satisfied by the torture and lingering decay of my innards, the one who pushed me into such abominable bold acts of a savage crime” (*Non uiscerum meorum cruciatibus et lenta tabe daemonium exsaturetur, quod me in tam nefarios ausus saeui facinoris impedit*). I thank Carson Bay for noting this connection and his help in analyzing this passage.

156 Hebrew: אהוב ליונים. Flusser comments on *SY* 32, 90 and *SY* 47, 42 that *SY* at times uses אהוב (“beloved”) for אהוב (“lover”). Bowman (*Sepher Yosippon*, 124n11) uses the literal translation, but comments that “the author prefers the form *ahuv* (= beloved), instead of the literal ‘friend’ (*ahuv*).”

157 *AJ* 13.257 and 13.397.

And the rest of his words and mighty deeds, are they not written in the book of Yosef ben Gurion, in the book of the kings of Rome, and in the book of Strabo of Caphtor¹⁵⁸ and in the book of Timagenes the Jerusalemite.

saying the following: “This man was temperate and exceedingly beneficial to the Jews, for he acquired a province for them and joined part of the people of the Itureans to them by the bond of circumcision.

3.4.5.2 *Manuscript hr, Group C, and Sefer Yosippon*

While all grC manuscripts have a lacuna, ms hr does not. This manuscript is closely related to grC, with a high percentage of variants shared only with grC. In addition, like mss B, La, Pi, and V, it has *AJ* 1–16 and *DEH*. Does this 15th century manuscript, then, preserve an early form of the grC tradition before the material in the lacuna was lost and which might have been *Yosippon*'s source for the material in the lacuna? The variant *Homagenis* in the place of *Timagenis* or *Timagenes*, which connects hr with the unique grN variant *Omagenis* (cf. *Omagenes* in grE and grM) suggests that hr has filled in the lacuna in its grC source with material from a source related to grN, with which it shares a number of distinctive readings. A remnant of the grC source is found in the first interpolation from *BJ* (1.82b) which appears before the sentence immediately preceding the lacuna. However, the second *BJ* interpolation (1.83c–84), which fills in the lacuna in grC, is not found in hr, which has inserted the text omitted in the lacuna from another textual tradition. In any case, the text in hr cannot be related to the source for *Yosippon*, which clearly has a form of *Timagenis*.¹⁵⁹

3.4.5.3 *Sefer Yosippon and Distinctive Group C Readings*

In addition to not having the lacuna, in two places *Yosippon* appears to agree with the rest of the manuscript tradition against two of the uniquely grC readings discussed above.

321. genitum in Galilea nutriri *dimisit*] genitum in Galilea nutriri *permisit* grC

γενόμενον εἶασεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ τρέφεισθαι.

As mentioned above, based on the Greek εἶασεν, *permisit* probably represents the earliest reading. The word וידדוהו (“and he banished him (pushed

¹⁵⁸ See 13.286.

¹⁵⁹ Flusser's emendation תימגיניס is a reasonable conjecture based on the Hebrew manuscript evidence. It is supported by a Genizah fragment of the Arabic (تمنج[يغ]س), which he did not know (Sela, *Introduction and Hebrew Translation*, 176n31).

him away”) in *Yosippon* is closer to *dimisit* (“sent him away”) than to *permisit* (“allowed him”).

322. *Antigonum*] *Antiochum* grC

As mentioned above, the mistake *Antiochum* for *Antigonum*¹⁶⁰ is found in all but seven grC manuscripts. Three of these clearly are corrected over erasures and three others are copies of corrected manuscripts. Given that Antigonus is obviously the correct reading, it is surprising that the mistake has survived in so many manuscripts. The reading אנטיוגוניס in *Yosippon* agrees with the rest of the manuscript tradition against the distinctive grC reading. It is, of course, quite possible that the author of *Yosippon* made the correction from the context.

3.4.5.4 Sefer Yosippon and a Reading Shared by Groups C and G

cum mox genitus fuisset odio patris despectus erat et usque ad mortem] grG grC hr; omitted by all other mss

As mentioned above, the first part of the first sentence in 13.321 (shown in **bold** below) is omitted in all manuscript traditions except Groups G and C.

qui cum mox genitus fuisset odio patris despectus¹⁶¹ **erat et usque ad mortem** numquam ad¹⁶² faciem patris uenit (ὧ καὶ συνέβη γεννηθέντι εὐθὺς μισηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ μηδέποτε εἰς ὄψιν ἀφικέσθαι).

He [Alexander], **as soon as he had been born, had been demeaned by the hatred of his father and up to his death** never came before his father's face.

This sentence introduces the story of God's revelation to Hyrcanus in his sleep that Alexander would be his successor. After the revelation is reported, Josephus comments that Hyrcanus let him be brought up in Galilee (see above).

The *Antiquities* recounts Hyrcanus' revelation from God as a flashback, using it to introduce the reign of Alexander. *Yosippon* transfers the story to where it belongs chronologically, at the end of the reign of Hyrcanus.¹⁶³ It also

160 Note the mistake *Antigonum* for *Antiochum* in grC.2 at 13.276.

161 *dispectus* grC.3–4 hr

162 *ante* grC.3–4 hr

163 In his commentary to this passage, Flusser seems to assume but not cite *AJ* 13.322 as *SY*'s source.

combines the sentence introducing the dream with the sentence picking up the theme at the end of the story.

This one [Alexander] was *hated and despised* in the eyes of *his father* and he sent him away to Galilee, and *he did not see the face of his father* (זה היה שנאו ומתועב בעיני אביו וידיחהו בגליל ולא ראה פני אביו).

Here *Yosippon* clearly depends (in addition to the clause discussed above) on the entire first sentence of 13.321, as is indicated by the italicized phrases. The similarity between *despectus* and מתועב is especially striking. This is particularly significant for this study in that it clearly demonstrates a connection between *Yosippon* and material found exclusively in Groups C and G.

3.4.6 Summary and Conclusions for Case Study 4

AJ 13.313c–322 provides significant data both for the analysis of the grC and grG manuscript traditions and for the connection of those traditions to *Yosippon*.

1. A lacuna comprising five Niese sections (13.315c–320) with insertion of two texts from BJ 1.82–84, which replace the missing material, is a clear marker for identifying the 22 grC manuscripts collated.
2. Because *Yosippon*'s story includes a significant amount of material corresponding to the text missing in the lacuna, a grC manuscript cannot be its only source, although the possibility that *Yosippon* was reading the source of the grC archetype cannot be eliminated.
3. The unique grC reading *permisit* is much less likely to have been in *Yosippon*'s source than the reading *dimisit*, which is closer to the Hebrew וידיחהו.
4. *Yosippon* has *Antigonus* at 13.322 rather than *Antiochus*, found in almost all grC manuscripts, although this might have been an obvious correction made from the context.
5. This passage has three examples of readings shared only by all grG manuscripts: *arbitror* (vs *ut arbitror*), *meum* (not in any other manuscripts), and the phrase *fratribus et humiliores multum* (not in any other manuscripts). The last two examples are clearly the earliest readings.
6. This passage has two examples of readings shared only by all grC and grG manuscripts: *sceleris* (vs *celeris*) and twelve consecutive words at the beginning of 13.320. Based on the Greek being translated, it is clear that both represent the earliest stage of the textual tradition.
7. *Yosippon*'s inclusion of some of the material in 13.320 found only in grC and grG indicates that at least one of *Yosippon*'s sources was a manuscript related to one of these two groups.

4 Summary and Conclusions: Manuscript Groups in Latin *Antiquities* 13, *Sefer Yosippon*, and Moving beyond Flusser's Hypothesis

The purpose of identifying manuscript groups in this chapter has been to provide a tool for taking into account as wide a variety of textual traditions as possible for understanding how *LAJ* 13 was read in different times and places and, in particular, for identifying what textual traditions were used by *Yosippon*. Based on 98 of the 122 manuscripts that include *AJ* 13,¹⁶⁴ nine groups can be identified with a high degree of certainty. Only nine manuscripts remain unclassified, although clearly identifiable affinities with the firmly established groups can be recognized for eight of these. Identifying groups in the passages collated for this study with confidence is made possible both by the large number of unique variants for each group (i.e. variants that only appear in all manuscripts in a group and nowhere else in the manuscript tradition) and by a consistent pattern of the appearance in a particular group of the same secondary variants which are found elsewhere. All the unique variants for each group, with the exception of grC.4b and the 190 unique variants in grP, are listed either in the text (gr.C.1 and grG) or in Appendix 2. The importance of a common pattern of secondary variants is illustrated by the cases of the names of the three Seleucid rulers (Case Study 1) and of the names of cities under Jewish control at the end of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (Case Study 2).

Particular attention has been given to Groups G and C, both because, at this stage of research, they seem most important in reconstructing *Yosippon's LAJ* source and because they provide crucial data for understanding the earliest recoverable layer of the *LAJ* 13 manuscript tradition. Group G, and in particular ms St, has the fewest number of secondary readings to the extent that these can be determined by comparison with the Greek.¹⁶⁵ Group C has a large number of secondary readings found only in that group (68 in all grC manuscripts and many more when the distinctive readings in the grC subgroups are taken into account). There are, however, many readings shared only by grC and grG, most of which represent the earliest text. This leads to the conclusion that grG and grC share a common source for this section of the *Antiquities*. The source would be much closer to the extant grG manuscripts because the grC tradition exhibits so many errors already present in Naples V F 34, the

164 Not all available manuscripts were collated for each case study. 98 were collated for the Seleucid names; 92 for *LAJ* 13.395–397; 66 for *LAJ* 13.314–320; 48 for *LAJ* 13.228–313.

165 Determination of the earliest readings for a critical edition, will, of course, require consideration of other factors, such as the relationship of individual manuscripts and groups to one another and the careful application of text-critical principles to evaluate each variant.

manuscript closest to the grC archetype. These arose primarily from a misreading of the text, e.g. omissions, incorrect word divisions, and mistaking one word for another, such as reading *autem* for *uatem*, and *Oculonem* for *Aulonem* (mistakes in proper names are particularly common and especially helpful in identifying characteristic grC variants). Ideological, literary, or exegetical factors do not appear to play a large role in creating secondary variants in Group C, as opposed to the development of Group P, whose archetype introduced several hundred new readings with the aim of improving the text, or of the closely related manuscripts Pd (“Codex Gigas”) and Prague XXIII.D.121, which have significantly modified the tradition by frequent omissions, paraphrasing, and simplification of the language.

The data and analysis from the passages studied in this chapter confirm the priority of Naples V F 34 within grC based on two pieces of evidence: (1) six places where the uncorrected text has the earliest reading which is corrected by the unique grC reading in all subsequent manuscripts, a phenomenon that has already been noted in other passages;¹⁶⁶ (2) the insertion of material from *LBJ* to fill in part of a lacuna at *LAJ* 13.315c–320, which, along with the lacuna, is found in all grC mss,¹⁶⁷ appears to have first entered the grC manuscript tradition with ms B, since it appears to be added there in a different hand, while it is found in the same hand as the surrounding material in all other early grC mss.¹⁶⁸ While it is highly probable that Naples V F 34 was used by mss C and Vi as their primary source and perhaps by La as a minor source, the use of other sources in the early grC tradition cannot be absolutely ruled out and is clearly demonstrable in the case of Vi. In addition, a better understanding of the early grC tradition will be advanced considerably by a careful paleographical analysis of the manuscripts and their correctors.

4.1 *Sefer Yosippon and the AJ 13 Manuscript Tradition*

The identification of the *AJ* 13 manuscript tradition to which *Yosippon's LAJ* source belonged is complicated by several factors, all illustrated in the commentary section of the four case studies presented in this chapter.

First, even when the Hebrew text follows the Latin closely, becoming, in effect, a translation (something which is not very common), it is often impossible to determine which Latin textual variants would correspond to the Hebrew.

166 See Blatt, 27; Lukas, *Josephus Latinus*, xc–xc1, and a set of variants noted in this chapter for a passage in *AJ* 11 (n. 20 above).

167 With the exception of Ptr, which is missing the page where it would have been located.

168 See above, p. 228.

For example, ויקצף (SY 30, 15/LAJ 13.392) could represent either *iratus* (grC) or *irritatus* (all other groups).

While proper names are very useful in identifying variants that might correspond better to *Yosippon* than others, *Yosippon's* tendency to substitute biblical names for the form of the name in its Latin source makes this impossible in some cases. For example, the name מידבתה (Biblical מידבא) corresponds to *Medaba* or *Midaba* in some LAJ manuscripts, but the distinctive grC readings *Minadabam* (grC1), *Minadam* (grC.2), or *Nadabam* (grC.3–4) in one passage or *Midabalem* (all groups except grG) in another passage do not prove that *Yosippon* was not using a grC manuscript, because *Yosippon* might have simply substituted the biblical names for the form of the name in its source.

A second significant impediment to determining the reading in *Yosippon's* Latin source is the complicated question of determining the readings in the Hebrew text, which is found in multiple recensions in relatively late manuscripts and for which a full analysis of crucial evidence from the numerous fragments from the Cairo Genizah of both Hebrew and Arabic texts is in its early stages.¹⁶⁹ Here it should also be pointed out that in the case of many proper names, all the Hebrew variants are significantly distorted. Flusser often prints a convincing reconstruction of the original Hebrew on the basis of the Latin, but the readings in his text must remain provisional until more evidence is evaluated, not only from the Genizah fragments, but also from the manuscript tradition, from which Flusser reports only a limited number of readings in his critical apparatus.¹⁷⁰

Another difficulty in evaluating the form of the LAJ tradition used by *Yosippon* is the possibility, and in many cases strong probability, that the author has changed a distinctive but difficult reading to fit the narrative. For example, the reading *Antiochum* is found in place of *Antigonus* at 13.322 in all the early grC mss (except ms C where *Antiochum* has been corrected to *Antigonum*). *Sefer Yossipon's* אנטיוגנוס does not necessarily mean it did not use

169 See Dönitz's analysis of the Hebrew manuscript tradition in Chapter 8 of this volume.

170 In the passages analyzed in this chapter, there are two clear cases where his text can be improved on the basis of the Latin: on the basis of the Latin's *legibusque Iudaicis*, תורת יהודה in the manuscript tradition should be read instead of Flusser's emendation ״ תורת ״ (SY 29, 11; see n. 136), and מרשה אשר לאדום should be read instead of מרשה, because the longer reading, found in mss Vat. Ebr 52 and Vat. Borg. 1, in addition to Jerusalem oct. 41280 (the only ms cited for this variant in Flusser's apparatus), corresponds to *Marissam omnemque Idumaeum* in the LAJ manuscript tradition (SY 33, 60; see p. 254).

a grC manuscript, since *Yosippon* might have introduced the correct reading on the basis of the narrative context.¹⁷¹

In spite of these difficulties, there are a number of places where *Yosippon* has a reading for which there are clear cases of corresponding LAJ variants that distinguish specific groups.

For this purpose, proper names often provide the best evidence. The name of the Roman official Manlius, for example, is spelled *Mallio* (ablative of *Mallius*) in all but two grC mss and nowhere else and corresponds unambiguously to the Hebrew מלִיאֹוס.¹⁷² On the other hand, there are a number of readings in the Hebrew text that do not appear to depend on a grC manuscript:¹⁷³ שֵׁשֶׁה חֲדָשִׁים,¹⁷⁴ וידיחהו,¹⁷⁵ אֹלוֹן,¹⁷⁶ and, most significantly, the large lacuna from 13.315c–320, found in all grC mss and nowhere else in the manuscript tradition.¹⁷⁷ The reading מִיגִן presents an interesting case in which a reading cannot depend on a grC manuscript but provides indirect evidence of a connection between *Yosippon* and groups G and C.¹⁷⁸ All grC manuscripts read *Nemega*, but this is obviously the product of an incorrect word division, with the last syllable of the previous word (*Lembaoronemega*) attached to *Mega*. The reading *Mega*, found only in grG and the source of the grC archetype, corresponds more closely to *Yosippon* than do any of the readings in all other mss, which begin with *ma*. This would provide one of several cases of a reading in *Yosippon* corresponding to a Latin variant shared by Groups C and G. Only these two groups, for example, have preserved a clause describing Hyrcanus' hatred of Alexander, whose contact and specific language is paralleled in *Yosippon*.¹⁷⁹ In addition, the variant

171 See the similar example at 13.308, where the queen betrays Antigonus by having a messenger report that he should go to the king “with arms” (*cum armis*) (instead of unarmed) so that he might see their workmanship. All Group C manuscripts read “with armed men” (*cum armatis*), which makes little sense in the context of LAJ, but is presumably influenced by *cum suis armatis* in 13.304. sY’s “with implements of war and dressed in battle armor” (sY 31, 49) clearly agrees with the non-grC mss, but it is possible that the author changed the reading in his source to fit the context.

172 See above, p. 267, for Flusser’s use of this example to identify the group to which he thought sY’s source belonged.

173 In addition to the following list, the reading *Dagon* in LAJ 13.230 (not in one of the Case Studies) provides another example of a place where the reading in sY (דגונה (sY 27, 7 and 10)) cannot depend on a grC manuscript tradition, which has *Nandagon* (C.1–2); *inan Dagon* (C.3); *mandagon* Vt Ve Cr; *mamdagon* M; *madagon* Ne; *magadon* Ptr.

174 *sexto mense* (grC: *intra septem menses*; B^{a-c}: *septem menses*); see above, p. 264.

175 *dimisit* (grC: *permisit*); see above, pp. 278–279.

176 *aulonem* (grC: *oculonem*); see above, p. 256.

177 See above, pp. 276–278.

178 See above, p. 256.

179 See above, pp. 279–280.

Rinocora (13.395) is found only in *Yosippon* and in grC, grG, and grL.1,¹⁸⁰ and the variant *Samogan* (13.255) only in grG, grC.1–3 (-Pi), and grN ms L (which has several distinctive grC readings).¹⁸¹

There are only three variants I have found that might imply a connection between *Yosippon* and a group other than C or G. The reading בַּחֲוֹרֹן must reflect a stage of the tradition later than the reading *Lembaoronem* in grG, when the the first syllable was read as the final syllable in the previous word (*Midabalem*).¹⁸² The *Yosippon* reading with final nun is closer to the reading *Baoronee* found in Groups L, N, and P and ms Ba than to *Baoro* in grC.1–2 or *Baora* in grC.3–4. However, this reading is also possibly connected to the grC manuscript tradition in that *Baorone* would have been the reading in the source of the grC archetype, which would have had the reading *baoronemega* divided correctly. The common omission of the non-essential information in *mediterraneis uero per Idumeam* by sY and Groups E, L.2, N, P, and manuscripts Ba, G, and w could be accidental, but a connection between these related groups and manuscripts with sY is worth exploring, given the reading *Baoronee* mentioned above.¹⁸³

There is one possible connection between *Yosippon* and ms hr, which includes a large number of distinctive grC readings as well as at least as many readings from other groups (most prominently grN). Only *Yosippon* and hr omit the series of names *Samaria*, *Carmelum montem*, and *Itaburium* in 13.396.¹⁸⁴

4.2 *Flusser's Hypothesis and the AJ 13 Manuscript Tradition*

Flusser's hypothesis, described in detail in the first part of this chapter, can now be evaluated in the light of the data and analysis presented in the two following parts, summarized in the first section of the conclusion. For this purpose, it is helpful to distinguish two related elements of the hypothesis: (1) *Yosippon's* source for the material from Josephus was a single manuscript containing AJ 1–16 + DEH; (2) This manuscript was an early representative of a distinct manuscript group with the same format and textual tradition that is found in only four extant manuscripts: B, La, V, and Pi. Flusser implies, but does not state explicitly, that ms hr, which has AJ 1–16 + BJ + DEH, is also part of this group.

180 See above, p. 253.

181 See above, pp. 264–265.

182 See above, pp. 255–256.

183 See above, pp. 253–254.

184 See above, pp. 254–255.

I will begin with the second element of the hypothesis, since that is most directly affected by the new data and analysis presented here.

1. It is a credit to Flusser's intuition and erudition that he was able to identify, on the basis of only two manuscripts (B and La) and two printed editions (1524 Basel edition for the *AJ* and Ussani's critical edition for *DEH*), a variant in *LAJ* and a variant in *DEH* that each point to a connection between *Yosippon* and the manuscript group with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*. Flusser's identification of the reading *Mallio* (ablative of *Mallius*) in *AJ* 13.360 in both B and La can now be extended to include, not only V and Pi, but also 20 manuscripts in the larger group to which they belong, Levenson-Martin grC. Further support of Flusser's hypothesis is found in the omission of the word *Lucii* after *Manlio*, an omission which is also found in all grC manuscripts but nowhere else. Similarly, the reading *cythara* in B and La in *DEH* 5.22.1 is not only found in V and Pi, but also in three of the four other manuscripts belonging to the Cassinese group identified by Ussani.¹⁸⁵ Even more significantly, there is compelling evidence that the large lacuna from *DEH* 1.41.4 to 1.41.9 (Ussani, 97–99), found only in the Cassinese group, accounts for omitted material in *SY* 53, and there is also evidence that the transposition of a large part of Agrippa's speech from *DEH* 2.9 to Eleazar's speech in 5.53, found only in the Cassinese group, is reflected in *SY* 89.¹⁸⁶
2. While this additional evidence confirms a connection between the group represented by the manuscripts with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* and *SY*, it also extends the connection to many more related manuscripts that have only *AJ* or only *DEH*. In the case of *AJ*, the four manuscripts Flusser identifies as forming a distinct group (which he claims Blatt did not recognize), in fact belong to three different subgroups (Levenson-Martin C.1, C.2, C.3), each subgroup including manuscripts with both the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* and *AJ* 1–20.
3. Flusser's hypothesis is severely challenged by places in the four manuscripts (and also in all grC mss) where *Yosippon* has material that cannot be from this group. Furthermore, I have found no unique grC variants except for *Mallio* and the omission of *Lucii* immediately following it in the passages collated for this chapter that correspond to a reading in *Yosippon*. However, a close comparison of the Hebrew and Latin texts, using the large lists of Group C variants presented here for these

185 The fragmentary manuscript Compact VIII does not appear to have preserved the passage in which this reading occurs.

186 See Appendix 5 for discussion of *Sefer Yosippon* and the *DEH* Cassinese manuscript tradition.

Antiquities sections, might expose more examples. And of course, the analysis needs to be extended to the rest of the *Antiquities* passages that parallel *Yosippon*.

4. The text-tradition element of Flusser's hypothesis can be saved by assuming that *Yosippon* used the source of the grC archetype. This would not, for example, have had the lacuna at 13.315c–320, and would have had the correct form of the proper names (which correspond to the names in *Yosippon*) before they became distorted already in Naples V F 34, the manuscript with the earliest grC readings.
5. Fortunately, there is significant evidence in the passages collated for this chapter that can account both for the clearly grC and the clearly non-grC readings that can be identified in *Yosippon*. In four places there is evidence of a correspondence between the combination grC + grG and SY, summarized in the earlier part of these conclusions. As we have also seen, in a number of other places, grC + grG share significant readings found only in manuscripts of those groups, and in almost all cases these groups alone preserve the earliest reading.¹⁸⁷ Flusser's hypothesis could then be refined by specifying that *Yosippon's LAJ* source was not a grC manuscript (and therefore not a mss like B, La, V, and Pi) but the grC archetype's *source*, which in fact was very close to grG. This is not surprising, because in the passages collated here, grG consistently has the earliest readings. *Yosippon* then would have had access to an early form of the text before a large number of secondary readings had been introduced into the distinctive grC manuscript tradition. The South Italian location of this development is supported by the fact that the earliest grC manuscripts come from Benevento or Naples (B) and Monte Cassino (C and La). In other words, stripped of the unique grC readings, almost all of which represent various kinds of misreadings, the *AJ* 13 grC manuscript tradition has preserved an early form of the text very close to grG. It should be noted that the large number of secondary readings in grC manuscripts only appears to emerge fully after *AJ* 1–12. The high value Blatt puts on these "Italian" manuscripts in general and Naples V F 34 in particular (which he puts in his α family) is explained by the fact that his analysis is based primarily on the first half of *AJ*.¹⁸⁸
6. Even though distinctive variants in the four manuscripts identified by Flusser clearly represent three different grC subgroups, the fact that they all have the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* indicates a specific connection among

187 See above, pp. 242–243 for a few exceptions.

188 See Levenson and Martin, "Revised Classification," 82–85 for evidence of the very early textual form of grC.1 manuscript B in a passage from *LAJ* 6.

them. According to the analysis in this chapter, the connection between grC.3 mss V and Pi is best explained by their *AJ* texts up through *AJ* 16 depending on a manuscript with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*, from which only the last page of *AJ* and the *DEH* is extant (V^2). Pi then would depend on V^2 for its *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* format. Manuscript V^2 is more likely to depend on B (grC.1) than on La (grC.2), because grC.3 (Pi and V) has none of the 40 unique variants that mark grC.2, indicating it ultimately depends on grC.1 rather than grC.2. In addition, the lacuna at 13.315–20 in Pi and V is marked by a number of blank lines as in B, while La has a continuous text without any marking of the lacuna.¹⁸⁹ On the one hand, there are a few variants (including a lacuna) where there is a clear connection of manuscript La (but not any of the other grC.2 manuscripts) with grC.3 mss.¹⁹⁰ While this might indicate a common source, it is also possible that grC.3 used ms La directly as a supplementary source.¹⁹¹ In this case, grC.3 could have been aware of the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* in both B and La. The dependence of La on B is certainly the most likely explanation for their common *format*; however, there is no clear direct connection between the *texts* of the two manuscripts, since there are 38 variants for which La agrees with ms C against B, and only a few minor and possibly accidental agreements of La and B against C.

7. The probability that *Yosippon* depended on the common *source* of the grG and grC archetypes for its *AJ* 13 source and that it used a *DEH* text from the Cassinese group does not prove that these were found together in one volume with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*. Aside from the complicated question of the Embassy to Gaius, which ultimately (though not necessarily directly) depends on *AJ* 18, it is possible that *Yosippon* simply chose to follow *DEH* as its primary source after reporting the description of Herod's building of the temple just as the creator of the edition with *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* decided to jump from *AJ* to *DEH* at a slightly later point in the historical narrative. In fact, *DEH* becomes the primary source for *Yosippon* already at the beginning of *AJ* 16. That the author of *Yosippon* was aware of and had at least looked at more than one work of Josephus is clear from the comments at the end of *SY* 50, whose narrative ends with material corresponding to *AJ* 15. Here the author explicitly acknowledges that Josephus wrote about the building of Herod's temple in multiple

189 See above, p. 233.

190 See above, p. 233.

191 See above, p. 233.

books, one of which he calls the *Wars of the Jews*. This appears to be different from the source of his own account, which is clearly based on *L AJ*. If, as Flusser reasonably suggests, this is a reference to *DEH*, which would become *Yosippon's* main source in *SY* 51, the author of *Yosippon* would have been aware that *L AJ* and *DEH* were two separate works, whether or not they might have been found in one manuscript.¹⁹² It is also interesting to note that whatever form of the history of Josephus Duke John III of Naples had ordered for his library in the second half of the 10th century (which Lowe identified as *BJ* manuscript Monte Cassino 123), the three codices presented as a gift to the episcopal library of Naples by Sergius I in the 9th century most probably represented three different texts (rather than three copies of the same text) such as *L AJ*, *DEH*, and *LBJ* or perhaps *AJ* 1–12, *AJ* 13–20, and either *DEH* or *LBJ*.¹⁹³ The possibility that *Yosippon* had access to *AJ* (at least through *AJ* 16) and *DEH* as separate manuscripts or considered them separate works even if they were in one manuscript is by no means more probable than Flusser's model of one manuscript, which has the advantage of being a simpler hypothesis. It is raised here only as a reminder that other models might account for the certain data that we have that *Yosippon* turns to *DEH* as its primary source at the beginning part of *SY* 51.¹⁹⁴

8. Flusser's hypothesis, although based on an extremely narrow textual base (as he readily acknowledged), remains an important starting point for identifying the source of the Latin Josephus tradition used by *Yosippon*. His correct identification of the readings *Mallio* and *cythara* as pointing to a connection between *Yosippon* and a particular group of manuscripts was remarkable given the resources with which he was working. Not surprisingly, there are a number of places where he can be corrected, such as his description and/or dating of several key manuscripts (Vat. lat. 1998, Monte Cassino 124, Naples V F 34), his failure to fully appreciate the importance of Ussani's distinctive "Cassinense" group of *DEH* for the study of *Yosippon*, his dismissal of Blatt's analysis of the relationship of Monte Cassino 124 and Plut. 66.1, leading him to miss the fact that his four manuscripts actually belong to three different subgroups, and his overlooking

192 Of course, it is also possible that *Wars of the Jews* refers to the Latin *War* (*LBJ*), whose description of Herod's temple is considerably more detailed than that in *DEH*.

193 See above, pp. 229–230.

194 This does not rule out the possibility of *SY* using *LBJ* as a supplement to *DEH* in the same ways that *SY* used *DEH* as a supplement to *L AJ* before turning to *DEH* as its main source.

the fact that another manuscript, Clm 15841, includes the *Antiquities* and the *DEH* in one volume.

4.3 *Practical Considerations: What LAJ Manuscripts Should Be Consulted for Comparison with Sefer Yosippon?*

The practical question of which Latin Josephus manuscripts should be consulted as reliable guides to the text of *Yosippon's* source cannot be answered definitively based on the analysis in this chapter, which, as far as I am aware, represents the first comprehensive exploration of the relationship between *Sefer Yosippon* and the Latin manuscript tradition of *AJ* and *DEH*.

One thing, however, is very clear from the data and analysis presented here: the sole use of the manuscripts B, La, V, and/or Pi for this purpose would be a grave mistake. The theoretical question of whether these manuscripts are from the same group as *Yosippon's* Latin source is irrelevant to the practical question of which manuscripts should be consulted because the *AJ* 13 text of all grC manuscripts, the group to which these manuscripts belong, has a large number of unique omissions and unique secondary readings, several of which have been shown here to differ from the Latin text that *Yosippon* must have been using. It is possible and even likely that *Yosippon* was using a textual tradition that was closely related to the source for the grC archetype, into which so many errors were first introduced. However, the text of that source, which would not have contained most of the errors characterizing so many grC manuscripts, can only be reconstructed from the text of manuscripts that are not part of grC.

At this point in research, I would recommend consultation of the following *LAJ* manuscripts to cover the breadth of the *LAJ* manuscript tradition: St (grG), B (grC.1), and Sa (grL.1), L (grN), Adm (grL.2), Cl (grE), El (grH), Alb (grJ), Vat (grM), cf (grP), and the unclassified manuscripts Ba, hr, and pg. I fully expect that these recommendations will change on the basis of further research. There is no reason to consult the 1524 Basel edition. The primary manuscripts on which the *LAJ* text in that edition is ultimately based are known (and available online): grG ms Werd and grL.1 ms b. Since it is impossible to reconstruct from the 1524 Basel edition which manuscript is the basis of a particular reading and since the texts in these two manuscripts are not the earliest representatives of their respective groups, the 1524 Basel edition is inadequate and often misleading for comparison with *Yosippon*.¹⁹⁵ This also means that Flusser's Latin citations from *LAJ* cannot always be relied upon.

195 In addition to being ultimately based on these two manuscripts (through the 1524 Cologne edition), the 1524 Basel edition also incorporated some readings from the Lübeck edition (or one of the editions based on it), which clearly depended on a grJ manuscript.

The question of which Latin manuscripts of *DEH* to consult is much easier to answer. In addition to the limited apparatus in Ussani's edition, B, La (which has a major lacuna), V, and Pi should certainly be consulted, but so should the other four representatives of Ussani's Cassinese group: Vat. lat. 1987, Plut. 67.17, Plut. 89.sup.15, and the fragmentary Monte Cassino Compact. VIII (70 folio pages).¹⁹⁶

Finally, it should be stressed that the collection and analysis of data in this chapter represent only an initial attempt to better understand the textual history of Books 13, 14, and 15 of the Latin *Antiquities* and its relationship to *Sefer Yosippon*. The next step is the production of editions and synopses based on them that will attend both to the identification of the earliest readings and to the need to provide resources for those wanting to understand how the text was read in a variety of times and places. Only fully collaborative and interdisciplinary research will make possible the data collection and careful analysis of individual passages required to produce these fundamental tools for studying two texts which have played such an important role for so long in shaping the understanding of Jewish history in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

196 Additional fragments from the same manuscript are found in Monte Cassino Compact. III and in the Schøyen Collection, MS. 183 (*DEH* 1.2.10; 3.5; 1.1.7, 9)

Appendix 1: Collated Manuscripts

Siglum ^a	Manuscript	Contents	Date	Blatt ^b	Levenson–Martin
Adm	Admont 71/72	71: <i>AJ</i> 1–12; <i>BJ</i> pref.; <i>AJ</i> 13; 72: <i>AJ</i> 14–20; <i>BJ</i> 1–2	12	ρ	L.2
al	BL Add. 22859/22860	22859: <i>AJ</i> 1–11; 22860: <i>AJ</i> 12–20	13	ξ	E
Alb	BL Royal 13 D vi/vii	vi: <i>AJ</i> 1–14; vii: 15–20; <i>BJ</i>	12	ω	J
Aq	Douai 877	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12	φ	H
At	Boulogne-sur-mer 138	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i> (Blatt lists only <i>AJ</i>)	12	σ	H
Aus	Vich 162	<i>AJ</i>	14	φ	M
B	BN Naples V.F. 34	<i>AJ</i> 1–16, 379; <i>DEH</i> 1.1.–5.40.1	11	α	C.1
b	BSB Clm 4510	<i>AJ</i>	12/13	ρ	L.1
Ba	Bamberg 78	<i>AJ</i>	9	φ	Unclassified
Br	Brussels BR II 991	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i> 1–7.433	12/13	φ	H
C	Montecassino 124	<i>AJ</i>	11	β	C.2
c	Cambrai 680	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12/13	φ	J
Ca	Cambridge Dd I 1,4	I: <i>AJ</i> 1.68–14; II (St. Johns A 8): <i>AJ</i> 15–20, <i>BJ</i>	12	ω	J
Cb	BL Add. 15280	<i>AJ</i> 1–20; <i>BJ</i>	13	φ	H/J
cf	Vat. lat. 1996	<i>AJ</i> 1.34– <i>AJ</i> 14	14	χ	P
Cl	Troyes 137	<i>AJ</i>	12	σ	E
Cn	Klosterneuburg	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12	σ	L.2
Cor	BnF 16730	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12	φ	H
Cov	BL Harley 5116	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	14	ω	J
Cp	BnF 16941	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	13	ξ	H

a Blatt's ms sigla with abbreviated shelfmark for mss not in Blatt.

b Blatt's group sigla are included because they are frequently cited and as an acknowledgement of the work of a scholar who laid the foundation for all future work on the Latin *Antiquities*. His families, however, in many places do not fit the data presented in this chapter.

(cont.)

Siglum	Manuscript	Contents	Date	Blatt	Levenson–Martin
Cr	BML Plut. 19sin.01	<i>AJ</i> (lacunae in 6–11; 17–20 later hand); <i>CA</i>	11/12	ε	C.4a
D	Cologne Dom 162/163	162: <i>AJ</i> 1–4, 8–13; 163: <i>AJ</i> 14–20; <i>BJ</i>	12	σ	G
d	NYC Morgan 533/534	533: <i>AJ</i> 1–15; 534: <i>AJ</i> 16–20; <i>BJ</i>	13	ν	J
Du	Durham B.11.1	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12	ω	J
El	Valenciennes 546	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	11/12	φ	H
Fl	BL Harley 3699	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>CA</i>	1478	ζ	C.4b
G	Brussels 5571/2	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	11/12	σ	Unclassified
H	Berlin Ham. 359	<i>AJ</i> 1–15.416	12	χ	H
h	BL Harley 4960–4963	4960: <i>AJ</i> 1–7; 4961: 8–13; 4962: 14–20; <i>CA</i> ; 4963: <i>BJ</i>	1457	σ	H/J
Ha	Valenciennes 547	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12	φ	H
hr	BL Harley 3691	<i>AJ</i> 1–16; <i>BJ</i> 1.552–2.373; 5.366–7.455; <i>DEH</i>	15	α	Unclassified
L	BML Plut. 66.2	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>CA</i> 1–2; <i>BJ</i> 1.1–276	11	α	N
l	BML Plut. 66.3	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>CA</i> 1–2	15	ε	C.4a
La	BML Plut. 66.1	<i>AJ</i> 1–16; <i>DEH</i>	11	β	C.2
Lamp	Graz 105	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12	ρ	L.2
Lau	BML Plut. 66.5/66.6	<i>AJ</i> 1–18.3; 18–20, <i>BJ</i>	12	χ	G
ld	BL Add Royal 13 E viii	<i>AJ</i> 1–20; <i>BJ</i>	13	ω	H/J
li	Lincoln 145	<i>AJ</i> (many lacunae); <i>BJ</i>	12	ω	J
Ly	Rouen 1124/1125	<i>AJ</i> 1–14	12	ω	J
M	BML San Marco 385	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>CA</i> 1	11/12	ε	C.4a
Mir	Winchester ms. 6	<i>AJ</i> 1–20.268	12/13	ω	J
Mk	Cambridge, Trinity Hall 4	<i>AJ</i> 1–20	12	ω	J
Ml	Cesana S 11.2	<i>AJ</i> 1–20; <i>CA</i>	15	φ	G
Mn	Manchester Ryland's 40	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12	φ	H
mz	Mazarine 1581	<i>AJ</i>	16	ω	J
n	BnF 16731	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12	ξ	J

(cont.)

Siglum	Manuscript	Contents	Date	Blatt	Levenson–Martin
Ne	BnF 5045	Vol. 1: <i>AJ</i> 1–12; Vol. 2: <i>AJ</i> 13–20; <i>BJ</i> 1.1–351; <i>BJ</i> 4.325–7.455	12	ζ	C.4a (uncorr) C.4b (corr) ^a
No	Novara 28 (xvii)	<i>AJ</i>	11	σ	N
Nv	BL Harley 3883	<i>AJ</i>	12	ξ	E
O	Vat. Otto. lat. 84	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>CA</i>	13/14	σ	C
p	BnF 5047	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	12/13	σ	P
Pa	BnF 5049	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i> ; <i>CA</i>	12/13	φ	H
pa	BnF 5050	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i> 1.1–351; <i>BJ</i> 4.325–7.455	13/14	ζ	C.4b
Pal	Vat. Pal. lat. 815	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i> ; <i>CA</i>	15	σ	N
par	BnF 5051	<i>AJ</i>	15	η	C.4a
pat	BnF 8835	<i>AJ</i>	15	η	C.4a
Pd	Stockholm A 148 (Codex Gigas)	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	13	ρ	L.2
Pi	Pisa 20	<i>AJ</i> 1–16; <i>DEH</i>	13	γ	C.3
pg	Leipzig 782/783	<i>AJ</i> 1–20	12	χ	Unclassified
Pr	Prague, NK ČR, XIV.A.14	<i>AJ</i> 1–13	13	φ	Unclassified
Prs	BnF 8959	<i>AJ</i> 1–17; <i>BJ</i> 1–7; <i>AJ</i> 18–20	12	σ	P
Pt	Bas. s. Petri A 37	<i>AJ</i>	12/13	β	C.2
Ptr	Bas. s. Petri A 39	<i>AJ</i> 1.207–20.268 (missing 13.314–333); <i>BJ</i> 1.1–351; 4.325–5.390	11/12	σ	C
R	Reims 1343, 1344, 1345	1343: <i>AJ</i> 1–10; 1344: 11–20; 1345: <i>BJ</i>	12	ν	H
r	Vat. Reg. 900	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	15	χ	G
Re	Reims 1341, 1342	1341: <i>AJ</i> 1–12; 1342: 13–20; <i>BJ</i>	12	φ	H
re	Reims 1347, 1348	<i>AJ</i> 11–20; <i>BJ</i>	14	ξ	H
Rem	Reims 1346	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i>	13	φ	H
rg	Vat. Reg. lat. 1935	<i>AJ</i>	15	ξ	M
Sa	BSB Clm 15841	<i>AJ</i> ; <i>BJ</i> ; <i>DEH</i>	12/13	ρ	L.1

^a See Bader's analysis of Ne's 12th and 13th century correctors (Josephus Latinus, 21–23).

(cont.)

Siglum	Manuscript	Contents	Date	Blatt	Levenson–Martin
Sch	BSB Clm 17404	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	13	ρ	L.1
Sec	Graz 132	<i>AJ 1–12, BJ pref., AJ 13</i>	12	ρ	L.2
Si	Charleville 203/1 & 2	<i>AJ 1.205–12; 14–20; BJ 1–7.436</i>	12/13	φ	H
Sr	BnF 15427	<i>AJ 1–20 (missing 13.279–311)</i>	12	η	C.4a
St	Brussels II 1179	<i>AJ 1–20; BJ</i>	11	χ	G
t	BSB Clm 18003	<i>AJ 10–20</i>	11	ρ	L.1
Tr	Chantilly, 774–775	<i>AJ 1–13; AJ 14–20, BJ</i>	12	φ	G
U	BnF NAL 2453	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	12	ω	J
u	Vat. Urb. lat. 400	<i>AJ</i>	15	α	N
V	Vat. lat. 1998	(1) <i>AJ 1–20 (V¹); (2) AJ 16.368–394 (V²); DEH</i>	11/12	γ	C.3
v	Vat. lat. 1995	<i>AJ</i>	15	β	C.2
Vat	Vat. 1997	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	12	φ	M
Ve	Vercelli 13	<i>AJ</i>	11	η	C.4a
ve	Berlin 625	<i>AJ; CA; BJ</i>	14	α	N
Vi	BnF 5048	<i>AJ</i>	11 ^{end}	α	C.1
vl	Valencia Bibl. Cat. 29	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	12	ω	J
Vn	Vienna: Pal. Lat. 333	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	14	ρ	L.2
Vt	Vat. lat. 7015	<i>AJ; BJ 1.1–351; 4.325–7.455</i>	13	η	C.4a
vt	Vat. lat. 8698	<i>AJ</i>	14/15	φ	M
w	Fulda 100 C 1	<i>AJ 1–13</i>	12	ι	Unclassified
Werd	Berlin 226	<i>AJ 1–20; BJ</i>	12	χ	G
z	Zwettl 25	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	12	ρ	L.2
	Cologne Hist. Archiv. Best 7010	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	12		G
	BML Plut. 18sin.10	<i>AJ; CA</i>	15		C.4b
	Copenhagen GKS 1571	<i>AJ 13–20</i>	12		G
	Madrid, BNE, 10270	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	15		M
	Cremona, Fondo Civico 1	<i>AJ; BJ</i>	1284		P
	Prague, NK ČR, XXIII.D.121	<i>AJ 1–13</i>	15		L.2

Appendix 2: Unique Variants for Each Group

Unique readings for grG, all grC manuscripts, grC.1–2, and grC.1–3 are listed on pp. 237–238, 242–242. Variants for grC.4b (Corrected text of Ne followed by its copies pa and Plut.18sim10) are not listed here.

Group C.2

230. hinc] hic; 231. quos] quod; reputaretur] deputaretur; 232. mater ... manus] manus ... mater; hostes] hostem; 240. citius] Hyrcanus; 241. proiectos] proiectas; saeuissimis] saeuissimus; 242. argentea] artea (- La); 256. similitudinem] similitudine (-Pt v); principis] principi (-La); 254. Medaba] Minadam; 259. Romanorum] omitted; 260. omnem senatum] senatum omne; 261. publicis] puplicis (-Pt v: pu^{eis}); rebus habuerunt] (p)rebuerunt (v: rehabuerunt); Zora uel] Zoarobabel; 265. festinabitur] festinauit; 267. exercitum] exercitu; malitiam] malitia (-Pt); 269. amicitiam] amicitia (-Pt v); 273. post] sine post; summam] summa (-Pt v); 275. qualiter] quatenus; obsidebat] obsedebat; 276. circumdedisset] circumdedissent r; Antiochum] Antigonom; 278. a] omit; Samariae] marie; 283. processisset] processissent (La processent); 285. sacrarii] sacrari; tradidisset] tradisset (-Pt v^{p.c.}); 287. permansere] permansere vl; reginam] regineam (-Pt v); 288. eum pati] eupati; dixissent] dixisset; 292. captiuam] captiua (-Pt v); 293. scientibus] scriptibus; fecisse] fecisset; 294] ad mensuram] ad deum si iram; 302] amans] clamans; altercantem] altercante; uinculis] a uinculis; 307. fratrem autem] autem fratrem; intraret] intrare; 309. Stratonis] Startoris; peruenisset] peruenisse; 311. hoc] his (Pt is)

Group C.3

228. Hyrcanus] Hycanum; 230. et] omit; 232. deperirent] deperiret; 234. protractus] prostratus La Ptr hr; 236. sexagesima] sexagesimo; 247. obsidibus] obsidionibus hr L; 257. Marisso] Matriso (Pi corr. from Mariso); 260. et] omit; Alexandri] Alexandrii; 262. per Antiochum] Antiochum; 267. malitiam] militiam; 269. cum] omit; 270. congregasse] congregasset; 271. terminarat] terminaret; 275. nominata] anominata; 282. solus] solo; 283. constat euenisse] constat euenisset; 285. Ananiam] Ammaniam; 291. sacerdotii et tantum sufficiat tibi populi regere magistratum] omitted La; 292. captiuam] captam; 293. existit] extitit; 294. uestra sententia] uestram sententiam; 204. uidebatur] uidebantur; potuisset] potuissent; 299. rebus] regibus; 309. ornatum] ornamentum; 313. haec] hoc

Group C.4

231. obsidionis] obsidioni (- Sr par); 232. ne] omitted (-Sr par); sed] omitted; deperirent] deperire (-Sr); 234. uacant] uocant (- Vt Sr par) hr; obseruant] obseruabant (- Vt) hr; 236. Olympiade] Olympi de (-Sr par pat); 237. domabatur] domabitur; 240. necessariis]

necessarius (- Cr); 244. hunc] hic (- Sr par); animaduertens] auertens V; 247. erat] erant (- Vt par) hr; 254. ciuitates] ciuitatem Pi Ptr hr (- Ne); inparatas] inparatus inparatas (-Sr par); 255. ac Garizin gentemque] narzari ingentemque (-Sr par); 271. nuncupatur] non cupabatur (Ne Sr: nuncupabatur; - par); 273. ut (amicus)] omitted; quando] quo modo (-Sr par); Iudeam] Iudea (-Cr par); 276. Aristobolum] eristobolum (-Cr Sr par); 279. ad] a hr L (- par); 280. Samariae] Samarei - par); 281. uallum] uallium Ptr; 282. audisse] audisset Ptr hr; 285. Ptolomeum] omitted (-par) hr; Ananiam] Amaniam Ptr; templum aedificasse] aedificasse templum hr; 287. et Ananiam] eaniam (- par); Strabon] trabon (- par); 293. ualde] uel de hr; 294. non (uidebatur)] omitted (-Vt par) hr; morte] mortem (-Ne par); quas] quia hr; 297. successione] sucessionem (-Cr); 303. ammittens] amittens (- par); 304. expeditione] expectatione (- par) hr; 305. occasionem se cepisse pompam Antigoni putauerant et uictoriam] omitted (-Vt par); 307. fratrem autem] fratrem ante (-Ne par; M fratrum ante); 313. esset] esse (-Ne Sr par); maritima] maritana (- par; Ne maritania); uatem hoc] autem per hoc (Ne^{a.c.?}); 322. Deus] deo (- Sr par); 395. Rinocora] Rinocoram (- Cr Sr par; omit pat) hr

Group C.3-4

229. portam] omit C.3 Ptr; 230. hostem] hostes Ptr hr; amore] amorem (-Ne Vt par); 233. tormentis] tormentum Ptr (Ne?); impetum] omit Vi Ptr; 236. centesima] centesimo; secunda] secundo; 237. propter] omit; conclusit] concludit Ptr hr; 240 consumendis] consumendi hr; 242. ad (Antiochum)] omit; indutias] indutiam; sacrificium] ad sacrificium Vi Ptr hr b; magnificentissimum] omit Ptr; 243. ius] uis (- Sr); 245. erga] circa; 251. legitimum] legitimum sic; 255. Medaba] Nadabam hr (Nabadam) Ptr (Minadabam); 257. ciuitates] ciuitatem Ptr hr; Marisso] Mariso (-V) Ptr No hr; 260. Februarias] Februarius; 262. subiecti sint] subiecti sunt hr; 265. uacuerit] uacauerit; 266. pecunias eis publicas] et pecunias eis publicas Ptr (ei); 271. obuius] ob huius Ptr (-Sr par); Antiochi] hochi Ptr (bochi); duxisse] duxisset (Vt dixisse); 275. ad eam] ad eum (- Sr par M); 279. Epicrati] Epigrati Ptr hr; 280. locis] omit Ptr hr L; Epichrates] Epigratis Ptr hr Bo; 287. Cleopatram] Cleopatrae; 289. scitis] sitis L No (-par); 294. poenae] plene La; 295. putabat] putat Ptr hr; 303. uidebatur] uidebantur (-Vt); 311. futura] futurae hr (-Ne); 312. mortem] morte La Ptr hr; 313. perturbauit] turbauit; 315. causamque] causam; 321. despectus] dispectus hr; ad] ante hr; 322. nutrir]i] nutrire p Adm; 395. Appolloniam] Apollonium; 397. Lembaoronem] Baora Pt

Group E

230. in aliis] malis pg; 231. subsidia] subsidii Vat; 241. muros] interminis uel inter muros; miserabiliter] mirabiliter (-Nv); 245. modestiam] modestia; suadentium] suadentum (-Nv); 246. ciuitate] ciuitatem Adm; 250. exercitum] exercitus; 253. eum] omitted; eo] eum Vat; 255. ac Garizin] et argarizim; 260. et Diodorus] et liodorus; 261. Zora] Dora; 273. collegit] colligens; 276. adiutorem Antiochum] Antiochum adiutorem; 284.

agebant] degebant; 285. et] ordinauit et; 289. deo et uobis] uobis et deo; 291. uis] uelis; depone] deponere (al depone); 299. annis] annos; 300. praedicabat] praedicebat; sentiamus] sciamus; 312. iam] omitted ve; dubitare] dubitari Aus; 314. possedit] possidebat; quod] quem Ml; 318. Filellin] Filelnin; 320. et] omitted; 395. Rinocorura] Rinocoron; 396. Gaulanitidem] Gauladitidem

Group H

245. conuersationem] conuersationemque hr; 248. deposuisset] deposuit; 259. ipsos] eos; 268. tentus] tentusque

Group J

230. in Hiericho] omit; 231. quantum] cum (vl omits); 243. duxerunt] adduxerunt; 248. deposuisset] deposuit et Bo; 250. eum] omitted; 260. hoc] omitted Iudaeorum] omitted; 269. Gryppi] Erippi Pa h; 271. erat] fuerat; Graspi] Gaspi (vl Iaspi); 273. ipse] omitted; Zebennei] Zabinnei (-vl); 282. vocem] omitted; 285. templum] omitted (vl templum); sacrarii] omitted; 289. nimis] minus pg; 290. me] omitted; 297] traditae] traditae non (vl traditae); 299. triginta uno] uiginti et uno; 311. et Iudam] omitted; 312. uero stadiis] uero Stratonis; 317. interemptis] interempti; 319. pudoris] prudentis; 320. ligatos] omitted; 322] apparuisset ei] ei apparuisset; 395. Rafiam] Rafia; 396. (H)itaburium] T(h)abirium; 397. Hanc etiam destruxit cum non promisissent habitantes in ea patrios Iudaeorum se mores suscipere. Alias quoque Syriae ciduitates euerterunt] omitted

Group L

228. misit] misit ut; occidi] apprehenderet; 233. uero] ergo L.1; 234. obsidendi] obsidionis; 239. si uero] si L.2; praesensisse]; praesentes esse L.1; 240. ut] sed L.2; 241. animam] animas Ml; 242. autem] itaque L.1; 243. in] omitted; exercitum] exercitui; 245. capi] capere; dissonantem] dissolutis L.2; 250. testis est] est testis L.1; 251. haec quidem] quidem haec; 252. institit] instabat; uel (2nd)] omitted L.2; 255. Medaba] Medabam; ac Garizin] Garizim; 257. Abora cum] Aboracum Mn; 262. cassentur] censeantur L.1; 263. ut] omit L.1; recipientur] recipient; 265. festinabitur] festinabit L.1; 266. et] ex L.1; consultum] consultu L.1; 273. Antiochi mortem] mortem Antiochi L.1; 275. Sebastia] Sebasta L.2; Marisenos] Marissenos L.1 pg; 277. secundo necessitatis] secundo necessitate coacti L.1; 279. circumuentus] circumuentos; 281. quisquam illic fuisse] fuisse illic quisquam L.1; 283. constat euenisse] constanter euenit; 286. Cappadox] Capadocus pg; 287. eo] eis; 288. male] mala L.1; pati ualebant] ualebant pati; 290. ornarum] ornatum esse; 291. tunc] tum; 294. quae potuisset] omit L.1 cf Ba; modesti]

molesti L.1; 295. putabat] omitted L.1; 301. Babylonia] Babylonica Ml; 302. de] pro L.1; omitted L.2; 303. ammittens] admittente; 308. cum] omitted Ml; contraria] contra L.1 L; frater] quia frater; 312. est mihi] est mihi inquit; distabat sexcentis] sexcentis distabat L.1; uaticinatio] uaticinatione; regni] regni sui L.1; 318. Iudaicas] Mosaicas Ba r; 321. dicitur fuisse] fuisse dicitur L.1 r; 395. Rinocorura L.2 (Pd Rinocoruram; PragXXIII.D.121 Rinocoruca); 397. destruxit] destruxerunt

Group M

232. aestimans] extimans; 245. eis conuersationem] conuersationem eis; 256. Sanabalath] Sannabalath pg; 262. ut etiam] et ut etiam al; 263] reuerterentur] reuertentur (-Aus); 271. hic] hoc; 276. ergo] uero; 277. Samaritae] compulsu Samarite; 281] iudicaret] indicaret; 288. eum pati] pati eum; 316. consumerer] consumeret (-Aus); 396] (H)itaburium] Thabiricum (Aus Bithabericum)

Group N

234. protractus] protactis; 234. obsidendi] obsidenti Ba G; 235. ptolemeus] tholomeus (-No); 241. muros] interminos; 255. ac Garizin] agarizin Ba G; 260. Lucii] Luci Ba pg; 265. expendendas] expetendas; 269. tandem] tanto; 283. constat euenisse] constanter euenisset; 286. istis] is (ve eis; No his); 286. Cappadox] Capadorum Ba G; 293. omnibus] in omnibus (-No); 300. praescientiam] praesentiam (-No) hr; 305. sublimis] in sublimis Ba w hr; 312. transierat] transiebat (-No); 319. Timagenis] Omagenis hr (Homagenis); 396. Gaulanitidem] Gaulantidem Ba G

Group P (selections from 190 unique readings)

229. sensisset] sentiens audisset; euasit] fugiens euasit; de populo propter] benivolentiam populi ob; 30. accipiens] sumens; 247. talenta] auri talenta; 254. pugnatoribus] a bellatoribus; 255. ac Garizin] et Garizim pg; 268. interiit] ueneno interiit; 269. accipiens et] adeptus; 274. igitur] itaque Hyrcanus; 277. currens] fugiens mortis; 278. terrae] patriae; 289. pasceret] aleret; 290. peccantem] deuiantem; 305. dilatabant] detrahebant; 308. eorum facturum] decorem eorum; 309. tenebroso] obscure; 314. possedit] inuasit; 320. ordinauit] consuit

Appendix 3: AJ 13.228–322: Text of Brussels, Bibliothèque royale 11 1179 (St; Group G) with Variants from Naples, Biblioteca nazionale di Napoli, VF 34 (B; Group C.1), and Valenciennes, Bibliothèque de la ville 40 (El; Group H)¹

Murder of Simon by His Son-in-Law Ptolemy and Pursuit of Hyrcanus

[228] XIV. Igitur annis octo principatum sacerdotii Iudaeorum regens,² moritur in conuiuio per insidias Ptolomei generi. Et³ uxorem eius cum duobus filiis capiens et uinctos habens, misit tertium Iohannem, qui et Hyrcanus uocabatur, occidi. [229] Quod cum sensisset iuuenis, euasit periculum et ad ciuitatem festinauit, confidens de populo propter patris sui⁴ beneficia Ptolomeique odium. Properantem uero per aliam portam Ptolomeum intrare populus expulit; nam iam Hyrcanum receperat. [230] Hinc Ptolomeus ad aliquod castellum nomine Dagon⁵ in Hiericho discessit.

Hyrcanus Becomes High Priest and Attacks Ptolemy Who Kills His Mother and Brothers

xv. Accipiens autem paternum principatum, Hyrcanus Deum hostiis placauit et ita contra Ptolomei militiam produxit exercitum. Et cum ad locum peruenisset, in aliis omnibus hostem circumueniens, praeualebat. Vincebatur tamen matris et fratrum amore, [231] quos super murum Ptolomeus trahens in prospectu eius torquebat⁶ et praecipitare minabatur si non ab obsidione discederet. Hyrcanus autem quantum

1 The text presented here is intended to provide an aid to the reader by making available the complete text of three manuscripts that illustrate a wide range of readings. Mss St (grG) and B (grC) with few exceptions provide the earliest text for their specific groups. Manuscript El (grH) is a representative of the earliest form of the most widespread secondary tradition. The text and lemmata are transcriptions of St aside from the punctuation, capitalization, and regularization of the orthography. A transcription of the entire *LAJ* text of Bamberg 78 (Ba) can be found at the Latin Josephus Project website, edited by R.M. Pollard, J. Timmermann, J. di Gregorio, M. Laprade, and J.-F. Aubé-Pronce (<https://www.latinjosephus.org>). The range of variants found in St, B, El, and Ba represent a high percentage of readings to be considered in the reconstruction of the earliest recoverable text. The addition of readings from one manuscript representing each Levenson-Martin group would raise this percentage even more (see p. 290 for suggestions). For evaluation of unique readings in St and B and their relationship to the earliest recoverable text, see the data and analysis for Groups C and G readings in sections 2.3–8. One obvious emendation, not found in any of the manuscripts collated for this project, is recorded in the apparatus here at 13.243 (*pauit*).

2 regens] gerens B

3 et] qui et El

4 sui] om B

5 Dagon] nandagon B

6 torquebat] torquebatur B; torquebat El (s.l.)

remitteret⁷ de obsidionis industria, tantum carissimis putabat offerre subsidia, ne, dum male paterentur, eius crudelitati reputaretur. [232] Mater autem protendens manus petebat ne propter eos differret, sed multo magis impetu castellum inuaderet, inimicoque suae potestati subacto, pro carissimorum tormentis redderet retributionem, sibi quoque aestimans hoc esse utilimum,⁸ si per suam mortem hostes atrocius deperirent. [233] Hyrcanum uero petitionibus matris incensum castellum capiendi furor tenebat, rursusque cum uidisset matrem caedi uel dissipari, soluebatur et pro ingestis matri tormentis impetum deponebat obsidionis. [234] Taliq̄ue necessitate obsidendi⁹ protractus annum expleuit in quo Iudaei semper¹⁰ uacant; nam per septem hunc obseruant sicut in septimis diebus. [235] Qua propter Ptolomeus a bello solutus occidit matrem et fratres Hyrcani et fugit ad Zenonem,¹¹ qui Cotylas appellabatur, in Philadelphia tyrannidem¹² exercentem.

Antiochus Sidetes Invades Iudaea and Lays Siege to Jerusalem

[236] XVI. Antiochus autem, infestus Symoni de interitu sui¹³ exercitus, contra Iudaeam accessit quarto anno¹⁴ sui imperii, primo uero principatus¹⁵ Hyrcani, Olympiade centesima sexagesima¹⁶ secunda. [237] Cumque deuastasset prouinciam, Hyrcanum in ciuitatem¹⁷ conclusit,¹⁸ quam¹⁹ septem aciebus circumdedit. Nihil tamen penitus proficiebat propter murorum munimina²⁰ et propter obsessorum uirtutem nec non et aquarum inopiam,²¹ qua²² propter²³ siccitate domabatur. [238] In parte uero planissima turres statuit celsiores, numero centum, tria²⁴ tecta unaquaque habente,²⁵ super quas militares ordines disposuit; [239] multosque cottidie laboris²⁶ congressus

-
- 7 remitteret] remittere B
 8 utilissimum] El
 9 obsidendi] obsedendi B
 10 Iudaei semper] semper Iudaei B El
 11 Zenonem] Cenonem B
 12 tyrannidem] tirnidem B (or tiruidem?)
 13 sui] suo B
 14 anno] om. B
 15 principatus] om. El
 16 sexagesima] om. El
 17 ciuitatem] ciuitate B El
 18 conclusit] inclusit El
 19 quam] quem B
 20 munimina] munima B (only B)
 21 inopiam] inopia B
 22 qua] quam B
 23 propter] pro B
 24 tria] tres El
 25 unaquaque habente] unamquamque habentem El
 26 cotidie laboris] cotidie labores B; labores cotidie El

inferebat fossamque altam et latissimam²⁷ construens, muros ciuitatis deposuit. Iudaei uero multas incursiones²⁸ contra moliebantur²⁹ et, si quidem incautos aduersarios inuenissent, pessime eos conterebant. Si uero praesensisse eos cognoscerent, innocui redibant. [240] Vt uero noxiam multitudinem intra ciuitatem Hyrcanus attendit, consumendis citius necessariis, nihilque populum prodesse conspexit, inutilem partem eius³⁰ secernens foras ciuitatem emisit. Quae³¹ uero³² bellicosa et fortis erat, hanc tantum tenuit. [241] Antiochus autem proiectos egredi uetabat. Qui dum inter muros errarent, saeuissimis tormentis miserabiliter animam³³ exhalabant. Cum uero festi dies tabernaculorum uenissent, miserati eos, intra ciuitatem denuo receperunt. [242] Hyrcanus autem ad Antiochum legatos direxit, petens indutias septem dierum³⁴ propter festiuitatem Deique supplicationem. Qui cum audisset, respondit legatis: "Immolate." Nec non etiam sacrificium³⁵ magnificentissimum destinauit, taurum cornibus inauratis, et pocula plena omnibus aromatibus aurea uel argentea. [243] Quod sacrificium adductum susceperunt qui ante portas stabant et ad templum duxerunt. Antiochus autem iste in exercitum³⁶ melius Antiocho Epiphane claruit.³⁷ Nam ille, capiens ciuitatem, porcos super aram immolauerat et ius carniū per totum templum³⁸ sparserat etiam leges Iudaeorum paternamque religionem confuderat, propter quae³⁹ gens rebellauit et minime reconciliari passa est. [244] Hunc uero Antiochum propter pietatem religionis omnes pium uocauerunt. [245] Laudatque⁴⁰ modestiam eius Hyrcanus, et, animaduertens⁴¹ studium ipsius erga Deum, petiuit eum ut patriam eis conuersionem⁴² restitueret. Qui cum refutasset pessimum consilium suadentium gentem capi legibus dissonantem, [246] ad omnem pietatem flexus, legatis respondit, si traderent arma partemque tributorum Ioppen⁴³ aliarumque ciuitatum⁴⁴

27 altam et latissimam] latam et altissimam El

28 incursiones] cursiones B

29 moliebantur] moliebatur B

30 eius] ei El

31 emisit. Quae] emisitque B (corr. to emisit quae)

32 uero] om. B

33 animam] om. El

34 dierum] diebus El

35 sacrificium] ad sacrificium B

36 exercitum] exercitu El

37 claruit] St B El; earliest reading pauit (cf. ἐστ(α) not in any collated mss; claruit grG grC grH grL.1 grM hr; paruī grE grJ grP grN (-L Bo) grL.2 Ba w; apparuit L Bo pg

38 templum] St (s.l.)

39 propter quae] propterque B El

40 laudatque] B (corr. to laudantque); laudansque El

41 et animaduertens] etiam aduertens B

42 conuersionem] conuersionemque El (corr. to conuersionem)

43 Ioppen] Ioppe B El

44 ciuitatum] ciuitatum B

circa Iudaeam existentium soluerent et custodiam⁴⁵ in ciuitate susciperent, confirmans pactum finiret bellum. [247] Iudaei uero omnia perferre praeter custodiam consentiebant, quam non propter aliud nisi pro dissimili conuersatione recusabant. Pro custodia tamen obsides dare profitebantur et talenta argenti quinquaginta,⁴⁶ ex quibus statim trecenta cum obsidibus optulerunt, inter quos erat et frater Hyrcani. [248] Quae cum suscepisset rex Antiochus et coronam ciuitatis deposuisset,⁴⁷ obsidionem soluens discessit. [249] Hyrcanus uero sepulchrum Dauid aperiens, qui multo ditior quondam regibus fuit, tria milia talenta pecuniarum exinde protulit, ex quibus primus Iudaeorum coepit peregrinos alere. [250] Composuit etiam cum Antiocho amicitias,⁴⁸ suscipiensque eum intra ciuitatem, munificenter abundeque militibus omnia necessaria ministrabat. Cumque exercitum Antiochus contra Parthos duceret, cum eo Hyrcanus egressus est.⁴⁹ De his testis est⁵⁰ nobis Nicolaus Damascenus, sic in historia docens:⁵¹ [251] “Tropheum autem sistens Antiochus iuxta fluuium Lycum ubi uicerat Indatim Parthorum ducem, ibi⁵² duobus diebus remoratus est, petente Hyrcano Iudaeo propter aliquam⁵³ patriam Iudaeorum celebrationem, in qua non erat legitimum eos proficisci.” Et haec quidem non est mentitus. [252] Nam quinquagesima⁵⁴ festiuitas post sabbatum institit, in qua minime licet nobis uel in sabbatis uel in festo die uiam conficere. [253] Tunc et enim Antiochus cum Arsace Parthorum rege confligens et multum perdens exercitum interiit. In regno autem Syriae frater eius Demetrius succedit, Arsace eum a captiuitate soluente eo tempore quo Anthiochus Parthorum terram ingressus est, sicut prius demonstratum est.

Hyrcanus and the Samaritans and Idumeans

[254] xvii Hyrcanus uero Antiochi morte cognita statim ad Syriae ciuitates expeditionem parauit, arbitratus imparatas eas⁵⁵ et desertas pugnatoribus defensoribusque inuenire. Quod etiam euenit. [255] Nam Medaba,⁵⁶ cum multum exercitus eius laborasset sexto mense⁵⁷ capit, post etiam Samogan⁵⁸ uel illas quae uicinae fuerunt,

45 custodiam] custodia B (macron erased?); custodias El
 46 quinquaginta] St (corr. to quingenta); quingenta grG (-St^{a.c}) B El (quinquaginta s.l.)
 47 deposuisset] deposuit El
 48 amicitias] amicitiam B
 49 est] om. B
 50 testis est] testis B
 51 docens] dicens El
 52 ibi] ubi El
 53 aliquam] aliam El
 54 quinquagesima] quinquagesimae El
 55 eas] St (s.l.); om. B
 56 Medaba] Minadabam B; Midaba El
 57 sexto mense] intra (s.l.) septem menses B
 58 Samogan] Samogam El

nec non etiam Sychimam ac Garizin gentemque⁵⁹ Cutheorum, [256] quae templum aedificatum ad similitudinem Hierosolimitani⁶⁰ possidebat, quod Alexandri mandato Sanabalath dux condidit propter Manassen suum generum fratrem Iaddi⁶¹ principis sacerdotum, sicut superius intimauius. Contigit uero templum hoc dirui post annos ducentos.⁶² [257] Hyrcanus uero ciuitates Idumeae, Abora cum Marisso cunctosque cum domuisset Idumeos, permisit eis prouinciam habitare si circumciderentur legibusque Iudaicis uterentur. [258] Qui desiderio patriae terrae circumcisionem et aliam conuersionem Iudaeorum pertulerunt ideoque ex illo tempore coeperunt esse Iudaei.

Hyrcanus and the Romans

[259] Quo⁶³ facto Hyrcanus princeps sacerdotum, societatem Romanorum renouare cupiens, legationem ad ipsos⁶⁴ direxit. Cumque senatus scripta eius suscepisset, composuit amicitias hoc modo: [260] "Fannius Marci filius consul omnem senatum⁶⁵ octauo Idus Februarias⁶⁶ in campo⁶⁷ iussit conuenire, praesente Lucio Manlio⁶⁸ Lucii⁶⁹ Mentini filio et Gaio Sempronio Falernae filio, propter hoc quod legati Iudaeorum petiuerunt,⁷⁰ Symon filius Dosithei et Apollonius Alexandri et Diodorus Iasonis, uiri optimi a populo Iudaeorum destinati [261] de societate uel auxiliis exhibendis, quam cum Romanis de publicis rebus habuerunt, ut Ioppe et portus et Zora uel⁷¹ fontes et ciuitates insuper et uillae,⁷² quas Antiochus pugnans contra senatus consultum tenuit, restituantur, [262] quatinus⁷³ nec regii milites per terram eorum, cum subiecti sint, transeant,⁷⁴ ut etiam illa,⁷⁵ quae per Antiochum gesta sunt contra senatus consultum, cassentur,⁷⁶ [263] ut et⁷⁷ legatos mittant, quatinus recipiantur

-
- 59 ac Garizin gentemque] nargariz ingentemque B; ac Garizim gentemque El
 60 Hierosolimitani] Hierosolimitanae B
 61 Iaddi] St (corr. to Ihaddi); Iaddo grC
 62 ducentos] ducenti B
 63 quo] cum quo B
 64 ipsos] eos El
 65 omnem senatum] senatum omnem B El
 66 Februarias Feb El
 67 campo] campum B El
 68 Manlio] Mallio B
 69 Lucii] om. B
 70 petiuerant] St (corr. to petiuerunt) grG; petiuerunt B El
 71 Zora uel] Zorobabel B
 72 insuper et uillae] insuper et uillas B
 73 quatinus] et quatenus El
 74 transeant] transeat B (corr. to transeant)
 75 illa] om. B
 76 cassentur] cessent El
 77 ut et] et ut El

quae ab Antiocho sunt ablata,⁷⁸ ut et⁷⁹ prouinciam aestiment uastatam, utque eis ad reges et populos liberos litterae darentur, quatinus ad propriam domum illes reuerterentur. [264] Placuit igitur amicitias et auxilia cum hominibus bonis et⁸⁰ a bono populo uel amico transmissis esse renouandas.” [265] De rebus autem ablatiis responderunt consulares. “Cum a suis negotiis senatus uacuum habuerit,⁸¹ festinabitur in posterum nullam in eos iniquitatem ab aliquo fieri;” decernentes uero⁸² dare consulem Fannium publicas iusserunt⁸³ pecunias expendendas, dum ad patriam remearent. [266] Et Fannius quidem legatos Iudaeorum remittit, pecunias eis publicas praestans et senatus consultum, per quod debuissent cum tutela ad suam redire patriam.

Demetrius, Ptolemy Physcon, Alexander Zebinas

[267] In his quidem princeps sacerdotum Hyrcanus erat. Interea rex Demetrius cum exercitum aduersus Hyrcanum colligeret, nec⁸⁴ tempus ei nec occasio data est, cum milites et Syri malitiam eius abhorrentes,⁸⁵ per legationem peterent Ptholomeum Physconem cognominatum, quatinus de genere Seleuci⁸⁶ transmitteret eis qui deberet⁸⁷ accipere principatum. [268] Ptolomeus autem cum Alexandro Zebenna exercitum mittens,⁸⁸ pugnaque commissa, Demetrius superatur. Qui dum fugeret ad Cleopatram suam uxorem in Ptolomaide, ab ea non susceptus, Tyrum recedens tentus⁸⁹ multaque passus ab inimicis, interiit. xviii. [269] Alexander autem, regnum accipiens et amicitiam cum Hyrcano principe sacerdotum componens, interiecto tandem⁹⁰ tempore, expugnatus ab Antiocho filio Demetrii Gryppi⁹¹ nomine, occiditur.

Antiochus Grypus, Antiochus Cyzicenus, and the Rise of Hyrcanus

[270] Cumque Antiochus imperium Syriae tenuisset, contra Iudaeam exercitum destinare timuit. Audiens uero germanum suum et ipsum nomine Antiochum ex

78 sunt ablata] ablata sunt El

79 ut et] et El

80 et] om. El

81 uacuum habuerit] St^{a-c.} (uacauerit s.l.) grG; uacuauerit B; uacauerit El

82 uero] om. B El

83 iusserunt] om. B El

84 nec] B (s.l.)

85 abhorrentes] abhorrent et El

86 Seleuci] Seleucii B

87 deberet] deberent B

88 mittens] misit El

89 tentus] temptus B (orth. variant); tentusque El

90 tandem] tamen El

91 Gryppi] B (corr. to Agrippa [grC]); Crippi El

eadem matre progenitum multas uires contra se a Cizico⁹² congregasse, [271] eum intra prouinciam statuit expectare, quatinus obuius⁹³ incursionibus fratris Antiochi, resisteret, qui Cizicenus dicebatur quod in illa ciuitate nutritus esset. Filius autem fuerat Antiochi qui Sother nuncupatur,⁹⁴ et uitam bello Parthico terminarat. Hic etiam frater erat Demetrii Grasp⁹⁵ patris. Contigit uero ambos fratres unam uxorem Cleopatram duxisse, quemadmodum et alibi retulimus. XVIII. [272] Cizicenus autem Antiochus ad Syriam perueniens, diu cum fratre bella commisit. Interim Hyrcanus omni tempore illo pace fruebatur. [273] Nam et ipse post Antiochi mortem a Macedonibus destitit, dum neque ut amicus uel subiectus aliquid eis praebuisset. Cuius res abunde creuerunt temporibus Alexandri Zebennei et magis tunc quando hi fratres contra se pugnabant. Nam dum bello occupati fuissent,⁹⁶ Hyrcanus Iudaeam cum licentia possidebat multamque pecuniarum summam collegit [274] ambosque inter se dimicantes contemnens,

Hyrcanus and Samaria

[275] expeditionem contra ciuitatem Samariam ualde munitam produxit, de qua suo loco referam, qualiter ab Herode sit condita et Sebastia nominata. Accedens igitur ad eam studiose obsidebat, memor malorum quae Samaritae contra Marisenos colonos et auxiliares Iudaeorum commiserunt oboedientes Syrorum regibus. [276] Cum ergo moenia undique circumdedisset duplici muro cincta stadiis octoginta, filios suos obsidioni praeposuit Antigonum et Aristobolum. Quibus imminentibus in tantam necessitatem famis Samaritae inciderunt, ut etiam illicita tangerent et uocarent adiutorem Antiochum Cizicenum. [277] Qui statim ueniens ad defensionem uincitur ab Aristobolo fugatusque a fratribus, usque ad Scytopolim⁹⁷ currens, euasit periculum. Hi rursus ad Samaritas reuersi concludunt eos intra murum, ut secundo necessitatis Samaritae adiutorem uocarent Antiochum. [278] Qui cum⁹⁸ a Ptolomeo Latyro sex milia uiros petisset quos Ptolomeus⁹⁹ inuita matre direxit (nam necdum a principatu¹⁰⁰ eum expulerat), primum praedatorio modo inuadit Hyrcani prouinciam cum Aegyptiis, non audens aperte pugnam committere (nam uires suas sciebat impares), sed sperans

92 a Cizico] azicico B
 93 obuius] ouius B (corr. to obuius)
 94 nuncupatur] nuncupabatur B
 95 Grasp] Grasbi B
 96 fuisset] El (corr. to fuissent)
 97 Scytopolim] Cytopolim B
 98 cui cum] qui dum El
 99 quos Ptolemeus] eos (over erasure) B
 100 principatu] principatum B

populatione¹⁰¹ terrae cogere¹⁰² Hyrcanum a¹⁰³ Samariae obsidione recedere.¹⁰⁴ [279] Cumque multos milites perderet insidiis circumuentus, discessit ad Tripolim, Callimandro et Epicrati bellum Iudaicum committens. [280] Callimander ergo,¹⁰⁵ aduersariis fugam simulantibus et post reuersis, statim consumitur. Epichrates autem manifeste pecuniis seductus Scytopolim cum uicinis locis prodidit Iudaeis. Samariae uero obsidionem soluere non potuit. [281] Igitur Hyrcanus, sub anni conclusione capiens ciuitatem, non hoc¹⁰⁶ solo contentus¹⁰⁷ est, sed totam deleuit Samariam. Nam sic eam euertit ut uallum magis quam ciuitatem quisquam illic fuisse iudicaret.¹⁰⁸

God Speaks to Hyrcanus in the Temple

[282] Mirabile tamen aliquid de principe sacerdotum Hyrcano dicitur, quemadmodum¹⁰⁹ ei Deus locutus est. Nam referunt illo die quo filii eius cum Ciziceno conflixerant, dum ipse in templo solus sacerdos adoleret thura, audisse uocem, quod filii eius uincerent Antiochum. [283] Qui cum a templo processisset, hoc omni populo manifestum fecit. Quod ita constat euenisse. Hyrcanus quidem in his degebat.

Cleopatra and the Jews

[284] Per idem uero tempus non solum Hierosolimorum Iudaei, sed et prouinciales et Alexandriam habitantes et Aegyptum et Cyprum feliciter agebant. [285] Nam Cleopatra regina, contra filium Ptolomeum Lathyrum seditionem mouens, ordinauit duces Celchiam¹¹⁰ et Ananiam¹¹¹ filios Oniae, quem superius retulimus templum aedificasse in terra Heliopolitana¹¹² ad similitudinem sacrarii Hierosolimorum. [286] Cleopatra tamen, cum tradidisset istis¹¹³ exercitum, sine sententia eorum nihil tractabat, sicut testatur et¹¹⁴ Strabon Cappadox¹¹⁵ ita dicens: [287] “Nam plures, et qui cum eo descenderunt et quos postea Cleopatra mittebat in Cypro,¹¹⁶ statim ad

101 populatione] copulatione B
 102 cogere] B (corr. to cogere cepit [grC]); cogente El
 103 a] B (corr. to ut a [grC])
 104 recedere] B (corr. to recederet [grC])
 105 ergo] uero El
 106 hoc] oc B (corr. to loco)
 107 contentus] contemptus B (orth. variant)
 108 quisquam illic fuisse iudicaret] fuisse illi iudicarent El
 109 quemadmodum] quemamodum B (corr. to quemadmodum)
 110 Celchiam] Chelchiam El
 111 Ananiam] Annaniam El
 112 Heliopolitana] Hieropolitana B
 113 istis] his El
 114 testatur et] testatus est El
 115 Cappadox] El (s.l.)
 116 Cypro] Cyprum B

Ptolomeum transibant.¹¹⁷ Soli uero Iudaei, qui Oniae dicebantur, apud Cleopatram permansere reginam propter Celchiam¹¹⁸ et Ananiam.¹¹⁹ Haec Strabon disseruit.

Hyrcanus and the Pharisees

[288] Hyrcano autem inuidiam mouit apud Iudaeos felicitas, magis autem Pharisei; nam male¹²⁰ eum pati uolebant. Qui tantum apud populum ualebant, ut, si quid contra regem uel¹²¹ principem sacerdotum dixissent, facile crederetur. [289] Discipulus tamen eorum et Hyrcanus fuerat et nimis ab eis diligebatur. Sed cum eos ad conuiuium uocaret et amicabilem pasceret nimisque delectari uidisset, dicere coepit: "Scitis me uelle¹²² iuste uiuere omniaque¹²³ agere per quae Deo et uobis placeam. [290] Rogo autem si quid me peccantem uideritis et a recta uia deuiantem, reuocate atque corrigite." Qui dum ei testimonium praeberent omni uirtute ornatum, laetatus est. [291] Tunc unus ex accumbentibus,¹²⁴ Eleazarus nomine, maliuolus et seditionibus gaudens, "Quoniam iustum," inquit, "dixisti te uiuere¹²⁵ uelle et¹²⁶ ueritatem cognoscere uis, iustum est;¹²⁷ depone principatum sacerdotii et tantum sufficiat tibi populi regere magistratum."¹²⁸ [292] Hyrcano uero causam consulente qua propter deponeret principatum, "Quoniam," inquit, "audiuimus a senioribus captiuam fuisse matrem tuam sub Anthiocho Epiphane;" quod falsum fuerat. Contra quem¹²⁹ irritatus est¹³⁰ Hyrcanus, omnesque Pharisei ualde indignabantur. [293] Tunc Ionathas quidam¹³¹ de Sadduceorum heresi, quae¹³² contraria Pharisaeis existit, ualde¹³³ Hyrcano amicus, dicebat, scientibus omnibus Pharisaeis, Eleazarum blasphemiam fecisse,¹³⁴ et hoc manifestum illi posse fieri, si requireret illos qua¹³⁵ dignus esset poena pro uerborum qualitate multari.¹³⁶

117 transibant] transiebat B (corr. to transiebant [grC])

118 Celchiam] Chelchiam B; Chelchiam El

119 Ananiam] Annaniam El

120 male] mali B

121 uel] et El

122 uelle] uel B

123 uiuere omniaque] omnia El

124 accumbentibus] accubentibus B

125 te uiuere] te El; om. B

126 uelle et] St; uelle El; et uelle B

127 est] esse B El

128 magistratum] principatum B

129 contra quem] contraque B

130 irritatus est] St; iratus B; irritatus El

131 quidam] quidem El

132 quae] que B

133 ualde] om. El

134 fecisse] fecisset B

135 qua] quia B

136 multari] multati B

[294] Cumque Hyrcanus Pharisaeos interrogasset qua iudicarent eum poena meritum (“Non enim credo,” inquit, “cum uestra sententia factam iniuriam”), tunc illi, cum eum honorare uellent, dicebant ad mensuram poenae plagas et uincula sufficere; nam non uidebatur digna contumelia quae¹³⁷ potuisset morte multari, et quia modesti sunt naturaliter ad tormenta Pharisei. [295] Valde contristabatur¹³⁸ unde putabat illorum sententia¹³⁹ maledictiones Eleazarum¹⁴⁰ sibi fecisse. Incitator¹⁴¹ uero irae¹⁴² eius Ionathas flexit eum, [296] relictis Pharisaeis, ad Sadduceorum partem transire, ut et leges ab eis populo dispositas solueret custodesque earum¹⁴³ puniret. Vnde summum ei uel filiis odium a multitudine concitatum est. [297] Sed de his quidem iterum disseremus.¹⁴⁴ Nunc autem uolo demonstrare quas leges populo patrum successione tradidissent Pharisei, quae non sunt inter¹⁴⁵ Moysaicas¹⁴⁶ leges conscriptae. Ideoque Sadducaeorum gens has¹⁴⁷ expulit, dicens illas debere leges tenere¹⁴⁸ quae conscriptae sunt, illas uero quae a patribus traditae fuissent minime custodiri. [298] Et de his¹⁴⁹ multa questio uel altercationes maximae fiebant, et Sadducaeos copiosi uel diuites sequebantur. Populares uero non eis obsequebantur, sed Phariseos unanimiter adiuuabant. De his¹⁵⁰ tamen duabus heresibus atque Essenorum in secundo uolumine Iudaicae historiae disseruimus.

Death and Eulogy of Hyrcanus

[299] Hyrcanus autem post seditionem sedatam feliciter uixit et principatum optime rexit annis triginta uno¹⁵¹ defunctusque reliquit filios quinque. Qui maximis¹⁵² his tribus rebus dignus a Deo iudicatus est : magistratu populi, principatu sacerdotii, et praedicatione prophetiae. [300] Nam Deus cum eo erat, et futurorum praesentiam ei donauit. Ita enim cognoscebat et praedicabat, ut etiam de duobus filiis praediceret

-
- 137 quae] qua B El
 138 contristabatur] B (corr. to contristabantur [grC])
 139 sententia] sententiam B
 140 Eleazarum] Eleazarum B (B only)
 141 incitator] St (r s.l.); incitata B
 142 irae] ira B
 143 earum] eorum B El
 144 disseremus] disserimus B
 145 inter] St (s.l.)
 146 Moysaicas] Mosaicas B El
 147 has] om. B
 148 leges tenere] tenere leges El
 149 et de his] et de is B
 150 De his] deis B (corr. to de his)
 151 uno] et uno B
 152 maximis] maximus El

quod rerum domini¹⁵³ non diutius permanerent. Quorum interitum¹⁵⁴ operae pretium est narrare quatinus sentiamus quantum indigni felicitate patris fuissent.

Aristobulus Becomes King and Turns against Antigonus

[301] xx. Defuncto enim patre maior Aristobolus magistratum ad regiam dignitatem transferre decreuit, primusque sibi diadema imposuit post quadringentos octoginta et unum annos et tres menses, ex quo de captiuitate Babylonia populus liberatus ad propria remeauit. [302] Amans autem fratrem suum secundum Antigonus, simili dignitate eum ornavit.¹⁵⁵ Alios uero uinculis tenebat astrictos. Inclusit etiam et matrem de magistratu altercantem; nam illam Hyrcanus dominam esse reliquerat. Qui ad tantam crudelitatem perductus est, ut uinculis eam puniret atque¹⁵⁶ consumeret.

Murder of Antigonus

[303] Insuper addidit matri etiam Antigonus, quem amare¹⁵⁷ uidebatur et communis regni habere consortem, accusationibus alienatus ab eo. Quibus primum quidem non credebat, aliqua amore non¹⁵⁸ ammittens, aliqua uero per inuidiam arbitratus dicta. [304] Sed Antigonus cum¹⁵⁹ clarus ab expeditione redisset tempore quo festiuitatem tabernaculorum Deo celebrant,¹⁶⁰ contigit Aristobolum quidem morbo teneri. Tum Antigonus agens dies festos ad templum ascendit ualde splendidissime ornatus cum suis armatis et multum pro salute fratris orauit. [305] Maluoli uero cupientes eorum separare concordiam, occasionem se cepisse pompam Antigoni putauerunt, et uictoriam eius coram rege pompamque maluole dilatabant, quomodo in celebratione tabernaculorum sublimis apparuit, [306] ut non haec a priuato fieri uiderentur, sed regiae munificentiae ostentatio crederetur, eumque cum multitudine militum uenturum ad fratris interitum¹⁶¹ nuntiabant. [307] Aristobolus autem cum his accusationibus inuitus credidisset, timens ne in fratris suspicionem incideret simulque suam custodiam curans, disponit custodes sui corporis in subterraneo uel tenebroso loco. Iacebat autem ipse in turri, quae Antoniana¹⁶² dicebatur, et praecepit ut inermem occiderent¹⁶³ nullum, fratrem autem Antigonus,¹⁶⁴ si armatus intraret,

153 domini] domino B

154 interitum] om. B

155 ornavit] ordinauit El

156 puniret atque] penuriaque El

157 amare] amari B

158 non] om. B

159 Antigonus cum] cum Antigonus B El

160 celebrant] celebrarent El

161 fratris interitum] fratrem B

162 Antoniana] Antonia B

163 occiderent] B (corr. to non occiderent [grC])

164 Antigonus] Antigonus B

interficerent. [308] Mandauitque Antigono¹⁶⁵ ut sine armis ueniret. Regina uero cum insidiatoribus Antigoni persuasit mandata portanti contraria dicere. “Frater,”¹⁶⁶ inquit, “tuus,¹⁶⁷ audiens construxisse te arma ornatumque bellicum, petit ut ingrediaris cum armis¹⁶⁸ quatinus uideat eorum facturam.” [309] Quo nuntio Antigonus nihil arbitratus dolosum, sed confidens de fratris affectu, sicut erat armatus ad Aristobolum ingreditur, ut ei armorum¹⁶⁹ demonstraret ornatum. Cumque ad turrin quae Stratonis dicitur peruenisset, ab eis, qui in tenebroso loco¹⁷⁰ fuerant collocati, prosternitur. [310] Cuius mors ostendit nihil inuidia, nihil accusatione ualidius, neque magis aliud¹⁷¹ secernit fidem seu naturalem familiaritatem quam istae passiones.

Prophecy of Judas the Essene

[311] Ammirari potest quilibet et Iudam, Esseum genere, qui nunquam in his quae¹⁷² praedixit mentitus est. Nam hic cum uidisset Antigonom per templum transire, clamauit sociis suis et notis, qui gratia praedicendi¹⁷³ futura doctrinae eius obseruabant: [312] “Melius est mihi mori quam si mortem fuero mentitus Antigoni, quem hodie uideo periturum in Turre Stratonis.” Locus uero stadiis¹⁷⁴ distabat sexcentis¹⁷⁵ ubi eum praedixit interfici, dieique iam¹⁷⁶ plurima pars transierat, ut etiam dubitare uaticinatio uideretur. [313] Cumque haec dixisset tristisque esset, nuntiatu ei Antigonom esse defunctum in subterraneo. Nam et ipsa Turris Stratonis dicebatur eodem nomine quo Maritima Caesarea nuncupatur. Igitur uatem¹⁷⁷ hoc perturbauit.

Aristobolus’ Remorse, Illness, and Death

[314] Aristobolum autem¹⁷⁸ fraternalis caedis¹⁷⁹ paenitentia fletusque possedit nec non etiam aegritudo mentem eius sceleris¹⁸⁰ dolore peruasit et intolerabilem passionem corruptis uisceribus sustinebat. Copiam quoque sanguinis euomebat. Quod dum

165 Antigono] Antigonus B

166 frater] cui frater B

167 inquit tuus] tuus inquit B

168 armis] armatis B

169 ei armorum] armorum El

170 loco] lo B (corr. To loco)

171 magis aliud] aliud magis El

172 his quae] hisque B (corr. To his quae)

173 praedicandi] praecinendi B

174 uero stadiis] stadiis uero B

175 stadiis distabat sexcentis] distabat stadiis sexcentis El

176 deique iam] B (erasure btw words)

177 uatem] autem B

178 autem] et eum B

179 caedis] necis El

180 sceleris] celeris El

puer aliquis portaret, lapsus est in loco in quo maculae sanguinis¹⁸¹ adhuc Antigoni¹⁸² permanebant, arbitrator¹⁸³ Dei prouidentia disponente. [315] Quo facto clamor uidentium fusum sanguinem eleuatus est, dum existimarent hoc puerum sponte fecisse.¹⁸⁴ Clamorem uero cum Aristobolus audisset causamque requisisset, tacentibus amplius minabatur,¹⁸⁵ discere uolens clamoris causam. Homines enim suspicantur in his quae tacentur et semper esse peiora¹⁸⁶ putant. [316] Vt uero cogenti et interminanti ueritatem aperuerunt, confunditur eius mens, percussa conscientia sua, gemensque cum lacrimis ex alto pectore dixit: “Numquid latere Deum potui in tam impiis et crudelibus factis ut non scelere fraternae caedis¹⁸⁷ ueloci poena consumerer?¹⁸⁸ [317] Vsque quo, improbum corpus, prohibes animam ad umbras fratris et matris accedere? Cur non eam celeriter reddis, sed paulatim meum¹⁸⁹ libo sanguinem interemptis?”

Eulogy of Aristobulus

[318] Quae cum dixisset, moritur regni primo anno. Qui etiam dictus est Phylellin, id est amator Graecorum. Multum uero patriae profuit. Nam subegit Ituraeos plurimamque eorum prouinciam Iudaeis adiecit et compulit habitantes in ea ut, si uellent in prouincia permanere, circumciderentur secundum leges Iudaicas. [319] Erat autem naturae ualde modestae¹⁹⁰ uel pudoris ingenui,¹⁹¹ sicut testimonium praestat Strabon, nomine Timagenis,¹⁹² ita dicens: “Modestus fuerat hic uir et nimium Iudaeis utilis. Nam prouinciam eis adquisiuit et partem gentis Ituraeorum sibi circumcisionis uinculo coniunxit.”

181 Sanguinis] sanguis corr. to sanguinis B

182 Antigoni] Antigonus B

183 arbitrator] ut arbitrator B El

184 clamor uidentium fusum sanguinem eleuatus est dum existimarent hoc puerum sponte fecisse] ululatus continuo sublatus est qui puerum tamquam de industria sanguinem libasse conspexerant (= BJ 1.82b) B

185 minabatur] conabatur B

186 esse peiora] peiora esse El [lacuna in B]

187 caedis] necis El [lacuna in B]

188 consumerer] consumeret El [lacuna in B]

189 meum] om. El [lacuna in B]

190 modestae] moderatae El (modestae s.l.) [lacuna in B]

191 ingenui] ingenii El [lacuna in B]

192 Timagenis] Timagenes El grG (- St) [lacuna in B]

Alexander Jannaeus Becomes King

[320] XXI. Defuncto tamen Aristobolo Salomi¹⁹³ uxor eius, quae apud Graecos Alexandra nominatur, soluens fratres eius,¹⁹⁴ quos ligatos Aristobolus tenebat, ut praedictum est, Iamneum, qui et Alexander dicebatur, regem ordinavit aetate maiorem fratribus et humiliorem multum.^{195, 196} [321] Qui cum mox genitus fuisset, odio patris despectus erat et usque ad mortem¹⁹⁷ numquam ad faciem patris uenit. Causa uero huius odii talis dicitur fuisse.

God Appears to Hyrcanus in His Sleep

[322] Cum diligeret priores suos filios¹⁹⁸ Hyrcanus Antigonum¹⁹⁹ et Aristobolum, et apparuisset ei Deus in somnis, et interrogasset eum quis filiorum successor eius existeret, Deo demonstrante uultum istius, contristatus quod omnium bonorum suorum hic heres existeret, genitum in Galilea nutriri dimisit.²⁰⁰ Deus uero nequaquam mentitus est Hyrcano;²⁰¹ [323] namque regnum post Aristoboli finem iste suscepit.

193 Salomi] Salome El [lacuna in B]

194 eius] eos El [lacuna in B]

195 fratribus et humiliorem multum] om. B (lacuna) El [lacuna in B]

196 homines (13.315c)... multum] om. B [major lacuna] which substitutes the following from the parallel in B_J for the missing material: Atque ille cum lacrimis opplesset oculos et quantum poterat ingemisset, haec locutus est. Sperandum certe non erat, ut maximum Dei lumen facta mea nefaria laterent; nam cito me ultrix cognatae caedis iustitia persequitur (= B_J 1.83b–84a).

197 cum mox genitus fuisset odio patris despectus erat, et usque ad mortem] om. El

198 suos filios] filios suos El

199 Antigonum] Antiochum B

200 dimisit] permisit B

201 Hycano] Hyrcani B

**Appendix 4: AJ 13:395–397: Text of Manuscript St (Brussels II 1179)
with Variants from 92 Manuscripts¹**

[395] Per idem tempus iam² Syrorum³ et Idumeorum et Phoenicum ciuitates Iudaei⁴ possidebant: iuxta mare⁵ quidem⁶ Stratonis Turrim,⁷ Apolloniam,⁸ Ioppem,⁹ Iamnam,¹⁰ Azotum,¹¹ Gazam. Antidonem,¹² Rafiam,¹³ Rinocora;¹⁴ [396] in mediterraneis uero per Idumeam,¹⁵ Aboram,¹⁶ Marissam,¹⁷ omnemque Idumeam; Samariam,¹⁸ Carmelum¹⁹ montem,²⁰ et Ithaburium²¹ montem,²² Scytopolim,

-
- 1 The punctuation in St is modernized, but the division between city names is maintained.
- 2 **Per idem tempus iam**] Nam per felicitatem eius Iudei Pd PragXXIII.D121 (- eius)
- 3 **Syrorum**] Syriorum (corr. to Syrorum) Cp
- 4 **Iudaei**] omit Pd PragXXIII.D121
- 5 **mare**] mare galilee Mad10270
- 6 **quidem**] omit Pd PragXXIII.D121
- 7 **Turrim**] grG grP Sa w Cp; Turrem all other mss
- 8 **Ap(p)ol(l)oniam**] Ap(p)ol(l)onium C.3 C.4a; Antoniam C.4b
- 9 **Ioppem/Ioppen**] Iopen hr
- 10 **Iamnam**] Laniam hr
- 11 **Azotum**] Azoton C.1 C.3; C.4a (- pat M l Ne^{a.c.}?) Ptr; Azotan M l; Azaton pat; Azotam rg
- 12 **Antidonem**] Ant(h)edonem grP
- 13 **Rafiam**] Rafia grJ (Ly Mk U: Rafiam)
- 14 **Rinocora**] grG (- Werd Best7010 GKS1571) grC.1–4a (- M l Vt) grL.1 pg Ly; Rinocoram C.4 (-Cr Sr par pat) hr GKS1571; Rinocoro grH (Br Rinocero) grJ (- Ly) grN grP (Prs: arynocoro) Ba G Werd Best7010 Aus Cp Pr; Rinocoron grE; Rincoro grM (- Aus); Rinocorura grL.2 (Pd: Rinocoruram; PragXXIII.D121 Rinocoruca) (cf. Ῥινωκόρουρα, the rdg in almost all Grk mss); Ronocoruram w (transposed to after Cilicum); omit pat; Rinocoruram Niese (citing also Rinocora in Naples V F 34);
- 15 **in mediterraneis uero per Idumeam**] omit grE grL.2 grN grP Ba G w (mg: in mediterraneis uero per Idumeam)
- 16 **Aboram**] Abora C.2; Aboran Ly Mk U; omit w
- 17 **Marissam**] Marissimam C.1 C.3 C.4a; Marissima C.2; Marisam C.4b; Maresam grP; Marissa Alb; Marissan Ly Mk U; Marissiam Aus; Maritimam pg
Aboram. Marissa] aboram marissimam (or aboramarissimam) grC (-C.4b)
- 18 **Samariam**] et Samariam grP Pd PrgD121; omit Cor hr
Marissam omnemque Idumeam Samariam] transposed to before Aulonem w
- 19 **Carmelum**] Carmerum Du vl; et Carmelum Pd PrgD121; omit hr
- 20 **montem**] omit Pd PragXXIII.D121
- 21 **(H)itaburium**] grG ve; (H)it(h)abirum grC (par: Tabirum); (H)it(h)abirum grE grH grN (-ve) G w Sa pg n d Pr; Ithaburium grL (- Sa) grP (p : Bitabrium) Ba (erasure btw b and r); T(h)abirum grJ (- n d); Thabiricum grM (Aus: Bithabericum); omit hr
- 22 **Samariam, Carmelum montem, et Itaburium montem**] omit hr

Gadaram,²³ Gaulanitidem,²⁴ Seleuciam, Gabala,²⁵ [397] Moabitidem,²⁶ Sebon,²⁷ Medaba,²⁸ Lembaoronem,²⁹ Mega,³⁰ et Onzora,³¹ Cilicum,³² Aulonem,³³ Pellente.³⁴ Hanc etiam destruxit.³⁵ cum non³⁶ promisissent³⁷ habitantes³⁸ in ea³⁹ patrios⁴⁰ Iudaeorum se mores⁴¹ suscipere. Alias quoque⁴² Syriae ciuitates⁴³ euerterunt.⁴⁴

- 23 **Gadaram**] Gazaram Aus Crem1
 24 **Gaulanitidem**] Gaulantidem **grN** Ba G (corr. to Gaulanitidem); Gauladitidem **grE**; Gaudantidem vl; Gaulanitiden Ly Mk U PragXXIII.D121; Gaulanindem hr; Gaulantidem GKS1571
 25 **Gabala**] Gabela Aus
 26 **Moabitidem**] Moabiten Ly Mk U
 27 **Sebon**] sebon c; transposed after Maga PragXXIII.D121; (Grk ἐσ(σ)εβών/ ἡσεβών)
 28 **Medaba**] **grG** pg; Midabalam G (corr. to Midabalem) re; Midabilem Pr; Midabalem all other manuscripts
 29 **Lembaoronem**] **grG** (Ml Lembada.Oronem); Lembedonee pg; Baoro C.1 C.2 (- Pt); Baora C.3-4 (V: Boara; Ptr O: Bocora) Pt; Baoronee **grL** (Pd PragXXIII.D121; Bagronee) **grN grP** Ba; Baorenee **grE grH** (Br orenee) **grJ** (- Ly Mk U) **grM** (Aus Baoreuce) G Pr; Baorene Ly Mk U; Borane hr; Barronee w;
 30 **Mega**] **grG**; mag(etonzora) pg; Nemega **grC**; Maga **grH grJ grL grM grP** Ba G w Pr; Magnam **grE grN**; Magam hr;
 31 **et Onzora**] ecozora M l; Azoram PragXXIII.D121
 32 **Onzora Cilicum**] Onzoracilium Pr
 33 **Aulonem**] Oculonem [Beneventan "a" read as "oc"] **grC** (Ml aulonem; B: prob Ocolonem, but could be Aulonem); oculonem hr
 34 **Pellente**] **grG** (- Lau Ml) **grC.4a grN** (-ve No) St Tr Bo L Pal u; pellentem Lau Ml hr ve; pellante C.2 **grH grJ grM grP** B No Ba G Pr; pellantem C.3 C.4b **grE grL** Vi w pg
 35 **destruxit**] destruxerunt **grL**
 36 **non**] omit **grC** St (non above line) pg; uero rg
 37 **promisissent**] **grG** (- St^{a.c.}) **grE grL** (- Sa Sch Pd PragXXIII.D121) **grN grP** pg hr Ba Aus; promississet **grC** St^{a.c.} (n above line); permisissent **grH** Vat Pr Sa Sch G ; permisisset **grM** (- Vat Aus). Niese incorrectly reports the reading in B as promissent
 38 **habitantes**] in eam se habitantes C.4b (Ne: in eam se over erasure after which habi is added in margin and tantes in patria beginning next line over erasure)
 39 **ea**] eo M; eorum Cr; omit C.4b
 40 **patrios**] patria C.4b; patrias Cr
 41 **se mores**] **grG grE** pg t (ἔθῆ); seniores all other mss
 42 **Alias quoque**] aliosque (corr. to aliasque) Crem1; aliasque Pr
 43 **Syriae ciuitates**] ciuitates Syriae Crem1 GKS1571 pg
 44 **euerunt**] euertit C.4b (Ne is a correction, prob of euertunt); destruxere Pr; **Hanc etiam destruxit. cum non promisissent habitantes in ea patrios Iudaeorum se mores suscipere. Alias quoque Syriae ciuitates euerunt**] omit **grJ** Ly Mk; has omnes ciuitates Alexander pugnando Iudeis subiecit Pd PragXXIII.D121

Appendix 5: Textual Evidence for *Sefer Yosippon's* DEH Source

It is remarkable that David Flusser, working with such limited resources, was able to provide convincing textual evidence to confirm a key component of his hypothesis about the manuscript tradition to which *Sefer Yosippon's* LAJ and DEH source belonged. Using only two printed editions and selections from the same passages in two manuscripts, he was able to identify two textual variants that clearly indicated *Sefer Yosippon* had access to at least one manuscript tradition related to both the *Antiquities* and DEH texts of Naples V F 34 (B) and Plut. 66.1 (La).

For the Latin *Antiquities* Flusser identified a correspondence between the reading מליאוס in *Yosippon*, 29,15, with the variant *Mallio* (ablative of *Mallius*) in the text of LAJ 13.260 in both B and La that differs from the reading *Manlio* in the 1524 Basel edition of the Latin *Antiquities*. Flusser's results can now be confirmed by the evidence from more than fifty manuscripts, as *Mallio* is found in 20 manuscripts collated from Group C to which B and La belong and nowhere else in the manuscript tradition, which has *Manlio* in almost all manuscripts not included in Group C (see above p. 267).

The Reading cythara in the Cassinese Group and Sefer Yosippon

For the *De excidio*, Flusser identified the reading *cythara* in both B and La which corresponds to the text in *Yosippon* as opposed to the reading *cera*, which, with a few exceptions, appears in the rest of the DEH manuscript tradition. The argument is not as straightforward here, but equally convincing.

In a lengthy speech, composed by the author of the *De excidio*, which has no counterpart in the *War*, Matthias, facing the prospect of watching his sons executed before his own execution, excoriates himself for bringing Simon bar Giora into the city to oppose John of Gischala:

Therefore let us behold what we have done: the wax (*cera*) [image] of John frightened us (*Iohannis nos cera terruit*), the plunders of Simon delighted us. Let the parade be quickened by funeral processions, let the executioner come, let him slaughter sons before the face of their father and father over the corpses of his sons.

DEH 5.22.1 [Ussani, 349, 12–16]; trans. Bay, *Biblical Heroes*, 160¹

1 For the purpose of understanding Flusser's argument, I have changed "[wax] image" to "wax [image]." See Bay, *Biblical Heroes*, 157–171, for a comprehensive analysis of the speech emphasizing its presentation of Matthias' self-proclaimed guilt and merited punishment as a tool to contrast Matthias' suffering with the suffering of heroic martyrs.

The reference to *cera* (wax), printed by Ussani and found in the vast majority of manuscripts, is obscure.² Flusser suggests that wax refers to the cosmetics, which the *DEH* (based on Josephus) reports that John and his men used to make themselves up like women, while they engaged in forbidden sexual acts while at the same time committing murder (*DEH* 4.25.2 [cf. *BJ* 4.562]). But whatever the meaning, Flusser astutely observed that *Yosippon's DEH* source must have read the hardly less obscure variant *cythara*, the reading in both B and La, for which *Yosippon* supplies a narrative context.

For this reason, we abhorred John because he destroyed old men and did not respect old age, and now behold, you kill old men and destroy young ones. John, while killing the elders of the city, used to play his music with lyre and harp (ויזחנן בהורגו את זקני העיר היה מנגן בנגינותיו בנבל וכינור), and you, while murdering old men with young and fathers with sons, trumpet the loud blast of the shofar.

SY 81, 52–54; trans. Bowman, 353

Because Ussani's critical edition only cites ten manuscripts, it is not possible to tell how widespread the reading *cythara* might have been. It is only mentioned in his apparatus as a later correction over an erasure in the 5th/6th CE section of M (Ambrosian Library C 105 inf).³ For Flusser the important point is that *cythara* is the distinctive variant found in B and La, the manuscript tradition with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*, to which he believed *Yosippon's DEH* source belonged.

As in the case of the reading Mallio at *LAJ* 13.260, the data collected for this chapter confirm Flusser's suggestion. Manuscripts Pi and V, with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*, also have *cythara*.⁴ However, this variant not only appears in B, La, Pi, and V, but in three of the other four manuscripts that are found in a well-defined manuscript group which Vincenzo Ussani identified in the context of his research on Compact. VIII, an 11th century manuscript from Monte Cassino that contains a substantial fragment (70 folio pages) of the *De excidio*.⁵ In addition to Compact. VIII, Ussani included in the group B, La, V, Plut. 89sup.15, Plut 67.17, and Vat. lat. 1987. On the basis of Blatt's catalogue description of Pisa 20 (Pi), which reported it had the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*,

2 Other variants cited in the apparatus include *(nos)cere*, *(nos)cerat*, and *scelere*.

3 Flusser suggests the correction might be based on a manuscript from the same groups as B and La (2.126 n.385).

4 Of the two other manuscripts that have *DEH* together with *LAJ*, neither has *cythara*. In spite of having *LAJ* 16 1–16 and *DEH*, hr has *cera*, and the *DEH* variants in that manuscript in a short passage collated for this project are quite different from those in La and B. Sa has *cetera*, which in context would mean “the other things” of John, but could possibly be derived from either *cythara* or *cera*. Its variants also do not agree with those in La and B or with those in hr.

5 “Un ignoto codice cassinese,” 610–616. I have not been able to locate this passage in the images of Compact. VIII to which I have had access.

Flusser correctly assumed that manuscript should also be part of the group,⁶ something our research has clearly established on the basis of its reading *cythara* and, more significantly, on the presence of a large lacuna in *DEH* 1 and the transposition of Agrippa's speech from *DEH* 2 to *DEH* 5, the two most salient characteristics of Ussani's "Cassinese" group.

Unfortunately, Flusser only had the opportunity to read Ussani's groundbreaking article identifying this group at a late stage in his work on *Sefer Yosippon*.⁷ When he finally read it, he expressed disappointment that the information about the manuscripts was "inexact" and that Ussani had not noted the connection of the group with the format AJ 1–16 + *DEH* found in B, La, V, and Pi (Flusser, 2.125n380).

However, Flusser did not appreciate how much a careful reading of Ussani would have contributed to the understanding of *Yosippon's* source and, in fact, have supported his hypothesis. Ussani lists a number of specific features characterizing his Cassinese group.⁸ As already mentioned, the two most obvious are (1) the lacuna at *DEH* 1.41.6 [end] (Ussani, 97)—*DEH* 1.41.9 [end] (Ussani, 99) and (2) the transposition of Agrippa's speech in *DEH* 2.8.2–2.9.2 [mid] (Ussani, 144–157) to Eleazar's speech at Masada in 5.53.1 (Ussani, 412).⁹ The first feature definitely and the second possibly establish a link between Ussani's Cassinese group and *Yosippon*.

The Lacuna in the Cassinese Group and Sefer Yosippon

The lacuna in the Cassinese group in *DEH* 1.41 explains why *Yosippon*, which has been following *DEH* closely, goes directly from Eurycles receiving 50 talents of gold to Herod travelling from Tyre to Caesarea. Here *Yosippon*, like the manuscripts with the lacuna, omits the dramatic account of Herod's imprisonment of his sons and their eventual trial at Beirut where they are condemned to death:

DEH Cassinese Manuscripts: 1.41.5–1.41.9 (cf. BJ 1.530–543)

[Ussani, 96, 22–23] Eurycles, having been rewarded with fifty talents, was considered to be the agent of his (Herod's) salvation and life. [LACUNA: Ussani 97, 8–99,

6 Flusser, 2.125n380.

7 In "Der lateinische Josephus and der hebräische Josippon," he states that he only knew the summary of the article in Mras' preface to the second volume of Ussani's critical edition (Ussani, 2.xx–xxi).

8 Ussani, "Un ignoto codice," 609–611.

9 In addition to the lacuna in *DEH* 1 and the transposition of Agrippa's speech from *DEH* 2 to *DEH* 5, La also omits 2.18.1 through the end of *DEH* 3, transposes the text of *DEH* 4.1.1–4.15.1 to the end of *DEH* 5.24, and has several other pages out of order. Neither manuscript hr nor Sa has the lacuna or the transposition of Agrippa's speech. In addition, based on the evidence from a short passage collated for this project (*DEH* 1.1.8–1.1.9), their textual variants agree neither with B, La, Pi, and V nor with each other.

20] [Ussani, 99, 20] And so, in the manner of those who celebrate triumphs, he dragged his sons through various places and sought the famous city Tyre, from where he traveled by boat to Caesarea.

Sefer Yosippon 52, 26–29 (*Flusser, 1.244*)

He gave Euryclaus fifty talents of gold, and he [Euryclaus] went his way. In those days, Herod went to Tyre by the sea; from there he came unto Caesarea, and to every place that he went, he dragged his sons with him bound in chains.

Trans. Bowman, 224

Transposition of Agrippa's Speech from *DEH* 2.8.2–2.9.2 to 5.53.1 and *Sefer Yosippon*

While Agrippa's speech is found in its original place in *Yosippon* (SY 60), there is a reference to it in Eleazar's speech at Masada, which is neither in *DEH* nor in *LBJ*, at about the same point at which Agrippa's entire speech is inserted in the Cassinese group manuscripts (Ussani 412, 6):

If you had craved life, you should have listened to King Agrippa when he said that we cannot rebel against the Roman king or raise a hand—but you did not heed. Now that you have raised your hand and killed Florus...

SY 89, 81; trans. Bowman, 390

The introduction of Agrippa at this point and of Florus, who appears at the very end of the inserted material, are possible indications that *Yosippon* might have been familiar with a *De excidio* manuscript that mentioned Agrippa (and perhaps included his speech) within Eleazar's speech. This also raises the possibility that *Yosippon* consulted more than one *DEH* manuscript. It is interesting to note that Plut. 67.17 has the material from Agrippa's speech both in its original place and in *DEH* 5.53, indicating, in this admittedly late manuscript (15th CE), influence from at least two manuscripts.

A connection of *Yosippon* with not only the manuscripts with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH* but also with the entire Cassinese group is clear from the evidence of the variant *cythara* and the correspondence between *Yosippon's* story of Eurycles and Herod's sons and the version of the story in the Cassinese manuscripts, where a lacuna is responsible for the omission of some key narrative elements. The fact that *Yosippon's* story has only a hint of the transposition of Agrippa's speech might mean that he is familiar both with an earlier stage of the tradition before the transposition had occurred and a later stage of the tradition. It is also possible that it preserves a

transitional version of the *DEH* Cassinese text in which a reference to Agrippa's speech is first introduced into Eleazar's speech before the entire speech is moved to that point in the narrative in later manuscripts.

The discovery of at least one additional connection between *Yosippon's* text and the text in the Cassinese group should lead to a more comprehensive comparison of this *DEH* tradition with the Hebrew text of *Yosippon*. This has the potential of identifying a form of the Cassinese textual tradition as it might have appeared before our earliest extant representatives of the tradition were produced.¹⁰ As Flusser suggested, it also has important implications for the study of the *LAJ* manuscript tradition. This is especially true for understanding the pre-history of the textual tradition that appears in Naples VF 34, the manuscript closest to the grC archetype. Clearly this study should not be limited to the manuscripts with the format *AJ* 1–16 + *DEH*, as Flusser tried to do, but should also include the *LAJ* manuscripts comprising *LAJ* 1–20 (Vi, C, Pt, and V¹) and all the *DEH* manuscripts from the Cassinese group (including V²).

Bibliography

- Ammann, Andreas. *Josephus Frobenianus: Editions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte des Flavius Josephus im Basler Humanismus*. Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2021.
- Bader, Bernd. *Josephus Latinus: De Bello Iudaico. Buch 1*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2019.
- Bay, Carson. *Biblical Heroes and Classical Culture in Christian Late Antiquity: The Historiography, Exemplarity, and Anti-Judaism of Pseudo-Hegesippus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- Bilotta, Maria Alessandra. *I libri dei Papi*. Vatican City: BAV, 2011.
- Blatt, Franz. *The Latin Josephus. 1. Introduction and Text. The Jewish Antiquities: Books 1–V*. Copenhagen: University of Aarhus, 1958.
- Bowman, Steven B. *Sepher Yosippon: A Tenth-Century History of Ancient Israel*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2023.
- Brown, Virginia. "A Second New List of Beneventan Manuscripts (1)." *Medieval Studies* 40 (1978): 239–350.
- Brown, Virginia. *Terra Sancti Benedicti. Studies in the Palaeography, History, and Liturgy of Medieval Southern Italy*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2004.

10 A poem copied in Vat. lat. 1987 provides evidence for the existence of an exemplar of this manuscript tradition in 991 CE, when Abbot Manso of Monte Cassino commissioned a copy to be made (Ussani, "Un ignoto codice," 606).

- Cavallo, Guglielmo. "La trasmissione dei testi nell'area beneventano-cassinese." Pages 357–424 in *La cultura antica nell'occidente latino dal VII airxisecolo*. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1975.
- Dönitz, Saskia. "Historiography among Byzantine Jews the Case of *Sefer Yosippon*." Pages 953–970 in *Jews in Byzantium. Dialectics of Minority and Majority*. Edited by Robert Bonfil, Oded Irshai, Guy G. Stroumsa, and Rina Talgam. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Dönitz, Saskia. *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Dönitz, Saskia. "*Sefer Yosippon (Josippon)*." Pages 382–389 in *A Companion to Josephus*, edited by Honora H. Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2016.
- Flusser, David. "The Author of the Book of Josiphon: His Personality and His Age." *Zion* 18 (1953): 109–126. [Hebrew]
- Flusser, David. "Review of Blatt, *The Latin Josephus 1*." *Kiryat Sefer* 34 (1959): 458–463. [Hebrew]
- Flusser, David. "Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon." Pages 122–132 in *Josephus—Studien, Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament. Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Edited by Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker, and Martin Hengel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Flusser, David. ספר יוסיפון. יוצא לאור סדור ומוגה על-פי כתב-יד בלוויית מבוא ביאורים וחילופי גרסאות. 2 Volumes. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1978/1980. English title: *The Josippon [Josephus Gorionides]: Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Notes*.
- Flusser, David. "Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus." Pages 386–397 in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Gaspar, Camille, and Frédéric Lyna. *Les principaux manuscrits à peintures de la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique; Première Partie*. Paris: Société française de reproductions de manuscrits à peinture, 1937.
- Gessler, Jean. "Les catalogues des Bibliothèques monastiques de Lobbes et de Stavelot." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 29 (1933): 82–96.
- Gottlieb, Theodor. *Über Mittelalterliche Bibliotheken*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1890 (Vienna, 1915).
- Liebl, Ulrike. *Die illustrierten Flavius-Josephus-Handschriften des Hochmittelalters*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Leoni, Tommaso. 2007. "Translations and Adaptations of Josephus's Writings in Antiquity and the Middle Ages." *Ostraka* 16 (2007): 481–492.
- Levenson, David B. and Thomas R. Martin. "Akairos or Eukairos? The Nickname of the Seleucid King Demetrius III in the Transmission of the Texts of Josephus' *War* and *Antiquities*." *JSJ* 40 (2009): 307–341.

- Levenson, David B. and Thomas R. Martin. "The Latin Translations of Josephus on Jesus, John the Baptist, and James: Critical Texts of the Latin Translation of the *Antiquities* and Rufinus' Translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* Based on Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions." *JSJ* 45 (2014): 1–79.
- Levenson, David B. and Thomas R. Martin. "The Ancient Latin Translations of Josephus." Pages 322–344 in *A Companion to Josephus*. Edited by Zuleika Rodgers and Honora Howell Chapman. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2016.
- Levenson, David B. and Thomas R. Martin. "The Place of the Early Printed Editions of Josephus's *Antiquities* and *War* (1470–1534) in the Latin Textual Tradition." Pages 765–825 in *Sybils, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*. 2 Volumes. Edited by Joel Baden, Hindy Najman, and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Levenson, David B. and Thomas R. Martin. "A Revised Classification of Manuscript Groups for the Early Books of the Latin Translation of Josephus's *Antiquities* Based on Textual Variants in *AJ* 6.356–360 and 6.362b." *M&H* 46 (2021): 69–146.
- Lowe, Elias Avery. *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1914.
- Lowe, Elias Avery. *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule*. Second Edition prepared and enlarged by Virginia Brown. 2 Volumes. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1980.
- Lowe, Elias Avery. "A New List of Beneventan Manuscripts." Pages 211–244 in *Collectanea Vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. card. Albareda a Biblioteca Apostolica edita*. Vatican City: BAV, 1962.
- Lowe, Elias Avery. *Scriptura Beneventana*. 2 Volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1919.
- Lukas, Randolf. *Josephus Latinus, Antiquitates Judaicae Buch 6 und 7: Einleitung, Edition und Kommentar zur Übersetzungstechnik*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2022.
- Mallet, Jean, and André Thibaut. *Les manuscrits en bénéventaine de la Bibliothèque capitulaire de Bénévent. Volume 1: Manuscrits 1–18*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1984.
- Marcus, Ralph. *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Mazzucchi, Carlo Maria. "Natura e storia del Giuseppe Flavio Ambrosiano." Pages 271–318 in *Miscellanea Graecolatina* IV. Edited by Stefano Costa and Federico Gallo. Milan: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 2017.
- Newton, Francis. *The Scriptorium and Library at Monte Cassino, 1058–1105*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Niese, Benedikt, and Justus von Destinon. *Flavii Iosephi opera*. Volumes I–VII. Berlin: Weidmann, 1885–1895.
- Nogara, Bartolomeo. *Codices Vaticini Latini*. Volume 3. Rome: BAV, 1912.

- Pollard, Richard M. "The *De Excidio* of 'Hegesippus' and the Reception of Josephus in the Early Middle Ages." *Viator* 46 (2015): 65–100.
- Sela, Shulamit. *The Arabic Josippon*. 2 Volumes. Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute and Tel Aviv University, 2009. [Hebrew]
- Ussani, Vincenzo. "Un ignoto codice cassinese del così detto Egesippo e i suoi affini." In *Casinensia*, Volume 2, 610–616. Monte Cassino: ex Typographia Casinensii, 1929.
- Ussani, Vincenzo. *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae libri v—Pt. 1: Textum criticum continens*. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1932.
- Ussani, Vincenzo. *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae libri v—Pt. 2: Praefationem Caroli Mras et indices Vicentii Ussani continens*. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1960.
- Veltri, Giuseppe. *Gegenwart der Tradition: Studien zur jüdischen Literatur und Kulturgeschichte*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Villeneuve, François, Étienne Nodet, Anca Dan, and Édith Parmentier. *Les Antiquités juives, Livres XII à XIV*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2021.
- Warichez, Joseph. *L'abbaye de Lobbes depuis les origines jusqu'en 1200*. Paris: Établissements Casterman, 1909.
- Wasserstein, Abraham, and David J. Wasserstein. *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Watson, Andre G. *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 700–1600. Volume 1: The Text*. London: The British Library, 1979.
- Weitz, Georg. *Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum*. Hannover: Hahn, 1878.