I.

PSEUDO-JOSEPHUS, JOSEPH BEN GORION.

This chronicle of the Jewish race, from Adam to the time of Titus, is written in Rabbinical Hebrew, which, however, approaches nearer to the classical language than the majority of mediaeval prose compositions, and was much read by the Jews of the Middle Ages. Only four MSS. of the text are known to me—two in the Vatican Library¹, which, however, are defective, one in Turin, and one in Paris, all of which agree with the editio princeps, besides some fragments in the Bodleian Library (MSS. no. 793, ff. 218b to 246; no. 2585, ff. 104 to 106; d. 64, ff. 118 to 120; e. 30, fol. 56). The printed editions, on the other hand, are by no means few. The earliest are those of Mantua (1476–9), which has the best support from the MSS., of Constantinople (1510), divided into books and chapters, and containing considerable additions, and thirdly the Venice edition (1544). The numerous later editions are mostly based on the Constantinople text. The preface, written in the thirteenth century by

¹ The title 'PSEUDO-JOSEPHUS, JOSEPH BEN GORION', quoted by Dr. Vogelstein (Geschichte der Juden in Rom, I, p. 186, n. 6), does not belong to the original MS., but is merely due to the compiler of the index, a converted Jew named J. Baptista Jona.
Yehudah Leon ben Moses Mosconi (see *Magazin Berliner*, 1878, p. 017), mentions a shorter and a longer text, to which I shall refer later. The date of the original composition has been a matter of much dispute. The veteran Professor Chwolson (in the *Sammelband* of the *Schoor Israel*, 1897, p. 5) contends that the Hebrew text, as found in the *editio princeps*, was written towards the latter half of the ninth century, on the following grounds:

1. The learned Mussulman Ibn Hazm, who died in the year 1063 A.D., was acquainted with the translation from Hebrew into Arabic made by a Jew in Yemen. The passage in which he mentions it is found in a Leyden MS. (*Catal.*, no. 1982), and was kindly sent to me by Dr. Steinschneider, who received it from Dr. Schreiner in Hebrew characters. I subjoin the extract in Arabic characters, as copied for me by Dr. Kampffmeyer, with some slight variations.

2. Professor Chwolson next argues that "from the time of the composition of the original work in Italy until its
translation from Hebrew into Arabic in Yemen, and the
return of this translation to Spain (where Ibn Hazm was
living), we must allow at least 150 or 175 years.” This
seems to me a rather liberal allowance of time, and
perhaps we might reduce the interval at least to fifty
years. Rapoport¹ and Grätz (Geschichte der Juden, V,
3rd ed., p. 235, n. 2 and p. 295) propose the end of the ninth
or beginning of the tenth century, and the latter is now
the date most generally accepted by scholars. Weiss
(Jüdische Tradition, IV, p. 224, n. 5) places the author
a little earlier than the celebrated liturgist Eleazar Kalir,
who lived in the ninth century. Drs. Vogelstein and Rieger
(Geschichte der Juden in Rom, I, p. 185 sqq.) argue for the
tenth century, but the pages which they devote to our
author contain little that is new on the subject. I must
further mention the ingenious arguments of Dr. Konrad
Triebel (Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Göttin-
gen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1895, Heft 4) in support of the view
that the Yosippon was composed in the fourth century,
on the ground of its pure and classical Hebrew. “Unser
Autor selbst schreibt in reinem, biblischem Hebräisch, seine
Sprache und sein Ton ist schlicht und sachlich, erhebt sich
aber in tragischen Momenten . . . zu künstlerischer Vollendung.”
This favourable verdict on his style, however, is
unfortunately reversed by Professor Siegmund Fraenkel
(ZDMG., vol. L, p. 418 sqq.), who shows that the Hebrew
is more than half Rabbinic, although the writer borrows
the phraseology of the Bible wherever he can do so.
In my opinion, the arguments by which the date must be
determined are mainly these: (1) That no Jewish writer men-
tions Yosippon before Dunash b. Tamim, whom Munk places
about the middle of the tenth century (see Journ. Asiat.,
1850, p. 18, n. 2); (2) That it is not named in the writings
of the Geonim, although it must be admitted that a great
many of these are lost; (3) That there is no trace of it in
the collection of chronicles and fragments to which I have

¹ See more fully in Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vorträge, 1892, p. 158, and notes.
devoted two volumes of the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (1887 and 1895), not even in that of A.D. 1100, written in Arabic and in Egypt. According to Mosconi again (loc. cit., p. 012), the earliest evidence for the text of Yosippon is in connexion with the names of Abraham b. David, Abraham b. אלעזר and Samuel הנרי (circ. A.D. 1060), who made abridgements of the book. It may be inferred from Mosconi's preface that he had not seen the Great Yosippon (Major) from which the ordinary Hebrew text (Minor), as in the *editio princeps*, is abridged. We have in a MS. recently acquired by the Bodleian Library (MS. Heb. d. 11) fragments of a "Great Yosippon" (נושご覧) which may possibly belong to this Yosippon מןור. They are there attributed to the little known ירוחמהel b. Shelomoh (see *Med. Jew. Chron.*, I, introd., p. xx sqq.), of whom I propose to speak farther on, giving a collection of his unpublished compositions.

I may mention as a curiosity that Yosippon appears to have been known in Persia at the beginning of the fourteenth century. See Prof. Bacher in the *Rev. des Études Juives*, XXXVII, p. 145.

With regard to the Arabic version, there is no reason to doubt Ibn Hazm's statement quoted above, that it was made by a Jew resident in Yemen. Among the MS. fragments obtained from Cairo in the last few years by the Bodleian Library are six leaves (MS. Heb. e. 45, ff. 101 sqq.) of this version written in the Rabbinical character of Yemen, and containing the history of Aristobulus (אשחריילו), &c., and of Crassus. The fragment begins as follows:—

(See the Arabic version of 2 Maccabees xxxix.) The corresponding Hebrew, on fol. 57 of the Mantua edition, is as follows:—
I. PSEUDO-JOSEPHUS, JOSEPH BEN GORION

On fol. 102 the MS. fragment begins a new section, thus:

A comparison of the Arabic version with the Hebrew text of the Mantua edition will show that the former is considerably the shorter. It agrees, except for slight variations, with the Arabic version contained in two British Museum MSS. (nos. 1, xi and 31), in two Bodleian MSS. (Marshall Or. 139, Hunt. 238), and in the edition printed at Beyrouth about ten years ago. (This edition
is now not to be bought, but I was fortunate enough to obtain the loan of a copy through Mr. H. W. Hogg.) The Arabic Macc. ii also exhibits the same text, though still further shortened. That the Arabic was intended as a compendium of the Hebrew is indeed definitely stated in another fragment (MS. Heb. d. 64, fol. 121), consisting of a single leaf, also in the Rabbinical character of Yemen, and containing on the verso the first nine lines of the Arabic version. The entire passage, so far as it can be read, is as follows:

This is an abbreviated version of the book attributed to Joseph b. Gorion, consisting of the history of the Jews at the time of the second temple, and the history of their kings and... in their days, from the beginning of the restoration of the temple and their return to it, until its destruction and the dispersion. The book begins: Adam begat Seth, ...

The Arabic seems to me here to be shorter than any known text of the original Hebrew. Dr. Trieber (op. cit., p. 409) expresses a desire that the “arabische Uebersetzung zugänglich gemacht und für die Herstellung eines gesäuberten Textes verwendet würde,” not knowing of the Beyrouth edition, which is as inaccessible as a MS. Prof. Wellhausen, in his “Der arabische Josippus” (Abhandlungen d. K. Ges.

\[\text{Cf. the introduction to MS. Marshall (Or.) 139.}\]
d. *Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, neue Folge, Bd. I, no. 4, Berlin, 1897), rightly concludes that the version was made from the Hebrew, although he had only the inferior Paris MS. at his disposal.

It remains to consider the possible date at which such a work might have been produced in Yemen. That settlements of Jews existed there certainly before the eleventh century is shown by the early epitaphs given by Prof. Chwolson in his *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum* (p. 126 sqq.) of the years 687 to 749. We have positive evidence that a congregation existed there early in the twelfth century; see the article on Nathan'ël al-Fayyūmi, by Dr. R. Gottheil, in the *Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstage M. Steinschneiders*, p. 144.

In order not to omit anything, I shall conclude with a list of names of places in Yemen occupied by Jews. Besides being important in connexion with the above remarks, perhaps it may also serve as a contribution towards the Jewish geography of Yemen. The list has been collected, with the help of Prof. Büchler (Vienna), from the colophons of all the known Yemen MSS. except those in America. The names are arranged alphabetically, with an indication of the MSS. in which they are found. Professor Margoliouth kindly compared them with the forms found in Hamdani (H.) and Yakut (Y.), and his comparisons are added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MS. Details</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>םאלסרהא</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. Orient. 2417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָרָמֶשֶׁנ (מדרש ונהל)</td>
<td>Ramsgate, MS. Schechter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָהוּ בָּרָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 2338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>םאלסרהא</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>םאלסרהא</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oxford 2498.


Berlin, p. 61. דיבאן H.

Oxford 2333.


דמיאר 1479; Add. 9398; Berlin, p. 61. בהemet ה אלפליזני H.

Berlin, p. 95.


חונן柏林 p. 68.

בירה קראוניאי MS. Schechter.


ח'טפניאן Proper name? cf. H.


לגי柏林 p. 115. ח'טפניאן H.

Oxford 2493. ח'טפניאן柏林 H.

Brit. Mus. Orient. 2348. ח'טפניאן柏林 H.

לגי柏林 p. 68. ח'טפניאן柏林 H.

Brit. Mus. Orient. 2212. ח'טפניאן柏林 H.


ח'טפניאן柏林 H.


לגי柏林 H.

Brit. Mus. Orient. 2212. טריב H.

Brit. Mus. Orient. 1472. טריב H.

Oxford 2517.


לגי Berlin 2346.


בר unusually MS. Wertheimer.


מגלה Brit. Mus. Orient. 2218. מגלה H.

לגי Brit. Mus. Orient. 2672. מגלה (tribal name?).

לגי Berlin, p. 62.
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Oxford 2631, fol. 54.


Oxford 2498.

Berlin, p. 95.

Oxford 2346.

Oxford 2333; Berlin, 8° 338; Brit. Mus. Orient. 2215; 2354.

Oxford 2498.

Oxford 1451, 1521; Berlin, pp. 95, 97.

Herod. 2377, 2397; Brit. Mus. Orient. 2212.

Berlin, p. 95.

Oxford 2488.

Oxford 2382.

Oxford 2497, 2498.


For صنعاء H. 


صادة H.

م. p Berlin, p. 68.
II.

YERAHMEEL BEN SHELOMOTH.

Since the year 1887 new evidence has come to light for the history of the Yosippon-text. In that year the Bodleian Library acquired, from the late R. N. Rabinowitz, a manuscript (now MS. Heb. d. i i ) consisting of 388 leaves on vellum, quarto, written in an old German Rabbinical character. (The general number will be found in the Supplement to my Catalogue, which will shortly be completed.) I have already spoken of this MS., and given some quotations from it in Grätz’s Monatsschrift for 1887, p. 504 sqq. According to the fragment of a calendar at the beginning of the volume it appears to have been written in the year 1325 A.D. by Eleazar b. Asher hal-levi. Among the various treatises which it contains is the greater part of the text of Yosippon, in which the name of the compiler, Yerahmeel, frequently occurs, and a ידוע הנני is also mentioned 1. The writer is sometimes called in full, Yerahmeel ben Shelomoh, and sometimes simply ירושalien. Thus on fol. 26 the copyist says ירושalien בלולוב,花纹 מחקותל ומสะפ קנה, וו иметь עניינ בניינו, הוא הערל מערสะפ. Then follows a short passage of Yosippon, agreeing in the main with the ed. princeps, from הינו יתי ונימי

1 On ff. 152b and 153 are marginal references, in an Italian cursive hand, to a יששק ישלום (see my Med. Jew. Chron., I, p. x, note 5).