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ABSTRACT

In this dissertation I analyze the reception history of selected passages from Josephus’s *Jewish War* as they are transmitted through various Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic texts in the late-antique and medieval periods. My focus is the medieval *Sefer Yosippon* textual tradition, which includes the Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon*, its Latin sources, and its subsequent Arabic and Ethiopic adaptations. *Sefer Yosippon* (“The Book of Yosippon”) is written in Hebrew by an anonymous Jew in the tenth century and receives Josephus’s *Jewish War* through a Latin work and known as the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* (“On the Destruction of Jerusalem”). The Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon* is then translated into Arabic sometime in the eleventh or twelfth centuries. The Arabic adaptation of the Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon*, sometimes referred to as the *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd* (“The Book of Historical Notices on the Jews”), is in turn translated into Ethiopic sometime in the fourteenth century; the Ethiopic version of *Sefer Yosippon* comes to be called the *Zena Ayhud* (“The History of the Jews”). The first part of this dissertation provides an introduction to the critical issues involved in the study of these texts. In the second part of this project, I provide the first English translations and comparative analysis of selected passages from the Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic texts that transmit Josephus’s *Jewish War*. I present a detailed comparison of the receptions of Josephus’s accounts of the great famine in Jerusalem and the famous story of Maria, the mother who kills and eats her own son. I pay close attention to the redactional changes made by the author of each text and note the ideological, cultural, rhetorical, and historical factors that lie behind the various editorial activities. I then draw conclusions about the historical backgrounds and about important source-critical questions that are relevant to the study of each text.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 From the Jewish War to the Zena Ayhud

This dissertation presents the first detailed analysis of the reception of Josephus’s *Jewish War* within an important but little-studied medieval textual tradition, namely the Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon* and its Arabic and Ethiopic adaptations. The Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon* (“The Book of Yosippon”) is a work written by an anonymous Jew living in southern Italy around the start of the tenth century. The text has a fascinating transmission history, tracing its connection to the *Jewish War* through a Latin reworking of Josephus’s text known as the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* (“On the Destruction of Jerusalem”). Produced in the latter part of the fourth century, the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* becomes the *Sefer Yosippon*’s most important source for the Jewish Revolt against Rome. In turn the *Sefer Yosippon* comes to serve as a very important source of the history of first-century Judea for Coptic and Ethiopian Christians through its Arabic and Ethiopic translations.

The Arabic translation of *Sefer Yosippon* is made sometime around the eleventh or twelfth century and (among other names) comes to be called the *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd*.¹ Two versions of this Arabic translation are extant, one in Judeo-Arabic using Hebrew letters and the

---

¹ As Ronny Vollandt notes, there are several titles for the text in the Copto-Arabic tradition. Some manuscripts preserve the full title of the text: *Kitāb akhbār al-‘Ibrānīyīn al-mansūbāh Kitāb al-Makkābiyīn al-mansūb īlā Yūsuf ibn Kūryūn* (“The Book of Historical Notices on the Hebrews, Called the Book of the Maccabees that is Attributed to Josephus, Who is Also Known as Joseph Ben Gurion”) (Ronny Vollandt, “Ancient Jewish Historiography in Arabic Garb: Sefer Josippon Between Southern Italy and Coptic Cairo,” *Zutot* 11.1 [2014]: 73). This longer version of the title is shortened by others as either *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd* (“The Book of Historical Notices on the Jews”) or as the *Kitāb Yūsuf ibn Kūryūn* (“The Book of Joseph Ben Gurion”) (Ibid.). In my dissertation, I refer to the text as the *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd*; for a more detailed discussion of this issue concerning the titles of the Arabic versions of *Sefer Yosippon*, see Chapter 2 of this dissertation.
other in Arabic script, the latter of which is sometimes distinguished as the Christian-Arabic (or Copto-Arabic) version. The Christian-Arabic text is subsequently translated into Ethiopic sometime in the fourteenth century and becomes known as the Zena Ayhud. My dissertation closely examines the reception history of selected passages as they are transmitted across these various texts, analyzing the source-critical and redactional issues that arise at each stage of transmission.

Although critical editions of each of these texts have been produced, a close analysis of this unique reception history has remained a desideratum. A major part of this gap in the scholarship results from the dearth of critical work on the Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions of Sefer Yosippon. There has also been very little work done on the relationship between the Hebrew Sefer Yosippon and its Latin sources. Moreover, what little work that has been done focuses on comparing the broad schematic outlines that exist among these texts. No project has undertaken the task of conducting a close textual analysis of the reception history of Josephus’s Jewish War within this textual chain of transmission. As a result, the source critical and redactional questions behind the reception of Josephus within the four texts outlined above remain little understood.

My dissertation fills this gap in the scholarship. The first part of this project provides an introduction to Josephus’s Jewish War (BJ) and the four texts that play important roles in the transmission this text from first-century Rome to fourteenth-century Ethiopia: the fourth-century Latin De Excidio Hierosolymitano (DEH), the tenth-century Hebrew Sefer Yosippon (SY), the eleventh or twelfth-century Arabic Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd (KAY) in both its Judeo-Arabic and Christain-Arabic versions, and the fourteenth-century Ethiopic Zena Ayhud (ZA). Having covered the critical issues related to these texts, the second part of the dissertation presents the
first English translations of selected passages from these Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic texts. I focus specifically on the various receptions of Josephus’s accounts of the famine in Jerusalem, which culminates in the dramatic story of Maria of Bethezouba, the mother who kills and eats her own son (BJ 6.199–219). I trace the reception of these accounts by paying close attention to the redactional changes made by the author of each text and noting the ideological, cultural, rhetorical, and historical factors that lie behind the various editorial activities.

The story of Maria offers a particularly interesting test case for analyzing the reception history of Josephus within medieval Jewish and Christian historiographical traditions. Second only to the famous Testimonium Flavianum, this story featured prominently in the histories of those who received the works of Josephus. Its popularity is demonstrated in part by textual evidence in some manuscripts, in which the story of Maria was “the most often illustrated of all the episodes recounted in Josephus’s histories.” The story was not only popular because of its sensational nature, but also because of its unique utility for communicating the rhetorical arguments of writers who received and reworked the story. As such, it serves as a particularly rich opportunity for conducting a close redactional analysis.

In order to more precisely discern the differences in the various texts, I have arranged selected passages from the five texts into parallel passages in order to conduct a synoptic analysis. For each set of parallel passages, I list and discuss the various changes that are made at the point of each reception. I examine each receiving text in light of the redactional changes it

---

2 For a fuller discussion of the reception of Josephus’s account of the story of Maria, see Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1992). Mason writes, “Of all the Christian references to Josephus that have survived from the ancient world and the Middle Ages, the passage most commonly cited from his works, next to his reference to Jesus [Ant. 18.63–64], is one that describes a horrible act of cannibalism during the Roman siege” (Ibid., 11).

makes to its *Vorlage*. The highly detailed nature of this project, coupled with the fact that such a methodology has never been employed with regard to these texts, has allowed my dissertation to provide significant results both for the understanding of the receptions of Josephus within the various historiographical traditions examined here and for the understanding of the historiographical and literary methods of each individual author. As such, my project sheds light on the developments within the reception of Josephus in medieval Jewish, Christian, and Muslim historiography.

1.2 Major Trends in the Study of the Reception of Josephus

There is a significant difference between the amount of scholarship devoted to the study of Josephus’s *Jewish War* and the other texts treated in this dissertation. The scholarly literature on Josephus is vast, and a comprehensive treatment of it is outside the purview of this project. However, because of its relevance to this project, it is important to highlight the growing scholarly interest in the reception of Josephus. Building on earlier works like Heinz Schreckenberg’s *Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus* (1977), scholars have more recently taken up the task of analyzing the receptions of Josephus in various cultural and historical contexts. A number of articles on the reception of Josephus included in a volume edited by Honora H. Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers, *A Companion to Josephus* (2016), are good examples of works recently produced in this burgeoning sub-field within Josephus studies.⁴

---

⁴ The important collection of articles deriving from the Oxford Conference on the reception of Josephus should also be noted. For more information on this project, see the following website: http://josephus.orinst.ox.ac.uk/workshops/late-antiquity-to-c-1750. Selected papers from the conference have also been published in a special issue of the International Journal of the Classical Tradition (Volume 23, Issue 3, October 2016).
In “Josephus and Patristic Literature,” Sabrina Inowlocki surveys the use and abuse of Josephus by Christian authors who are writing between the second and fifth centuries. She covers issues such as Josephus’s status as an important historical source for early Christian authors and their ironic use of Josephus in writing anti-Jewish polemics. In a similar vein, in her article entitled “The Christian Reception of Josephus in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages” (2016), Karen Kletter provides an overview of the reception of Josephus among prominent Christian writers such as Eusebius, Jerome, and Bede. She also briefly discusses the reception of Josephus’s works in contexts such as the monastic houses of medieval Europe and the use of Josephus within crusader accounts such as Baldric of Dol’s *Historia Hierosolymitana* and Fulcher of Chartres’s *History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*. While these recent studies have furthered the understanding of the reception of Josephus, there has not been an investigation of the reception of the War within the medieval Sefer Yosippon traditions.

The scholarly work that has been done on the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* to date has not been very extensive. No critical edition of the text has been undertaken since V. Ussani’s 1932 edition, the second volume of which containing an introduction and extensive appendices appeared in 1960. Only two translations of the text have been made. First, an old French translation of the text under the title *Les cinq livres de l'Histoire d'Égésippe* was produced by Jean Millet (1556). Second, an overly-literal translation into English was made by Wade Blocker (2005).\(^5\) Beginning in the early part of the twentieth century, a small number of books and

---

\(^5\) In the introduction to his translation, Blocker states, “Although I have labeled the following work as a ‘translation’ of Hegesippus it was not made for the purpose of stating in good English what is stated in Latin in Hegesippus. Rather the purpose has been to assist the translator in understanding what the Latin says as Latin without any translation into English…To the extent possible without causing absolute confusion in the English, the Latin sentence structure, word order, and phrasing have been followed…Since the purpose of the translation is to be an aid to understanding the Latin, the translation is as close to literal as the translator can keep it without doing too much violence to standard English
articles were published, which examined some of the critical issues relating to the dating, authorship and Latin style of the *DEH*.


First, Tommaso Leoni provides a survey of the scholarship on the *DEH* in his “Translations and Adaptations of Josephus's Writings in Antiquity and the Middle Ages” (2007). Second, in his “The De Excidio of ‘Hegesippus’ and the Reception of Josephus in the Early Middle Ages” (2015), Richard Pollard has recently contributed a fundamental study of the textual reception of the text, paying special attention to the manuscript tradition. Third, in her monograph entitled *Egesippo-Ambrogio: Formazione scolastica e cristiana nella Roma della metà del IV secolo* (2009), Chiara Somenzi has provided a valuable study of the Christian and non-Christian contexts of the *DEH*, which also includes an important and up-to-date section on its anti-Jewish polemic. A more detailed discussion of the scholarship on the *DEH* and other critical issues related to its study are provided below in Chapter Two (see section 2.2).

Given its importance for the development of Jewish historiography and its popularity among medieval Jews, it is surprising that there have not been many scholarly works devoted to
the study of the Hebrew Sefer Yosippon. Despite the short number of studies, a couple of recent works have become very important for our understanding of the text. Any study of the Sefer Yosippon must begin with the foundational contribution of David Flusser, who provides a critical edition of an eclectic version of what he takes to be the earliest text. He also provides an extensive introduction to the text and a brief commentary in his two-volume, Modern Hebrew work: Sefer Yosippon: Organized and Edited According to Manuscripts Along with an Introduction, Explanation and Variant Readings (1978).\(^6\)

Flusser’s work has been supplemented by Saskia Dönitz, whose recent work is immensely valuable for the understanding of the development of the texts and recension of SY. She critiques and refines Flusser’s work, providing a more up-to-date discussion of the textual and source critical questions behind the SY tradition in her monograph, Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon (2013). The contributions of Flusser and Dönitz, as well as other issues dealing with the study of the SY, are discussed in much more detail in section 2.3 below.

The Arabic translations of the Hebrew Sefer Yosippon have received far less attention than the DEH and the SY. Undoubtedly the most important contribution to the study of the

---

Arabic versions of *Sefer Yosippon* has been the work of the late Israeli scholar, Shulamit Sela. In her two-volume work, *The Arabic Book of Yosef ben Gorion: Texts in Arabic and Judeo-Arabic with a Hebrew Translation and Introduction* (2009), Sela provides critical editions of both the Judeo-Arabic and Christian Arabic versions of the *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd*. She also provides a Modern Hebrew translation of the *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd* as well as an introduction to the text (also in Modern Hebrew). In her extensive introduction, she covers a range of issues, including the source critical relationship between the Hebrew and Arabic versions of *Sefer Yosippon*, as well as some of the prominent themes present in the texts.

Two important supplements to Sela’s work have come from Saskia Dönitz and Ronny Vollandt. Dönitz discusses the Arabic translations of the Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon* in her work *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon* and Ronny Vollandt covers issues such as the historical backgrounds to the production of the Arabic versions of *Sefer Yosippon* in his recent article, “Ancient Jewish Historiography in Arabic Garb: Sefer Josippon Between Southern Italy and Coptic Cairo” (2014). The contributions of Sela, Dönitz, and Vollandt, as well as other critical issues relevant to the study of the *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd* are discussed in more detail in section 2.4 below.

In comparison with the amount of scholarship on the *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd*, there has been even less scholarly work done on its Ethiopic translation, the *Zena Ayhud*. Murad Kamil produced the only critical edition of the text, *Des Josef ben Gorion (Josippon) Geschichte der Juden: Zena Ayhud* (1937). Kamil provides a very brief introduction to the text, noting the proximity of the Ethiopic text to its Arabic *Vorlage* and providing a short discussion of the twelve manuscripts he employs in producing his critical text. Since Kamil’s text, there have been a few short articles that discuss the *Zena Ayhud*. For example, in “L’édition de Zena Ayhud”
Jean Simon provides an overview of the publication of Kamil’s *Geschichte Der Juden*. In his article, “Arabisch-äthiopische Übersetzungstechnik am Beispiel der Zena Ayhud (Yosippon) und des Tarikä Wäldä-‘Amid” (1986), Manfred Kropp investigates the linguistic influences that Arabic has on Ge’ez and analyzes certain features of the Ethiopic translations of the *Zena Ayhud* and the history of al-Makîn known as *Tarikä Wäldä-‘Amid*. In addition to these two articles, there is a brief encyclopedia entry by Witold Witakowski in the fifth volume of the *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica* entitled “Zena Ayhud” (2014). These works as well as other issues relevant to the study of the text are covered in more detail in section 2.5 below.

1.3 Contributions to the Field

My findings in this project have allowed me to address the absence within the scholarship of detailed studies of the reception history of Josephus involving the texts outlined above. First, my close examination of the reception of selected passages from the *Jewish War* within the Latin *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* supports and supplements the conclusions of scholars like Bell, Somenzi, and Pollard who have worked on the text. Through my close analysis of the redactional tendencies of the author of this Latin text, I demonstrate that the latter’s adaptation of the *Jewish War* is best characterized as a polemical Christianizing of Josephus’s history. More specifically, my analysis of the accounts of the siege of Jerusalem and the story of Maria shows that the author of the Latin text employs these themes within the *Jewish War* to buttress his program of delegitimizing Judaism as a religious system. The sufferings endured by the Jews during the revolt against Rome and the subsequent destruction of the Temple as being signs of divine punishment visited upon the Jews for killing Jesus serves as the central and explicit theme of the text.
In order to emphasize his point, the author of the Latin text introduces literary embellishments to Josephus’s narrative. He adapts Josephus’s descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem by adding graphic details of the sufferings endured by the people. He also significantly lengthens Josephus’s account of the story of Maria, introducing a large number of motifs and details to the story. The tragedy of Maria is heightened under the pen of the author of the *DEH*, who emphasizes the suffering of the cannibalistic mother even more than Josephus with the aim of highlighting the divine punishment of the Jews through Maria’s story. The author also greatly expands the discourse of Titus that appears in the *Jewish War* in order to more directly put forward his Christian polemic against Jews and Judaism.

Secondly, my close analysis of the reception of selected passages from the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* within the Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon* demonstrates a clear redactional pattern that runs through the second half of the Hebrew text. As scholars like Dönitz and Steven Bowman have argued, the *Sefer Yosippon* represents a Jewish counter-history to the Christian polemics found in the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano*. This overarching program that underlies the Hebrew text surfaces in different ways within the *Sefer Yosippon’s* adaptation of the accounts of the famine as they appear in the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano*. The author of the Hebrew text also omits, truncates, and alters his Latin source at different points in the narrative. He also inserts his own arguments, which situate the Jewish Revolt against Rome and the resulting famine in Jerusalem within a Jewish understanding of the covenant between God and the Jews.

Third, I have been able to employ a close synoptic reading in order to demonstrate certain features of the reception of *Sefer Yosippon’s* accounts of the famine in Jerusalem and the story of Maria within the *Zena Ayhud* by way of the *Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd*. My findings illustrate two things. First, supporting the arguments of scholars like Sela, I show that there is a consistent
move to Christianize the text that takes place at the level of the Arabic translation circulating in the Coptic community. This redactional move is made in a number of ways including the omission of explicitly Jewish material and the insertion of Christian material. Moreover, my work has allowed me to make some preliminary remarks about the source-critical relationship among the Hebrew, Judeo-Arabic, and Christian-Arabic versions of the Sefer Yosippon. More specifically, I have uncovered evidence that supports Sela’s argument that the Judeo-Arabic version of Sefer Yosippon written in Hebrew letters used a text written in Arabic script as its source (for example, see section A1 in Chapter 4 below).

Finally, my findings also demonstrate that the Ethiopic Zena Ayhud is a very close translation of its Arabic Vorlage, as indicated by Kamil who collated the only critical version of the text. While the Ethiopic text follows its Arabic Vorlage quite closely, I have found that it deviates from its source in a few instances, most notably at points where the Ethiopic translator incorporates liturgical material within the text.

1.4 Chapter Outline

This dissertation is divided into two parts, the first comprising Chapter Two and the second Chapters 3–5. Chapter Two will provide an introduction to the critical issues involved in the study of the five texts being examined in this work. I discuss each text by highlighting the major text-critical and source-critical questions behind each text. I also discuss issues such as the dating and authorship of the texts, as well as providing an overview of the major themes and narrative outlines of the texts. I also include a detailed discussion of the scholarly literature that has been done on the texts, providing an outline of some of the major questions prevalent in the
scholarship. The purpose of this discussion of the critical issues and historical context of each text is to provide background for the detailed exegetical work presented in Chapters 3–5.

The second part of the dissertation represents the core of the work. In Chapters Three, Four, and Five, I present selected passages from each one of the five texts in synoptic format. I then provide a commentary on each set of parallel passages, discussing the redactional changes that are made to each passage in the process of its transmission. The passages selected for this project are based on Chapter 7.7 in Arabic and Ethiopian texts, which is comprised of three primary sections: 1) descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem; 2) the story of Maria; 3) the discourse of Titus delivered in response to the story of the Maria.

Chapter Three of this dissertation covers the first section dealing with descriptions of the famine, which provides the background to the story of Maria. Chapter Four presents a close redactional analysis of parallel passages dealing with the story of Maria. Chapter Five is a discussion of the transmission of the discourse of Titus as it appears in the various texts. Each chapter also includes a list of the parallel passages, which can be found on page 90 in Chapter 3, page 132 in Chapter 4, and page 214 in Chapter 5. Furthermore, in Appendices B, C, and D, I include the parallel passages in the original languages, in formats that correspond to the parallel passages that appear in each chapter.

I have used the standard critical edition of each text as the basis of my analysis, and have included a list of the manuscripts utilized in each critical text in Appendix A. I rely on Niese and Thackeray’s edition for the Jewish War; on Ussani’s 1960 critical text for the De Excidio Hierosolymitano; on Flusser’s 1978 critical text for the Sefer Yosippon; on Sela’s 2009 critical text for the Zena Ayhud, see Appendix D.
text of Christian Arabic (and when necessary the Judeo-Arabic) versions of Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd; and finally on Kamil’s 1937 critical text of the Zena Ayhud.

In the case of the Greek text, I have used David Levenson and Thomas Martin’s literal translation of Book 6 of the War, which will appear as part of their forthcoming commentary. For sections in the BJ outside of Book 6, I employ Martin Hammond’s new translation of the Jewish War (2016). All translations of the Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopian texts are my own. I have consulted Blocker’s unfinished English translation of the Latin text, Böner-Klein’s German translation of the Hebrew text, Sela’s Modern Hebrew translation of the Arabic text, and the Amharic translation of the Zena Ayhud published by the Ethiopian Orthodox Church.

---

CHAPTER TWO
INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXTS

2.1 The Textual Transmission of the Jewish War

This chapter presents an introduction to the critical issues involved in the study of each one of the five texts being examined in this dissertation. I begin by providing an overview of the manuscript evidence for each text, before discussing questions concerned with the date of composition, background, and authorship (when relevant) of each text. My introduction to these texts also includes a brief overview of the content of these five histories. Moreover, in the case of the Sefer Yosippon and its Arabic adaptations, I discuss some of the main critical questions that are currently being discussed in the scholarship. More specifically, I provide a survey of the multiple recensions of the Hebrew Sefer Yosippon, summarizing the viewpoints of both Flusser and Dönitz. I also discuss the source-critical questions involved in the study of the different Arabic versions of the Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd, providing some preliminary observations based on the evidence I have uncovered through my own work on these texts. Finally, I present a brief discussion of the historical background to the Ethiopic translation of the Zena Ayhud, and provide textual evidence for the dating of the text to the fourteenth century.

2.1.1 The Jewish War of Josephus

Flavius Josephus stands out as the most important historian for understanding first-century Judea.\(^{10}\) In addition to writing the Jewish War, which relates the history of the first

\(^{10}\) According to his autobiography, Josephus was born to a distinguished priestly family sometime around 37–38 CE. For a summary of the life of Josephus and an analysis of his autobiography, see Harold W. Attridge, “Josephus and His Works,” in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha,
Judean Revolt against Rome (66–73 CE), he also composed the *Jewish Antiquities*, an apology of Judaism called *Against Apion*, and a short autobiography known as *The Life*.\(^{11}\) As noted above in Chapter One, there has been significantly more scholarship done on the works of Josephus than on the rest of the histories included in this reception study.\(^ {12}\) Because this project is not meant to provide a comprehensive overview of all the critical issues involved in the study of Josephus, in what follows I discuss only a few of the issues most salient to this study of his reception in the medieval *Sefer Yosippon* traditions. In particular, I focus on the composition of the *War*, discussing the text, date, background, and overview of the text.

### 2.1.2 The Text, Date, and Background of the *Jewish War*

The Greek text of Josephus’s *War* is extant today in a large number of manuscripts dating from the ninth century or later.\(^ {13}\) The critical edition of the text produced by Justus von Destinon and Benedikt Niese over a hundred years ago is still the standard text for scholars who study the text and serves as the basis of all modern translations of the *War*.\(^ {14}\) For their text of the *War*,

---

\(^{11}\) While the *Jewish Antiquities* is commonly dated to the middle of the last decade of the first century (i.e. 93–94 CE), the dating of *Against Apion* is less certain. However, it is clear that the latter was written after Josephus writes the *AJ*, since he refers to this text in *Ag. Ap*. Thus *Ag. Ap.* was most likely produced toward the end of the reign of Domitian (i.e. 96–98 CE) ([Ibid.], 210; 227–228).


Destinon and Niese relied on seven important textual witnesses from the eleventh century.\footnote{The list of the sigla of the seven codices and the descriptions of these manuscripts, including their current locations, is as follows: 1) P – Codex Parisinus Graccus 1425, parchment, tenth or eleventh century; Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; 2) A – Codex Ambrosianus (Mediolanensis) D 50 sup. – Gr. 234, parchment, early eleventh century; Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan; 3) M – Coded Marcianus (Venetus) Graecus 383, parchment, twelfth century; Biblioteca Nazionale di S. Marco in Venice; 4) L – Codex Laurentianus, Plut. 69, Cod. 19, parchment, eleventh or twelfth century; Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence; 5) V – Codex Vaticanus Graecus 148, parchment, tenth or eleventh century; Biblioteca Vaticana in Rome; 6) R – Codex Palatinus (Vaticanus) Graecus 284, parchment, eleventh or twelfth century, Biblioteca Vaticana in Rome; 7) C – Codex Urbinas (Vaticanus) Graecus 84, parchment, eleventh century; Biblioteca Vaticana in Rome (Justus von Destinon and Benedikt Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera. Edidit et apparatu critico instruxit B. N. Vol. VI: De Bello Judaico libros VII (Berlin, 1894), iii–xxii).}

Despite its importance to the study of Josephus’s War, recent textual and philological studies on the works of Josephus have shown that the editio maior of Destinon and Niese entitled Flavii Iosephi opera. Edidit et apparatu critico instruxit B. N. Vol. VI: De Bello Judaico libros VII is in need of updating.\footnote{Tommaso Leoni makes this observation following his survey of the principal manuscripts of the War. He writes, “Although on their first appearance Niese’s editions (maior and minor) were justly greeted as a major achievement in Josephan studies, today, more than a century later, few will dispute that they should be revised and updated, so as to take into account the most significant advances in scholarship” (Tommaso Leoni, “The Text of the Josephan Corpus: Principal Greek Manuscripts, Ancient Latin Translations, and the Indirect Tradition,” in A Companion to Josephus, ed. Honora Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers (Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 13).}

As Steve Mason points out, most scholars agree as to the dating of Josephus’s writing of the War, which was his earliest extant composition. The text was produced after Josephus’s arrival in Rome in 71 CE, during which he engages with others about the events that took place over the course of the recent war in Judea.\footnote{Mason, “Josephus’s Judean War,” 14. For Mason’s more extensive discussion of the dating of the War, see Steve Mason, A History of the Jewish War, A.D. 66-74 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 91–93.} Furthermore, the internal evidence within the Jewish War provides a timeframe of 75–79 CE within which Josephus would have composed his work.\footnote{Attridge writes, “The War is normally dated between 75, the date of the dedication of the Flavian Temple of Peace mentioned in War 7:158, and 79, the year of Vespasian’s death. The latter date is normally taken to be a terminus ante, because Josephus reports having presented Vespasian copies of his work (Life 359–61, Ag. Ap. 1:50–51). It seems likely, however, that the final version of at least Books 1–6 was published in the reign of Titus (June 79 to Sept. 81)” (Attridge, “Josephus and His Works,” 192).}

\footnote{The list of the sigla of the seven codices and the descriptions of these manuscripts, including their current locations, is as follows: 1) P – Codex Parisinus Graccus 1425, parchment, tenth or eleventh century; Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; 2) A – Codex Ambrosianus (Mediolanensis) D 50 sup. – Gr. 234, parchment, early eleventh century; Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan; 3) M – Coded Marcianus (Venetus) Graecus 383, parchment, twelfth century; Biblioteca Nazionale di S. Marco in Venice; 4) L – Codex Laurentianus, Plut. 69, Cod. 19, parchment, eleventh or twelfth century; Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence; 5) V – Codex Vaticanus Graecus 148, parchment, tenth or eleventh century; Biblioteca Vaticana in Rome; 6) R – Codex Palatinus (Vaticanus) Graecus 284, parchment, eleventh or twelfth century, Biblioteca Vaticana in Rome; 7) C – Codex Urbinas (Vaticanus) Graecus 84, parchment, eleventh century; Biblioteca Vaticana in Rome (Justus von Destinon and Benedikt Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera. Edidit et apparatu critico instruxit B. N. Vol. VI: De Bello Judaico libros VII (Berlin, 1894), iii–xxii).}

\footnote{Tommaso Leoni makes this observation following his survey of the principal manuscripts of the War. He writes, “Although on their first appearance Niese’s editions (maior and minor) were justly greeted as a major achievement in Josephan studies, today, more than a century later, few will dispute that they should be revised and updated, so as to take into account the most significant advances in scholarship” (Tommaso Leoni, “The Text of the Josephan Corpus: Principal Greek Manuscripts, Ancient Latin Translations, and the Indirect Tradition,” in A Companion to Josephus, ed. Honora Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers (Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 13).}

\footnote{Mason, “Josephus’s Judean War,” 14. For Mason’s more extensive discussion of the dating of the War, see Steve Mason, A History of the Jewish War, A.D. 66-74 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 91–93.}

\footnote{Attridge writes, “The War is normally dated between 75, the date of the dedication of the Flavian Temple of Peace mentioned in War 7:158, and 79, the year of Vespasian’s death. The latter date is normally taken to be a terminus ante, because Josephus reports having presented Vespasian copies of his work (Life 359–61, Ag. Ap. 1:50–51). It seems likely, however, that the final version of at least Books 1–6 was published in the reign of Titus (June 79 to Sept. 81)” (Attridge, “Josephus and His Works,” 192).}
Most scholars are also in agreement in placing the composition of the *War* within the background of Josephus’s desire to write an account of the Judean revolt that would meet both his apologetic goals of defending the Jews and his desire to paint his Flavian patrons in a favorable light.\(^{19}\) Josephus himself gives his reasoning for composing the *War* in his introduction to the text, claiming that correcting the imprecise or deliberately false accounts of the war is his primary reason for writing his own history of the events.\(^{20}\)

### 2.1.3 Overview of the *Jewish War*

Josephus begins his history of the Jewish Revolt against Rome by highlighting the major social and political events that precede the rise of rebellion in 66 CE. In Book 1, following his comments in the introduction, he provides a summary of political history from Antiochus Epiphanes to the death of Herod the Great (*BJ* 1.31–673). He opens Book 2 by describing some of the political unrest that plagues Judea during the reign of Herod’s sons (see *BJ* 2.1–118) and the governorships of Roman commanders like Pontius Pilate (*BJ* 2.167–183). He focuses on groups of troublemakers who call for political independence in Judea, and claims that such seditious groups begin to sow the seeds of rebellion (*BJ* 2.264–265).\(^{21}\) After recounting the

---

\(^{19}\) For a concise and up-to-date discussion of the background to Josephus’s writing of the *Jewish War*, see Mason, “Josephus’s Judean War,” 14–17. See also his discussion of the context of the war in Mason, *A History of the Jewish War, A.D. 66-74*, 60–137.

\(^{20}\) Josephus writes, “The historians of this war fall into two categories: those who had no part in the events have gathered from hearsay a random collection of inconsistent stories and made a rhetorical exercise of them; whereas the participants distort the facts either to flatter the Romans or out of hatred for the Jews, and in their writings you will find denunciation here, glorification there, but historical accuracy nowhere. I have therefore taken it on myself to publish to the inhabitants of the Empire a Greek translation of the factual account…” (*BJ* 1.2–3).

\(^{21}\) Josephus writes, “The charlatans and the terrorists joined forces to incite large numbers to revolt: they encouraged a fight for independence by threatening death to anyone who kowtowed to the dictates of Roman rule, proclaiming that those who preferred their slavery would have freedom forced on them. With separate units sent out to cover the country, they ransacked the estates of the powerful, murdered the owners, and burnt the villages. Ultimately the whole of Judea was infected by this crazy campaign, and it
incendiary events of 66 CE (BJ 2.407–457), he relates the campaign of Cestius, which fails to quell the rebellion (BJ 2.499–555). He concludes Book 2 by describing the new government that the rebels institute in Jerusalem, after they have either killed or kicked out from the city all the Roman forces (BJ 2.559–654).

Book 3 of the War opens with the campaigns of Vespasian and Titus in Galilee: sent by Nero after the defeat of Cestius, Vespasian takes command of the 5th and 10th legions in Syria and heads for Galilee, while Titus marches up from Egypt with the 15th (BJ 3.1–7). Josephus describes the great slaughter of Jews living in Galilean cities (BJ 3.8–134), before recounting in detail Vespasian’s siege of Jotapata and Josephus’s own defense of the city (BJ 3.135–408).22 The rest of Book 3 relates the other Flavian campaigns in Galilee and the regions surrounding Jerusalem (BJ 3.409–542).

Book 4 of the War shifts the focus of the narrative from the battles in Galilee to the internal conflicts between the rebel factions in Jerusalem. The escape of John of Gischala from his captured city to Jerusalem serves as the pivotal point in this narrative turn (BJ 4.82–128). Josephus describes the influx of outsiders who flood into Jerusalem for safety from the terror of Roman campaigns. The sudden rise in the city’s population (BJ 4.129–137), as well as the devastating battles between the rebel factions (who burn one another’s grain storages [BJ 5.21–39]), sets the scene for the great famine that is described in Books 5 and 6. The latter part of Book 4 juxtaposes the civil discord in Jerusalem with the political chaos in Rome (BJ 4.549–

22 The siege of Jotapata famously ends with Josephus managing to save his own life from the swords of his comrades, who wanted to commit mass suicide once the Romans take the city (BJ 3.340–348). After narrowly escaping death, Josephus gains the favor of Vespasian by predicting that the Roman general would become the next emperor (BJ 3.392).
588), after which Vespasian is declared emperor by his troops in Caesarea (BJ 4.601–621) and Josephus is freed from his chains (BJ 4.622–629). At the end of Book 4, Vespasian leaves for Rome from Alexandria and Titus marches against Jerusalem (BJ 4.655–663).

As Mason succinctly puts it, “Book 5 is about the education of Titus.” More specifically, Book 5 is about Titus’s learning about the obstinacy of the rebels, who refuse to surrender to him no matter what. In spite of the fact that Titus brings four legions with him to make a quick end to the rebellion (BJ 5.71–97), and even puts on a parade as a show of force (BJ 5.348–355), the rebels refuse to listen to his requests for surrender. Titus’s army demolishes all the vegetation and trees surrounding the city in their construction of siege engines (BJ 5.402–409) and a circular wall around the entire city, designed to completely cut off Jerusalem from all sources of food and supplies (BJ 5.491–501). Josephus closes Book 5 by describing several scenes of the horrors of the great famine that ensues inside the city as a result of the siege (BJ 5.425–572).

Book 6 continues the narrative of Book 5, describing both obstinacy of the rebel factions and the disastrous consequences of their actions. At the start of Book 6, the rebels work together to fight the Romans, and succeed in preventing the Romans from gaining access to the city (BJ 6.1–149). The Romans respond by building earthworks around the northwestern corner of the inner Temple, after carrying timber from long distances (BJ 6.150–192). When the situation gets desperate and a Roman breach is imminent, Josephus then recounts the story of Maria, the woman who kills and eats her child (BJ 2.199–214). This tragedy sets up the climax of Book 6 and the War as a whole, namely the destruction of the Temple (BJ 2.220–265). Josephus concludes Book 6 by relating the end of the war in Jerusalem, the fate of the rebel leaders, and

23 Mason, A History of the Jewish War, A.D. 66-74, 408.
the burning of the city (BJ 6.414–434). In Book 7, he highlights some of the major events that follow the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, including the Roman triumph (BJ 7.21–163) and Silva’s siege and capture of the Jewish fort at Masada (BJ 7.252–406).

2.2 The De Excidio Hierosolymitano and the Reception of Josephus in Late Antiquity

Among the various early Christian writings that employ the works of Josephus to propagate Christian triumphalism over against Jews and Judaism, a fourth-century reworking of Josephus’s Jewish War stands out as an exceptional case. For reasons delineated below, this text comes to be mistakenly associated with the name Hegesippus, and thus the title Pseudo-Hegesippus commonly serves as the name of the text. The original title of the work, however, has been lost and later manuscripts give several different titles to the text in the centuries following its production in the fourth century.

Most of the earliest manuscripts that contain the text bear as their titles different variations on historia Iosippi (the History of Josephus) or de bello Judaico (the Jewish War). For example, in the Reichenau catalogue that is produced around 822 CE, the title of the text is de bello Judaico libri V excerpti de historia Josephi. But it is the title first given to the text in a tenth-century Spanish manuscript that has become the standard appellation for the work: De excidio Hierosolymitano (“On the Destruction of Jerusalem”). This title appears in several subsequent manuscripts and also becomes the title most often preferred by modern scholarship

---

25 Ibid., 78.
on the text. The preference for this title is justified because the title encapsulates the major emphases of the work, namely the tragedies that befall the Jews during the revolt against Rome and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple that ensues. As a result, I refer to the text here as *De excidio Hierosolymitano* (*DEH*).

### 2.2.1 The Text of the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano*

According to some estimates, there are probably as many manuscripts and fragments of the *DEH* as there are manuscripts and fragments of the Latin *Jewish War* or the Latin *Jewish Antiquities*. However, a comprehensive list of all the known manuscripts that contain the *DEH* is currently not available. Pollard does provide a list of twenty-one of the earliest known manuscripts, all dating from before 1000 CE and three dating from before 700 CE. He cites the majority of these manuscripts by the catalogue number given to them in E.A. Lowe’s *Codices Latini Antiquiores* or in Bernhard Bischoff’s *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts* (Bischoff).

See Appendix A for a table listing the manuscripts used in Ussani’s edition, along with the *sigla*, the date, provenance (as known), and catalogue references.
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27 Bell notes four codices that bear this title: Laon 403b (ninth century); Laon 403 (twelfth century); Saint-Omer 700 (twelfth century); and Troyes 287 (twelfth century) (Ibid., 360). Most scholars have opted for this title, or variations of it. For example, in J.P. Migne’s *Patrologiae cursus complete*—*series Latina* the text appears under the title *De excidio urbis Hierosolymitanae libri quinque*. The critical editions of the text, in contrast, choose different titles for the text. Vincenzo Ussani’s *editio critica* bears the title *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae libri V* (Tommaso Leoni, “Translations and Adaptations of Josephus’s Writings in Antiquity and the Middle Ages,” *Ostraka* 16, no. 2 (2007): 484). The *editio critica* compiled by C. Weber and J. Caesar is entitled *Hegesippus qui dicitur sive Egesippus: De Bello Judaico* (Pollard, “The De Excidio of ‘Hegesippus,’” 68).

28 Pollard, “The De Excidio of ‘Hegesippus,’” 69. Given that there are more than 150 manuscript copies of the Latin *BJ* and close to 200 copies and fragments of the Latin *AJ* that are extant, Pollard’s estimation of the number of manuscripts of the *DEH* is surprising.

29 Pollard writes that “the manuscripts used by Ussani in his edition are unevenly described” and the discussion of them presumably does not include all of the known manuscripts. In addition, the manuscripts used by Weber are generally older witnesses of the text (Ibid., 79).

30 Ibid., 79.
of the manuscripts. Appendix A also includes Pollard’s list of important manuscripts that were not consulted by Ussani (see Table 9).

In addition to manuscripts of the \textit{DEH}, it is also important to highlight a few more manuscripts of the \textit{DEH} that share a particular trait relevant to the reception history of this text. As David Levenson and Thomas Martin have shown, the individual works of Josephus are transmitted in different combinations within the manuscript tradition of the Latin translations of Josephus. For example, the \textit{Jewish War} appears in some manuscripts by itself, together with various books of the \textit{Jewish Antiquities} in other manuscripts, and alongside \textit{Against Apion} in still other manuscripts.\footnote{David B. Levenson and Thomas R. Martin, “The Ancient Latin Translations of Josephus,” in \textit{A Companion to Josephus}, ed. Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers (Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 327.} Given the widespread association of the \textit{DEH} with Josephus in the medieval period, it comes as no surprise that several manuscripts couple the \textit{DEH} with the \textit{Jewish Antiquities} in place of the \textit{Jewish War}. At least four manuscripts survive that contain the first sixteen books of the \textit{Jewish Antiquities} alongside the \textit{DEH}.\footnote{David Flusser, “Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” in \textit{Josephus, Judaism and Christianity}, ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 392.} Most likely, it is one such manuscript that serves as one of the primary sources for the tenth-century Hebrew text \textit{Sefer Yosippon}.

The popularity of the \textit{DEH} within the manuscript tradition is not mirrored by the popularity of the text within modern scholarship. Although not much scholarly work has been done on the text, there are a couple of important works that need to be mentioned. The early modern period saw the publication of the \textit{editio princeps}: J.L. d’Etaples’s \textit{Aegesippi historiographi fidelissimi ac disertissimi et inter christianos antiquissimi historia de bello...}
Moreover, modern scholarship has provided two critical editions of the text. The first, *Hegesippus qui dicitur sive Egessipus: De Bello Judaico*, was published in Marburg in 1864 by C. Weber and J. Caesar. The second and more reliable edition, *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae libri V*, was published by Vincenzo Ussani in 1932 with a second volume appearing in 1960 with an introduction and indices provided by C. Mras.

### 2.2.2 The Date, Authorship and Background of the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano*

While the exact date for the production of the *DEH* has remained elusive, several clues within the text itself place the dating of the text sometime around 370 CE. The first set of clues provides a range of one hundred years within which the text must have been written. First, in *DEH* 3.5 there is a reference to the founding of Constantinople within the context of describing Antioch as the fourth city of the empire. This allusion establishes the year 330 CE as a definitive *terminus post quem*. Second, the French monk and bishop Eucherius of Lyon, quotes a passage from the *DEH* verbatim; his quotation designates 430 CE as a definitive *terminus ante quem*.

Moreover, as Albert Bell has noted, “virtually all scholars who have studied the matter agree that the references to *Britannia redacta* (2.9; 5.15) indicate a date soon after 367, when Count Theodosius led an expedition to reassert Roman supremacy in the island.” The text also

---

33 Pollard, “The De Excidio of ‘Hegesippus,’” 68.
features a couple of long panegyrics on the strength of the city of Rome (DEH 2.9; 5.46) and describes the barbarian tribes as inhabiting the frontiers of the empire (DEH 5.50). Taken together, these passages suggest that the author of the DEH does not know about the Germanic infiltrations of the empire in the last two decades of the fourth century or the blow to Roman might delivered at Adrianople in 378 CE.\(^{38}\) If the author was indeed unaware of these events, the likelihood is high that the DEH was produced sometime between 367 and 378 CE.\(^{39}\)

While internal evidence within the text helps to shed some light on the dating of the DEH, it does little to illuminate our knowledge of the identity of the author. The name of the original author is lost; thus the DEH is either written anonymously or the author’s name was lost at some point in the manuscript transmission. However, sometime in the medieval period, authorship of the text is ascribed to a certain Hegesippus.\(^{40}\) In addition to being the name of a minor Greek orator from the third century BCE, Hegesippus is also the name of a second-century Christian writer.\(^{41}\) According to Eusebius, the latter Hegesippus penned a five-book history of the

---


\(^{39}\) Bell has furthered suggested that the DEH could have been written as a polemic response to the emperor Julian’s abortive attempt to rebuilt the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem in 363 CE. He notes that as late as 387, Christians were still “laying great stress on the failure of Julian’s effort” and cites the support of Sebastian Brock (S.P. Brock, “The Rebuilding of the Temple Under Julian: A New Source,” \textit{PEQ} 108, no. 2 (2013): 103–7). David Levenson’s work on Christian responses to Julian’s failed attempt also corroborates and supplements Bell’s point, providing a comprehensive lists of sources as late as the fourteenth century that discuss the event (David B. Levenson, “The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian’s Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple,” \textit{JSJ} 35, no. 4 (2003): 409–60). Bell convincingly argues that the DEH should be viewed in the vein of such Christian polemics, since the primary theme of the text is the \textit{supremum excidium} (5.2) of the city of Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple cult as a punitive act of God (Ibid). For a recent survey of this issue, see Chiara Somenzi, \textit{Egesippo-Ambrogio: Formazione scolastica e cristiana nella Roma della metà del IV secolo} (Italian) (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2009).

\(^{40}\) The first known writer who refers to the text is Hincmar of Rheims, who is writing in the ninth century and cites a passage from \textit{Hegesippi historia} (Bell, “Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus,” 359).

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 349.
early Christian period, from the first century down to the Antonine emperors (HE 2.23; 3.20; 3.32; 4.8, 11; 4.22).42

There are two probable reasons why the text becomes associated with this Hegesippus: one, the DEH and the “memoirs” of Hegesippus mentioned by Eusebius are both produced in five books and it is possible that this coincidence led to the attribution of the DEH to the second-century Christian writer; two, the name Hegesippus could be a corruption of Josephus (in Latin Iosippus), particularly resulting from the phrase e(x)-Iosippo.43 This conjecture is supported by manuscript evidence in which the DEH is attributed to Iosippi or Iosephi, leading to the assumption present as late as the ninth century that the text is written by Josephus.44 These two hypotheses do not have to be mutually exclusive, however. As Pollard has suggested, “[the] name ‘Hegesippus’ may in fact have been ‘restored’ from a corruption of the phrase ex Iosippi historia, by a scribe who remembered that Eusebius had mentioned a Hegesippus who wrote a five-book history.”45 In other words, the attribution of the DEH to Hegesippus may have resulted both from a corruption of Iosippus and the subsequent scribal move to associate the text with the second-century Christian writer.

Scholarship on the DEH has altogether moved away from the association of the text with Hegesippus but has not been able to form a consensus on the identity of the real author. Several candidates have been proposed. Ambrose of Milan was a popular candidate for a long time. Some of the earliest manuscripts attribute authorship of the text to him. For example, at the end

42 Jerome also mentions Hegesippus in De viris illustr. 2.3-5; 22.1-5.
43 This is the assumption made by Destinon and Niese (1894): “re enim uera Hegesippi siue Egesippi nomen corruptela ortum est ex Iosepi aut Iosippi” cited in Pollard, “The De Excidio of ‘Hegesippus,’” 76. Leoni further notes that the idea of this corruption of Josephus dates back to at least to the eighteenth century, since Mazocchi makes the same case in his Commentarii in marmoreum Neapol. Kalendariun (1743) (Leoni, “Translations and Adaptations of Josephus’s Writings,” 483).
44 Pollard, “The De Excidio of ‘Hegesippus,’” 78.
45 Ibid., 76.
of book one of the *DEH* in MS Milan Biblioteca Amrosiana C 105 inf, an original subscription reads “*Iosippi liber ambrosi episcopi de grego transtulit in latinum*.” Such an association of the *DEH* with Ambrose most likely stems from Cassiodorus’s comments regarding the Latin translations of Josephus, which are discussed above.

Scholars have continued to debate the question of Ambrosian authorship. Ambrosian authorship was first put forward in early in the first half of the twentieth century, by scholars who argued that Ambrose wrote the text based on linguistic and stylistic similarities between the *DEH* and the writings of the Bishop of Milan. This argument has largely been abandoned, however, mostly due to the work of J.P. McCormick, who has steered the conversation away from Ambrosian authorship. McCormick argues that the evidence presents “a strong case in favor of an authorship for the *De Bello Iudaico* other than Ambrosian.” In contrast to McCormick’s arguments, Chiara Somenzi has recently revived the idea of Ambrosian authorship. She argues that despite some of the inconsistencies in the linguistic relationship between Ambrose and Pseudo-Hegesippus, the placement of the *DEH* in eighth and ninth-

---

46 Ibid., 76–77.
47 The first writer to note the linguistic and stylistic similarities between the *DEH* and the writings of Ambrose was William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta regum Anglorum* (Bell, “Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus,” 360). He was followed by Landgraf (1902), V. Ussani (1933), G. Ussani (1945), and Lumpe (1968) (Leoni, “Translations and Adaptations of Josephus’s Writings,” 483).
48 John P. McCormick, “A Study of the Nominal Syntax and of Indirect Discourse in Hegesippus” (The Catholic University of America, 1935), 214. McCormick accounts for the linguistic and stylistic similarities between the *DEH* and Ambrosian works by suggesting that the author of the *DEH* and Ambrose must have shared a common literary and cultural milieu. He notes that while there is “a formidable array of syntactical phenomena common to St. Ambrose and the author of the *De Bello Iudaico*, their value as arguments for Ambrosian authorship is reduced to insignificance when we note the same phenomena in other authors of the same time. As contemporaneous writers who were in the main conservative, the two were bound to have many points in common and to reflect the chief uses of their day. These likenesses, then, both emphasize the fact that St. Ambrose and Hegesippus were contemporaries and came under the same cultural influences” (Ibid., 213).
century manuscripts of Ambrose, as well as the shared ideology and content between the DEH and the exegetical writings of Ambrose, point in the direction of Ambrosian authorship.  

Candidates other than Ambrose have been suggested. G. Morin puts forward Nummius Aemilianus Dexter. But Bell counters this suggestion, noting the lack of evidence that Dexter had a first-hand knowledge of Syria and Palestine, something which the author of the DEH demonstrates throughout the text. Instead, Bell submits that a certain Evagrius of Antioch could be the author. Evagrius was an intimate friend of Jerome and was fluent in Greek and Latin. “In short,” Bell claims, “nothing that is known about Evagrius militates against his being pseudo-Hegesippus.” But as Bell himself admits, this suggestion is (albeit not baseless) still merely a conjecture. No evidence has come to light that has been able to lift the veil of anonymity by which the writing of the DEH is covered when it is first penned in the fourth century.

Moreover, it seems more pertinent to the historian of the reception of Josephus to uncover not the identity of the individual author behind the text but rather to explore the literary and cultural milieu that serves as the background to the production of the text. In this matter, we are assisted by the internal evidence within the text, which helps to shed light on the social and ideological issues prevalent among Christians in the Latin west during the late-antique period. So understood, the section below presents an overview of the content and major themes of the DEH.

49 Somenzi, Egesippo-Ambrogio, 189.
52 Ibid., 349.
53 Ibid.
2.2.3 Overview of the De excidio Hierosolymitano

Unlike the close, fourth or fifth-century Latin translation of Josephus’s *Jewish War*, the *DEH* diverges significantly from the *BJ* and has long been recognized by scholarship as “a substantially independent book.” Through a systematic and thorough process of rearranging, omitting, supplementing, and editing Josephus’s *BJ*, the author of the *DEH* composes a wholly different account of the first Judean Revolt against Rome. There are several important editorial changes made by the author of the *DEH* in order to create this history, which McCormick has termed “one of the more careful products of the [late-antique] period.”

First, the author of the *DEH* truncates Josephus’s *BJ*, omitting elements in Josephus’s account of the war that he deems to be irrelevant to his propagandist objective. The narrative presented in seven books in the *BJ* is re-presented in the *DEH* in only five books. Books 1–2 of the *DEH* follow Books 1–2 of the *BJ* relatively closely. Beginning in Book 3, however, the *DEH* begins to diverge from the order and content of the *BJ*. Josephus dedicates most of Book 3 of the *BJ* to the description of the military affairs taking place in Galilee, leading up to the climactic scene of his ingenious escape from the mass suicide of his companions.

---

54 This close Latin translation of the *War* produced in the fourth century was often attributed to Rufinus of Aquileia, a mistaken attribution which first appears in the fifteenth century (see Levenson and Martin, “The Ancient Latin Translations of Josephus,” 321–324).


56 McCormick, “A Study of the Nominal Syntax and of Indirect Discourse in Hegesippus,” 212.

57 While he follows the order of Books 1-2 of the *BJ* for the most part, the author of the *DEH* does employ several other sources that were available to him. As Bell has demonstrated, the author of the *DEH* prefers to use sources like the Latin versions of 1 and 2 Maccabees, Tacitus, Suetonius, Livy, Lucan and Christian apocryphal writings. While he does not rely significantly on such sources, whenever another source covers the same event as Josephus (as in the case of 1 and 2 Maccabees) or provides a varying detail from Josephus, the author of the *DEH* often cites the non-Josephan source (Bell, “Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus,” 355–356). For more on the *DEH*’s use of sources other than Josephus, see Albert A. Bell, “Classical and Christian Traditions in the Work of Pseudo-Hegesippus,” *ISSQ* 33 (1980): 60–64.
Many of these events are omitted from the *DEH*, which is unconcerned with the Jewish civil strife that leads to and prolongs the Judean Revolt.\(^{58}\) The narrative of the *DEH* focuses on the events through which the city of Jerusalem and the Temple are destroyed. Book 4 thus serves as the transition away from the battles taking place around Jerusalem and turns the lens of the narrative exclusively to Jerusalem. The author of the *DEH* presents his most original composition in Book 5, which compresses Books 5–7 of the *BJ* into one Book. He omits a large part of the final three books of the *BJ* and adds material that extenuates his major theme: the destruction of Jerusalem.

Pseudo-Hegesippus’s use of Josephus is similar to that of Eusebius of Caesarea, who employs the works of Josephus in his rewriting of Jewish history that appears in Book 3 of the *Ecclesiastical History*. But unlike Eusebius, the author of the *DEH* creates a loose translation of the *War*, as opposed to quoting Josephus verbatim. In this way, he sets out to refashion Josephus’s account of the Judean Revolt so that it could fit into the Christian view of history dominant in his time.

More specifically, whereas Josephus seeks to show how civil strife in Judea led to the revolt and aims to elicit sympathy for the Jews from his audience, the author of the *DEH* sets out to argue for the permanence of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and to highlight the

---

\(^{58}\) Bell notes, “Some passages that are intrinsically interesting and pertinent to a history of the Jewish War (e.g., the digressions on the three Jewish ‘sects’ [*BJ* 2.119–166] and on the organization of the Roman army [*BJ* 3.70–109]) are extraneous to Pseudo-Hegesippus’s theme and are omitted without even a passing summary. Other passages, particularly military maneuvers, are condensed to the point of obscurity” (Bell, “Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus,” 352). Pollard also reiterates this point, writing, “Gone was Josephus’s thorough, grieving account that stressed it was Jewish civil strife and disobedience to the Law that brought about an immense calamity. Describing the military details of the siege only vaguely (something Josephus had done with fastidious care), the *De Excidio* adopts and amplifies Eusebius’s portrayal of the ruin (*excidium*) of Jerusalem as divine vengeance for Jewish disbelief and participation in the death of Jesus” (Pollard, “The De Excidio of ‘Hegesippus,’” 77).
severity of God’s punishment of the Jews for their sins against Christ.59 A simple analysis of the number of times the term *excidium* (“destruction”) appears in the *DEH* reveals the importance of the concept for the author. The term is used at least forty-nine times, with twenty-eight of those instances appearing in Book 5, where the *DEH* deviates the most from the *BJ*.60 The author also explicitly states his agenda in the preface to the book; given its importance to understanding the reception of Josephus within the *DEH*, parts of the author’s opening words are quoted here:61

…The burning and looting of the Temple by Titus Caesar has been told by Josephus, an outstanding historian. If only he had paid as much attention to religion and truth as he did to the investigation of facts and moderation in writing. For he shows himself to be sympathetic to Jewish faithfulness even in the very things he sets forth about their punishment. Although he deserted them in a military sense, he did not wholly forsake their sacrileges. He bemoaned the catastrophe which befell them, but he did not understand the cause of it. Therefore, not relying on a wealth of intellect but on the application of my faith, I have felt the need to proceed a little further in the history of the Jews beyond the chronological limits of Holy Scripture…And so that no one will think I have undertaken a useless task, or one of no value to the Christian faith, let us consider the whole race of the Hebrews embodied in its leaders, so that it may be perfectly clear whether the succession of this generation “from the thighs of Judah” has ever been closed or whether it has truly failed in the line of princes but continues in him “to whom all things remain entrusted” and who is himself “the hope of the Gentiles” (*DEH* 1.1–3).

Given the evidence outlined here, Bell has argued convincingly that one coherent theme runs through the *DEH*: “the destruction of Jerusalem, its causes and implications.”62 He goes on to note terminologies present in the *DEH* but absent in Josephus, like *ultimum excidium* (“the

---

59 The theme of divine punishment against the Jews for the crime of killing Jesus is made explicit in *DEH* 5.32: “God had long been pressing the faithless minds, from which crucifying Jesus Christ they defiled themselves by that wicked murder. He is the one whose death is the ruin of the Jews, born from Maria.”

60 Bell, “Josephus and Pseudo-Heuesippus,” 352. A notable change made to Josephus’s account appears in *DEH* 5.11, where the author changes the name of the battering ram used by the Romans to *excisorem urbium* (“destroyer of cities”) from the name of the battering ram in *BJ* 5.299, Νικών (“victory”) (Ibid., 358).

61 In this instance, I have relied on Bell’s translation, who appears to have left out a sentence from the Latin text (Ibid., 352–353).

62 Ibid., 352.
ultimate destruction” [DEH 2.6]) and *supremum excidium* (“the final destruction” [DEH 5.2]). Such instances demonstrate the fact that the author of the *DEH* actively seeks to portray the results of the first Judean Revolt as a lasting, divine punishment against the Jews.

While Bell’s emphasis on this point is well-founded, it does run the risk of overshadowing another important motif propagated by the author of the *DEH*. This shortcoming of Bell’s analysis emerges in his interpretation of the account the Cestius affair as it appears in the *DEH*. Bell cites the religious explanations provided by both Josephus and the author of the *DEH* for Cestius’s curiously premature departure from Jerusalem.63 According to him, “These different interpretations of God’s rejection of the Jews exemplify the basic differences in theme between Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus. Josephus depicts God as punishing misdeeds; Pseudo-Hegesippus sees him as deliberately setting out to destroy the Jewish race.”64

However, given that the Cestius affair is relevant not for its role in the destruction of Jerusalem but rather for its role in prolonging the war, it is more accurate to see the Cestius affair in the *DEH* as highlighting not the ultimate destruction of the city but the severity of the suffering of the people. The terribleness of the tragedies that fall on the Jews is as crucial a motif in the *DEH* as the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.65 The great extent to which the Jews suffer is as much proof of the gravity of the crime of killing Jesus leveled against the Jews as the

---

64 Ibid., 354.
65 Karen M. Kletter highlights this tendency of the *DEH* to concentrate on scenes that depict particularly awful episodes in the *BJ* and writes, “The Pseudo-Hegesippian description of Jerusalem’s destruction is largely a chronicle of the most grotesque and sensational aspects of the siege and battle described in the *Jewish War*” (Karen M. Kletter, “The Christian Reception of Josephus in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages,” in *A Companion to Josephus*, ed. Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers (Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 371). Similarly, Pollard notes that the author of the *DEH* focuses “on the most horrible scenes in Josephus’s narrative” in order to “emphasize the harshness of this punishment” (Pollard, “The De Excidio of ‘Hegesippus,’” 77).
destruction of Jerusalem. As such, the revised and expanded version of the story of Maria that appears in the \textit{DEH} must be read in this context.

\subsection*{2.3 \textit{Sefer Yosippon} and the Reception of Josephus in Medieval Hebrew Literature}

In the medieval period, Latin translations of Josephus’s works serve as the most common channels by which Europeans could read the works of the ancient historian. Both the \textit{Jewish Antiquities} and the \textit{Jewish War} become important historiographical sources not just for Christians but for Jews as well.\footnote{Highlighting the dual presence of both Greek and Latin literary traditions in southern Italy during the medieval period, Michael McCormick has coined the term “imperial edge” to refer to how its geographic location between East and West helped foster cultural and literary diversity (Michael McCormick, “The Imperial Edge: Italo-Byzantine Identity, Movement and Integration, A.D. 650-950,” in \textit{Studies in the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire}, ed. H. Ahrweiler and A. Laiou (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 17–52).} Copies of the Latin translations of Josephus’s \textit{Jewish Antiquities}, \textit{Jewish War}, and \textit{Against Apion} circulate widely, sometimes the three texts appearing together in the same manuscript.\footnote{Kletter, “The Christian Reception of Josephus in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages,” 368.} As highlighted above, some manuscripts even place the \textit{Jewish Antiquities} alongside the \textit{DEH}.\footnote{For a list of the Latin manuscripts of Josephus, and a discussion of selected groups of manuscripts, see Levenson and Martin, “The Ancient Latin Translations of Josephus,” 326–329.} One of these manuscripts almost certainly serves as one of the main sources for a Hebrew history that is anonymously written in southern Italy in the tenth-century.\footnote{Flusser, “Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 392. Despite the anonymity of the text, authorship is subsequently ascribed to Yosef ben Gorion, the name of one of the Judean commanders listed in the \textit{DEH}. Because Pseudo-Hegesippus omits Josephus’s name (i.e. Yosef ben Mattitayhu) from the list of Judean commanders, Yosef ben Gorion is mistakenly ascribed authorship of the text. As a result, the \textit{SY} subsequently circulates as \textit{Sefer Yosef ben Gorion}, a title that sticks as the text is translated into Arabic.} Although it initially circulates under various names, this text eventually comes to be known as \textit{Sefer Yosippon}.
2.3.1 The Text of the Sefer Yosippon

*Sefer Yosippon* is extant today in a large number of fragments, complete manuscripts, and a few early printed editions. Today there are around eighty known partial or full manuscripts of the text. However, the majority of these manuscripts have only recently been identified and were unavailable to David Flusser when he collated his critical edition of the text in 1978. In reconstructing the version of *SY* that he considered to be the earliest, Flusser relied on thirteen manuscripts, a listed of which is provided in Table 10 in Appendix A. I have also provided a list of manuscripts of the *SY* identified by Dönitz, which were not consulted by Flusser (see Table 11 in Appendix A).

In addition to manuscript evidence, there are also early printed editions of *SY* that serve as important witnesses of the text. The first printed edition appeared in Mantua in 1480. A longer recension was printed in Constantinople in 1510 and was followed by the Venice printing in 1544. The latter printing in Venice was used by Hayim Hominer for his edition of *SY*, which was published in Jerusalem in 1965.

---

70 Dönitz, “Historiography Among Byzantine Jews,” 962. For a list of recently-discovered manuscripts that were not available to Flusser, see Saskia Dönitz, *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 39–45.


72 Dagmar Börner-Klein and Beat Zuber, “Einleitung,” in *Josippon: Jüdische Geschichte Vom Anfand Der Welt Bis Zum Ende Des Ersten Aufstands Gegen Rom* (Wiesbaden: Marixverlag, 2010), 6. According to Flusser, the Mantua printing “is based on a carelessly restyled and, at times, even abbreviated manuscript of the original version [wherein] Josephus appears as a dramatis persona, but all reference to him as an author has been omitted” (Flusser, “Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 388).

73 Flusser notes that among the interpolation added to the expanded version of *SY* represented by the Constantinople printing is an account of the crowning of Vespasian in Rome, a narrative that betrays the influence of the crowning of monarchs during the medieval period (Ibid.).

2.3.2 The Various Recensions of the Hebrew Sefer Yosippon

Not all of the manuscript evidence bears witness to the same version of SY. There are several different recensions of the text present in the manuscript tradition, resulting from the editorial activity of medieval copyists and scribes who altered the text for a variety of reasons. The alteration of texts in the process of their being translated and transmitted was not an alien practice within medieval textual traditions.\(^75\) In fact, editing of texts was such a common practice that some manuscripts contain requests from authors to their readers to emend and supplement the text.\(^76\)

Given that such editorial activity was prevalent within medieval Hebrew manuscripts as well, it comes as no surprise that the transmission of SY too bears the mark of various stages of editing. There are multiple incidents of alterations, omissions, and interpolations that were introduced within the manuscript tradition during the process of transmission. As Steven Bowman has noted, “there never was, aside from the author’s intent and possible autograph, one canonical text of Yosippon.”\(^77\) Additionally, the popularity of the text, which was “one of the most disseminated works in medieval Jewry,” further contributed to the wide range of recensions within the manuscript tradition.\(^78\)

In his foundational critical edition of the text, David Flusser compiled what he considered to be the earliest version of SY based on the small number of manuscripts available to him at the time. He also categorized the different recensions of the text that were extant in the manuscript

---

\(^75\) Ibid., 5.
\(^78\) Dönitz, “Historiography Among Byzantine Jews,” 963.
tradition into three groups that he labeled Redaction A, Redaction B, and Redactions C. His primary objective was to employ the earliest manuscript witnesses at his disposal in order to reconstruct the oldest SY tradition, or Redaction A. To this end, he relied mostly on three complete textual witnesses of Redaction A, which originated in the 15th and 16th centuries: MS New York 3572, MS Rothschild 24, and MS Vatican Urb. 52. He also consulted MS Budapest 355 and MS Oxford Heb. d 11, both of which he identified as belonging to Redaction A. Flusser discovered more witnesses of Redaction A, namely MS Jerusalem oct. 41280 and the Cairo Geniza fragments, only at the very end of his collating of the critical text. Although he was able incorporate the readings of these newly-discovered textual witnesses in some places within his critical text, he did not consult them systematically throughout his edition.

Because he was writing prior to the identification of many of the manuscripts of SY listed above, Flusser consulted only a few manuscripts that he categorized as witnesses of Redaction B and C. First, he designated MS Vatican 408 (Italian, 1443) as the primary witness of Redaction B. He further noted that this manuscript served as the basis for the Mantua printing of 1480, which was produced by Abraham Konat. He also listed MS Raimundus Martini and the beginning of the Venice printing of 1544 as belonging to Redaction B as well. Secondly, Flusser identified MS Paris 1280 and MS Vatican Borg. 1 (both of which emerged in fifteenth-

---


80 Ibid., 51. MS New York 3572 and MS Rothschild 24, together with the late-discovered MS Jerusalem oct. 41280, constituted a special group of manuscripts for Flusser not only because of their relatively early date but also because of their association with Gershom ben Yehuda, also known as Rabbenu Gershom (965–c. 1040) (Ibid., 7–8).

81 Ibid., 37.


83 Ibid., 254.
century Italy) as belonging to Redaction C.\textsuperscript{84} To this recension he added the Constantinople printing of 1510 and the Venice printing of 1544, as well as a manuscript attributed to Abraham ibn Daud, whom Flusser claimed had access to Redaction C of SY.\textsuperscript{85}

Saskia Dönitz has taken up the task of supplementing Flusser’s pioneering work. She begins by noting the problems in Flusser’s categorization of the different recensions of SY. She writes, “Für das Verständnis der Rezeptionsgeschichte des SY ist eine Untersuchung der Textentwicklung von Redaktion A bis C unentbehrlich. Die komplexe Textgeschichte des SY ist jedoch aufgrund des problematischen Textbestandes von Flussers Edition nur durch eine erneute Betrachtung der Handschriften nachzuvollziehen.”\textsuperscript{86} Thus taking into account the manuscripts of SY that have been identified since Flusser’s publication in 1978, she makes the case for a more accurate classification of the different recensions present in the manuscript tradition.\textsuperscript{87}

While she retains Flusser’s classification of the various recensions into Redactions A, B, and C, she suggests that the presence of overlapping features among the manuscripts warrants a more accurate organization. Thus her revised classification includes categories for manuscripts demonstrating a transition from one Redaction to another, in addition to a reassignment of the manuscripts that belong to each Redaction.

First, Dönitz argues that Flusser did not succeed in reconstructing the earliest version of SY, since he failed to take into account the most important manuscripts

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 32.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., 254.
\textsuperscript{86} Dönitz, \textit{Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon}, 37.
\textsuperscript{87} Dönitz notes that she has compiled “twenty-five Hebrew manuscripts preserved in the Cairo Geniza which were only partly included in Flusser’s edition” (Dönitz, “Historiography Among Byzantine Jews,” 955. She also consulted the catalog of the \textit{Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts} (IMHM), which lists 43 entries for the Hebrew SY. In her reclassification of the different recensions, she consults sixteen new textual witnesses that were unavailable to Flusser. She also notes that an additional eleven manuscripts were identified, but they are not included in her book on the reception of SY because they emerged only after the sixteenth century (Dönitz, \textit{Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon}, 37).
Flusser relied heavily on a few complete manuscripts, including MS New York 3572 and MS Rothschild 24, for his reconstruction of Redaction A. But according to Dönitz, the Geniza fragments bear witness to an earlier version of SY than Flusser’s reconstruction of Redaction A; thus she designates the version of SY present in the Geniza fragments as Redaction A. She also assigns MS Vatican Urb. 52 to this category, since it—together with the Geniza fragments—does not contain any of the interpolations found in later manuscripts. Since most of the manuscripts that Flusser listed under Redaction A represent edited versions of SY, Dönitz re-lists these manuscripts under different categories.

MS Jerusalem oct. 41280, MS Rothschild 24 and MS New York 3572 are listed under a category she calls “Ashkenazi Redaction A,” since they attest to a recension of SY that was popular with and most likely originated among Ashkenazi Jews. Another manuscript that

---

88 Ibid., 36.
89 The biggest difference between Flusser’s Redaction A and Dönitz’s Redaction A is a passage included in chapters 4–6 of Flusser’s edition known as the Daniel Interpolation. These narratives about Daniel are present in the one group of manuscripts on which Flusser relied for his reconstruction of Redaction A. However, the Daniel Interpolation is absent in the Cairo Geniza fragments and MS Vatican Urb. 52. Flusser had argued that these passages were present in the original version of SY, only to be later removed due to the discrepancies in the chronology of the reign of Darius (Flusser, Sefer Yosippon, 2:23). As a result, he considered the manuscripts that included the Daniel Interpolation to be witnesses of Redaction A. In contrast, Dönitz notes that the earliest textual witnesses of SY (i.e. the Geniza fragments and the Judeo-Arabic translation of SY) do not include this interpolation. Thus the manuscripts without the Daniel Interpolation constitute the earliest version of the text (Dönitz, Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon, 39–40).
90 Flusser had considered MS Vatican Urb. 52 to be a link between Redaction A and B because he thought it might have contained the Daniel Interpolation (Flusser, Sefer Yosippon, 2:10). The pages in the manuscript where the Daniel Interpolation would have been located, however, are missing. Considering the lack of explicit evidence of an interpolation, together with the fact that MS Vatican Urb. 52 shares the readings of the Geniza fragments, Dönitz designates this manuscript as belonging to the earliest stage of the SY textual tradition. Additionally, based on features that they share with MS Vatican Urb. 52, MS Oxford Heb. d 64, MS Cambridge Or. 1080 A 45.1, and MS Oxford Heb. e 30 are also included in Redaction A (Dönitz, Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon, 46).
91 These three manuscripts share a number of interesting features. First, although they lack the Daniel Interpolation present in the other manuscripts that make up Flusser’s Redaction A, they do contain other interpolations about the conquest of Babylon, the vow of Cyrus, and an account of the death of Darius that is different from the biblical narrative. Second, all three manuscripts feature a note that the copy of
Flusser categorized under Redaction A is reclassified by Dönitz based on the overlapping features that it shares with manuscripts designated as Redaction B by Flusser. MS Oxford Heb. d 11 contains the wording of the older version preserved in the Geniza fragments, but it also contains the Daniel Interpolation and other adaptations that belong to manuscripts in Redaction B. As a result, Dönitz designates it as a textual witness that falls within a transitional stage between Redaction A and Redaction B.

Moreover, Dönitz expands on Flusser’s Redaction B and suggests that there are in fact different multiple versions of SY present among the manuscripts that Flusser lists under this one category. First, she suggests that there are two versions of Redaction B: one long and one short. MS Vatican 408 and MS Budapest 355 represent the longer version of Redaction B. These manuscripts attest the wording of the “Ashkenazi Redaction A” manuscripts instead of the Geniza fragments and share a common set of interpolations. MS Munich Cod. Hebr. 153, Nr. VIII and MS Oxford Hunt. 345 represent the shorter version of Redaction B. These two manuscripts contain elements belonging to manuscripts in Redaction B, but the wording of both manuscripts has been abbreviated at certain points.

---

the text was made by Gershom ben Yehuda. Third, the structure of chapters 7, 9, 60 and 89 differ in these manuscripts from the other textual witness of SY (Ibid., 44–45).

92 Ibid., 45.
93 Ibid., 73. Since the designation of a given manuscript to Redaction B is based largely on its inclusion of certain interpolations, Dönitz submits that MS St. Petersburg Evr. 1 306 should also be included as part of Redaction B. Although the manuscript is severely damaged and cannot be reconstructed, it does appear to have parts of the Daniel interpolation and also shares certain features with MS Oxford Heb. d 11 and MS Budapest 355 (Ibid., 72).
94 Ibid., 45.
95 Ibid, 73.
96 The truncated version of Redaction B found in these manuscripts is similar to the Mantua printing of 1480, which itself most likely was dependent on a manuscript of the shorter version of Redaction B (Ibid., 74).
In addition to distinguishing between the longer and shorter versions of Redaction B, Dönitz also highlights a couple of manuscripts that represent a development within the Redaction B tradition and thus constitute a transitional stage between Redaction B and C: MS Milan I 67 and MS Moscow 258. These manuscripts contain some interpolations present in the textual witnesses of Redaction C, but they also demonstrate agreement with MS Vatican 408 and MS Budapest.97

Redaction C can be described as an expanded form of Redaction B, and constitutes the most well known version of SY.98 One-third longer than Redaction B, it includes an expansion of speeches and narratives, as well as additions of passages from other sources. As Flusser claimed, this recension is best represented by the Constantinople printing of 1510 and the Venice printing of 1544.99 Dönitz agrees with Flusser on this classification, as well as on the point that MS Paris 1280 and MS Vatican Borg. 1 both belong to this recension. She adds one more manuscript (MS Milan H 70 inf.) to the list of Redaction C, which was not available to Flusser but shares common features with MS Paris 1280 and MS Vatican Borg. 1.100 Because the textual witnesses to Redaction C contain a preface written by Yehuda ben Leon Masqoni (1328–1370), Dönitz suggests that this recension of SY was first created by him.101

Table 1 below provides a comparative outline of Flusser’s and Dönitz’s classifications of the textual witnesses that represent the various recensions of SY.

---
97 Ibid., 72–74.
98 Dönitz, Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon, 91.
100 Dönitz, Überlieferung Und Rezeption Des Sefer Yosippon, 92.
101 Ibid.
Table 1: Comparative Chart of the Various Redactions of the Hebrew SY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction</th>
<th>Flusser</th>
<th>Dönitz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>- MS Jerusalem oct. 41280 (נ)</td>
<td>- MS Vatican Urb. 52 (ג)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Vatican Urb. 52 (ג)</td>
<td>- MS Cambridge T.-S. 10 K 16.20, Nr. 1–5; 6–9; 20 (ג)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Rothschild 24 (ס)</td>
<td>- MS Cambridge T.-S. C 2.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS New York 3572 (ס)</td>
<td>- MS St. Petersburg Antonin B 283 (ס)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Oxford Heb. d 11 (ס)</td>
<td>- MS St. Petersburg Antonin B 917 (ס)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Budapest 355 (ס)</td>
<td>- MS Oxford Heb. d 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Oxford Heb. e 30</td>
<td>- MS Oxford Heb. e 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Cambridge Or. 1080 A 45.1</td>
<td>- MS Cambridge Or. 1080 A 45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS St. Petersburg Evr. II A 1424</td>
<td>- MS St. Petersburg Evr. II A 1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashkenazi A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Jerusalem oct. 41280 (נ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition A to B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Rothschild 24 (ס)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS New York 3572 (ס)</td>
<td>- MS New York 3572 (ס)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>- MS Vatican 408 (ס)</td>
<td>- MS Oxford Heb. d 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Budapest 355 (ס)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS St. Petersburg Evr. 1 306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short B</strong></td>
<td>- MS Munich Cod. Hebr. 153</td>
<td>- MS Munich Cod. Hebr. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Oxford Hunt. 345</td>
<td>- MS Oxford Hunt. 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mantua Printing (1480)</td>
<td>- Mantua Printing (1480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition B to C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Milan I 67 (ס)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Milan H 70 inf.</td>
<td>- MS Milan H 70 inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Constantinople Printing (1510)</td>
<td>- Constantinople Printing (1510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Venice Printing (1544)</td>
<td>- Venice Printing (1544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>- MS Paris 1280</td>
<td>- MS Paris 1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MS Vatican Borg. 1</td>
<td>- MS Vatican Borg. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Constantinople Printing (1510)</td>
<td>- Constantinople Printing (1510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Venice Printing (1544)</td>
<td>- Venice Printing (1544)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 The Date, Authorship and Background of the Sefer Yosippon

The date of the original composition of *Sefer Yosippon* has been a contentious issue within the scholarly literature. On the one hand, there has been a general consensus among
scholars that the composition of *SY* takes place in tenth-century Italy, amidst the resurgence of Hebrew literature in Europe that occurs in the ninth and tenth centuries. On the other hand, scholars investigating the issue after Flusser’s foundational work on *SY* have not always agreed with his attempts to date the text more precisely.

Flusser narrows down the range for the possible date of *SY* to between 896 and 965 CE, deriving these two markers from two particular pieces of internal evidence. First, he notes that the author of *SY* accurately portrays the settlements of nations like the “Russi” (the Russians) and the Hungarians. Because the Hungarians found their settlement on the river Danube around 896 CE, the text of *SY* that mentions them and their settlement could not have been written any earlier. Secondly, according to the author of *SY*, the city of Tarsus is conquered by Muslims. However, the Byzantines recapture Tarsus from the Muslims in 965 CE. From these two pieces of evidence, Flusser designates 896 CE as the *terminus post quem* and 965 CE as the *terminus ante quem*.

Moreover, Flusser has argued for an even more precise dating of the text based on a colophon found in only one manuscript (i.e. the Rothschild Miscellany). He argues that the date of the original composition of *SY* was deleted from all other manuscripts because the late

---


103 This is a determination with which Dönitz is in agreement; she places the *terminus post quem* at 895 based on this evidence. See Saskia Dönitz, “Sefer Yosippon (Josippon),” in *A Companion to Josephus*, ed. Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 385.


105 This exquisitely decorated and colorful manuscript is dated between 1453 and 1480 CE. According to Bowman, it was produced for a wealthy Ashkenazi family living in northern Italy and contains a series of liturgies, in addition to *SY* and other writings (Bowman, “Dates in Sefer Yosippon,” 355).
date contradicts the attribution of authorship of the text to Josephus. However, he claims that the Rothschild Miscellany manuscript preserves the date of authorship “by a fortunate coincidence.”¹⁰⁶ The critical passage on which Flusser’s argument hangs is found at the end of chapter 40 of the text and reads as follows:¹⁰⁷

And many letters like this one which we found in the book of Joseph ben Gurion we did not write them here for the book is full of such letters in the copy which we found from the year 508 after the destruction of the Temple. Now we have written and copied from the book, from the book of Joseph ben Gurion the priest in the year 885 of the Destruction Era.¹⁰⁸

Much of the controversy surrounding Flusser’s dating of SY revolves around one central question: what exactly is “the book of Joseph ben Gurion” referred to in this passage? According to Flusser, the book of Joseph ben Gurion refers to Josephus—and more specifically—to the Latin versions of Josephus.¹⁰⁹ He suggests that the first date given in this passage (i.e. 508) is a reference to the Latin Josephus that Yehuda ibn Moskoni mentions in the introduction to his version of SY.¹¹⁰ The second date mentioned in the passage, according to Flusser’s reckoning, would then be the date of the original composition of SY. Flusser writes, “it was customary then to reckon the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem by the Romans from the year A.D. 68,

¹⁰⁶ Flusser, “Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 390. For a more detailed discussion of the evidence regarding the dating of SY, see Flusser, Sefer Yosippon, 2:79–84. See also his article, David Flusser, “The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age” (Hebrew), Zion 18 (1953): 109–126.
¹⁰⁷ Bowman relates some observations made by Ben Zion Wacholder relating to the medieval practice of inserting colophons in the middle of a text: “the appearance of a date (in the Destruction Era) in the appropriate place (usually in the middle) of a text is an important rabbinic injunction to protect the identity of a treatise whose beginning and end were subject to the vicissitudes of men, mice, and natural elements…whoever wrote [this] internal chronological colophon was familiar with that scribal tradition” (Bowman, “Dates in Sefer Yosippon,” 356).
¹⁰⁸ The translation of this passage is that of Bowman (Ibid., 354).
¹¹⁰ Bowman, “Dates in Sefer Yosippon,” 355. Given that dates for the “Destruction Era” were reckoned beginning with 68 CE, 508 would be equivalent to 576 CE.
[thus] it follows that the Hebrew book was composed in A.D. 953.\footnote{111} In other words, 68 CE served as the commencement of the “Destruction Era”; thus adding 885 years to 68, Flusser arrives at 953 CE. \footnote{112}

However, not all scholars are in agreement with this conclusion. Objections to Flusser’s dating of the text have been raised on the grounds that there is evidence of a familiarity with the text of SY present within several sources written before 953 CE. Reuven Bonfil first makes this observation in his review of Flusser’s critical edition of SY.\footnote{113} Similarly, Dönitz takes issue with the dating proposed by Flusser. She notes that Dunash ibn Tamīn and Saadia Gaon knew SY, probably in its Judeo-Arabic translation.\footnote{114} She writes, “Therefore, it is impossible to date it to 953, since Saadia Gaon already died in 942.”\footnote{115} Considering this piece of evidence, she suggests that the first half of the tenth century (sometime before 942) better serves as the date of SY.

Alternately, Bowman suggests that the dating issue is more complicated than coming up with a single date because there is evidence that SY is a composite text made up of parts written at different times. He writes, “the attempt to find a single date and author for the Hebrew versions of Yosippon leads through a labyrinth to a scholarly cul de sac.”\footnote{116} In addition to the issue of identifying the Latin sources of SY, Bowman notes that scholarship must now take into serious account the relationship between the Hebrew and Arabic versions of SY. This observation has been made forcefully by the recent work of Shulamit Sela, who has provided a critical text of

\footnote{111} Flusser, “Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 390.
\footnote{112} As for the first date given in this passage, Flusser suggests that it is a reference to the Latin Josephus that Yehuda ibn Moskoni mentions in the introduction to his version of SY (Ibid., 355).
\footnote{114} Dönitz, “Historiography Among Byzantine Jews,” 954.
\footnote{115} Ibid., 955.
\footnote{116} Bowman, “Dates in Sefer Yosippon,” 357.
the Arabic and Judeo-Arabic versions of SY. Sela argues that the Hebrew SY is a culmination of a long process of editing and expanding that begins with the Arabic Book of Maccabees, probably sometime in the eighth or ninth century. The composite nature of SY thus seems to be resistant to a singular date, although it is reasonable to assume that the first Hebrew version of the text appears sometimes in the first half of the tenth century.

While there have been different viewpoints on the dating of SY, scholars are generally agreed that it was written anonymously. Thus most of the discussion regarding the authorship of SY has revolved around the falsified attribution of authorship to Josephus and the confusion of Josephus with Joseph ben Gorion. As a result, Josephus was thought to have been the author of the text up until the modern period. Flusser submits that a close reading of the earliest textual witnesses of SY reveals that the medieval author of SY never pretends to be Josephus; in certain places the author refers to himself in the first person while simultaneously referring to Josephus

---


119 Flusser, “Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 388. The confusion of Josephus with Joseph ben Gorion was caused by the omission of Josephus’s name, Yosef ben Mattityhu, from the list of Jewish generals in DEH 3.3. Because the DEH served as the sole source for the Jewish War for the author of SY, the lack of Josephus’s name led to the adoption of the name of another general listed as a general: Joseph ben Gorion. In this way, the text comes to be known commonly as the Book of Joseph ben Gorion both in the Hebrew and Arabic manuscript traditions. Interestingly enough, David Ben Gurion was inspired to change his last name because of this, albeit ultimately erroneous, title of the text—according to Flusser (who claims to have learned this information from Ben Gurion himself) (Ibid., 396).

120 For example, Yehuda Mosconi in his introductory letter to the text writes, “Indeed Joseph ha-Cohen ben Gurion ha-Cohen is also called Yosippon, and behold he wrote Yosippon in the holy tongue. He also wrote yet another book, larger than this, for the Romans in their language and in their writing in the stories of their kings and in their sources and in the stories of the universe, according to what he heard and saw, and this is the large book that is found among them to this day” (Bowman, “Dates in Sefer Yosippon,” 352).
in the third person. Additionally, Flusser describes the intellectual character of the author as follows:

Though his history is a classical Hebrew book, written more or less in biblical Hebrew, its author was far more at home in the Latin culture of the non-Jewish world than in the world of the rabbinic learning of his Jewish compatriots. His knowledge of Talmudic literature was comparatively poor; and when he knew of a Talmudic parallel to the events which he described, he preferred citing Josephus to citing the pertinent text from the Talmudic literature...In any case, the author of Josippon was not a full member of the rabbinic Judaism of his time and of his homeland...He is a believing Jew but does not show a special feeling for the deeper sides of religion or theology (italics mine).

Whatever the relationship of the SY with the “rabbinic Judaism of his time,” the text is clearly a product of ninth or tenth century Italy. Flusser has demonstrated that the author of SY was quite familiar with certain places in southern Italy, where he most likely lived. In this period, southern Italy was home to a Hebrew literary renaissance and became one of the most important centers of Jewish learning in Europe. This intellectual revival produced, for

---

121 Flusser, “Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 393. It is only beginning in the twelfth century that the text comes to be explicitly ascribed to Josephus in certain manuscripts. However, modern critical scholarship has now conclusively shown that it is neither written by Josephus nor an ancient text, noting that among other anachronistic features, SY contains names of medieval towns and nations (Ibid., 388–89).

122 Ibid., 394–95. Such a tendency to avoid rabbinic conventions on the part of the author that Flusser points out is echoed by Bowman, who writes, “In his treatment of the subject—the history of the Jews from the destruction of the First Temple through the destruction of the Second—the author does not indicate any intellectual reliance on the general medieval Jewish tendency to emphasize Kiddush ha-Shem (‘Sanctification of the Name’), that is, martyrdom...Nor is there any indication that his historiographical approach was influenced by his eschatological framework of the Four Kingdoms outlined in the Book of Daniel and accepted by all medieval chronographers” (Steven Bowman, “Josephus in Byzantium,” in Josephus, Judaism and Christianity, ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 375).

123 Given the references to Naples indicating an intimate familiarity with the political and commercial life of the city, Flusser suggests that the author of SY may himself have been a resident there (Flusser, “Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 393–94).

example, the medical school at Salerno, the medieval Hebrew Chronicles of Yerahme’el, and a number of liturgical poets who exerted their influence on Ashkenazi synagogal poetry.  

Translation of Greek and Latin texts into Hebrew also became an important aspect of this cultural and literary renaissance. These Greek and Latin works had been preserved by Christians, and in the Medieval period Jewish intellectuals begin to see the value of such works for understanding their own history and heritage. This was especially the case for extra-biblical books of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, like the so-called Apocrypha and the writings of Josephus. The author of SY was one such scholar, who translated various Latin sources into Hebrew and compiled them into one book so as to make them available to those who could not read Greek or Latin. In addition to the Jewish Antiquities of Josephus and the DEH, the author of SY also translated and incorporated into his history portions of other ancient sources like Virgil’s Aeneid, 1-2 Maccabees, and several early Christian historiographical works.

Moreover, beyond the cultural and literary renaissance taking place among Italian Jews, the author of SY was also influenced by the fact that he was writing at the intersection of Jewish and Christian cultures. Certain prominent themes in the text indicate that the ideological debates between Christians and Jews, for example, directed the author’s historiographical program. One of these themes, as Dönitz notes is, “[SY’s] reworking of Josephus’s Latin works mirrors the


126 The Hebrew translation of the Greek Alexander Romance known as Pseudo-Callisthenes is one of very few examples of Hebrew translations directly from Greek sources. Whether Josephus was known in the original Greek to Jews living in southern Italy at this time has yet to be resolved. There are, however, several examples of Hebrew translations from Latin sources, including (of course) the SY (Ibid.).


128 Dönitz, “Historiography Among Byzantine Jews,” 956. In addition to these sources, as Dönitz notes, the SY shows familiarity with Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History, Jerome’s De viris illustribus, Orosius’s Historia contra Paganos, Livy’s Ab urbe condita, and Virgil’s Aeneis (Ibid.).
contact and debate between [Judaism and Christianity] about the true interpretation of the destruction of the Temple.”¹²⁹ Thus in the case of SY, one sees an attempt by the medieval Jewish author not only to supplement the biblical narrative about Jewish history with reference to extrabiblical sources but also a desire to reappropriate Jewish history from Christian sources and use it to mount a defense against contemporary Christian polemics.¹³⁰

### 2.3.4 Overview of the Sefer Yosippon

*Sefer Yosippon*, in Flusser’s critical edition, spans 89 chapters and covers a variety of historical topics from the genealogies in Genesis to the capture of Masada by the Romans in 73 CE. The first two chapters present a reworking of the list of nations in Genesis 10 (including details of nations contemporaneous with the writing of the text), as well as a survey of Roman antiquities based on the writings of Josephus, Virgil, and Livy.¹³¹ Chapters 3–10 recount certain famous narratives of the post-exilic period such as the rebuilding of the Second Temple, the story of Esther and Mordecai, and Alexander’s visit to Jerusalem.¹³² Relying primarily on 1–2 Maccabees and books 9–16 of Josephus’s *Jewish Antiquities*, chapters 11–50 retell the accounts of the translation of the Septuagint, the Maccabean martyrs, the Hasmonaeans, and Herod and his

---

¹²⁹ Ibid., 960.
¹³⁰ This leads to, among other things, the use of SY by late-medieval and modern readers as a source for an inspirational account of Jewish history in the antiquity. For a discussion of how the text becomes read both as commentary and collective memory by modern Jewish nationalist movements, see Bowman, “‘Yosippon’ and Jewish Nationalism.”
¹³² Ibid., 9–47.
sons.\textsuperscript{133} The second half of the book, comprising chapters 50–89, represents a reworking of the
\textit{DEH} and covers the Jewish Revolt against Rome and destruction of the Temple.\textsuperscript{134}

As mentioned above, one of the central programs of the author of \textit{SY} is to re-appropriate
Christian writings about the Jews and provide a counter-history to Christian formulations of the
Jewish heritage. This is especially the case with \textit{SY}'s treatment of the \textit{DEH}. The author of \textit{SY} is
not merely translating the \textit{DEH}, but is also engaging in the polemical dialogue that the \textit{DEH}
spurs by offering contrasting interpretations of the Jewish War. The author employs several
rhetorical strategies to accomplish this objective, at times supplementing and often omitting the
history of the so-called Pseudo-Hegesippus. For example, whereas the \textit{DEH} fixes the blame for
the destruction of the Temple of the Jews’ killing of Jesus, the author of \textit{SY} drops all passages
regarding Jesus or Christianity and instead promotes the Josephan and rabbinic notion that a
group of rebels among the Jews was to blame for the disaster of the first Jewish revolt against
Rome.\textsuperscript{135} Despite the overtly Jewish elements in the text, the \textit{SY} becomes popular not only
among medieval Jews, but also—through its Arabic translations—among Christians and
Muslims as well.

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 48–270.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 271–431.
\textsuperscript{135} Flusser notes that “the author of \textit{Josippon} writes about John the Baptist in his book, following
Hegesippus’s account, but does not speak about Jesus. Two manuscripts of \textit{Josippon} contain a strange
interpolation about Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity that has no historical value and is written in a
spirit that is unfriendly toward Christianity, like some other Jewish notices about Christianity” (Flusser,
“Josippon, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” 395). Flusser provides these interpolations as an
2:54–60.
2.4 The Receptions of Sefer Yosippon in Medieval Arabic Literature

The popularity of Sefer Yosippon across communities of different cultures and religions is demonstrated by the evidence we have of early Arabic translations of the text that are made both in Judeo-Arabic and Arabic script. The version appearing in Arabic letters has Christian interpolations and is therefore sometimes referred to as the Christian-Arabic version. In addition to these Arabic versions of SY, the medieval period also sees the emergence of the Arabic Book of Maccabees, which corresponds roughly to chapters 11–48 of the Hebrew SY. Although these important works remained unstudied for a long time, recent scholarship has begun a renewed analysis of them and their relationship to the Hebrew versions of SY.

The renewed interest in these important works was in part spurred by the discovery of manuscripts of Arabic versions of SY in both Hebrew and Arabic script among the Cairo Geniza fragments. Although a comprehensive analysis of all the known manuscripts of the Arabic versions of SY remains a desideratum, several textual witnesses have been identified by Dönitz and Shulamit Sela. The manuscripts consulted by Sela for her critical texts of the Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic versions of the KAY are provided in Table 11 and 12 in Appendix A.

The relative dearth of scholarship on the Arabic versions of SY has meant that several questions remain without definitive answers. One of the most contentious issues has been the source-critical pedigree of these texts, which is an issue that bears implications for our understanding of the dating, authorship and background of the Arabic versions of SY as well. The

\[\text{\footnotesize{136} This “Christian-Arabic” version of SY serves as the Vorlage to the Ethiopic SY, known as Zena Ayhud.}
\[\text{\footnotesize{137} Dönitz, Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon, 106.}
\[\text{\footnotesize{138} Although Sela has edited and compiled approximately two-thirds of the sixty or so known manuscripts of the Judeo-Arabic SY, according to Dönitz, there are still other fragments that have not been catalogued and are still in the identification stage (Ibid., 104).}
\[\text{\footnotesize{139} Sela notes that there are no complete textual witnesses of the Judeo-Arabic version of SY…(Sela, The Arabic Book of Yosef Ben Gorion, 2:543–44).}
\]
two most recent and most extensive works on the source-critical question have provided two opposing accounts of the relationship between the Arabic Book of Maccabees, the Arabic versions of SY, and the earliest Hebrew version of SY.\textsuperscript{140}

Several questions have been posed regarding this issue: 1) What is the relationship between the Arabic Book of Maccabees and the earlist Hebrew version of SY? 2) What is the relationship between the the Arabic translations of SY and the Hebrew version of the text that is now known as Redaction A? 3) What is the relationship between the Judeo-Arabic version of SY and the translation written in Arabic script (also known as the Christian-Arabic version)? I present here the positions of Sela and Dönitz, before making a few remarks about the source-critical issues and their relevance to the reception history of SY tradition in Ethiopia.

In her work on the Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic version of SY, Sela brings back into the scholarly discussion the relationship of the Arabic Book of Maccabees to SY. The text had largely been ignored by scholars working on the Hebrew SY in the twentieth century, despite the fact that Julius Wellhausen had highlighted its importance for understanding the emergence of the Hebrew SY in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{141} Building on Wellhausen’s observations, as well as the suggestions made by Shlomo Pines in his analysis of the Arabic versions of SY,\textsuperscript{142} Sela argues that the Arabic Book of Maccabees served as the nucleus around which the Hebrew SY tradition was ultimately constructed.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{141} Julius Wellhausen, trans., \textit{Der arabische Josippus} (Berlin: Weidmann, 1897), 47–50.
\textsuperscript{143} Sela, \textit{The Arabic Book of Yosef Ben Gorion}, 1:12.
She suggests that the Arabic Book of Maccabees as we have it today was translated into a Hebrew work known as the Book of the Sons of the Hasmoneons, which is now lost.\textsuperscript{144} According to her source-critical reconstruction, $SY$ emerged after several stages of expansion on this lost Hebrew book of Maccabees. The extant Hebrew $SY$ (Flusser’s Redaction A) is therefore a compilation of the Hebrew Book of Maccabees, accounts of Roman antiquities, legends about Alexander, *Jewish Antiquities*, and the DEH.\textsuperscript{145}

Moreover, in addition to addressing the *Entstehungsgeschichte* of the Hebrew $SY$, Sela also provides a couple of notable observations about the relationship of the two Arabic versions of $SY$ to the Hebrew version and with each other. Regarding the former, she notes that the Arabic versions preserved in the Cairo Geniza fragments represent an earlier stage of the Hebrew $SY$ tradition, which is shorter and more pure than all of the extant Hebrew texts.\textsuperscript{146} Regarding the second issue of the relationship between the Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic versions of $SY$, Sela concludes that both versions derive from a lost Arabic translation of the earliest Hebrew version of $SY$.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., 21–22.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., 9.
\textsuperscript{146} Sela writes, "תודהו המשועה מנהベン שת נשותי ערביה קורמית וורשה מנוסת עבר, קפר קפריה, יוצר מכל החבשים המבריקים שלפני (Ibid., 4). Sela is relying on Flusser’s critical text as a representative of the earliest version of the Hebrew $SY$, to which she refers here. Her argument that the Arabic version (at least the one Judeo-Arabic version) represents an earlier textual stage than Flusser’s reconstructed text is echoed by Dönitz. Dönitz views the Judeo-Arabic text as a representative of the version of the Hebrew $SY$ preserved in manuscripts like the Cairo Geniza fragments and MS Vatican Urb. 52. She submits, “Daraus folgt, dass die judaeo-arabischen Übersetzung des SY in einem frühen Stadium der Überlieferung des SY erstellt wurde, vermutlich von der Fassung, die in den hebräischen Geniza-Fragmenten des SY erhalten ist” (Dönitz, *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon*, 104).
\textsuperscript{147} Sela writes, "את המאה העברית אין מביאה מדיה ויביר נמצאות: נרשה שלמה החוסבית אתא ערביה. שמתתאת בחליל הקופטים, נרשה אתא החוסבית אתא ערביה. שלמה חוסית קפר מפורת, יצרה אתא החוסבית אתא ערביה מפורת לשליה; חשוף לקסיקלא אתי וקרימת לחרישתה. יצרה אתא החוסבית אתא ערביה זכר השורה החוסבית אתא ערביה (Sela, *The Arabic Book of Yosef Ben Gorion*, 1: 4)."
Thus, according to Sela, although the Judeo-Arabic version of *SY* is transcribed from a version of the text written in Arabic script, it is not dependent on the Christian-Arabic version extant today. Rather, the Judeo-Arabic version represents an earlier version of the Arabic *SY* than the Christian-Arabic version. While the Christian-Arabic version contains later Christian interpolations, the Judeo-Arabic is a witness of the earliest and now-lost translation of the Hebrew *SY* into Arabic (using Arabic script).\(^{148}\)

Dönitz provides a different account of the source-critical relationship between the Arabic Book of Maccabees, the Hebrew *SY*, and the two Arabic translations of *SY*. First, whereas Sela argues that the Arabic Book of Maccabees represents an earlier Hebrew text that serves as the nucleus for the *SY* tradition, Dönitz argues that the Arabic Book of Maccabees is instead an epitome of chapters 11–48 of *SY*.\(^{149}\) To demonstrate why the latter scenario is more probable, she points to other examples of shortened versions of the Hebrew *SY* such as Abraham ibn Daud’s *Divre Malkhe Yisra’el* and Yehuda Mosconi’s note in Redaction C of *SY*, which mentions several truncated versions of the text.\(^{150}\) She also notes that given the importance of the *SY* tradition among Coptic Christians as a source for Maccabean history, the production of an epitome of *SY* that focuses mainly on the Maccabean narratives would make sense.\(^{151}\)

Additionally, Dönitz suggests a different source-critical relationship between the Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic versions of *SY*. She argues that the Judeo-Arabic version of *SY*

\(^{148}\) Ibid., 1: 24–25.
\(^{149}\) She notes that there are two possible explanation of its emergence: either the Arabic Book of Maccabees as we have it today is a direct translation of the corresponding chapters of the Hebrew *SY* or it is an excerpt from the Arabic translation of *SY* (Dönitz, *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon*, 106–107).
\(^{150}\) Ibid., 111. Mosconi claimed to have searched zealously for all the versions of *SY* he could find because the words of the text “were like honey in [his] mouth” (Yôsêf Ben-Gôryôn, *Sefer Yôsifôn: History of the Jews During the Period of the Second Temple and the War Between the Jews and the Romans*, ed. Hayim Hominer [Jerusalem: Hominer, 1967], 33).
\(^{151}\) Dönitz, *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon*, 111.
represents the first translation of the text into Arabic, on the basis of its parallels with the Hebrew text of SY found in the Cario Geniza fragments and MS Vatican Urb. 52. She also suggests that the Christian-Arabic version was transcribed from the Judeo-Arabic version of the text. This transcription into Arabic letters, she further notes, could have taken place in the Jewish context or at least with Jewish participation. The two charts provided in Figure 1 and Figure 2 below demonstrate the different source-critical reconstructions provided by Sela and Dönitz.

### 2.4.1 Evaluation of the Source-Critical Hypotheses of Sela and Dönitz

Since it has been established that SY is a composite text and the Maccabean material makes up one of its several constituent parts, both Sela’s and Dönitz’s arguments are feasible. In other words, it is plausible that a book of Maccabees could have served as a source for the redactor of SY and it is plausible that the Arabic Book of Maccabees represents an epitome of SY. What is more, Dönitz’s point that the importance of Maccabean history among medieval Christian historiographers in Egypt does have some force. However, the question can only be settled after more detailed comparative work can be done on the relationship between SY and the Arabic Book of Maccabees.

Secondly, as far as the relationship between the Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic text is concerned, Sela’s argument seems to be more substantial.

---

152 Ibid., 104.
153 Ibid., 108.
154 She mentions several examples of Jewish writings in Arabic script that took place around the time that the SY was translated from Hebrew to Arabic, including the works of Maimonides and the translations of Sa'adia Gaon (Ibid).
155 Cf. Charlesworth, who concludes that without further research, we cannot say one way or the other, as the two sources resist a simple explanation of their relationship (James Charlesworth, The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 153–156.
Figure 1: Sela’s Source-Critical Reconstruction

Figure 2: Dönitz’s Source-Critical Reconstruction
Dönitz provides little evidence for the Christian-Arabic’s dependence on the Judeo-Arabic, aside from the parallel outline that the two versions share. However, sharing a similar outline does not necessarily warrant that one text is dependent on another. Instead, the parallel outlines could be the result of the fact that both texts trace back to the same Vorlage, despite the fact that one of them has undergone certain revisions. Moreover, I have found several indications in my own work that suggest that the Judeo-Arabic version is a transcription from a source written in Arabic letters. Thus, as this stage in the research, Sela’s reconstruction of the relationship between the Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic versions is more convincing.

2.4.2 The Date, Authorship and Background of the Arabic Versions of Sefer Yosippon

Several observations on issues related to the “emergence-history” of the Arabic versions of SY have been put forward by recent scholarship. To begin, Dönitz suggests a couple of dates for the earliest translations of SY into Arabic. She identifies eleventh-century Cairo as the most likely place and time for the emergence of the translation of the Hebrew SY into Judeo-Arabic. Furthermore, working from the theory that the Christian-Arabic text is transcribed from the Judeo-Arabic text, she suggests that the transcription from Judeo-Arabic to Arabic script could have taken place as early as the eleventh century.

Ronny Vollandt has also made parallel suggestions for the text’s translation into Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic. He notes that Copto-Arabic scholars (like the Aвлād al-‘Assāl) have also made parallel suggestions for the text’s translation into Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic. He notes that Copto-Arabic scholars (like the Aвлād al-‘Assāl)

156 For examples of such evidence see the following pages below: pp. 138–39; p. 223; fn. 316 on p. 249; fn. 320 on p. 251; and fn. 331 on p. 254.
157 Dönitz, Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon, 104.
158 The oldest complete manuscript of the Arabic version is MS Paris 1906, which is dated to 1342 (.
159 The designation Aвлād al-‘Assāl (“the Sons of al-‘Assāl”) refers to three scholars who were brothers and active in the latter half of the thirteenth century (Vollandt, “Ancient Jewish Historiography in Arabic Garb,” 79.
spur a literary Golden Age in the thirteenth century. The works of these scholars, who for instance transcribe into Arabic script Judeo-Arabic works like Maimonides’s *Guide For the Perplexed*, show a renewed interest in the history of the Jews.\(^{160}\) Just as it serves as a source of information of Second Temple Judaism for Jewish communities in the medieval period, the transcription of *Sefer Yosippon* into Arabic by Christians seems to have been made in order to satisfy similar historiographical agendas. Not only does the text provide Coptic Christians with a historical background for the origins of Christianity, but it also serves as a source for Christian polemics against Jews.\(^{161}\)

In addition to its importance as a historical witness, the association of *Sefer Yosippon* with the Books of Maccabees (as well as Josephus) might have contributed to the desire on the part of Arabic-speaking, Christian and Muslim scholars to translate Jewish works into Arabic.\(^{162}\) Coptic Christians identified Josef ben Gorion, the assumed author of the text, as the same author who wrote the books of Maccabees. For example in the canon list of Al-Ṣafī ibn al-ʿAssāl (d. 1238), the Arabic *Yosippon* is listed as an accepted (*qabīl*) book because it is “one of the books of the Maccabees.”\(^{163}\) Even ʿĪbn Khaldūn, in his *al-Muqaddima*, notes that there are three books of Maccabees and attributes authorship of all three texts to Joseph ben Gurion.\(^{164}\) Thus it is quite likely that *Sefer Yosippon* is seen by medieval Copts as especially authoritative, given its association with an author presumed to have written canonical texts.

\(^{160}\) Ibid., 80.

\(^{161}\) Ibid., 121.


\(^{163}\) Ibid. Although Al-Ṣafī ibn al-ʿAssāl claims to be depending on the Coptic version of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, in the latter work 3 Maccabees is the third book of Maccabees listed, as opposed to *Sefer Yosippon*. Moreover, the Arabic Book of Maccabees, which is also known as 5 Maccabees, is also copied and transmitted during this period.

\(^{164}\) Ibid.
In further addressing the question of why Sefer Yosippon becomes popular within Christian Arabic circles, Witold Witakowski situates the translation of the text within the wider context of historiographic writing in the Copitic tradition. Similar to the apparent lack of interest in historiography in the Jewish literature of Late Antiquity, historiography does not seem to have been very prevalent within early Coptic literature. While some might suggest that such a dearth of historical writing within the extant Coptic corpus could be explained by pointing out that very little Coptic texts have survived, Witakowski has observed that even in the Coptic literature that has survived, there are few mentions made of historical works.\textsuperscript{165} Witakowski contrasts this scenario with the greater number of allusions to lost historical sources made within extant Syriac sources.\textsuperscript{166}

By contrast, only two Coptic historiographical works can be identified from the surviving material: a Coptic Ecclesiastical History and the Chronicle of John of Nikiu.\textsuperscript{167} The Ecclesiastical History was compiled by a certain Menas the Scribe of the White Monastery of Sohag sometime in the fifth century and it contains portions of Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History and other, non-Eusebian material.\textsuperscript{168} The other historiographical Coptic text, the Chronicle of John of Nikiu, covers the history of the world from Creation to the seventh century and only

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{167} Ibid., 140.
\textsuperscript{168} The text was first published in English by W.E. Crum, “Eusebius and Coptic Church Histories,” Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, 24 (1902), 68–84. After Crum’s publication and the discovery of more manuscripts, the Coptic Ecclesiastical History was published as Storia della chiesa di Alessandria, 2 vols., ed. and trans. Tito Orlandi (Milan, 1968–70) and Orlandi, “Nuovi frammenti della Historia ecclesiastica copta,” in S.F. Bondi (ed.), Studi in onore di Edda Bresciani (Pisa, 1985), 363–83. In addition, there is still some unpublished material from the Coptic HE preserved in Cambridge University Library and in the Institut français d’archéologie orientale in Cairo. Much of the subject material is concerned mainly with local, Alexandrian matters and thus relies much more on the Greek Alexandrian History than it does on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius (Ibid., 139–140).
survives in an Ethiopic translation.\textsuperscript{169} Witakowski argues that this dearth of historical writing in the Christian Coptic tradition can be explained by pointing out the political isolation and marginalization that characterizes Coptic Christianity after the rise and expansion of Islam.\textsuperscript{170} Their political position forces Coptic Christians to situate their history within the histories of the dominating political forces that surrounded them. It is in this context of having to import histories that Witadowski places the translation of \textit{Sefer Yosippon} into Arabic.\textsuperscript{171}

\textbf{2.4.3 Overview of the Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd}

Within certain manuscripts in the textual tradition, the \textit{Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd} is divided into eight parts. Generally speaking, this translation of SY maintains the broad outlines of the Hebrew text and provides a relatively similar narrative order. That being said, it does heavily summarize certain sections of the Hebrew SY and at times rearranges the narrative order of some stories. Part One contains five major subsections: 1) the genealogy of nations that is partly derived from Genesis (Sela, pp. 367–371); 2) legends of the founding and early history of Rome (Sela, pp. 372–374); 3) histories of the Persian kings, including the story of Esther and Mordecai ((Sela, pp. 375–382); 4) the legend of Alexander’s visit to Jerusalem (Sela, pp. 383–389); and 5) the reign of Ptolemy in Egypt and the translation of the Septuagint (Sela, pp. 390–393).

Part Two and Part Three constitute the Maccabean corpus of \textit{KAY}. Part Two opens with the reign of Antiochus IV and the accounts of the martyrs who die under his rule (Sela, pp. 394–400). The story of the Maccabean Revolt (Sela, pp. 401–407) and the histories of the

\textsuperscript{169} Ibid., 140. For a discussion of this material, including the \textit{Arabic Synaxarium of the Coptic Church} and the \textit{Ethiopic Synaxarium}, see Levenson, “The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian’s Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple,” 339–445.
\textsuperscript{170} Ibid., 151.
\textsuperscript{171} Ibid.
Hasmoneans (Sela, pp. 408–434) are also covered in Part Two, with Part Three beginning in the middle of the accounts of the Hasmoneans. Part Three also relates stories that take place during the Roman conquest of Judea under Pompey, before covering the assassination of Caesar in Rome (Sela, pp. 435–448). Part Four is dedicated to the acts of Herod the Great during his reign (Sela, pp. 449–471). Part Five is a single chapter without a heading that summarizes more stories about Herod (Sela, pp. 472–477).

Part Six begins by describing the reigns of the heirs of Herod the Great, from Archelaus to Agrippa II (Sela, pp. 478–483). The rest of Part Six and the beginning of Part Seven relate the beginning of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, focusing primarily on the three leaders of the rebel factions—Eleazar son of Ananias, Yohanan the Galilean, and Simon (Sela, pp. 484–501). Part Seven also recounts the coming of Titus to Jerusalem and the Roman siege of the city (Sela, pp. 502–515), including stories about the great famine that takes place in Jerusalem, such as the account of the woman who kills and eats her son (Sela, pp. 516–519). Part Eight covers the end of the war in Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple (Sela, pp. 520–535). The KAY finishes with the death of Eleazar son of Ananias the rebel. Notably it does not include the Masada episode that is present in the Hebrew SY.173 The Ethiopic translation of the KAY follows the order of its Vorlage; thus it features a nearly identical breakdown of sections and chapters.174

---

172 Immediately following the chapter on the return of Agrippa II to Rome and the beginning of the rebellion led by Eleazar son of Ananias, the heading of the following chapter reads, “These are the histories of Yosef ben Gorion, the author of the book” (Sela, The Arabic Book of Yosef Ben Gorion, 2:490).

173 See above for Bowman’s discussion of the popularity among various Jewish societies of the Hebrew SY’s account of the Masada episode, discussing how the Masada episode in SY differs from Josephus’s account of the event: Bowman, “‘Yosippon’ and Jewish Nationalism,” 4.

174 See Appendix E for a table comparing the layout of chapters in the Hebrew, Christian-Arabic, and Ethiopic versions of SY.
2.5 The Zena Ayhud and the Reception of Sefer Yosippon in Ethiopia

The Christian-Arabic adaptation of the Hebrew SY makes its way to Ethiopia after the ascendency of the so-called Solomonic dynasty in 1270. This political revolution spurs a renaissance of Ethiopian literature, which lasts well into the fifteenth century. In addition to the production of indigenous texts like the Kǝbrä Nägäšt, this time period also sees the revitalization of Ethiopian relations with Coptic Christians in Egypt. This change then provides an opportunity for the introduction of texts written in the surrounding areas to make their way into Ethiopia by way of translations. The Christian-Arabic adaptation of SY is one of the first of such texts to be translated and comes to be called the Zena Ayhud (or the History of the Jews), and represents an almost literal translation of the Arabic.

2.5.1 The Text, Date, and Authorship of the Zena Ayhud

There is only one critical edition of the ZA, which was compiled by Murad Kamil who relied on the twelve manuscripts given in the Table 13 in Appendix A. While several manuscripts of the text have been identified since Kamil’s edition, a comprehensive list of all the known manuscripts of the ZA does not yet exist. A copy of Kamil’s critical text, along with an Amharic translation of Kamil’s critical text was published in 2006 by the Mahibere Kidusan Press under the direction of the editorial board of the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church.

---

177 Ibid., xii–xiv.
178 There are at least eight more manuscripts of the Zena Ayhud that have since been identified and are located in the Hill Monastic Museum Library: MS EMML 21, MS EMML 258, MS EMML 4773, MS EMML 6240, MS EMML 7404, MS EMML 7961, MS EMML 8140, and MS EMML 8155.
179 Zena Ayhud: A Translation.
Although a precise date for the translation of the *Zena Ayhud* has remained elusive, almost all scholars agree that the text belongs to the large number of translations into Ethiopic that are made during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As early as 1907, E. Littmann makes the case that the ZA is translated from the Arabic version of *SY* “in der Periode der Übersetzungsliteratur aus dem Arabischen (1270–ca. 1430).”\(^{180}\) Kamil agrees with Littman’s dating and sees no evidence to suggest another time period for the translation.\(^{181}\) More specifically, he posits that the ZA is most likely translated as part of the ecclesiastical reforms that take place with the ascendancy of Yekūnō Amlāk (1270–1285), who commissions the translation of large numbers of theological and ecclesiastical works into Ge’ez.\(^{182}\) Similarly, Witakowski places the translation at around the same time, namely c. 1300.\(^{183}\) While acknowledging that the text could have indeed been translated late in the thirteenth-century, Manfred Kropp suggests that the scribal cultures that flourish during the reign of Amdā Seyon (1314–1344) could have also served as the provenance of the translation.\(^{184}\)

Although not previously mentioned by the scholarship on this text, I have seen a colophon present in several manuscripts that is relevant to the dating of the translation of the ZA. Kamil includes this colophon in the preface to his critical edition, but he does not mention its importance to the issue of the dating of the text in his brief introduction. The preface is a benediction praising God and noting that the text is written by Yosef ben Gorion. In a majority of

---


\(^{181}\) Kamil, *Zena Ayhud*, xviii.


the textual witnesses Kamil uses, the preface closes with the following: ይምትር፡ይኩኑ፡ላዕለ፡ገብሩ፡ንዋየ፡ማርያም፡ለዓለም፡አሜን (“and may his [God’s] mercy be on his servant, Newaya Maryam, forever and ever, amen”).

The reference here is to an Ethiopian ruler who reigns from 1371 to 1380 and adopts the imperial name Newaya Maryam (or “the Vessel of Mary”) upon his succession. Given this allusion, it is reasonable to conclude that the ZA must have been translated either during or prior to the reign of Newaya Maryam. Based on this evidence, I have been able to conclude that we have a terminus ante quem of 1380 for the translation of the text into Ethiopic.

2.5.2 The Background of the Zena Ayhud

The ZA is an anonymous work, but there are several geographic and cultural contexts that can be posited as backgrounds for its production. First, it is possible that the ZA is translated by diasporic Ethiopian communities living among non-Ethiopian Christians. One obvious setting for the translation of Christian-Arabic works into Ge‘ez would be Coptic monasteries. Although it is well known that the abuna of the Ethiopian church always came from Egypt, what is less known is that during the medieval period, Ethiopian monks were going to Egypt just as the Coptic bishops were being sent to Ethiopia. As such, the translation of the ZA could have been the work of Ethiopian scholars living in Coptic monasteries (such as Dayr al-Muharraq).

---

185 Kamil, Zena Ayhud, 1. Kamil’s earliest manuscript, and the one most important to his critical edition (i.e. MS Paris BN Abb. 38) does not have the reference to Newaya Maryam.
187 Because the Coptic bishops that came to Ethiopia did not know Amharic, Ge‘ez or local politics, their leadership would often be diluted and consisted primarily of the power to consecrate deacons and priests (Detlef C. Müller and Lothar Störk, “Coptic Church,” Encyclopaedia Aethiopica (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2003), 799–800).
188 See Störk (Ibid.) for a discussion of Ethiopian scholars in Coptic monasteries.
The translation could have also been made among the diasporic Ethiopian community of monks and clergy who lived in Jerusalem and were thus in frequent contact with other Christian communities. Anthony O’Mahony has highlighted several pieces of documentary evidence of the sustained presence of Ethiopian in Jerusalem and their contacts with both Coptic and Syrian Christians. The main center of the Ethiopian community in Jerusalem was the monastery at the Grotto of David on Mount Zion, which remained under Ethiopian control until 1559. Monasteries like this one could have served as the places where texts such as the ZA were translated.

Conversely, given the large growth of monastic houses in Ethiopia during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the possibility of the ZA’s translation taking place in Ethiopia is relatively high and so cannot be ruled out. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries see the resurgence and proliferation of monasticism in Ethiopia largely as the result of the military and political programs of two rulers: Yekūnō Amlāk and Amdā Seyon. In 1270, Yekūnō Amlāk puts an end to the Zagwē dynasty by killing the last Zagwē king and declares himself king, beginning what comes to be called the Solomonic Dynasty. In order to consolidate his newly-gained power, Yekūnō Amlāk allies himself with the Amhara and the Christian communities of the

---


190 Ibid., 152–153.

191 According to Tamrat, “the origins and early life of Yekūnō Amlāk still remain very obscure. On his father’s side tradition makes him a descendant of Dilna ‘od, who is said to have been the last Aksumite king deposed by the Zagwē. His mother is nevertheless said to have been ‘one of the slaves’ of a rich Amhara chief in Sāgārāt…On the eve of the downfall of the Zagwē dynasty, Yekūnō Amlāk had apparently established a virtually independent kingdom of his own” (Ibid., 66).
Shāwa region. His alliance with Christian communities is solidified by Amdā Seyon, who takes the throne in 1314. Amdā Seyon succeeds in conquering the most important Muslim strongholds in Ethiopia, including Īfat, which was considered the center of Muslim political power. He thus succeeds in not only consolidating the victories of Yekūnō Amlāk, but also in further extending the Christian territories beyond Shāwa and Amhara, to include northern territories such as Lasta and Tigrē.

As part of their program to extend territories into non-Christian regions, the Christian rulers employ the influence of the royal court on the Ethiopian churches to evangelize non-Christians. In this effort, the royal patronage of monastic houses becomes an important tool of evangelization and Christian education. Tamrat notes, for example, that following his ascension to power, Yekūnō Amlāk makes a religious pact with Iyāsus-M'o'a, who founds one of the most important monastic houses in Ethiopia, Dabra Hayq. In addition to founding Dabra Hayq, Iyasus M'oa (d. 1292) also gains a number of students, who become important monks in their own right and found their own monasteries. A certain monk named Takla-Haymanot becomes the most famous of Iyāsus M’oa’s students, himself founding several monastic houses (e.g. Dabra Asbo, also known as Dabra Lībānos). Takla-Haymanot becomes renowned for his conversion of many to Christianity, primarily through the education centers he establishes across the Christian territories.

The theological and intellectual cultures of monastic houses such as Dabra Hayq and Dabra Asbo likely serve as the centers of the large number of translations from Arabic to Ge’ez

---

192 Tamrat, *Church and State in Ethiopia*, 134.
193 See the helpful map of the conquests of Amdā Seyon in Tamrat, *Church and State in Ethiopia*, 133, 156–157.
194 Ibid., 67. For Tamrat’s discussion of Iyāsus-M’oa, see pp. 158-160.
195 Ibid., 161–173.
that are made during this time period. In addition to hagiographic literature, monastic rules, and theological writings, the translation of historiographical works from Arabic also becomes a part of the literary life of Ethiopian monasteries.\textsuperscript{197} Ethiopian historiography remerges in the medieval period after about a 700-year gap in the source evidence, following the period of early Ethiopic literature in the fourth and fifth centuries. The renewed interest in writing history begins with the official royal chronicles of rulers like Amdā Seyon and Zara Ya’ecob (1434–1468).\textsuperscript{198} Then sometime around the turn of the fourteenth century, efforts are made to situate Ethiopian history within the wider context of the outside world.\textsuperscript{199} As part of such efforts, indigenous texts like the \textit{Kəbrä nägäşt} are produced.\textsuperscript{200} More often than the production of texts native to Ethiopia, however, the resurgence of historiographical works in the medieval period features translations of Copto-Arabic texts. Table 2 below illustrates the timeline of the major historiographical works that are translated from Copto-Arabic into Ge’ez in this time period.

Among the historiographical works listed below, the ZA stands out as a unique case because of its reception in the Ethiopian traditional as a biblical text.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Witakowski, “Ethiopic Universal Chronography,” 285.
\item Ibid., 286.
\item The Kəbrä nägäşt is a medieval, Ethiopic text that dates from the thirteenth century but is informed by numerous Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions circulating in Syria, Palestine, Arabia and Egypt during the first four centuries CE. The text also betrays influences from the Quran. The core of the text outlines the legend of Sheba, king Solomon, and their son Menelik I. Utilizing this legend about how the Ark of the Covenant arrived in Ethiopia, the Kəbrä nägäståts attempts to legitimate the presence of the Ark in Ethiopia both theologically and historically. For an introduction of the text and some relevant secondary sources, see Siegbert Uhlig, “Kəbrä Nägäşt,” \textit{Encyclopaedia Aethiopica} (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007), 364–368.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
In certain canon lists of the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church, for example, the ZA appears as *Maṣḥafa Yosēf Walda Koryon* and is listed as the final book of the Old Testament. The reception of the Ethiopic version of SY as canonical largely stems from the fact that the text is

---

201 Ibid.
already received by Coptic Christians as an important witness of the Maccabean tradition. The association made between the SY tradition and the books of Maccabees clearly makes its way into Ethiopia, as demonstrated in part by the fact that the ZA replaces the books of Maccabees in the canon list provided in the Ṣṭḥa Nägäšt.\textsuperscript{202}

In conclusion, the monastic lives of medieval Ethiopian scholars most likely serves as the cultural and historical background for the translation of the Christian-Arabic version of SY into Ge’ez. The translation is made at a time when such scholars are becoming increasingly interested in both preserving Ethiopian history and anchoring Ethiopian history within the broader context of surrounding cultures. The ZA gains an important place among other historiographical works that are translated during this time period because it is seen as an important witness to a period in biblical history that is otherwise vacant in historical imagination of medieval Ethiopian monks. They understand the text as filling in the intertestamental gap, as well as further illuminating the historical context of the emergence of Christianity. They also view the text as canonical in nature, which affects the way in which the translation is made.

As will be demonstrated below, for example, one finds in the Ethiopic text a recurring pattern of adjusting the Arabic text to fit certain liturgical motifs prevalent in the lives of Ethiopian Christians in the medieval period. As a result, the reception of the SY tradition in Ethiopia should be viewed in the context of scribal cultures of monks who view themselves as translating and preserving scripture in light of the needs of their communities.

\textsuperscript{202} Witold Witakowski, “Zena Ayhud,” \textit{Encyclopaedia Aethiopica} (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2014), 177. It is also quite possible that the ZA serves as a source for the the indigenously produced texts known as Māqabeyan, or the Ethiopian books of Maccabees. However, more comparative work between the two texts would need to be done before anything conclusive can be said.
CHAPTER THREE

THE RECEPTION OF THE FAMINE IN JERUSALEM

3.1 Introduction to the Reception of the Famine in Jerusalem

In the Zena Ayhud, the story of Maria is sandwiched between a section describing the great famine that takes place in Jerusalem and a section that presents the discourse of Titus given in response to the story of Maria. These two sections, together with the Maria story, comprise one chapter in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY. I begin my analysis of this chapter by providing a side-by-side comparison of the descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem as they appear in the ZA and in the various sources antecedent to the Ethiopic.

First, I will situate the various descriptions of the famine within the broader context of each text. Second, I divide this section on the descriptions of the famine into smaller units and sub-units. After isolating the various themes contained in this section into individual pericopes, I present them in parallel format with their counterparts in the other texts. I then discuss the various redactional changes that are made in each pericope in the process of its reception across the various historical and cultural contexts being examined here. I pay special attention to the following recurring categories of changes that are made across the different points of transmission: stylistic embellishments, insertion of details, omission of themes/details, et al.

The chapter in the ZA that contains the story of Maria closely follows its Arabic Vorlage. However, the KAY alters the Hebrew SY by summarizing, omitting, supplementing and rearranging different sections of the Hebrew text and reformatting them into one chapter. This process of summarizing and rearranging mimics the SY’s treatment of the DEH as well; several sections from the Latin text are either summarized, rearranged, or omitted by the author of SY. In
contrast, the insertion of more themes and details is the primary *modus operandi* by which the author of the *DEH* treats the text of Josephus. As a result, the descriptions of the famine in the *ZA* feature a number of themes that trace back to multiple dispersed sections in the *BJ, DEH*, and the Hebrew *SY*. Before analyzing the Ethiopic reception of Josephus’s account of the famine in Jerusalem, it will thus be helpful to first note where in the narrative order descriptions of the famine are placed by the author of each text and what rhetorical functions these passages play within the broader objectives of each author. I begin with the placement of descriptions of the famine and their rhetorical function in Josephus’s *War*.

### 3.2 The Famine in Jerusalem in the *BJ*

It is easy to see the utility of producing often-graphic accounts of the great famine in Jerusalem for anti-Jewish authors like Pseudo-Hegesippus, who are concerned with fashioning histories that are entirely polemical toward Jews and Judaism. But why would Josephus include horrific descriptions of the suffering of the Jews in his account of the Judean Revolt? I submit that there are primarily two reasons for his inclusion of the famine in Jerusalem in his history: 1) he seeks to illustrate that the Judean Revolt was one of the greatest wars ever fought; 2) he wants to vilify the rebels who incite the Judean Revolt as a way to differentiate them from the conception of Jews and Judaism held by his Greek and Roman audiences.

First, as discussed above, Josephus writes the *Jewish War* in large part to demonstrate the greatness (*μέγιστον*) of the Judean Revolt in the context not only of the history of the Jews but also the wars of the Romans (*BJ* 1.1). Josephus’s accounts of the great famine that takes places during Titus’s siege of Jerusalem are produced in part to buttress this claim that the Judean
Revolt was one of the greatest wars ever fought on Earth. In the preface to Book One, he writes, “it appears to me that the misfortunes of all men, from the beginning of the world, if they be compared to these of the Jews are not so considerable as they were” (BJ 1.12). For Josephus, the greatness of the Jewish war against Rome is thus measured partly by the severity of the sufferings of the Jews during the war.

Second, Josephus employs graphic descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem as a way to illustrate the savagery and irrationality of the rebels (BJ 1.27). He depicts the rebels, whom he often calls the “tyrants” (τύραννοι), as the primary cause of the sufferings of the Jews of Jerusalem. In this context, the severity of the sufferings of the Jews serves to demonstrate the callousness and irrationality of the rebels. Concerning the short but terrible reign of the rebels, Josephus writes,

To give a complete and detailed account of all their criminal actions would be an impossible task. Suffice it to say that no other city has ever been subject to such a reign of terror, and no generation in human history has spawned more prolific wickedness. In the end they resorted to denigrating the whole Hebrew race, to make their impiety appear less extreme to foreign eyes, and presented themselves—as indeed they were—as slaves, the jetsam of society, the bastard outcasts of their nation (BJ 4.442–443).

In this way, the author highlights the cruelty of the rebels in order to vilify them and undermine their humanity. It becomes important for Josephus to distinguish between good Jews and bad Jews in his history. The worse he portrays the rebels, the more he invites the sympathy of his audience toward the decent and rational Jews who fall victims to their barbarity. The descriptions of the famine in Josephus’s War thus serve to accentuate said barbarity.

---

203 In Josephus’s words “the war which the Jews made with the Romans has been the greatest of all those, not only that have been in our times, but in a manner, of those that ever were heard of, both of those wherein cities have fought against cities, or nations against nations” (BJ 1.1).
Josephus places accounts of the ordeals suffered by the Jews during the famine in strategic places within the narrative. His descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem are dispersed throughout Books 5–6 of the BJ, while Books 3 and 4 contain important background information to the siege of Jerusalem. Book 3 opens with Flavian campaigns in Galilean cities. The rebuff of Cestius and the twelfth legion by the rebels in Jerusalem (BJ 2.499–555), as Mason puts it, leaves “the viability of this fortress polis, deep in Judea’s hills, an open question.”

To address this problem, Nero selects the tested general Vespasian to subdue the Judean Revolt (BJ 3.1–7). Vespasian’s campaigns are recounted in BJ 3.8–134, along with Josephus’s own participation in the war (BJ 3.135–409).

In the first half of Book 4, Josephus continues his account of Flavian campaigns in Galilee. He relates the siege and capture of Gamala by Titus and Vespasian (BJ 4.1-83) and Gischala’s peaceful surrender to the Romans and the subsequent escape of John of Gischala to Jerusalem (BJ 4.84-128). He also describes the influx of people entering Jerusalem as the campaigns of Vespasian succeed in capturing more cities like Jamnia and Azotus (BJ 2.129-137). Those migrating to Jerusalem to escape Vespasian become trapped in the city and the swelling population later exacerbates the severity of the famine. In the second half of Book 4, Josephus presents the turmoil between the rebel factions in Jerusalem parallel with the political turmoil in Rome following Nero’s suicide (4.486–491).

In contrast to Book 4, Books 5 and 6 increasingly focus on Jerusalem as opposed to the events in the surrounding areas and in Rome. With Vespasian declared emperor and departed

---

204 Mason, A History of the Jewish War, A.D. 66-74, 402.
205 Mason describes these inhabitants of cities and towns around Jerusalem who make their way to the big city as collateral victims of the rebellion. They are “forced to make a quick decision” in order to escape the terror strikes by Roman armies seeking to make an example of cities as they made their way to Jerusalem (Ibid., 407).
from Palestine, Titus remains behind to launch the last phase of the war (BJ 5.71–97). The latter orders a siege to be placed around Jerusalem, which cuts the city off from its avenues of resources and spurs a food shortage. The problem is then exacerbated by the rebel factions, who burn one another’s grain storages (BJ 5.21–39). To make matters even worse, the population of the city again swells when more people come to the city in order to celebrate Passover (BJ 5.99). Notwithstanding these factors, however, the rebels remain defiant. In response, Titus builds a wall around the city in three days, further choking the remaining lines of resources making it into the city (5.507–10). As Book 6 opens, the Romans further demolish the resources of the land around Jerusalem in their building of siege machines (BJ 6.1–8); as Book 6 closes, Roman soldiers (having infiltrated the city) set fire to the Temple and conquer Jerusalem (BJ 6.220–433).

Josephus strategically situates descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem in several places within the narrative briefly outlined above. There are three major sections of the Jewish War dedicated to the ordeals suffered by the Jews in Jerusalem as a result of the famine: 1) BJ 5.425–445, 2) BJ 5.491–572, 3) BJ 6.193–214. These three sections are preceded by exposition and foreshadowing in Books 1, 2, and 3, which represent rhetorical devices used by Josephus to anticipate the accounts of the famine that appear in Books 5 and 6. Josephus also prefaces his three major sections on the famine in Jerusalem with several statements about the role of the

206 Mason places this in the spring of 70 and somewhat understates the situation, writing, “So Jerusalem is getting crowded” (Ibid., 409).
207 One can also note Josephus’s discussion of other instances of famines that take place in Galilee prior to Titus’s siege of Jerusalem. For example, he notes Vespasian’s strategy to suspend his attack and let the famine kill the inhabitants of the city during the siege of Jotapata (BJ 3.178–380). Josephus responds to Vespasian’s tactic by having his men show off the plentitude of their water reserves by soaking their clothes in water and hanging them out to dry for the Romans to see (BJ 3.186–189). The siege of Gamala also causes a famine; this episode more clearly anticipates the episodes of the famine in Jerusalem as the fighting men of Gamala horde the food reserves for themselves (BJ 4.53) and the poor and sick inhabitants of the city die of starvation as a result (BJ 4.62).
rebels as the primary cause of the famine that afflicts the Jews. A few references to the famine are also made after the third major section on the famine, which closes with the story of Maria (BJ 6.193–214). In the following, I provide an outline of the placement of Josephus’s discussions of the famine. I then discuss the three major sections of the War that contain the author’s descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem.

Table 3: Outline of the Famine in the Jewish War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Precedents to and Foreshadowing of the Famine in Jerusalem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 1.27–28 – Josephus puts forward the famine as one of this themes/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 1.64 – Hyrcanus’s siege of Sebaste and the resulting famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 4.53 – Vespasian’s siege of Gamala and the resulting famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portraying the Rebels as the Cause of the Famine in Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 4.137 – Rebels’ strife depletes resources and causes the famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 4.361–362 – The imprecation of Niger against the rebels foreshadows the famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.23–24 – The rebels burn grain storages inside the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.343–345 – God blinds the rebels to the impending famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First Major Section on the Famine (BJ 5.425–445)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.370–374 – Josephus’s Speech to the rebels notes the danger of famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.420–424 – The rebels refuse to allow the people to leave the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.425–445 – Descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second Major Section on the Famine (BJ 5.491–572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.491–509 – Titus builds a wall around Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.512–526, 571–572 – Descriptions of the famine inside the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.569–570 – An account of the number of the dead carried out through the gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 5.548–561 – An account of what happens to the Jews who leave the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 6.1–8 – Descriptions of the desolation of the land around the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Third Major Section on the Famine (BJ 6.193–214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 6.193–194 – Repetition of descriptions of the famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 6.195–198 – The ordeals suffered by the rebels because of the famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 6.199–214 – The Story of Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o BJ 6.215–219 – Titus excuses himself before God upon hearing the story of Maria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first major section on the famine in Jerusalem, which appears in *BJ* 5.425–445, is prefaced by several allusions to it in Book 4. For example, the execution of one of the leading generals of Jerusalem, Niger of Perea, serves as an opportunity for Josephus to foreshadow the horrors of the famine that appear later in his history. Before the rebels kill Niger, Josephus claims that the general places a curse on them that they might undergo both pestilence and famine (*BJ* 4.360–361). Josephus goes on to remark that the imprecation was borne out by later events.

In *BJ* 5.23–24, the author highlights the rebels’ burning of the storehouses of grain that are in one another’s ownership as another factor that contributes to the severity of the famine. Additionally, the author adds a theological layer to his interpretation of the history of the Judean Revolt, noting that it was God who blinded the rebels to the coming of the great famine (*BJ* 5.343–345). When Josephus makes the first mention of the famine in Jerusalem, he does so in the context of the arrival of John of Gischala to the city. The author explicitly states that rebels like John and his followers were the cause of not only the rebellion but also of the famine in the city (*BJ* 4.137).

After foreshadowing the famine and having placed the blame for its occurrence squarely on the shoulders of the rebels, Josephus begins his descriptions of the famine. This first section on the famine is immediately preceded by one of Josephus’s long speeches to the rebels, recounted in *BJ* 5.362–374. Josephus delivers this indirect discourse to the rebels within earshot of his bellicose audience but outside the reach of their projectiles. He tells the rebels that even their fortifications should prove too strong, “the famine would fight for the Romans” (*BJ* 5.374). Josephus follows his indirect discourse with a lengthy speech, incorporating biblical history in an attempt to persuade the rebels to surrender (*BJ* 5.376–419).
His speech succeeds in persuading some of Jerusalem’s inhabitants, who go over to the Romans. The rebels, however, ignore Josephus and even go so far as to force the people to remain in the city under threat of death (BJ 5.420–424). In the section that follows this episode, the author presents his first set of descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem. He details various themes such as the disappearance of food in Jerusalem, the fury of the rebels against the people, and the crucifixions of the Jews at the hands of both the Romans and the rebels (BJ 5.425–445).

The second major section describing the famine in Jerusalem comes after the failed attempts of the Romans to breach the second wall when the Jews burn their siege engines (BJ 5.446–490). Instead of rebuilding the siege engines, Titus decides to build a wall around the entire city; his eager army completes the construction in three days (BJ 5.492–504). The erection of this wall amplifies the severity of the food shortages inside the city. The descriptions of the famine that follow are largely concerned with the vast number of dead bodies that litter the city (BJ 5.512–518). Josephus also describes more accounts of the fury of the rebels, the eating of unclean things by the people, the killing of Jews suspected of having swallowed precious stones, and the desolation of the land at the hands of the Romans (BJ 5.519–6.1–8).

The third major section describing the famine in Jerusalem is much shorter than the previous two and for the most part repeats the accounts of the famine given in the first two (BJ 6.193–214). By this point in the narrative, the rebels have become so emaciated that they are

208 Josephus describes the parameters of the wall as follows: “Titus began the wall from the camp of the Assyrians, where his own camp was pitched, and drew it down to the lower parts of Cenopolis; from there it went along the valley of Cedron, to the Mount of Olives; it then bent towards the south, and encompassed the mountain as far as the rock called Peristereon, and that other hill which lies next [to] it, and is over the valley which reaches to Siloam; thus it bended again to the west, and went down to the valley of the Fountain, beyond which it went up again at the monument of Ananus the high priest, and encompassing that mountain where Pompey had formerly pitched his camp, it returned back to the north side of the city, and was carried as far as a certain village called ‘the House of the Erebinthi,’ after which it encompassed Herod’s monument, and there, on the east, was joined to Titus’s own camp, where it began” (BJ 5.504–507).
delirious as well as ruthless. The short description of their consumption of whatever remotely-edible materials they could find primarily serves as an introduction to the most important example of Jewish suffering at the hands of the rebels: the story of Maria of Bethezouba (BJ 6.199–214). The story of the mother who kills and eats her child closes Josephus’s descriptions of the famine and acts as the rhetorical seal to his presentation of the barbarity of the rebels and the greatness of the Jewish Revolt against Rome (see chapter 4 of this dissertation).

3.3 The Famine in Jerusalem in the DEH

In the De Excidio, the descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem appear in Book 5 while scenes in Book 4 paint the narrative background to the siege and the famine. The narrative order in Book 4 of the DEH follows the order of Josephus’s text rather closely. Like Book 4 of the BJ, Book 4 of the DEH opens by recounting the operations of the Roman armies in Galilee (DEH 4.1–4). In DEH 4.5 the author purports to turn the attention of the reader to the events that take place in Jerusalem. With this view, he describes the internal strife within the city between the rebel leaders John of Galilee (DEH 4.6–10) and Simon (DEH 4.22–24). However, the rest

---

209 Josephus does mention certain aspects of the role of the famine in the war after the story of Maria. He provides an account of Titus’s indirect discourse, wherein Caesar reflects on the tragic nature of Maria’s story and excuses himself before God concerning her deed (BJ 6.214–219). The burning of the Temple is made more dramatic in BJ 6.274 when even those whose mouths had been shut by the famine broke out into groans and lamentations. The famine also forces the priests (BJ 6.321) and the rebel leaders like John and Simon (BJ 6.433) to come out of hiding and surrender to Titus.

210 The DEH presents slightly different accounts of the events that cause the rebellion. Josephus highlights the rise of criminal terrorism in Jerusalem, the mismanagement of Florus, and the violence carried out against Jews in surrounding regions as the primary causes of the rebellion (BJ 2.39–265). In contrast, the author of the DEH highlights Pontius Pilate as the first inciting cause of the war between the Jews and the Romans (DEH 2.3). Pilate is emphasized in the narrative over against Felix and Florus most likely on account of his involvement in the crucifixion of Jesus. The author writes of Pilate, “he who killed Christ hastened the destruction of the Temple” (DEH 2.5).

211 The introduction of the leader of the third group, Eleazar, does not appear until the opening of Book 5. (5.1).
of the book focuses on Jerusalem only sporadically, while the author relates the death of Nero in Rome and Vespasian’s subsequent departure from the campaign in Judea (DEH 4.21; 4.25–33).

Only in Book 5 does the author of the DEH focus exclusively on Jerusalem. As noted above, Book 5 represents the freest adaptation of the War by the author of the DEH and only sometimes maintains the order of the BJ. While DEH 5.1 parallels the opening of Book 5 of the BJ by beginning with the account of Eleazar the rebel, for example, the author immediately deviates from the course of the BJ in DEH 5.2 to state the polemical and primary theme of the work: the condemnation of the Jews that they brought upon themselves. This theme is reiterated several times throughout the remainder of the book (e.g. DEH 5.15–15; 5.32). The bulk of the remainder of Book 5 summarizes Books 5–7 of the BJ. The author notes the temporary alliance made between the rebel factions and their fight against the Romans (DEH 5.3–13), the erection of the wall around the city by Titus (DEH 5.21), the burning of the Temple (DEH 5.42–43), the end of the war in Jerusalem (DEH 5.45), and the account of the fall of Masada (DEH 5.52–53).

While the author of the DEH summarizes much of the narrative in Books 5–7 of the BJ, he follows Josephus’s placement of the descriptions of the famine in the narrative order rather closely. Just like the BJ, the DEH also contains three major sections on the great famine that takes place in Jerusalem. Table 4 below presents a comparative outline of the placement of the descriptions of the famine as they appear in the War and the DEH.

---

212 See chapter 2 of this dissertation for an excerpt from the Latin text and a more detailed discussion of this theme.
The first major section appears in *DEH* 5.18. Similar to the first section on the famine in the *BJ*, this section in the *DEH* immediately follows Josephus’s lengthy speech to the rebels. Josephus’s words fail to persuade the people and they instead imprison the people inside the city. The second major section on the famine appears in several places within *DEH* 5.21–36 and contains numerous details, some of which represent expansions and embellishments of the second major section on the famine in the *BJ*.

Table 4: Outline of the Famine in the *DEH* and the *BJ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Heirosolymitano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• First Major Section on the Famine (<em>BJ</em> 5.425–445)</td>
<td>• First Major Section on the Famine (<em>DEH</em> 5.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second Major Section on the Famine (<em>BJ</em> 5.491–572)</td>
<td>• Second Major Section on the Famine (<em>DEH</em> 5.21; 5.24–25; 5.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Third Major Section on the Famine (<em>BJ</em> 6.193–214)</td>
<td>• Third Major Section on the Famine (<em>DEH</em> 5.39–40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the narrative order of the *BJ*, this section follows Titus’s erection of the wall around the city. The third major section containing descriptions of the famine (i.e. *DEH* 5.39) also mimics the third major section in the *BJ*: it too repeats descriptions of the famine given in the previous two sections before introducing the climatic episode of Maria, which appears in *DEH* 5.40.²¹³

²¹³ After *DEH* 5.40 presents a significantly longer version of the story Maria than the version found in the *BJ*, *DEH* 5.41 gives an expanded account of Titus’s reflection on the tragedy of Maria (see chapter 4 of this dissertation). Titus’s discourse following the story of Maria reiterates many of the themes articulated in earlier episodes in the text. Moreover, in a later episode—when the rebels surrender to Titus—the author of the *DEH* employs the mouth of Caesar to argue for the might of Rome: Titus tells the rebels that it is too late for mercy and says to them, “the hunger and nourishment of the world is in the hands of Rome” (*DEH* 5.46).
Although the placements of descriptions of the famine within the narrative orders in the *BJ* and the *DEH* are parallel, the rhetorical uses of the accounts of the famine in the *DEH* differ radically from those of the *BJ*. The author of the *DEH* omits Josephus’s presentation of the famine as a consequence of the sins of the rebels. For example, the anonymous author excludes the imprecation of Niger against the rebels from his account of Niger’s execution (*DEH* 4.10). He also omits Josephus’s argument that the rebels become the cause of the famine (as presented in *BJ* 4.137). These omissions can be explained with reference to one of the *DEH*’s primary rhetorical objectives: that the crimes of the Jews against Christ were the cause of the famine and the suffering of the people.

Thus in the *DEH*, the descriptions of the sufferings endured by the Jews during the great famine in Jerusalem is framed within the bounds of the author’s rhetorical invective against Jews and Judaism. Josephus’s portrayal of the rebels and the people of Jerusalem as two related but diametrically-opposed groups does not survive the adaptation of his history by Pseudo-Hegesippus. In the *DEH*, both the rebels and the people are portrayed as being guilty of the crime that results in the sufferings of the people during the famine and the destruction of the Temple. In fact, the author of the *DEH* go so far as to highlight the death of Jesus (without mentioning the resurrection) in order to emphasize the crime of deicide he levels against the Jews:

> You [Jews] have what you sought, you have snatched away from yourself the patron of peace, you sought for the arbiter of life to be killed, for Barabbas to be released to you, who on account of rebellion done in the city and murder had been sent to prison. Thus

---

214 The first mention of the famine in the city, for example, is given in 5.18. Immediately before the introduction of the famine, the author mention in 5.17 that the rebels had shut in the inhabitants of the city under threat of death. In this way, the rebels contribute to the severity of the famine and the high number of people who succumb to its savageness. Despite the sharp focus on the role played by the rebels, the author of the *DEH* does not overlook the role played by Titus in bringing about the famine. For example, he notes that Titus’s decision to erect a wall around the city amplifies the severity of the famine more than any other factor (*DEH* 5.21).
salvation departed from you, peace went away, calm left off, rebellion was given to you, destruction was given. Recognize that Barabbas is alive today, Jesus is dead. Thus in you rebellion rules, peace is buried, and you are being destroyed more cruelly by your own people than if you were being destroyed by foreigners (DEH 5.2.2 [296, 23–28]).

Having framed the famine in Jerusalem within the framework of his theological arguments, the author of the DEH proceeds to transmit Josephus’s descriptions of the famine. He spends a considerable amount of space recounting both the barbarity of the rebels and the severity of the sufferings of the Jews. He expands upon the horrors of the famine described by Josephus through the addition of (often graphic) details, literary embellishments, and theological invectives. As a result, the descriptions of the famine that appear in the three major sections in the DEH are significantly longer than their counterparts in the BJ.

3.4 The Famine in Jerusalem in the SY

The narrative order of the DEH’s account of the Roman campaigns in Galilee and the subsequent siege of Jerusalem is largely maintained by the author of SY. Chapters 58–60 of SY recount the origins of the Judean revolt. The author describes the rising animosity between the Jews and the Romans on account of events such as the decree of Gaius (SY 58) and the violent government of Florus in Jerusalem (SY 59). The growth of criminal activity in Jerusalem, especially the crimes of the Sicarii is also highlighted (SY 59). Agrippa II’s speech attempting to persuade the Jews not to arouse the wrath of the Romans ultimately fails (SY 60). The rebel factions among the Jews rise up and force Florus out of Jerusalem. In SY 61-64, the author relates the first stages of the revolt, focusing on the defeat of Cestius and Nero’s sending of
Vespasian to Judea (SY 63–64). These episodes are followed by the accounts of the Galilean campaigns of Vespasian and Titus, including the story of Josephus’s defense of Jotapata and his clever saving of his own life (SY 65–68).

Beginning with chapter 69, the narrative of SY shifts its focus to Jerusalem. While “the kingship of Vespasian” (מלכותו שלОСיוס) does not go without mention (see SY 70), much of the history in this section focuses on the internal strife between the rebel factions (SY 69–82). The three primary rebel factions are led by John of Galilee, Simon, and Eleazar. The rebels wreak havoc on the city and inflict terrible sufferings on the people of Jerusalem, while Titus commences his siege and assault on Jerusalem (SY 74–77). The descriptions of the famine in SY appear in the context of Titus’s siege and the internal strife between the rebels.

Table 5: Outline of the Famine in the SY and the DEH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De Excidio Heirosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. First Major Section on the Famine (DEH 5.18)</td>
<td>1. First Section on the Famine (SY 79.12–24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second Major Section on the Famine (DEH 5.21; 5.24–25; 5.36)</td>
<td>2. Second Section on the Famine (SY 80.35–53).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Third Major Section on the Famine (DEH 5.39–40)</td>
<td>3. Third Section on the Famine (SY 82.37–45; 74–83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fourth Section on the Famine (SY 86)</td>
<td>4. Fourth Section on the Famine (SY 86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

215 The DEH’s theological explanations for the rebuff of Cestius is omitted. There is no attempt to provide an explanation of Cestius’s defeat with reference to the Jewish tradition, similar to the one found in Josephus.

216 The accounts of the battles between the different rebel factions as well as the accounts of Titus’s assault on the fornications of the city are interrupted by two major discourses that are delivered through the mouth of Josephus; the first appears in chapter 73 and the other in chapter 78.
SY transmits the descriptions of the famine that appear in the DEH within four individual sections that come toward the end of the book. The first section on the famine in the SY appears in 79.12–24, and immediately follows Yosef ben Gorion’s (i.e. Josephus’s) speech to the rebels and their refusal to allow the people of the city to leave. The second section appears in SY 80.35–53 and roughly corresponds to DEH 5.21. The third section appears in SY 82.74–83, which rearranges material from several places in the DEH 5.25 and 5.36. The fourth section appears in chapter 86 of the SY and deals exclusively with the story of Maria. Similar to its strategic placement at the end of accounts of the siege in the BJ and the DEH, the story of Maria is similarly reserved for the climatic end of the siege of Jerusalem in the SY. It is immediately followed by the burning of the Temple (SY 87).

The rhetorical function of the famine in Jerusalem as presented by the author of SY is more nuanced than its rhetorical function in the DEH. To begin, the author of SY omits the Christian invective that the sufferings of the Jews during the famine are punishments for their crimes against the Christ. In place of the DEH’s anti-Jewish framing of the famine in Jerusalem, the author of SY presents an alternative theological picture. As mentioned above, SY interprets the Jewish revolt against Rome in light of the rabbinic understandings of the Deuternomistic view of history. In other words, the author portrays the horrors of the famine as divine punishment for the sins of the people.

However, there is more nuance to the theological framework in the SY. One the one hand, the author maintains Josephus’s portrayal of the leaders of the rebels as the primary cause of the

---

217 SY 85 also contains some themes and details relating to the famine.
218 The descriptions of the famine that appear immediately before the story of Maria in the DEH and the War have been omitted by the redactor of the Hebrew SY. The passages are most likely omitted because they are repetitions of motifs presented in earlier passages in the DEH and the War.
both the revolt and the famine (as transmitted by the \textit{DEH}). As such, there are several explicit references wherein the author claims that the sufferings of the people were caused by the rebels (e.g. see tables “A” and “F4” below for examples). On the other hand, the Jews as a people are not entirely innocent. The author highlights the decision on the part of the Jews as a people to take their salvation from Roman rule into their own hands instead of trusting in God (see table __ in chapter 5).

The author’s portrayal of the generation of Jews living in Jerusalem during the revolt mimics the Hebrew Bible’s depiction of sinful generations among ancient Israelites. For example, as the narrative in \textit{SY} shifts from the deeds of the sons of Herod to the rebellion against Rome, the author prefaces the start of the rebellion with a discussion of the growth of wickedness in the land. The text reads as follows:

Then great wickedness sprouted (גדולה רעה צמחה) in the midst of Jerusalem in its streets, in its markets, and in the temple of YHWH. If one hated his neighbor, he bought one of the rebels as a murderer against him…At that time Jonatan, the just and pious priest, was killed with the dagger, and fell dying in the midst of the people to the temple court. It was not known who had stabbed him. Many of the pious were killed like him in those days (\textit{SY} 59.27–30).

The language employed in introducing the beginning of the Jewish Revolt against Rome in this text is highly biblicized. It bears remarkable parallels to biblical narratives that introduce a time of war and oppression in the history of the ancient Israelites.\textsuperscript{219} Such moments in Israelite

\textsuperscript{219} Cf. the various passages that begin a cycle of discord and reconciliation between God and the Israelites, which open with the Israelites doing what is evil in the sight of God: “The Israelites did what was evil (ประธาน בני ישראל אות הרעה) in the sight of the Lord…therefore the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel” (Jud 3.7–8); “the Israelites again did what was evil (לעשות ישראל בני ויספו הרעה) in the sight of the Lord” (Jud 3.12; 4.1; 6.1; 10.6; 13.1). See also Ezek 5.6, where God says of Jerusalem, “But she has rebelled against my ordinances and my statues, becoming more wicked than the nations and the countries around her, rejecting my ordinances and not following my statues.” This passage is especially salient here since in Ezek 5.10, the text goes on to read, “Surely, parents shall eat their children in your [i.e. Jerusalem’s] midst, and children shall eat their parents.” Therefore, one can make the argument that the redactor of the Hebrew \textit{SY} would have been reading the occurrence of the
history in the Hebrew Bible are spurred by the growth of wickedness in the land, as is the case in first-century Judea according to the author of *SY*.

The theme of growing criminal activity in Jerusalem preceding the Revolt is not entirely absent in the *War* and the *DEH*. Both Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus note that certain criminals, most notably the Sicarii, are wreaking havoc in the city as the revolt is beginning (see *BJ* 2.204-249 and *DEH* 2.6). Pseudo-Hegesippus refers to the emergence of the Sicarii, for example, in this way: “in Jerusalem itself another kind of brigands sprang forth, who were called dagger-men” (*DEH* 2.6). Yet both the *BJ* and the *DEH* make a clear distinction between the criminal class and the people who fall victim to their crimes.

In the *SY*, by contrast, the rise of the Sicarii and the troubles they cause are not depicted solely as the actions of a small class of criminals. Instead, their actions are depicted as symptoms of a general wickedness (רעה) that sprouts right in the middle of the city and the Temple itself. Moreover, it is not only the Sicarii who are guilty of murder; the people themselves become accomplices in the crimes of the Sicarii by hiring them as assassins. This is a motif that is absent in the *DEH*, and it buttresses the rhetorical strategy of the author of *SY*, who depicts the Jewish Revolt as another instance of the rise of wickedness among the Jews as a people. The sprouting of wickedness in the city is the first in a sequence of events, which is followed by the murder of Jonathan the pious High Priest. A few sentences later, the wickedness among the Jews evolves and they (not the rebels) rebel against Rome: “At that time, Jews and Romans aroused a war, for the Jews rebelled against the Romans…” (*SY* 59.31–32).

---

famine and cannibalism in light of biblical allusions such as these. For a more detailed discussion of cannibalism in the Hebrew Bible and its relation to the story of Maria in the *Jewish War*, see chapter 4 of this dissertation.
Placing the Jewish Revolt against Rome within the cycle of the ancient Israelites’ rebellion against and reconciliation with God serves two primary rhetorical functions for the author of SY. First, it provides a theological framework for explaining the sufferings of the Jews during the war with Rome and the subsequent destruction of the Temple in a way that counters the DEH’s claims that these events evinced the ultimate destruction of God’s covenant with the Jews. Second, the SY’s presentation of the revolt within the context of the cycle of sin in the Hebrew Bible suggests that a moment of redemption will eventually complete the cycle. The Jews remain within God’s covenant, as the author claims through the mouth of Titus in a prayer spoken by Caesar to God: “You let your name to dwell in their midst. You have chosen the pious ones among them and you raised them heaven ward toward you” (SY 86.62–63). Thus, such a presentation of the history closes the narrative with an air of hope, despite the tragic ending of the Judean Revolt against Rome.

3.5 The Famine in Jerusalem in the KAY and the ZA

As mentioned above, the KAY is divided into eight major sections in the manuscript tradition, a categorization that is replicated in the Ethiopic ZA, which follows the narrative outline of its Vorlage very closely. As such, what is true for the KAY in terms of narrative outline is true for the ZA as well. In turn, while the Arabic adaptation of the Hebrew SY maintains the latter’s narrative order, it does abbreviate and at times rearrange the contents of its Hebrew predecessor. The major outlines of the narrative of the Judean Revolt remain largely the same. The Judean Revolt against Rome begins midway through section six of the KAY and the ZA and continues until the close of the section eight, which ends with the fate of the leaders of the rebels after the destruction of the Temple.
KAY/ZA 6.5 highlights the origins of the rebellion by describing the rise of Eleazar son of Ananias the High Priest. This is followed by Agrippa II’s return to Judea from Rome and his unsuccessful attempt to put an end to rebellious sentiments with a long speech (KAY/ZA 6.6). When he fails to persuade the rebels from revolting against Rome, Agrippa returns to Rome and reports the fomenting sedition in Judea to Nero (KAY/ZA 6.6). Nero first sends Cestius to squash the rebellion; then he sends Vespasian after Cestius fails (KAY/ZA 6.7). Truncated accounts of Vespasian’s campaigns in Galilee are recounted in (KAY/ZA 6.7), and section six closes with the capture of Gischala and John’s escape to Jerusalem (KAY/ZA 6.7).

Section seven is dedicated to the siege of Jerusalem. It opens with accounts of the trouble caused by the leaders of the rebels, particularly John of Gischala (KAY/ZA 7.1). The KAY then relates the rise of Simon the rebel and the subsequent battles that take place between the rebel factions (KAY/ZA 7.2). Chapter three of section seven recounts the coming of Titus to Jerusalem, followed by the destructions of the first and second walls of the city in KAY/ZA 7.4. A large part of chapter five is dedicated to the words of Yosef ben Gorion (or Josephus) to the rebels. This chapter also contains the first of two sections on the famine in Jerusalem, which follows Yosef ben Gorion’s attempts to persuade the rebels to surrender (KAY/ZA 7.5). KAY/ZA 7.6 deals with Simon’s murder of Amitais the priest, before the descriptions of the famine are presented in KAY/ZA 7.7.

Chapter 7.7 in the KAY and ZA weaves together several details and themes that are taken from all four sections on the famine that appear in the SY (i.e. SY 79, 80, 82, 86). The redactor of the Arabic version of SY molds one stand-alone account about the famine out of the various sections in the Hebrew text.
Table 6: Outline of the Famine in the KAY/ZA and the SY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sefer Yosippon</strong></th>
<th><strong>Kitab ahkbar al-Yhud/Zena Ayhud</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• First Section on the Famine (SY 79.12–24)</td>
<td>• Brief Reference to the famine (KAY/ZA 7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second Section on the Famine (SY 80.35–53)</td>
<td>• Sole Chapter on the Famine in Jerusalem (KAY/ZA 7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Third Section on the Famine (SY 82.37–45; 74–83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fourth Section on the Famine (SY 86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The story of Maria serves as the narrative and rhetorical center of this chapter. The chapter in turn closes section seven; section eight then relates the end of the war in Jerusalem. It covers a number of stories including the destruction of the third wall (KAY/ZA 8.1), the destruction of the Temple (KAY/ZA 8.4), the killing of John and Simon (KAY/ZA 8.6), and the death of Eleazar (KAY/ZA 8.8).  

The redactors of the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY couch the presentation of the famine in Jerusalem within the rhetorical program that situates the Jewish Revolt in the context of early Christian history. To this end, the biblicizing rhetoric of the Hebrew SY aids the redactors of the KAY and the ZA, who follow the motif in SY that the sufferings of the Jews and the destruction of the Temple come largely as a result of the wickedness that emerges in the land. Moreover, the authors of the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY expand on this theme in several ways. First, they both include more references to the rise of criminal activity in Jerusalem prior to the revolt, expanding on the the sprouting of great wickedness mentioned in the SY. For

---

220 Interestingly enough, there is no account of the Roman conquest of Masada in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopian texts. Cf. with the endings of the DEH and the SY.
example, the Ethiopic text, which follows the rhetorical moves of its Arabic Vorlage closely, reads as follows:

The author of the book said: when Claudius Caesar the King of Rome died, another Nero Caesar reigned after him (ძያኔው የታሸው ማክ, ከረዳ ፌናር). Then fighting and violence multiplied in the country of the Jews and the country of the Arameans...the hand of evil people expanded (ማንስሳር ከረዳ ከረራ) and their actions grew in strength; suffering intensified and righteousness disappeared (ማንስሳር ከረዳ ከረራ ስድቅ ሷዕር ስዕር ስለሽ በዀቢሮን የወለክ (ZA 6.4.1–8).

Second, the Arabic and Ethiopic texts portray Vespasian and Titus as the means by which the wickedness in the land comes to an end. In ZA 6.4.15, the Ethiopic text reads, “goodness disappeared and wickedness increased until Vespasian, the delegate of Nero Caesar, arrived” (ძያኔው ስዕር ሰው የወስናኒ የዐቢ እስከ በሰብ ስዕር ስለሽ በዀቢሮን የወለክ) (ZA 6.4.15). The Arabic and Ethiopian texts also go on to note that Vespasian commands Titus to lay a siege against the city, after which Titus “destroys the Temple and captured the people” (ZA 6.4.16–17). In this way, the Flavian campaigns against Judea are thus understood as tools by God to eradicate an age of great wickedness. Moreover, the redactors of the KAY and the ZA omit the SY’s portrayal of the Jews as the covenental people of God. As a result, the destruction of the Temple and the sufferings of the Jews is presented as irredeemable in the Arabic and Ethiopian texts.

In the following, I present an analysis of the first of three sections in ZA 7.7, the chapter containing almost the descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem and the story of the unnamed woman who kills and eats her son. I divide the motifs in this section into individual pericopes and present them chronologically as they appear in the Ethiopic text. Each pericope is presented in parallel format with its corresponding parts (when available) in the texts antecedent to the Ethiopic. I then discuss the changes made to various details and themes in the process of transmission. I begin by contextualizing the opening words of the chapter, which are concerned
with the disappearance of food in Jerusalem. I also provide below an outline of the parallel pericopes being analyzed in this chapter:

### 3.6 List of Parallel Passages on the Famine in Jerusalem

A. The Disappearance of Food  
B. Eating Detestable Things  
C. The Sound of the Millstone and the Fury of the Rebels  
D. Eating Uncooked Wheat  
E. Family Feud  
F. The Walking Dead  
   F.1. The Magnitude of Corpses  
   F.2. The Living Join the Dead  
   F.3. The Living Bury Themselves  
   F.4. The Dead Are Neglected  
   F.5. The Dead Are Thrown Away  
G. The Discourse of Titus  
   G.1. Titus’s Reaction to the Magnitude of Corpses  
   G.2. Titus Desires the Welfare of the Jews  
   G.3. Titus Offers Peace and Mercy  
   G.4. Titus Blames the Leaders of the Jews  
   G.5. Titus Asks God for Pardon  
H. God’s Punishment of the Rebels  
   H.1. The Rebels Taste the Famine  
   H.2. The Rebels Eat Excrement  
   H.3. The Rebels Eat Leather  
I. The Desolation of the Land  
   I.1. Searching in Vain for Plants  
   I.2. The Desolation of the Land Around Jerusalem  
   I.3. The Former Beauty of Jerusalem  
   I.4. The Weeping of Nostalgia

---

A. The Disappearance of Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Grain] was nowhere to be seen, so [the rebels] invaded and searched the</td>
<td>And also the famine had begun to rage and the sedition proceeded more</td>
<td>The sustenance from the city disappeared because the rebels consumed</td>
<td>The master of the book said [that] when the siege grew long on the city, the</td>
<td>The master of the book said [that] when the siege of the city of Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
houses (BJ 5.425). Grain could not be found, and there was no bread for public use (DEH 5.18.1 [333, 26–28]).

Grain could not be found, and there was no bread for public use. (DEH 5.18.1 [333, 26–28]).

The sustenance of the people…(SY 79.13–14).

city of Jerusalem, everything that was in it from sustenance to edible things disappeared (KAY 7.7.1–2).
grew long, all of the food and edible things that were inside of [the city] disappeared (ZA 7.7.1–2).

ZA 7.7 opens with an often-recurring transitional phrase: “the master of the book said” (ወም፡በዐለ፡መጽሐፍ). This is a rather literal translation of the Arabic phrase قال صاحب الكتب. This transitional phrase introduces each chapter and major sub-sections within each chapter. It appears twice in this chapter of the ZA, once in the opening where it introduces the descriptions of the horrors of the famine that take place in Jerusalem and again at the start of the story of Maria. Employing this phrase, this chapter in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts begins by mentioning the disappearance of food in the city of Jerusalem.

The disappearance of food inside in the city is first mentioned in Josephus’s War at the start of the descriptions of the famine recounted in the first section on the famine at appears in BJ 5.425–445. 221 As mentioned above, in the War, this passage is preceded by Josephus’s indirect discourse to the leaders of the rebels (BJ 5.370–374), which in turn is followed by his lengthy speech delivered within earshot of the the rebels but outside the range of their projectiles (BJ 5.376–419). In BJ 4.420–424, the rebels prevent the people from leaving the city by slitting the throats of anyone suspected of wanting to escape. Then Josephus makes the first mention of the disappearance of food from the city.

221 Josephus is careful to note that initially the famine does not affect all the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the same way. First, he makes allusions to the wealthy, who are able to purchase (albeit hardly edible) foodstuffs even as the food is disappearing from the city. Secondly, and more importantly, Josephus notes that the leaders of the rebels and their men still have food at this stage in the siege. They steal from the people only to avoid cutting into their own reserves so as to keep what they had for the days ahead (BJ 4.432–438).
In the *DEH*, a Christianized version of Josephus’s speech appears in 5.16. Following this long speech, John and Simon imprison the people inside the city (*DEH* 5.17), before the first mention of the disappearance of food is made in *DEH* 5.18. In the *SY*, Josephus’s words to the rebels constitutes the entirety of chapter 78. The account of the rebels forcing the people to remain in the city appears in *SY* 79.1-11, and the first mention of the disappearance of food is found in *SY* 79.12. In chapter five of section seven of the Arabic and Ethiopic texts, the same narrative order of this passage is maintained. Josephus gives his speech (*KAY/ZA* 7.5), the rebels imprison the people inside the city (*KAY/ZA* 7.5), and the first mention of the disappearance of food is made (*KAY/ZA* 7.5). Thus a trace of the order of events that is present in the Hebrew *SY* can still be seen in *KAY/ZA* 7.5, which mentions the disappearance of food inside the city in the same order as the preceding texts.

However, while the Arabic and Ethiopic texts maintain the narrative order of events preceding the disappearance of food in the city in chapter 7.5, the rest of the descriptions of the famine have been completely rearranged. As discussed above, all four sections on the famine that appear in the Hebrew *SY* are compiled into one chapter in the *KAY* and the *ZA*, namely chapter 7.7. The redactor of the Arabic text rearranges all the accounts of the famine into one chapter and moves that chapter to the end of the siege of Jerusalem.

In addition, the translator of the Arabic text relates the story of Simon’s killing of Amitais (which appears in *KAY/ZA* 7.6) before picking up the accounts of the famine in chapter 7.7. The translator of the Arabic text deliberately places all the descriptions of the famine and the story of the cannibalistic mother in chapter 7.7, just before describing the destruction of the Temple (*KAY/ZA* 8.1). Such an arrangement can best be explained as a rhetorical move that serves to more dramatically highlight the destruction of the Temple, by employing the horrors of the
famine in Jerusalem as a suspenseful build-up to the tragic denouement of the demise of the Second Temple.

B. Eating Detestable Things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then they added pestilence to the green lizards and the other stripped off parts of the serpent race which they had cooked, they added pestilence ((DEH\ 5.18.4 [336, 10–11]).)</td>
<td>[Things got worse] until the people ate every creeping thing of the earth, from mouse to gecko to snake and mole, turtle, cat and dog ((SY 79.22–23).)</td>
<td>And the intense famine was on the people until they ate the corpses and the creeping things of the ground ((KAY\ 7.7.2).)</td>
<td>And the famine grew worse upon the people until they [began to] eat rotten things and every reptile inside the ground ((ZA 7.7.3–4).)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After noting the disappearance of the food in Jerusalem, ZA 7.7 describes the detestable things that the people inside the city are forced to eat. The consumption of detestable things the people eat in this pericope represents a motif that originates not with Josephus’s \(War,\) but rather with the history of Pseudo-Hegesippus. Josephus does mention a number of detestable items that the people and the rebels are forced to eat (as demonstrated below in tables G.2 and G.3). He also makes generalized references about the eating of abnormal things. For example, in the third major section on the famine he writes, “their hunger was so intolerable, that it obliged them to chew everything, while they gathered such things as the most sordid animals would not touch, and endured to eat them” \((BJ\ 6.197).\) Josephus does not, however, list any specific animals that the people eat.

Such details are introduced first in the \(DEH,\) which makes the claim that the people eat “green lizards” \((lacertis viridibus)\) and “other spoils of the serpent race” \((ceterisque serpentina\)
generis exuuiis). The author of the SY lists specific animals consumed as part of the unfortunate menu including mouse (עכבר), gecko (שממית), snake (נחש), mole (חולד), turtle (וצב), cat (חתול), dog (כלב), and more generally “every creeping this of the earth” (כל רמש הארץ). The author of the Hebrew texts seems to have in mind a similar list of prohibited animals found in Leviticus, which prescribes the following: “These are unclean (הטמא) for you among the creatures that swarm the earth: the weasel, the mouse (עכבר), the great lizard (הנבה) according to its kind, the gecko (ﬂ ﬀ), the land crocodile (), the lizard (), the sand lizard () and the chameleon ()” (Lev 11.29–30). By making such an allusion to the dietary restrictions found in the Torah, the author of SY further accentuates the breaking of the covenant by the people, a theme that dominates the Hebrew text.222

The list of unclean animals consumed by the people is abbreviated by the redactor of the Arabic version of SY, who is content to note that the people are forced to eat “the creeping things of the ground” (دبับ الأرض).223 The KAY does, however, introduce the motif of eating corpses (الجيف), a detail that does not appear in the previous texts. The Ethiopic translator does not provide a direct translation at this point; rather corpses is translated as “rotten [things]” (ጋወ). A

222 Jonathan Price has argued that “the law sanctioned the consumption of any kind of food under stress of severe hunger,” citing a number of passages from the Talmud in order to buttress his claim (Jonathan J. Price, Jerusalem Under Siege: The Collapse of the Jewish State 66-70 C.E. (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 154). Whether or not the author of the Hebrew SY agrees with the claim that foods considered unclean are permissible under the burden of severe hunger, here he is making a clear allusion to the dietary restrictions in the Levitical law code. Given the wider rhetorical program of demonstrating the lawlessness present in the city during the Jewish Revolt against Rome, the allusion to Leviticus is most likely made in order to accentuate the people’s distance from a right observance of the Torah, as opposed to a legal mitigation for their eating of unclean animals and detestable things.

223 Here the Arabic translator seems to be rendering the Hebrew כל רמש הארץ (“every creeping thing of the earth”) with the phrase دبيب الأرض. Unlike the generic reference to detestable animals in the Latin text, which reads “other spoils of the serpent race,” the Hebrew text makes a clear allusion to Leviticus 11.41: “All creatures that swarm upon the earth (הארץ על השרצ כל) are forbidden; they shall not be eaten.”
more literal translation would translate the Arabic الجيف as ماء or ضر، the conventional Ethiopic terms for “corpse.” Even فlesh (“flesh”) could also have conceivably been used to translate the Arabic الجيف.

The reason for this move on the part of the Ethiopic translator is not entirely clear. It could be merely a stylistic change. If not, perhaps “corpses” is translated as “rotten things” in order to retain the uniqueness of the story of the cannibalistic mother that appears later in the chapter. As will be demonstrated below, there is also a tendency on the part of the translator of the Ethiopic text to sanitize the particularly abhorrent parts of narrative. In any case, the reception of this motif of eating animals not commonly fit for food is notable for that fact that it evinces instances of both the addition and omission of details at several points in the transmission process.

C. The Sound of the Millstone and the Fury of the Rebels

Bellum Judaicum | De Excidio Hierosolymitano | Sefer Yosippon | Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd | Zena Ayhud
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
…some in the extremity of their hunger would eat the grain unground, and others made bread as best they could and as far as they dared (BJ 5.427). | Nor indeed even the practice of baking bread was not awaited, lest death should come first or delay summon a betrayer (DEH 5.18.2 [334, 17–18]). | Whoever had wheat was afraid to grind or bake it, lest it became known to the rebels and they took it (SY 79.17–18). | …and it happened that whoever preserved for himself some of the wheat and the like would be afraid to grind it and bake it because it would be known through it, the sound of the grinding or the smoke, then it would be | …even if there was a little bit of wheat left over, a neighbor was afraid to grind it or bake it, lest it became known [through] the sound of the millstone or breaker that there was [wheat] and they rise up from among

---

224 (see Leslau, 676).
The motif of eating detestable things in ZA 7.7 is followed by an episode describing the people’s reluctance to grind wheat or bake bread for fear of being discovered. The Arabic and Ethiopian texts employ the passive voice in relating this episode, and thus hide the identity of the object of the people’s fear. These two texts merely note that the people were afraid to grind wheat or bake it because, if discovered, the food would be taken away from them. While this motif is described in the passive voice in the Arabic and Ethiopian texts, the preceding texts more clearly highlight the agency of the rebels and their role in exacerbating the famine in Jerusalem. In the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew texts, the fear of the people is a direct consequence of the marauding and murderous rebels who are terrorizing the city.

---

225 The Arabic and Ethiopian texts do not ignore this motif completely. They make explicit references to the role of the leaders of the rebel factions as one of the primary reasons for the destruction of Jerusalem and the annihilation of her citizens. For example, the title of chapter 6.8 reads, “The story of John the Galilean, and he was one of the three reasons for the destruction of Jerusalem and the annihilation of the people, because of what they did against Rome.”

226 Both the BJ and the DEH provide much more detail regarding the villainy of the rebels at this point in the narrative. Josephus writes, “The madness of the seditious did also increase, together with their famine, and both those miseries were every day inflamed more and more. For there was no corn which anywhere appeared publicly; but the robbers came running into, and searched men’s private houses; and then, if they found any, they tormented them, because they had denied they had any: and if they found none, they tormented them worse; because they supposed they had more carefully concealed it. The indication they made use of whether they had any or not was taken from the bodies of these miserable wretches: which if they were in good case, they supposed they were in no want at all of food: but if they were wasted away, they walked off, without searching any farther. Nor did they think it proper to kill such as these: because they saw they would very soon die of themselves, for want of food” (BJ 5.424–426). Pseudo-Hegesippus adds more charges to the crimes of the rebels and writes, “The agents of the rebellions would rush forward, they stormed the closed places, they enforced unbearable punishments of new cruelty. Not even from the private parts of the body was it withheld. To these also the punishment was applied, because in these there is a greater sensation of punishment. Many when they already saw the murderers breaking in, seized the prepared food so that they should not themselves be cheated of a final allowance and might avenge their death, which was about to occur. And this is where the barbarity appeared to be most painful: those who seized food from the starving were not themselves starving” (DEH 5.18.3 [335, 9–13]).
A use of the passive voice in describing this episode also appears at certain points in the Latin text, which includes both explicit references to the role of the rebels and general descriptions of crime within the city. It is interesting that the Christian accounts of the famine in Jerusalem all emphasize an atmosphere of widespread criminal activity, wherein the civilians in the city are terrorizing their own neighbors by stealing food from one another. In this context, the crimes of the rebels appear less severe. In contrast, in the War and (to a lesser degree in Sefer Yosippon), the people are portrayed primarily as the victims of the ruthless rebels.

In this account of the famine in Jerusalem and in other places in the narrative, the presentation of the rebels is increasingly shortened within the reception history of the War in the SY tradition. The vast amount of details Josephus dedicates to describing the affairs of the leaders of the rebel factions is diminished in the DEH, and further simplified by the translator of the Hebrew SY. Thus while Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus describe the viciousness of the rebels in gruesome detail, the presentation of the rebels in this episode is sparse within the Sefer Yosippon traditions.

The various texts also employ different terminologies to refer to the rebel factions. Josephus uses a few separate terms when discussing the rebels. By far the most common term he employs when describing them is τύραννοι (“tyrants”). He uses this term to refer particularly to the leaders of the rebel factions, whom he portrays as irredeemably tyrannical. When referring to the rebels as a political faction, the author usually refers to them as λῃστοι (“robbers”) and sometimes as στασιώτες (“seditious, rebels”).

Pseudo-Hegesippus distinguishes between the rebel leaders and their followers by referring to the former as principes seditionum (“leaders of the rebellion”) and the latter as ministri seditionum (“agents of the rebellion”). Various other terms are used to refer to the rebels
as a political faction in the *DEH* including *latrones* (“brigands” or “robbers”), *concitores bellis* (“instigators of war”), and *percussores* (“assassins”). The *SY* refers to the rebels primarily as לוחרים ("robbers” or “murderers”), while a leader of one the rebel factions is called שר לוחרים (“leader of the robbers”).

In the Arabic version of *SY*, the rebels are referred to primarily as الخوارج (“the rebels”). The same term is employed in the Judeo-Arabic version of *SY*: אלכוארג. The Ethiopic text employs a rather interesting term to describe the rebels: እለ፡ያርብሕ. This same term is used in the Ethiopic Bible to refer to the giants who roam the land in primeval history of Genesis 6: እሱ እለ፡ያርብሕ በወበው እቱ መዋዕል እኑ እለ፡ያርብሏል በወወለዳ ይምድር በና ይውስተ እግዚአብሔር ኢን ቔብ ኢያውል እድወ ኢው ይውም ኢለ፡ያርብስ በና ኢያው ኢይት ይው ይው ኢለ፡ያርብሏል (“In those days, the giants were in the land because the sons of God entered into the daughters of men and they bore for them the giants”) (Gen 6.4).²²⁷

The terminology used to refer to them notwithstanding, the rebels play a critical role in the accounts of the famine present in the five texts. In the *War* and the *DEH*, the crimes of the rebels against the people of Jerusalem are recounted in great detail. The author of *SY* similarly highlights the agency of the rebels in bringing famine and death upon the people, but omits many of the graphic details in the *DEH*. The translator of the Arabic version of *SY* in turn downplays the agency of the rebels.

---

²²⁷ One can here point out that the Ethiopic employs the term እለ፡ያርብሕ to refer to two distinct groups mentioned in the Hebrew text: the Nephilim (هةנפילים) and the mighty men (הגברים). As James Vanderkam and George Nickelsburg have pointed out, this conflation of the Nephilim and the mighty men already takes places on the level of the Septuagint, which translates both nouns as οἱ γίγαντες (“the giants”) (George W. E. Nickelsburg, *I Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001), 184. Because the Septuagint serves as the *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic version of the Hebrew Bible, it is not surprising that only one term is used to refer to both the Nephilim and the mighty men.
Instead, the fear of the people is placed in the framework of the general rise of crime that permeates the wicked generation of Jews as presented in the Christian adaptation of SY. Thus the people are not afraid of the rebels, but of their own neighbors. Such a presenting of this motif serves to accentuate one of the major themes found in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts: the sufferings of the people during the famine are a result of the sins of the people who collectively represent the growth of wickedness in Jerusalem.

D. Eating Uncooked Wheat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…but they snatched the food out of the fire half-cooked and tore it to pieces (BJ 5.428).</td>
<td>Those hiding devoured the uncooked wheat in secret (DEH 5.18.2 [334, 18–19]).</td>
<td>…but they were eating the wheat in secret (SY 79.18–19).</td>
<td>Now they were eating the seed of the wheat and stowing away the flour…(KAY 7.7.4)</td>
<td>Now they were eating the seeds of the wheat raw and feeding on the grounded powder of grain…(ZA 7.7.7–8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the fury of rebels, the ZA relates the issue of the people’s eating of raw wheat necessitated by the dangers involved in grinding and baking wheat during the famine. Although the Ethiopian follows the Arabic closely for the most part in this passage, it does change the “stowing away” of wheat to “feeding on the grounded powder” of wheat. The Arabic omits the explicit reference to the secrecy with which the people are eating the wheat, although secrecy is certainly implied in the context of the narrative of the Arabic. The Hebrew text in turn leaves out
the explicit reference to “uncooked wheat” (\textit{incoctum triticum}) made in the Latin; but again, the
case of the Hebrew makes it clear that the people are eating wheat without baking it.\footnote{228}

The Hebrew text omits a couple of other details that appear in the \textit{DEH} and the \textit{BJ}. First, 
Josephus mentions two different types of grain (\textit{sítòς}) and distinguishes between what the rich
could afford and what the poor inhabitants of the city could afford. He notes that the rich go to
great lengths to purchase wheat (\textit{πυρός}) while the poor could only get their hands on barley
(\textit{κρίκη}) (\textit{BJ} 5.427). This detail is retained in the \textit{DEH}, which relates that “the rich spend their
entire wealth on wheat” (\textit{qui ditiores erant mensuram tritici toto censu emebant}) while “the poor
find it difficult to purchase barley” (\textit{qui pauperiores vel hordei ita ut nemo vendentem aut
ememtem videret}) (\textit{DEH} 5.18.2 [334, 14–16]).

\textit{SY} omits this distinction between the grain of the rich and the grain of the poor; it
mentions only the consumption of unground and unbaked wheat and makes no reference to
social classes. Secondly, both the \textit{BJ} and the \textit{DEH} note the desperation of the people by
describing the buying and selling of fibrous strips and pieces of chaff at great prices. This detail
is also omitted by the redactor of the Hebrew text and does not make it into the \textit{SY} tradition. The
changes made to the motif of eating raw wheat in the process of the transmission of this passage
appear to be merely stylistic.

\footnote{228} It is interesting to note that the \textit{DEH} omits part of Josephus’s account of this episode, which is more
animated and dynamic than the account found in the Latin text: the version in the \textit{War} reads, “When these
had so done, they shut themselves up in the inmost rooms of their houses, and eat the corn they had
gotten. Some did it without grinding it; by reason of the extremity of the want they were in: and others
baked bread of it, according as necessity and fear dictated to them. A table was nowhere laid for a distinct
meal: but they snatched the bread out of the fire, half baked, and eat it very hastily” (\textit{BJ} 5.427–428). The
author of the \textit{DEH} omits this account in the Greek text, wherein the people are dramatically pulling half-
baked breads from fires and eating it hurriedly. Such an omission is uncharacteristic of the author of the
\textit{DEH}, who more often than not only retains the motifs in Josephus’s account of the famine, but usually
expands upon and dramatizes the details found in the \textit{War}. 
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So wives would snatch food from their husbands, children from their parents, and, most pitiable of all, mothers would take the food from the very mouths of their babes and not scruple (BJ 5.430).

...there were frequent murders of family members, sad fights among one’s own...children snatched [food] from parents, parents from children and from the very jaws to which the food was being offered (DEH 5.18.2 [334, 23–31]).

In the houses where there was food...the father snatched it from the hand of the son and the son from the hand of the father and the mother from the hand of her son and the son from the mouth of his mother (SY 79.19–21).

And if a fraction of the food was found the father would seize it from the son and the son from the father (KAY 7.7.4–5).

Even if they found a little bit [of food], a father would violently seize it from his son and likewise a son from his father (ZA 7.7.9–10).

The next section in ZA 7.7 deals with infighting between family the fighting for food that takes places among family members, which can ultimately be traced back to one of the most powerful scenes in Josephus’s descriptions of the famine. This is one of the few motifs in Josephus’s War that is repeated, appearing first in the first major section on the famine (i.e. BJ 5.425–445) and coming up again in BJ 6.193–95.229 In the former account, Josephus places the infighting between family members in the context of the “madness of the rebels” (ἡ ἀπόνοια

229 Josephus’s full account of the infighting between family members comes in BJ 5.429–431: “It was now a miserable case, and a sight that would justly bring tears into our eyes, how men stood as to their food: while the more powerful had more than enough; and the weaker were lamenting [for want of it.] But the famine was too hard for all other passions: and it is destructive to nothing so much as to modesty; for what was otherwise worthy of reverence, was in this case despised. Insomuch that children pulled the very morsels that their fathers were eating out of their very mouths: and, what was still more to be pitied, so did the mothers do as to their infants. And when those that were most dear were perishing under their hands, they were not ashamed to take from them the very last drops that might preserve their lives.” In Book 6, Josephus summarizes the detailed account he provides in Book 5: “For in each house, if a shadow of food would appear anywhere, there was war, and the dearest relations came at each other with their hands, snatching away the most miserable provisions for life” (BJ 6.193–95).
It is once again the fury of the rebels that forces the people of Jerusalem to such miserable states of war against each other. Josephus goes on to note that people snatch food even from their family members who are on the verge of death. Moreover, he notes that the rebels would break into the houses continually and steal whatever small amounts of food the people have forcefully procured from their own family members (BJ 5.430–431).

In the De Excidio, the infighting of family members also appears in the first major section on the famine (i.e. DEH 5.18). Similar to the first major section on the famine in the BJ, the motif of warring family members follows the description of the fury of the rebels. The author of the DEH expands Josephus’s account of the family feuds and inserts more graphic details to the story. In addition to describing the snatching of food by one family member from another, Pseudo-Hegesippus writes that fathers hide food from their starving wives and children. The author also writes that the absence of food leads people to lick up the vomit of strangers “in the manner of dogs” (canum more) and that frequent murders of family members take place (DEH 5.18). Given its powerful imagery, the motif of infighting among family members readily fits the rhetorical objectives of the author of the DEH. As a result, the expansion of Josephus’s version of the motif here is not surprising and represents the conventional style and method of the DEH’s redaction of the descriptions of the famine that appear in the War.

In the opening sections of DEH 5.18, however, the rebels are not explicitly identified as the ones causing havoc in the city. Instead the crimes being committed are described in the passive voice, and it is only at the latter part of DEH 5.18 that the agents of the rebels are specifically identified as the criminals. The description of the people behaving as dogs found here in the Latin text seems to be replaying a motif found toward the end of the second section on the famine present in the War, in which Josephus describes the rebels as mad dogs and drunken men. The text reads, “These robbers gaped for want, and ran about stumbling and staggering along, like mad dogs; and reeling against the doors of the houses, like drunken men. They would also, in the great distress they were in, rush into the very same houses, two or three times in one and the same day” (BJ 6.4).
The Hebrew SY transmits a significantly truncated account of the DEH’s description of the family members warring for food.\textsuperscript{232} This motif appears in chapter 79 of the SY and is part of the first of two major sections on the famine that appear in the Hebrew text. Several details from the Latin text are omitted; however, the translator of the SY does note that parents were snatching food from their children and vice versa. The Hebrew text also preserves the imagery of family members seizing morsels of food out of the mouths of relatives, which appears both in BJ 5.430 and DEH 5.18.\textsuperscript{233} The shortened version of this passage that appears in the KAY and the ZA omits this detail of food being snatched away from hungry mouths. Instead the Arabic and Ethiopian texts merely note that family members would violently seize food from one another.

The transmission of this pericope, therefore, represents a typical development during the process of transmission (i.e. the omission of details deemed to be extraneous).

F. The Walking Dead

After relating the infighting between starving family members, the narrative in ZA 7.7 shifts to the issue of the vastness of the number of those dying in Jerusalem as a result of the famine. The problems caused by the large number of corpses that begin to litter the city as the Roman siege of Jerusalem is protracted represent an important motif in the descriptions of the famine that appear in the five texts. Several different motifs concerned with the dead and the dying are transmitted from Josephus’s War to the Ethiopic Zena Ayhud. These motifs include

\textsuperscript{232} The translator of the Hebrew text also omits the repetition of this motif found in the third major sections on the famine in the BJ and the DEH.

\textsuperscript{233} Josephus’s account describes a scene wherein children seize morsels of food out of the mouths of their fathers, while mothers do the same to their infants. This scene is more dramatic in the DEH: Pseudo-Hegesippus writes, “Sons snatched [the food] from parents, parents from sons and from the very throats (\textit{de ipsis faucius}) to which the food was offered” (DEH 5.18). In the Hebrew text, fathers and mothers are described as snatching food from the hands of their sons, and sons from the hands of their fathers; but sons are snatching it from the mouths, and not hands, of their mothers (SY 79.19–20).
descriptions of the magnitude of the corpses that fill the city, the desire to die on the part of the living, and the mistreatment of corpses by the overburdened citizens of Jerusalem.

F1. The Magnitude of Corpses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...the streets [were filled] with the dead bodies of the old...the burial of relatives was...avoided by those still in good health because of the pure numbers of the dead and the personal risk involved (BJ 5.513–514).</td>
<td>Every place was filled full with the half-dead and, if you would wait a short while, with dead bodies...very many even died while arranging the burial of their family members and also left unfulfilled the duty of this final service by their own death (DEH 5.21.2 [344, 4–5; 17–19]).</td>
<td>Many were going to bury the dead and the living fell on the dead and they died and there was no one to bury [them] because there was no place for the burying and those being buried (SY 80.42–43).</td>
<td>Thus the famine and the struggle increased, the situation became serious, and the famine intensified until many of the people died. The living were busy with themselves so they were not burying their dead (KAY 7.7.5–6).</td>
<td>And the famine increased greatly until a large number of the people died and the living labored to the point of exhaustion burying the dead (ZA 7.7.10–11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problems caused by the large number of corpses inside Jerusalem are described by Josephus in the second major section on the famine that appears in BJ 5.491-572. This section in the War follows the decision by Titus to erect a wall around the city, thus completely cutting off access to resources the inhabitants of the city had (BJ 5.491–511). After noting the speed and efficiency of the Roman army’s construction of the wall, Josephus writes that the famine devours the people to the extent that the houses and streets of the city begin to fill with dead bodies (BJ 5.512–513). To make matters worse, the few people who are able to bury the dead neglect to
perform the task because they do not know how soon they themselves would die. Some die, according to Josephus, just as they are in the middle of burying others (BJ 5.514).

Toward the close of Book 5, the author gives exceedingly large figures for the dead. He writes that a certain Manneus son of Lazarus, who is a guardian of one of the gates of the city, reports to Titus that 115,880 dead bodies had been carried out through his gate (BJ 5.567). Eminent citizens of the city who run to Titus also report that no fewer than 600,000 corpses were thrown out of the gates (BJ 5.569). Besides these dead bodies, they claim that they had piled up many other corpses in heaps inside the houses of the city so that the real number of the dead is undiscoverable (BJ 5.570). The figures that Josephus provides are undoubtedly inflated. However, the large number of casualties serves to illustrate his primary rhetorical objective: to demonstrate that the Jewish War was one of the greatest wars ever fought.

Pseudo-Hegesippus too places the descriptions of the magnitude of dead bodies in Jerusalem in the second major section on the famine that appears in DEH 5.21. This account follows the narrative order of the BJ and comes after Titus’s erecting of the wall around the city. In addition to recounting the large number of corpses and the problems involved in burying them, the author of the DEH also introduces new details concerned with describing the physical and psychological states of the living. The living are described as walking dead, physically emaciated and wasted away by hunger and psychologically defeated by the magnitude of the number of those who are dying around them (DEH 5.21). Such a portrayal of the people lines up nicely with the the author’s attempt to portray the consequences of the Jewish revolt as divine punishment leveled against the Jews as a people. For the author of the DEH, the descriptions of those walking around Jerusalem as if dead and surrounded by the actually dead embody the judgment of God against the Jews.
Pseudo-Hegesippus also preserves the large figures of the dead given by Josephus. The number of the dead bodies that go out through the gate of Manneus the son of Lazarus is given as 115,880; 600,000 other corpses are said to have gone out through other gates (DEH 5.25). These figures are the same as those found in the War. The same figures are also given in SY 82.60: 115,880 corpses are carried out through Menachem’s gate and 600,000 go out through the other gates in Jerusalem.

In contrast to the preceding texts, which provide the figures for the dead immediately following the section on Titus’s construction of the wall, the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY recount these figures at the close of their narratives. It is not until chapter 8.7, after the destruction of the Temple and the subsequent executions of the rebel leaders, that the figures of the dead carried out through the gates of the city are provided. Moreover, the figure for the corpses carried out through Menachem’s gate is changed from 115,800 to 125,061 (KAY/ZA 8.7). The figure for the corpses that are carried out through other gates remains the same at 600,000. The translators of the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY also follow the preceding texts in noting that many other Jews die but are not counted.

Another notable change that occurs in the transmission of this pericope is the Ethiopic’s slight emendation of the Arabic version of SY. The Hebrew and Arabic versions of SY depict the living in Jerusalem as neglectful of their duty of burying the dead. In the Hebrew text, the living do not bury the dead because there is no place to bury them. In the Arabic text, the dead are not buried because the living are too busy with themselves (واشغلو االحياء بانفسهم). In the Ethiopic text, however, “the living labor to the point of exhaustion burying the dead” (µωσ.αβ: ḫosphē: ἀγωνύζοντες τὸν φρόνημα νεκρῶν). Although the reason behind this change in the Ethiopic text is again not clear,
the slight alteration of the account does fit into the broader program to sanitize the text that appears throughout the Zena Ayhud.

F2. The Living Join the Dead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitanus</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…and many fell dead while burying others (BJ 5.514).</td>
<td>They collapsed upon the dead whom they had undertook to guard, so that he also added to the burden which he had come to ease, requiring that service which he was offering to another (DEH 5.21.2 [344, 20–22]).</td>
<td>Many were throwing the dead into the pits and they were also falling with them and they died (SY 80.44).</td>
<td>Some people were throwing the dead into the pits and then hurling themselves at their heels, in order that they would die and be released from the terrible tragedy (KAY 7.7.6–7).</td>
<td>There were [some] among the people who were casting their dead into the pits and then throwing themselves after them so that they might die and find relief from the ruin and tribulation (ZA 7.7.11–13).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actions of the living vis-à-vis the magnitude of the dead in the city represent a motif that is reworked several times in the process of its transmission. In his description of the problems caused by the magnitude of corpses, Josephus describes a scene in which those engaged in burying the dead fall dead themselves, presumably from exhaustion. In DEH 5.21, the author of the Latin text transmits this dramatic nature of this scene by also depicting the living as falling on the dead (ruebant super defunctos).

The Hebrew text merges the theme of the living desiring to join the dead with the throwing of corpses into the pits or valleys around the city. In the Hebrew SY, therefore, the living follow the dead not into the graves; instead they throw themselves into the same pits into which they cast the dead. This motif in the Hebrew SY is retained by the translators of the Arabic
and Ethiopic versions of SY. The translators of these latter two texts also situate this scene within the wider program of depicting the sufferings of the Jews during the war against Rome as a consequence of divine punishment. This rhetorical move is made by reiterating here the motif of a terrible “tragedy” (البلاء in Arabic and በኝስና in Ethiopic) coming upon the Jews in order to eradicate the wickedness from the land.

F3. The Living Bury Themselves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...and many others went early to their own graves before their proper time had come (BJ 5.514).</td>
<td>Many prepared these [burial places] for themselves with their own hands, lest a service of this type should not be available and inserted themselves voluntarily in these... (DEH 5.21.3 [345, 15–17]).</td>
<td>Many went while they were still alive and made graves for themselves and lied down inside of them a day or two and died there because there was no one to bury [them] (SY 80.45–46).</td>
<td>Many people were digging graves for themselves and after that lying down inside them until they died (KAY 7.7.7–8).</td>
<td>Moreover, many of the people were digging graves for them[elves] and then lying down inside them until they died (ZA 7.7.13–15).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to describing the death of grave-diggers while they are engaged in the process of burying others, Josephus also writes that some people voluntarily go to their coffins while still alive. This motif is transmitted across the chain of reception of the War with very little emendation. The DEH only adds an explanatory gloss, noting that the people’s decision to go to their graves before their deaths occurs because they fear that if they do not bury themselves while living, no one would be available to bury them once they died.

This addition to Josephus’s account represents one of the many changes made to the War by the redactor of the DEH aimed at depicting more-dramatically the breakdown of social norms.
caused by the revolt, the siege, and the famine. The author of the Latin text portrays the perversion—and at-times complete abandon—of social norms inside the city not only as tragic, but also as indicative of the punitive measures taken by God against the Jews. To this end, the severity of the situation is heightened by the redactor of the *DEH*. Pseudo-Hegesippus writes that in addition to the shortage of grave-diggers, “by then land was lacking for tombs” (*deerat iam terra tumulis*) because all the land available for burials had been used up (*DEH 5.21*).

The Hebrew *SY* transmits many of the motifs describing the breakdown of social norms as presented in the *DEH*. In this case, the Hebrew retains the motif of the living burying themselves because there is no one willing and able to bury the dead (*SY 80.41–42*). The motif is also transmitted by the redactor of the *KAY* (see sec. E2 above), although it is not repeated in this pericope. As mentioned above, the living continue to bury the dead in the Ethiopic adaptation of the Arabic *SY*. However, the Ethiopic by no means neglects to describe the breakdown of social norms. Despite this small difference between the Arabic and Ethiopian versions of *SY* vis-a-vis this motif, the general outline of the breakdown of social norms is maintained by the Ethiopic text through other examples, as demonstrated below.

**F4. The Dead Are Neglected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-vahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was no lamentation, no weeping at all this death. Famine negated emotion (<em>BJ 5.515</em>)</td>
<td>All things were silent out of fear, starvation had taken away voice, the city was full of death and there was no weeping in the funeral rites inside the entire</td>
<td>The crying had stopped and the tears had dried and the voices were silent…and there was no collecting [of the dead] no burying [of the</td>
<td>The weeping stopped and the sounds [of mourning?] ceased and compassion and lamentations came to an end; and the houses, streets and</td>
<td>Weeping, mourning, and grief on account of the dead were neglected and the houses, streets and market places were filled with the corpses of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no lamentation, no weeping at all this death. Famine negated emotion (*BJ 5.515*)
city (DEH 5.21.3 [345, 18–20]). dead] no weeping [for the dead] and no trembling (SY 80.46–47).
alleys were filled with [lit. by] the dead… (KAY 7.7.8–9).

Another theme, namely the absence of mourning for the dead, adds to the depiction of the breakdown of social norms in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts. In the War, Josephus employs this theme in order to invite sympathy for the inhabitants of Jerusalem who are oppressed by the rebels during the siege of city. As a result, his description of the eerie and dark silence that invades the city after the famine kills many of its inhabitants is immediately followed by a description of the terrors caused by the rebels (BJ 5.515–517). These rebels continue to plunder the houses of innocent civilians, which have become no more than “graves of dead bodies” (BJ 5.516). As the rebels go through the houses, they use their swords to mutilate dead bodies, but (in a cruelly ironic fashion), they refuse to grant a death by the sword to those asking for it. Those that they leave alive to be consumed by the famine, Josephus writes, die with their eyes fixed upon the Temple (BJ 5.517). Such a contrast between the barbarity of the rebels and the piety of their victims furthers the author’s rhetorical objectives.

In contrast to Josephus’s rhetorical moves, the author of the DEH employs this theme in order to further his argument that the inversion of social norms is a sign of God’s punishment. Within this framework, Pseudo-Hegesippus shifts Josephus’s depiction of the dying inhabitants of Jerusalem from pious to hopeless. He writes that the people were “gazing upon the Temple with mute senses as if from there vengeance for such a cruel death was being demanded” (sed tamen mutis iam sensibus aspicientes templum quasi inde ultio tam diri exitus deposceretur) (DEH 5.21). This motif is entirely omitted by the redactor of the Hebrew SY, who shortens much
of the material in the *DEH* regarding the neglect of the dead, given the Latin text’s glorification of the suffering of the people and the destruction of the Temple.

F5. Throwing Away the Dead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At first the [rebels] had the bodies buried at public expense…when this could no longer be maintained, they threw them from the wall into the ravines (BJ 5.518).</td>
<td>Even those who practiced robbery had put on a certain show of piety, so that they ordered these people to be buried from the public treasury. But when this could not be done, they threw the remains of the dead from the wall into deep valleys (<em>DEH</em> 5.21.4 [346, 4–5]).</td>
<td>When Titus saw the bodies of the dead who had died in the famine having been thrown into the Kidron Valley without number like waste…(<em>SY</em> 80.50–51)</td>
<td>…and the rebels were throwing them from the top of the wall into the valley that was east of the city until there was a great number of them in the valley (<em>KAY</em> 7.7.9–10).</td>
<td>As for therobbers, they too were throwing them [the dead] from the high wall into the valley east of the city until there was a large number of them in the valley (<em>ZA</em> 7.7.17–19).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of his vilification of the “tyrants,” Josephus goes on to note that they go so far as to throw the bodies of the dead from the walls of the city into the valleys below. He notes that initially, the rebels use the funds form the public treasure to bury the dead, since they could not tolerate the stench of unburied corpses (BJ 5.518). The author of the *DEH* transmits this detail, adding that the rebels initially oversee the burial of the dead only to put on a show of piety (*DEH* 5.21). The rebels’ use of the public treasury to bury the dead is omitted by the translator of the Hebrew *SY*, who again omits several details in the Latin text that he deems to be extraneous to his history.
Moreover, SY does not explicitly state that the rebels throw dead bodies from the wall. In the Hebrew text, it is the people who cast the bodies of the dead into the pits and valleys (see sec. E2 above). In contrast, both the Arabic and Ethiopic texts mention that the rebels (as well as many of the people) throw corpses from the wall. The reappearance in the KAY and in the ZA of this detail which is absent in the SY can best be explained by the fact that later in the Hebrew text Titus sees the dead bodies littering the valleys and states that the horror was the doing of the rebel leaders (SY 80.50).

In summary, there are several noteworthy changes made to the motif of the problems caused by the large number of unburied corpses inside the city during the transmission from Josephus’s War to the ZA. First, whereas this motif appears in the BJ, DEH, and SY immediately following Titus’s building of a wall around Jerusalem, this is not the case in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts. This is because the translator of the Arabic text relocates all the accounts of the famine in the Hebrew SY by placing them inside one self-contained chapter. The placement of this motif immediately after the building of the wall by Titus is thus lost in the shuffle. Moreover, the Arabic and Ethiopic translators couch this motif of “the walking dead” within one of the major themes that run through the two texts: the calamities and tribulations that come upon the Jews serve as a means to put an end to the wickedness that increases in the land (see section 3.4 above for a more detailed discussion of this theme).

G. The Discourse of Titus

Following a discussion of the problems caused by the large number of corpses, chapter 7.7 in the ZA relates a speech given by Titus. In each one of the texts being examined here, discourses serve as the most direct means of delivering the arguments of the respective author of the text. The character of Titus thus becomes the vehicle for making various rhetorical moves. In
chapter 7.7 in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY, Titus gives two speeches—a short speech before and a longer speech after the story of the nameless woman who kills and eats her child. In what follows, I present a side-by-side analysis of the various discourses delivered through the character of Titus that appear in KAY/ZA 7.7 and the corresponding passages in the texts antecedent to the Arabic and Ethiopic texts. I divide this section into the following units: 1) Titus’s reaction to the magnitude of corpses; 2) Titus’s unrealized desire for the welfare of the Jews; 3) Titus’s offer of peace and mercy; 4) Titus’s blaming of the leaders of the Jews; 5) and finally, Titus’s request for pardon from God.

G1. Titus’s Reaction to the Magnitude of Corpses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When Titus on his rounds saw the ravines clogged with corpses, and pools of putrid matter oozing out from the decomposing bodies, he groaned aloud… (BJ 5.519)</td>
<td>And so Titus seeing the deep valleys full of bodies, the fluids flowing from the torn up entrails, groaned deeply… (DEH 5.21.4 [346, 6–7]).</td>
<td>When Titus saw the bodies of the dead who had died in the famine having been thrown into the Kidron Valley without number like waste, he was very frightened (SY 80.50-51).</td>
<td>Titus passed through among them on one of the days and when he saw their great number he considered this [matter] great and was shocked by it…(KAY 7.7.10–11).</td>
<td>On one of [these] days, Titus crossed over to their side and he saw the great number of their corpses and he was extremely saddened (ZA 7.7.19–21).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first and shorter speech delivered by Titus in chapter 7.7 of the ZA immediately follows the description of the vastness of the number of corpses in the city and the problems they
cause for the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The narrative order of these two motifs as it appears in the
Ethiopic follows the narrative order of all the preceding texts. In all five texts, Titus’s words
follow his observation of the large number of corpses littering the chasms and valleys around the
city. Caesar’s speech is much shorter in the Greek and Latin texts and it is delivered as indirect
discourse. In the SY tradition, Titus speaks directly and has a little more to say. In addition to
changing the words of Titus, the Hebrew SY and its Arabic and Ethiopic adaptations also alter his
initial reaction to the horror that he witnesses. According to the BJ and DEH, after he comes
across the corpses littering the valleys, Titus “groans” (ἔστεναξε in the Greek and ingemuit in
the Latin).

The translator of the Hebrew text changes Titus’s groan to shock, writing, “he was very
shocked” (רהביהל חנה). The shift in attitude on the part of Caesar fits within the larger picture of
Titus and the Romans that the author of SY paints. In the Hebrew text, Titus is quite aware
of the special relationship between God and the Jews and his words and actions are moderated by his
desire not to violate the sacred dynamic. The portrayal of Titus as being shocked or disturbed by
what he sees accentuates this theme. The Arabic version of SY preserves the portrayal of Titus
presented in the Hebrew text. Titus is described as concerned and shocked by the matter (استعظم
ذلك واغتم منه). The translator of the Ethiopic text alters Titus’s reaction to sadness, and writes that
Caesar “became very sad” (ቀከሳት) after he witnesses the magnitude of corpses littering the
valleys outside the city.

G2. Titus Desires the Welfare of the Jews

| Bellum Judaicum | De Excidio Hierosolimitano | Sefer Yosippon | Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd | Zena Ayhud |
Following Titus’s initial reaction to the valleys of the dead around Jerusalem, Josephus depicts Caesar raising his hands to heaven and disavowing any blame for the tragedy that falls on the city. This description of Titus is maintained and slightly expanded by Pseudo-Hegesippus, who has Titus (in addition to disavowing blame) proclaiming that he had actually wanted to pardon the Jews. The redactor of the Hebrew SY depicts Titus as reverential toward the Jewish religious tradition, a theme that is discussed in more detail below (see sec. __ in chapter five).

In line with such a depiction of Titus, in the Hebrew SY, Caesar addresses God directly. Furthermore, in lieu of disavowing blame, he asks for forgiveness. The Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY expand this motif found in the Hebrew text: Titus speaks more specifically and says that he did not desire the annihilation of the people. Moreover, in both of the latter texts, Caesar goes on to declare that he wanted nothing but good things for the Jews before the occurrence of the terrible tragedies.

---

235 The motif that Titus is a merciful general is a recurring theme in the BJ, and plays a large role in the Josephan apology of the Flavians. For a more detailed theme is discussed in further detail.
Josephus keeps short Titus’s indirect discourse following his initial reaction to witnessing the large number of dead bodies in the valleys. Thus in the BJ, Titus brings his thinking to a close by merely concluding that “such was the sad case of the city itself” (α μὲν δὴ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἶχεν οὖν οὐτως). In contrast, in the expanded account of this pericope that appears in the DEH, Titus proceeds to contemplate his desire and readiness to pardon the Jews if they had only surrendered in peace. Titus’s indirect discourse in the DEH is shortened by the translator of the Hebrew SY, most likely because the author of the DEH makes no distinction between the rebels and the Jews as a people in this passage. So in the Hebrew SY, Titus’s words make no reference to the people; instead, Titus speaks generally of his desire for peace.

While the SY shortens its Latin Vorlage, the translator of the Arabic has expanded this section on the reaction of Titus. The Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY expand the motif of a peace-seeking Roman commander. Titus is described not only as wanting peace (à la the Hebrew SY), but also as having actively sought peace before the calamities of the famine fell on the population. In the Arabic text, Titus proclaims that he had “offered [the Jews] protection and promised them goodness.” In the Ethiopic text, Titus makes a similar claim and says, “I offered [the Jews] a treaty that I would pardon them.” Thus the translators of the Arabic and Ethiopic
texts take extra steps to exonerate Titus from any wrongdoing. While such a depiction of Caesar and the Romans paints a sympathetic portrait those laying siege to Jerusalem, the real purpose of the positive portrayal of Rome is to depict Jerusalem and its inhabitants as deserving of the tribulations.

G4. Titus Blames the Leaders of the Jews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolimitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…but the leaders of the rebels refused. They did all of this evil to the people” (SY 80.53).</td>
<td>“But their leaders and troublemakers prevented them until this powerful affliction came upon them” (KAY 7.7.13).</td>
<td>“…but their elders and their criminals prevented them until they came upon this great ruin” (ZA 7.7.25–26).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The translator of the Hebrew SY inserts an addition to Titus’s words regarding the large number of dead bodies that is present only in the SY traditions. The addition furthers one of the rhetorical objectives of the author of the Hebrew SY, namely the desire to distinguish between the rebels and the Jews as a people. In the context of the speech of Titus being examined here, the DEH blurs the line between these two groups by referring ostensibly to both groups as “they.” The author of SY carefully redacts this passage in the DEH by first omitting Titus’s generic reference to the people, as discussed above in sec. F3. Then the author of SY puts more words in the mouth of Caesar, who goes on to blame the leaders of the rebels as the culprits behind the sufferings of the people. In one rhetorical move, the author of the Hebrew text succeeds in preserving the innocence and piety of Titus while making a clear distinction between the rebels and the people. This depiction of Titus and his analysis of the role of the rebels in
bringing about the tragedies of war on the inhabitants of Jerusalem is maintained by the redactors of the KAY and the ZA.

G5. Titus Asks For Pardon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“So I ask you, oh Lord, that you pardon me from their sins and do not condemn me because of what has afflicted them” (KAY 7.7.14).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…I ask you, Lord, that you deliver me from their sins and not condemn me on account of what they have come upon” (ZA 7.7.26–27).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to maintaining the SY’s careful distinction between the rebels and the people, the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY also transmit Titus’s asking for forgiveness from God. This motif appears in the Hebrew SY at the beginning of Titus’s speech (see sec. F2). In the KAY and ZA, however, Titus asks God for deliverance at the end of his speech. Moreover, in the latter two texts, Caesar’s request is stated more specifically. Titus asks to be pardoned not only from the responsibility for the the tragedies that afflict the Jews (as is the case in the Hebrew SY), but also from the sins of the rebels. Such a portrayal of Titus elicits comparisons with the portrayal of Pilate in the New Testament, particularly in Matthew 23. This motif appears again at a later point in ZA 7.7, when Titus give a longer speech in reaction to hearing the story of the mother who kills and eats her own son. In this latter account, the parallels between the depiction of Titus and the depiction of Pilate in the Gospels are more direct. As a result, this theme will be discussed in greater detail in section E in Chapter 5 of this dissertation.
H. God’s Punishment of the Rebels

Following the first speech of Titus, chapter 7.7 of the ZA describes the sufferings of the rebels and their leaders under the weight of the famine and the lengths that they go to in order to find food. Once again, this series of pericopes within chapter 7.7 of the Arabic and Ethiopic texts contains elements taken from different places in the SY, DEH, and the War. While the tribulations of the rebels are not very prominent in the corresponding passages present in the BJ and the DEH, more attention is placed on this theme in the SY traditions. A number of motifs related to the ordeals suffered by the rebels are present in ZA 7.7 including 1) their hunger, 2) their eating excrement, and 3) their eating leather.

H1. The Rebels Taste the Famine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahud</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Romans though were in high spirits, with no rebels coming out against them (even they were now feeling the pinch of desperate hunger) (BJ 5.520).</td>
<td>In those days the famine grew heavy in the midst of the city and also upon the leaders of the rebels (SY 82.74).</td>
<td>[The author of the book] said: when the siege grew long, the rebels starved and God afflicted them also and caused them to taste what they had made the people taste of the famine (KAY 7.7.14–15).</td>
<td>He [the author of the book] said [that] when the siege lasted for a long time, the robbers and their followers were hungry and God made them taste the famine just as he made the people taste the famine (ZA 7.7.27–29).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the War, Josephus places Titus’s indirect discourse regarding the dead bodies in the valley in between two descriptions of the depravity and obstinacy of the “tyrants.” Before Titus begins to contemplate the horrors of what he is seeing, Josephus discusses the rebels’ mutilating
of corpses and their casting of dead bodies from the walls (BJ 5.516–518). After Titus’s indirect discourse, the author describes the obstinacy of the rebels, who refuse to surrender to Titus despite their difficult position.

In this context of arguing for the absurdity of the rebels’ refusal to surrender, Josephus tangentially remarks that the rebels (who up to this point in the narrative had food to eat) “were now feeling the pinch of desperate hunger” (BJ 5.520). While Josephus introduces the hunger of the rebels in BJ 5.520, he does not elaborate on it until he returns to the issue in the third major section on the famine, which appears in BJ 6.193-198 and immediately precedes the account of Maria. Here Josephus describes the rebels as “mad dogs” whose hunger makes them both ruthless and delirious.

In the Latin text, no explicit references are made to the affliction of the rebels because of the famine. Instead, the author of the DEH simply states the obstinacy of the rebel leaders, writing, “the leaders of the rebellion, however, were not disheartened in mind” (nec tamen frangebantur animis principes seditionum) (DEH 5.21). In DEH 5.22, the anonymous author makes a passing reference to the point that the ravages of the famine ultimately reach everyone, including presumably the leaders of the rebellion. However, unambiguous references to the famine afflicting the leaders of the rebels is absent from the text.

By comparison, when the redactor of the Hebrew SY adapts the Latin text, he describes the famine as growing strong against both the city and the leaders of the rebels (הרעבHeavy and its city within. SY 82.74). This passages appears in the second and final of the

---

236 While Josephus does not at this point in the narrative explicitly state that the famine comes upon the people as a punishment from God, he does advance this idea at the beginning of Book 6: “But as they had their right hands already polluted with the murders of their own countrymen, and in that condition ran out to fight with foreigners, they seem to me to have cast a reproach upon God himself, as if he were too slow in punishing them” (BJ 6.4).
two major sections on the famine that appear in the Hebrew SY prior to the story of Mariam. The motif of the rebels being afflicted by the famine is picked up and expanded by the redactor of the Arabic text, who adds the claim that the coming of the famine upon the rebels is a sign of divine punishment. The same claim is made in the ZA, which characteristically follows its Arabic Vorlage closely in this passage.

H2. Eating Excrement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…some people had been reduced to such desperate straits that they were picking through the sewers and heaps of old cow-dung and eating what garbage they could find (BJ 5.571)</td>
<td>…[the Jews] searched through the old dung of cattle, so that, what was horrible to see, this became food for the hungry (DEH 5.25.2 [360, 18–20]).</td>
<td>The famine took place until they were eating the dung of their horses…(SY 82.74–75).</td>
<td>He caused their commanders to eat the kernels that were in the dung of of animals (KAY 7.7.15–16).</td>
<td>…[the rebels] came to the point of eating the vermin that were in the excrement of animals (ZA 7.7.29–30).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The redactor of SY introduces another shift in the narrative, adding to the development of the theme of God’s punishment of the rebels in the SY traditions. The author of the Hebrew text rewrites a portion of the descriptions of the famine that appear in the War and in the DEH. As part of the second major section on the famine in the War (BJ 5.491–6.8) and in the DEH (DEH 5.21, 24, 24, 27, 36), references are made to the people’s eating of the excrement of animals on account of the disappearance of all edible things from the city. In the War, the reference to the consumption of deplorable things is first mentioned in the context of the report made to Titus by
some of the citizens of Jerusalem who escape to the Romans at the end of Book 5 and middle of Book 6 (BJ 5.571–572; 6.193–198).

Similarly, the reference to this theme also comes after some Jews flee to Titus in the narrative of the DEH. By comparison, in the second major section on the famine that appears in the SY, the theme of eating the excrement of animals is merged with the hardships of the rebels and their leaders under the famine. Whereas in the War and the DEH it is the people of Jerusalem who must endure the horror of eating detestable things for lack of food, in the SY traditions it is the leaders of rebels who are forced to do so.

H3. Eating Leather

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the end, they came down to gnawing belts and shoes, and stripping the leather off their shields to chew it (BJ 6.197).</td>
<td>...they tore away the leather from their shields so that what was not protection would become food for them (DEH 5.39.2 [381, 21–22]).</td>
<td>The famine took place until they were eating the dung of their horses and all the leather vessels of their chariots and their vessels of war (SY 82.75–76).</td>
<td>After that all the animals disappeared and they ate the dead hides that were on their saddles and swords (KAY 7.7.16).</td>
<td>Then they ate the leather of their wagons and the leather of the sheaths of their swords (ZA 7.7.30–32).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to eating excrement, the leaders of the rebels are also portrayed as eating the leather on their saddles and sheathes in the SY traditions. Once again, in the War and in the DEH, the references to the eating of leather are made in the context of describing the sufferings of the people of Jerusalem in general, not the leaders of the rebels specifically. In fact, leather eating is not mentioned in the Greek and Latin texts until the third major sections on the famine that appear in these two texts. The redactor of the Hebrew SY, who has collated the three major
sections on the famine that appear in the *DEH* into two sections, pulls this motif from *DEH 5.39* and splices it onto his discussion of the trials of the rebels. The motif is again rearranged by the redactor of the Arabic text, who has taken elements from both the first and second major sections on the famine in the Hebrew *SY* and compiled them into one chapter.

I. Desolation of the Land

After describing God’s punishment of the rebels, chapter 7.7 in the *Zena Ayhud* begins to relate an account of the destruction of the land surrounding Jerusalem. This motif appears first at the opening of Book 6 in the *War* (*BJ* 6.1–8), which closes the second major section on the famine in Jerusalem. Similar to its placement in the *War*, the accounts describing the desolation of the land appear in the second major sections on the famine in the *DEH* and the *SY* as well. In chapter 7.7 of the Arabic and Ethiopic texts, this passage relates a number of themes including the rebels’ unsuccessful searches for food outside of the city, a description of the former beauty of Jerusalem, and the weeping of visitors who see the disparity between the state of the land before and after its destruction under the hands of the Romans.

I1. Searching in Vain for Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore many thinking it a benefit to die, or so that they might pluck or tear away the bark of trees if perchance some greenery in them might serve as a source of</td>
<td>The leaders of the rebels sought to find a leafy branch of a tree or vegetables or weeds to eat it but there was none because the Romans cut down all the trees around</td>
<td>And they were searching [for] some plants but they were not finding them, neither inside the city nor outside of it, because the Romans had destroyed</td>
<td>then they sought continually [for] a few herbs of the grass; but they were not finding it, neither inside the city nor outside of it because Rome cut down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comfort provided by food, went out from the city; whom the Romans discovering would kill (DEH 5.18.3). Whatever was around the city from trees to plants (KAY 7.7.17–18). Everything that was around the city, from trees to shoots to herbs (ZA 7.7.32–34).

While the author of the DEH follows the narrative order of Josephus’s War rather closely in the second major section on the famine, he does rearrange a couple of the motifs found in the Greek text. Additionally, the author also inserts a statement without a direct parallel in the War, wherein he claims that the Romans kill Jews who go out of the city in search of different plants to eat as food. This statement, given in the above synopsis, anticipates a story presented at a later point in DEH 5.18, which corresponds to BJ 5.446–451. These passages in the DEH and BJ recount the Roman crucifixion of Jews who flee the city in order to search for food.\textsuperscript{237} The redactor of the Hebrew SY omits both the DEH’s abbreviated claim that the Romans kill Jews who exit the city in search of food and the story of the crucifixion of the Jews by the Romans. As a result, the killing of those searching for food outside of the city in the midst of the famine does not appear in the SY tradition.

Moreover, the author of the Hebrew SY also places the motif of searching for food outside of the city in the context of his discussion of the ordeals of the leaders of the rebels,

\textsuperscript{237} Josephus claims that the Romans caught about five hundred Jews per day, whom they whipped and tortured before crucifying them (BJ 5.449–450). In order to emphasize the large number of those being crucified, the author concludes this story in the following way: “So the [Roman] soldiers, out of the wrath and hatred they bore the Jews, nailed those they caught, one after one way, and another after another, to the crosses, by way of jest, when their multitude was so great, that room was wanting for the crosses, and crossing wanting for bodies” (BJ 5.451). Pseudo-Hegesippus re-presents Josephus’s account as follows: “You might discern people fastened up in diverse manners and various types of punishments, the forms of tortures such an innumerable multitude, that already space for the forked gibbets was lacking, and gibbets for the bodies” (DEH 5.18).
which appears in the second major section on the famine in the *SY*. In the Hebrew text, therefore, it is the leaders of the rebels who go searching for plants and other types of vegetation, not the civilian inhabitants of Jerusalem (as presented in the *DEH* and the *BJ*). Although the placement of this motif has been altered by the redactor of the Arabic text, the details of the account remain the same. Both in the Arabic and Ethiopian texts, it is the leaders of the rebels who go outside the city in search of food and are unable to find any because the Romans have destroyed all the vegetation in the land.

I2. The Desolation of the Land Around Jerusalem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…the Romans managed to complete the erection of their earthworks in twenty-one days…cutting down the whole area round the city within a radius of ten miles (<em>BJ</em> 6.5–6).</td>
<td>For nearly thirteen miles about the city the land far and wide had been ravaged…(<em>DEH</em> 5.25.2 [360, 27–28]).</td>
<td>The Romans cut down all the trees around Jerusalem [for] thirteen miles in [every] direction…and the entire land was round like a land of wilderness and desert (<em>SY</em> 82.77–78).</td>
<td>But the Romans did not leave behind anything from any of this and these places became like an arid desert (<em>KAY</em> 7.7.19–20).</td>
<td>But the Romans did not spare any of this whatsoever and the gardens that were [there] before became a wasteland (<em>ZA</em> 7.7.34–35).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josephus, who dedicates a considerable amount of his history to detailed descriptions of the military strategies of the Romans, describes in several places the various construction projects of Titus’s army. In the second major section on the famine that appears in the *BJ*, he notes that Caesar (moved by compassion for the Jews suffering from the famine inside the city)

---

238 In an earlier passage, a general reference is made to Jews going out from the city to find food and being killed by the Romans (see *SY* 79.21–22).
decides to push forward his assault on the city by building more banks around the walls of the city \((BJ\ 5.519–526)\). However, because the Romans had already cut down all the trees around Jerusalem for the siege-engines that they had built earlier, they were forced to find trees from more distant places around the city.

In this context, Josephus notes that the Roman armies brought material “from the distance of ninety stadia” \(\dot{\alpha}π\' \dot{\epsilon}νενίκοντα \sigmaταδίων\), a detail he sees fit to repeat later in \(BJ\ 6.6\).

Pseudo-Hegesippus presents the measurement of the devastated land as a thirteen-mile circumference around the city, a measurement that the redactor of the Hebrew SY keeps. However, this rather precise measurement does not enter the Arabic and Ethiopic texts, since the redactor of the \(KAY\) omits it.

### I3. The Former Beauty of Jerusalem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbar al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where there had once been attractive woods and orchards there was now utter desert everywhere, with all the trees reduced to stumps ((BJ\ 6.6)).</td>
<td>All that pomerium in which formerly verdant groves, gardens breathing the flowers, a variety of fruit trees and suburban villas offered their pleasing appearance… ((DEH\ 5.25.3 [361,1–2])).</td>
<td>Around Jerusalem there were countless gardens and orchards… ((SY\ 82.79)).</td>
<td>There were around Jerusalem in every direction many gardens and in them [different] kinds of trees and fruits a mile’s journey in every direction ((KAY\ 7.7.18–19)).</td>
<td>Now around Jerusalem there were many gardens on all sides of [the city], each one varied in its appearance and pleasantness and in its odor and [each one’s] measurement was two me’raf’s on every side… ((ZA\ 7.7.35–37)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The translator of the Hebrew SY connects the destruction of the land by the Romans with the descriptions of the former beauty of Jerusalem that appear at the close of the second major
sections on the famine in the *DEH* and the *War*. In his account of the devastation of the land under the Romans, Josephus provides a brief description of the trees and gardens that had once adorned the city “in all directions” (πανταχόθεν). The author of the *DEH* expands upon the imagery in this passage, noting not only the pleasant appearance but also the pleasing odor of all the vegetation that had once surrounded Jerusalem. The translator of the Hebrew *SY* omits many of the details that are present in the *DEH*, merely noting that there were countless gardens and orchards (גינות ופרדסים להאר) around Jerusalem before they are destroyed by the Romans.

The account of Jerusalem’s former glory is expanded by the redactor of the Arabic text, who writes that the many gardens and orchards stretched for “a mile in every direction” (مسيرة) around the city. The translator of the Ethiopic text makes a couple of changes to the Arabic text: 1) he depicts the former gardens around Jerusalem as not only pleasing in appearance, but also in odor; 2) he presents the measurement of the gardens as two *me’raf* on every side (ወመጠኑ፡ ዉምራት፡ ይግብ).

### I4. The Weeping of Nostalgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No visitor from abroad who had seen the old Judea and the handsome suburbs of the city, and now looked on the present scene of devastation, could have failed to groan</td>
<td>If anyone saw [it] later, the visitor would groan, the inhabitant would not recognize, and returning to their place of birth, although being present, they would continue to</td>
<td>It happened that all those coming from afar who had seen the forests of Jerusalem, the gardens and the orchards earlier looked to the right and there was no tree and turned to the left</td>
<td>Everyone who was familiar with these gardens before, upon seeing them after the Romans destroyed them, would weep and be saddened (KAY 7.7.20-21).</td>
<td>And when one who was used to seeing them before saw them, he would weep over their ruin and desolation (ZA 7.7.40–41).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in dismay at the enormous change which had taken place (BJ 6.7).

search for their ancestral land (DEH 5.25).

and there was nothing [or no weeds]. And they were astonished and wept with bitterness and wailing (SY 82.81–83).

The first of three sections on the famine in Jerusalem that appears in chapter 7.7 of the ZA closes with a description of the reaction of those seeing Jerusalem after the devastation brought upon the land by war. Several changes are made to this motif at the different points of its reception. In the War, Josephus writes that those who were familiar with the former beauty of Jerusalem would weep when coming upon it after its devastation under the hands of the Romans. He also goes on to note, somewhat hyperbolically, that visitors to the city would not recognize the city even when they were right in the middle of it (BJ 6.8). The author of the DEH retains both of these elements from Josephus’s description of the reactions of visitors to war-torn Jerusalem, although he somewhat shortens the wording of the Greek text.

3.7 Conclusion: The Reception of the Famine in Jerusalem

In this chapter, I have presented an overview of the depictions of the famine in Jerusalem as they are presented in each one of the five texts. I have outlined the placement of accounts of the famine within each text, noting that the translator of the Arabic text chooses to place nearly all accounts of the famine from the Hebrew SY into one chapter. The author of each text employs the descriptions of the famine in his own unique way, making the sufferings of the Jews of Jerusalem an important part of his rhetorical strategy. Having situated the accounts of the famine
within the narrative outline and rhetorical program of each text, I have then provided a synoptic analysis of the transmission of various themes from the War to the ZA.

One notable pattern that characterizes the developments that emerge in the process of the transmission of the famine in Jerusalem is the introduction of details on the level of the Latin text. The specificity of the details that appear in Josephus’s War increases as the Greek text is transmitted into the Sefer Yosippon tradition through the De Excidio. For example, whereas Josephus notes that the people of Jerusalem are forced to eat detestable things once the food inside the city disappears, the author of the Latin text expands this motif by listing a number of unusual animals and materials consumed by the people (see section B above).

Moreover, in this chapter I have also shown that the Hebrew and Arabic texts expand their version of the accounts of the famine at certain key points in the narrative. The most interesting example of this is the response given by Titus when he learns about the horrors of the famine and the vast number of deaths that the famine causes. In addition to transmitting the Josephan motif that Titus presents himself as innocent before God, the Hebrew SY also portrays Titus as blaming the famine and its consequences on the leaders of the rebels (see section G4 above). The author of the Hebrew text makes this rhetorical move in order to more clearly make a distinction between the rebels and the Jewish people as a whole. Lastly, the Arabic and Ethiopic texts go even farther than all the preceding texts in portraying Titus as innocent of the tragedies of the Jews (see section G5 above).
CHAPTER FOUR

THE RECEPTION OF THE STORY OF MARIA

4.1 Introduction to the Reception of the Story of Maria

Having painted the background to the story of Maria by describing the horrors of the famine in Jerusalem, the Zena Ayhud turns to the climactic and tragic story of the mother who kills and eats her child. So too our investigation must turn and compare the presentation of the tragic mother in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts with the texts antecedent to them. In what follows, I present a synoptic analysis of the story of the cannibalistic mother as it appears in the five texts being examined here. I focus on the variations that exist in each author’s portrayal of the character of the mother, and connect each portrayal to the wider themes that are present throughout each text. I also situate the story within the broader narrative arch of each text and highlight its function with reference to the rhetorical objectives of each author.

The story of Maria plays an important role in each one of our texts. It is very important for Josephus, who employs the story of Maria with three primary goals in mind. First, he wants to develop his vilification of the rebels by charting their role in the suffering of the mother and the destruction of the city and the Temple. Second, he seeks to elicit the sympathy of his Greco-Roman audience for the Jews who suffer the consequences of the crimes of the rebels. Third, he wants to provide an explanation for the Roman hatred of the Jews, which leads to the Roman destruction of the Temple. Josephus goes about accomplishing all of these objectives by employing tropes from Greek tragedy to depict Maria as a tragic figure. Building on the work of Honora Chapman, I discuss the various ways in which Josephus goes about constructing the
story of Maria on the model of Greek tragedies. I also illustrate the extent to which his particular construction of the story survives the process of transmission.

In his account of the story of Maria, the author of the *DEH* also adopts and expands upon Josephus’s use of the model of Greek tragedies. Pseudo-Hegesippus seeks not only to argue for the ultimate destruction of Jerusalem and Judaism’s legitimacy as a religious system, but also to demonstrate the severity of the suffering of the Jews. For the author of the *DEH*, the more the Jews suffer, the clearer the divine judgment against Jews and Judaism becomes. In this line of reasoning, the story of Maria presents an opportunity for the author to emphasize the most *pathetic* elements of the story. The author, therefore, inserts many embellishments and significantly expands Josephus’s account of Maria. He particularly highlights the gruesome and unnatural points in the story, in order to make the argument that destruction of the Temple and the sufferings of the Jews were deserved because of their corrupted nature, which itself was a result of their rejection of the Christ.

The *SY* adaptation of the Latin text more often than not is characterized by its truncating of the Latin text, whereas the Latin text is best characterized by its expansion of the Greek text. The shortening of the *DEH* can best be explained by the fact that the author of *SY* considers many of the details in the *DEH*’s portrayal of Maria to be part of the Latin text’s celebration of Jewish suffering. The lengths to which the Jews suffer serves as legitimation of the Christian viewpoint in the Latin text, which explains Pseudo-Hegesippus’s efforts to heighten the tragedy of Maria. While the author of *SY* does want to highlight that the Jewish people’s infraction of the divine covenant (such as the revolt against Rome) does lead to disciplining punishments, he does not transmit many of the details in the *DEH* that seem to relish the suffering of the mother. In contrast, Maria is important in the *SY* not so much for the level of suffering she endures, but
more for the lesson she becomes in Jewish history as a personification of divine punishment as prescribed in the Hebrew Bible. In order to highlight this biblical motif, the author of SY employs the archaic Hebrew of the Bible and inserts several biblical allusions throughout the text.

Moreover, the Hebrew author argues that the crimes of the rebels are actually greater than the crime of Maria. In interpreting the story of Maria, the author of the Hebrew text writes, "All the evil they have done has surpassed this great evil that the woman ate her son" (SY 86.62).

Thus for the author of SY, the tragedy of Maria (albeit notable) is merely a part of the larger and more notable tragedy of the Jews who lived during the destruction of the Second Temple, who rebel against Rome and against God’s plan for the Jewish nation. One way the author draws the reader’s attention to the larger tragedy of the Jews is by truncating the story of Maria and tempering the more sensational parts of the story found in the Latin text. As a result, the Maria that emerges in the SY is often a mere skeleton of the more developed character found in the DEH.

As for the reception of the Hebrew SY, while the Christian-Arabic text follows the content and narrative order of its Hebrew Vorlage, it does contain some additions to the narrative. Most notably, there is an expanded version of the discourse of the mother to her son, which she delivers before she kills him. Similar to the DEH’s treatment of the account of Maria in the BJ, the translator of the Christian-Arabic text adapts the account of Maria in the SY by embellishing the dramatic portrayal of the mother. In the Christian-Arabic text, more space is given to the discussion of the inner thoughts and feelings of the woman who kills and eats her child. An effort is made to demonstrate more effectively the deep bond that the woman has with
her son. As a result, the denouement of the story becomes more tragic in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts, the latter of which follows its Vorlage very closely.

Additionally, in the Arabic and Ethiopic speaking Christian scribal traditions that receive the Hebrew SY, the story of Maria is related within the context of the broader theme of divine punishment that comes to root out the growth of wickedness among the Jews. The sensational story of the woman who kills and eats her child serves as the proverbial straw that breaks the camel’s back, becoming the incident that lifts the veil of blindness that caused the rebellion in the first place. Thus the story of the cannibalistic mother becomes another instrument, similar to the armies of Vespasian and Titus, that is used by God to punish the people for their sins. In what follows, I present a synoptic analysis of the story of Maria at it appear in the five texts, having divided the story into sections that contain individual pericopes. I also here present a list of the section titles.

4.2 List of Parallel Passages on the Story of Maria

A. Introducing the Tragic Mother
   A1. The Woman from Across the Jordan
   A2. The Woman Moves to Jerusalem
   A3. The Woman’s Wealth
   A4. The Woman’s Son
B. The Woman and the Fury of the Rebels
C. The Woman Desires to Die
D. The Woman and the Famine
E. The Intensity of the Famine on the Woman
F. Infanticide as Mercy Killing
G. A Mother’s Dilemma
H. The Mother is Unable to Endure
I. The Mother’s Discourse to Her Son
   I1. “I Had Hoped”
   I2. “I Was Afraid You Would Die Before Me”
   I3. “I Would Have Buried You”
   I4. “Adversity Has Surrounded Us”
   I5. “The Dead Are Not Buried”
   I6. “There Will Be No One to Bury You”
I7. “I Have Decided to Kill You”
I8. “Womb to Tomb”
I9. “This Will Be a Repayment”
I10. “Since I Carried You”
I11. “You Will Be Granted a Great Gift”
I12. “A Disgrace to the Rebels”
I13. “Our Story Will Endure”

J. The Woman Kills Her Son
K. The Woman Roasts Her Son’s Body”
L. The Rebels Enter
M. The Rebels Question the Woman
N. The Woman’s Discourse to the Rebels
   N1. “I Reserved for You the Larger Portion”
   N2. “Sit and I Will Set the Table”
   N3. The Woman Presents Her Son’s Body
   N4. “This is My Son Whom I Loved”
   N5. “Eat and Be Satisfied”
   N6. “Do Not Let Your Hearts Become Weak”
   N7. “You Brought This Great Ruin”

O. The Rebels Flee in Fear
P. The Spread of the News of the Mother’s Deed
Q. The Threatening Matter from God
R. The Rebels Break
S. The People Go Out to the Romans

A. Introducing the Tragic Mother

   Josephus introduces the story of Maria with a lengthy and strategically crafted preface, in which he argues for (among other things) the uniquely tragic nature and the veracity of the story he is about to relate. This Josephan preface does not survive the process of transmission.

   The DEH converts Josephus’s lengthy and strategic introduction to Maria into a short but rhetorically powerful question: “What is appropriate to say about the deed of Maria?” The SY, in turn, omits the DEH’s rhetorical question. Such an omission could be a result of the fact that the author of the DEH has so heavily shortened Josephus’s preface to the story that the translator of the Hebrew text deems it irrelevant for his purposes.
However, it could also be explained as an attempt to downplay the significance of the story of Maria on the part of the author of SY, who chooses to focus more on the crimes of the rebels and the Jewish leaders and less on the tragic deed of Maria. Because there is no formal preface to the story of in the Hebrew SY, the same is absent from the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic versions of the text. Instead, in the middle of Chapter 7.7 in the KAY/ZA, one finds an understated and fluid transition from the descriptions of the famine in Jerusalem to the story of the woman who kills and eats her child. This transition is marked by the often-recurring phrase, “the master of the book said” (see section 3.A for a discussion of this phrase).

Before discussing the reception history of the actual story of Maria, it will be helpful to briefly discuss Josephus’s preface to his version of the story. After providing descriptions of the famine in the third major section on the famine in the War (i.e. BJ 6.193–198), the first-century author pauses his narrative of the siege in order to insert a disclaimer of sorts:

Indeed, why is it necessary to speak of the shamelessness toward inanimate things from the famine? For I am here going to relate a deed, such as has been recorded among neither Greeks nor Barbarians—horrifying to speak of and incredible to hear. And for my part, so that I would not seem to posterity to be telling tall tales, indeed I would have gladly passed over the calamity, if I had not from among my contemporaries countless witnesses. Above all, I would be granting a cold favor to my homeland by suppressing the account of what it suffered in actual fact (BJ 6.199–200).

By this point Josephus has already recounted the desolation of the land, the people’s famine-induced desperation for anything resembling food, and the enormous number of corpses littering the city. Such details are not exactly lacking in their capacity to communicate the gruesome and ghastly nature of the siege and the famine. Yet Josephus feels the need to introduce the “deed” (ἐργὸν) of Maria with the claim that this story stands in a category of its
own as far as atrocities go (BJ 6.199). It is a deed the likes of which have been heard neither by Greeks nor Barbarians. In fact the story is so incredible that Josephus feels obligated to defend his trustworthiness as a historian by citing “countless contemporary witnesses” as his source (BJ 6.199).

Such rhetorical framing serves to designate the story as something special. This is not just another horrific scene in a series of horrific scenes. Through the special attention paid to the introduction of Maria, Josephus is deliberately creating a “spectacle.” As Chapman points out, “spectacle was not merely live action for the Romans; is also appeared in their literature as a specific literary device designed to focus the attention of readers.” Chapman illustrates the way in which Greco-Roman authors employ certain terms and phrases strategically whenever they want to turn the spotlight of their narrative onto a particular character or event. She demonstrates

---


240 As several scholars have pointed out, Josephus exaggerates the uniqueness of Maria’s story (see Thackeray 1928: p. 434; Whiston et al, p. 893; S. Schwartz 1990, p. 43; J. Price; 1992, p. 156). In 2 Kings 6.26-31, during a similar war-induced famine, a Samaritan woman tells the king of Israel that she had shared eaten her son with another woman with the understanding that she would be given part of the other woman’s son to eat the next day. Other parts of the Hebrew Bible also discuss cannibalism, and specifically parents eating their own children, all in the Deuteronomistic context: such atrocities are signs of the punishment of God for the sins of the covenant people (see Deut 28; Jer 19.9; Lamen 2.20, 4.10; Ezk 5.9-10; Baruch 2.3). In addition, as noted by Chapman, Josephus would have been keenly aware of how the story of Maria would have been received by a Greco-Roman audience as similar tales appear in Greco-Roman literature. For her discussion of how Josephus’ contemporary, Philo, treats the topic of cannibalism both in light of the Hebrew scriptures and Greek literature, see Honora Chapman, “A Myth for the World: Early Christian Reception of Infanticide and Cannibalism in Josephus, Bellum Judaicum 6.199-219,” in Society of Biblical Literature 2000 Seminar Papers (Atlanta, 2000), 362–363.

241 Josephus employs the term logos, as opposed to mythos, to describe his narrative of Maria. This is a deliberate choice, as Chapman argues, which aims to present the climatic episode as true history and corroborate Josephus’s claims for the historical integrity of his work. Chapman sees Josephus’s claim here as part of his “aspiring to Thucydidean reliability, trustworthiness, and permanence,” in light of similar claims made by Thucydides in his history (Thucydides 1.20-22) (Ibid).

242 For a fuller discussion of this issue, see also Honora Chapman, “Spectacle and Theater in Josephus’s Bellum Judaicum” (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1998).
that Josephus uses such techniques adroitly, especially in his placing of the Temple as the central focus of both his internal audience (Titus and the army) and his external audience. Elsewhere Chapman notes the Maria story also serves to draw one’s attention to the spectacle of the Jewish War as a whole. In *BJ* 1.1-4, Josephus claims that the Jewish war against Rome is the greatest of all wars waged. His assertion that no story like Maria’s had ever been heard makes sense in light of this wider objective to portray the Jewish war as unique.

Thus for Josephus, the insertion of the tragic tale of Maria is not incidental but quite deliberate in both its graphic detail and placement within the narrative. Both its place in the climatic crescendo of the siege of Jerusalem as well as its especially heinous nature make it a ready and efficient conduit to transmit the author’s argument. The powerful utility of the story is not a fact that is lost on the transmitters of the history. But as the story is transmitted through different cultural and historical contexts, under the hands of writers with varied objectives, the function of the story shifts. The various Late-Antique and medieval historians analyzed here refashion the narrative to fit their viewpoints in their versions of this popular story. What aspects of Maria and her deed change, and what stays the same, are considered in what follows.

A1. The Woman from Across the Jordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A certain woman from among those dwelling across the Jordan, Maria by name, whose</td>
<td>What should I undertake to say about the deed of Maria?...She was from the wealthiest women</td>
<td>Now there was in Jerusalem a certain woman from the daughters of the nobles and her</td>
<td>The master of the book said that there was in Jerusalem a woman from a prosperous</td>
<td>The master of the book said that there was in Jerusalem a woman from a prosperous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

243 Ibid., 296–303.
father was Eleazar, of the village of Bethezouba (this means house of hyssop), distinguished by birth and wealth… (BJ 6.201).

As Chapman has noted, Josephus repetitively employs the term “a certain woman” (Γυνής τῆς) as a way to signal that he is going to talk about an exemplary character who will play an important role in his history. Like other important, but not necessarily central characters, Maria is introduced in the War with the use of this phrase. According to Josephus, this woman is not a native Jerusalemite. The irony of this fact adds another tragic element to the story of the woman who finds herself trapped in the city during one of the darkest episodes in Jerusalem’s long history. Josephus writes that she is the daughter of Eleazar and hails from the village of Bethezouba, in which she was “dwelling beyond the Jordan” (ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἰορδάνην κατοικουντῶν). Maria is “well-known” (ἐπίσημος) both for her familial heritage (γένος) and

245 Chapman, “Spectacle and Theater in Josephus’s Bellum Judaicum,” 77. For example, the Roman soldier whose “mooning” of the Jews leads to a Jewish revolt in which 30,000 people perish is introduced by Josephus with the phrase “a certain one of the soldiers” (εἰς τίς τῶν στρατιωτῶν) (BJ 2.224).
246 Josephus includes the detailed biographical information about this “certain woman” in part to substantiate his claim that he is not making up the story. He also defines Bethezoub for his Greco-Roman audience, noting that the term means “House of Hyssop” (ιξιος ὑσσοπου) (BJ 6.201). Chapman highlights the fact that Maria’s husband is not mentioned; if she did have one, and she was in the city for two years, that her husband would have been killed is not outside the realm of possibility (Ibid., 78). The fact that she is depicted (at least by the omission of certain details) as a single mother later becomes an important point for medieval Orthodox Christians who receive the story. Because her singleness makes her seem too much like another Mary, it leads to the omission of her name most likely as a way to avoid an associate with Mary the mother of Jesus (Chapman, “A Myth for the World,” 25).
her wealth (πλούτον); at a time unspecified by Josephus, she “flees” (καταφυγούσα) to Jerusalem with “the rest of the multitude.””

Pseudo-Hegesippus somewhat-freely adapts these biographical details about Josephus’s Maria and writes, “she was from the wealthy women of the region of Perea, which lies across the Jordan.” While the DEH casts aside the details of Maria’s reputable heritage (in addition to the names of her father and village), it does describe her as one of the “wealthy women from the region of Perea.” In introducing Maria, the translator of the Hebrew text omits one detail and slightly amends another. The reference in the Latin text to Maria’s origins in the region of Perea (regionis Pereae) is omitted; instead the Hebrew text employs a biblical phrase and describes her as hailing “from across the Jordan” (מלככי לירדן). Furthermore, whereas Maria is described as one of the wealthy women of Perea, in the Hebrew text she is described as one of the daughters of the nobles (מבנו הנדיבים).

In its adaptation of the Hebrew לירדן עברה היוהה והיאתה, the Arabic text reads “and her family was from a city in the neighborhood of the Jordan” (وكان اصلة مدنية في جيرة الأردن). Going against its usual tendency to follow its Arabic Vorlage closely, the Ethiopic text simplifies the description of the woman’s provenance that appears in the KAY. The ZA merely notes that her city was from “across the Jordan” (የተለከብ እንወን ከየሆን ከየርይ). This summarized adaptation of the Arabic coincidentally puts the Ge’ez version closer to Hebrew, Latin and Greek than the Arabic.

Additionally, one other editorial change made by the author of the Arabic KAY warrants discussion. In what is perhaps the most notable change made to the Hebrew’s introduction of Mariam, the Arabic redactor decides not to give her name. As Sela has noted, Maria/Mariam is

247 In BJ 4.129–137 Josephus gives the details of the people who presumably constitute “the rest of the multitude” that he mentions here in passing.
only once introduced by name in the *DEH* and *SY*, only to be referred to simply as “the woman” the rest of the time. The same is the case with Josephus’s account of Maria (*BJ* 6.199-219).

The singular use of her name in the Hebrew text may have contributed to an unintentional dropping of her name in the Arabic text. But given the importance of the name *Mariam* in Coptic and Ethiopian Christian communities, such an oversight is unlikely. The appearance of the name in the preface to the *Zena Ayhud*, moreover, might hold the clue to a more plausible explanation for the omission of the woman’s name.

The elevated status of the mother of Jesus is demonstrated in the preface of the *ZA*, which contains a benediction addressed to an Ethiopian emperor who has taken the imperial name “Vessel of Mariam” (* Daughter of God*) (*Kamil* 1.8–10). In all likelihood, for medieval Orthodox Christians, the name Mariam has become too sacred to be associated with as troubling a character as a mother who eats her son. The real reason for the omission of her name notwithstanding, however, Maria of Bethezouba arrives nameless in Africa.

Thus one finds that as the account of Maria makes its way into the *SY* tradition, biographical details about her become increasingly less important. This shift can be explained by the fact that the authors transmitting the story of Maria do not share Josephus’s preoccupation with advertising the story as credible through the use of specific details. In addition, for the authors of the histories that transmit Josephus’s account, the story of the mother who kills and

---


249 Moreover, Maria’s being a single mother with only one infant son would have been too reminiscent of portrayals of Mary with the infant Christ. Josephus’s reasoning for portraying Maria as a single mother with a suckling infant son might have been incidental; that is, he only included the elements of the story that served his rhetorical objectives. However, this portrayal of a single mother and her son would have been too reminiscent of the Madonna, an image with which Coptic and Ethiopian Christians would have been quite familiar.
eats her son becomes important less for its historicity, and more for its power to support the rhetorical and theological programs of each text.

A2. The Woman Moves to Jerusalem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…having fled for refuge with the rest of the multitude to Jerusalem, was confined along with them by the siege (BJ 6.201).</td>
<td>When the terror of war arose, she went with the others to Jerusalem, so that she would be safer (DEH 5.40.1 [381, 30–31]).</td>
<td>When the war intensified in the days of Vespasian, she went up to Jerusalem with those going up [there] (SY 86.2).</td>
<td>When the fighting increased there in the days of Vespasian, the woman went down to Jerusalem and resided in it (KAY 7.7.22–23).</td>
<td>When the conflict there increased in the days of Vespasian, that woman emigrated to Jerusalem and she resided there (ZA 7.7.28–30).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josephus writes that while she is not a native Jerusalemite, Maria escapes to the city for refuge. Mason has noted that such immigrations to the capital city of Judea during the Jewish Revolt against Rome would have occurred mostly during the raids of Vespasian on the coastal cities of Jamnia and Azotus in the spring of 68. 250 “Rather than die-hard or ideological anti-Romans,” Mason writes, “we see residents of the countryside who were minding their own business now overrun by an army, with all that entails, forced to make a quick decision” (emphasis mine). 251

251 Ibid.
According to Josephus, one of these waves of immigration to Jerusalem comes after the campaign of Placidus in the region of Perea, across the Jordan (BJ 4.436–445).\(^{252}\) It is not too difficult to imagine Maria’s escape to the city as taking place as a result of such Roman campaigns of terror as related by Josephus. Thus even populations that were not initially involved in the uprising in Jerusalem are pulled into the conflict against their will. As Mason notes, “Peraeans who had never imagined opposing Rome were driven by fear to actions that made them look just like enemies to the Romans.”\(^{253}\)

The author of the *DEH* transmits Josephus’s statement that the woman flees to the city for refuge by noting that Maria goes to Jerusalem “where it would be safer” (*quo esset tutior*). The author of the Latin text most likely phrases the woman’s migration to the city in this way so as to foreshadow the tragedy to come through the use of irony. Maria goes to Jerusalem to be safer, but as the author has already noted at the opening of Book 5 of the *DEH*, “No place [in Jerusalem] was free of danger, no time was found for deliberation, no hope for change, no opportunity for escape” (*DEH* 5.1.3, [295, 6–7]). Within the narrative arc of the *DEH*, Maria’s very ascent to Jerusalem spurs the action of her tragic deed.

The translator of the Hebrew text makes a couple of notable changes to the *DEH*’s presentation of the woman’s move to Jerusalem. In the Hebrew *SY* she “went up” (עלחה) to Jerusalem. The author of the Hebrew text also attempts to give a more precise timetable for her ascent to the city, noting that she makes the trek “during the days of Vespasian” (בימי מוסא). This timetable is most likely a reference to the campaigns of Vespasian, which are

\(^{252}\) Josephus recounts the bloodiness of the massacres committed by Placidus’s forces, which killed so many people that the Jordan River was filled with corpses (*BJ* 4.436–445).

recounted in SY 67–70 and begins as follows:

When Vespasian came, King Nero told him, according to the words which Cestius and Agrippa, the king of Judah had said, of all the evil which the priests had done to the army of the Romans in the land of Judea, and to their people and their troops had killed. After these events, King Nero sent Vespasian, the army commander, and his son Titus, to go with him into the land of Judea. He commanded them, “Thus you shall go there, and when you come into the land of Judea, you shall take their fortified cities, you shall destroy them, and you shall kill all whom you find.” Now Vespasian and his son Titus crossed the sea, and with them were the whole army of the Romans, and a selection of their men of war, and they came to the fortress of Antioch (SY 67.29–34).

This description of the beginning of the Flavian campaigns in Galilee follows the failure of Cestius to take Jerusalem and the report given to Nero by Cesitus and Agrippa regarding the affairs in Judea (SY 67.21–44). For the reader of the SY, these events contextualize the phrase “in the days of Vespasian,” which opens the story of Maria. The author of the Hebrew text most likely adds this phrase to the narrative in order to make the point that, even though she is not from Jerusalem, Maria has been there during the war for quite some time. The woman kills her son during the days of Titus, i.e. after Titus has taken over the Roman assault on Jerusalem from Vespasian’s command. The author of SY reminds the reader that Maria has been in the city since before Vespasian leaves for Rome, an event recounted in SY 70. Thus the Hebrew text goes one step further than the DEH in clarifying the duration of Maria’s stay in Jerusalem before her terrible deed. The Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts closely follow the Hebrew text in this passage.

A3. The Woman’s Wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tyrants plundered her other property.</td>
<td>She transported her wealth there</td>
<td>She went up with her man servants and</td>
<td>She had an enormous wealth and many</td>
<td>She had an enormous wealth and kindness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as much as (DEH 5.40.1 [381, 31]). having packed up from Peraea she brought to the city (BJ 6.202).

maidservants and great wealth (KAY 7.23).

servants... (SY 86.3)

and slaves and maidservants (ZA 7.7.30).

In the War, it is the fury of the rebels that spurs the action of Maria’s tragic story. In the comparatively terse account of her story that appears in Josephus’s history, the brief sketch of her as a wealthy woman is juxtaposed with the fury of the rebels, who have made Jerusalem far from safe. Josephus describes a twofold ravaging of her resources, first by the tyrant themselves and later by certain “armed men,” who are presumably under the command of the tyrants (For a fuller discussion, see section B below). The author of the DEH changes Josephus’s reference to the woman’s “property” (τὴν κτῆσιν) to “wealth” (opes). This slight alteration is part of the DEH’s portrayal of Maria as a very wealthy woman, not used to harsh conditions (see section D below).

The Hebrew renders the Latin’s portrayal of Maria as a wealthy woman by claiming that she comes to Jerusalem with her “manservants and handmaidens” (עבדים ושפחותיה). The change is a part of the biblicizing of the narrative by the translator of the Hebrew text. Having a large number of servants is one of the hallmarks of wealthy people that is often cited in the Hebrew Bible. For example, the description of Abram’s wealth in Genesis is given as follows: “And for her sake [Pharaoh] dealt well with Abram; and he had sheep, oxen, male donkeys, male and female slaves (עבדים ועבדות), female donkeys, and camels” (Gen 12.16).²⁵⁴

---

²⁵⁴ Cf. in describing Job’s enormous wealth before he loses his riches, the text reads, "He had seven thousand sheep, three thousand camels, five hundred yoke of oxen, five hundred donkeys, and very many servants (עבדה רבה מאדם); so that this man was the greatest of all the people of the east (Job 1.3).
The Arabic text faithfully transmits the Hebrew SY in the case of this passage, noting that the woman had “a vast amount of wealth” (نعمّة واسعة) and “many servants” (عبيد كثير). The translator of the Ethiopic text has at this point uncharacteristically made a couple of changes to the Arabic text. First, the Ethiopic text claims that the woman owned both manservants (አግብርት) and maidservants (አዕማት), whereas the Arabic only mentions her many servants (عبيد كثير). The fact that the Ethiopic parallels the Hebrew text more closely than its Arabic Vorlage is most likely coincidental. Like the author of the Hebrew SY, the translator of the Ethiopic too appears to be employing a common biblical phrase. Second, the author of the ZA adds “kindness” (牰) to the list of things that the woman has. This curious addition to the description of the woman serves to make her a more sympathetic figure, a theme that both the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY emphasize more than their Hebrew counterpart.

### A4. The Woman’s Son

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And grasping her child, for she had a boy under her breast, she said… (BJ 6.205).</td>
<td>The woman had a small infant to whom she had given birth (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 9–10]).</td>
<td>Now she had one son (SY 86.8)...and she said to her son... “You are so small” (SY 86.13–14).</td>
<td>...and she had but only one small son [whom] she loved with an exceeding love (KAY 7.7.23–24).</td>
<td>...and she had one small son and she loved him exceedingly (ZA 7.7.30–31).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the five texts being analyzed here, there is a division marked by when in the narrative a given text makes the revelation that the woman has a son. More specifically, the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew texts withhold that revelation until just before the woman begins her discourse to her son. In contrast, the Arabic and Ethiopic texts disclose the woman’s motherhood...
early in the narrative, just after their description of the woman’s wealth and provenance.

Josephus delays the revelation that Maria has a baby until just before she seizes him in order to kill him (BJ 6.205). In doing so, as Chapman has observed, “Josephus heightens the suspense and the tragic pathos by delaying this revelation until the beginning of Maria’s tragic monologue.” He further heightens the pathos of the story by describing her “child” (παίς) as one “suckling under the breast” (ὑπομάστιος). Like Josephus, the author of the DEH withholds the revelation of the woman’s motherhood until right before she kills her son. Moreover, in translating παίς ὑπομάστιος, Pseudo-Hegesippus describes the child as a “small infant to whom she had given birth” (infantulum quem genuerat). This description further heightens the shocking nature of the murder/cannibalism that follows, since the author makes both the infancy of the child and the biological relationship between mother and child abundantly clear.

Following its Latin Vorlage, the Hebrew text withholds the revelation that the woman has a son until shortly before her discourse to her son. What is notable is that the author waits until the discourse of the mother to her son before giving the detail of the infancy of the child (SY 86.15. He also eliminates the the emphasis in the Latin text that the child is one to whom the woman has herself given birth, resulting in the postponing of the pathetic notion until the discourse of the mother to her son. The author of the SY probably sees this emphasis in the Latin text as extraneous.

255 Chapman, “A Myth for the World,” 7. Chapman goes on to note, “That the baby is nursling make it that much more vulnerable, thereby increasing the pathos and inviting the audience’s pity. This component of a mother and child suffering during [a] siege is one shared in the Hebrew and Greek traditions, surely because the literary topos is a reflection of the realities of war through which both cultures suffered. Homer’s Andromache serves as the archetype in Greek literature of the pathetic woman left alone with a babe in arms after the father has died in war. The tragedians turned to Homer’s poetry on the Trojan War as a source of inspiration for describing the pain of war, as did Thucydides and later historians. Likewise, Josephus turns to Greek tragedy and historiography as inspiration for shaping this moment in his narrative. Josephus, however, is also recalling the Hebrew prophetic literature of Lamentation, which describes the plight of women in war” (Ibid.).
Over against all three of the texts that precede it, the Arabic version of SY introduces the woman’s son at the beginning of the story. Not only is this revelation made early, but the author of the Arabic text also embellishes the description of the woman by emphasizing the bond that she has with her son. This pericope in the Hebrew SY is quite terse and simply reads, “now she had one son” (ריהמ לְהָ ובן אָחָדו) (SY 86.8). The Arabic text expands this passage by moving to this juncture a detail given later in the Hebrew text, namely that her son is an infant. The author of the KAY also makes a concerted effort to illustrate a deep bond between the woman and her son, writing that the woman "loved him with an exceeding love" (تحبه حب شديد). This detail is also preserved in the Ethiopic text, which reads, “she loved him exceedingly” (ወታፈቅሮጥቀ).

In describing the mother’s love for her son in this fashion, the translators of the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY are expanding a motif that surfaces during the mother’s discourse to her son as it appears in the Hebrew text. When the mother speaks to her son prior to killing him in the SY, she addresses him as, “desire of my eyes whom I have loved with all of my might” (מְהֵמד עַנִי אֲשֶר אָהַבְתִּיךָ בְכָל אֲהֵבָה) (SY 86.21–22). While this motif of the deep love that the mother has for her son originates in the Hebrew SY, it is expanded and becomes a much more prominent theme in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of the story. Thus the latter two texts set the stage for the tragedy of the woman’s deed very early by revealing the fact that the woman has an infant son and by highlighting the deep love that she has for her son at the beginning of the story.

B. The Woman and the Fury of the Rebels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But the remains of her valuables and if she contrived</td>
<td>She transported her wealth there also, which the leaders of the</td>
<td>When the famine took place in Jerusalem, the</td>
<td>And when the famine increased in Jerusalem, the rebels took</td>
<td>Now when the famine grew worse in Jerusalem, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned above in section A3, Josephus presents a two-stage description of the crimes committed by the rebels against Maria, which ultimately lead her to commit her tragic deed. First Josephus notes that whatever wealth she brings from Peraea is confiscated by “the tyrants” (οἱ τύραννοι). Then “her remaining resources” (τὰ δὲ λείψανα τῶν κειμηλίων), as well as any food she happened to contrive, are plundered by “the armed agents” (οἱ ἠδορυφόροι), who are presumably under the command of the rebel leaders and come “bursting in daily” (καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἐισπηδῶντες) to the woman’s house. Josephus’s description of this scene makes a clear allusion to the first section on the famine, which begins in BJ 5.425, where the rebels are portrayed as committing similar crimes against other inhabitants of the city. In this way, Josephus portrays the terror caused by the rebel factions in Jerusalem as the fateful instrument that leads Maria to her tragic deed, in much the same way that this error leads to the destruction of the Temple and the city.

The author of the DEH situates the tragic turn of Maria’s story within the context of the “competition” (certatim) between the rebels. The internal strife within the city between the three major rebel factions (led by Eleazar, Simon, and John) is introduced at the opening of Book 5 of
the DEH and discussed throughout the remainder of the text. In this way, the insertion of the rebels and their mad competition is woven into the tragic plot of the mother. The hand of fate places her not only in the famine, but also within the ruthless strife that is the driving force of the plot of the entire war in general. This heightens the pathos because, as the woman will herself note (see section J4 below), her adversity is increased by the strife. Additionally, the author of the DEH omits Josephus’s note that the “armed agents” of the rebels were raiding the woman’s house on a daily basis. The omission is most likely made because Pseudo-Hegesippus views the detail of daily looting as too hyperbolic.

The translator of the Hebrew text couches the tragedy of Maria within the context of the fury of the rebels that raged against the people of Jerusalem (cf. with section B in chapter 3 of this dissertation). The author also slightly modifies his Latin Vorlage. For example, it is not the leaders of the rebels who plunder Maria’s resources (as is the case in the DEH). Instead, the SY merely states that the rebels (הפריצים) go around searching houses to find sustenance. The text goes on to note that “they took everything the woman had, from food to sustenance” (כל אשר لها מאוכל ועד מחיה) (SY86.4–5). The focus on the crimes of the rebels re-emerges at a later point in the Hebrew text, in which the author makes the case that the evil deeds of the rebels surpasses the terrible nature of Maria’s deed because it itself is the cause of the mother’s cruel deed.

---

256 DEH 5 opens as follows: “In the first year after the supreme power was bestowed upon Vespasian, Judea was tormented by savage battles and civil riots, and it did not experience a cessation of evils during the winter, when the savageries of wars are accustomed to become less severe. But when the third tyrant Eleazar arrived there…the city suffered from a threefold battle within itself; [there was] no let-up no respite, no suspension of hostilities; there was conflict at every moment. Many fell, countless were butchered, blood flowed, it polluted everything, it filled the threshold itself of the temple, dead bodies piled up everywhere, some were struck by arrows and others by missiles” (DEH 5.1.1–7).
The tragic turn of the story of the woman who kills and eats her child in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY takes place with the plundering of the rebels, as is the case in the Hebrew text. The Christian-Arabic text notes that the rebels “took every edible thing that was inside the woman’s house” (رنهبا الخوارج جميع ما كان فيمنذل لامراه منالطعام), and the Ethiopian text similarly reads, “the rebels took everything of sustenance that was inside that woman’s house” (ወበርበሩ እለ ያርብሕኵሎ ወኮነውስተ በታለይእቲ በእBarButton). In all five texts, this pericope serves as the beginning of the woman’s troubles and sets up the portrayal of the tragic mother as a victim of terrible suffering before she commits the horrible deed.

C. The Woman Desires to Die

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A terrible indignation came upon the woman, and she kept on provoking the plunderers against her by constantly reviling and cursing them… (BJ 6.203).</td>
<td>She was disturbed by what was lost, and called down dire curses; she wished to die but she could not find an assassin (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 3–4]).</td>
<td>And it happened that when the famine grew heavy upon her, her spirit asked to die but her end did not come…(SY 86.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a passage in Josephus’s War that does not appear in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY but is transmitted by the authors of the Latin and Hebrew texts. In this passage, Josephus describes a moment in which Maria desires to die. Although he notes the woman’s attempts to elicit her own murder by provoking the plunderers, Josephus says nothing about the woman’s desire to commit suicide. This is a noteworthy omission given the important role
played by Josephus’s discussions of suicide in other places within the *War* (e.g. the suicide of his comrades at Jotapata [BJ 3.356-59]) and especially the mass suicide at Masada (BJ 7.323-336 and 7.341-388). Without mentioning suicide, Josephus goes on to note that the rebels refuse to take the woman’s life, a decision which sets up the stage for the woman’s tragic deed.

The author of the *DEH* takes the scene describing the woman’s desire to die as it appears in the *War* and makes the theme more explicit. First, he takes what is only implied by Josephus (i.e. that the woman wants to die) and states it explicitly: he writes, “she wanted to die” (*volebant mori*). Thus whereas in the *War* Maria is portrayed as antagonizing those plundering her house, here her desire for death is made more explicit. Secondly, the author of the *DEH* claims that Maria actually seeks “an assassin” (*percussorem*). The term *percussorem* is the same term used elsewhere in the *DEH* to refer to the Sicarri. So, the *DEH* portrays Maria as being more aggressive in her attempt to end her life.

Just as is the case in the previous pericope, the translator of *SY* also makes some stylistic changes in this particular passage. One noteworthy change is the omission of the reference to the woman’s seeking an assassin to kill her; in place of this motif, the Hebrew text merely reads that although “the woman’s spirit asked to die” (*شاءל נפשו למות*), “her end did not come” (*ולא בא*). The de-emphasis of this motif in the Hebrew text, which omits the more dramatic portions of the Latin text, perhaps explains why this motif does not make its way into the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of *SY*.

---

257 For a fuller discussion of this issue, see Chapman, “Spectacle and Theater in Josephus’s Bellum Judaicum,” 82–83.
258 For example, see *DEH* 2.6, which describes the beginning of the criminal activity of Sicarri in Jerusalem during the reign of Claudius. There are also other points in the narrative when the same term is used to refer to one of the rebels. For example, before he is executed by Simon (the man he himself invited into Jerusalem), Matthias says to him, “I feared a phantom and *brought in an assassin*” (*percussorem introduxi*) (5.22.4 [349, 12]).
D. The Woman and the Famine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...and on the on hand she was becoming weary of finding some food for others, and on other hand even finding it from anywhere was impossible now (BJ 6.204).</td>
<td>All things had already run short and having been accustomed to luxuries, she could not soften the harshness of husks or the hardness of leather (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 6–8]).</td>
<td>The woman began to collect from the earth everything that she would find to eat, from thatch to straw, but there was none (SY 86.6–7).</td>
<td>The woman went hungry and her son went hungry (KAY 7.7.25).</td>
<td>The woman was hungry and her son too went hungry (ZA 7.7.32).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While building up to the tragic conclusion of the story of Maria, Josephus notes that the woman is unable to find any food. In addition, the author intimates that the woman is responsible for taking care of other people besides her son. Whoever these people for whom Maria has to provide food might be is irrelevant to the development of the plot; but the detail does intensify the tragic nature of the story, since the woman has to care for more people than just her son. As the author notes, “she was becoming weary of finding some food for others” (τὸ μὲν εὑρεῖν τι οἰτίνοι ἄλλοις ἐκοπία πανταχόθεν). This makes the woman more vulnerable to the fury of the rebels, and it heightens the pathos of her tragedy.

One finds a different portrayal of the woman’s experience of the famine in the DEH. While the War presents a portrait of a woman searching for food for others, while she herself presumably goes hungry, the Latin text paints a portrait of a wealthy woman “accustomed to luxuries” (deliciis adsueta) and thus unable to endure the hardships of the famine. In Pseudo-Hegesippus’s words, Maria “was not softening the bitter hardness of husks and hides” (asperiora palearum uel coriorum dura non emolliebat). Such a depiction of the woman immediately
follows the third section on the famine in the *DEH*, wherein the author highlights the eating of husks and leather by those desperate from starvation. As a result, Maria comes off as someone who does not wish to eat what others are eating. Because she does not exhaust all of her (albeit undesirable) options before deciding to kill and eat her son, she arguably becomes a less sympathetic figure.

However, the portrayal of the woman as spoiled by her former life of luxury is not a consistent theme that runs through the *DEH*. In fact, nothing else in the text seems to suggest that her previous wealth has made Maria more inclined to commit her tragic deed. The author of the *DEH* even goes further than Josephus in his attempts to make her more sympathetic, by more fully developing the tortured changes in her mental state before she kills her son. Therefore, it is best to read the insertion of this detail as a literary embellishment of the detail of the woman’s wealth as it appears in the *War*. Josephus mentions that Maria was wealthy, and Pseudo-Hegesippus here is merely extending that biographical detail.

In describing the beginning of the woman’s suffering, the translator of the Hebrew text once again chooses to abbreviate and alter the Latin text. Whereas the *DEH* depicts Maria as not able to consume husks and leather, in the *SY*, the author describes her as presumably wanting to eat “everything that she could find, from thatch to straw” (כל אשר תמצא מקש עד תבן). But as the author proceeds to note, she cannot find anything to eat. The change made here by the translator of the Hebrew text parallels his general tendency to omit details in the Latin text that he deems to be extraneous to his overall rhetorical objective. As a result, the biographical sketch of the mother in the *SY* is comparatively less developed than its Latin predecessor, and the drama of the tragedy is not as intense.
The translator of the Arabic text omits the detail of the woman’s searching for anything remotely edible, as presented in the Hebrew SY. Instead both the KAY and the ZA simply state that following the rebels’ plundering of her house, the woman goes hungry. The Christian versions of the SY do add one small detail: only these two texts note the hunger of the woman’s son, writing, “her son also was hungry” (yāqūtū ṭālīʿāh; የአንድ ዋለስ ይሆን). While the other texts being examined here focus on the mother’s hunger alone, the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of the SY highlight the son’s hunger as well in order to create a more tragic portrait of the woman’s suffering. Taken together with the two texts’ emphasis on the deep love that the woman has for her son, this passage serves to make more acute the woman’s pain. She not only has to endure the famine’s effect on her body, but must also watch the effect it has on her son. The addition of this detail also sets up the depiction of the woman’s subsequent decision to kill her son as merciful (see section G below).

E. The Intensity of the Famine on the Woman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...and the famine was moving through her guts and her marrow and, more than the famine, her emotions were inflaming her...and taking her anger along with necessity as a counselor, she moved against</td>
<td>Savage famine infused itself into her innermost marrow...Aroused by his crying... she lost her affection and with the custom of parental tenderness forgotten, she swallowed up her sorrow and took up fury (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 8–14]).</td>
<td>And it came to pass that when the famine grew strong against her and went down into the inner parts of the marrow of her bones, that they turned all of her mercy into cruelty. When the woman heard the voice of the</td>
<td>When what was found in the famine and what reached her heart from the pain of the crying and complaints of her son grew heavy upon her. She was exhausted and lost patience. She made a plan to kill her son and eat him</td>
<td>And when the famine grew worse on her, she did not know what she would do because of the famine, the ruin, the tribulation, and the weeping of her son. She was unable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nature (BJ 6.204).

child crying for bread, she became convinced that there was none, and she said… (SY 86.8–10).

order to] put an end to her hunger through him… (KAY 7.7.25–27).

to endure and her hope collapsed and she wanted to kill her son and eat him because of the famine (ZA 7.7.32–34).

In the War, the words included in this pericope begins the passage that Josephus carefully constructs in order to explain how the woman arrives at the point of committing her horrific deed. As Chapman notes, “this passage is rich with tragic imagery and themes crucial to Josephus’s history as a whole. It plays its role as a mythos meant to embody the logos of his apologetics.”

This portion of Josephus’s portrayal of Maria is important to his overall objective because he must succeed in depicting Maria as a tragic figure in order to elicit the pity of his Greco-Roman audience. As a result, Josephus focuses on the woman’s changing emotional state, describing her as becoming a victim to her emotions, which were inflaming her more than the famine (καὶ τοῦ λιμοῦ μᾶλλον ἔξεχαον οἱ θυμοί).

The author of the DEH makes several allusions to the changing state of the woman’s mind, expanding Josephus’s use of madness. Again the reference is made to the agitation of her mind; it is right after this second reference to her deteriorating mental state that the revelation

---

259 Chapman, “Spectacle and Theater in Josephus’s Bellum Judaicum,” 82.
260 With reference to this passage, Chapman writes, “The picture of a passionate female from Greek tragedy strongly emerges. Her anger (‘οἱ θυμοί’) against the marauding rebels replaces the famine as her consuming motivation, burning through her ‘σπλάγχναν καὶ μυελῶν.’ The image of [Maria’s] ‘σπλάγχνα’ on fire is especially loaded, since it can, on the physical level, represent not only her ‘innards’ but, more specifically, her womb. Furthermore, ‘σπλάγχνα’ are the organ parts which are eaten by participants at a Greek sacrifice, and may be foreshadowing for [Maria’s] eating [of] the product of her own womb at her so-called ‘sacrifice.’ Finally, ‘σπλάγχνα,’ in both classical Greek and Jewish literature, can serve metaphorically as the source of human emotions” (Ibid., 83–84).
that she has a child is made. The juxtaposition of the revelation that she has a child with the disturbance of her mind follows Josephus, and seems to be quite deliberate. Just as is the case in the Greek text, the object of Maria’s deed is kept hidden by the author of the DEH until the mother has descended into madness.

The Hebrew text preserves Josephus’s motif of the famine coursing through the marrow of the woman’s bones, which is transmitted by the DEH. The author of the SY writes that the famine “went down” (יורד) into the “inner parts” (חדרים) of “the marrow of her bones” (מקמותיה). This neatly aligns with the author of SY’s efforts to biblicize his history. The author of the Hebrew text alters the tragic elements of the madness that invades the woman’s mind that is present in the War and the DEH. An explicit reference to Maria’s changing state of mind is absent in the SY. However, the translator of the Hebrew text writes that the pains of the famine “turned all of her mercy into cruelty” (ויהפכו_PACKET:7:12(ויהפכו_PACKET:7:12)ברחמיה).

The Arabic and Ethiopic texts again emphasize the woman’s pain of having to watch her son suffer. The translator of the KAY omits the motif of the famine reaching the marrow of the bones of the woman and instead describes “the pain and the crying of her son and his complaints” (אלאם بكאה ولדו ותصوم), which afflicts her heart. This motif is picked up in the parallel Ethiopic passage, which states that the woman did not know what to do “because of the famine…and the weeping of her son” (አምረብ…ወብካየወልዳ). The alteration made to the Hebrew text in this pericope further buttresses the depiction of the woman’s killing of her son as a merciful act, which itself serves to portray the mother as a more sympathetic figure.

Moreover, Josephus continues his depiction of Maria as a tragic figure by noting the role played by “anger” (ὀργή) and “necessity” (ἀνάγκη) in leading her to commit her terrible deed. Chapman notes the close parallel between Maria and Medea at this juncture in the Jewish War:
The combination of anger, necessity, and an unnatural act committed by a mother are characteristics which Josephus and his audience would have readily identified with the mythological Medea. In Euripides’ rendition, Medea is driven by ὀργὴ against her former husband, Jason. After killing Jason’s new bride (and his new father-in-law), Medea believes she must kill her own children, an unnatural act, so that they will not be killed by another: “Surely it is necessity for them to die; and since it is necessary, I, the very one who bore them, will kill them.”

If Josephus was successful with his rhetorical objectives, his Greco-Roman audience would have been able to connect the allusions to account of Medea and would have read his account of Maria through the same interpretive lens as they would have applied to Euripides’ text.

While in the War the final moments before Maria plunges into madness are prefaced with remarks about her anger at the rebels and her inability to find food, the author of the DEH adds the crying of the woman’s son as another factor. Thus in the DEH, the final moments before her descent into madness ring with the crying of her son. Her son, whom the author is careful to portray as her own biological son, is given more attention than in the Greek text. The mother is disturbed (excita) by the emaciation of the child (paruulum commacerari) and by his crying (uagitu eius).

The author of the DEH also rationalizes the woman’s decision more than Josephus does by expanding on the description of her descent into madness. For example, he makes a reference to her situation as “great, unequaled cruel misfortune” (inpar tam atroci calamitati). He also spends more time describing the changing emotional state of the woman, noting that she “loses her affection” (affectum amisit) and “forgets the custom of motherly tenderness” (pietatis genitalis usu oblitterato). Pseudo-Hegesippus also makes another addition, which plays off of the graphic imagery of the deed the mother is getting ready to commit. He writes that she “devours her sorrow” (dolorem absorbuit). Only then does he transmit Josephus’s motif of anger

---

becoming a counselor. Therefore, right before Maria turns and speaks to her infant son, the author of the *DEH* writes, she “takes up fury” (*furorem adsumsit*).

The Hebrew text’s abbreviation of the portrayal of Maria that appears in the *DEH* appears most starkly in the pericope dealing with the mother’s decision to kill her son. At that critical moment, both Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus note the tragedy of madness and necessity that compel the woman to her fateful deed. In sharp contrast, the author of the Hebrew text provides little background into the mother’s thinking. The author simply notes that it is upon hearing the crying of her child and upon becoming convinced that there was no bread that the woman decides to kill her son. The abbreviation of the characterization of the mother results in a much less tragic and arguably less sympathetic version of Maria. The change made here fits the redactional tendency of the author of the Hebrew text, who seeks to diminish the sensationalism of Maria’s story in order to shift the focus of the narrative on the evil crimes of the rebels.

Having established the woman’s dual-sided suffering of having to witness her infant son starve and having to endure starvation herself, the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopian texts then note the woman’s hopelessness and inability to endure the famine any further. The translator of the *KAY* adds this details to the parallel passage that appears in the Hebrew SY, situating the woman’s extreme decision to kill her son within the context of the hopelessness that her great suffering produces within her.

F. Infanticide as Mercy Killing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...and to grant him rest through the killing from...</td>
<td>...and to grant him rest through the killing from...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The efforts on the part of the translators of the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts to depict the mother’s killing of her son as sympathetically as possible is most apparent in the following three pericopes, which appear only in these two texts. In this particular pericope, the translators of the Christian versions of SY make the case that the mother decides to kill her son not only to satisfy her own hunger (as highlighted in section F above), but also to grant her starving infant son relief from the famine by killing him. The KAY claims that she kills her son in order to “grant him rest through the killing” (وتريحه بالقتل), and the Ethiopic text similarly notes that she commits the dead in order “to give him rest through the killing (ወታዕርፎበቀትል). Such an extreme decision is mitigated by the efforts the translators of the two texts have already taken in the preceding passages to emphasize the great amount of love the mother has for her son. Thus, read in the context of the beginning of the story, the mother’s decision to kill her son is portrayed as a loving and merciful act.

G. A Mother’s Dilemma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhābār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhūd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She remained confused and was ignorant concerning two problems [related to] her own endurance: either she would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For she was bereaved about what she would do concerning two matters [related to] enduring the famine. Either she would kill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Christian versions of SY further the positive and sympathetic portrayal of the mother by including a passage that depicts the torment through which the woman goes as she contemplates her horrifying decision. While the preceding versions of the story quickly move from the woman’s decision to kill her son to her discourse to her son, the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopian texts describe a scene in which the woman finds herself between the rock of having to kill her own son and the hard place of having to starve to death. The terribleness of either option directly precedes and thus is portrayed as the most immediate cause of what takes places in the following passage, namely the woman’s breaking point.

H. The Mother is Unable to Endure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolimitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endurance had already abandoned her and the famine</td>
<td>And endurance was taken away from her and the famine increased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant gap in the story of Maria at this point in the narrative in the Judeo-Arabic version of SY (See Sela, *The Arabic Book of Yosef Ben Gorion*, 2:667). The narrative resumes at the start of the discourse of the mother to the rebels (see section N1 below).
By this point in the narrative, the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts have recounted the mother’s great love for her son, her pain of having to witness his suffering, and her torment caused by the difficulty of the options before her. The authors of these two texts paint such a background in order to make the character of the unnamed mother more sympathetic by providing justifications for her decision. Having done so, they then note the mother’s inability to further endure the simultaneous pain of starving and having to witness her infant son starving as well. Due to the omission of the motif of madness that takes place already at the level of the Hebrew text, there are not explicit references to the woman becoming mad in the KAY or the ZA. Instead, the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts highlight the woman’s loss of her counsel, compassion, and mercy.

I. The Mother’s Discourse to Her Son

In what follows, I discuss the discourse of the mother to her son as it appears in the five texts, having divided this section into thirteen separate parallel passages. In his account of the story of Maria, Josephus includes a very short monologue that the mother delivers to her son through direct discourse. As Chapman notes, this speech demonstrates the author’s apologetic goals of eliciting pity for the Jews and blaming the rebels for the sufferings of the Jews.263

Maria’s words to her son are much longer in the *DEH* than the *BJ*. Pseudo-Hegesippus’s account of her words to her son becomes the source for much of what Maria says in the *SY* tradition. They serve to depict Maria as a loving mother who had hopes for the welfare and future of her son, emphasizing her hopelessness and communicating her madness.

Despite abbreviating much of the narrative in the Latin text, the translator of the Hebrew text preserves the contours of the discourse of Maria to her son present in the *DEH*. In addition, the author of *SY* inserts biblical motifs into the mother’s discourse to her son, motifs dealing particularly with issues of honor and rewards for children who honor their parents. The translator of the Arabic text maintains much of the discourse of Maria that appears in the Hebrew text. He also reiterates within the discourse the motifs of the deep love that the unnamed mother has for her son as well as the motif of her deed being a merciful killing.

### I1. “I had Hoped”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…I had hoped that, if you had grown to maturity, you would have fed me your mother and bury me when I died…” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 18–19]).</td>
<td>“…I was hoping for you that you would grow up and provide support for my old age and bury me on the day of my death” (SY 86.13–14).</td>
<td>She said to her son, “I was hoping, oh my one precious son, that you would work until you inherited my gold and property and you would take care of my affairs [when] I died…” (KAY 7.7.30–31).</td>
<td>She said to her son, “I was hoping, oh my only son, that you would indeed live to take over my property so that you might manage and set my property in order if I were to grow old as well as bury me if I were to die…” (ZA 7.7.38–40).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the DEH, the woman begins her discourse to her son by talking about the hope she had held for her son. These words are an adaptation and expansion of the mother’s discourse to her son in Josephus’s text. Initially the author of the DEH closely follows the beginning of Maria’s discourse to her son as it appears in the War, but then adds elements of his own. For example, Maria begins her speech by saying, “What can I do for you, little one (paruule), what can I do for you?” Here the Latin is translating the first words of the mother to her son as they appear in the Greek text: “Poor infant, for what shall I preserve you in war and famine and civil strife?” (βρέφος ἡθλιον ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ λιμῷ καὶ στάσει τίνι σε τηρήω). Having begun the mother’s discourse in a similar way as does Josephus, the author of the DEH then introduces the motif of the hope that Maria had held for her son prior to her decision to kill him.

The words of the mother here sound like the words of a mother. She is not mad, and this seems to contradict the previous claims that she has forgotten that she is his mother (iam matrem oblita) and “she is raging in mind” (furens animi) as she is about to commit the deed. Additionally, although the author of the DEH does not explicit transmit Josephus’s reference to necessity as a driving force behind Maria’s deed, here her words couch her subsequent action within the argument of necessity. The mother begins her words to her son by noting the hopelessness of her son’s situation. If the reader were to wonder why she does not commit suicide, this may serve as an answer: she is the only guardian for the child. As the mother adds

---

264 The last words that Maria speaks in the DEH again emphasize the point that she commits her deed out of necessity. Speaking to the rebels who come to see what food she has found, she says, “and suffering held me, but necessity conquered” (et me tenebat passio sed uicit necessitas) (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 18–19]). For the context of her last words, see section O7 below.
later in her speech, “We have done what is characteristic of piety; [now] let us do what hunger demands” (*fecimus quod pietatis fuit, faciamus quod suadet fames*) (*DEH* 5.40.2 [383, 7–8]).

While expanding this passage, the author of the *DEH* departs from Josephus, who makes a sudden and dramatic shift between the mother lamenting the hopelessness of her and her son’s situation to her saying to her son, “Come be food for me” (*ἰθι, γενοῦ μοι τροφὴ*) (*BJ* 6.207). In contrast, having mapped out the routes of reasoning that lead the mother to view her deed as necessary, the author of the *DEH* proceeds to portray Maria as a good mother who desires good things for her son. Anticipating the grave deed she is about to commit, the mother voices her desire that her son would have grown to maturity and taken care of her in her old age. The imagery of her dreaming of her son (voluntarily) feeding her is sensationalized by his (involuntarily) being food for her that follows.

The Hebrew text preserves the motif of the motherly concern that Maria displays toward her son throughout her first discourse. The mother speaks about the hopes she had held for her son, after highlighting the many factors that make her and her son's situation hopeless. Many of the motifs in the mother’s discourse to her son as presented in the *DEH* are transmitted by the Hebrew *SY*. The mother begins talking to her son in this way: “What will I do for you, my son, since everything around is scorched and from every corner [comes] hunger. Also the rebels are growing strong and our enemies are gaining strength as well. Behold fire, behold ruin, behold famine and behold pestilence” (*SY* 86.9–12) (see sec. I4 below). After saying this, the Hebrew text translates the Latin quite closely. The mother voices the hope she had held for the

---

265 The mother later presents her infant son with what is—one must presume—a rhetorical question: “What would you do, my son, if you too had a son?” (*DEH* 5.40.2 [383, 7]). The implied answer, given the context of the tragedy to follow, is as clear as it is disturbing.
maturation of her son into adulthood, so that he would have supported her in her old age and buried her when she died.

The mother’s opening words to her son as presented in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts serve to highlight the deep love that she has for him. First, the mother employs a more intimate phrase to address her son: in the KAY she addresses him as “my one precious son” (اﺑﻧﻲ وواﺣﺪي وواﻟﻌزﯾز) and in the ZA she calls him “my only son” (אֶת זַעְר). Secondly, whereas in the DEH and the SY the mother expresses only her hope that her son would take care of her when she grew old and bury her when she died, in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts her monologue focuses on her son. She explains that she had hoped that her son would grow to maturity and inherit her wealth. This small shift in the narrative further substantiates the motif that the unnamed mother truly loves her son and shares a very intimate bond with him, making her decision to kill him more tragic.

I2. “I Was Afraid You Would Die Before Me”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I was already afraid that you would die before me and your death would make me sad and I would be afflicted by your absence” (KAY 7.7.31–32).</td>
<td>“I was afraid that you would not die before me and I would be saddened over your death and shaken by my childlessness…” (ZA 7.7.40–41).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The translator of the Christian-Arabic text extends the motif of the love that the mother has for her son by introducing a passage into the mother’s discourse to her son that highlights her
attachment to her son. In the *KAY*, the mother enumerates the fact that she had already been afraid that her son would die before her and that she would be *afflicted by his absence* (وأصاب بفقدتك). The Ethiopic translator transmits this motif, but the mother employs a slightly different terminology in the *ZA*: she tells her son that she was afraid he would die before her and that she would be *shaken by her childlessness* (*አንድም ከልክትምናይ*). Despite the slightly different terminologies, in both the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts, the case is made for the strong attachment that exists between the mother and her son.

### I3. “I Would Have Buried You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…certainly, if you preceded me in death, (I had hoped) that I would have enclosed you in an expensive grave with my own hands” (<em>DEH</em> 5.40.2 [382, 19–20]).</td>
<td>“In the case that you died before I died, I was going to bury you with honor like a mother [does] for a son of her womb” (<em>SY</em> 86.14–15).</td>
<td>“If only you were already dead and if only you had died by another reason than this your annihilation, God would not see this adversity…” (<em>KAY</em> 7.7.32–33).</td>
<td>“…and [I would be shaken] over why you did not die on the other side of this tragedy. If only I had buried you and entrusted you to God, he would not see this ruin…” (<em>ZA</em> 7.7.41–42).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author of the *DEH* here returns to the problem of the lack of burials for the dead, which has been discussed several times in the narrative preceding the story of Maria (e.g. see section E3 and E4 in chapter 3 of this dissertation; also cf. section I6 below). Continuing the monologue of the hopes she had held for him, the mother tells her son that she was hoping to bury him if he had died before her. The “precious grave” (*pretioso tumulo*) that she wishes she
could have built for him contrasts the “prepared grave” (tumulus paratur) in her womb that actually awaits him (see section I8 below).

The Hebrew text continues to transmit the Latin DEH closely, citing Maria’s words that she would have buried her son if he had died before her (in another context). At this point, the author of the Hebrew text introduces the important, biblical motif of the honor between parents and their children. Whereas in the DEH the mother emphasizes that she would have buried her son with her own hands, in the SY Maria says, “I was going tobury you with honor” (אני התרצה לה/graphql הraphicsה). The mother’s allusion to the biblical injunction to honor one’s mother anticipates her later use of the principle as she requests that her son also does what is honorable by providing for her hunger.

The author of the KAY emends the text of the Hebrew SY at this point. Instead of saying that she would have buried him if he had died before her, in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts, the unnamed mother expresses her wish that her son would have already died before the tragedy of the famine. In the KAY the mother says, “if only you had died by another reason than this your annihilation” (וליתק youre עליך ללא זו הרעה قد פניתק). In the Ethiopic text she laments to her son saying that she is saddened “because you did not die on the other side of this tragedy” (ואלремת אתיך על sede הלא זו הרעה). Taken together with the previous pericope (section I2 above), these passages in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts illustrate the fact the mother would prefer childlessness to seeing her son suffer despite how painful the former is for her. By placing such sentiments in the mouth of the mother, the authors of the latter two texts reassert the motif of the mother’s deep love for her son, once again with the aim of making her a more sympathetic figure.
I4. “Adversity Has Surrounded Us”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“On the one hand among the Romans there is slavery, if indeed we live until them; on the other hand, the famine is arriving even before slavery, and the rebels are harsher than both” (BJ 6.206).</td>
<td>“Everything savage surrounds you: war, famine, fires, robbers, ruin…” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 16–17]).</td>
<td>“What will I do for you, my son, since everything around is scorched and from every corner [comes] hunger…Behold fire, behold ruin, behold famine and behold pestilence” (SY 86.10–12).</td>
<td>“Now, oh my son, adversity has already descended upon us from every side and we are deprived of our discernment and our understanding, and therefore we do not have hope and we are being eradicated by destruction” (KAY 7.7.33–34).</td>
<td>“But now, my son, behold, tribulation has surrounded us everywhere and we lack knowledge and understanding and we have given up hope and we are being eradicated by destruction and tribulation” (ZA 7.7.42–44).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of her discourse to her son in the BJ, the mother itemizes all of the dangers that make hopeless the predicament of her and her son. At this point in the mother’s discourse, the author of the DEH makes an interesting change to the text of the War.266 Whereas Josephus includes “slavery among the Romans” (τὰ μὲν παρὰ Ἰούδαιος δούλεια) as part of his list of dangers, the Latin text does not. While it is not entirely clear why the author of the DEH has omitted Josephus’s reference to slavery among the Romans as one of the dangers surrounding the woman and her child, I submit a couple of possible explanations. One reason might be that the author of the DEH emends the text because of the following passage, which appears in Book 5 of the War prior to the story of Maria:

266 In the DEH, this passage actually appears at the beginning of the mother’s discourse to her son, but it has been moved to a later point in the monologue by the translator of the Hebrew SY.
For all this emotional appeal by Josephus, the insurgents would not budge, and thought it far from safe to change their course. The people though, took it as a spur to desertion…once they had escaped to the Romans…Titus released most of them to go where they wanted in the country, and this of itself was a further invitation to desert— freedom from the hell inside the city without enslavement to the Romans (BJ 5.420–422).

It is possible the author of the *DEH* has this passage in mind while translating the story of Maria and thus chooses to omit slavery among the Romans from the list of dangers that frighten the mother. Another reason for the omission could be that the author of the *DEH* wants to portray the Jewish Revolt as a permanent destruction of the city of Jerusalem and of Judaism as a legitimate religious system. In this context, one can argue that he here wants to de-emphasize any references to the continuation of the Jewish race, even under Roman slavery.

In the Hebrew text, this passage appears first in the mother’s discourse to her son, just as is the case in the order of Maria’s discourse in the Latin text. The list of calamities that appear in the Hebrew text once again make biblical allusions. For example, the term מִפְּלָת (which seems to be a translation of the Latin *ruinae*), arguably serves a double-function, since it is used in the Hebrew Bible to mean both “carcass” and “ruin.”

The translator of the Christian-Arabic text here slightly modifies the text of the Hebrew *SY* in order to reassert the motif of the disappearance of truth and righteousness from the land as part of God’s punishment. In addition to transmitting the Josephan theme of adversity

---

267 In the *DEH*, this passage wherein Titus offers amnesty from slavery for all those who come over to the Romans appears in 5.17: “Josephus cried out these things with tears and he influenced very many of the people, that they should take refuge with the Romans having sold all they possessed. Titus directed these [people] to go wherever each wished, and to surrender themselves without fear to the Romans even though the remainder were being challenged. And so the opportunity of coming out was found, and [the people] were assured of safety if they came to the Romans, and they to whom freedom was saved were not anxious about slavery” (*DEH* 5.17.1).

268 See Jud 14.8, for example, where the term is used to refer to “the carcass of a lion” (מִפְּלָת הָאָרִיָּה), in which Samson finds honey. In another context, e.g. Ezek 26.15-18 and Ezek 27.27, the term is used to refer to the fall or ruin of cities like Tyre. Because the story of Maria is sandwiched between the account of the corpses that litter the city and the fall of the Temple, the multiple meanings of the term work quite well for the author’s purposes.
coming from all directions, as transmitted by the *DEH* and the *SY*, the author of the *KAY* also has the unnamed mother telling her child “we are deprived of our discernment and our understanding” (وعدنا عقلنا وقلوبنا). In the Ethiopic text, the mother says, “we lack knowledge and understanding” (አእምሮ በናት ያስገኝ የሆኔ ከፋመ ይገኝ). 269

The theme reiterated here by the translators of the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts is one that is woven throughout the whole narrative of the Judean Revolt as it appears in the two texts. The authors of the two texts first mention this theme at the beginning of their accounts of the rebellion in Chapter 6.4 (see section 3.4 in chapter 3 of this dissertation for a fuller discussion). They also allude to this same theme at the close of the story of the unnamed mother who kills and eats her child: in the same way that the lack discernment and understanding cause the Jews to rebels, it also causes the cannibalistic mother to commit her horrific deed.

I5. “The Dead Are Not Buried”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The living among us do not hope to continue to live, and the dead are not buried” (<em>KAY</em> 7.7.34).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The living from among us do not hope to live, and the dead are not buried” (<em>ZA</em> 7.7.44–45).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author of the *KAY* introduces another supplement to the Hebrew text at this point. There are two parts to this pericope that appears only in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopian versions of *SY*. First, the mother tells her son that the living among Jerusalem’s inhabitants have

---

269 Both the Arabic and Ethiopic terms employed here to mean “understanding” literally mean “heart”.

169
lost their hope. The mother’s observation of the absence of hope on a communal level, in addition to the absence of hope on a personal level (see section J4 above for the hopelessness of the mother), serves to solidify the theme that God’s punishment is being directed against the whole community and not just the unfortunate mother. Secondly, the mother makes a reference to the lack of burials for the dead. The reiteration of this motif serves to hearken back to the problem of corpses (see section E in chapter 3 of this dissertation), which in the KAY and the ZA appears in the same chapters as the story of the unnamed cannibalistic mother. It also serves to set the stage for the mother’s subsequent words, in which she tells her son that she will provide him with (an albeit unusual) grave since no one is available to bury him.

I6. “There Will Be No One to Bury You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Or indeed in what tomb shall I hide you so that you are not prey for dogs, birds, or wild beasts?” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 22–24]).</td>
<td>“But now, my son, what will I do for you since there is no grave [in which] to bury you and you alive are as good as dead. Come and I will choose for you a grave within my womb, lest the dogs eat you” (SY 86.15–17).</td>
<td>“You and I will die and when you die, my son (bni), no one will bury you and you will be like your neighbors whom the dogs and the birds of the sky ate” (KAY 7.7.34–35).</td>
<td>“Both you and I will die and when you die, no one will bury you and you will be like your neighbor[s], after the dogs and the birds of the sky ate them” (ZA 7.7.45–46).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pseudo-Hegesippus again invokes the problem of the lack of burials for the dead, which (as mentioned before) are discussed several times throughout the text. The author of the Latin text develops this motif by making allusions to the Hebrew Bible. The judgment of God
represented the absence of burials for the dead as described in Jeremiah 16 serves as an especially acute parallel to this motif as developed by the author of the DEH. In delivering God’s condemnation of the people, the prophet writes, “They will die of deadly diseases, they will not be lamented or buried; they will be as dung on the surface of the ground and come to an end by sword and famine, and their carcasses will become food for the birds of the sky and for the beasts of the earth” (Jer 16.4).

In the SY, the mother says that she will convert her womb into a tomb so that her son is not eaten by dogs (הכלבים). The translator of the Hebrew text has here omitted the birds (alitis) and wild beasts (feri) listed together with dogs as the scavengers of corpses (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 22–24]). The author of SY also summarizes the hopelessness of the woman; in the Hebrew text the woman says to her son, “you alive are as good as dead” (ואתה חי נחה כמת). This addition is another example of the Hebrew text’s truncating of its Lain Vorlage.

The mother repeats the problem that the dead in Jerusalem are not being buried. Once again, the repetition of this motif serves to set up the following passage, in which the mother tells her son that she will be his grave. Similar to the author of the DEH, the translator of the Arabic also completes a biblical trope that is partially included in the Hebrew text. In the SY, the mother says that she will become her son’s grave so that the dogs would not eat him (see section J8 below). This motif is most likely borrowed from the biblical idea that the scavenging of unburied corpses by dogs and birds of the sky is a sign of God’s judgment.270

The Hebrew text employs the same theme in SY 58, which recounts the death of Gaius after he refuses to grant favor to the Jewish embassy that came to him, led by Philo. The text

---

270 Compare with the following passages from the Hebrew Bible: “Anyone belonging to Jeroboam who dies in the city, the dogs shall eat; and anyone who dies in the open country, the birds of the air shall eat; for the LORD has spoken” (1 Kings 14.11).
reads, "On the third day the Lord awoke the spirit of his troops against Gaius. They jumped against him with drawn swords, shred him into pieces, until nothing was left to be buried. The dogs ate his flesh, for he had not been buried. So the Lord made his revenge on Gaius" (SY 58.24–27). The translator of the KAY must have had this biblical trope in mind when translating this section, and adds “…and birds of the sky” (وططور السماء) to the passage. The same addition, i.e. “…and birds of the sky” (የተለም ያሆን), also appears in the Ethiopic text.

I7. “I Have Decided to Kill You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolimitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I have already decided that I will kill you and give you rest from the famine” (KAY 7.7.35).</td>
<td>“Now behold, I have decided [that] I will kill you [so that] you may find relief from the famine” (ZA 7.7.46–47).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attempt to provide moral justification for the mother’s killing of her infant son that appears in the Christian versions of SY is perhaps most conspicuous in this passage than anywhere else. The pericope appears only in these two texts, and does not have a parallel in the texts antecedent to the Christian-Arabic version of SY. The mother tells her son that she is killing him in order to grant him rest from the famine. This idea is presented through slightly different syntax in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts. In the former, the mother tells her son, “I have already decided that I will kill you to grant you rest from the famine” (وﻗد راﯾت ان افتکلتستريح من الجوع) (KAY 7.7.35). In the Ethiopic text, she says to her son, “Now behold, I have decided that I will kill you and you will find rest from the famine” (መወስ እይታክሹ እያስተላሸው መወስር እምረኔ) (ZA 7.7.46–47).
7.7.46–47). Despite the small difference in grammar, the motif presented in the two texts is the same: the mother’s deed is committed out of love and mercy, not out of desperation or madness.

I8. “Womb to Tomb”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In that place where you took up your spirit, there a grave is prepared for you in your death” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 1–2]).</td>
<td>“Come and I will choose for you a grave within my womb, lest the dogs eat you. I will be a grave for you and you will be sustenance for me” (SY 86.16–18).</td>
<td>“Then I will eat you; after that I will make my womb, which carried you in it, your grave and I will satiate my hunger through you” (KAY 7.7.35–36).</td>
<td>“After that I will eat you and I will convert my womb that carried you so that it may be a grave for you and I will regain health from the famine by eating you” (ZA 7.7.47–48).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his expansion of the discourse of the mother to her son, the author of the DEH introduces the element of having the mother speak about her womb as the location of both life and death for her son. Thus in the Latin text, the mother tells her son that the same place where he “took up his spirit” (sumpsi spiritum), a tomb is prepared for him there. The author of the Hebrew SY introduces the term womb (נתן) in the transmission of this pericope, and has chosen to place the reference to scavenging dogs here instead of the preceding passage that refers to the absence of burials. The Hebrew text also invokes an element of quid pro quo, in which the mother portrays her offering of her womb as a grave as something to be exchanged for the sustenance provided by her son’s corpse. The motif of the mother’s quid pro quo appears later in the Latin text, but has been placed in this passage by the translator of the Hebrew text.
In the Arabic text, which follows its Hebrew Vorlage closely, the mother tells her son that she will convert her womb into a grave for him. Then she says, “…and I will satiate my hunger through you” (واسع بیک جوعی). The reference to the mother’s desire to satisfy her own hunger points back to the tormenting dilemma she faces as she contemplates her decision (see section G above). But it also tempers the moral justification for her deed provided by the translator of the Christian-Arabic text in the preceding passages (see especially sections I6 and I7 above). One finds a similar motif in the ZA: the mother first tells her son, “I will convert my womb…so that it may be a grave for you” (ወእሬስያለከርሥየ…ከመትኩንለከመቃብረ). Then she says, “I will regain health from the famine by eating you” (ወእጥዒእምረኀብበበሊዖትከ). Thus in this passage, the mother comes to a decision that will address both of her problems, as laid out in section H above. She will put a stop to her son’s suffering by killing him and to her own suffering by eating him. She will also fix the problem of the lack of burials for the dead. She is killing three birds, so to speak, with one stone.

I9. “This Will Be a Repayment”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…before hunger completely consumes you, restore to your mother what you have received; return to that hidden place (provided by) nature…” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 26–27]).</td>
<td>“Instead of the honor that was required of you (lit. upon you) to honor me, please feed me your flesh and provide support for my old age before the famine consumes you” (SY 86.18–19).</td>
<td>“This will be repayment [for] the benevolence that I was hoping you would perform for me” (KAY 7.7.36–37).</td>
<td>“This will be in place of the good things which I was hoping you would have” (ZA 7.7.48).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The motif of the mother presenting her son with a *quid pro quo* first appears in the *DEH*. Maria instructs her infant son to “return to your mother what you have received” (*reddite matri quod accepistis*), referring to his reception of his spirit in her womb. The author of the *DEH* employs this theme primarily as a literary way to depict the descent of the mother into madness. He does so in this passage by having the woman speak in unnervingly ironic terms. For example, the mother proceeds to address her son, sweet one (*dulcis meus*), which rings with irony given her subsequent and literal eating of him (*DEH* 5.40.2 [382, 24]). She then, foreshadowing the fact that she would divide up her son’s dead body into pieces, employs language that emphasizes her madness, as she seems to revel in the words: “your hands are fit for food. Oh, how sweet are your innards to me, how delicious your limbs…” (*idoneae ad cibum manus tuae. o suavia mihi uiscera tua, artus iucundi…*) (*DEH* 5.40.2 [382, 25–26]).

While it downplays the portrayal of madness, the Hebrew text does add a biblicizing motif to the mother’s speech. In her monologue in the Hebrew text she says, “instead of the honor that was required of you to honor me” (*ותחת כבוד אשר היה عليك לアルバני*). Such a command makes a striking allusion to one of the Ten Commandments, “honor your mother and father” (*כבד את אביך ואת אמה*) as listed in Exodus 20.

At this point in the mother’s discourse to her son, one finds a small divergence between the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic versions of *SY*. In the former, the mother focuses on the service that her son will provide for her, i.e. his becoming food for her. In the Ethiopic text, she focuses on the service she will provide for him, i.e. the conversion of her womb into his tomb. Thus in the *KAY*, the unnamed mother says to her son, “this will be a repayment [for] the good things I was hoping you would perform for me” (وْيَكُون ذَلِكَ عَمَالًا الَّذِي كَانَت اؤمَلًا تَفْعَلُهُ بِي) (*KAY* 7.7.36–37). In the *ZA*, she says, “This will be in place of the good things which I was
hoping you would have” (መከውንዝ መንገድ ይወያን ለእደፍ ከስሌጣን) (ZA 7.7.48). The translator of the
Ethiopic text has made this alteration to the Christian-Arabic text in order to more effectively
reassert the motif that the mother’s motivations for killing her son are positive and merciful in
nature.

I10. “Since I Carried You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Repay your mother that which she gave to you, since from my insides you went out and there you shall enter [again]” (SY 86.19–20).</td>
<td>“It will be appropriate because I carried you, suckled you, and you grew up in my care” (KAY 7.7.37).</td>
<td>“And you will do it with me and you will repay me since I carried you, suckled you, and raised you” (ZA 7.7.49).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The translator of the Hebrew text continues to biblicize the narrative by making another
illusion to the Hebrew Bible, this time hearkening back to the book of Job. In the SY, the mother
tells her son to repay what he has received (which is a command that first appears in the Latin
text). The she adds, “since from my insides you went out and there you shall enter [again]” (כממעיה יצאת ושם תבוא (SY 86.19–20). The terminology employed by the author of the
Hebrew text in this pericope closely parallels Job’s words that come at the end of Job 1. After
losing his great wealth and his children, Job says, “naked I came from my mother’s womb and
naked I shall return there” (ערם יצאתי בטן אמי וערם אשוב שם). While Job’s reference to his
mother’s womb (בטן) is metaphorical, here the author of the Hebrew text is able to employ it
literally, simultaneously couching his narrative in biblical tropes and heightening the dramatic nature of the story.

As was the case in the preceding passage, there is a slight difference between the way this passage is presented in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts. In the Arabic text, the woman tells her son that “it will be appropriate” (وھائن قد کافیتی) for him to serve as her food, since she suckled and took care of him. In the Ethiopic text, she says to her son, “you will do it with me and you will repay me” (ወትገብሮ ስሌየ ትፈድየኒ), since she suckled and took care of him. It is likely that the translator of the ZA modifies the text here because it is not very clear what the “it” refers to in the Arabic text when the mother says, “it will be appropriate.” The translator of the Ethiopic text mostly likely decides to insert the phrase “you will do it with me,” so as to once again portray the mother a little more positively, since she is thinking of giving her son a more cooperative (albeit not optional) role in her deed.

111. “You Will Be Granted a Great Gift”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“And now, my son, hear the voice of your mother and sustain my spirit and have mercy on me and your lot will be in the Garden of Eden” (SY 86.23–24).</td>
<td>“Through this you will attain an honor greater [than] the repayment and mercy” (KAY 7.37–38).</td>
<td>“[If] you follow my glory and my commandments, then through that you will be granted a great gift and payment” (ZA 7.7.49–50).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Christian-Arabic translator has decided to omit the Hebrew text’s insertion of an afterlife in the Garden of Eden as the reward for the mother’s son. Instead in the the KAY, the
mother tells her son that he will receive “an honor greater than the repayment”
(واکرامي...اعظم الجزاء), i.e. the repayment mentioned in section I9 above. The idea of the the son receiving a reward also re-emerges in the Ethiopic text. In the ZA the mother says to her son, “you will be granted a great gift and payment” (ወንቁት መጋቢት መቅጣት). Moreover, the translator of the Ethiopic text adds something to the Arabic here, namely the mother’s instructing her son by saying to him that you will only receive your reward if you “follow my commandments” (ወቻገን케 ይትእዛዝዎ). This insertion on the level of the Ethiopic text has most likely been made by the translator of the Ethiopic text in order to make this passage more consistent with the previous one, where the mother gives the son a more cooperative role in her deed.

I12. “A Disgrace to the Rebels”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Come, become for me food, for the rebels an avenging spirit, and for the world a story, the only one lacking from the disasters of the Jews” (BJ 6.207).</td>
<td>“Therefore be food for me, fury for the rebels, and a tale for life, which alone is lacking from our sustenance” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 5–7]).</td>
<td>“You will also become a [source of] shame for the rebels who took our sustenance” (SY 86.22–23).</td>
<td>“And this will be a disgrace upon those rebels who assaulted you (var. ‘us’) in this great affliction and increased the wrath of God against themselves” (KAY 7.7.38–39).</td>
<td>“And it will be a disgrace to those robbers who brought me to this great ruin and increased the wrath of God against themselves” (ZA 7.7.50–52).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While much of the discourse of the mother analyzed above traces its origins to the pen of Pseudo-Hegesippus, the mother’s words in this pericope go back to Josephus. The author of the War delivers his interpretation of the significance of the story of Maria through the mother’s
short monologue. Here I quote at length Chapman’s instructive reading of the rhetorical moves that Josephus makes in this passage:

The fact that [Maria] is addressing her own son and commanding him to serve a higher purpose through his death belongs to the tradition of the Jewish stories in 2 and 4 Maccabees describing the courageous mother who urges her seven sons to resist…Josephus, too, is telling a story of resistance to political power…against the rebels, whom the historian has been so careful to blame for the famine and the forthcoming destruction of Jerusalem. [Maria] offers an interpretation of what her baby’s death signifies: food, fury, and myth all rolled into one. On the practical level within the story, the baby will serve as “food” to alleviate the mother’s hunger. On the thematic level, the baby will play the tragic role of a “fury” after its death…Finally, the label of “myth” elevates the baby to a heroic role in a tragedy, which is a further clue to the nature of this particular narrative.271

The Latin text renders Maria’s words to her son in the Greek text rather literally; μοι τροφὴ is translation cibus mihi; τοῖς σταυροισταῖς ἐρινὺς is rendered furor latronibus; and τῷ βίῳ μόθος is translated as uitae fabula;272 the author does slightly emend the last part of this Josephan construction: where Josephus refers to the μόθος of Maria as ὁ μόνος ἔλλειπων ταῖς Ἰουδαίων συμφοραῖς (“the only one lacking from the disasters of the Jews”), Maria in the DEH calls her story quae sola deest nostris calamitatis (“which alone is lacking from our disasters”). The change here seems to be merely stylistic.

The author of the Hebrew text abbreviates Josephus’s three-part description of the significance of the story of Maria’s deed, as transmitted by the DEH. In the SY, the mother merely tells her son that he will become a source of shame for the rebels (לפריצים לחרפה). The references in the DEH to the story of Maria’s deed becoming “a tale of life” and the only one lacking from the misfortunes of the Jews is omitted. It appears that the translator of the Hebrew

272 Although Josephus employs the term βίος here to mean “world,” the translator of the Latin text reads it as “life,” the alternative and more common meaning of the Greek term.
text either deems certain parts of the three-part description as extraneous details or omits them because they are unclear.

Because Josephus’s three-fold description of the significance of Maria’s story does not survive its transmission through the Hebrew SY, it does not appear in the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic versions of the text either. Instead, the latter two texts only transmit the Hebrew text’s condemnation of the rebels through the mother’s discourse to her son. The translator does make one minor addition to the Hebrew text. He has the mother saying that the rebels “increased the wrath of God against themselves” (وزياة سخط الله عليهم). The insertion of this motif very much plays to the broader theme of understanding the rebellion and its consequences as divine punishment, which runs throughout the latter half of the Christian versions of SY.

113. “Our Story Will Endure”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Your case, however, is better and (has) a certain appearance of rightness, because it is more tolerable that you will have given your mother food...than that your mother is able to kill or devour you” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 8–11]).</td>
<td>“You will become for me and [a source of] satiation and shame so that it will be said that his mother killed him and ate him” (SY 86.24–25).</td>
<td>“Our story will continue to be passed through the ages and they will talk about it from generation to generation” (ZA 7.7.52–53).</td>
<td>“Our story will endure forever and they will tell it generation after generation” (KAY 7.7.39).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After transmitting Josephus’s three-part description of the significance of Maria’s story, the author of the DEH reasserts the tragic motif of necessity that compels the mother to eat her son. She asks her son a presumably rhetorical question: “What would you do, my son, if you too had a son?” (DEH 5.40.2 [383, 7]). The implied answer, given the context, is as clear as it is disturbing. She goes on to speak to her son in the first person plural form; she presumes to give her son agency, as she says, “We have done what is good, and we are doing what hunger urges” (DEH 5.40.2 [383, 7–9]). The author of the Latin text uses these words to set up her next words, in which Maria contemplates how their story would be received.

On the one hand, she conjectures that her son’s case (causa) at least has an “appearance of piety” (pietatis species), since he will be remembered for feeding is mother. On the other hand, she contemplates how she will be remembered less favorably than her son, since she would be remembered as “the mother who was able to kill and eat her son” (mater aut occidere potest aut deuorare). Through the insertion of this motif into the narrative, the author of the DEH succeeds in bringing the character of Maria’s son into sharper focus, which in turn heightens the tragic nature of the drama. Maria’s son is an almost-invisible victim in the Greek account; but by expanding the mother’s words to her son—and by having her contemplate the child future—Pseudo-Hegesippus creates a more compelling tragedy.

The translator of the Hebrew text has once again transmitted a truncated version of the passage that appears in the DEH. In the SY, Maria merely notes that her son will become a source of shame for her (והיָה לי...לחרפה), just as he would become a source of “shame for the rebels” (ולפריצים לחרפה). The translator of the Christian-Arabic text overhauls this passage at it appears in the Hebrew SY, and closes the mother’s discourse to her son by having her contemplate the afterlife of their story. In the DEH and the SY the mother has a two-pronged
assessment of how her deed will be remembered, one concerning how she will be remembered and the other concerning how her son will be remembered. In the Christian versions of SY, however, she speaks about her deed as “our story” (حديثنا; ḥadithanā), and contemplates its projected length across generations of storytellers.

J. The Woman Kills Her Son

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the same time as saying this, she killed her son… (BJ 6.208).</td>
<td>Saying this, she plunged the sword in with her faced turned away… (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 11–12]).</td>
<td>And it came to pass when she had spoken these words to her son that she seized the child with her hands, turned backwards, cut him with a knife, and killed him. And her eyes turned backwards and they did not see (SY 86.26–27).</td>
<td>Then the woman seized her son with one hand and took a knife with another hand. And after turning away her mind she turned her face away from him so as not to see him. Then she struck him with the knife and he died (KAY 7.39–41).</td>
<td>Then that woman leapt [up] and took her son with one of her hands and seized a knife with her other hand. She was faint of heart and she turned her face from him so that should would not see him. Then she pierced him with the knife and he died” (ZA 7.7.53–55).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the length of his introduction to Maria’s story, and the various actions and turns of events that lead to her horrible deed, it is interesting to note how little space Josephus dedicates to the description of the actual deed itself. He describes Maria’s killing in the briefest possible way, laconically stating, “at the same time as stating this she killed her son” (καὶ ταῦθ’ ἀμα λέγουσα κτείνει τὸν υἱόν). The terse nature of Josephus’s description is perhaps an
indication that the author does not wish to dwell on the infanticide for fear of its being interpreted in a manner unfavorable to his rhetorical objectives. It is clear that by the time he is writing the War, the story of Maria has become a point of invective against the Jews among Roman soldiers (see section T below).

The DEH adds one notable feature to Josephus’s account of the infanticide of the mother, which serves to humanize Maria. According to Pseudo-Hegesippus the mother plunged the sword (gladium demersit) with her face turned away (auerso uultu). Even after demonstrating her madness through the unnerving words she speaks to her son, the author portrays Maria as someone who still feels the heinous poignancy of the deed she is committing. Once again, this redactional move serves to accentuate the dramatic nature of the drama. The mother becomes more relatable and thus more tragic; in contrast, Josephus’s Maria, who appears to kill her son with very comparatively little reservation, is less relatable and thus arguably less tragic.

The author of the Hebrew text makes a couple of changes to the Latin text. First, in keeping with his program to coat the narrative in the grammar and tone of the Hebrew Bible, the author makes the transition from Maria’s discourse to her dead through the often repeated phrase, “and it came to pass” (ויהי). Second, against the usual redactional tendency of shortening the Latin text, the Hebrew SY actually expands its Latin Vorlage. The author provides even more details in describing the motions of the mother as she commits the tragic deed. Unlike the action in the DEH, in the SY, Maria seizes her son with her hand (ותאחז את הילד בידה) before killing him with a knife.

The Hebrew text also emphasizes the pain of the mother, by twice referring to her inability to look at her son as she kills him. The author notes that Maria turns backwards (ותפן אחורי) before killing her son, and ends this pericope by again noting that “her face turned
backwards and her eyes did not see” (SY 86.27). The emphasis on the mother’s pain and reluctance to kill her son not only bolsters the motif of necessity woven through the story, but also makes a connection with the author’s ultimate explanation that appears later in Titus’s discourse (see section C in chapter 5 of this dissertation). Maria is portrayed in the vein of biblical characters like Abraham and Jephthah, who when finding themselves in a situation that necessitated grave actions, very reluctantly choose to kill their own children.

The Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY follow their Hebrew predecessor closely in this passage, and the three passages that follow. As is the case in the Hebrew text, in the KAY and the ZA, one finds a detailed description of the mother’s hesitation in performing the deed of killing her son. Depicting her hesitation bolsters the objective on the part of the translators of the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts, both of whom wish to show the deep love that the mother holds for her son.

K. The Woman Roasts Her Son’s Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>then having roasted (him), she devoured half, and covering up the remainder, she kept it under guard (BJ 6.208).</td>
<td>...and cutting her son into pieces, she placed [him] in the fire; she ate a part, and a part she covered up lest someone should come upon it (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 12–14]).</td>
<td>She took the carcass of the child and cut it into pieces. She roasted it, cooked it, and ate it, and what was left over she saved for keeping (SY 86.27–28).</td>
<td>She took some of his flesh and roasted it over the fire and ate from it what she needed and kept what [remained] of his corpse for later use (KAY 7.7.41–42).</td>
<td>Thereafter she took some of his flesh and roasted it over the fire and she ate what she needed from it and put away what was left over (ZA 7.7.55–56).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Josephus closes this passage by noting that Maria covers up the remainder of her son’s roasted flesh and keeps it under guard (τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν κατακαλύψασα ἐφύλαττεν). This description reminds the reader of the atmosphere of danger created by the rebels under which the mother (see section A3 in this chapter) and the people (see section B in chapter 3) have suffered. The author of the DEH adds a conspicuous element to Maria’s deed. Whereas in the War, the mother roasts her child and consumes half (ἵμιον), in the DEH she places her dead son’s body in the fire only after cutting her son into pieces.

As Chapman has noted, the author of the DEH makes a more prescient connection with Agave in the Bacchae than does Josephus. Chapman writes, “One might wonder whether the author [of the DEH] knew that Josephus’s text was based in part on Euripides’s depiction of Agave in the Bacchae or was simply reminded of it and went to the source for more inspiration for this detailed presentation the dismembered baby.”273 In any case, Pseudo-Hegesippus utilizes the motif of a dismembered baby to once again heighten the tragic nature of the story. Whereas Josephus says she covers up the remains and keeps it under guard (ἐφύλαττεν), the DEH makes a more direct allusion to the danger of looting the mother faces by noting that she covers up the remains so that no one would come upon it (ne quis superueniret).

The Hebrew text transmits the emphasis on the mother's cutting of her son’s corpse into pieces. After she takes the carcass of the child, the SY reads, “she cuts it into pieces” (והזיחוההו). The author of SY then makes a change to the DEH; where the Latin text has the mother covering up the remains of her son’s corpse so that it would not be discovered (presumably by marauders), the Hebrew notes that Maria guards “the remainder” of the corpse “for keeping” (שמרה

In the Hebrew Bible, the term שמר can have the sense of protection; for example, in Ex. 23.20, God says to the Israelites, “I am going to send an angel in front of you to guard you (לִשְׁמַרךָ).” Therefore, the author of the Hebrew text could be employing this term in order to transmit the Latin text’s emphasis that the woman covers up the remainder of her son’s corpse in order to protect it from would-be thieves.  

While the Arabic and Ethiopic texts parallel the Hebrew SY closely in this pericope, in both texts there is an omission of the explicit reference to the mother’s cutting of her son’s corpse into pieces. Instead, the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopian texts note that the woman takes “some of the flesh” of her son and roasts it, implying (but not explicitly stating) that she does cut up at least a part of her son’s body.

L. The Rebels Enter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediately the rebels arrived, and drawing in the unholy odor, threatened that if she did not show what had been prepared, they would slaughter her immediately (BJ 6.209).</td>
<td>But the smell of that which had been burned reached the leaders of the revolt and immediately following the odor they entered the woman’s quarters threatening murder…(DEH</td>
<td>The smell also went to the leaders of the rebels and they came to the house of the woman with fierce anger…(SY 86.30).</td>
<td>Now when the aroma of that flesh ascended, the rebels and their companions rushed upon the woman with great anger (KAY 7.7.42–43).</td>
<td>Now when the smoke of that flesh arose and the robbers and their followers smelled it, they ran hastily and entered the house of that woman in a great rage (ZA 7.7.56–57).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

274 The term שמר is also used in Gen 41.35 to refer to the keeping of preservation of food, as Joseph instructs Pharaoh that the people should preserve the food produced in the years of plenty as provisions for the years of famine that would follow.
In the *War*, following the mother’s deed, the rebels arrive *immediately* and they threaten to kill her *immediately* if she did not produce what she has eaten. As Chapman has noted, the Greek text describing the arrival of the rebels has a “neatly chiastic” structure:

\[
εὐθέως δ᾽ οἱ στασιοσταὶ παρῆσαν καὶ τῆς ἀθεμίτου κνίσης σπάσαντες ἥπειλον εἰ μὴ δεῖξειν τὸ παρασκευασθὲν ἀποσφάξειν αὐτὴν εὐθέως (BJ 6.209).
\]

The *DEH* retains the fast-paced action of the Greek: the leaders of the rebel arrive at Maria’s house immediately (*continuoque*) after the smell of roasted flesh reaches them. The author of the Latin text also employs a couple of different terms to refer to the smell: when referring to the smell that wafts its way to the leaders of the rebels, the author employs the term (*nidor incensi*); when referring to the smell again as what the rebels follow to get to Maria’s house, the author employs the term *odor*.

At this point in the narrative, the Hebrew text follows its Latin *Vorlage* closely. However, the author of the *SY* does make a small change. In the *DEH*, the anger of the men who enter Maria’s house is communicated through Pseudo-Hegesippus’s comment that the leaders of the rebellion barge in “threatening murder” (*minantes necem*). In contrast, in the Hebrew text the reader finds a more generic description of the mood of the rebels, as the *SY* reads, “they entered the woman’s house with fierce anger” (ויבואו אל ביתה אשה בחור אפק). The change made here appears to be merely stylistic.

The action of the narrative following the woman’s roasting of her son in the Arabic and Ethiopic text closely parallels that of the Hebrew text. The translator of the Arabic text only makes one small change to his source: where the Hebrew text claims that it is the leaders of the*
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rebels who come barging into the woman’s house, the Arabic text states that it is “the rebels and their followers” (الخوارج واصحابهم) who rush upon the woman. The Ethiopic similarly reads, “the rebels and their followers…entered the house of that woman” (ወእሊአሆሙ ከባኡ ጋወት ለእቲ በእሳት).

M. The Rebels Question the Woman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-Yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...[threatening murder] because she had dared to eat while they were famishing and had excluded them from the food that she had discovered (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 16–17]).</td>
<td>and [they] said to her, “Why do you eat [while] we are dying from hunger?” (SY 86.31).</td>
<td>...and they said to her, “What was it that you were eating and where did you get this meat from and why did you eat it alone by yourself and not inform us about it?” (KAY 7.7.43–44).</td>
<td>And they said to her, “What were you eating and from where did you find (this meat) and why did you eat it alone before you informed us?” (ZA 7.7.57–59).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josephus once again keeps his story short and brief—this time in his description of the exchange between the rebels and Maria. There is no elaboration on the reason behind the fury of the rebels. Given earlier portrayals of them in the War, however, one can argue that Josephus expects his reader to fill in the gaps he leaves in the story. Pseudo-Hegesippus, in contrast, explicitly states the reason behind their anger: Maria dared to eat while they were famishing and excluded them from her meal (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 16–17]). The embellishment in this case is characteristic of the translator of the Latin text, who often expands Josephus’s account by
increasing the specificity of the details in the narrative. This scene is further elaborated in the following section, which concerns Maria’s words to the rebels.

The author of the Hebrew text chooses to present the complaints of the rebels first introduced in the *DEH* through direct discourse. In contrast to the narrative in the *BJ* and the *DEH*, the rebels speak to Maria in the *SY*, and ask her why she has eaten while they go without food. The Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts adopt the Hebrew text’s construction of the rebels’ questioning of the woman as direct discourse, and slightly expand the contents of the interrogation. In addition to asking the woman why she has eaten without before informing them that she had food, they also ask her, “what were you eating”? As the reader will soon find out, this is a question with an answer that the rebels will regret to learn.

N. The Woman’s Discourse to the Rebels

The discourse of Maria to the rebels that appears in the *DEH* is significantly longer than its counterpart in the *War*. Maria’s words to the rebels in the *SY* are truncated and edited versions of the words of the mother that appear in the *DEH*. The author of the Hebrew text chooses to avoid explicitly referring to the true nature of what Maria has cooked in order to heighten the dramatic nature of the revelation that she has cooked her son. The Arabic and Ethiopic versions of *SY* closely follow the outline of Maria’s discourse to the rebels as it appears in the Hebrew *SY*. The translator of the *KAY*, however, does make a few small changes to the content of the mother’s discourse, which are reproduced by the translator of the *ZA*. In particular, the theme of the mother’s deep love for her son is reiterated again in this section of the story.

As discussed above (see section F in chapter 3 of this dissertation), discourses become one of the major conduits employed by the various authors to deliver their arguments directly.
The discourse of the mother who kills and eats her child delivered to the rebels immediately following her deed is no exception. While Josephus presents Maria’s words through indirect discourse, beginning with the *DEH*, the authors of the subsequent texts build their rhetorical argument through a direct discourse given by the mother. In addition to converting indirect discourse to direct discourse, the author of the *DEH* also introduces several new elements to the mother’s discourse as it appears in the original Greek. I have divided up the motifs that appear in the mother’s discourse as it is present in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts into the following seven synoptic sections.

N1. “I Reserved for You the Larger Portion”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitanus</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...and she, having said that she had also saved a fine part for them, uncovered the remains of the child (<em>BJ</em> 6.209).</td>
<td>But she said: “Your part, I have saved for you; I was neither greedy nor inhumane. Do not be indignant; you have what you will eat. From my internal organs I have prepared food for you” (<em>DEH</em> 5.40.3 [383, 17–20]).</td>
<td>The woman answered and said to them, “Please do not let your anger burn against your maidservant! Behold I have preserved your portion” (<em>SY</em> 86.31–32).</td>
<td>The woman said to them, “Be merciful and do not hasten because I have not wronged you and have not loved myself more than you. But rather I have set aside for you a larger portion from what I ate” (<em>KAY</em> 7.7.44–45).</td>
<td>And the woman said to them, “Sit and do not hasten because I have not wronged you and I have not loved myself more than you. On the contrary, I set [aside] for you the larger portion from what I ate” (<em>ZA</em> 7.7.59–60).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

276 The gap in the Judeo-Arabic text, which begins in section G above, comes to a close at this point.
277 A scribal error at this point in the Judeo-Arabic text demonstrates the dependence on the text on a source written in Arabic letters. The Arabic term النصيت (translated here as “portion”) appears as 알נציב in the Judeo-Arabic text; the scribe has made the easy mistake of reading a َت as a ب (Sela, *The Arabic Book of Yosef Ben Gorion*, 2:667).
In line with his terse description of the actual deed of Maria, Josephus keeps brief his account of Maria’s words to the rebels. As indicated in the above synopsis, the mother’s words are given through indirect discourse. Josephus depicts Maria as referring to the remaining portion of the child’s corpse as “a fine portion” (μοῖραν καλῆν). That she would use such benign terminology at such a grave moment serves to further highlight the madness of the mother that Josephus wants to emphasize.

In the expanded and direct discourse that appears in the DEH, the mother begins her words to the rebels by transmitting Maria’s indirect discourse in the Greek, wherein she says to the rebels that she had saved a “fine portion” of what she had eaten for them. In the Latin, she says, “I have saved your part for you” (partem uestram uobis seruaui). She goes on to defend herself, saying, “I was neither greedy nor inhumane” (non fui auara nec inhumana). The claim to being humane rings as tragically ironic given the inhumane deed she has committed. Beginning a motif that is picked up subsequently in the SY tradition, the mother attempts to subdue the fury of the rebels by saying, “do not be indignant” (nolite indignari). She then makes a graphic reference to the inhuman table she is getting ready to set by telling the rebels, “I have prepared food for you from my internal organs” (de meis uobis uisceribus cibum paraui).

Once again the translator of the Hebrew text inserts biblical terminology into the narrative, transmitting the woman’s plea toward the rebels with reference to biblical allusions. The woman’s words to the rebels, “do not be angry with your maidservant” (אל נא יחר אפכם באמתכם) closely mimic the words spoken to Joseph by Judah in Gen 44.18: “do not be angry with your servant” (אל יחר אפך בעבדך). The woman’s saying that she has prepared food for the rebels from her internal organs is omitted by the author of the Hebrew SY. Instead, in the Hebrew text, the woman merely says to the rebels, “I have preserved your portion” (חלקכם).
This change could be seen in line with the tendency on the part of the author of **SY** to shorten the **DEH**. Alternatively, it could also be seen as a change made to make the subsequent revelation of Maria’s unusual meal more dramatic. The translator of the Arabic text chooses to omit the Hebrew’s use of this biblical phrase at this point in the narrative.

**N2. “Sit and I Will Set the Table”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayyud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Be seated quickly, I will arrange the table; you have to marvel at my service and to judge that you have found in no woman such a disposition, who would not defraud you of the favor of her sweet son” (<strong>DEH</strong> 5.40.3 [383, 20–23]).</td>
<td>“Please sit and I will set the table before you and you will eat your portion which I have set aside for you” (<strong>SY</strong> 86.32–33).</td>
<td>“Recline until I bring it to you” (<strong>KAY</strong> 7.7.45).</td>
<td>“Recline, all of you, until I bring [it] out for you” (<strong>ZA</strong> 7.7.61).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author of the **DEH** expands Maria’s discourse to the rebels through another passage meant to emphasize the depth of the mother’s madness. Maria instructs the rebels to sit quickly then says “I will set the table” (**mensam adponam**). Here, as Chapman puts it, the mother behaves “like a good hostess.”²⁷⁸ She acts in accordance with the protocols of conventional hospitality. However, the situation is far from conventional, and Maria’s apparent failure to

recognize that fact adds a different dimension to the rhetorical portrayal of her mental state. Right before she presents her dead son’s body as food, the mother makes the first of several of her challenges to the rebels, telling the rebels that they must judge and see that they would not find another woman like her “who would not cheat you even of the favor of her sweet son” (*quae uos nec dulcis filii fraudaret gratia*).

As in the preceding pericope, the Hebrew version of this passage also shortens the Latin *DEH*. In the Latin text, the words of the woman to the rebels right before she places the corpse of her son before them serve both to demonstrate her madness and to foreshadow the unusual meal she subsequently uncovers. The author of the Hebrew text, in contrast, more effectively maintains the suspense of the narrative by having Maria surreptitiously refer to what she has set aside as the rebels’ “portion” (منظمة) and not as “my sweet son” (*dulcis filii*), before she discloses the true nature of what she has prepared for the rebels. The Arabic and Ethiopic texts follow the Hebrew *SY* in not disclosing the true nature of the meal that the mother has prepared.

### N3. The Woman Presents Her Son’s Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saying this, she at the same time uncovered the scorched limbs and offered them for banqueting with the encouragement of a speech of this kind: <em>(DEH</em></td>
<td>She set the table before them… <em>(SY 86.34)</em></td>
<td>So the men sat down and she went and set up the table before them and brought out what she had kept of the corpse of her son and placed it on the table</td>
<td>So the men sat down and the woman went and spread out the table before them and brought out what was left over from the flesh of her son and placed it on the table</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the War, Josephus notes that Maria “uncovered the remains of the child” (τὰ λείψανα τοῦ τέκνου διεκάλυψεν) right after providing her short indirect discourse (BJ 6.209). The author of the DEH makes the ghastly revelation more graphic, with a repeated reference to the disremembered parts of the dead infant. In contrast, even in its description of the mother’s presentation of the unusual meal, the Hebrew text does not explicitly refer to the corpse of the child. Instead, the SY simply reads, “[the woman] set the table before them” (תרעותו לפני השולחן). Once again, the absence of explicit references to the true nature of what she has cooked serves to heighten the dramatic aspect of the moment when Maria finally tells the rebels what it is that they had smelled.

In contrast to the suspense that the author of the Hebrew SY builds by withholding the true nature of the mother’s meal, the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic versions of the text at this point make the unsettling revelation. In addition to transmitting the Hebrew text’s veiled description, “she set the table before them,” the Christian versions of SY also go on to describe what she places on the table: “what was left over from the flesh of her son” (موابقى من جثة ابنها; ወንተርፈ እምሥጋወልዳ). The translator of the Christian-Arabic text has chosen to make the revelation earlier perhaps because this particular author wants to focus more attention not on a dramatic disclosing of the contents of the meal, but rather on the words that the mother speaks after she presents her son’s corpse to the men. As discussed below, her words reiterate some themes that are important to the translator of the Christian-Arabic text.
N4. “This is My Son Whom I Loved”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-ayhūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediately a shudder and shock took hold of them, and they froze at the sight; and she said “This is my very own child and my deed” (BJ 6.210).</td>
<td>“This is my meal, this your portion…behold one hand of the boy, behold his foot, behold half of the rest of his body, and you should not think him another’s; the son is mine, do not suppose this is the work of another, I did it, I carefully divided, for me, what I might eat, for you, what I would preserve” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 25–29]).</td>
<td>…and she said, “Eat your meal! Behold your portion which I have kept for you. Behold the hand of the child, behold his foot and behold his pieces before you. And do not say he is the child of another woman because he is my child! I gave birth to him and I ate him and I also preserved your portion” (SY 86.34–37).</td>
<td>And she said to the men, “This is my son, most beloved of all creatures. I killed him with my hands [when] the famine grew heavy on me and I ate from his flesh his limbs and body. I saved it from his flesh and I saved it; see the greater part of it is for you” (KAY 7.7.63–64).</td>
<td>Then she said to them, “This is my son, whom I loved more than everyone. I killed him with my [own] hand [and] when I was hungry I ate from his flesh and his limbs. I left [some] for you” (ZA 7.7.63–64).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this passage, Josephus continues his depiction of Maria as a tragic figure by using terminology reminiscent of Greek tragedies. Maria calls her killing and subsequent eating of her own son her “deed” (ἔργον). The reaction of the rebels also serves to depict the scene as spectacle; the rebels “froze at the sight” (παρέκκλησας ἦσε καὶ παρὰ τὴν ὅψιν), drawing attention to the sensationally tragic nature of Maria’s “deed.” The author of the DEH chooses not to adopt Josephus’s insertion of the reaction of the rebels to seeing the corpse of Maria’s son. Instead he lengthens the mother’s words to the guests, before turning to describing their reaction.
In addition, in this passage and the next (see sec. O5 below), Pseudo-Hegesippus also alters Maria’s words in the Greek text in order to avoid terminology present in the New Testament. In the War, after she places her dead son’s corpse in front of them, Maria says to the rebels this is my child (ἡ δ᾽ ἐμὸν ἐφή τούτο τέκνον) (BJ 6.210). In the DEH, in contrast, she says to them “this is my meal, this your portion” (hoc est prandium meum, haec uestra portio) (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 25–26]). The author of the Latin text has perhaps avoided translating the term child here so as to avoid any comparisons with a familiar passage that appears in the Gospels, wherein a voice is heard from heaven to say “this is my son.”

While the author of the DEH seems to be working to avoid language too reminiscent of the New Testament, he does make more allusions to Greek tragedies. In the Latin text, the discourse of Maria focuses on the dismembered nature of her son’s corpse. While she never says, “this is my child,” she does itemize her son’s body parts for the rebels. As Chapman has noted, the DEH’s emphasis on the the dismembered body here may have been influenced by the story of Agave in the Bacchae and the myth of Thyestes. That the author of the DEH may have had the latter story in mind when composing his account of Maria is supported by what Titus says later in the narrative in response to hearing about the story Maria: “We thought the feast of Thyestes a fable, but we see a scandal; we see a truth more atrocious than the tragedies” (DEH 5.41.4 [387, 17–18]). In this way, the author of the Latin text expands this motif; the mother not only says that the dead corpse was her son, but also confesses that she divided up his body herself. All of these additions serve to heighten the dramatic nature of the story, both by making

279 For example, cf. with the following: “And a voice from heaven said, ‘This is my Son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased’” (Lk 3.22); “And a voice came from heaven, ‘You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased’” (Mt 3.17); “And the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form like a dove. And a voice came from heaven, ‘You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased’” (Mk 1.11).
allusions to Greek tragedies and by portraying Maria as a loving mother who has gone mad, thereby making her more relatable and her story more tragic.

When considering this passage in the SY, one finds that it is only at this point in the Hebrew text that Maria finally reveals the true nature of the meal she has prepared. The mother tells the rebels that the portion (חלק) she has prepared for them is actually her son. Just as in the DEH, Maria also itemizes her son’s body parts for the rebels and emphatically makes clear that it is her son and not someone else’s. In the Hebrew text, the mother goes even farther to emphasize that it is her son that is before them and it is she that has killed him: she says, “I gave birth to him and I ate him” (SY 86.34–37).

The Arabic text picks up the mother’s discourse to the rebels by re-emphasizing the theme of the mother’s deep love for her son. What she says to the rebels at this point in the narrative in the KAY and the ZA is different from what she says at the same point in the narrative in the SY. In the latter, the woman says to the rebels, “eat your meal” (אכלו ארוחכם). This puts the emphasis on the punishment of the rebels, who as the text proceeds to argue, are deserving of their portion of such a meal. In contrast, in the Christian versions of SY, the mother says to the rebels “this is my son, most beloved of all creatures” (וְלֵדָיו וּאֱעֶזֶה אֲלֹהָיו) and “this is my son, whom I loved more than anyone” (זֶה וּלָדֵי וְעַזָּם הַחֵלָכָה). Here again the motif of the mother’s bond with her son resurfaces, in order to make the mother a more relatable figure and her deed a more tragic event.

N5. “Eat and Be Satisfied”

| Bellum Judaicum | De Excidio Hierosolimitano | Sefer Yosippon | Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd | Zena Ayhud |
“Eat, for I, too, have eaten. Do not be softer than a woman or more compassionate than a mother” (BJ 6.211).

“Taste and see that my son is sweet. Do not wish to become softer than a mother, weaker than a woman” (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 11–12]).

Then the woman said to them, “Please eat and be satisfied because I have satisfied myself with my son! Taste and see how sweet my son is! Do not let your mercy be stirred more than mine” (SY 86.42–44).

“Eat and be satisfied and do not become more merciful than me toward my son…” (KAY 7.7.47–48).

“Eat and be satisfied. You will not be [better] than me [with respect] to the strength of [your] mercy toward my son” (ZA 7.7.64–65).

Josephus continues his depiction of Maria as a tragic figure, this time by making allusions to the story of Agave in the Bacchae, as well as to the story of Medea. Maria calls her son’s body her “sacrifice” (θυσία), in much the same way that Medea call the deaths of her children her “sacrificial offerings” before she kills them. 281 Maria also invites the rebels to join her in eating her sacrifice, in a fashion similar to Agave’s invitation to the choir to “share her banquet” after she mistakenly kills her son Pentheus. 282 In using this model, Josephus makes Maria a tragic figure in the vein of Medea and Agave, in order to invite the sympathy of his audience for the sufferings of the Jews.

In his adaptation of the War, the author of the DEH once again seems to be avoiding terminology familiar to Christians. Josephus employs the term φάγετε, or “eat!” But in the Latin text, the mother says to the rebels, “taste.” The change may have been made because Maria’s words in the Greek, i.e. “this is my child…eat” (ἡ δ’ ἐμὸν ἔφη τούτο τέκνον…φάγετε) may have struck the Christian ears of the author of the DEH as too parallel to the words of Christ at

282 Ibid.
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the Last supper. For example, in Matthew 26:26, Jesus says, “take and eat, this is my body”
(λάβετε φάγετε, τούτο ἐστίν τὸ σῶμά μου). In addition to avoiding New Testament
terminology, the term also hearkens back to the mother’s madness. Calling attention to the
deliciousness of her son’s body emphasizes the mother’s break with sanity, thus making her
story fall in line with the contours of Greek tragedy.

In this passage, the author of the Hebrew text closely transmits the contents of the DEH.
Following the words of the mother in the Latin text, the mother in the SY instructs the rebels to
taste how sweet her son is and then challenges them to not be more compassionate than she had
been. While the Arabic and Ethiopic texts maintain the motif of the mother’s challenge to the
rebels, the two texts omit her telling the rebels to taste and see how sweet her son is. The
omission can be explained by the fact that this motif is a construct of the DEH’s effort to portray
the madness of Maria, and the correlated fact that the translators of the Christian-Arabic and
Ethiopic texts show little interest in this motif. Thus in the latter two texts, the mother simply
says the rebels, “eat and be satisfied.”

N6. “Do Not Let Your Hearts Become Weak”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhībār al-ayahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“See to it that it is not a reproach to you that a woman is discovered to be braver than you, who takes up the banquets of men” (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 15–17]).</td>
<td>“…and do not let your hearts soften more than mine because it is shameful for men of war to be more soft of heart than the heart of a woman” (SY 86.44–45).</td>
<td>“…and do not let your hearts be weak because of this since it will be disgraceful for brave ones like yourselves that a woman be stronger of heart”</td>
<td>“Do not [let] your hearts be afflicted concerning this because it will be disgraceful for strong [men] like yourselves that a woman be stronger of heart”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The author of the Latin text once again ornaments the Greek account by adding more challenging remarks to the discourse of the mother to the rebels. In addition to the challenge of the mother present in the Greek text, in the DEH Maria refers to her son’s corpse as the feast of men (epulas uirorum). In doing so, the mother reasserts the fact that if the rebels refused to eat her son’s body, they would be discovered as weaker than a woman. The designation of her son’s corpse as epulas uirorum contrasts with the author’s subsequent assertion (which appears only in the Latin text) that after their encounter with Maria, the rebels begin to check the foods that they seized so that they would not come upon similar foods (see section R below).

In the Hebrew text, continuing her challenge to the rebels, Maria calls the rebels “men of war” (אַנָּשֵׁי הָהָמִІָּכָה), in order to more dramatically contrast the strength of their hearts with hers. The Arabic and Ethiopic texts faithfully reproduce the continuation of the mother’s challenge to the rebels as it appears in the Hebrew SY.

O7. “You Brought This Great Ruin”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I indeed have prepared such banquets, but you have made a mother feast in this way. And suffering was holding me but necessity conquered”</td>
<td>“For it is appropriate to arrange a table like this before mighty men like yourselves. Indeed I have arranged this meal and it is prepared on account of you”</td>
<td>“In addition to this, you are required to agree to the matter and not quarrel, since you brought this horrible tragedy on me and on the people and did not have”</td>
<td>“And it is obligatory for you [to be] in agreement with this and not quarrel because you are the ones who brought upon me and upon all the people this great”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(DEH 5.40.4 [384, 17–19]).

because you caused me to arrange a meal such as this” (SY 86.46–48).

mercy on us, until we reached this condition” (KAY 7.7.49–50).

ruin. You had no mercy up to the point that we arrived at this affair” (ZA 7.7.66–68).

This part of her speech turn the focus of the attention on the rebels, who are previously portrayed in the manner of dogs (see section I6 above). For the author of the DEH, the rebels serve as the hand which afflicts the body of which it is a member. They are the conduit of divine punishment, and in this case, they fulfill that role by forcing an innocent mother to kill, roast, and eat her son. At the close of Maria’s discourse to the rebels, the Hebrew text follows its Latin Vorlage in shifting the focus of the narrative to the crimes of the rebels. Just as is the case in the DEH, in the SY the mother blames the rebels for the deed she has committed and identifies them as the cause of her misfortune. This trope is succinctly summarized by the author of the SY, who closes Maria’s discourse to the rebels by having her say to them, “you caused me to arrange a meal such as this” (SY 86.46–48).

The final words of the mother addressed to the rebels are slightly different in the Hebrew SY and the KAY/ZA. While in the former text the mother blames the rebels for her own misfortunes, in the latter two texts, she blames them both for her own misfortunes and the misfortunes of all the people. This addition can be explained with reference to the KAY and ZA’s portrayal of the rebellion against Rome as a symptom of divine punishment. By having the mother blame the rebels for the misfortunes of all the people, the Arabic and Ethiopic texts situate the tragedy of the cannibalistic mother within the larger context of the tragedy of the rebellion.
The reaction of the rebels to witnessing Maria’s deed represents an important moment in Josephus’s portrayal of them in the War. Josephus depicts the rebels as entirely irrational and cold throughout the War. These horrible men, who are unmoved by the suffering of the people or even by the burning of the Temple (arguably the most momentous event of the war) are moved only by one sight: Maria’s son. By describing their reaction in this way, Josephus further highlights the uniqueness of Maria’s story. This in turn highlights the uniqueness and greatness of the Jewish War against Rome.

Neither the DEH nor the SY describe the actual exit of the rebels from Maria’s house. The Arabic text has noticed the absence of the rebels’ exit from the woman’s house and has decided to insert a scene describing this action. As a result, a coincidental agreement appears between the Greek text and the Arabic and Ethiopian versions of SY, despite the gaps on the level of the Latin and Hebrew texts. Interestingly, the terms used for “the rebels” throughout the narratives in the Christians Arabic texts, i.e. الخوارج and ِ partido, are not employed in this instance. Instead in the Christian-Arabic text “the people” (القوم) go out from the house, and in the Ethiopic text “the men” (ዕደው) exit the woman’s house. Given the otherwise consistent reference to the rebels with
the terms mentioned above (see section B in chapter 3 of this dissertation), the variants here appear to be merely stylistic.

P. The Spread of the News of the Mother’s Deed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But the whole city was immediately filled with the news of this abomination, and everyone, picturing the tragic scene in their mind’s eye, felt a shiver as if they themselves had gone that far (BJ 6.212). 283</td>
<td>The impious act of such great wickedness immediately filled the whole city and each person trembled as if the service of the parricidal banquet was placed before his eyes (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 20–22]).</td>
<td>Now the matter was heard throughout the whole city and the Jews mourned exceedingly (SY 86.51).</td>
<td>The story of the woman became famous in the city and the people were very shocked by it… (KAY 7.51).</td>
<td>And the story of the woman was heard in the whole city and the people were disturbed by this matter and [even] a brave one was disturbed…(ZA 7.7.69–70).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josephus, who has already noted in his preface that the story of Maria gains fame among both Jews and Romans, notes that the whole city hears about the mother’s deed immediately. Then he adds that each person in the city shuddered (ἕφριττε) as if the tragic event (τὸ πᾶθος) was something personally dared by her/him (ὡςπέφρω αὐτῷ τὸλμηθὲν) (BJ 6.212). In doing so, Josephus presents the tragedy of Maria as something that afflicts the Jews as a whole. The people of the city feel the pain of the mother, in the same way that Josephus says he feels the pain of his people in his introduction to the War. 284

283 In this passage, I have chosen to use Martin Hammond’s translation.
284 In his introduction to the War, Josephus writes, “But if any one makes an unjust accusation against us, when we speak so passionately about the tyrants, or the robbers, or sorely bewail the misfortunes of our country, let him indulge my affections herein, though it be contrary to the rules for writing history;
In this passage, the Latin text preserves the content and structure of this passage in the Greek Vorlage quite faithfully, while changing some of the terminology. τοῦ μύσος (or “the defilement”) is translated as sceleris, “the crime,” which immediately fills the whole city (repleuit continuo totam urbem). Instead of having the people place the tragedy (τὸ πάθος) before their eyes, the author of the Latin text specifies that it is the “service of the parricidal feast” (parridalis convivii ministerium). The author of the Hebrew text omits the motifs present in Josephus’s description of the people’s reaction to the story of Maria, as transmitted by the DEH. Instead, the author of SY simply notes that “the Jews mourned exceedingly” (ויתאבלו ההודים מאד).

The Arabic and Ethiopic texts closely follow the Hebrew SY’s rendition of the reaction of the city to the news of the mother’s deed. Only one slight change is made to the narrative in these two texts: where the Hebrew text states that the Jews mourned exceedingly, the KAY and the ZA read, “the people were shocked” ( millennials). Even though this is a minor change, the choice of shock over sadness is not accidental. In the following passage, the Arabic and Ethiopic texts highlight a theme that is important to understanding the place and function of the story of the unnamed mother within the two texts. The most important function of this story is that it becomes the instrument by which the blindness of the people, which caused them to rebel against Rome in the first place, is finally lifted. The divine hand thus uses the “shock” of because it had so come to pass, that our city Jerusalem had arrived at a higher degree of felicity than any other city under the Roman government, and yet at last fell into the sorest of calamities again. Accordingly, it appears to me that the misfortunes of all men, from the beginning of the world, if they be compared to these of the Jews are not so considerable as they were; while the authors of them were not foreigners neither. This makes it impossible for me to contain my lamentations. But if anyone be inflexible in his censures of me, let him attribute the facts themselves to the historical part, and the lamentations to the writer himself only” (BJ 1.11–12).
the story of the cannibalistic mother to break the wickedness and obstinacy of the people in
general and the rebels in particular.

Q. The Threatening Matter from God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...and the threat was verified, which threatened them from the direction of God, exalted and magnified, and they were convinced to learn that the end had awoken upon them (KAY 7.7.51–52).</td>
<td>...and they contemplated the threatening matter concerning them, which preceded from God, the glorious and exalted (ZA 7.7.70–71).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The function of the story of the unnamed mother within the wider narrative of the Jewish Revolt against Rome as recounted in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts is outlined in two stages. In stage one, which appears in this passage, these versions of SY describe a “threatening matter” that proceeds from God. This addition to the Hebrew text continues a theme introduced in the beginning of the Revolt in Chapter 6.4 of the KAY/ZA: the dire consequences of the Revolt were sent by God against the Jews. The people, especially the rebels, are blind to the workings of the divine hand and thus rebel against it. It is not until they hear about the tragic story of the cannibalistic mother that their eyes are opened to the judgment of God that has been sent against them. Their (albeit too little to late) recognition of this fact sets up the end of the war and the destruction of the Temple, which immediately follows the chapter containing the story of Maria.
R. The Rebels Break

After this the inciters of the rebellion themselves also began to check what foods they seized, lest they should find similar food and consume it unaware (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 22–25]).

The leaders of the rebels were also humbled by this affair because it was a great matter in their eyes (SY 86.51–53).

And the rebels were fractured and cowardice entered their hearts. And they left alone the people going out of the city (KAY 7.7.52–53).

And the robbers contemplated their works and were broken [apart] and their hearts became weak and they sent away the people who were going out (ZA 7.7.71–72).

Although Pseudo-Hegesippus never describes the actual exit of the rebels from the stage of Maria’s domicile, he returns to the effect of the encounter with the infanticidal and cannibalistic mother on them after discussing the spread of the news of the tragedy in the city. The rebels are called the inciters of the rebellion (incentores seditionis), and they are portrayed as fearful of encountering other similar food (ne similes escas inuenirent). The translator of the Hebrew text again shortens his Latin source, omitting the reference to the rebels’ taking care not to come across foods similar to the one presented to them by Maria. He describes the leaders of the rebels as becoming humbled by the affair (שרי הפריצים נכנעו לדבר הזה).

The second stage describing the function of the story of the unnamed mother in the Arabic and Ethiopic texts is presented in this passage. The tragic and shocking nature of the mother’s story becomes the instrument by which the divine hand breaks both the morale and the cohesion of the rebels. The Arabic text states that they “became fractured and cowardice entered their hearts” (وضعفت قلوبهم وانكس), The Ethiopian text similarly notes, “their hearts became weak”
In addition, both the Arabic and Ethiopic texts state that the rebels finally allow the people to go out to the Romans. This is a critical addition to the narrative, since the rebels’ imprisoning of the people inside the city had served as a sign of their irrationality and obstinacy. By adding this detail to the reactions of the rebels to the story of the unnamed mother, the translators of the Arabic and Ethiopic texts succeed in portraying it as the straw that broke the rebels’ back and spurs the end of the rebellion.

S. The People Go Out to the Romans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum</th>
<th>De Excidio</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-Yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judaicum</td>
<td>Hierosolymitano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tragic event was quickly reported also to the Romans. Some of them disbelieved, others felt pity, but it happened that the majority proceeded to a more intense hatred of the nation (BJ 6.214).</td>
<td>The brutality of this deed even reached the Romans. For very many, terrified by this horror, fled to the enemy (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 26–27]).</td>
<td>Many of the people went out from Jerusalem to the camp of the Romans with everything that they had (SY 86.53–54).</td>
<td>At that time many people went out from the city to the Romans, and they did not prevent them (KAY 7.7.53).</td>
<td>At that time many people went out from the city to the Romans, and they did not prevent them (ZA 7.7.72–73).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josephus concludes his account of the story of Maria by describing the various reactions of the Romans to the story. He describes a three-part reaction on the part of the Romans, who exhibit either incredulity, pity, or hatred upon hearing the story. All three responses inform themes that are important to Josephus. First, Josephus desires to combat accusations that he has made up the story, and his anticipation of this charge surfaces in this passage. Second, Josephus here makes a more explicit mention of his ultimate objective of inviting the sympathy of his
audience. Lastly, Josephus notes that the story of Maria leads to “a more intense hatred of the nation,” perhaps as a way to provide an explanation for the subsequent ferocity of the Romans (whom he works to portray as merciful throughout the War).285

The author of the DEH omits the reference to the hatred of the nation because the reaction of the Romans will be described in the discourse of Titus, which follows the story of Maria. In the DEH, the story of Maria leads not only to the Roman hatred of the Jews, but also to the permanent condemnation of the Jews under the rhetorical program of this Christian invective. In transmitting the Latin text’s account of the exodus of the people of Jerusalem to the Romans, the Hebrew texts adds that they leave “with everything that they had” (םו כל אש ו). This addition does not appear in the Latin text and it is not preserved in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY. The translators of the Arabic and Ethiopic texts here reiterate the important point that the rebels cease preventing the people from going out to the Romans. For a discussion of the importance of this point, see section R above, where the story of the cannibalistic mother is portrayed as the final straw that breaks the resolve of the rebels.

4.3 Conclusion: The Reception of the Story of Maria

In the process of transmission from Josephus’s first-century history to the fourteenth-century Zena Ayhud, the story of Maria of Bethezouba undergoes several changes. The sensational nature of the story allows it to become a powerful tool for delivering the rhetorical

285 Chapman points out the interesting wordplay that Josephus employs in this passage. She writes, “We now receive the mixed audience response of Jews in the city and of the Roman soldiers just outside of it. Josephus engages in wordplay when the ’mythos’ of the mother’s deed gets out and is interpreted by the residents of Jerusalem as a ’mysos’, an abomination…The triple wordplay creates a causal link and explanation for the events to follow: the mythos of the baby’s mysos inflames Roman misos” (Chapman, “Spectacle and Theater in Josephus’s Bellum Judaicum,” 97).
and pedagogical objectives of each individual author and translator involved in the reception his of this story. The character of the mother who kills and eats her child, as well as the significance of the mother and her story, change several times over.

In the *War*, Josephus seeks to show that the story of Maria is a truthful and tragic fabula which sets the stage and provides the explanation for the destruction of the Temple. He emphasizes the uniqueness of the story in order to buttress his claim that the “greatness” (μέγιστον) of the Jewish War against Rome. He employs the elements of Greek tragedy to elicit pity from his audience, portraying her as a tragic victim of the fury of the rebels. Because Maria represents the Jewish people as a whole, by inviting pity for her, Josephus succeeds in inviting pity for the sufferings endured by the Jewish nation as a whole. Yet Josephus is also careful not to spend too much time on the story of Maria. While it is one of the most dramatic spectacles he recreates in his history, in comparison with the later traditions, he is relatively terse. This is most likely the case because he is aware of the negative attention that the story of the cannibalistic mother has garnered for the Jews.

In the *DEH*, the author of the Latin text employs his rhetorical skills to flesh out the skeletal narrative of his Greek source. In the beginning of the story, he portrays Maria as a woman accustomed to luxuries (*deliciis adsueta*) who undergoes unbearable suffering when she fails to find relief from the famine. He goes further than Josephus in emphasizing her desire to die, as she seeks an assassin (*percussor*). This point, taken together with the expanded discourse to her son, makes the mother appear more human and easier to relate to than the portrait of Maria present in the Greek text, where the move from the beginning of the story to Maria’s deed takes

286 The Arabic and Ethiopic texts, for example, not only follow the *DEH* and the *SY* in dedicating a lot of space to Maria’s story, but also organize all the other references to the famine in Jerusalem around the story.
place much more quickly. Such a portrayal serves to accentuate the tragic nature of the story, so that the author of the *DEH* could achieve his ultimate rhetorical objective of illustrating the severity of the sufferings endured by the Jews. The Latin text expands the elements of tragedy that are inserted into the narrative by Josephus. One such element that surfaces numerous times throughout the Latin text is the motif of necessity. Expanding upon the Greek text, the mother in the Latin text refers to the necessity of her deed several times, especially in her discourse to her son.

Moreover, the tragedy of Maria is couched within the context of the strife between the rebel factions that is raging inside the city. The viciousness of the rebels becomes the primary cause for the tragic turn that the story of Maria from Peræa takes. The author of the *DEH* places this tragic necessity within the framework of the divine punishment leveled against the Jews for their crimes against Christ (see section 2.5 in chapter 2 of this dissertation for a more detailed discussion of this theme). Because the Jews rejected Christ, they receive the rebellion and the famine as signs of God’s disfavor. Pseudo-Hegesippus is careful to situate Maria’s deed in the context of the strife among the rebel factions and their viciousness toward the people of Jerusalem. They make the infanticide-cannibalism necessary. Moreover, because Maria represents the Jewish people, the rebels are portrayed as making such a feast necessary not only for the poor mother, but for all the Jews.

The account of the story of Maria that appears in the *SY* can concisely be described as a truncated version of the story that appears in the *DEH*. Many of the stylistic embellishments introduced to the story by Pseudo-Hegesippus have been omitted. The omission of many biographical details results in the omission of the elements of Greek tragedy that are present in the *War* and the *DEH*. In their place, the author of *SY* inserts biblical allusions, placing the story
of the mother who kills and eats her child in the same category as tragedies that inflict biblical characters.

Such a rhetorical move has the effect of situating the terrible results of the Jewish Revolt in general and the story of Maria in particular within the framework of a Jewish understanding of divine punishment and reward based on the degree of the Jews’ observance of God’s covenant. In the end, the author of SY actually downplays the significance of Maria’s story, in sharp contrast to all the other texts being examined here. For the producer of the Hebrew text, the ultimate function of Maria’s story is to point to the crimes of the rebels and Jewish leaders. This argument is fleshed out by the author in the discourse delivered by Titus after Caesar hears about Maria’s deed (see chapter 5 of this dissertation).

Lastly, in their adaptation of the Hebrew SY, the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY introduce several new elements to the story of the cannibalistic mother. Most notably, both texts omit the woman’s name, since Maria shares her name with a more famous figure in the Christian tradition. The translators of the two texts also work to make the mother more sympathetic, by emphasizing the motif of the deep love that the mother has for her son. As a result, the moment that the mother decides to kill and eat her son becomes more dramatic in the KAY and the ZA than it is in the preceding texts. The drama of the mother’s infanticide is heightened by the translators of the two texts because they use its sensationalism to highlight the function of the story in the larger narrative of the two histories. The story of Maria becomes the final instrument used by God to break the obstinacy of the rebels. After the rebels are defeated, then the judgment of God is made manifest through the destruction of the Temple and the deaths of the people.

Tracing the changes made to the story of Maria throughout its transmission in this reception history has already revealed a lot about the cultural and intellectual contexts within
which each one of these texts was produced. However, the texts that receive Josephus’s account also go on to provide commentaries of their own in the form of a discourse delivered through the mouth of Titus. In the following chapter, I provide a synoptic analysis of Titus’s discourse as it appears in each text, and examine how each the author of each text seeks to interpret both the story of Maria and the Jewish Revolt as a whole.
CHAPTER FIVE
THE RECEPTION OF THE DISCOURSE OF TITUS

5.1 Introduction to the Reception of the Discourse of Titus

Following the account of the unnamed mother who kills and eats her child, chapter 7.7 of the Zena Ayhud presents a short discourse that is delivered by Titus in reaction to the news of the mother’s terrible deed. The translators of the Arabic and Ethiopic texts follow the authors of the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew texts in employing Titus’s reaction to the story of the cannibalistic mother to deliver their rhetorical objectives. It is Josephus who first uses the words of Titus to present his own interpretation of the importance of the story of Maria. The authors who transmit Josephus’s history not only preserve this discourse that follows account of Maria in the War, but also embellish it in light of their own rhetorical arguments.

Josephus employs indirect discourse immediately following the climactic story of Maria (BJ 6.199–214) in order to highlight two of his primary rhetorical objectives: 1) presenting Titus’s innocence of the tragedies that fall on the Jews and on Maria; 2) presenting the tragedy of Maria as a justification for the Roman destruction of the Temple and the city. The author of the DEH employs the discourse of Titus primarily as a way to highlight the Christian polemic against Jews. To this end, he makes the argument that the tragedy of Maria and the consequences of the Jewish Revolt are results of the Jews’ killing of Jesus. In contrast, the author of the Hebrew SY portrays a Titus who is reverential toward the Jewish tradition. The author of the SY also presents a counter-narrative to the DEH, arguing that it was their failure to trust in God that brought the tragedy of the war on the Jews, not their crimes against Christ as presented in the Latin text. The Arabic and Ethiopian versions of SY, moreover, adapt the Hebrew text’s
In this chapter, I present a comparative analysis of selected passages from the discourse of Titus as it appears in the five texts, in order to illustrate the various ways meaning is inscribed at the point of each reception. First, I note the differences and similarities in the portrayals of Titus that appear in these texts. Second, I highlight the various representations in the five texts of the Jews in general and the rebels in particular, paying special attention to the contrasts between the DEH and the SY. Lastly, I discuss the redactional changes made by the author/translator of the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of Sefer Yosippon, changes that serve the needs of medieval Coptic and Ethiopian Christians. I also provide an outline of the parallel pericopes below.

5.2 List of Parallel Passages on the Discourse of Titus

A. Titus Addresses God
B. “I Did Not Come for War”
C. Titus Blames the Jews
D. The Reception of the DEH in the SY
   D1. Titus’s Characterization of the Jews
   D2. Titus’s Explanation for the Disasters of the Jews
E. “I Am Clean of This Sin”
F. “Give Me Victory Over Them”

A. Titus Addresses God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caesar also defended himself before God with regard to this matter…</td>
<td>When this was found out, Caesar cursing the contagion of the unhappy</td>
<td>And it came to pass that when Titus heard this matter, he became</td>
<td>When the report reached Titus, he considered it a grave [matter] and he was very disturbed and he</td>
<td>Now when Titus heard this, he marveled and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Josephus begins his indirect discourse delivered through the character of Titus by noting that, after he learns about the story of Maria, “Caesar defends himself before God” (Καίσαρ δὲ ἀπελογεῖτο…τῷ θεῷ). Josephus here presents one of the major arguments of his history very early in this discourse, namely that Titus and the Romans were merciful and kind in their suppression of the Judean Revolt. The defense of the just actions of Titus and his armies during the war also serves to set up the blame that Josephus directs at the irrationality and obstinacy of the rebels, who according to Josephus bear full responsibility for their own suffering and the destruction of the Temple.

The author of the *DEH* opens his account of the discourse of Caesar by shifting the focus away from the innocence of Titus, and instead begins by recounting the imprecation of Titus against the Jews. The author notes that when he learns about the story of Maria, Titus delivers his discourse after first “cursing the contagion of the unhappy land” (*exsecratus infelcis terrae contagium*). Titus’s reaction to the story of Maria is characterized by its portrayal of the mother’s deed as a sign of the corruption of Jews and Judaism. The story of Maria, as Pseudo-Hegesippus illustrates through Titus’s discourse, represents the decay of Judaism brought about through the rejection of Christ. The focus thus shifts very quickly from the cannibalistic mother to the
depravity among the Jews, which the author of the *DEH* seeks to emphasize. Titus goes on to note this depravity saying, “we came for war but we are not contending with men” (*ad bellum quidem uenimus sed non cum hominibus dimicamus*).

In contrast to the disgusted Titus portrayed in the *DEH*, the Hebrew *SY* portrays a Titus whose reaction to the story of Maria is best characterized as reverential or pious. For example, instead of cursing the land and the Jews as he does in the Latin text, Titus’s initial reaction to hearing the story of the cannibalistic mother is one of deep fear. The text reads, “and it came to pass that when Titus heard this matter he became exceedingly afraid” (*ויהי שמה פ.optsא אערז*).

Moreover, the five texts employ varying terminologies to refer to the divine. In the *War*, Titus refers to the divine as ὃς, the same term he uses to refer to the divine in an earlier speech that he gives in *BJ* 6.34–53.287 In the Latin text, Caesar uses a more ambiguous terminology and directs his words to “whatever power you are in heaven” (*quaecumque in caelo potestas es*) (see section E below). The author of the *DEH* most likely depicts Titus as addressing the divine in this way in order to add verisimilitude to his narrative. Because Titus is considered a pagan in the eyes of the Christian author, Pseudo-Hegesippus avoids putting pietistic language in the mouth of Titus.

In contrast to the *DEH*, the terminology that Titus employs in the *SY*—i.e. “God of Heaven” (*אלהים השמים*)—is reflective of a knowledge of the Hebrew scriptures. For example,

---

287 Earlier in Book 6 of the *War*, Titus speaks to his men and says, “It would be disgraceful if men who are Romans and soldiers in my army, trained in peacetime for war and in war accustomed to victory, should prove inferior to the Jews in fighting strength or courage, yet more so when we are on the brink of the final triumph and God is working on our side. Our reverses are the result of Jewish desperation, but their troubles will be multiplied by your courageous action and the means by which God is assisting us” (*BJ* 6.38–39).
both Daniel and Jonah use this term is used to refer to the divine when speaking with non-Jews.\(^{288}\) The term השמים אֱלֹהִי is also more specific than the relatively generic terms for the divine employed in the Greek and Latin texts. Such a portrayal of Titus as a pious commander ultimately serves to buttress the *apologia* for Jews and Judaism that the author of Hebrew SY presents.

The Arabic text omits the addressing of the divine that appears in its Hebrew *Vorlage*. The KAY merely states that Titus “lifted his hands to the heavens and said to them, ‘You know that…’” (ورفع يده إلى السماء وقال اللهم انك انت العالم…). The most plausible explanation for this omission seems to be scribal error due to dittography on the level of the Hebrew text, wherein a scribe accidently omits the phrase ראהו אלִי השמיים והאמר אלִי השמיים וה杷רות נלחמות while copying the following sentence: רפויים כפאי אֱלֹהו השמיים והאמר אלִי השמיים וה杷רות נלחמות.\(^{289}\) It is easy to see how the translator of the Arabic text would have omitted “God of heaven” if he was copying a Hebrew text that did not include that phrase.\(^{290}\)

However, the reading preserved in the Ethiopic text may also hold a clue for a different explanation of the absence of a reference to the divine in the Arabic text. In the ZA, Titus addresses the divine saying, “Oh Lord, you know…” (애malı אלִי תֶהָפֶך). It could be the case that the Ethiopic text is a witness to an earlier version of the Christian-Arabic text than the

\(^{288}\) When interpreting the dream of king Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel says, “And in the days of those kings the God of heaven (אֱלֹהִי השמיים) will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed” (Dan 2.44). Also, when Jonah reveals his identity to the sailors, he says, “I am a Hebrew. I worship the Lord, the God of heaven (אֱלֹהִי השמיים), who made the sea and the dry land” (Jonah 1.9).

\(^{289}\) Flusser notes that mss. פ and ד have the variant reading “God of heaven and earth” (והארץ).\(^{290}\) Sela does not provide any variant readings for this passage (Shulamit Sela, *The Arabic Book of Yosef Ben Gorion: Texts in Arabic and Judeo-Arabic with a Hebrew Translation and Introduction* (Hebrew), vol. 1, 2 vols. (Tel Aviv: Makhon Ben-Tsevi le-heker kehilot Yiśra’el ba-Mizraḥ, 2009), 310.
one that appears in Sela’s critical edition. There could have originally been an addressing of the
divine in the Arabic text that would have read, “[Titus] lifted his hands to the heavens and said,
‘God, you know that…” (ورفع يديه الى السماء وقال الله انك انت العالم). The difference between such
a reading and the reading preserved in the extant Arabic text is only the difference between الله
and اللهم. It is possible that a scribe inadvertently changes اللهم to الله at this point in the narrative.
If this was the case, one would have to posit that the translator of the Ethiopic text chooses to
insert “Oh Lord” where the term is lacking in the Arabic text, perhaps because the term is
conventionally employed while addressing the divine.

B. “I Did Not Come for War”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayyud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews… (BJ 6.215).</td>
<td>“You know, you know surely that with a sincere desire I frequently offered peace…I wished to… spare the people, to preserve the city…But what am I to do against those fighting back?” (DEH 5.41.2 [385, 7–12]).</td>
<td>“I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling” (SY 86.47–48).</td>
<td>“You know that I did not come to this city to fight against her people or to injure them. I have already summoned them to submit to a reconciliation but they did not answer” (KAY 7.7.55–56).</td>
<td>“You know that I did not come to this city in order that I might fight the people and ill-treat them. And I invited them [to] a time of peace but they refused” (ZA 7.7.74–76).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josephus anticipates the destruction of the Temple as it appears in the War by continuing
his defense of the actions of Titus through the Roman commander’s indirect discourse. He
portrays a Titus who contemplates his offering of “peace and autonomy” (εἰρήνην καὶ
αὐτονομίαν) to as well as “amnesty” (ἀμνηστίαν) to the “the Jews” (Ἰουδαίοις), despite their reckless behavior. Titus’s claim here points the reader back to Book 5 of the BJ, wherein Josephus depicts Titus as offering mercy to the rebel leaders in several episodes (e.g. BJ 5.114, 262, 361). The author of the DEH transmits Josephus’s depiction of a merciful and peace-seeking Titus and extends the motif through literary embellishments. Having converted Titus’s indirect discourse into direct discourse, Pseudo-Hegesippus intensifies Titus’s peaceful nature by describing his sincerity. In the Latin text, speaking to the divine, Titus says, “you know that with a sincere desire I frequently offered peace” (intimo affectu pacem frequenter obtuli). The sincerity of Titus here is emphasized by the author of the DEH in order to better contrast the irrationality and obstinacy of the Jews as a whole, motifs which are repeated in the remainder of the discourse.

Although the author of the Hebrew SY reverses the wholesale condemnation of Jews and Judaism that appears in the DEH, he maintains the Latin text’s portrayal of Titus as a peace-seeking commander. A shortened version of Titus’s words in the DEH are translated by the author of the SY, in which Titus makes the claim that he sought peace with the Jews multiple times. Titus says in the Hebrew text, “how many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling” (אבה ואלא השלום בקשתי והשלאה ולא אבד). Additionally, the author of SY also transmits Titus’s blaming of the Jews for their obstinacy in refusing to surrender to him. Both of these themes are transmitted by the Arabic and Ethiopic texts at this stage.
C. Titus Blames the Jews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…but that they [“the Jews”], choosing civil strife instead of concord, war instead of peace, famine in place of plenty and prosperity… (BJ 6.216).</td>
<td>“What am I to do with those raging against their own people? Arms for the most part having been set aside, because they did not desist from the slaughtering of their own people” (DEH 5.41.2 [385, 12–13]).</td>
<td>“I often pleaded with them but they did not incline their ears [toward me]. I sought to have mercy on them [and] perhaps they will live” (SY 86.48–49).</td>
<td>“And I had mercy on them and I desired that they would not be destroyed. But they did not have mercy on themselves, until their condition deteriorated to such as this” (KAY 7.7.56–57).</td>
<td>“And I had mercy upon them and I desired that they would not die. But they had no mercy on themselves to the point that they came upon a great affliction” (ZA 7.7.76–77).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josephus employs the indirect discourse of Titus to shift the focus of his criticism from the rebels and Jewish leaders to “the Jews” (Ἰουδαίοις) as a whole. According to him, Titus concludes that the Jews themselves are the ones responsible for the horrors of the famine and the destruction of the Temple. Caesar cites their choice to continue the “civil strife” (ὁμονοιας στάσις) and the “war” (πόλεμος), resulting in the “famine” (λιμός) and its many atrocities. He also presents Titus as asserting that the Jews themselves are ultimately responsible for the destruction of the Temple. Titus’s indirect discourse in the War reads, “the Jews…with their very own hands beginning to burn the temple which had been carefully preserved by us for them, were deserving indeed of such food” (Ἰουδαίοις…ιδίας δὲ χερσὶν ἀφέσαμένους καὶ εἶναι τὸ συντηρούμενον ψῆφ. ἡμῶν ιερὸν αὐτοῖς, εἶναι καὶ τοιαύτης τροφῆς ἀξίους) (BJ 6.216). In this passage, which does not have a direct parallel in the texts that receive the War, Josephus
even makes the claim that the Jews deserved to witness something as tragic as the account of Maria.

The author of the War also goes on to present the tragic deed of the cannibalistic mother as a contributing factor to Titus’s decision to destroy the city. Titus speaks through indirect discourse saying that “he would not leave a city upon the inhabited earth for the sun to look upon, in which mothers fed themselves in this way” (οὐ καταλείψειν ἐπὶ τῆς οίκουμένης ἠλιᾷ καθορᾶν πόλιν, ἐν ᾗ μητέρες οὕτω τρέφονται) (BJ 6.217). During the siege of the city, Josephus makes deliberate efforts to portray Titus as a merciful and reasonable commander. Before the Roman general makes the seemingly merciless move of destroying Jerusalem and her beloved Temple, therefore, Josephus feels the need to present a reason that contextualizes or explains Titus’s fatal decision. The gruesome nature of the deed of Maria becomes a sufficient justification for Titus to destroy the city in which such an unnatural deed is committed.

The author of the DEH maintains Josephus’s negative presentation of the Jews and further expands the argument by adding his own material to Titus’s discourse. Pseudo-Hegesippus inserts a rather lengthy diatribe against Jews and Judaism at this point in the narrative, as is discussed in section C2 below. Before highlighting some examples of the motifs introduced to the discourse of Titus in the DEH, however, I here present an interesting change that the author of the Latin text makes. Whereas Josephus portrays a Titus who blames “the Jews” as a whole, Pseudo-Hegesippus has Titus initially making a distinction between the rebel leaders and the Jews. Thus in the DEH, Titus remarks that the people actually desire a Roman victory as a means to escape the harsher oppression of the rebels. Titus asks, “What type of citizens are [these], to whom their enemy is a remedy?” (quales sunt ciues, quibus hostis remedio est?) (DEH 5.41.2 [385, 16]. The distinction made between the rebels and the Jews, it should be
noted, does not serve to exonerate the Jews who endure the oppression of the rebels. Instead, the very existence of the rebels inside the Jewish communities becomes a mark of the corruption and divine condemnation of the community as a whole.

The DEH’s distinction between the rebels and the people is not transmitted by the translator of the Hebrew text, and so does not survive in Titus’s discourse as it appears in the SY tradition. However, the author of the SY does pass on the motif of blaming the Jews for what takes place at the end of the Revolt, because it fits into his apologetic rhetoric concerning the dangers of failing to observe God’s covenant (see section C2 below for a fuller discussion). Similar to how he speaks in the War, in the Hebrew text Titus speaks about the Jews as whole, saying that although he sought to have mercy on them, they “did not incline their ears” (לֹא אֶתָנוּ הָטָוְôtel) toward him. Titus goes on to say, “We came and we found evil beings who are cruel to one another. All the evil they have done has surpassed this great evil that the woman ate her son” (SY 86.49–51). In this way, the author of SY not only blames the Jews as a community for the consequences of the Revolt, but also makes the case that their action of breaking God’s covenant is more consequential than Maria’s horrific deed.

The Arabic and Ethiopic texts closely follow their Hebrew counterpart at this stage in the discourse of Titus. Both texts transmit the motif introduced to Titus’s discourse by the author of the SY, namely Titus’s recitation of the fact the he had been merciful to the people. The translator of the Arabic text slightly changes the terminology of the Hebrew; whereas in the Hebrew text Titus says that the Jews “did not incline their ears” toward him, in the Arabic (and the Ethiopic which follows it closely), Titus says “they did not have mercy on themselves” (فَلَمْ يَشُفَقُوا عَلَى نَفْسِهِمُ). Such a formulation fits in neatly with one of the
primary themes found in the *KAY* and the *ZA*, which argues that the Jews participate in their own punishment because they are blinded by God when they choose to rebel against the Romans.

In addition, a textual difference between the Judeo-Arabic and Christian Arabic versions of *SY* at this point in the narrative is worthy of note. The difference between the two texts illustrates a scribal error, namely an omission of a word in the Judeo-Arabic text due to haplography, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judeo-Arabic</th>
<th>Christian-Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ו飧避けת عليهم ואשפקת והלכו אלא והלמה</td>
<td>ﻋﻠﯾﮭم يشفقوا على نفوسهم حتى انتهى أمرهم الي مثل هذا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עליהם והלכו אלא</td>
<td>ﻋﻠﯾﮭم ﻋﻠﻰ نفوسھم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אנפסהם</td>
<td>ﻋﻠﯾﮭم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עלי וושפקו פלם</td>
<td>ﻋﻠﯾﮭم</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parallel passages from the two texts shows that whoever transcribed the Judeo-Arabic version of the text mistakenly omits the word underlined in the Christian-Arabic passage above. This is mostly easily explained as an omission due to the scribe missing the word as he glanced from the first * عليهم* that comes before *وارددت* to the next * عليهم* that immediately follows it. Such evidence further supports Sela’s claim that the Judeo-Arabic version of *SY* relies on a text written in Arabic script.

D. The Reception of the *DEH* in the *SY*

In the section that follows (containing tables D1 and D2), I present some of the motifs that illustrate the reception history of the *DEH* within the Hebrew *SY*. As mentioned above, the author of the Latin text significantly expands the discourse of Titus that appears in the *War*. Many of the motifs the *DEH* introduces into Titus’s discourse are transmitted in altered forms by
the translator of the Hebrew text. In many cases, the anti-Jewish arguments of Pseudo-Hegesippus are inverted and employed by the author of the SY in order to defend the legitimacy of the Jews as a people and Judaism as religious system.

In addition to contributing to an understanding of the transmission between the Latin and Hebrew text, this analysis will also aid in the overall examination of the Arabic and Ethiopic texts. While the passages analyzed in this section are omitted by the translator of the Arabic version of SY, their absence in the Christian versions of SY does inform our understanding of the redactional programs of these texts, as it illustrates the types of ideas that these later translators sought to exclude from their histories. Below I give two examples of the reception of the DEH in the SY concerning the following pericopes: 1) Titus’s characterization of the Jews; 2) Titus’s explanation for the disasters of the Jews.

D1. Titus’s Characterization of the Jews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Indeed I had heard that the fierceness of this people is intolerable, who by their absurd ideas arouse themselves toward every insolent act…” (DEH 2.12.1 [163, 6–9]).</td>
<td>“But I also heard [about] the strength of this people and I have loved you who love them” (SY 86.51–52).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To begin, one finds two very different characterization of the Jews by Titus in the DEH and by Titus in the Hebrew SY. In the former text, the author of the DEH highlights the
“fierceness of the people” (*populi ferocitatem*), referring back to Titus’s previous words of condemnation of the obstinacy and arrogance of the Jews. In this passage, Pseudo-Hegesippus speaks through the mouth of Caesar and makes the argument that the obstinacy and arrogance of the Jews stems from their “incredible beliefs” (*incredibilis opinionis*). Thus having depicted the Jews as entirely irrational for choosing to rebel against the Romans, the author of the *DEH* explains their irrationality by reference to their beliefs, which in turn (according to Titus’s discourse) stem from the miracles recounted in their scriptures.

The characterization of the Jews in the Hebrew *SY* is much different than in the *DEH*. There is no condemnation of the over confidence of the Jews in divine assistance. In fact, quite the opposite is true for the author of the medieval Hebrew text. Instead of outlining the irony of how divine assistance leads the Jews astray by making them overconfident, in the *SY*, Titus makes a very pious statement and speaks of the “strength of this people” (נכבדת העם). He goes on to emphasize the love that God has for the Jews, and even goes so far as to proclaim his own love for the God of the Jews saying, “I have loved you who loved them” (אני אהבתכם ואתם). In this way, the translator of the Hebrew *SY* not only alters the characterization of the Jews in the discourse of Titus, but also presents a much more pietistic portrayal of Caesar himself.

---

291 Titus goes on to say of the Jews that “they regard themselves to have descended from the sky, to have descended for the cultivation of the earth, to return from the earth to the sky, to have crossed through the seas with dry feet, the waves of the sea to have fled before them…” (*de caelo se genus ducere, ibi primum induisse corporis formam, caeli se fuisse incolas, descendisse ad cultus terrarium, de terries ad caelum redire, transisse per maria sicco pede, fugisse ante se fluctus maris…*) (*DEH* 5.41.2 [385, 19–22]).
D2. Titus’s Explanation for the Disasters of the Jews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“There is the common opinion that these people also plotted against divine things and their punishment is the proof” (DEH 2.12.1 [163, 9–11]).</td>
<td>“Now [about this people with whom I am fighting I said that they trusted in you but they are not trusting in you. Behold now you see that they do not trust in your salvation but rather they trust in their swords and in their battles” (SY 86.55–58).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author of the *DEH* also employs the discourse of Titus as a means to put forward one of the central arguments of the text: the results of the Jewish Revolt are a sign of God’s punishment of the Jews for their crimes against Christ. Titus says in the *DEH* that “there is the frequent opinion” (*hos opinio frequens*) that the sufferings of the Jews are a sign of divine punishment because they “plotted against divine things” (*aduersus diuina conspirasse*). The speculation of Titus here never explicitly connects the tragedy of the Jewish Revolt with the killing of Christ. Instead, the author of the *DEH* makes a veiled allusion to the idea, which he states more explicitly in other places in his history. For example, in *DEH* 2.12–13 one finds a reworked version of the *Testimonium Flavianum*, which appears in Book 18 of the *Jewish Antiquities*. There Pseudo-Hegesippus writes, “[The Jews] indeed paid the punishments of their crimes, who after they had crucified Jesus the judge of divine matters, afterwards even persecuted his disciples” (*DEH* 2.12.1 [163, 9–11]).
In contrast to the Christian polemic found in the *DEH*, the author of the Hebrew *SY* makes the argument that what gets the Jews in trouble is not overconfidence in light of their history. Instead, he makes the case that the Jews’ confidence in their own military prowess being exhibited over against their confidence in God leads to their annihilation at the hands of the Romans. The words of Titus in *SY* make it clear that this is the sin of the Jews and the rebels that causes the destruction of the city and Jerusalem: the author writes, “Behold now you see that they do not trust in your salvation but rather they trust in their swords and in their battles”

(וראה הנך כי לא בטחוה בישועתכם כי אם בסכ_datos ובמלחמותם וב⊂ם) (*SY* 86.57–58).

In this way, the translator of the Hebrew text changes the arguments of the *DEH*, in order to conform the narrative in the Latin text to his rhetorical and theological programs.

E. “I Am Clean of This Sin”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayyud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “I absolve myself before you as clean from this contagion, whatever power you are in heaven” (*DEH* 5.41.2 [385, 6–7]). | “When I became aware of this situation with the woman, it pained me and disturbed me. I did not take pleasure in it nor did I condone it. Now I am absolved from it in your presence and I ask you, oh Lord, to not pursue me” (*KAY* 7.7.57–58). | “Behold, it distressed me when I heard the matter of the woman. It alarmed me and disturbed me and I did not take pleasure in this thing. And I am clean of this sin before you [and] I ask, oh Lord, that you not pursue me” (*ZA* 7.7.77–79). |}

An interesting development takes place in the transmission of this passage concerning Titus’s claim to innocence regarding the deed of Maria. While the Arabic and Ethiopic texts contain this passage, it does not appear in the Hebrew *SY*. As demonstrated in the synoptic chart.
above, the motif first appears in the *DEH*, disappears at the level of the Hebrew text, and re-emerges within the Arabic text. Toward the beginning of his long discourse in the *DEH*, Titus addresses an unnamed deity and says, “I absolve myself clean before you from this contagion” (*mundus ego ab hoc contagio tibi me absoluo*). The *DEH*’s depiction of Titus at this moment resembles a famous scene in the Gospel of Matthew, where the Roman governor Pilate speaks similar words about the execution of Jesus. Although Titus’s words are parallel to the words of Pilate in Mat 27.24, they are not exactly the same. In the New Testament, Pilate washes his hands and then says, “I am innocent of this man’s blood.” Despite the lack of verbatim agreement, it is likely that the Christian author of the *DEH* had the words of Pilate in mind when writing the words of Titus.

In the Christian-Arabic and Ethiopic texts, one finds a much more parallel allusion to Pilate’s words in Matthew 27. In the Ethiopic text, for example, toward the end of his discourse, Titus proclaims his shock over the story of Maria before saying, “and *I am clean* of this sin before you” (*ዘንተ የአነንጹሕእምዝኀጢአት የበወአኲ*). The terminology in this passage agrees more directly with Pilate’s words in the Ethiopic Gospel of Matthew: “*I am clean* of the blood of this righteous man (*ንጹሕአነእምደሙለzerbai ጻቀጥ*). Given the closer parallel in terminology, it is very likely that Coptic and Ethiopian Christians reading this passage would be reminded of the words of Titus in Matthew 27. As a result, they would have drawn parallels between Titus and Pilate and the relationship of the two Romans with the Jews. In the same way that the literal washing of Pilate’s hands condemns the Jews who call for the crucifixion of Jesus, the metaphorical washing of Titus’s hands condemns the Jews who blindly rebel against the Romans.
F. “Give Me Victory Over Them”

Bellum Judaicum  De Excidio Hierosolymitano  Sefer Yosippon  Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd  Zena Ayhud

“But I ask that you take revenge on those rebels who wronged the people with their plundering and give me victory over them” (KAY 7.7.59).

“But only pursue the rebels, the men who mistreated them. Take vengeance against them and give me victory over them” (ZA 7.7.79–80).

In the Arabic and Ethiopic texts, Titus concludes his discourse by asking God to give him victory over the rebels. This request from Caesar immediately follows Titus’s previous request that God not pursue him for what happened to the unnamed woman who kills and eats her child. Titus’s words in this passage serve two functions within the narratives found in the KAY and the ZA. First, it reasserts the often-occurring motif that the rebels are responsible for the sufferings of the people, not the Romans. Second, the passage serves to portray Titus as an especially pious commander. Caesar is depicted as someone who is both in God’s favor and is being used by God for a higher purpose. The Arabic and Ethiopic texts thus contrast Titus’s status before God with the position of the rebels and the Jewish people as a whole, whom the two texts depict as not being in God’s favor.

5.3 Conclusion: The Reception of the Discourse of Titus

Discourses often serve as efficient means of directly putting forward the objectives of the author. As a result, the authors of five texts being examined here use the discourse of Titus to deliver their interpretations of the significance of the story of the cannibalistic mother. Given its
place in the climatic part of the narrative of the war, Titus’s discourse becomes a crucial moment for each author to highlight his most important arguments. Josephus uses this moment to re-emphasize his apology for the actions of Titus and to present the tragedy of Maria as the final straw in the series of events that lead the Romans to destroy the city and the Temple. In light of this, the fact that the destruction of the Temple directly follows the story of Maria in the War should not be seen as merely coincidental. In sharp contrast to Josephus, the author of the DEH employs the discourse of Titus in order to put forward his Christian polemic, arguing that the tragic results of the story of Maria and the Revolt itself are signs of divine punishments against the Jews for their crimes against Christ.

Moreover, several developments take place in the Sefer Yosippon tradition during the transmission of the discourse of Titus. First, in the Hebrew SY, Titus is depicted as a pious and reverential observer of the Jewish tradition. The author of the Hebrew text portrays Titus in this way in order to argue for the enduring importance of the Jewish tradition. He also omits the Christian polemics found in the Latin text that serves as his primary (perhaps only) source for the Jewish Revolt. Secondly, in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY, the presentation of Titus as a pious God-fearer is expanded, in a way that would have connected Titus to the character of Pilate in the minds of medieval Christians.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

The medieval Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon*, its various Greek and Latin sources, as well as its subsequent Copto-Arabic and Ethiopic adaptations together constitute an immensely rich opportunity to analyze the cross-cultural receptions of Josephus. The richness of this project arises from the fact that the works of Josephus are transmitted through a number of very different cultural and historical contexts before they arrive in medieval Ethiopia. In this dissertation, I have sought to illustrate the ways in which the narratives of the famine in Jerusalem and the story of Maria as written by Josephus are either changed or preserved at each level of the reception history between the *Jewish War* and the *Zena Ayhud*. Instead of presenting broad schematic analyses of the relationships among the various texts involved in this reception history, as a few previous scholars have done, I have provided very close readings of the redactional tendencies of each text. By focusing on the transmission of a few selected passages, particularly the story of Maria, I have been able to provide much more specific evidence illustrating the redactional relationships among these texts than the evidence presented by previous scholarship.

Through my analysis of the reception of Josephus within the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano*, I have demonstrated the redactional tendencies of the so-called Pseudo-Hegesippus. In contrast to early Christian historians like Eusebius, who incorporate Josephus into their histories by quoting him, this anonymous fourth-century author instead produces a translation of Josephus’s *War* that is at times close to and at other times widely divergent from its Greek *Vorlage*. His most conspicuous changes to Josephus’s text are found in Book 5 of the
DEH, which focuses on the siege of Jerusalem by Titus and his army. In this dissertation, I have demonstrated that although the author of the DEH maintains the narrative order of the descriptions of the famine as they appear in the War, he provides an entirely different interpretation of the occurrence and severity of the famine. As a central theme of his work, he makes the case that the sufferings of the Jews all result from their crimes against the Christ (see p. 30 above).

In my close analysis of the parallel passages between the War and the DEH, I have shown the way in which the author of the latter text adapts Josephus’s text through the insertion of literary embellishments. He often expands the motifs found in Josephus in order to heighten the tragic nature of the famine. For example, where Josephus is content to simply note that the famine forces the citizens of Jerusalem to consume detestable things, the author of the DEH lists a number of specific animals and things that the people eat (see p. 92 above). He expands nearly all of Josephus’s descriptions of the horrors of the famine and the problems caused by the vast number of corpses in the city (see pp. 104–110 above).

In the case of the story of Maria, the author adds details to the elements of tragedy found in Josephus’s account of the story in order to heighten the pathos of the cannibalistic mother. For example, he emphasizes Maria’s desire to die more than Josephus does, noting that she actually seeks an assassin (percussorem) before she decides to kill and eat her own son (see p. 149 above). The pathos that Maria experiences is heightened in the DEH partly because the suffering mother comes to represent the suffering of the Jews as a whole. Pseudo-Hegesippus seeks to highlight not only the ultimate destruction of Jerusalem, but also the severity of the sufferings endured by the Jews as a result of their crimes. The author also significantly expands the
discourse of Maria and Titus and utilizes the speeches of these characters to deliver his interpretation of events more directly.

The discourse of Titus in particular serves as a very good example of the redactional objectives of the author, who presents a much longer version of Titus’s response to the story of Maria and uses the character of Caesar to paint a defamatory portrait of the Jews. In his speech Titus makes the claim that the Jews became overconfident in their abilities because of the miracles that they believe occurred in favor of their ancestors (see p. 224 above). Moreover, I have also demonstrated that the DEH’s reworked accounts of the famine in Jerusalem, the story of Maria, and the discourse of Titus become the source for the tenth-century Hebrew text Sefer Yosippon. As a result, many important elements that enter the medieval Sefer Yosippon traditions are produced not by Josephus but rather by Pseudo-Hegesippus.

In addition to illustrating the DEH’s treatment of the War, I have also shown that there is a consistent pattern to the redactional tendencies of the Hebrew Sefer Yosippon’s use of the DEH. By employing a close synoptic reading, I have been able to go beyond merely confirming the conclusions of scholars like Bowman and Dönitz by uncovering evidence that brings nuance to their observations that the SY represents a counter-history to the DEH. More specifically, my work on the SY’s reception of the DEH’s accounts of the famine in Jerusalem and the story of Maria demonstrates that the author of the Hebrew text carefully balances his condemnation of the generation of Jews who rebel against Rome with his validation of the perseverance of the Jewish covenant with God. To this end, he not only omits the explicitly Christian elements found in his Latin source, but he also reframes the tragedy of the great famine in Jerusalem in light of a Deuteronomistic view of history (see p. 83, note 291 above).
For example, the author of the Hebrew SY argues that the tragic consequences of the revolt result from the fact that the rebels in particular and the Jews in general place their trust not in God but in their own military prowess (see p. 225 above). In order to emphasize the consequences of rebelling against God’s commandments, he preserves the graphic descriptions of the suffering of the people during the famine. Because he seeks to make this crime of the Jews of Jerusalem the central point of his plot, the author also de-emphasizes the crime of Maria. He even states explicitly that the deed of Maria was not as evil as the evils committed by the rebels (see p. 131 above). Moreover, the author also reworks the long discourse of Titus that is found in the DEH to fit his own theological interpretation of the events. He makes the case that despite the error of the Jews, they continue to be the people whom God loves. In this fashion, the writer of the Hebrew text employs the accounts of the famine and the story of Maria for his purpose of both condemning the Jewish Revolt and defending Jews and Judaism despite the consequences of the Revolt.

Furthermore, my close reading of the reception of the Hebrew SY within its Arabic adaptations has demonstrated how the pro-Jewish narrative of the Hebrew text is reworked in several ways. I have shown how the translator of the Arabic version of SY depicts Titus and Vespasian as agents used by God to bring an end to an age of wickedness (see p. 88 above). In view of this argument, the Arabic and Ethiopic texts present the account of the famine, and especially the story of the unnamed mother who kills and eats her child, as signs of God’s punishment leveled against the Jews in order to bring an end to wickedness. In order to emphasize the role of the famine in this narrative, the translator of the Arabic text has moved all accounts of the famine and placed them together into one chapter, situating the story of the
cannibalistic mother as the center of the chapter. Most significantly, the Arabic text is also bereft of the Hebrew SY’s validation of the perseverance of God’s covenant with the Jews.

In addition to demonstrating how the Arabic translation treats its Hebrew Vorlage, I have also been able to make some preliminary remarks about the relationship between the Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic versions of SY. I have shown that in some places, the evidence suggests that the Judeo-Arabic is translated from a text written in Arabic script, as opposed to being translated from a Hebrew text (see p. 55, note 156 above).

Finally, my project illustrates the way in which the Ethiopian text parallels its Arabic Vorlage quite closely. The translator of the Ethiopic ZA provides a faithful and literal translation, making changes to the KAY in only a handful of places. One of the more notable changes made to the Ethiopian, namely the insertion of benedictions at the end of each chapter, demonstrates its use as a liturgical or monastic text within the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. Such changes indicate the inclusion of the ZA as part of the scriptural tradition of medieval Ethiopian Christians (for a discussion of this issue see p. 66 above).

The intricate questions involved in the study of the Arabic versions of SY help to illustrate the need for the individualized study of each receiving text examined in this project. In the future, I plan to extend the scope of my investigation of these texts by conducting a more detailed analysis of the textual, historical, and other critical issues involved in their study. More specifically, I will examine the source-critical relationship between the Judeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic versions of SY, mining the two texts for pieces of evidence similar to what I have uncovered in this project. The points in the narrative where explicitly Christian interpolations have been inserted will become especially critical to answering some of the source-critical questions that remain contested in the scholarship.
As Dönitz has observed, a more extensive investigation of the textual evidence for the Hebrew and Arabic versions of SY that are present among the Cairo Geniza fragments remains a desideratum. More work needs to be done on the earliest witnesses of the Hebrew SY, in order to construct the earliest possible version of Redaction A. The analysis of the earliest textual witnesses of the Arabic versions of SY will certainly aid in the process of compiling a more reliable version of the earliest Hebrew text. As such, the manuscripts of the Hebrew and Arabic versions of SY that have been identified in the Cairo Geniza will become very valuable for future works on the SY traditions. I hope to investigate these textual witnesses and contribute to the study of the Hebrew SY and its fascinating reception within medieval Arabic literature.

Moreover, while this project begins the study of the reception history of the Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions of SY, there is still much more work that needs to be done concerning the differing points of reception and their afterlives. In the future, I plan to investigate in more detail the historical backgrounds for the translations of the Hebrew SY into Arabic and Ethiopic. The scribal cultures that flourished within the monastic and intellectual contexts of Coptic and Ethiopian Christianity in the medieval period have received little scholarly attention. Furthermore, the relations between Coptic and Ethiopic Christians and their Jewish, Christian, and Muslim neighbors also remain little-studied. I plan to explore on these issues in order to inform our understanding of the intellectual and historical backgrounds that gave birth to the Arabic and Ethiopic translations of the SY in the medieval period.

In addition, I also plan to investigate the audience receptions of the various versions of SY. After their composition, the Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions of the text become extremely important sources within their respective communities. The Hebrew SY becomes the most important source for the history of Judea in Antiquity among medieval Jews and has
continued to be a popular historical and literary text in the modern period (see p. 7, note 6 above). The Arabic and Ethiopic versions of the text become important sources for Coptic and Ethiopic Christians, and are at times even listed within some canon lists (see p. 56 and p. 62 above). Furthermore, as Witokawski has noted, the Ethiopic ZA is still read not only by Ethiopian Orthodox Christians, but also by Ethiopian Jews.\(^{292}\) Despite their importance for these communities, no thorough study has been made of the understanding of these texts by the communities that utilize them. I plan to conduct a study investigating the audience reception of the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of SY in order to inform our understanding of how Coptic and Ethiopian Christians, we well as Ethiopian Jews, have received these texts.

In conclusion, I have presented an account of the long and winding journey of textual reception that begins in first-century Rome and ends in fourteenth-century Ethiopia. I describe the way in which the narratives being transmitted are changed at each level of reception, and explain the changes in light of the wider rhetorical programs of each text. In the Jewish War, Maria claims that her and her son’s story would become “a story for the world” (BJ 6.212). The fascinating reception history of this story from Josephus to medieval Africa makes her prediction a reality.

\(^{292}\) Witakowski, “Zena Ayhud,” 177.
APPENDIX A

LISTS OF MANUSCRIPTS

Table 7: Manuscripts of the DEH Consulted by Ussani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Ussani’s Sigla): Manuscript</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
<th>Catalogue Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (M): Milan, B.A.C 105 inf</td>
<td>s. V–VI + VIII, N. Italy</td>
<td>CLA 323a–b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (C): Kassel, LB Theol. 65</td>
<td>s. VI, N. Italy, England c. 715, Fulda</td>
<td>CLA 1139/Lapidge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (P): Paris, BnF Lat. 13367</td>
<td>an excerpt; s. VII, France [?]</td>
<td>CLA 658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (I): Innsbruck, UB Frag. 72 + Vienna Lat. ser. nov. 3643</td>
<td>s. VIII–IX, Anglo-Saxon center in Germany</td>
<td>CLA 1443; Bischoff 1548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (V): Rome, BAV Pal. Lat. 170</td>
<td>c. 800, Lorsch</td>
<td>Bischoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (A): Karlsruhe, LB Aug. perg. 82</td>
<td>s. IX²/³, Reichenau</td>
<td>Bischoff 1618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (H): Leiden, UB VLF 17</td>
<td>s. X, W. France</td>
<td>De Meyier²⁹³/Mras²⁹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (T): Turin, BN D.IV.7</td>
<td>s. X</td>
<td>Mras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Z): Besançon, BM MS 833</td>
<td>s. X–XI, Murbach?</td>
<td>Mras/Castan²⁹⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Manuscripts of the DEH Not Consulted by Ussani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Ussani’s Sigla): Manuscript</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
<th>Catalogue Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Koblenz, Landeshauptarchiv Best. 701 Nr. 759.22 + Marburg, Hess. Sta Hr 4.17</td>
<td>s. IX²/³, St. Amand</td>
<td>Bischoff 1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 St. Gall, SB Cod. 626</td>
<td>s. IX²/³, St. Gall</td>
<td>Bischoff 5823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cherbourg, BM MS 51</td>
<td>s. IX¹²/₁³, Verona</td>
<td>Bischoff 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Karlsruhe, LB Aug. perg. 101</td>
<td>s. IX²/³, N. Italy</td>
<td>Bischoff 1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 B. Bern, BB MS 180</td>
<td>s. IX²/³, west of Paris, prov. Fleury</td>
<td>Bischoff 549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Laon, BM MS 403b</td>
<td>s. IX²/³, N.E. France</td>
<td>Bischoff 2110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Paris, BnF Lat. 12512</td>
<td>s. IX³/⁴, N. France (Corbie?)</td>
<td>Bischoff 4838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Leiden, UB BPL 21</td>
<td>s. IX³/⁴, N.E. France</td>
<td>Bischoff 2134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁹⁴ Mras, Hegesippi qui dicitur, CSEL 66.2 (Vienna 1960) xiii-xiv.
### Table 8 Contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Ussani’s Sigla): Manuscript</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
<th>Catalogue Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Paris, BnF Nouv. Acq Lat. 1490</td>
<td>s. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Paris, BnF Lat. 12513</td>
<td>s. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cambrai, BM MS 678</td>
<td>s. X–XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chartes, BM MS 117</td>
<td>s. X–XI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Manuscripts of the SY Consulted by Flusser

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript (Flusser’s Sigla)</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(ג&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;, ג&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;, etc.): Schechter Genizah (Cambridge T.S. 10 K. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(לו&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;, לו&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;, etc.): Fragments from the Leningrad Genizah (Antonin Collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(ג): MS Rabbenu Gershom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(י): MS Jerusalem 41280 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(י): MS Rothschild 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(א): MS New York (Adler 1674)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(י): MS _. Bodleian 2797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(פ): MS Kauffman (Academy Library, Budapest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(א): MS Urbino (Hebr. 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(י): MS Huntington 345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: Manuscripts of the SY Not Consulted by Flusser

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript (Flusser’s Sigla)</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MS Budapest 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MS Budapest 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MS Cambridge T.-S. C 2.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MS Cambridge Add. 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MS Cambridge 504.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MS Cambridge Or. 1080 A 45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MS Florence Laur. Plut. 66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MS Hamburg Levy 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MS Hamburg Steinschneider 152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>297</sup> Omont, Molinier, Coudere, and Coyecque, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, vol. 11 (Paris 1890) 64–65.
Table 10 – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript (Flusser’s Sigla)</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10  MS Jerusalem Mahzor Nürnberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11  MS JNUL oct. 41280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  MS London Or. 1326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  MS London Or. 1336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  MS London 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  MS Milan B 35 Inf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16  MS Milan I 67 Inf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17  MS Milan H 70 Inf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18  MS Montecassino Casinensis 124 QQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19  MS Moscow 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20  MS Moscow 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21  MS Moscow 1665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22  MS Munich Cod. Hebr. 153</td>
<td>14\textsuperscript{th}/15\textsuperscript{th} cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23  MS Munich Clm 3560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24  MS Naples Cod. Lat. V F 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25  MS New York 3572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26  MS New York 4009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27  MS Oxford Can. Or. 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28  MS Oxford Heb. d 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29  MS Oxford Heb. e 30</td>
<td>Oriental, 11\textsuperscript{th}/12\textsuperscript{th} cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30  MS Oxford Hunt. 238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31  MS Oxford Hunt. 345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32  MS Oxford Laud. 271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33  MS Oxford Mich. 365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34  MS Oxford Opp. 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35  MS Oxford Opp. 171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36  MS Oxford Opp. 272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37  MS Oxford Opp. 697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38  MS Oxford Add. Qu. 127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39  MS Paris BN 1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40  MS Paris BN Ar. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41  MS Paris BN Ar. 5255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42  MS Paris BN Sup. Ar. 2067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43  MS Paris BN héb. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44  MS Paris BN héb. 326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45  MS Paris BN héb. 585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46  MS Paris BN héb. 671.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47  MS Paris BN héb. 710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48  MS Paris BN héb. 716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49  MS Paris BN héb. 750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50  MS Paris BN héb. 1244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51  MS Paris BN héb. 1280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript (Flusser’s Sigla)</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52  MS Parma 2457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53  MS Parma 2844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54  MS Parma 3187–89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55  MS Parma 3205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56  MS Parma 3218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57  MS Parma 3235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58  MS Parma 3507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59  MS St. Petersburg Antonin B 916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60  MS St. Petersburg Evr. I 306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61  MS St. Petersburg Evr. II A 1424</td>
<td>Oriental, 13th/14th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62  MS Vatican Ar. 468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63  MS Vatican Ar. 693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64  MS Vatican Borg. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65  MS Vatican ebr. 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66  MS Vatican ebr. 301.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67  MS Vatican ebr. 408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68  MS Vatican ebr. 617.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69  MS Vatican Urb. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70  MS Vatican Lat. 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71  MS Zurich Or. 157/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Manuscripts of the Christian-Arabic Version of KAY Consulted by Sela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript/Printing (Sela’s Sigla)</th>
<th>Provenance/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  MS London Or. 1326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  MS London Or. 1336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  MS Oxford Hunt. 238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  MS Paris BN Sup. Ar. 2067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  MS Paris BN 1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  MS Paris BN Ar. 5255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  MS Vatican Ar. 693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  MS London Or. 2598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Beirut Printing</td>
<td>Beirut, 1872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Manuscripts of the Judeo-Arabic Version of KAY Consulted by Sela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript (Sela’s Sigla)</th>
<th>Provenance/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  MS Oxford Heb. d 64, fol. 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  MS Oxford Heb. e 45, fol. 101-107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  MS Paris Consistoire Israélite VII 8 A</td>
<td>Oriental, 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  MS London BM Or. 5554 A, fol. 43–4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  MS Mosseri 114.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  MS Strasbourg 4038, fol. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. I 2989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. I 2981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. I 2988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. I 2985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. I 2984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. II 265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. I 2983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. I 2982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. I 2987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 MS St. Petersburg Yev. Arab. II 1094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 MS Cambridge T.-S. Misc. 28.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 MS Cambridge T.-S. NS 298.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 MS Cambridge T.-S. NS 337.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 162.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 MS Cambridge T.-S. Misc. 8.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 MS Cambridge T.-S. NS 31.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 MS Cambridge T.-S. Misc. 8.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 157.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 MS Cambridge T.-S. 6. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 MS Cambridge T.-S. NS 339.42.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 MS Cambridge T.-S. NS 298.31A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 MS Cambridge T.-S. NS 298.31B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 MS Cambridge T.-S. Ar. 23.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 159.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 171.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 MS Cambridge T.-S. NS 298.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 MS Cambridge T.-S. Ar. 30.167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 MS Cambridge T.-S. 8 K.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 MS Cambridge T.-S. K 21.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 175.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 MS Cambridge T.-S. Ar. 6. 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 MS Cambridge T.-S. Misc. 8.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 156.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 MS Cambridge T.-S. NS 298.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 MS Cambridge T.-S. Misc. 8.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript (Sela’s Sigla)</th>
<th>Provenance/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 MS Cambridge T.-S. Misc. 8.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 160.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 172.83-85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 MS Cambridge T.-S. Ar. 6. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 MS Cambridge T.-S. AS 178.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Manuscripts of the ZA Consulted by Kamil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Kamil’s Sigla): Manuscript</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (A): MS Paris BN Abb. 38</td>
<td>16th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (P): MS Paris BN Abb. 77</td>
<td>16th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (R): MS Paris BN Abb. 124</td>
<td>16th/17th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (D): MS London Or. 822</td>
<td>17th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (N): MS London Or. 823</td>
<td>18th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (E): MS London Or. 824</td>
<td>18th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (O): MS London Or. 825</td>
<td>18th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (M): MS London Add. 24, 989</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (L): MS Berlin 6 fol. 397</td>
<td>17th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (B): MS Berlin 62 Peterm., II Nachtr. 57</td>
<td>17th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (F): MS Frankfurt Rüppellschen No. 2</td>
<td>18th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (S): MS Strasburg No. 4366 Ethiop. 5</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### CHAPTER 3 PARALLEL PASSAGES IN ORIGINAL LANGUAGES

#### A. The Disappearance of Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>φανερὸς μὲν γὰρ οὐδαμοῦ σῖτος ήν, ἔπεισπηδώντες δὲ διηρέων τὰς οἰκίας</td>
<td>Etiam fames saeure atque amplius seditio grassari coeperat furore ac uesania. frumentum non reperiebatur, nullus panis in publico usu</td>
<td>The famine began to rage and the strife proceeded with frenzy and madness. Grain could not be found and there was no bread available for public use</td>
<td>The master of the book said [that] when the siege grew long on the city, the city of Jerusalem, everything that was in it of sustenance and edible things disappeared</td>
<td>The master of the book said [that] when the siege of the city of Jerusalem grew long, all of the food and edible things that were inside of [the city] disappeared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Grain] was nowhere to be seen, so [the rebels] invaded and searched the houses ( BJ 5.425).

The sustenance from the city disappeared because the rebels consumed the sustenance of the people… (SY 79.13–14).

The master of the book said [that] when the siege of the city of Jerusalem grew long, all of the food and edible things that were inside of [the city] disappeared (ZA 7.7.1–2).

#### B. Eating Detestable Things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Grain] was nowhere to be seen, so [the rebels] invaded and searched the houses ( BJ 5.425).

The famine began to rage and the strife proceeded with frenzy and madness. Grain could not be found and there was no bread available for public use (DEH 5.18.1 [333, 26–28]).
Next to green lizards and to other spoils of the serpent race which they had cooked they added pestilence (DEH 5.18.4 [336, 10–11]).

…the people ate every creeping thing of the earth, from mouse to gecko to snake and mole, turtle, cat and dog (SY 79.22–23). And the intense famine was on the people until they ate the corpses and the creeping things of the ground (KAY 7.7.2).

And the famine grew worse upon the people until they [began to] eat rotten things and every reptile inside the ground (ZA 7.7.3–4).

C. The Sound of the Millstone and the Fury of the Rebels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>тинев σὲν ὑπ᾽ ἀκρας ἐνδείας ἀνέργαστον τὸν σῖτον ἰσθιον, οἱ δ᾽ ἐπεσον ὡς ἦ τε ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸ δέος παρήνει (BJ 5.427).</td>
<td>neque uero coquendi panis usus expectabatur, ne mors praueuniret aut mora proditorem acerseret (DEH 5.18.2 [334, 17–18]).</td>
<td>…some in the extremity of their hunger would eat the Nor truly was the practice of baking bread awaited, lest Whoever had wheat was afraid to grind or bake it, lest it …and it happened that whoever preserved for …even if there was a little bit of wheat left over, a neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והלא כל רמש תמר מפכבר על שמייה נמר נחש וה롤 כוכב רוחו ויבל (SY 79.17–18)</td>
<td>ואשר היה לљ٪ תמר. ריו וס בם מים לחרוזות אינ אופא פיר ויירעיים ירקו אוח (SY 79.17–18)</td>
<td>והלא כל רמש תמר מפכבר על שמייה נמר נחש וה롤 כוכב רוחו ויבל (SY 79.17–18)</td>
<td>והלא כל רמש תמר מפכבר על שמייה נמר נחש וה롤 כוכב רוחו ויבל (SY 79.17–18) . (The Judeo-Arabic text agrees with the variant in this case)</td>
<td>. (The Judeo-Arabic text agrees with the variant in this case)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The famine grew worse upon the people until they [began to] eat rotten things and every reptile inside the ground (ZA 7.7.3–4).
D. Eating Uncooked Wheat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaeicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…τοῦ δὲ πυρὸς ύψελκοντες ἑτ’ ὰμω τὰ σιτία διηρπαζον (BJ 5.428).</td>
<td>in occultis abditi incoctum mandebant triticum (DEH 5.18.2 [334, 18–19]).</td>
<td>became known to the rebels and they took it (SY 79.18–19).</td>
<td>himself some of the wheat and the like would be afraid to grind it and bake it because it would be known through it, the sound of the grinding or the smoke, then it would be taken from him and he would be killed (KAY 7.7.2–4).</td>
<td>was afraid to grind it or bake it, lest it became known [through] the sound of the millstone or breaker that there was [wheat] and they rise up from among them and kill him (ZA 7.7.4–5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...but they snatched the food out of the fire half-cooked and tore it to pieces (BJ 5.428).

...but they were eating the wheat in secret (SY 79.18–19).

Now they were eating the seed of the wheat and stowing away the flour...(KAY 7.7.4).

Now they were eating the seeds of the wheat raw and feeding on the grounded powder of grain...(ZA 7.7.7–8).

(The Judeo-Arabic text agrees with the variant in this case) 301
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303 S, B, L ṣewi'.
So wives would snatch food from their husbands, children from their parents, and, most pitiable of all, mothers would take the food from the very mouths of their babies and not scruple (BJ 5.430).

...there were frequent murders of relatives, sad fights between those kin...sons snatched it from parents, parents from sons and from the very jaws to which the food was being offered (DEH 5.18.2 [334, 23–31]).

In the houses where there was food...the father snatched it from the hand of the son and the son from the hand of the father and the mother from the hand of her son and the son from the mouth of his mother (SY 79.19–21).

And they would snatch away a fraction of the food if they found it; the father would seize it from his son and a son from his father (KAY 7.7.4–5).

Even if they found a little bit [of food], a father would seize it from his son and a son from his father (ZA 7.7.9–10).

---

### E. Family Feud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>υναίκες γυνών ἀνδρῶν καὶ παιδὲς πατέρων, καὶ τὸ οἰκτρότατον, μητέρες γηπίων ἔξημπαξιον ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν στομάτων τὰς τροφὰς (BJ 5.430).</td>
<td>...frequentiae parricidales, inter suos triste certamen... rapiebant filii [cibus] parentibus, parentes filii et de ipsis faucibus cibus proferebatur (DEH 5.18.2 [334, 23–31]).</td>
<td>In the houses (SY 79.19–21)</td>
<td>And they would snatch away a fraction of the food if they found it; the father would seize it from his son and a son from his father (KAY 7.7.4–5).</td>
<td>Even if they found a little bit [of food], a father would seize it from his son and a son from his father (ZA 7.7.9–10).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

F1. The Magnitude of Corpses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>υναίκες γυνών ἀνδρῶν καὶ παιδὲς πατέρων, καὶ τὸ οἰκτρότατον, μητέρες γηπίων ἔξημπαξιον ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν στομάτων τὰς τροφὰς (BJ 5.430).</td>
<td>...frequentiae parricidales, inter suos triste certamen... rapiebant filii [cibus] parentibus, parentes filii et de ipsis faucibus cibus proferebatur (DEH 5.18.2 [334, 23–31]).</td>
<td>In the houses (SY 79.19–21)</td>
<td>And they would snatch away a fraction of the food if they found it; the father would seize it from his son and a son from his father (KAY 7.7.4–5).</td>
<td>Even if they found a little bit [of food], a father would seize it from his son and a son from his father (ZA 7.7.9–10).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

305 S, B, L ἔλεγχος.
...the streets [were filled] with the dead bodies of the old...the burial of relatives was...avoided by those still in good health because of the pure numbers of the dead and the personal risk involved (BJ 5.513–514).

repleta erant uniuerse sa seminecum et, si paululum expectares, cadauerum...plerique etiam condiendis suorum funeribus immoriebantur et inexpleta suprmi muneres officia suo quoque obitu derelinquebant (DEH 5.21.2 [344, 4–5; 17–19]).

Every place was filled full with the half-dead and, if you would wait a bit, with bodies...very many died while arranging the burial of their family members and left unfulfilled the duty of this final service by their own death (DEH 5.21.2 [344, 4–5; 17–19]).

Many were going to bury the dead and the living fell on the dead and they died and there was no one to bury [them] because there was no place for the burying and those being buried (SY 80.42-43). Thus the famine and the struggle increased, the situation became serious, and the famine intensified until many of the people died. The living were busy with themselves so they were not burying their dead (KAY 7.7.5–6).

And the famine increased greatly until a large number of the people died and the living labored to the point of exhaustion burying the dead (ZA 7.7.10–11).
F2. The Living Join the Dead

Bellum Judaicum De Excidio Hierosolymitano Sefer Yosippon Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd Zena Ayhud

...πολλοὶ γούν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν θαπτομένοις ἐπαπέθνησκον (BJ 5.514).

ruebant super defunctos quos susceperant muniendos, ut ipse quoque oneri accederet cui leuando aduenerat, indigens eius ministerii quod alii deferebat (DEH 5.21.2 [344, 20–22]).

...and many fell dead while burying others (BJ 5.514).

They collapsed upon the dead whom they had undertook to guard, so that he also added to the burden which he had come to lighten, requiring that service which he was offering to another (DEH 5.21.2 [344, 20–22]).

Many were throwing the dead into the pits and they were also falling with them and dying (SY 80.44).

Many were throwing the dead into the pits and then hurling themselves in their heels, in order that they would die and be released from the terrible tragedy (KAY 7.7.6–7).

Some people were throwing the dead into the pits and then hurling themselves after them so that they might die and find relief from the ruin and tribulation (ZA 7.7.11–13).

F3. The Living Bury Themselves

311 S Ἐλληνικά: λαοῖς.
...and many others went early to their own graves before their proper time had come (BJ 5.514).

Many prepared [graves] for themselves with their own hands, lest a service of this type should not be available and inserted themselves voluntarily in these...(DEH 5.21.3 [345, 15–17]).

Moreover, many of the people were digging graves for them[elves] and then lying down inside them until they died (ZA 7.7.13–15).

F4. The Dead Are Neglected
There was no lamentation, no weeping at all this death. Famine negated emotion (BJ 5.515)

All things were silent from fear, starvation had taken away voices, the city was full of death and there was no lamentation in funeral rites within the entire city (DEH 5.21.3 [345, 18–20]).

The crying had stopped and the tears had dried and the voices were silent…and there was no collecting [of the dead] no burying [of the dead] no weeping [for the dead] and no trembling (SY 80.46–47).

The weeping stopped and the sounds [of mourning?] ceased and compassion and lamentations came to an end; and the houses, streets and alleys were filled with the corpses of the dead… (KAY 7.8–9).

Weeping, mourning, and grief on account of the dead were neglected and the houses, streets and market places were filled with the corpses of the dead (ZA 7.7.15–17).

F5. Throwing Away the Dead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐδὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου θῆσαρνοῦ τοὺς νεκροὺς θάπτειν ἐκέλευον τὴν ὁσμὴν οὐ φέροντες, ἐπειδὴ οὐ δύηκον ἀπὸ τῶν τειχῶν ἔρριπτον εἰς...</td>
<td>ut eos de publico aerario sepeliri iuberent. sed ubi occurrere nequimum, tunc de muro defunctorum reliquias in profunda praecipitiae deiciebant (DEH 5.21.4 [346, 4–5]).</td>
<td>וכבראתה ימרים</td>
<td>וכראתה פרס</td>
<td>וכראתה פרס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 There is a lacuna in the Judeo-Arabic text at this point in the narrative. The narrative picks up a few words later with (הנותן). (The Judeo-Arabic text agrees with the variant in this case)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 יָעֵבְרָה בֵּית וָעֵבְרָה בִּיהוּדָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318 S, B, P, L, F וִיהוּדָה:</td>
<td>(ZA 7.7.17–19).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At first the [rebels] had the bodies buried at public expense...when this could no longer be maintained, they threw them from the wall into the ravines (BJ 5.518).

When Titus saw the bodies of the dead who had died in the famine having been thrown into the Kidron Valley without number like waste... (SY 80.50–51)

As for the rebels, they too were throwing them from the top of the wall into the valley east of the city until there was a large number of them in the valley (ZA 7.7.17–19).

G1. Titus’s Reaction to the Magnitude of Corpses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitanus</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Περιμόν δὲ ταύτας ὦ Τίτος ὡς ἐθεσαυστὸ πεπλησμένας τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ βαθὺν ἵψα ἔστεναζέ... (BJ 5.519).</td>
<td>itaque aspiciens Titus praeruptos specus plenos cadauerum, saniem dilaceratis usceribus innatantem, alte ingemuit... (DEH 5.21.4 [346, 6–7]).</td>
<td>...and the rebels ordered them to be buried from the public treasury. But when this could not be done, they threw the remains of the dead from the wall into deep precipices (DEH 5.21.4 [346, 4–5]).</td>
<td>...and the rebels were throwing them from the top of the wall into the valley that was east of the city until there was a great number of them in the valley (KAY 7.7.9–10).</td>
<td>... (SY 80.50–51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Titus on his rounds saw the ravines clogged with corpses, and pools of putrid And so Titus seeing the steep chasms full of bodies, the bloody matter flowing from the</td>
<td>When Titus saw the bodies of the dead who had died in the famine having been thrown through among them on one of the days and when he saw their great</td>
<td>On one of these days, Titus crossed over to their side and he saw the great</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

319 מִלָּיִל: יָתוּם קְרֵרֵתֵם.
manner oozing out from the decomposing bodies, he groaned aloud… (BJ 5.519)
torn up entrails, groaned deeply… (DEH 5.21.4 [346, 6–7]).
to the Kidron Valley without number like waste, he was very frightened (SY 80.50-51).
number he considered this [matter] great and was shocked by it… (KAY 7.7.10–11).
number of their corpses and he was extremely saddened (ZA 7.7.19–21).

G2. Titus Desires the Welfare of the Jews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείνας κατεμαρτύριον τὸν θεόν, ὡς οὐκ εἶπά τῷ ἔργῳ αὐτοῦ (BJ 5.519)</td>
<td>...et manus ad caelum eleuans testabatur hautquaquam illud sibi adscribendum, qui uoluisset ueniam dare si procederet (DEH 5.21.4 [346, 7–10]).</td>
<td>...and raising his hands to heaven, calling God to witness that this was not his doing (BJ 5.519)</td>
<td>...and raising his hands to the heavens, he bore witness that this should by no means be attributed to him, who had wished He spread his hands to heaven and said, “God of Heaven, cleanse me but of this debt because I did not want to ...and he raised his hands in the direction of the heavens and said, “Oh Lord, you know that I did not long for or want the annihilation of ...He lifted his eyes toward the heavens and said, “Oh Lord, you know that I did not long for or want the annihilation of...</td>
<td>...et manus ad caelum eleuans testabatur hautquaquam illud sibi adscribendum, qui uoluisset ueniam dare si procederet (DEH 5.21.4 [346, 7–10]).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an instance of haplography in the Judeo-Arabic text at this point in the narrative. The following word is omitted, which serves as another indication that the Judeo-Arabic version of the text is relying on a source written in Arabic script.

There is an instance of haplography in the Judeo-Arabic text at this point in the narrative. The following word is omitted, which serves as another indication that the Judeo-Arabic version of the text is relying on a source written in Arabic script.

There is an instance of haplography in the Judeo-Arabic text at this point in the narrative. The following word is omitted, which serves as another indication that the Judeo-Arabic version of the text is relying on a source written in Arabic script.
to give pardon if submission had proceeded \((DEH 5.21.4 [346, 7–10])\). commit [it]…” (SY 80.51-52). the people and I did not wish for them [anything] except prosperity” \((KAY 7.7.11–12)\). have passed. However, what I indeed wanted for them was good things…” \((ZA 7.7.21–23)\).

G3. Titus Offers Peace and Mercy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>expectasse se ut pacem rogarent, paratum se fuisset ut incolumes reseruaret si bellum deposuisset ((DEH 5.21.4 [346, 10–11])).</td>
<td>وقد استدعيتهم الي الصلح وبدلت لهم الامان ووعدتهم بالإحسن ((SY 80.52-53))</td>
<td>“…but I wished peace” ((SY 80.52-53)).</td>
<td>“…So I invited them to a reconciliation and offered them protection and promised them goodness” ((KAY 7.7.12–13)).</td>
<td>“…and behold I cried out to them to make peace and I offered them a treaty that I would pardon them…” ((ZA 7.7.23–25)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G4. Titus Blames the Leaders of the Jews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

325 לְכָּלִים אֶבָּאֵים וּבִזָּלַת.

326 לְאַחַת אֲגַדְּרַת וּבִזָּלַת.

327 S, B om.
“...but the leaders of the rebels refused. They did all of this evil to the people” (SY 80.53).

“But their leaders and troublemakers prevented them until this powerful affliction came upon them” (KAY 7.7.13).

“I ask you, oh Lord, that you pardon me from their sins and do not condemn me because of what has afflicted them” (KAY 7.7.14).

“(The Judeo-Arabic text agrees with the variant in this case)” (KAY 7.7.14)
H1. The Rebels Taste the Famine

Bellum Judaicum | De Excidio Hierosolymitano | Sefer Yosippon | Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd | Zena Ayhud

"Ρωμαίοι δὲ μηδένος ἐτὶ τὸν στασιαστῶν ἐκτρέχοντος, ἢδη γὰρ καὶ τούτων ἄθιμία καὶ λιμὸς ἐφύπτετο (BJ 5.520).

The Romans though were in high spirits, with no rebels coming out against them (even they were now feeling the pinch of desperate hunger) (BJ 5.520).

In those days the famine grew heavy in the midst of the city and also upon the leaders of the rebels (SY 82.74).

[The author of the book] said: when the siege grew long, the rebels starved and God afflicted them also and caused them to taste what they had made the people taste of the famine (KAY 7.7.14–15).

He [the author of the book] said [that] when the siege lasted for a long time, the rebels and their followers were hungry and God made them taste the famine just as he made the people taste the

---

330 ز وحاج

331 There is another instance of haplography in the Judeo-Arabic text at this stage in the narrative.

332 م ۲ چن‌یا‌ی ایرانی، واقع.

333 L, F add. "ΠΑΤΟΥ: Ὀμηρὸς:"

334 L, F "ΠΑΤΟΥ: Ὀμηρὸς:"

335 S, B "ΚΑΥΣΟΥΑ: − L "ΚΑΥΣΟΥΑ:"

336 L "ΚΑΥΣΟΥΑ:"
### H2. Eating Excrement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>προσέλθειν τινας εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀνάγκης, ὠστε τάς ὀμίρας ἐρευνώντας καὶ παλαιὸν ὄνθον βοῶν προσφέρεσθαι τα ἐκ τοῦτον σκύβαλα (BJ 5.571)</td>
<td>…[Iudaeorum] utetuta rimaretur boum stercora, ut, quod uisu erat horribile, hoc fieret esca esurientibus (DEH 5.25.2 [360, 18–20]).</td>
<td>…[the Jews] searched through the old dung of cattle, so that, what was horrible to see, this became food for the hungry (DEH 5.25.2 [360, 18–20]).</td>
<td>The famine took place until they were eating the dung of their horses… (SY 82.74–75).</td>
<td>…[the rebels] came to the point of eating the vermin that were in the excrement of animals (ZA 7.7.29–30).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

…some people had been reduced to such desperate straits that they were picking through the sewers and heaps of old cow-dung and eating what garbage they could find (BJ 5.571)…

…[the Jews] found…

He caused their commanders to eat the kernels that were in the dung of animals (KAY 7.7.15–16).

### H3. Eating Leather

---

337 F ṭḥm : מְחִלָּה;
338 F ḥrš-h : מְחִלָּה;
In the end, they came down to gnawing belts and shoes, and stripping the leather off their shields, they chewed it (BJ 6.197).

...they tore away the leather from their shields so that what was not protection would become food for them (DEH 5.39.2 [381, 21–22]).

and they ate all the leather vessels of their chariots and their vessels of war (SY 82.75–76).

After that all the animals disappeared and they ate the leather of their wagons and the leather of the sheaths of their swords (ZA 7.7.30–32).

---

I1. Searching in Vain for Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>plerique etiam beneficium putantes mori urbm, ut herbes uel radices</td>
<td>وكانوا يطلبون شيء من النباتات فلا يجدونه لا في داخل المدينة ولا في ظاهرها لأ أن الروم لم يكونوا أكلوا قطعوا كلمة</td>
<td>ו_CUBE:</td>
<td>ה_ג א_ה:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>وكانوا يطلبون شيء من النباتات فلا يجدونه لا في داخل المدينة ولا في ظاهرها لأ أن الروم لم يكونوا أكلوا قطعوا كلمة</td>
<td>ו_CUBE:</td>
<td>ה_ג א_ה:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>י_ד:</td>
<td>ל_א ש_ד:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>א_ה:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ל_א ש_ד:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ל_א ש_ד:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ל_א ש_ד:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ל_א ש_ד:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ל_א ש_ד:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Furthermore many thinking it a benefit to die, or so that they might pluck or tear away the bark of trees if perchance some greenery in them might serve as a source of comfort provided by food, went out from the city; whom the Romans discovering would kill (DEH 5.18.3 [335, 22–26]).

The leaders of the rebels sought to find a leafy branch of a tree or vegetables or weeds to eat it but there was none because the Romans cut down all the trees around Jerusalem… (SY 82.76–77).

And they were searching [for] some plants but they were not finding them, neither inside the city nor outside of it, because the Romans had destroyed whatever was around the city from trees to plants (KAY 7.7.17–18).

And they sought continually [for] a few herbs of the grass; but they were not finding it, neither inside the city nor outside of it because Rome cut down everything that was around the city, from trees to shoots to herbs (ZA 7.7.32–34).

I2. The Desolation of the Land Around Jerusalem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ρωμαῖοι δὲ καίτοι πολλὰ περὶ τὴν τῆς ὕλης συγκομιδὴν</td>
<td>per tredecim ferme in circuitu urbis milia longe</td>
<td>רומאים רבים经历了</td>
<td>فلم يتركوا الروم من جميع ذلك شي وصارت</td>
<td>שודד איהוד:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

344 L, F שודד איהוד: 345 L וֹנִי—S וֹנִי: 259
...the Romans managed to complete the erection of their earthworks in twenty-one days...cutting down the whole area round the city within a radius of ten miles (BJ 6.5–6).

For nearly thirteen miles about the city the land far and wide had been ravaged... (DEH 5.25.2 [360, 27–28]).

The Romans cut down all the trees around Jerusalem [for] thirteen miles in [every] direction...and the entire land was round like a land of wilderness and desert (SY 82.77–80).

But the Romans did not leave behind anything from any of this and these places became like an arid desert (KAY 7.7.19–20).

But the Romans did not spare any of this whatsoever and the gardens that were [there] before became a wasteland (ZA 7.7.34–35).

I3. The Former Beauty of Jerusalem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τὰ γὰρ πάλαι δένδρα καὶ παραδεισοὺς κεκοσμημένα τότε πανταχόθεν ἡρμῆμοτο καὶ περικέκοπτο τὴν ὑλὴν (BJ 6.6).</td>
<td>omne illud pomerium, in quo ante nemora uridantia, horti inhalantes floribus, diuersa pomaria suburbana praedia gratan sui speciem dabant</td>
<td>ויהי סיבורה ירושלם נווה ופר든지 ולאף מספר... (SY 82.79)</td>
<td>ואוננו בן מקדש מפי סערים גיהנאים יבשנים كثيرה فيما אنشاط האזיווא וเภואを持つו מאמצעים מכל جهة (KAY 7.7.18–19)</td>
<td>ישה productId: 347 ש, ב, ל, פ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where there had once been attractive woods and orchards there was now utter desert everywhere, with all the trees reduced to stumps (BJ 6.6).

All that pomerium in which formerly verdant groves, gardens breathing the odor of flowers, a variety of fruit trees and suburban villas offered their pleasing appearance (DEH 5.25.3 [361, 1–2]).

Around Jerusalem there were countless gardens and orchards… (SY 82.79).

There were around Jerusalem in every direction many gardens and in them [different] kinds of trees and fruits a mile’s journey in every direction (KAY 7.7.18–19).

Now around Jerusalem there were many gardens on all sides of [the city], each one varied in its appearance and pleasantness and in its odor and [each one’s] measurement was two me’rafs on every side… (ZA 7.7.35–37).

I4. The Weeping of Nostalgia

Bellum Judaicum

De Excidio Hierosolymitano

Sefer Yosippon

Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd

Zena Ayhud


355 S, B, L ימיה:
No visitor from abroad who had seen the old Judea and the handsome suburbs of the city, and now looked on the present scene of devastation, could have failed to groan in dismay at the enormous change which had taken place (BJ 6.7).

…if anyone saw [them] afterward, the visitor would groan, the inhabitant would not recognize, and returning to their place of birth, although being present, these would continue to search for their ancestral land (DEH 5.25.3 [361, 2–4]).

Those coming from afar who had seen the forests of Jerusalem earlier looked to the right and there was no tree and turned to the left and there was nothing [or no weeds]. And they were astonished and wept with bitterness and wailing (SY 82.81–83).

Everyone who was familiar with these gardens before, upon seeing them after the Romans destroyed them, would weep and be saddened (KAY 7.7.20-21).

And when one who was used to seeing them before saw them he would weep over their ruin and desolation (ZA 7.7.40–41).
A certain woman from among those dwelling across the Jordan, Maria by name, whose father was Eleazar, of the village of Bethezouba (this means house of hyssop), distinguished by

What should I undertake to say about the deed of Maria?...She was from the wealthiest women of the region of Perea, which lies across the Jordan (DEH 5.40.1 [381, 27–29]).

Now there was in Jerusalem a certain woman from the daughters of the nobles and her name was Maria. She was from across the Jordan (SY 86.1–2).

The master of the book said [that] there was in Jerusalem a woman from a prosperous people and her family was from a city in the neighborhood of the Jordan (KAY 7.7.21–22).

The master of the book said that there was in Jerusalem a woman from a rich people and her [home] city was across the Jordan River (ZA 7.7.27–28).

356 في وادي الاردن.
357 زيارة.
358 جازية.
birth and wealth… (BJ 6.201).

A2. The Woman Moves to Jerusalem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolimitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…μετὰ τοῦ λοιποῦ πλῆθους εἰς τὰ Ἰεροσολύμα καταφυγόοσα συνεπολορχέετο (BJ 6.201).</td>
<td>belli terrore oborto cum ceteris in Hierosolymitanam urbem contulerat, quo esset tutior (DEH 5.40.1 [381, 30–31]).</td>
<td>וכתהاداتם דומלאתם ב svn לארבעה אל ר偵ה אל会议室 (SY 86.2)</td>
<td>וכנל קלתו התנן هناק בזמא אספיאסיאנס 361 אנטנתל האמרם הלי בים المقدس וואנסמ (KAY 7.7.22–23)</td>
<td>והנהו בז אלי חין בזמא אספיאסיאנס 361 אנטנתל האמרם הלי בים المقدس וואנסמ (ZA 7.7.28–30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…having fled for refuge with the rest of the multitude to Jerusalem, was confined along with them by the siege (BJ 6.201).</td>
<td>When the terror of war arose, she went with the others to Jerusalem, so that she would be safer (DEH 5.40.1 [381, 30–31]).</td>
<td>When the war intensified in the days of Vespasian, she went up to Jerusalem with those going up [there] (SY 86.2).</td>
<td>When the fighting increased there in the days of Vespasian, the woman went down to Jerusalem and resided in it (KAY 7.7.22–23).</td>
<td>When the conflict there increased in the days of Vespasian, that woman emigrated to Jerusalem and she resided there (ZA 7.7.28–30).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3. The Woman’s Wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolimitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ταύτης τὴν μὲν ἄλλην κτήοιν οἱ eo quoque suas deuexerat</td>
<td>וכתהاداتם דומלאתם בsvn לארבעה אל会议室</td>
<td>וכתהاداتם דומלאתם בsvn לארבעה אל会议室 (SY 86.2)</td>
<td>וכתהاداتם דומלאתם בsvn לארבעה אל会议室 (SY 86.2)</td>
<td>וכתהاداتם דומלאתם בsvn לארבעה אל会议室 (SY 86.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tyrants plundered her other property, as much as having packed up from Peraea she brought to the city (BJ 6.202).

She transported her wealth there also…(DEH 5.40.1 [381, 31]).

She went up with her man servants and maidservants and great wealth with her (SY 86.3)

She had an enormous wealth and kindness and slaves and maidservants (ZA 7.7.30).

And grasping her child, for she had a boy under her breast, she said…(BJ 6.205).

The woman had a small infant to whom she had given birth (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 9–10]).

Now she had one son (SY 86.8) …and she had but only one small son [whom] she loved exceedingly (lit. with exceeding love) (KAY 7.7.23–24).

…and she had one small son and she loved him exceedingly (ZA 7.7.30–31).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τὰ δὲ λείψανα τῶν κειμηλίων καὶ εἶ ὁ τροφῆς ἐπινοηθεὶς καθ’ ἕμεραν εἰσπηδῶντες ἠμπαζον οἱ δορυφόροι (BJ 6.202).</td>
<td>eo quoque suas deuexerat opes, quas principes factionum certatim inuasere. alimentorum etiam si quid pretio quaesierat, de manibus eruebatur (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 1–3]).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But the remains of her valuables and if she contrived something for food, the armed agents of the tyrants, bursting in daily, kept on plundering (BJ 6.202).</td>
<td>She transported her wealth there also, which the leaders of the factions in competition (with each other) took possession of. Even if she sought to obtain something edible for a price, it was plucked out of her hands (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 1–3]).</td>
<td>When the famine took place in Jerusalem, the rebels searched the houses to find sustenance. They came to the house of this woman and took everything that she had, from food to sustenance (SY 86.4–5).</td>
<td>And when the famine increased in Jerusalem, the rebels took every edible thing that was inside the house of the woman and thus made her destitute (KAY 7.7.24–25).</td>
<td>Now when the famine grew worse in Jerusalem, the robbers pillaged everything of sustenance that was inside that woman’s house, so that they made it twice as bad for her (ZA 7.7.31–32).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

366 וָיְבֹאָו [SY 86.4–5]
367 וּבְיָבַאַהוּ קֶסְאָה [KAY 7.7.24–25]
368 וְיָבָאַהוּ [KAY 7.7.24–25]
369 וְיָבְאוּ [KAY 7.7.24–25]
370 וָיְבֹאָו [ZA 7.7.31–32]
C. The Woman Desires to Die

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yāhūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δεινή δὲ τὸ γύναιον ὀγανάκτησις εἰσῆι καὶ πολλάκις λοιδοροῦσα καὶ καταρωμένη τοὺς ἄρσαγας ἐφ᾽ αὐτὴν ἤρεθιξεν (BJ 6.203).</td>
<td>exagitabatur a perditis, dira imprecabatur, uolebat mori sed percussorem non inueniebat (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 3–4]).</td>
<td>And it happened that when the famine grew heavy upon her, her spirit asked to die but her end did not come…(SY 86.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A terrible indignation came upon the woman, and she kept on provoking the plunderers against her by constantly reviling and cursing them…(BJ 6.203).

D. The Woman and the Famine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yāhūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...καὶ τὸ μὲν εὑρεῖν τι οἰτίον ἄλλοις ἑκοπίᾳ πανταχόθεν δὲ</td>
<td>defecerant iam omnia et deliciis adsueta asperiora palearum uel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And it happened that when the famine grew heavy upon her, her spirit asked to die but her end did not come…(SY 86.6)

371 δεινὴ δὲ τὸ γύναιον 372 οὐλὴν ἀπῄρουσα
373 μὴ ημισκρίνοσθε Ιαχו. נפשה
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...and on the one hand she was becoming weary of finding some food for others, and on other hand even finding it from anywhere was impossible now (BJ 6.204).

All things had already run short and having been accustomed to luxuries, she could not soften the harshness of husks or the hardness of leather (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 6–8]).

The woman began to collect from the earth everything that she would find to eat, from thatch to straw, but there was none (SY 86.6–7).

The woman went hungry and her son went hungry (KAY 7.7.25).

The woman was hungry and her son too went hungry (ZA 7.7.32).

E. The Intensity of the Famine on the Woman

Bellum Judaicum  De Excidio Hierosolymitano  Sefer Yosippon  Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd  Zena Ayhud

dὲ διὰ σπλάγχνων καὶ μυελῶν ἐχώρει καὶ τοῦ λιμοῦ μάλλον ἐξέχασαν οἱ θυμοὶ… σύμβουλον λαμβάνει τὴν ὀργὴν μετὰ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἐπὶ

saeua fames intimis se infudit medullis…uagitu eiusmod excita… affectum amisit et pietatis genitalis usu oblitterato dolorem absorbuit,

γιὰ τὸ εὑρεῖν ὁ λιμὸς… (BJ 6.204).

The woman went hungry and her son went hungry (KAY 7.7.25).

The woman was hungry and her son too went hungry (ZA 7.7.32).

382 S, B, L, F ṣaṭhe:
383 S, B, F ṣḥāṭah:
384 S, B, P, L ṣḥaṭah: – F ṣḥaṭah: ṣḥaṭah: ṣḥaṭah:
...and the famine was moving through her guts and her marrow and, more than the famine, her emotions were inflaming her...taking her anger along with necessity as a counselor, she moved against nature (BJ 6.204).

Savage famine infused itself into her innermost marrow...Aroused by his crying...she lost her affection and with the custom of parental tenderness forgotten, she swallowed up her sorrow and took up fury (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 8–14]).

And it came to pass that when the famine grew strong against her and went down into the inner parts of the marrow of her bones, that they turned all of her mercy into cruelty. When the woman heard the voice of the child crying for bread, she became convinced that there was none, and she said... (SY 86.8–10).

When what was found in the famine and what reached her heart from the pain of the crying and complaints of her son grew heavy upon her, she was exhausted and lost patience. She made a plan to kill her son and eat him [in order to] put an end to her hunger through him... (KAY 7.7.25–27).

And when the famine grew worse on her, she did not know what she would do because of the famine, the ruin, the tribulation, and the weeping of her son. She was unable to endure and her hope collapsed and she wanted to kill her son and eat him because of the famine (ZA 7.7.32–34).

F. Infanticide as Mercy Killing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>muşnūn</td>
<td>furorem</td>
<td>adsumsit</td>
<td>(DEH 5.40.2 [382, 8–14])</td>
<td>(ZA 7.7.32–34).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

378 בּוֹכָה לַלֶּחָם
379 לַלֶּחָם נָכוּךְ אֱוִיִּן
385 לַהֲדוֹר
386 לַהֲדוֹר  אֲבָא
387 לַהֲדוֹר אֲבָא

378 לַלֶּחָם נָכוּךְ אֱוִיִּן
379 לַלֶּחָם נָכוּךְ אֱוִיִּן
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…and to grant him rest through the killing from the affliction of the famine and the pain (KAY 7.7.27).

…and to give him rest through the killing from the affliction of the famine (ZA 7.7.35).

G. A Mother’s Dilemma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She remained confused and was ignorant concerning two problems [related to] her own endurance: For she was bereaved about what she would do concerning two matters [related to] enduring the

388 حايره لا تدري على أي الامرين تحمل نفسها هل تقتل ابنها الواحد العزيز عليها بيدها وتكتشف ذلك أعظم الأمور وأفسعها ام تصدبر على ما تراه به ونفسها من البلاء. (KAY 7.7.27–29)

389  زب اشنع الأمور وافضها.

390 L om.
391 S, B סנהי: – L סה
392 S, B, L סנהי:
393 P, L סנהי:
394 P, B, S add. סנהי: – S סנהי:
395 L סנהי:
either she would kill her only beloved son with her own hand and eat him, and this would be the worst situation; or she would suffer through the calamity that she saw in him and in herself (KAY 7.7.27–29).

famine. Either she would kill her only son, seizing him herself by her hands and eating him (and this was a great misfortune); or indeed she would suffer on account the famine and tribulation (ZA 7.7.35–37).

### H. The Mother is Unable to Endure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>وقِدَ فَارِقَهَا الصَّبْرِ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>وَغَلِبَهَا الجُوعُ حَتَّى</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>لَمْ يِبِقَ لَهَا رَأٍيٌ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>وزَالَتْ عَنْهَا الرَّحْمَهُ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>وَالْإِشْفَاقُ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(KAY 7.7.29–30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Endurance had already abandoned her and the famine overcame her until there did not remain for her counsel or mercy and affection came to an end (KAY 7.7.29–30).

And endurance was taken away from her and the famine increased upon her until there remained for her no counsel, or compassion, or mercy (ZA 7.7.37–38).

---

396 S, B, L, F יִּזְכַר: 271
### I. “I had Hoped”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolimitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...speraueram quod, si adoleuisses, me pasceres matrem aut sepelires defunctam...” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 18–19]).</td>
<td>...I had hoped that, if you had grown to maturity, you would have fed me your mother and bury me when I died...” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 18–19]).</td>
<td>...I was hoping for you that you would grow up and provide support for my old age and bury me on the day of my death” (SY 86.13–14).</td>
<td>She said to her son, “I was hoping, oh my one precious son, that you would work until you inherited my gold and property and you would take care of my affairs [when] I died...” (KAY 7.7.30–31).</td>
<td>She said to her son, “I was hoping, oh my only so son, that you would indeed live to take over my property so that you might manage and set my property in order if I were to grow old as well as bury me if I were to die...” (ZA 7.7.38–40).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

397 S, B, L ṣawh.y.: אֲלִיל יֵא: מַלֵּא כָּל מִן א: לִי־חֲכֵי
398 S, B, L ṣawh.y.: אֲלִיל יֵא: מַלֵּא כָּל מִן א: לִי־חֲכֵי
399 S, B, L ṣawh.y.: אֲלִיל יֵא: מַלֵּא כָּל מִן א: לִי־חֲכֵי
400 S, B, L ṣawh.y.: אֲלִיל יֵא: מַלֵּא כָּל מִן א: לִי־חֲכֵי
401 S, B ṣawh.y.: אֲלִיל יֵא: מַלֵּא כָּל מִן א: לִי־חֲכֵי
I2. “I Was Afraid You Would Die Before Me”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

وقد كنت أخاف أن تموت قلي فاحزان أموتك وأصاب بفقدك.

(KAY 7.7.31–32)

“I was already afraid that you would die before me and your death would make me sad and I would be afflicted by your absence” (KAY 7.7.31–32).

“I was afraid that you would not die before me and I would be saddened over your death and shaken by my childlessness…” (ZA 7.7.40–41).

I3. “I Would Have Buried You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

وليت كنت قد تكتلك! وليت كنت مت على غير هذا.

(KAY 7.7.40–41)

“…certe, si praeuines obitu, quod ego

402 L א complied

410 L כ עב הָיָה – F add. פָּרָשַׁת.
te pretioso tumulo meis manibus includerem” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 19–20]).

“…certainly, if you preceded me in death, (I had hoped) that I would have enclosed you in an expensive grave with my own hands” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 19–20]).

In the case that you died before I died, I was going to bury you with honor like a mother [does] for a son of her womb (SY 86.14–15).

If only you were already dead and if only you had died by another reason than this your annihilation. Then God would not see this adversity…(KAY 7.7.32–33).

“…and over why you did not die on the other side of this tragedy. If only I had buried you and entrusted you to God, then he would not see this ruin…” (ZA 7.7.41–42).

I4. “Adversity Has Surrounded Us”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhāb ar-ayyūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“tà μὲν παρὰ Ψωμαίοις θουλεία, κἀν ζησομεν ἐπ’ αὐτούς, φθάνει δὲ καὶ θουλείαν ὁ λυμός, οἴ</td>
<td>“saea te circumstant omnia, bellum, famae, incendia, latrones, ruinae” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 16–17])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

On the one hand among the Romans there is slavery, if indeed we live until them; on the other hand, the famine is arriving even before slavery, and the rebels are harsher than both (BJ 6.206).

“Everything surrounds you: war, famine, fires, robbers, ruin…” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 16–17]).

“Everything that surrounds you: war, famine, fires, robbers, ruin…” (SY 86.10–12).

“What will I do for you, my son, since everything around is scorched and from every corner [comes] hunger…” (SY 86.10–12).

Now, oh my son, adversity has already descended upon us from every side and we are deprived of our discernment and our hearts, and there we do not have hope and we are being eradicated by destruction (KAY 7.7.33–34).

“I5. “The Dead Are Not Buried”

Bellum Judaicum De Excidio Hierosolymitano Sefer Yosippon Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd Zena Ayhud

Falalhi mana la yitim fi al-baqat wa al-mit la yitim. (KAY 7.7.34)

“The living among us do not hope to continue”

“The living from among us do not have hope and we are being eradicated by destruction and tribulation” (ZA 7.7.42–44).

“The living among us do not hope to continue.”

I5. “The Dead Are Not Buried”

418 S ḫār [ taraf] :
419 L ḫār [ taraf] :
420 S, B, L om. – F ḫār [ taraf] :
421 S, B, L ḫār [ taraf] :
422 L, F ḫār [ taraf] :
I6. “There Will Be No One To Bury You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Aut certe quo condam sepulchro ne canibus alitibus uel feris praedas?”</td>
<td>“Fānā wānt mt yā bīni! Lām ydīnīk ḍār ʾal-ṭuhār ḍārā ḍanī ḍanī.”</td>
<td>“Or indeed in what tomb shall I hide you so that you are not prey for dogs, birds, or wild beasts?”</td>
<td>“Or indeed in what tomb shall I hide you so that you are not prey for dogs, birds, or wild beasts?” (DEH 5.40.2 [382, 22–24]).”</td>
<td>“Yāniː ḍār ʾal-ṭuhār ḍārā ḍanī ḍanī.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEH 5.40.2 [382, 22–24]).</td>
<td>(SY 86.15–17)</td>
<td>But now, my son, what will I do for you since there is no grave [in which] to bury you and you alive are as good as dead. Come and I will choose for you a grace within my womb, lest the dogs eat you (SY 86.15–17).</td>
<td>You and I will die and when you die, my son (bni), no one will bury you and you will be like your neighbors whom the dogs and the birds of the sky ate” (KAY 7.7.34–35).</td>
<td>“Both you and I will die and when you die, no one will bury you and you will be like your neighbor[s], after the dogs and the birds of the sky ate them” (ZA 7.7.45–46).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

423 S, B, L ḍār ʾal-ṭuhār ḍārā ḍanī ḍanī.
424 S, B, P, L, F ḍār ʾal-ṭuhār ḍārā ḍanī ḍanī.
425 S, B, L ḍār ʾal-ṭuhār ḍārā ḍanī ḍanī.
I7. “I Have Decided to Kill You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

وقد رأيت إن اقتلك لتستريح من الجوع. (KAY 7.7.35)

“I have already decided that I will kill you and give you rest from the famine” (KAY 7.7.35).

Now behold, I have decided that I will kill you [so that] you may find relief from the famine” (ZA 7.7.46–47).

I8. “Womb to Tomb”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“in quo domicilio sumpsisti spiritum, in eo tibi tumulus defuncto paratur” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 1–2]).

ثم لكلك بعد ذلك واجعل بطني الذي حملتني فيها قبرك وأسد بيك جوعي. (KAY 7.7.35–36)

“Now behold, I have decided [that] I will kill you and give you rest from the famine” (ZA 7.7.46–47).

430 לְבֵית אֲבָבֹתךְ;

431 מֵעִי בִּטְנֵךְ;

432 לַעֲשׂוּ יָבוּן;

433 S הָיְהוּ; – B הָיְהוּ; – F om.

434 S הָיְהוּ;
“In that place where you took up your spirit, there a grave is prepared for you in your death” (*DEH* 5.40.3 [383, 1–2]).

“Come and I will choose for you a grave within my womb, lest the dogs eat you. I will be a grave for you and you will be sustenance for me” (*SY* 86.16–18).

“Then I will eat you; after that I will make my womb, which carried you in it, your grave and I will satiate my hunger through you” (*KAY* 7.7.35–36).

“After that I will eat you and I will convert my womb that carried you so that it may be a grave for you and I will regain health from the famine by eating you” (*ZA* 7.7.47–48).

I9. “This Will Be a Repayment”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhūd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…prior quam vos penitus consumat fames, reddite matri quod accepistis, reddite in illud naturale secretum”</td>
<td>(DEH 5.40.2 [382, 26–27])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“…before the famine completely consumes you, restore to your mother what you have received, instead of the honor that was required of you (lit. upon you) to honor me, please feed me your flesh and this will be in place of the good things which I was hoping you would have” (*ZA* 7.7.48).

435 S, B אשת הים | שוהה ים
436 L, F אשת | לא יים
437 L, F om.
I10. “Since I Carried You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Repay your mother that which she gave to you, since from my insides you went out and there you shall enter [again]” (SY 86.19–20).</td>
<td>“It will be appropriate became I carried you, suckled you, and you grew up in my care” (KAY 7.7.37).</td>
<td>“And you will do it with me and you will repay me since I carried you, suckled you, and raised you” (ZA 7.7.49).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I11. “You Will Be Granted a Great Gift”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

parentheses in the text indicate a note or source.
“And now, my son, hear the voice of your mother and sustain my spirit and have mercy on me and your lot will be in the Garden of Eden” (SY 86.23–24).

“Through this you will attain an honor greater [than] the repayment and mercy” (KAY 7.7.37–38).

“[If] you follow my glory and my commandments then through that you will be granted a great gift and payment” (ZA 7.7.49–50).

I12. “A Disgrace to the Rebels”
“Come, become food for me, for the rebels an avenging spirit, and for the world (τῷ βίῳ) a story, the only one lacking from the disasters of the Jews” (BJ 6.207).

“You will also become a [source of] shame for the rebels who took our sustenance” (SY 86.22–23).

“And this will be a disgrace upon those rebels who assaulted you (var. “us”) in this great affliction and increased the wrath of God against themselves” (KAY 7.7.38–39).

“And it will be a disgrace to those robbers who brought me to this great ruin and increased the wrath of God against themselves” (ZA 7.7.50–52).

I13. “Our Story Will Endure”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“tua tamen causa melior et quaedam pietatis species, quia tolerabilius est quod matri dederis cibum uisceribus tuis,”</td>
<td>“uitae fabula, quae sola deest nostris calamitatis” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 5–7]).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Therefore be food for me, fury for the rebels and a tale for life (uitae), which alone is lacking from our misfortunes” (SY 86.22–23).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You will also become a [source of] shame for the rebels who took our sustenance” (SY 86.22–23).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“And this will be a disgrace upon those rebels who assaulted you (var. “us”) in this great affliction and increased the wrath of God against themselves” (KAY 7.7.38–39).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“And it will be a disgrace to those robbers who brought me to this great ruin and increased the wrath of God against themselves” (ZA 7.7.50–52).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

455 S, B, L יָבַי יִבְיָה: 

456 S, B, L, P יָבֵי יִבְיָה: 

460 L, F ָּבַי יִבְיָה: 

461 S, B, L, P ָּבַי יִבְיָה:
quam quod te mater aut occidere potest aut deuorare” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 8–11]).

“Your case however is better and (has) a certain appearance of piety, because it is more tolerable that you will have given your mother food…than that your mother is able to kill or devour you” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 8–11]).

“Your will become for me [a source of] satiation and shame so that it will be said that his mother killed him and ate him” (SY 86.24–25).

“Our story will continue to be passed through the ages and they will talk about it from generation to generation (lit. from after the generations)” (KAY 7.7.39).

“Our story will endure forever and they will tell it generation after generation” (ZA 7.7.52–53).

J. The Woman Kills Her Son

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-ayahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ταῦθ’ ἀμα λέγουσα κτείνει τὸν υἱόν... (BJ 6.208).</td>
<td>haece dicens auerso uultu gladium demersit... (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 11–12]).</td>
<td>מִבְּנֵי הָאָרְעָה</td>
<td>קַשְׁכִּיתוּהוּ</td>
<td>קַשְׁכִּיתוּהוּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the same time as saying this, she killed her son… (BJ 6.208).

Saying this she plunged the sword in with her faced turned away… (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 11–12]).

And it came to pass when she had spoken these words to her son that she seized the child with her hands, turned backwards, cut him with a knife, and killed him. And her eyes turned backwards and they did not see (SY 86.26–27).

Then the woman leapt [up] and took her son with one hand and took a knife with another hand. And after turning away her mind she turned her face away from him so as not to see him. Then she struck him with the knife and he died (KAY 7.7.39–41).

Then that woman leapt [up] and took her son with one hand and seized a knife with her other hand. She was faint of heart and she turned her face from him so that should would not see him. Then she pierced him with the knife and he died” (ZA 7.7.53–55).

K. The Woman Roasts Her Son’s Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἔπειτ᾽ ὀπτήσασα τὸ μὲν ἡμῖν κατεσθεῖε τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν κατακαλύψασα ἐφύλαττεν (BJ 6.208).</td>
<td>…et in frusta filium secans igni imposuit, partem comedit, partem operuit ne quis superueniret</td>
<td>468 ὑπὰκα ἐν τῇ ἁλίᾳ ἔθηκε; ἄρα ἀπεδέχατο τὸν αὐτῷ τὸν κατασκεύασαν μὲν ἔφυλαττεν, ἄρα πεποίησεν τὸν αὐτῷ τὸν ἔφυλαττεν (BJ 6.208).</td>
<td>469 ὑπὰκα ἐν τῇ ἁλίᾳ ἔθηκε; ἄρα ἀπεδέχατο τὸν αὐτῷ τὸν κατασκεύασαν μὲν ἔφυλαττεν, ἄρα πεποίησεν τὸν αὐτῷ τὸν ἔφυλαττεν (BJ 6.208).</td>
<td>470 ὑπὰκα ἐν τῇ ἁλίᾳ ἔθηκε; ἄρα ἀπεδέχατο τὸν αὐτῷ τὸν κατασκεύασαν μὲν ἔφυλαττεν, ἄρα πεποίησεν τὸν αὐτῷ τὸν ἔφυλαττεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...then having roasted (him), she devoured half, and covering up the remainder she kept it under guard (BJ 6.208).

...and cutting her son into pieces, she placed [him] in the fire; she ate a part, and a part she covered up lest someone should come upon it (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 12–14]).

She took the carcass of the child and cut it into pieces. She roasted it, cooked it, and ate it and what was left over she saved for keeping (SY 86.27–28).

Thereafter she took some of his flesh and roasted it over the fire and ate what she needed from it and put away what was left over (ZA 7.7.55–56).

L. The Rebels Enter

Bellum Judaicum | De Excidio Hierosolymitano | Sefer Yosippon | Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd | Zena Ayhud
---|---|---|---|---
 εὐθέως δὲ οἱ στασισταὶ παρῆσαν καὶ τῆς αθεμίτου κνίσης στάσαντες ἤπειλον εἰ μὴ δεῖξειν τὸ παρασκευασθέν ἄποσφάξειν αὐτὴν εὐθέως... (BJ 6.209). | sed nidor incensi peruenit ad principes seditionis continuoque odorem secuti introierunt mulieris hospitium minantes necem... (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 14–16]). | όνομα: παρηγοροῦντον: | όνομα: εὐθέως... (SY 86.30) | ἐλέειν αὐτὴν δὲ ἄμα γὰρ ἰόθεν ἔλησεν ἀπὸ τοῖς ἀθεμίτους καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις παρασκευασθέν ἄποσφάξεν αὐτὴν εὐθέως... (KAY 7.42–43) | (ZA 7.7.56–57).

473 S, B ὄπισθεν τοῖς: 474 S, B ἀλλὰ: 475 S, B ἄλλοι: ἄλλοι: 476 ἀπὸ:
Immediately the rebels arrived, and drawing in the unholy odor, threatened that if she did not show what had been prepared, they would slaughter her immediately (BJ 6.209).

But the smell of that which had been burned reached the leaders of the revolt and immediately following the odor, they entered the woman’s quarters threatening murder...(DEH 5.40.3 [383, 14–16]).

The smell also went to the leaders of the rebels and they came to the house of the woman with fierce anger...(SY 86.30).

Now when the aroma of that flesh ascended, the rebels and their companions rushed upon the woman with great anger (KAY 7.7.42–43).

Now when the smoke of that flesh arose and the robbers and their followers smelled it, they ran hastily and entered the house of that woman in a great rage (ZA 7.7.56–57).

M. The Rebels Question the Woman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…[minantes necem] quod ausa esset ipsis ieunantibus edere atque eos exortes facere cibi quem repperisset (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 16–17]).</td>
<td>وقالوا لها ما الذي موريا ذات السليمة. 477</td>
<td>…[threatening murder] because she had dared to eat while they were famishing and had</td>
<td>قالوا لها ما الذي كنت 479 تأكل وان هذا اللحم وكيف اكلته وحك ولمن تعلمنا به. (KAY 7.7.43–44)</td>
<td>…[threatening murder] because she had dared to eat while they were famishing and had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…[they] said to her, “Why do you eat [while] we are dying from</td>
<td></td>
<td>…and they said to her, “What was it that you were eating and where did you get this meat from</td>
<td></td>
<td>…and they said to her, “What were you eating and from where did you find (this meat) and why did</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

477 אליה נשך: אליה נשך
478 ואתה נשבך: 479 זנב קנט.
excluded them from the food that she had discovered (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 16–17]).

and why did you eat it alone by yourself and not inform us about it?” (KAY 7.7.43–44).

you eat it alone before you informed us?” (ZA 7.7.57–59).

N1. “I Reserved For You the Larger Portion”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excido Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ...ἡ δὲ καὶ μοῖραν αὐτοῖς εἰποῦσα καλὴν τετηρηκέναι τὰ λείψανα τοῦ τέκνου διεκάλυψεν (BJ 6.209). | at illa: “Partem,” inquit, “uestram ubis seruaui, non fui auara nec inhumana. nolite indignari, habitis quod et uos edatis. de meis ubis uisceribus cibum paraui” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 17–20]). | The woman answered and said to them, “Be merciful and do not hasten because I have not wronged you and I have not loved myself more than you. But | And the woman said to them, “Sit and do not hasten because I have not wronged you and I have not loved myself more than you. On the contrary, I set [aside] for you the |...

...and she, having said that she had also saved a fine part for them, uncovered the remains of the child (BJ 6.209).
From my internal organs I have prepared food for you” *(DEH 5.40.3 [383, 17–20]).

rather I have set aside for you a larger portion from what I ate” *(KAY 7.7.44–45).

larger portion from what I ate” *(ZA 7.7.59–60).

N2. “Sit and I Will Set the Table”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“considite ocius, mensam adponam, mirari habetis ministerium meum, iudicare quod talem nullius inueneritis mulieris affectum, quae uos nec dulcis filii fraudaret gratia” *(DEH 5.40.3 [383, 20–23]).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Be seated quickly, I will arrange the table; you have to marvel at my service and to “Please sit and I will set the table before you and you will eat your portion which I have set aside “Recline until I bring it to you” *(KAY 7.7.45). “Recline, all of you, until I bring [it] out for you” *(ZA 7.7.61).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

judge that you have found in no (other) woman such a disposition, who would not defraud you of the favor of her sweet son” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 20–23]).

N3. The Woman Presents Her Son’s Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al- yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>simul dicens redoperuit</td>
<td>ambusta membra et epulanda obtulit cum adhortatione huiusmodi sermonis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEH 5.40.3 [383, 23–25]).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saying this she at the same time uncovered the scorched limbs and offered them for banqueting with the encouragement She set the table before them…(SY 86.34).

So the men sat down and she went and set up the table before them and brought out what she had kept of the

So the men sat down and the woman went and spread out the table before them and brought out what was left over

497 | тухорр или вареха Д |
498 | לָפְנֵיכֶם חָשׁלָוִת בָּא לָפְנֵיכֶם חָשׁלָוִת בָּא חָשׁלָוֵה לָפְנֵיכֶם חָשׁלָוֵה (לָפְנֵיכֶם אֶחָד) |
499 | 2 כְּנֶנֶל וּבֵיהֶה לָפְנֵיכֶם (לָפְנֵיכֶם אֶחָד)

500 | S, B, L add. שְׁפַקְוָה: |
501 | L שְׁפַקְוָה: |
502 | S, B, L add. שְׁפַקְוָה: |
of a speech of this kind: *(DEH 5.40.3 [383, 23–25]).*

N4. “This is My Son Whom I Loved”

Bellum Judaicum

De Excidio Hierosolymitano

Sefer Yosippon

Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd

Zena Ayhud

tōuς δ’ εὐθέως φύση καὶ παρέξοντως ἤμει καὶ παρὰ τὴν ὅψιν ἐπεπήγεον ἢ δ’ ἐμὸν ἐφή τὸ τέκτον ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ ἐφιγνὸν ἐμὸν *(BJ 6.210).*

“hoc est prandium meum, haec uestra portio, uidete diligentius ne uos fraudauerim. ecce pueri manus una, ecce pes eius, ecce dimidium reliqui corporis eius, et ne alienum putetis, filius est meus, ne alterius opus arbitremini, ego feci, ego diligenter diuisci, mihi quod manducrem, uobis quod reseruarem”

وقالت للقوم هذا: أرواهم! 503

والذي واع الخلق علينا قتلته بيدى لفراق الجوع بي فاكلت من لحمه حاجئى وهى! بفيه جِنَّتى وأعضاء تر كنها تك 504.(KAY 7.7.46–47)

אכלו 503:

ותאמר! 504

הנה אשר חלקכם שמורתי 505.

לכם הילד 506

יד 507

רגלווהנה 508

נתחיווהנה לפניכם 509.

ואל כי תאמרו אשה 510

יליד 501

כי ילדותיו והאני 511

אכלתיו

513 S, B, L, A, F add. וָקָּלָלַת־לְכֹם־הִזַּה: אַשֶּׁר שְׁמַרָתָם לְכֹם—לֹא יָד יוֹדֵעַ.

514 S, B ἢμαραγκίνη: – L ἢμαραγκίνη:
Immediately a shudder and shock took hold of them, and they froze at the sight; and she said “This is my very own child and my deed” (BJ 6.210).

“This is my meal, this is your portion...behold one hand of the boy, behold his foot, behold half of the rest of his body, and you should not think him another’s; the son is mine, do not suppose this is the work of another, I did it, I carefully divided, for me, what I might eat, for you, what I would preserve” (DEH 5.40.3 [383, 25–29]).

...and she said, “Eat your portion! Behold your portion which I have kept for you. Behold the hand of the child, behold his foot and behold his pieces before you. And do not say he is the child of another woman because he is my child! I gave birth to him and I ate from his flesh and his limbs. I saved it from his flesh and I saved it; see the greater part of it is for you” (KAY 7.7.46–47).

And she said to the men, “This is my son, beloved over all creatures. I killed him with my hands [when] the famine grew heavy on me and I ate from his flesh his limbs and body. I gave birth to him and I ate him and I also preserved your portion” (SY 86.34–37).

Then she said to them, “This is my son, whom I loved more than everyone. I killed him with my [own] hand [and] when I was hungry I ate from his flesh and his limbs. I left [some] for you” (ZA 7.7.63–64).

N5. “Eat and Be Satisfied”

Bellum Judaicum

De Excidio Hierosolymitano

Sefer Yosippon

Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd

Zena Ayhud

“φάγετε καὶ γαρ ἐγώ βέβηρσα μὴ γένησθε μήτε”

“gustate et uidete quia suaus filius meus. nolite fieri

“זאת התורה של א práctica עליך ולא תקבעו באד

רָחֵם מְנִי לוֹדִי נָא לָהוּ וְזָה

העצירת: 512

512 S, B, L, F שִׁית הָלָה:

521 S, B רָשֵׁהוּ:

522 S, B עַל:

290
μαλακώτεροι γυναικὸς μήτε συμπαθέστεροι μητρὸς” (BJ 6.211).

“Eat, for I, too, have eaten. Do not be softer than a woman or more compassionate than a mother” (BJ 6.211).

moliores matre, infirmiores muliere” (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 11–12]).

“Taste and see that my son is sweet. Do not wish to become softer than a mother, weaker than a woman” (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 11–12]).

Then the woman said to them, “Please eat and be satisfied because I have satisfied myself with my son! Taste and see how sweet my son is! Do not let your compassions be stirred more than mine” (SY 86.42–44).

“Eat and be satisfied and do not become more merciful than me toward my son…” (KAY 7.7.47–48).

“Eat and be satisfied. You will not be [better] than me [with respect] to the strength of [your] mercy toward my son” (ZA 7.7.64–65).

N6. “Do Not Let Your Hearts Become Weak”

Bellum Judaicum De Excidio Hierosolymitano Sefer Yosippon Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd Zena Ayhud

“אכלו ... מأكلל] נא ח י דקב 516
אככלו ... נא לפי בצלאת 517
השביעני; ... השביעני כ שלפני כ השביעני; ... השביעני כ 518
כ אככל ... בכי! לא י ח ודמ 519
ולא ייח ... מ LX) נא ח רדפק 520

523 כSH 7.7.64–65.
“uidete ne uobis opprobrio sit quod fortior uobis mulier reperta sit, quae absumeret epulas uiorum” (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 15–17]).

“See to it that it is not a reproach to you that a woman is discovered to be braver than you, who takes up the banquet of men” (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 15–17]).

“…and do not let your hearts soften more than mine because it is shameful for men of war to be more soft of heart than the heart of a woman” (SY 86.44–45).

“…and do not let your hearts be weak because of this since it will be disgraceful for brave ones like yourselves that a woman be stronger of heart than you” (KAY 7.7.48–49).

“Do not [let] your hearts be afflicted concerning this because it will be disgraceful for strong [men] like yourselves that a woman be stronger of heart than you” (ZA 7.7.65–66).

N7. “You Brought This Great Ruin”

Bellum Judaicum De Excidio Hierosolymitano Sefer Yosippon Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd Zena Ayhud

“ego quidem tales paraui epulas, sed uos sic epulari matrem fecistis. et me tenebat

530 S, B, L om.
531 S ḫwāṣāṭa:
532 S, B, L, F ḫwāṣāṭ: (F II) ṣeḏeq: S ḫwāṣāṭ: 529
533 S, B ḫwāṣāṭ: – L, F ḫwāṣāṭ: – P ḫwāṣāṭ:
passio sed uicit necessitas” (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 17–19]).

“I indeed have prepared such banquets, but you have made a mother feast in this way. And suffering was holding me, but necessity conquered” (DEH 5.40.4 [384, 17–19]).

“For it is appropriate to arrange a table like this before mighty men like yourselves. Indeed I have arranged this meal and it is prepared on account of you because you caused me to arrange a meal such as this” (SY 86.46–48).

“In addition to this, you are required to agree to the matter and not, since you brought this horrible tragedy on me and on the people and did not have mercy on us, until we reached this condition” (KAY 7.49–50).

“And it is obligatory for you [to be] in agreement with this and not quarrel because you are the ones who brought upon me and upon all the people this great ruin. You had no mercy up to the point that we arrived at this affair” (ZA 7.66–68).

O. The Rebels Flee In Fear
After this, they left trembling, in this one matter cowards and barely conceding this food to the mother (BJ 6.212).

[The author of the book] said: when the people saw this they considered it horrific and they went out terrified and frightened (KAY 7.7.50–51).

When the men saw this they were afraid and they went out terrified and trembling (ZA 7.7.68–69).

P. The Spread of the News of the Mother’s Deed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀνεπλήρωθη δ’ εὐθέως ὅλη τοῦ μύσους ἡ πόλις καὶ πρὸ ὀμμάτων ἐκατος τὸ πάθος λαμβάνων ὡσεὶ αὐτῷ τολμηθὲν ἐφριττε (BJ 6.212).</td>
<td>Repleuit continuo totam urbem tanti sceleris nefas et unusquisque tamquam ante oculos positum parricidalis conuiiui ministerium perhorrescebat (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 20–22]).</td>
<td>והשמוע חזרו מدعوין ק兮فين (KAY 7.7.50–51)</td>
<td>ואשתהוخبر האמראותבי phốה יתקלו הנשים لذلك (KAY 7.7.51)</td>
<td>מיזהו: זנה איה (ZA 7.7.68–69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immediately, the entire city was filled up with the defilement, and each one, on taking the tragic event before

The impious act was heard throughout the whole city and the Jews mourned

Now the matter was heard throughout the whole city and the Jews were very shocked by

The story of the woman became famous in the city and the people were disturbed by this matter and

And the story of the woman was heard in the whole city and the people were disturbed by this matter and

535 S, B מִסְמַרְתָּא אֶל מַזָּדוּרֵי.
their eyes as something dared by them, shuddered (BJ 6.212).
as if the service of the parricidal banquet was placed before his eyes (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 20–22]).

exceedingly (SY 86.51).

it… (KAY 7.7.51).

[even] a brave one was disturbed…(ZA 7.7.69–70).

Q. The Threatening Matter from God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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coeperunt et ipsi incentores seditionis examinare post haec quos raperent cibos, ne similes escas inuenirent et uelut inprudentes sumerent (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 22–25]).

After this the inciters of the rebellion themselves also began to check what foods they seized, lest they should find similar food and consume it unaware (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 22–25]).

The leaders of the rebels were also humbled by this affair because it was a great matter in their eyes (SY 86.51–53).

And the rebels were fractured and cowardice entered their hearts. And they left alone the people going out of the city (KAY 7.7.52–53).

And the robbers contemplated their works and were broken [apart] and their hearts became weak and they sent away the people who were going out (ZA 7.7.71–72).

### S. The People Go Out to the Romans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ταχέως δὲ καὶ Ῥωμαίοις δημιουργήσας τὸ πάθος τῶν δ᾽ οἱ μὲν ἠπίστουν, οἱ δὲ ὃκτειρον, peruenit etiam ad Romanos huius facti immansitas. nam plerique hoc horreor perterriti</td>
<td>peruenit ad Romanos honefis. nam plerique hoc horreor perterriti</td>
<td>peruenit etiam ad Romanos honefis. nam plerique hoc horreor perterriti</td>
<td>peruenit etiam ad Romanos honefis. nam plerique hoc horreor perterriti</td>
<td>peruenit etiam ad Romanos honefis. nam plerique hoc horreor perterriti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The tragic event was quickly reported also to the Romans. Some of them disbelieved, others felt pity, but it happened that the majority proceeded to a more intense hatred of the nation (BJ 6.214).

The brutality of this deed even reached the Romans. For many, terrified by this horror, fled to the enemy (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 26–27]).

Many of the people went out from Jerusalem to the camp of the Romans with everything that they had (SY 86.53–54).

At that time many people went out from the city to the Romans and they did not prevent them (KAY 7.7.53).

At that time many people went out from the city to the Romans and they did not prevent them (ZA 7.7.72–73).
## APPENDIX D

### CHAPTER 5 PARALLEL PASSAGES IN ORIGINAL LANGUAGES

#### A. Titus Addresses God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Καίσαρ δὲ ἀπελογεῖτο καὶ περὶ τούτου τῷ θεῷ,</strong> (BJ 6.215).</td>
<td>quo comperto Caesar exsecratus infelicis terrae contagium, manus ad caelum eleuans, talia protestabatur: “ad bellum quidem uenimus sed non cum hominibus dimicamus” (DEH 5.41.1 [384, 27–30]).</td>
<td>ויריה בשמועה</td>
<td>ולא אتصل الخبر בطيبוס_destination:</td>
<td><strong>Καῖσαρ δὲ ἀπελογεῖτο καὶ περὶ τούτου τῷ θεῷ,</strong> (BJ 6.215).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar also defended himself before God with regard to this matter</td>
<td>When this was found out, Caesar cursing the contagion of the unhappy</td>
<td>And it came to pass when Titus heard this matter that he became exceedingly</td>
<td>When the report reached Titus, he considered it horrific [lit. great] and he was greatly disturbed and he</td>
<td><strong>Now when Titus heard this, he marveled and was greatly disturbed and he</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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land, raising his hands to heaven and testified publicly in this fashion: “Indeed we came for war but we are not contending with human beings” *(DEH 5.41.1 [384, 27–30]).*

was very distressed by it. Then he lifted his hands to the heavens and said, “You have made known what is secret and have revealed hidden intentions” *(KAY 7.7.53–55).*

**B. “I Did Not Come for War”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“scis, scis profecto quia intimo affectum pacem freqüenter obtuli...uolui, parcere populo, urbem seruare...sed quid facerem repugnantibus <em>(DEH 5.41.2 [385, 7–12]).</em>”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(BJ 6.215).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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…[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…

"You know, you know surely that with a sincere desire I frequently offered peace…I wished to…spare the people, to preserve the city…But what am I to do against those fighting back?"

SY 86.57–58

(De Excidio Hierosolymitano 5.41.2 [385, 7–12].)

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58

(Sefer Yosippon 86.57–58.)

"You know that I did not come to this city in order that I might fight the people and ill-treat them. And I invited them [to] a time of peace but they refused"

(Kay 7.7.55–56.)

C. Titus Blames the Jews

Bellum Judaicum

De Excidio Hierosolymitano

Sefer Yosippon

Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd

Zena Ayhud

… τούς δὲ ἀντὶ μὲν ὁμονοίας στάσιν, ἀντὶ δὲ εἰρήνης πόλεμον, πρὸ κόροιν δὲ καὶ εὐθενίας λόμον αἱρουμένους…

(De Excidio Hierosolymitano 5.41.2 [385, 7–12].)

"…quid facerem adversus suos furentibus? positis plerumque armis, quia illi a suorum caedibus non desinebant"

SY 86.58–59

("You know, you know surely that with a sincere desire I frequently offered peace…"

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.

...[Caesar] asserting that peace and autonomy and amnesty for all the things recklessly undertaken were offered by him to the Jews…"

"I did not come to this city for war but rather to call out to it for peace. How many times did I seek peace but they were unwilling"

SY 86.57–58.
concord, war instead of peace, famine in place of plenty and prosperity…

the most part having been set aside, because they did not desist from the slaughtering of their own people” *(DEH 5.41.2 [385, 12–13]).*

[toward me]. I sought to have mercy on them [so that] perhaps they will live” *(SY 86.58–59).*

not be destroyed. But they did not have mercy on themselves, until their condition deteriorated to such as this” *(KAY 7.7.56–57).*

die. But they had no mercy on themselves to the point that they came upon a great affliction” *(ZA 7.7.76–78).*

D1. Titus’s Characterization of the Jews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“audieram equidem intolerabilem huius esse populi ferocitatem, qui incredibilis in opinionibus in omnem excitet insolentiam…” <em>(DEH 5.41.2 [385, 17–19]).</em></td>
<td>“Indeed I had heard that the fierceness of this people is intolerable, [they] who by their absurd ideas arouse themselves toward every insolent act…” <em>(DEH 5.41.2 [385, 17–19]).</em></td>
<td>“But I also heard [about] the strength of this people and I have loved you who love them” <em>(SY 86.61–62).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D2. Titus’s Explanation for the Disasters of the Jews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bellum Judaicum</th>
<th>De Excidio Hierosolymitano</th>
<th>Sefer Yosippon</th>
<th>Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd</th>
<th>Zena Ayhud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

“There is the common opinion that these people also plotted against divine things and their punishment is the proof”

(\textit{DEH} 5.41.3 [386, 13–14]).

“Now [about] this people with whom I am fighting I said that they trusted in you but they are not trusting in you. Behold now you see that they do not trust in your salvation but rather they trust in their...”

(\textit{SY} 86.64–67)
swords and in their battles”
(SY 86.64–67).

E. “I Am Clean of This Sin”

Bellum Judaicum | De Excidio Hierosolymitano | Sefer Yosippon | Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd | Zena Ayhud

“mundus ego ab hoc contagio tibi me absoluo, quaecumque in caelo potestas es” (DEH 5.41.2 [385, 6–7]).

“I absolve myself before you as clean from this contagion, whatever power you are in heaven” (DEH 5.41.2 [385, 6–7]).

“When I became aware of this situation with the woman, it pained me and disturbed me. I did not take pleasure in it nor did I condone it. Now I am absolved from it in your presence and I ask you, oh Lord, to not pursue me” (KAY 7.7.57–58).

“Behold, it distressed me when I heard the matter of the woman. It alarmed me and disturbed me and I did not take pleasure in this thing. And I am clean of this sin before you [and] I ask, oh Lord, that you not pursue me” (ZA 7.7.78–79).

F. “Give Me Victory Over Them”

Bellum Judaicum | De Excidio Hierosolymitano | Sefer Yosippon | Kitāb akhbār al-yahūd | Zena Ayhud

وان تطلب خوارج هؤلاء القوم بظلمهم (ZA 7.7.78–79).

---
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“But I ask that you take revenge on those rebels who wronged the people with their plundering and give me victory over them”

(KAY 7.7.59).

“But only pursue the rebels, the men who mistreated them. Take vengeance against them and give me victory over them”

(ZA 7.7.79–80).
| Appendix E |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **COMPARATIVE CHART OF CHAPTER HEADINGS** |
| **IN THE SY, KAY, & ZA** | |

<p>| 1) Table of Nations (p. 30) | Part One: 1) (without headings) Adam begat Seth...These are of the lineage of the sons of Japheth and [the author] has mentioned the places in which they lived (p. 2) |
| 2) The report of the story of Zepho son of Eliphaz, son of Esau, son of Isaac, son of Abraham—peace be upon him—and the course of the kings over the Kittim (pp. 370; 107) | The history of Zepho son of Eliphaz, son of Esau, son of Isaac, son of Abraham—peace be upon him—and the affair of the kingdoms of the Kittim (p. 5) |
| 3) The conquest of Babel (p. 56) | The history of those who reigned over the people of the Kittim after Zepho (p. 8) |
| 4) Daniel in the lions’ Den (p. 66) | |
| 5) Daniel, Bel and the Dragon (p. 82) | |
| 6) The deeds of Zerubbabel (p. 90) | |
| 7) The Holy Fire (p. 114) | |
| 8) The death of Cyrus (p. 122) | The history of Darius king of Media and Cyrus king of Persia and the report of their war with the Chaldeans and the death of Belshazzar king of Babylon (p. 13) |
| 9) The deeds of Mordecai and Esther (p. 128) | The history of those who reigned over Persia after Cyrus and the story of |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>story of Mordecai the Jew and Esther the daughter of his uncle with Ahasuerus the King (pp. 378; 118)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mordecai the Jew and Esther the daughter of his father’s brother along with [the story of] king Aksos (Artaxerxes) (p. 20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10) Alexander in Jerusalem (p. 142)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6) The story of the beginning of the reign of Alexander son of Philip the Greek [and his march against] Darius and the story of his travels among the Jews and additional stories of the outcomes of his life (pp. 383; 123)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The history of Alexander son of Philip the Greek and his campaign against Darius and his affair with the Jews and also other [tales] from his story (p. 28)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11) The deeds of Heliodorus (p. 152)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7) The story of the outcomes of the Jews after the death of Alexander and how the kings of the Greeks mistreated them, but at the start of the matter, how king Antiochus mistreated them (pp. 390; 132)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The history of the Jews after Alexander died and what happened to them because of the kings of Greece but first what happened with king Antiochus (p. 46)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12) The translation of the Seventy (p. 158)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8) The story of the command of king Ptolemy regarding the translation of the books of the Law and the Prophets; 24 books from the Hebrew language to the Greek language, in order that the sons of his people might read it (lit. understand it) in their [own] language (pp. 392; 135)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The story of king Bilmay (Ptolemy) as he had the 24 books of the Law translated from the language of the Hebrews to the language of the Greeks so that the people might understand [it] in their [own] language (p. 49)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13) The decree of Antiochus (p. 162)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Part Two: 1) First it is the story of the reign of Antiochus the Macedonian [over the Greeks and what happened</strong></td>
<td><strong>The history of king Antiochus the Macedonian and his reign over the Greeks—this is the first book; and what happened to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) The death of Eleazar (p. 164)</td>
<td>2) The story of the killing of Eleazar the priest (pp. 396; 139)</td>
<td>The story of the killing of Eleazar the priest (p. 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) The death of the mother and her seven sons (p. 168)</td>
<td>3) The story of the seven brother whom the wicked king Antiochus killed (pp. 398; 141)</td>
<td>The story of the seven brother whom the impious king Antiochus killed (p. 56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) The days of Mattathias son of Yohanan the priest (p. 178)</td>
<td>4) The story of the rebellion of Mattathias son of Yohanan the priest from the sons of the Hasmoneans; he was the first of the sons of the Hasmoneans who rose up to rescue the Jews from the Greeks and (the first one who) conquered them (in battle) (pp. 401; 145)</td>
<td>The story of the rise of Mattathias son of Yohanan from the sons Kismenay (Hasmonean); he was the first of the sons of Kismenay who rose up and the first one who fought the Greeks for the Jews and conquered them (p. 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) The beginning of the days of Judah the Maccabee</td>
<td>5) The story of the outcomes of Judah son of Mattathias and he was the second of the sons of the Hasmoneans (pp. 403; 147)</td>
<td>The story of Judah son of Mattathias who was the second of the sons of Kismenay (p. 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) The death of evil Antiochus and the Dedication of the Temple (p. 192)</td>
<td>6) The story of the death of king Antiochus and the torments which God—may he be praised and glorified—brought upon him (pp. 405; 149)</td>
<td>The story of the death of Antiochus and how the glorious and most high God tormented him (p. 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) The death of evil Antiochus and the Dedication of the Temple (p. 192)</td>
<td>7) The story of Hanukah and its circumstances (pp. 406; 150)</td>
<td>The story of the dedication (p. 336); and this will be called the festival of Hanukah (p. 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) The wars of Judah (p. 196)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) The war with Lysias (p. 202)</td>
<td>8) The story of the coming of Lysias the son of the uncle of Eupator the king to the Jews and his battles against them (pp. 407; 151)</td>
<td>The story of the arrival of Lysias the son of the brother of the father of king Aftara (Eupator) and the leader of his armies to the Jews and his making war against them (p. 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) Story of beginning of strengthening of Romans and they are the Kittim who</td>
<td>The history of the beginning of the affairs of the Kittim who lived in Rome and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resided in Rome and in the neighboring Roman territories and already they are mentioned at the start of the book (pp. 408; 153)</td>
<td>extent of the Roman territories and behold their mention comes first at the start of the book (p. 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21)</td>
<td>’The treaty of the Jews with the Romans (p. 206)</td>
<td>10) The report of the letter that the Romans wrote to Judah the son of Mattathias and the report of the treaty which they made (lit. cut) with him (pp. 410; 156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The report on the letter that Rome wrote to Judah son of Mattathias and the matter of the treaty which they made with him: “from the Senate and the 320 administrators with it to Judah son of Mattathias, leader of the government of all the Jews (p. 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22)</td>
<td>’The wars of Judah (p. 216)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23)</td>
<td>’The war of Antiochus Eupator (p. 222)</td>
<td>11) How Eupator son of Antiochus the Macedonian broke his treaty with the Jews and [how] he waged a war against them (pp. 411; 158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The story of how Eupator son of Antiochus the Macedonian made a treaty that was between him and the Jews and [how] he waged a war against them (p. 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24)</td>
<td>’The war of Nikanor (p. 226)</td>
<td>12) The story of the going out of Demetrius son of Seleucus from Rome and how he killed Eupator and (the story) of the coming of his friend Nikanor to Jerusalem (pp. 412; 160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The story of the rise of Demetrius son of Silvanus the Roman who killed Eupator and the arrival of his friend Bifabor (Nikanor) to Jerusalem (p. 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25)</td>
<td>’The death of Judah (p. 234)</td>
<td>13) The story of the death of Judah son of Mattathias (pp. 414; 163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The story of the assassination of Judah the son of Mattathias (p. 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26)</td>
<td>’The days of Jonathan and Simon (p. 236)</td>
<td>14) The histories of Jonathan, and he was the third of [the rulers] of the sons of the Hasmoneans (pp. 415; 164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The history of Jonathan son of Mattathias and he was the third of the sons of Kismenay (p. 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26)</td>
<td>’The days of Jonathan and Simon (p. 236)</td>
<td>15) The story of the histories of Simon son of Mattathias, and he was the fourth of the rulers of the sons of the Hasmoneans (pp. 416; 165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The history of Simon son of Mattathias and his was the fourth one out of the reign of the sons of Kismenay (p. 84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27) Hyrcanus and Ptolemy  
(p. 240) | 28) Hyrcanus and  
Antiochus Pius (p. 246)  
29) The wars of Hyrcanus  
(p. 250) | 16) The story of the histories of Hyrcanus son of Simon, and he was the fifth of the rulers of the sons of the Hasmoneans and the first one among them to be called king (pp. 417; 166)  
The history of Hyrcanus son of Simon and he was the fifth one out of the reign of the sons of Kismenay and the first one from among them to be called by the name “king” (p. 85) |
| 30) Hyrcanus and the Pharisees (p. 256) | 17) The story of the sects of the Jews in those times and the affair that took place from Hyrcanus’s changing of his party, which was the party of his fathers, to another one and the hatred, war and killing that occurred among the Jews because of this (pp. 420; 171)  
The report of the sects of the Jews in those times and the affair that took place from Hyrcanus’s changing of his party, which was the party of his fathers, to another one and the hatred, war and killing that occurred among the Jews because of this (p. 90) |
| 31) The days of Aristobulus I (p. 260) | 18) The histories of Aristobulus son of Hyrcanus, and he was the sixth of the rulers of the sons of the Hasmoneans and the second one out of them who was called king (pp. 422; 174)  
The history of Aristobulus the son of Hyrcanus who was the sixth in the reign of the sons of Kismenay and the second one from among them who was called by the name “king” (p. 93) |
| 32) The wars of Alexander Janneus (p. 272)  
33) Alexander and the Pharisees (p. 282) | 19) The histories of Alexander son of Hyrcanus, and he was the seventh of the rulers of the sons of the Hasmoneans and the third one out of them who was called king (pp. 425; 174)  
The history of Alexander son of Hyrcanus who was seventh in the reign of the sons of Kismenay and the third one who was called by the name “king” (p. 97) |
| Part Three:  
1) (Without headings) The author of the book said: then the festival of Sukkot arrived…(pp. 427; 179) | Part Three (p. 99) |
| 34) The days of Queen Alexandra (p. 292) | 2) The histories of Queen Alexandra and her sons Hyrcanus and Aristobulus (pp. 429; 182)  
The history of Queen Alexandra and her sons Hyrcanus and Aristobulus (p. 102) |
<p>| 35) The brother-wars between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus (p. 302) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36) The intervention of the Romans and the siege of Pompey on Jerusalem (p. 316)</th>
<th>37) The internal wars in the days of the Romans (p. 334)</th>
<th>38) The days of Julius Caesar (p. 346)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) The histories of Aristobulus son of Alexander son of Hyrcanus, and he was the eighth of the rulers of the sons of the Hasmoneans and the fourth one out of them who was called king (pp. 431; 184)</td>
<td>The history of Aristobulus the son of King Alexander and he was the eighth in the reign of the children of Kisemnay and the fourth one from among them who was called by the name “king” (p. 106)</td>
<td>The story of the beginning of the reign of Caesar king over Rome and his dominion over Rome and his exiling of the Senators from Rome; this Caesar was the first one who reigned over Rome having prevailed over Rikyos (?) (p. 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The histories of Antipater, and he was the father of king Herod, and how he caused disagreement and war between Hyrcanus and his brother king Aristobulus (pp. 432; 186)</td>
<td>The history of Antipater the father of king Herod: the record of what he did out of wickedness and strife with Hyrcanus and his brother king Aristobulus (p. 107)</td>
<td>The story of the beginning of the affair of Caesar king over Rome and his domination of Rome and his exiling of the Senators from Rome; this Caesar was the first one who reigned over Rome having prevailed over Rikyos (?) (p. 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The story of Pompey the Roman (pp. 435; 190)</td>
<td>The history of Pompey the Roman (p. 112)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Herod before the Sanhedrin (p. 356)</td>
<td>9) The beginning of the histories of Herod son of Antipater (pp. 442; 203)</td>
<td>The story of the beginning of the affair of Herod son of Antipater (p. 128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) The love of the prince of the Romans toward the people of Judea (p. 364)</td>
<td>10) The story of the message of Hyrcanus to Caesar king of the Romans and the letter of treaty that he wrote to Caesar (pp. 444; 206)</td>
<td>The report on the message of Hyrcanus to Caesar king of Rome and the letter of treaty that he wrote to Caesar (p. 132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) The death of Julius Caesar and Antipater (p. 368)</td>
<td>11) The story of the assassination of Caesar king of the Romans and Antipater the father of Herod [prince Hyrcanus king of the Jews] (pp. 445; 208)</td>
<td>The story of the assassination of Caesar king of Rome and [the assassination of] Antipater (p. 134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) The days of Antony (p. 374)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) The war against Antigonus (p. 380)</td>
<td>12) The story of the rebellion of Antigonus son of Aristobulus against his uncle Hyrcanus and how he abused him (pp. 447; 212)</td>
<td>The story of the uprising of Antigonus son of Aristobulus against the brother of his father Hyrcanus and what he did therein (p. 139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part Four: 1) (Without headings) Antinous defeated a Persian king…(pp. 449; 216)</td>
<td>Part Four (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) The death of Hyrcanus (p. 408)</td>
<td>2) The story of the return of Hyrcanus from the land of the Persians and how he was murdered (pp. 451; 218)</td>
<td>The story of the return of Hyrcanus from the region of Persia and his murder (p. 146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) The death of Aristobulus (p. 416)</td>
<td>3) How Herod killed Aristobulus son of Alexander son of Aristobulus son of Hyrcanus [the first]. and [this] Aristobulus was the son of Alexandra the daughter of the last Hyrcanus (pp. 453; 221)</td>
<td>The story of how Herod killed Aristobulus son of Alexander son of Aristobulus son of Hyrcanus the first; and [this] Aristobulus was the son of Alexandra the daughter of the last Hyrcanus (p. 151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) The war against the Arabs (p. 426)</td>
<td>4) The story of the going out to war of Antony against Augustus and how his fate went (pp. 456; 226)</td>
<td>The story of the uprising of Antony against king Augustus and what occurred out of his affair (p. 157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) <em>The days of Antony (p. 374)</em></td>
<td>5) The story concerning Antony and how he killed his wife Mariam and his mother Alexandra (pp. 459; 231)</td>
<td>The story of how Antony killed his wife Mariam and his mother Alexandra (p. 164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47) Herod after the defeat of Antony (p. 440)</td>
<td>6) The histories of Herod (pp. 461; 234)</td>
<td>The history of Herod (p. 167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48) The death of Mariam (p. 446)</td>
<td>7) How Herod killed his sons Alexander and Aristobulus (pp. 465; 239)</td>
<td>The story of how Herod killed his sons Alexander and Aristobulus (p. 175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49) The greatness of king Herod (p. 454)</td>
<td>8) The story of the murder of Antipater the son of Herod and the death of Herod (pp. 470; 245)</td>
<td>The story of the murder of Antipater the son of Herod and the death of Herod (p. 184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50) The construction [projects] of Herod (p. 464)</td>
<td>Part Five: Generalizing only one long chapter without headings (pp. 472; 248)</td>
<td>Part Five (p. 189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51) The sons of Herod (p. 474)</td>
<td>Part Six: 1) The story of the deeds of Archelaus son of Herod, and how he called himself Herod according to the name of his father (pp. 478; 256)</td>
<td>Part Six: The history of Archelaus the son of Herod; and he once more named himself with the name of his father (p. 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52) The death of the sons of Herod (p. 490)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53) Wicked Antipater (p. 508)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54) The fall of wicked Antipater (p. 508)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55) The death of Herod (p. 530)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56) The days of Archelaus (p. 538)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57) The deeds of Paulina (p. 546)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58) The decree of Gaius (p. 552)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59) The beginning of the rebellion against the Romans (p. 556)</td>
<td>60) Agrippa’s speech (p. 562)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Agrippa’s speech (p. 562)</td>
<td>2) The story Antipas son of Herod (pp. 480; 258)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59) The beginning of the rebellion against the Romans (p. 556)</td>
<td>The history of Antipas son of Herod (p. 202)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Agrippa’s speech (p. 562)</td>
<td>3) The story of the histories of Agrippa son of Aristobulus son of king Herod (pp. 481; 260)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Agrippa’s speech (p. 562)</td>
<td>The history of Agrippa son of Aristobulus son of Herod (p. 203)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59) The beginning of the rebellion against the Romans (p. 556)</td>
<td>4) The story of Agrippa son of Agrippa son of Aristobulus son of Herod; and he was the last of the kings the Jews in the days of the Second Temple and the capture and destruction of Jerusalem happened during his days [and the annihilation of the people] (pp. 482; 262)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Agrippa’s speech (p. 562)</td>
<td>The history of Agrippa son of Agrippa son of Aristobulus son of Herod; and he was the last of those who reigned over the Jews and over the construction of the Second Temple and the capture and destruction of Jerusalem happened during his days (p. 205)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59) The beginning of the rebellion against the Romans (p. 556)</td>
<td>5) The story of Eleazar son of Ananias (the priest) the rebel, and he was the first who rose up to rebel against the Romans and he was one of the three rebels who rebelled from among the Jews and caused the destruction of Jerusalem and the annihilation of the people (pp. 484; 264)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59) The beginning of the rebellion against the Romans (p. 556)</td>
<td>The story of Eleazar son of Ananias the rebel; and he was the first of those who began conspiring [against] Rome and he was one of the three rebels from the Jews who were the reason for the destruction of Jerusalem and the annihilation of the people (p. 208)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Agrippa’s speech (p. 562)</td>
<td>6) The story of the return of king Agrippa to Rome after [what] happened because of Eleazar son of Ananias [the priest] (pp. 488; 270)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Agrippa’s speech (p. 562)</td>
<td>The story of the return of king Agrippa to Rome after [what] happened because of Eleazar son of Ananias the priest (p. 216)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61) The rebels take over Jerusalem (p. 580)</td>
<td>7) These are the histories of Yosef ben Gorion, the author of the book (pp. 490; 273)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72) The battles between the rebels (p. 680)</td>
<td>8) The histories of Yohanan the Galilean the rebel; and he was one of the three rebels who were the reason for the destruction of Jerusalem and the annihilation of the people, because of their actions against Rome (pp. 496; 281)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The story of Yohanan the Galilean; and he was one of the three rebels who were the reason for the destruction of Jerusalem and the annihilation of the people, because of what they did against Rome (p. 232)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Seven:</td>
<td>1) (Without headings) [the author of the book] said: and when the reign of Jonathan grew stronger…(pp. 497; 282)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part Seven (p. 234)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71) The first of the deeds of Simon (p. 672)</td>
<td>2) The story of Simon the rebel and he was the third of the sons of the rebels (pp. 499; 285)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72) The battles between the rebels (p. 680)</td>
<td>The story of Simon the rebel; and he was third of the rebels (p. 237)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64) Vespasian is sent to fight the Jews (p. 594)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65) The battles of Josephus (Yosef) in Galilee (p. 602)</td>
<td>The story of Yosef ben Gorion who lived in the days of Vespasian king of Rome (p. 219)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66) The battle of Jotapata (p. 612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67) Josephus saves his own life (p. 628)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68) Battles in Galilee (p. 646)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69) Internal battles in Jerusalem (p. 656)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70) The crowning of Vespasian (p. 666)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71) The first of the deeds of Simon (p. 672)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72) The battles between the rebels (p. 680)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73) The lamentation of Josephus over Jerusalem (p. 688)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74) The first of the battles of Titus against Jerusalem (p. 696)</td>
<td>3) The story of the coming of Titus to Jerusalem and his wars against the Jews (pp. 502; 288)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The story of the arrival of Titus to Jerusalem and how he waged war against the Jews (p. 241)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75) The battles inside and outside [the city] (p. 704)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76) The words of Josephus about Jerusalem (p. 710)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77) The battle of the wall (p. 712)</td>
<td>4) The story of the destruction of the first and second walls from the walls of Jerusalem (pp. 504; 291)</td>
<td>The report of the destruction of the first and second walls of [the city] of Jerusalem (p. 245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78) The words of Josephus to the men of Jerusalem (p. 722)</td>
<td>5) The story of the calling of the Jews by Titus to surrender to him and the speech that Yosef ben Gorion delivered in front of them according to Titus’s command (pp. 506; 294)</td>
<td>The story of how Titus summoned the Jews to obey him and how Yosef ben Gorion told them [about] Titus’s order (p. 247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79) The deed of the Macedonian young man (p. 750)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80) The siege of Jerusalem (p. 756)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81) The death of Amitais (p. 764)</td>
<td>6) How Simon the rebel killed Amitais the priest and his sons and other people in one day (pp. 513; 304)</td>
<td>The story of how Simon the rebel killed Amitais the priest and his sons and other people in one day (p. 263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82) The prolongation of the battles [in] Jerusalem (p. 778)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80) The siege of Jerusalem (p. 756) 82) The prolongation of the battles [in] Jerusalem (p. 778) 86) The cruel deed of a mother (p. 820)</td>
<td>7) The story of the famine that took place in Jerusalem when the siege lasted for a long time and people died, and the deed of a woman who ate her child (pp. 516; 308)</td>
<td>The story of the great famine that took place in Jerusalem and how the siege of the war lasted for a long time and many people died and the story of the woman who ate her son (p. 269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Eight: 1) The story of the destruction of the third wall of Jerusalem (pp. 520; 312)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part Eight: The report on the destruction of the third wall of [the city] of Jerusalem (p. 276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82) The prolongation of the battles [in] Jerusalem (p. 778)</td>
<td>2) The story of the speech which Titus delivered to the Jews [after what they did to the Jews] (pp. 523; 316)</td>
<td>The story of how Titus responded to the Jews after the Jews became strong against Rome (p. 280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82) The prolongation of the battles [in] Jerusalem (p. 778)</td>
<td>3) Story of the last battle conducted between the Jews and Romans (pp. 525; 319)</td>
<td>The report on the last battle that took place between the Jews and Rome (p. 284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Page References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>The battle inside the Temple Court</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>The battle inside the city</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>The battle of the colonnade</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>The cruel deed of a mother</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>The burning of the Temple</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>The end of the war in Jerusalem</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>The battle of Masada</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The story of the entrance of the Romans into the magnificent Holy of Holies and how they burned it</td>
<td>528; 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The story of the things that occurred/were revealed before the destruction of Jerusalem and their indication of its destruction</td>
<td>530; 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The story of the killings of Yohanan and Simon the rebels</td>
<td>532; 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The reference to the number of the dead who were numbered in the war of the Jews in the time of the siege and the number of those killed and those taken captive [outside of those whom Titus received their surrender]</td>
<td>534; 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The story of Eleazar son of Ananias the rebel and how his fate was</td>
<td>535; 332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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