

# The Latin Translations of Josephus on Jesus, John the Baptist, and James: Critical Texts of the Latin Translation of the *Antiquities* and Rufinus' Translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* Based on Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions<sup>1</sup>

David B. Levenson

Religion Department, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, 32306, U.S.A.  
dlevenson@fsu.edu

Thomas R. Martin

Department of Classics, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, MA 01610, U.S.A.  
tmartin@holycross.edu

- 
- 1 We use the following abbreviations: *AJ* = *Antiquitates Iudaicae*; *BJ* = *Bellum Iudaicum*; *CAp* = *Contra Apionem*; *LAJ* = Latin translation of *AJ*; *Ruf.* = Rufinus, Latin translation of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*; *HE* = Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*; *DE* = Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica*; *PE* = Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*; *Theoph.* = Eusebius, *Theophania*; Niese = B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera* (7 vols.; Berlin: Weidmann, 1885-1895; the "editio maior"); Niese *ed. minor* = B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera* (6 vols.; Berlin: Weidmann, 1888-1895; the "editio minor"); Naber = S. A. Naber, *Flavii Iosephi opera omnia* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1888-1896); Blatt = F. Blatt, *The Latin Josephus I* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958); Cacciari = *Ecclesiasticae historiae Eusebii Pamphili libri novem*, ed. Pietro Tommaso Cacciari (Rome: Antonius de Rubeis, 1740); Schwartz = Schwartz's contributions to E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke* 2.1-3 (GCS Neue Folge 6.1-3; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999; reprint of Hinrichs edition, 1903-1909, with "Geleitwort" by F. Winkelmann); Mommsen = Mommsen's contributions to *Eusebius Werke* 2.1-3; Heinichen = F. A. Heinichen, *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri x* (2d ed.; vol. 1; Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1868); Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations" = D. B. Levenson and T. R. Martin, "The Ancient Latin Translations of Josephus," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Josephus* (ed. H. Chapman and Z. Rodgers; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, forthcoming).

## Abstract

This article presents the first critical texts of the passages on Jesus, John the Baptist, and James in the Latin translation of Josephus' *Antiquitates Iudaicae* and the sections of the Latin Table of Contents for *AJ* 18 where the references to Jesus and John the Baptist appear. A commentary on these Latin texts is also provided. Since no critical edition of the Latin text of *Antiquities* 6-20 exists, these are also the first critical texts of any passages from these books. The critical apparatus includes a complete list of variant readings from thirty-seven manuscripts (9th-15th C.E.) and all the printed editions from the 1470 *editio princeps* to the 1524 Basel edition. Because the passages in the Latin *AJ* on Jesus and John the Baptist were based on Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, a new text of these passages in Rufinus is provided that reports more variant readings than are included in Mommsen's GCS edition. A Greek text for these passages with revised apparatus correcting and expanding the apparatuses in Niese's *editio maior* of Josephus and Schwartz's GCS edition of Eusebius is also provided. In addition to presenting a text and commentary for the passages in the Latin *Antiquities* and Rufinus' translation of Eusebius, there is catalogue of collated manuscripts and all the early printed editions through 1524, providing a new scholarly resource for further work on the Latin text of the *Antiquities*.

## Keywords

Flavius Josephus – Latin Josephus – Testimonium Flavianum – Josephus Manuscripts – Josephus Early Editions – Rufinus

## Introduction

### 1.1 *The Testimonium Flavianum in Latin*

Outside of selections from the Bible, few short passages from Greco-Roman antiquity have been studied as intensively as Josephus' brief account of the career of Jesus, conventionally known to modern scholarship as the *Testimonium Flavianum*. The authenticity of the passage was first discussed extensively in the sixteenth century, and the size of the scholarly literature devoted to the subject since then is so immense that even the most extensive bibliographies have to be selective.<sup>2</sup> In addition to the vast quantity of printed

2 See A. Grafton and J. Weinberg, *"I have always loved the holy tongue": Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University

publications pertaining to this passage, in recent years online sites have provided the home for a wide array of scholarly (and not so scholarly) discussions and some very helpful collections of primary texts.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to the Greek manuscript traditions of Josephus and Eusebius (who includes the *Testimonium* in his *Ecclesiastical History*), scholars have

---

Press, 2011), 210-13, for a new discussion of the controversy in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. For recent scholarship, see A.-M. Dubarle, "Le témoignage de Josèphe sur Jésus d'après des publications récentes," *RB* 84 (1977): 38-58; L. H. Feldman, "The *Testimonium Flavianum*: The State of the Question," in *Christological Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Harvey K. McArthur* (ed. R. F. Berkey and S. A. Edwards; New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982), 179-99; Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 679-703, 957-58; É. Nodet, "Jésus et Jean-Baptiste selon Josèphe," *RB* 92 (1985): 321-48; Feldman, "A Selective Critical Bibliography of Josephus," in *Josephus, The Bible, and History* (ed. L. H. Feldman and G. Hata; Leiden: Brill, 1988), 429-35; J. P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 56-88; H. Schreckenberg, "The *Testimonium Flavianum*," in *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity* (ed. H. Schreckenberg and K. Schubert; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992), 38-40; A. Whealey, "Josephus on Jesus: Evidence from the First Millennium," *TZ* 51 (1995): 285-304; K. A. Olson, "Eusebius and the *Testimonium Flavianum*," *CBQ* 61 (1999): 305-22; J. Carleton Paget, "Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity," *JTS* 52 (2001): 539-624; S. Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum: examen historique, considérations historiographiques* (2d ed.; Paris: Cerf, 2002); A. Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003); A. Whealey, "Josephus, Eusebius of Caesarea, and the *Testimonium Flavianum*," in *Josephus und das Neue Testament* (ed. Christfried Böttrich and Jens Herzer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 73-116; Friedrich-Wilhelm Horn, "Das *Testimonium Flavianum* aus neutestamentlicher Perspektive," in *ibid.*, 117-36; C. K. Rothschild, "'Echo of a Whisper': The Uncertain Authenticity of Josephus' Witness to John the Baptist," in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (ed. D. Hellholm et al.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 255-90.

- 3 An extensive collection of ancient and medieval texts relevant to the *Testimonium* in the original languages (Greek and Latin only) and English translations of Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Arabic texts can be found at Ben Smith's "TextExcavation" site (<http://www.textexcavation.com/josephustestimonium.html>). For a helpful survey, see Peter Kirby, "Testimonium Flavianum," at the "Early Christian Writings" site (<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/testimonium.html>), which also contains a number of links to other online materials concerning the *Testimonium* (<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/josephus.html>). A detailed analysis can be found at the website of Roger Viklund, "The Jesus Passages in Josephus: A Case Study" (<http://rogerviklund.wordpress.com/2011/02/25/the-jesus-passages-in-josephus-%E2%80%93-a-case-study-part-1-%E2%80%93-abstract-and-biography>), which provides an English version of his Swedish study, "Jesuspassagerna hos Josefus—en fallstudie," also available online (<http://www.jesusgranskad.se/Josefus3.htm>).

closely scrutinized Slavonic, Syriac, and Arabic texts.<sup>4</sup> Two early Latin versions of the passage, one in Jerome's *De viris illustribus* and the other in pseudo-Hegesippus' *De excidio Hierosolymitano*, have also played an important role in the controversy surrounding the *Testimonium* because neither contains the explicit claim, found in all extant Greek manuscripts, that Jesus was the Christ.<sup>5</sup> In particular, the evidence from Jerome has stood at the center of the debate. Unlike pseudo-Hegesippus, who paraphrases the passage, Jerome includes in his chapter on Josephus a quite literal translation of the *Testimonium*, but, most strikingly, has the words "he was believed to be the Christ (*et credebatur Christus esse*)" in place of the statement in the received text of Josephus that "this was the Christ (ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν)."

It is surprising, given the amount of scholarship on the *Testimonium*, that so little attention has been devoted to its appearance in the ancient Latin translation of the *Antiquities* and in Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, the only versions of the passage known in the Christian West from the early medieval period until the publication of vernacular translations in the late fifteenth century and the Greek *editio princeps* in 1544. The Latin translation of the *Antiquities*, which included the *Contra Apionem*, was produced under the auspices of Cassiodorus at the Vivarium in the mid-sixth century.<sup>6</sup>

- 
- 4 E.g., R. Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* (trans. A. H. Krappe; New York: Dial, 1931); S. Pines, *An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1971); A.-M. Dubarle, "Le témoignage de Joseph sur Jésus d'après la tradition indirecte," *RB* 80 (1973): 481-513; A. Whealey, "The *Testimonium Flavianum* in Syriac and Arabic," *NTS* 54 (2008): 571-90.
- 5 Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 13 (text provided in section 5.2 below); ps.-Hegesippus, *De excidio Hierosolymitano* (also referred to as *De bello Iudaico*, *De excidio urbis Hierosolymitanae*, or *Historiae*) 2.12.1. A paraphrase of a Latin version of the *Testimonium* can also be found in Cassiodorus' *Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita* 1.2.4 (ed. W. Jacob and R. Hanslik, *Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita* [CSEL 71; Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1952], 10), which translates Sozomen's paraphrase of the *Testimonium* (Soz. 1.1.5 [ed. J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen, *Sozomenos Kirchengeschichte* (GCS 50; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960), 7]).
- 6 Cassiodorus, *Institutiones* 1.17.1: "... as for example Josephus (almost a second Livy), who composed his books of *Jewish Antiquities* on a large scale. Father Jerome writing to Lucinus Betticus says that he was not able to translate Josephus because of the size of this prolix work. But I have had him translated into Latin in twenty-two books by my friends, a task involving great labour on their part since he is subtle and complex. He also wrote seven other marvelously clear books on the *Jewish Captivity*. Some ascribe the translation of this work to Jerome, others to Ambrose, still others to Rufinus. The fact that this translation is ascribed to such men declares the special merits of its composition" (trans. Halporn in J. W. Halporn and M. Vessey, *Cassiodorus. Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul* [TTH 42; Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004], 149). Some fifteenth-century manuscripts, most

It became, according to James J. O'Donnell, "the single most often copied historical work of the middle ages."<sup>7</sup> To the best of our knowledge, only Alice Whealey, in her book surveying the controversy about the *Testimonium* from antiquity to modern times, discusses the Latin translation of the *Testimonium*.<sup>8</sup>

That so little attention has been given to the Latin translation of the *Antiquities* (hereafter *LAF*) is due in some measure to the fact that an easily accessible version of the Latin text does not exist. Boysen's 1898 edition of the *Contra Apionem* and Blatt's 1958 edition of *AJ* 1-5 are the only critical editions of any part of the translation made under Cassiodorus that have appeared.<sup>9</sup> Scholars working with books 6-20 are forced to consult one of the early printed editions, especially the 1524 Basel edition, which Niese declared to be the "*editio . . . omnium et nitidissima et optima*,"<sup>10</sup> but which, in fact, has serious

---

modern editions, and many scholars ascribe the Latin translation of the *War* to Rufinus, presumably because Jerome explicitly denies translating Josephus' works and Ambrose is commonly thought to be the author of pseudo-Hegesippus. This is almost certainly not the case, as G. Ussani demonstrates in "Studi preparatorii ad una edizione della traduzione latina in sette libri del *Bellum Iudaicum*," *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione della Edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* (nuova serie—fascicolo I; Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1945): 85-102. Ussani bases her conclusion on the facts that the work is not mentioned in the catalogue of Rufinus' translations by Gennadius (*De viris illustribus* 17) and that there are significant differences in both style and content between the translations of parts of the same two passages of the *War* in the Latin translation of the *War* and in Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' quotations from Josephus. We have confirmed her results by analyzing a larger sample of the material found both in the Latin translation of the *War* and in Rufinus. Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy*, 34 states simply that Rufinus cannot be the author of the translation of the *War* because it is different from Rufinus' translation of the Josephus passages in Eusebius. In fact, some fifteenth-century manuscripts of the *Antiquities* and most early printed editions also ascribe the translation of the *Antiquities* to Rufinus, leading to occasional confusion among modern scholars and library cataloguers. On the question of authorship, see Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations."

- 7 Cassiodorus (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 246. For the Vivarium and its projects, see O'Donnell, 177-222. For the context of the translation and full bibliography, see T. Leoni, "Translations and Adaptations of Josephus's Writings in Antiquity and the Middle Ages," *Ostraka: Rivista di antichità* 16 (2007): 482-83.
- 8 Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy*, 34-36.
- 9 C. Boysen, *Flavii Iosephi opera ex versione Latina antiqua, pars vi: De Iudaeorum uetustate siue contra Apionem libri ii* (CSEL 37; Vienna: Tempsky, 1898); F. Blatt, *The Latin Josephus I. Introduction and Text. The Antiquities: Books I-V* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958).
- 10 Niese, 1:1xx; cf. 1:lviii.

shortcomings.<sup>11</sup> Noting the lack of a critical edition of *LAJ*, Whealey says that her analysis had to be based on “Renaissance books,” without specifying which ones.<sup>12</sup> In a discussion of the Latin translation in a selective survey of scholarship on Josephus, Feldman singles out the possible implications of the lack of a critical text for the study of the *Testimonium*: “The value of a critical edition, particularly for such thorny questions as the *Testimonium Flavianum*, is considerable.”<sup>13</sup>

### 1.2 *The Need for New Critical Texts*

To fill the need for a critical text of the *Testimonium* in the *Antiquities* as well as for several other texts necessary for understanding the transmission of the Latin translation of the *Antiquities* in the context of the ancient, medieval, and modern textual tradition, we provide the following:

1. Critical texts of the passages on Jesus (*AJ* 18.63-64), John the Baptist (*AJ* 18.116-119), James (*AJ* 20.199-203), and the sections of the *AJ* Table of Contents that refer to Jesus and John the Baptist. In addition to their inherent interest, the passages on John the Baptist and James have played a significant role in the history of scholarship on the *Testimonium*.
2. A new critical text and apparatus for Rufinus’ translation of the passages on Jesus (*HE* 1.2.7-8) and John the Baptist (*HE* 1.2.4b-6), which he made as part of his translation of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*. The consideration of Rufinus’ translation is essential because *LAJ* reproduces his versions of these two passages with very few changes.<sup>14</sup>
3. New critical apparatuses for the Greek texts of the passages on Jesus, John the Baptist, and James as found in Niese’s *editio maior* of Josephus’

11 See 4.3 below. See also V. Bulhart, “Textkritische Studien zum lateinischen Flavius Josephus,” *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 6 (1953): 140-57, who uses the Greek text to emend the Latin of the 1524 Basel edition; Blatt, 22-23, who lists a number of places in *AJ* 1 where the 1524 Basel edition can be corrected from the evidence of the Latin manuscripts; and Levenson and Martin, “Ancient Latin Translations.”

12 “Josephus on Jesus,” *TZ* 51 (1995): 300, n. 25.

13 Feldman, “Selective Critical Bibliography,” 335.

14 Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy*, 34-35 correctly notes this and the fact that the account of the death of James in *LAJ* does not use Rufinus’ translation of Eusebius. We have checked nine other passages Eusebius reproduces from Josephus: *HE* 1.8.68 (*AJ* 17.168-170), *HE* 1.5.4 (*AJ* 18.1), *HE* 1.5.5 (*AJ* 18.4), *HE* 1.10.5 (*AJ* 18.34-35), *HE* 2.53-55 (*AJ* 18.257-260), *HE* 2.10.3-9 (*AJ* 19.343-351), *HE* 2.11.2-3 (*AJ* 20.97-98), 2.12.1 (*AJ* 20.101), *HE* 2.20.2-3 (*AJ* 20.180-181). In seven cases there is very little verbal overlap, but for *HE* 1.8.6-8 (*AJ* 17.168-170) and *HE* 1.10.5 (*AJ* 18.34-35) *LAJ* clearly depends on Rufinus.

*Antiquities* and Schwartz's edition of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. Errors in these two standard editions along with the need to update Niese with evidence from Schwartz's edition and from a fuller range of the manuscript evidence for Eusebius (for which we use Heinichen's 1868 edition) make this a necessity. We have not, however, attempted to catalogue all the emendations suggested by scholars trying to reconstruct the original (i.e., uninterpolated) Greek texts of the passages.

### 1.2.1 Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions of the Latin *Antiquities*

In the introduction to his edition of *AJ* 1-5 in Latin translation, Blatt lays the groundwork for all future work on *LAJ* by listing and providing a brief description of 171 manuscripts, 131 of which include books 18 and 20. He also attempts to group the manuscripts in families, a task he admits is very difficult.<sup>15</sup>

Our texts report the readings from 37 manuscripts and all the early printed editions published from 1470 to 1524. (We chose this end date because all editions of the Latin translations of Josephus beginning with the 1534 Basel edition were emended extensively on the basis of Greek manuscripts.) We have reported the evidence of all the manuscripts and early printed editions to which we have had access, not only to provide the basis for a reconstruction of the earliest possible form of the Latin translations of the passages we are considering, but also as a preliminary indication of how the translations of Josephus were generally known in the Latin West until the appearance of the *editio princeps* of the Greek text in 1544.

We have also included in an appendix catalogues of all the collated manuscripts and early printed editions that expand and correct currently available resources. Since the collection and analysis of all textual variants in a significant number of manuscripts contributes to investigation of the larger question of the relationships among these manuscripts and their place in the *LAJ* textual tradition, a subject we have been exploring for several years, we have supplemented our catalogue of manuscripts with detailed charts presenting the distribution of variants among several clearly identifiable manuscript groups.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Blatt, 25.

<sup>16</sup> On these groups, see below, section 3.2; for the identification of groups, based on several sample passages, for 74 *AJ* and *BJ* manuscripts, see Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations." At this stage of research, it seems best not to exclude any manuscript, even if it is most likely an apograph. Given the number of manuscripts not yet investigated, there is not enough evidence to establish a full stemma.

### 1.2.2 Manuscripts and Critical Editions of Rufinus' Translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*

As noted above, *LAJ* reproduces with very few changes Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' quotations from Josephus' reports of Jesus and John the Baptist. For this reason we present below a text and analysis of Rufinus' work, both to compare his text with the Greek of Eusebius and to identify the changes made by *LAJ*. In addition, comparison of *LAJ* and Rufinus (the source of *LAJ* for these two reports) is an important component of establishing the text of both.

Unfortunately, Mommsen's edition of the text of Rufinus' translation of the *Ecclesiastical History*, which appeared together with Schwartz's standard edition of the Greek text of Eusebius, was not sufficient for our purposes.<sup>17</sup> His text was not meant to be a critical edition of Rufinus based on a comprehensive study of the manuscript tradition. It was intended simply as an aid to the establishment of the Greek text of Eusebius.<sup>18</sup> He does list 92 manuscripts,<sup>19</sup> but he explains that he undertook no systematic collation of them, conducting, with help from colleagues, only trial collations of most of them with particular attention to those in London, Munich, Paris, and Rome.<sup>20</sup> Since the publication of Mommsen's edition, a number of other early manuscripts have been identified. Ciccolini, in her recent survey of the manuscript tradition of Rufinus' translation of Eusebius, lists 16 manuscripts from the eighth and ninth century C.E. not used by Mommsen.<sup>21</sup>

Mommsen chose four of the oldest manuscripts to serve as the sources for his critical apparatus. He postulates two streams of the manuscript tradition,

17 E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke 2: Die Kirchengeschichte* (2d ed. with introduction by F. Winkelmann; 3 vols; GCS Neue Folge 6.1-3; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999; 1st ed. 1903-1909). Vol. 1 has *HE* 1-5; vol. 2 has *HE* 1-10, *Mart. Pal.*, and Rufinus' continuation of Eusebius (books 10-11); vol. 3 contains extensive introductions to Eusebius and Rufinus and indices to both.

18 Mommsen did not have a chance to fully explain his aims, because he died before the edition was published. The brief preface to volume 1 of the GCS edition of the *HE* (iii-iv) was taken from a manuscript he left behind at his death (see F. Winkelmann, "Geleitwort zum Nachdruck der Edition," *Eusebius Werke* 2.1: viii). Schwartz explained Mommsen's work on Rufinus as a revision of the text that did not give a full view of the textual tradition and was securely established only to the extent necessary to make it helpful for controlling the Greek original (*Gesammelte Schriften* 2 [Berlin, 1956], 6, cited by Winkelmann, *Eusebius Werke* 2.1:viii).

19 *Eusebius Werke* 2.3:ccliii-cclvi.

20 *Eusebius Werke* 2.3:cclxix.

21 L. Ciccolini, "La version latine de l'*Histoire ecclésiastique*," in *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire ecclésiastique* (ed. S. Morlet and L. Perrone; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2012), 1:250-52.

both going back to an archetype of the sixth or seventh century. These two streams are represented by the ninth-century Vaticanus Palatinus 822 (P) and the eighth-century Bibliothèque nationale Lat. 18282 (N). Later manuscripts, he claims, represent a contaminated tradition. From these he chooses two, the ninth- or tenth-century Bibliothèque nationale Lat. 5500 (O) and Clm 6375 (F), a ninth-century manuscript from Freising now in Munich. For the first nine books of Rufinus' work, i.e., the part that was a translation of Eusebius, Mommsen did not even provide a full report of these manuscripts. Variants from O and F that are in neither P nor N are generally not reported. Also omitted are orthographic variants, inversions of word order, and clear scribal errors in P and N not supported by O or F. On the other hand, he does include readings that differ in P and N and what he considers to be incorrect readings that are characteristic of the individual manuscripts or are of interest on other grounds.<sup>22</sup> In the passages we are presenting here, Mommsen has one variant listed for the *Testimonium* and six variants for the account of John the Baptist. We include a number of other variants in our apparatus, and, in fact, list three places where Mommsen has not reported a significant variant found in his ms N.<sup>23</sup>

Mommsen's apparatus, then, is intentionally limited in scope and was never meant to provide the resources for studying the manuscript tradition of Rufinus' translation of Eusebius. Whatever the value of Mommsen's hypothesis about the development of the tradition and of his reconstruction of what Rufinus actually wrote, his text is clearly of limited value as a guide to the form of the text of Rufinus known by *LAJ* and by other late antique, medieval, and modern readers.

Mommsen's text for the passages under consideration here is in fact based on only three manuscripts, and, in addition, his apparatus only records selective readings from these three. Our list of variants is taken from ten additional manuscripts and reports of readings in Cacciari's 1740 edition not included in Mommsen's edition. This expanded manuscript base makes it abundantly clear that there are a number of readings not recorded in Mommsen's edition that will be of interest to students of the reception of the *Testimonium* in the Christian West. Although these readings almost certainly do not represent what Rufinus originally wrote, they nevertheless do reveal interesting developments in the textual tradition. Chief among these is our discovery of

<sup>22</sup> *Eusebius Werke* 2.3:cclxi-cclxviii.

<sup>23</sup> N has the following readings not reported by Mommsen (the reading in Mommsen's text is given in parenthesis): *dilixerunt* (*dilexerant*), *suo regno* (*a suo rege*; the variant *regno* is only reported for ms P), *uidebant* (*uidebat*; Mommsen might have considered this an obvious error).

the striking and previously unrecorded variant *et credebatur esse Christus* in both an eighth-century manuscript (one of the earliest surviving copies) and in a related ninth-century manuscript of Rufinus' translation.

In order to have a text that better serves our purposes, but does not involve an investigation of the full manuscript tradition, an immense task for which we do not have the resources, we have updated Mommsen's text in a number of ways by including:

- (1) all of Mommsen's variants from N, P, and F (the part of the text in which our passages are found is not preserved in O) and a fuller report than does Mommsen of the readings in N, which we were able to collate at the Bibliothèque nationale de France;
- (2) readings from four of the eighth- and ninth-century manuscripts not used by Mommsen;
- (3) variants reported in Cacciari's 1740 edition, which was based on five Vatican manuscripts;
- (4) variants from five manuscripts ranging from the twelfth to the fifteenth or sixteenth century, to which we have had access in digital form online.

### 1.2.3 Greek Texts of Josephus and Eusebius

The Greek texts and critical apparatuses for Josephus and Eusebius provided below are for the purpose of comparison with the Latin translations of *LAJ* and Rufinus. They are based on the monumental editions by Benedikt Niese and Eduard Schwartz, whose sigla for the manuscripts we adopt. The apparatus from each of these, however, has been expanded and at points corrected.

Niese's apparatus for the passages we are discussing is inadequate for several reasons. Most significantly, there is a glaring error in his citation of Eusebius for the *Testimonium*: passages found in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* are cited as "praep.," "praep. codd. plurimi," and "praep. codd. quidem" [*sic*; a proofreader's or printer's error for "quidam"]. This abbreviation would seem to refer to Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*, and indeed that is the way Niese designates the *Praep. ev.* in other volumes. The *Testimonium*, however, is not in fact included in the *Praep. ev.*, and all the readings so designated in Niese's apparatus are, in reality, found in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*.<sup>24</sup> Aside from this

24 At what stage this error entered Niese's apparatus is impossible to determine since it is hardly possible that Niese himself made the mistake, as can be seen from the fact that Eusebius' *HE* and *DE*, but not his *PE*, are listed among the witnesses for the text of this section.

error, which is unfortunately repeated in the textual notes to the Loeb Classical Library edition, there are other places where his citation of material from Eusebius can be improved. Niese did not have the benefit of Schwartz's edition of the *HE*, which was published twelve years after Niese's vol. 4, which contained *AJ* 16-20. Niese's vague indications of the degree of manuscript support for a particular reading (e.g., "codd. plurimi," "codd. quidam") can now be made more precise and at some points corrected.<sup>25</sup> Another problem with Niese's citation of the evidence from Eusebius is his failure to include the testimony of the *Theophania*, whose version of the *Testimonium Flavianum* is extant in an early (pre-411 C.E.) Syriac translation.

Finally, there are two other areas in which Niese's apparatus is misleading. After citing the manuscripts of the *AJ*, he cites the evidence from the manuscripts of *BJ* (designating them collectively with the siglum B) that include a version of the *Testimonium* at the end of the work. The problem is that these passages are drawn from Eusebius' *HE* and are therefore not direct witnesses to the text of the *AJ*, as Niese's apparatus appears to suggest.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, and of greatest importance for our study, Niese's citation in his apparatus of the readings of *L AJ* ("Lat") in the passages about Jesus and John the Baptist does not take into account the fact that *L AJ* is simply reproducing Rufinus' translation of the *HE*. "Lat" in these cases is therefore a witness to the text of Eusebius, and only indirectly relevant to the reconstruction of the Greek text of *AJ*.

Schwartz's apparatus is also not fully adequate for our purposes at several points. His citations from the *Theophania* are given in Greek without an indication that this is a retroversion from the Syriac. In one case, the retroversion is inaccurate.<sup>27</sup> Because his apparatus does not include what he considers to be inferior manuscripts from a particular branch of the tradition, it is sometimes difficult to get a sense of how widespread an individual reading is. For example, his citation of only one manuscript for the interesting variant Ἰησοῦς τις fails to indicate that the reading appears in several manuscripts, as can be seen in Heinichen's fuller apparatus.<sup>28</sup>

25 We have not found any reference in Niese to the editions of Eusebius that he used. The information in his notes about the quantity of manuscripts that have a particular reading ("plurimi," "quidam," etc.) corresponds to the reports in the extensive apparatus in Heinichen's second edition of the *HE*, published in 1868.

26 For the use of Eusebius' version of the *Testimonium* in *BJ* manuscripts, see Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke* 2.3:clxxxvii.

27 See 2.4.3 below on τῶν ἡδονῆ τάληθῆ δεχομένων.

28 See 2.4.3 below on Ἰησοῦς τις. For a detailed and authoritative recent study of the Greek manuscript tradition, see M. Cassin, "Tradition manuscrite grecque de *l'Histoire*

## 2 Texts, Translations, and Commentaries

### 2.1 Introduction

For the *Testimonium* and the account of John the Baptist, we present a text with a list of variants for (1) *LAJ*; (2) Rufinus; and (3) the Greek text of Josephus with variants from Eusebius in the apparatus. For the account of the death of James, we provide a text and list of variants for (1) *LAJ* and (2) the Greek text of Josephus with variants from Eusebius in the apparatus. After the texts with variants, we give a synopsis (without apparatus) of the Greek text of Eusebius, together with Latin texts of Rufinus and *LAJ* for *AJ* 18.63-64 and *AJ* 18.116-119, passages where *LAJ* depends on Rufinus, and a synopsis of the Greek text of Josephus and *LAJ* for 20.199-203, where *LAJ* does not use Rufinus' translation.<sup>29</sup> Following the texts and translations of each passage, we offer a commentary on selected issues, focusing primarily on textual variants in the Latin texts and on places where the Latin translations differ from the Greek texts and from each other. In order to make our work more accessible, we have provided translations for the texts of *LAJ*, translating any differences from Rufinus in the notes. The translations are intended for the sole purpose of comparing the Greek and Latin texts and are therefore as literal as possible.<sup>30</sup>

Because the Table of Contents in the manuscripts of *LAJ* appears to go back to the translation sponsored by Cassiodorus, we have also provided a text with variants for the sections of the Table of Contents for Book 18 where Jesus and John the Baptist appear. We also include the reference to James in the Table of Contents for one manuscript and a closely related early printed edition, although this notice was clearly not part of the original translation.

The Latin texts represent our own critical text. The textual notes include all variant readings in the manuscripts and early printed editions which we have collated, except non-significant orthographical differences<sup>31</sup> and, in the case of the early printed editions, simple printer's errors. We generally include variations in the spelling of proper names in the notes to the text because these

---

*ecclésiastique*," in Morlet and Perrone, eds., *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire ecclésiastique*, 1:209-42.

29 We have included the text of Rufinus' translation of the James passage in 5.2 in order to demonstrate how different it is from the translation in *LAJ*.

30 This does not mean that every word in Greek is represented by a separate Latin word. For example, *autem*, when it corresponds to the colorless δέ, is not translated; it is translated when it has a clearly adversative function.

31 E.g., ti/ci; ae/e where the e clearly corresponds to an original ae; ae/ε where ε corresponds to an original ae. E caudata (ε) is usually resolved to ae without comment, except in cases where it might be ambiguous (e.g., ae or oe), or stand for simple long or short e (e.g., ετιam).

are sometimes helpful in determining the relationship among the manuscripts and printed editions.<sup>32</sup>

We have followed Mommsen's orthography for the text of Rufinus, although it is clear that he often standardizes the readings found in the manuscripts. For the orthography of *LAJ* we have generally followed Blatt's edition of *AJ* 1-5, Boysen's edition of the *Contra Apionem*, and the Hanslik-Jacob edition of the *Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita*, a text produced under Cassiodorus' supervision.<sup>33</sup> Boysen and Blatt say that they have used the earliest manuscript of the *Antiquities*, the sixth- or seventh-century Cimelio ms 1 in the Ambrosian Library, as an orthographic guide.<sup>34</sup>

We have reported the readings in the early printed editions for two reasons. Some are based on manuscripts that we have not been able to identify and are therefore independent witnesses to the textual tradition. In the case of editions whose manuscript base we can identify and of editions clearly based on previous editions, it is important at this stage of research to demonstrate these relationships as clearly and as fully as possible.

Because the Greek texts of Josephus and Eusebius are both relevant for our inquiry, we present a text of Josephus, following with a few exceptions Niese's *editio maior*, but include in our apparatus all the information from both Niese's and Schwartz's apparatuses, correcting or expanding both at points. In the apparatus, we have also added references to Naber's edition of Josephus, which came out soon after Niese's, to Niese's *editio minor*, in which he included in the text itself some of his conjectures that he had relegated to the apparatus in his *editio maior*, and to Feldman's text and notes in the LCL edition. Those few readings for which the main manuscript tradition of Eusebius differs from that of Josephus can be easily tracked in the apparatus. With the exception of places that bear directly upon the Latin translations, we have not cited other emendations suggested in the extensive literature devoted to this passage, especially by those who attempt to recover a text that does not reflect Christian interpolations. For each passage, then, we first present the Latin and

32 The various spellings and abbreviations for Jesus, Christ, and Christians are not recorded for Rufinus because this information is not consistently preserved in Mommsen's and Cacciari's editions.

33 Cassiodorus himself discusses correct orthographic practice in *Institutiones* 1.9-10. His *Orthographia* is a compendium of earlier writers on orthography that he compiled as a guide to promote classical norms (*Cassiodoro de orthographia*, ed. P. Stoppacci [Florence: SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2010]).

34 This manuscript only includes *AJ* 5.334-10.204. Niese (1:xxviii) comments that this codex should provide the orthographical standard for editing the Latin *Antiquities*.

Greek texts with textual notes, and then include a synopsis of the relevant texts in order to make it easier for readers to observe how the Greek text was translated and, in the case of the passages about Jesus and John the Baptist, how *LAJ* modified Rufinus' translation. In each synopsis, we use underlining to indicate differences among the texts.

## 2.2 *Sigla for LAJ Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions*

### 2.2.1 Manuscripts

The manuscripts are listed in the alphabetical order of their sigla. We use Blatt's sigla except in the case of Best 7010 (Walraff 276), not included in Blatt's catalogue, which we designate Arn, from Arnsberg, its place of origin. For additional information about dating, provenance, and relationships of the manuscripts to one another, see below 3.2 and 4.1.

1. **al** = London, British Library, Add. 22860. 13th C.E.
2. **Alb** = London, British Library, Royal 13 D vii. 12th C.E. (1st part)
3. **Arn** = Cologne, Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln, Best 7010 (Wallraf 276). 12th C.E. (end)
4. **Ba** = Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Msc. Class. 78. 9th C.E. (middle)
5. **Cl** = Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, Ms. 137, vol. 2. 12th C.E.
6. **cl** = Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, Ms. 701. 12th C.E.
7. **Co** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5046. 12/13th C.E.
8. **Cor** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 16730. 1170-1180 C.E.
9. **Cp** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 16941. 1200-1230 C.E.
10. **D** = Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek, Cod. 163. 12th C.E. (3rd quarter)
11. **d** = New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Ms d 534. 13th C.E. (late)
12. **El** = Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 546. 11/12th C.E.
13. **f** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5763. 11th (end)-12th (beg.) C.E.
14. **Ha** = Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 547. 12th C.E.
15. **L** = Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.2. 11th C.E.
16. **I** = Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.3 15th C.E.
17. **Lau** = Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.5. 11th C.E. (end)
18. **Lau** = Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.6 (2nd vol. of Plut. 66.5). 11th C.E. (end)
19. **Ld** = London, British Library, Add. 22861. 13th C.E.
20. **n** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 16731. 12th C.E.
21. **Ne** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5045, vol. 2. 12th C.E. (early)

22. **p** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5047. 12/13th C.E.
23. **Pa** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5049. 13th C.E.
24. **pa** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5050. 13/14th C.E.
25. **par** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5051. 1400-1450 C.E.
26. **pat** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 8835. 1461 C.E.
27. **Pd** = Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Ms. A 148 ("Codex Gigas"). 1204-1230 C.E.
28. **Pl** = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 11302. 11/12th C.E.
29. **Prs** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 8959. c. 1160 C.E.
30. **S** = Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, GKS 157 folio. 9th C.E. (1st half)
31. **s** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 12511. 12th C.E. (2nd half)
32. **Sa** = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 15841. c. 1200 C.E.
33. **Sg** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 11735. 13th C.E. (early)
34. **Sr** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 15427. 12th C.E.
35. **U** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. NAL 2453. 12th C.E. (early)
36. **Vct** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 14361. 12th C.E.
37. **Werd** = Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Ms. Lat. Fol. 226. 12th C.E. (before 1159)

#### 2.2.2 Early Printed Editions

The editions are identified by date and place of publication; for further information on each edition, see 4.3 below.

1. **aug** = 1470 Augsburg
2. **na1475** = "Not after 1475." Probably Low Countries
3. **lüb** = c. 1475 Lübeck
4. **1481ven** = 1481 Venice. Part 1: *AJ* (May 10, 1481; incorrectly given as 1400 in the colophon)
5. **1486ven** = 1486 Venice
6. **1499ven** = 1499 Venice
7. **1502ven** = 1502 Venice
8. **1510ven** = 1510 Venice

**ven** = Readings found in all Venice editions; readings not found in all the editions are indicated by date + ven (e.g., 1481ven).

9. **1511par** = 1511 Paris
10. **mil** = 1513/1514 Milan
11. **1514par** = 1513/1514 Paris
12. **1519par** = 1519 Paris

paris = Readings found in both 1513/1514 and 1519 Paris editions; readings in only one indicated by 1514par or 1519par.

13. 1524col = 1524 Cologne  
 14. 1524bas = 1524 Basel

1524 = Readings found in both 1524 Cologne and 1524 Basel editions; readings found in only one indicated by 1524col or 1524bas.

### 2.3 *Sigla for Rufinus Manuscripts*

Our apparatus is based on manuscripts we have collated ourselves and on the editions of Mommsen and Cacciari for readings in the manuscripts they used, having been able to check for ourselves only the readings of Mommsen's manuscript N.

#### 2.3.1 From Mommsen's Apparatus

F = Munich, Clm 6375. 9th c.E. (1st third).<sup>35</sup> Freising

N = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 18282. 8th/9th c.E. 27r-27v (Jesus); 26v-27r (John)

P = Rome, Vaticanus Pal. lat. 822. 9th c.E.; P<sup>1</sup> = first hand of P

#### 2.3.2 From Cacciari's Text and Apparatus<sup>36</sup>

Vaticanus Lat. 1978. 13th or 14th c.E.

Vaticanus Lat. 5089. 1448 c.E. Verona

Vaticanus Reg. lat. 563. 14th c.E.

Vaticanus Reg. lat. 564. According to Cacciari, who gives no further information about the date, "uetustiozem Regium"

Vaticanus Urb. lat. 385. 15th c.E.

35 This is the date in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (hereafter BSB) online catalogue. Ciccolini, 249 has first half of 9th century. Schwartz-Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke* 2.3:cclv gives the date as 9th/10th c.E.

36 Cacciari's apparatus is presumably a highly selective report of variants.

## 2.3.3 From Manuscripts We Have Collated

BN11738 = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin 11738. ca. 840 C.E.

Saint-Maur-des-Fossés.<sup>37</sup> 10r (Jesus); 9v-10r (John)

BN12526 = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin 12526. Mid-9th C.E.

Corbie.<sup>38</sup> 22r-22v (Jesus); 21v-22r (John)

C = Cologne, Dombibliothek, Codex 1030. 15th C.E.<sup>39</sup> 11r-11v (Jesus); 11r (John)

Clm6381 = Munich, Clm 6381. 820-840 C.E.<sup>40</sup> Freising. Benediktbeuern. 27r (Jesus); 26r-27r (John)

Clm6383 = Munich, Clm 6383. End of 8th C.E.<sup>41</sup> Freising. Bodenseegebiet (?). 15r-15v (Jesus); 15r (John)

Clm14040 = Munich, Clm 14040. 1170-1180 C.E.<sup>42</sup> Regensburg, St. Emmeram. 14v (Jesus); 14r-14v (John)

G = Geneva, Bibliothèque de Genève, Ms. Lat. 18. 15th or 16th C.E.<sup>43</sup> Unknown origin. 50r (John and Jesus)

Sang = St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 547. c. 1200 C.E.<sup>44</sup> Prob. St. Gallen. 102r (Jesus and John)

T = Troyes, Bibliothèque du Grand Troyes, Ms 594. 12th C.E.<sup>45</sup> 13v (Jesus and John)

37 For date and provenance, see Ciccolini in *Histoire ecclésiastique* (ed. Morlet-Perrone), 251, who corrects Mommsen's 10th century dating.

38 For date and provenance, see Ciccolini, *ibid.*, who corrects Mommsen's 11th-century dating.

39 Digital copy: [http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de/ceec-cgi/kleioc/0010/exec/pagemed/%022kn28-1030\\_021.jpg%022/segment/%022body%022](http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de/ceec-cgi/kleioc/0010/exec/pagemed/%022kn28-1030_021.jpg%022/segment/%022body%022)

40 This is the date in the BSB catalogue. Ciccolini, 251i: 9th C.E. (2nd quarter). Schwartz-Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke* 2.3:cclv gives the date as 10th C.E. Digital copy: <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0005/bsb00054506/images/>

41 This is the date in the BSB catalogue. Ciccolini, 251: 8th/9th C.E. Schwartz-Mommsen, *ibid.*, gives the date as 11th C.E. Digital copy: <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0005/bsb00054508/images/>

42 Digital copy: <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00034257/images/>

43 Digital copy: <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/bge/lat0018/50r/x-large>

44 Digital copy: <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/0547/102>

45 Digital copy: [http://patrimoine.agglo-troyes.fr/simclient/integration/EXPLOITATION/dossiersDoc/voirDossManuscrit.asp?INSTANCE=EXPLOITATION&DOSS=BKDD\\_MS\\_0594\\_00](http://patrimoine.agglo-troyes.fr/simclient/integration/EXPLOITATION/dossiersDoc/voirDossManuscrit.asp?INSTANCE=EXPLOITATION&DOSS=BKDD_MS_0594_00)

## 2.4 *Josephus on Jesus*

### 2.4.1 The Latin Translation of *Antiquities* 18.63-64

63. Fuit autem<sup>46</sup> eisdem<sup>47</sup> temporibus Ihesus<sup>48</sup> sapiens uir,<sup>49</sup> si tamen uirum eum<sup>50</sup> nominare<sup>51</sup> fas est. Erat<sup>52</sup> enim<sup>53</sup> mirabilium operum effector<sup>54</sup> et doctor<sup>55</sup> hominum eorum<sup>56</sup> qui libenter quae<sup>57</sup> uera sunt audiunt.<sup>58</sup> Et<sup>59</sup> multos quidem<sup>60</sup> Iudaeorum multos etiam<sup>61</sup> ex<sup>62</sup> gentibus<sup>63</sup> sibi adiunxit.<sup>64</sup> Christus<sup>65</sup> hic erat.<sup>66</sup> 64. Hunc accusatione primorum nostrae gentis<sup>67</sup> uirorum<sup>68</sup> cum Pilatus in crucem<sup>69</sup> agendum esse<sup>70</sup> decreuisset,<sup>71</sup> non deseruerunt hi<sup>72</sup> qui

- 
- 46 autem] omitted by p Pd s  
 47 eisdem] isdem Alb cl Cor L Ld p Prs Sg U Vct lüb paris; hisdem al Ba Cl cl Co Cp d El f Ha l n Ne Pa pa par pat Pl S s Sa aug ven 151par mil  
 48 Ihesus] ihesus n aug na1475 lüb; iesus l S U ven 151par mil paris 1524; ihc or ihs all other mss; omitted by Arn  
 49 sapiens uir] uir sapiens Arn Pd lüb paris  
 50 uirum eum] eum uirum p  
 51 nominare] nominari Pl Prs Sg Vct, Ruf. mss BN12526 Clm6381 G T; nominare possibly corrected to nominari pat  
 52 hic erat enim] hic erat f S; hic erat above enim al Cl  
 53 enim] omitted by f  
 54 operum effector] effector (corrected from effectorum) operum al  
 55 doctor] doctor omnium Pd Sa aug ven 151par mil  
 56 hominum eorum] eorum hominum cl Co Cp Ld Pd Pl Prs s Sa Sg Vct aug ven 151par mil  
 57 quae] ea quae al Cl cl Co Ld Pl Prs s Sg Vct, Ruf. ms Clm14040  
 58 audiunt] omitted by Pd  
 quae uera sunt audiunt] audiunt quae uera sunt Ba p par Sa aug ven 151par mil  
 59 Et] et hic Ne pa  
 60 quidem] quidam Ld  
 61 etiam] uero Arn; omitted by Cp U; quidem (underlined with deletion mark) U  
 62 ex] corrected from et f  
 63 gentibus] gentibus Ruf. ms C; all other mss of Ruf. have gentilibus  
 64 adiunxit] audiunxit f  
 65 Christus] christus ven 151par mil paris 1524; cristus l; xpus aug; xc Cor; xpc or xps all other mss lüb  
 66 Christus hic erat] omitted by na1475  
 67 nostrae gentis] gentis nostrae Sa  
 68 nostrae gentis uirorum] uirorum nostrae gentis Pd  
 69 crucem] cruce Cp p pat  
 70 esse] omitted by p Pd Sa ven mil; esse in margin pa pat  
 in crucem agendum esse] agendum eum in cruce p  
 71 decreuisset] decreuisse 151par  
 72 hi] eum hi d n Pd p

ab initio eum<sup>73</sup> dilexerant.<sup>74</sup> Apparuit<sup>75</sup> enim<sup>76</sup> eis<sup>77</sup> tertio<sup>78</sup> die,<sup>79</sup> iterum<sup>80</sup> uiuus,<sup>81</sup> secundum quod<sup>82</sup> diuinitus<sup>83</sup> inspirati prophetae, uel<sup>84</sup> haec uel alia de eo<sup>85</sup> innumera<sup>86</sup> miracula futura<sup>87</sup> esse<sup>88</sup> praedixerant. Sed et in hodiernum<sup>89</sup> Christianorum,<sup>90</sup> qui ab ipso nuncupati sunt,<sup>91</sup> et<sup>92</sup> nomen perseuerat<sup>93</sup> et genus.

#### 2.4.2 Rufinus' Translation of *Ecclesiastical History* 1.11.7-8

7. Fuit autem iisdem<sup>94</sup> temporibus Iesus sapiens uir, si tamen uirum eum<sup>95</sup> nominare<sup>96</sup> fas est. Erat enim mirabilium operum effector doctorque hominum

73 eum] omitted by Pd

74 dilexerant] dilexerunt Alb Arm Cor Cp Ha L l Lau n Ne p Pa pa par pat Pd Werd aug lüb ven 151par mil paris 1524; dilexer't Ba D d El na1475; dilexer' Sa; all mss of Ruf. except N have dilexerant.

75 apparuit] apparui f

76 enim] omitted by f S; etiam al; etiam (underlined) U; etiam (struck through) enim Ld

77 eis] omitted by Pl Prs

78 tertio] omitted by cl Co f Pl Prs S s Sg Vct; in tercio al; tertia p Pd Sa aug ven 151par mil 1524

79 die] omitted by cl Co f Pl Prs S s Sg Vct

tertio die] die tertio L l

80 iterum] omitted by al

81 uiuus] uisus Co (corrected to uiuus in another hand) f (corrected to uiuus) Pl Prs S s Sg Vct; uiuens Alb d U (underlined) lüb paris (cf. Jerome *De uiris illustribus* 13); unus 1502ven (corrected to uiuus in margin by Manutius, according to Huntington Catalogue based on note by August Theiner written on the flyleaf and dated 15 Nov. 1855).

tertio die iterum uiuus] iterum tertia die uiuus Pd

82 quod] binding is too tight to read a word after secundum Alb

83 diuinitus] diuinitis (space between i and s) pat

84 uel] omitted by Pd

85 de eo] d'o Ld.; Ruf. ms Clm14040 has deo corrected to de eo (eo above o)

86 innumera] omitted by Pd; written above line in same hand p; munera Cp

87 futura] corrected from futurus S

88 futura esse] esse futura lüb paris

89 hodiernum] hodiernum diem Cp l Ne (diem above line) pa Pl Pd; Ruf. mss T G Clm14040 have hodiernum diem.

90 Christianorum] christianorum ven 151par mil paris 1524; christiani al; xpistianorum na1475; xpianorum all other mss aug lüb

91 nuncupati sunt] sunt nuncupati Ne pa par (sunt in margin) pat

92 et] celebre Ne (above the line) pa; omitted by l

93 perseuerat] possibly perseuerauit S; restat Ne pa par pat (corrected to perseuerat in another hand)

94 iisdem] isdem T; hisdem BN11738 BN12526 C Clm6381 Clm6383 Clm14040 G N S

95 uirum eum] eum uirum C Sang

96 nominare] nominari BN12526 Clm6381 G T, LAJ mss Pl Prs Sg Vct

eorum, qui libenter quae<sup>97</sup> uera sunt audiunt. Et multos quidem Iudaeorum, multos<sup>98</sup> etiam ex gentilibus<sup>99</sup> sibi adiunxit. Christus hic erat.<sup>100</sup> 8. Hunc accusatione primorum nostrae gentis uirorum cum Pilatus<sup>101</sup> in crucem agendum esse<sup>102</sup> decreuisset, non deseruerunt<sup>103</sup> hi qui ab initio eum dilexerant.<sup>104</sup> Apparuit enim<sup>105</sup> eis tertio<sup>106</sup> die iterum uiuus,<sup>107</sup> secundum quod diuinitus inspirati prophetae uel haec uel alia de eo<sup>108</sup> innumera<sup>109</sup> miracula futura esse praedixerant. Sed et<sup>110</sup> in hodiernum<sup>111</sup> Christianorum, qui ab ipso nuncupati sunt,<sup>112</sup> et nomen perseuerat et genus.

2.4.3 Greek Text of *Antiquities* 18.63-64 (Differences from *HE* 1.11.7-8 are in bold.)

63. Γίνεται δὲ<sup>113</sup> κατὰ τοῦτον<sup>114</sup> τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς<sup>115</sup> σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἀνδρα αὐτὸν<sup>116</sup> λέγειν χροῖ<sup>117</sup> ἣν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν

- 
- 97 quae] ea que Clm14040, *LAF* mss al Cl cl Co Ld Pl Prs s Sg Vct
- 98 multos] multus N
- 99 gentilibus] gentibus C, as in all *LAF* mss
- 100 hic erat] et credebatur esse Clm6381 Clm6383; in Clm6383 et credebatur appears at bottom of the page as correction of hic erat in the ms; hic erat has line through it pointing to bottom of page (see commentary).
- 101 cum Pilatus] pilatus cum Clm14040
- 102 esse] omitted by Clm14040
- 103 deseruerunt] deseruer' BN11738 C Sang T
- 104 dilexerant] dilexerunt N (not noted by Mommsen)
- 105 enim] autem Sang
- 106 tertio] tertia Clm6381
- 107 uiuus] uisus P<sup>1</sup>
- 108 de eo] corrected from deo (eo above o) Clm14040; cf. *LAF* ms Ld
- 109 innumera] multa et innumera Clm14040; innumerabilia C
- 110 et] added above line T
- 111 hodiernum] hodiernum diem Clm14040 G T, as in *LAF* mss Cp l Ne pa Pd Pl; for the change from in hodiernum to in hodiernum diem, see Schwartz-Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke* 2.3:cclxvi, which cites ms P's addition of diem to hodiernum at Eus. *HE* 7.13 and *HE* 7.31.2 (F N O have hodiernum).
- 112 nuncupati] nuncupantur C
- 113 δὲ] δὴ *Epitome*
- 114 κατὰ τοῦτον] κατ' ἐκεῖνον Eus. *DE* 3.5.105, 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤀𐤌𐤁 "at that time" Eus. *Theoph.* 5.44
- 115 Ἰησοῦς] Ἰησοῦς τις Eus. *HE* ms A (Heinichen lists three other manuscripts with this variant; according to Schwartz, these ultimately depend on A.) Here, as throughout Niese's app. crit. for the *Testimonium*, Eus. *HE* is mistakenly referred to as "praep."
- 116 ἀνδρα αὐτὸν] αὐτὸν ἀνδρα is the word order in Eus. *HE* mss A T E R and in some mss of the *Bellum*, where the *Testimonium*, derived from Eus. *HE* and not from Josephus *AJ* (Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke* 2.3:clxxxvii), appears at the end.
- 117 ἀνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χροῖ] χροῖ ἀνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν *Exc*

ἡδονῆ<sup>118</sup> τάληθῆ<sup>119</sup> δεχομένων,<sup>120</sup> καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους,<sup>121</sup> πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ<sup>122</sup> τοῦ<sup>123</sup> Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο.<sup>124</sup> ὁ χριστὸς<sup>125</sup> οὗτος ἦν. 64. καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν<sup>126</sup> σταυρῶ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλᾶτου, οὐκ<sup>127</sup> ἐπαύσαντο<sup>128</sup> οἱ τὸ<sup>129</sup> πρώτον<sup>130</sup> ἀγαπήσαντες· ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων<sup>131</sup> ἡμέραν<sup>132</sup> πάλιν

- 118 ἡδονῆ] σύν written above the line by the second hand of M
- 119 τάληθῆ] τήθη Eisler, *Messiah Jesus*, 53, followed by Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (1929), 145 (both Eisler and Thackeray cite Heinichen as the first to make this conjecture).
- 120 τῶν ἡδονῆ τάληθῆ δεχομένων] τάληθῆ σεβομένων Eus. *DE*; Eus. *Theoph.* 5.44 has ,ⲉⲃⲁⲗⲁ ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲥ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲕⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲥⲁⲃⲁⲛⲟ (“and the teacher of those people who receive pleasure in truth [or truly]”); cf. H. Gressmann and A. Laminski, *Die Theophanie. Eusebius Werke* 3.2 [GCS. 2d ed.; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992], 250 [apparatus]: “die das Vergnügen in Wahrheit aufnehmen”; text in S. Lee, *Eusebius on the Theophania: A Syriac Version* (London: Society for the Publication of Oriental Texts, 1842), 5.44. S. Lee, *Eusebius on the Theophania, Translated into English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), 330 translates “and the Teacher of those men who, with pleasure, receive him in truth” and retroverts into Greek as τῆ ἀληθείᾳ δεχομένων αὐτόν (330 note d). ,ⲉⲃⲁⲗⲁ (“receive him” or “receive it” [i.e., pleasure] is difficult). Emending to ⲕⲁⲥⲁⲥⲁ would yield: “who receive him truly with pleasure.” In his apparatus, Schwartz has τῶν ἡδονῆν ἀληθῆ δεχομένων without indicating that this is a retroversion from Syriac. It is hard to see why he would translate ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲥ as ἀληθῆ rather than (τῆ) ἀληθείᾳ.
- 121 Ἰουδαίους] τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Eus. *HE, BJ* (derived from Eus. *HE*); τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ Eus. *DE*; Eus. *Theoph.* has ⲛⲓⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟ ⲉⲃ (“from the Jews”); Jerome *de vir. ill.* 13 has *de Iudaeis*. Niese’s citation of *iudeorum* in the *LAJ* is misleading because that translation simply reproduces Rufinus’ translation of Eusebius and is not, therefore, evidence of the reading Ἰουδαίων in manuscripts of the *AJ*.
- 122 καὶ] omitted by *Exc*
- 123 τοῦ] ἀπὸ τοῦ Eus. *HE, BJ* (derived from Eus. *HE*), *ex gentilibus Ruf., ex gentibus LAJ, de gentibus Jerome, de vir. ill.* 13; τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ corrected from τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς *AJ* mss A
- 124 ἐπηγάγετο] ὑπηγάγετο Naber (without citation or comment in app. crit.)
- 125 χριστὸς] χριστὸς λεγόμενος Richards and Shutt, *CQ* 31 (1937): 176
- 126 τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν] τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχόντων Eus. *DE*; ⲁⲃⲁⲗⲁ ⲕⲁⲥⲁⲛⲟ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲕⲁⲥⲁⲓ “of the chief (literally “first”) leaders among us” Eus. *Theoph.* 5.44
- 127 οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο] σεβάξιν added before οὐκ in the margin by the second hand of M
- 128 ἐπαύσαντο] ἔξεπαύσαντο Eus. *HE* mss A B
- 129 τὸ] γε *W Exc*.
- 130 πρώτων] πρώτον αὐτόν M *Epitome* Naber. Heinichen reports this reading in Codex Venetianus 452 (Heinichen’s Q).
- 131 ἔχων] omitted by Eus. *DE*
- 132 ἔχων ἡμέραν] ἡμέραν ἔχων Eus. *HE* mss B D

ζών, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταυτά τε<sup>133</sup> καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια<sup>134</sup> εἰρηκότων. εἰς ἔτι τε<sup>135</sup> νῦν τῶν<sup>136</sup> Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε<sup>137</sup> ὠνομασμένον<sup>138</sup> οὐκ ἐπέλιπε<sup>139</sup> τὸ φύλον.

2.4.4 Synopsis of Eusebius, Rufinus, and *LAJ* (Non-orthographic differences between Rufinus and *LAJ* are italicized.)

Eusebius, <i>HE</i> 1.11.7-8	Rufinus	<i>LAJ</i> 18.63-64
7. Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή·	Fuit autem iisdem temporibus Iesus sapiens uir, si tamen uirum eum nominare fas est.	63. Fuit autem eisdem temporibus Ihesus sapiens uir, si tamen uirum eum nominare fas est.
ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής,	Erat enim mirabilium operum effector	Erat enim mirabilium operum effector
διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῆ τάληθῆ δεχομένων,	doctorque hominum eorum, qui libenter quae uera sunt audiunt.	et doctor hominum eorum qui libenter quae uera sunt audiunt.
καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, πολλοὺ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο.	Et multos quidem Iudaeorum, multos etiam ex <i>gentilibus</i> sibi adiunxit.	Et multos quidem Iudaeorum multos etiam ex <i>gentibus</i> sibi adiunxit.
ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν.	Christus hic erat.	Christus hic erat.

(Continued)

133 τε] omitted by *W Exc*

134 περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια] θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ *M W Exc. Naber*; θαυμάσια omitted by *Eus. DE* and *Theoph.*

135 εἰς ἔτι τε] *Epitome, Eus. HE, BJ* (derived from *Eus. HE*); εἶς τε *A W Exc.*; εἰσέτι καὶ *M* (with τε written above καὶ by the second hand and σέτι of εἰσέτι written in erasure by second hand); εἰς ἔτι γε *Ms D* of *HE*; εἰς ἔτι first hand of *ms B* of *HE* (Schwartz); ὅθεν εἰσέτι *Eus. DE*; *Eus. Theoph.* has  $\text{כִּי עַד שָׁם}$  (“so that from there until now”).

136 τῶν ] ὄν of τῶν is written in erasure in *A*

137 Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε] ἀπὸ τοῦδε τῶν Χριστιανῶν *Eus. DE*. Eusebius *Theoph.* agrees with the word order of *DE* and, more significantly, does not have a word corresponding to “named.”  $\text{כְּבָרְהֵם מִשְׁפָּחַת הַיְהוּדִים מִכֵּן}$  (“the family of the Christians from that [one? time?] has not disappeared”).

138 ὠνομασμένον] ὠνομασμένων *M* (second hand), *Epitome, Exc., BJ, Eus. HE*; omitted by *Eus. DE* and *Theoph.*

139 ἐπέλιπε] ἐπέλειπε *Eus. HE* mss *D M, Eus. DE, Exc.*; ἐπέλοιπε *Eus. HE* ms *B*

TABLE (Continued)

Eusebius, <i>HE</i> 1.11.7-8	Rufinus	<i>LAJ</i> 18.63-64
8. καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρωῖ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου,	Hunc accusatione primorum nostrae gentis uitorum cum Pilatus in crucem agendum esse decreuisset,	64. Hunc accusatione primorum nostrae gentis uitorum cum Pilatus in crucem agendum esse decreuisset,
οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπήσαντες·	non deseruerunt hi qui ab initio eum dilexerant.	non deseruerunt hi qui ab initio eum dilexerant.
ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν,	Apparuit enim eis tertio die iterum uiuus,	Apparuit enim eis tertio die, iterum uiuus,
τῶν θεῶν προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια εἰρηκότων.	secundum quod diuinitus inspirati prophetae uel haec uel alia de eo innumera miracula futura esse praedixerant.	secundum quod diuinitus inspirati prophetae, uel haec uel alia de eo innu- mera miracula futura esse praedixerant.
εἰς ἔτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον.	Sed et in hodiernum Christianorum, qui ab ipso nuncupati sunt, et nomen perseuerat et genus.	Sed et in hodiernum Christianorum, qui ab ipso nuncupati sunt, et nomen perseuerat et genus.

#### 2.4.5 Literal Translation of *LAJ* 18.63-64 with Variants from Rufinus in Footnotes

63. There was in those same times Jesus, a wise man, if nevertheless it is right to call him a man. For he was a doer of wondrous deeds and<sup>140</sup> a teacher of those people who gladly hear what things are true. And many indeed of the Jews, many even from the gentiles,<sup>141</sup> he joined to himself. This one was [the] Christ. 64. When, on the indictment of the first men of our nation, Pilate had decreed that he be led to the cross, they did not desert him who from the start had loved him. For he appeared to them on the third day once again alive in accordance with what the divinely inspired prophets had foretold, that both these and countless other wonders concerning him would occur. But even up to today both the name of the Christians, who are named from that one, has endured, as well as the group.

140 Rufinus: doctorque; *LAJ*: et doctor.

141 Rufinus: gentilibus; *LAJ*: gentibus.

2.4.6 Commentary on *LAJ* 18.63-64 and Ruf. *HE* 1.11.7-8<sup>142</sup>  
 63. **iisdem** (Ruf.)/**eisdem** (*LAJ*). Cf. Eus. *HE* 6.32.1, where Rufinus translates *κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον* as *per idem tempus*.

**Jesus**. None of the Latin manuscripts we have seen reflects the reading Ἰησοῦς τις found in several manuscripts of Eus. *HE* (see apparatus above).

**doctorque hominum eorum** (Ruf.)/**et doctor hominum eorum** (*LAJ*). Translating *διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων* and therefore to be preferred to the reading *et doctor omnium eorum hominum* that is found in related *AJ* manuscripts Codex Gigas (Pd) and Clm 15841 (Sa). The reading *et doctor omnium eorum hominum* is found in the 1470 *editio princeps*, which followed closely either Clm 15841 or a manuscript almost identical to it, in the 1481 Venice edition, which reproduced the *editio princeps*, in all subsequent Venice editions, in the 1511 Paris edition, and in the 1513 Milan edition, which used either the 1502 or 1510 Venice edition. The correct reading appears in the 1524 Cologne edition, which is based substantially on one of the Venice editions, but which often, as in this case, corrects it with readings from Berlin Lat 226.

**doctorque** (Ruf.)/**et doctor** (*LAJ*). This is one of only two places at which *LAJ* changes Rufinus' version of the *Testimonium*. Neither change alters the meaning of the text. See below at **ex gentilibus/ex gentibus**.

**nominare**. Four of the manuscripts of Rufinus we collated read *nominari*, a variant not reported by Mommsen, who bases his text on only three manuscripts and does not even report all the variants from these. The earliest of the manuscripts with *nominari* are BN12526 (mid-ninth century) and Clm 6381 (second quarter of the ninth century). Clearly the original reading is *nominare*, since it is widely attested and more closely reflects the Greek *ἀπὸν λέγειν*; *nominari* in Clm 6381 is a secondary reading, since *nominare* is found in Clm 6383 from the late eighth century, a manuscript that was apparently used by Clm 6381 (see below at *Christus hic erat*). Clm 6381 would then have made the change of an infinitive from *-are* to *-ari* here just as it did in the case of *anticipare* (Clm6383)/*anticipari* (Clm6381) in the story of John the Baptist (see the apparatus for Eus. *HE* 1.11.6). That this was a phonetic rather than a semantic change might be indicated by the fact that Clm 6381 corrects *desciscerent* to *disciscerent* (see the apparatus for Eus. *HE* 1.11.6). This sort of change is not surprising since *e* and *i* are often interchanged in medieval Latin. The reading *nominari* is also found in four closely related *LAJ* manuscripts (Pl, Prs, Sg, Vct).

**fas**. Translating *χρῆ* with a clear sense of religious reverence.

142 The lemmata follow the orthography of the text of Rufinus.

**quae.** Rufinus turns the substantive *τάληθῆ* into a verbal clause (cf. Rufinus' translation of Eus. *HE* 1.11.6 below: ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ / *a suo regno desciscerent*). The variant *ea quae* is found in ten related manuscripts of *LAJ* and one manuscript of Rufinus. All of the early manuscripts of Rufinus and *LAJ*, representing several different manuscript groups, read simply *quae*.

**audiunt.** Translating δεχομένων.

**et multos quidem Iudaeorum.** Translating καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίων, a word-for-word translation of Eusebius' Greek text (*quidem* is the standard translation for μὲν). Niese's note "Iudeorum Lat," which implies that the Latin supports a reading of Ἰουδαίων rather than the reading Ἰουδαίους, which is found in all the Greek manuscripts of *AJ*, is misleading. Rufinus is translating Eusebius, who changed Ἰουδαίους in *AJ* to Ἰουδαίων. *Iudaeorum* in *LAJ* simply reproduces Rufinus' literal translation of Eusebius and is not, therefore, evidence for the reading Ἰουδαίων in a Greek manuscript of *AJ*. Ἰουδαίων in the version of the *Testimonium* at the end of Greek manuscripts of the *Bellum* is also not evidence for the reading Ἰουδαίων in the *AJ* (as Niese's apparatus implies), since this version of the *Testimonium* is drawn from Eusebius.

**ex gentilibus (Ruf.)/ex gentibus (LAI).** Translating ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ. Manuscripts of Eusebius have ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ, while manuscripts of *LAI* have τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ (except ms A, where τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς is corrected to τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ). Rufinus translates ἀπὸ in Eusebius as *ex*, and *LAI* follows Rufinus. *LAI* is not, therefore, evidence for a reading with ἀπὸ in a Greek manuscript of *AJ*, as Niese's apparatus suggests. The reference to *Bellum* (i.e., the text of the *Testimonium* in some manuscripts of *BJ*) in Niese's apparatus is also misleading, because the version of the *Testimonium* appearing in manuscripts of *BJ* is drawn from Eusebius. Here Niese's apparatus mistakenly has *praep.* (i.e., *Praeparatio evangelica*) instead of *HE*.

The change of *gentilibus* to *gentibus* is one of two minor alterations *LAI* made to the text of Rufinus. The fact that *LAI* follows Rufinus so closely in this passage (it alters Rufinus a bit more in the passage on John the Baptist, for which see below) perhaps indicates a concern to preserve the precise wording of the *Testimonium*.

**Christus hic erat.** By far the most interesting variant in the texts we are discussing is the reading *et credebatur esse Christus* for *Christus hic erat*, which is found in two manuscripts of Rufinus currently in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: Clm 6383 from the late eighth century and Clm 6381 from the early ninth century. Both manuscripts were acquired from the Freising monastery library, where they had been located from at least the thirteenth century (the date of the first list of manuscripts in the library). Clm 6383 has

a line drawn through *Christus hic erat* with a sign pointing to a correction at the bottom of the page. The correction reads *et credebatur esse Christus*. Clm 6381 has the reading in the text without any indication of another reading. The simplest explanation for the data is that the scribe of Clm 6381 incorporated the marginal correction into the text. The correction itself almost certainly derives from Jerome's translation of the *Testimonium* in the entry on Josephus in *De viris illustribus* 13. This reading is also found in Otto of Freising's twelfth-century *World Chronicle* (MGH 20:146). Whealey, 57 notes this and explains it as Otto introducing the reading from Jerome. Our discovery suggests that Otto was simply copying a local manuscript. It remains a bit puzzling why a presumably pious scribe would prefer a text that did not explicitly acknowledge Jesus as Christ. Perhaps the best explanation is that he respected the authority of Jerome, whose version of the *Testimonium* was well known from his popular book recording the lives of famous men of faith.

The startling omission of *Christus hic erat* in the "Not After 1475" edition seems inexplicable, unless it is an accidental error by the printer. The Table of Contents for *AJ* 18 in this edition does have *De domino Ihesu Christo*, and this section in the main text is titled *De domino nostro Ihesu Christo*. Nowhere else in the early printed editions or in the manuscripts we have seen (including manuscripts close to the "Not After 1475" edition) is the sentence missing.

**non deseruerunt.** Translating οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο or οὐκ ἐξεπαύσαντο. Rufinus's translation, followed by *LAJ*, which says that "they did not desert him" rather than "they did not stop loving him," is not strictly literal. It is not clear whether Rufinus is reading οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο or οὐκ ἐξεπαύσαντο, both of which are well attested in the manuscript tradition of Eusebius.

64. **eum dilexerant.** In the majority of Greek texts, αὐτόν, which appears at the beginning of the sentence, functions both as the object of Pilate's judicial sentencing and of the disciples "loving" (ἀγαπήσαντες); four *LAJ* manuscripts and the *AJ Epitome* have an additional *eum/αὐτόν*. The additional αὐτόν is also found in Heinichen's ms Q of the *HE* (his siglum for Cod. Venet. 452). Schwartz does not report readings from this manuscript, with the result that this variant is not found in his apparatus. Rufinus is presumably translating a manuscript of Eusebius with this reading, although it is possible that he is simply clarifying the complicated syntax in the same way as the Greek texts that have an additional αὐτόν.

**dilexerant.** Translating ἀγαπήσαντες. Fifteen manuscripts of *LAJ* have the reading *dilexerunt* (another six have *dilexer'* or *dilex'r't*). *Dilexerant*, which is the reading in all the manuscripts of Rufinus, is to be preferred over *dilexerunt* in both the texts of Rufinus and *LAJ*, since it fits better in the sequence of tenses.

The variant *dilerexerunt* could have arisen from scribes choosing that word to resolve an ambiguous abbreviated form, such as *dilexer'* or *dilexr't*.

**enim.** The usual translation of γάρ. The closely related *LAJ* mss S and f omit enim. *LAJ* mss al and U have *etiam* in place of *enim*. *LAJ* ms Ld, closely related to al, has *etiam* struck through and replaced by *enim*. Since the correction is in the same hand as that of the scribe, this suggests Ld was based on al and was corrected against another manuscript.

**tertio die.** Omitted by S (9th c.E.) and f (11th c.E.), which is very close to S, and might in fact, depend on it. The omission occurs also in Cl, Co, Pl, Prs, s, Sg, and Vct, which are closely related to one other (see under *uiuus* immediately below), and often share distinctive readings with S and f (Group 1 below). For a particularly striking example of a relationship among these manuscripts, see the omission of fourteen words in *AJ* 20.202-203 (2.6.5 below) by Cl, Co, f, S, s, Sg, and Vct (Pl does not have *AJ* 20, and Prs follows a different textual tradition for *AJ* 20).

**uiuus.** The reading *uiuens* appears in *LAJ* mss Alb, d, and U and in the Lübeck edition, as well as the 1514 and 1519 Paris editions, which depend on it. This is one of the examples of a relationship between the Lübeck edition and Alb. While *uiuens* is a more literal rendering of the Greek ζῶν than *uiuus*, the widespread *LAJ* manuscript support for *uiuus* and the fact that all Rufinus manuscripts have *uiuus* make it more likely to be the original reading. It is possible that the reading *uiuens* is influenced by Jerome's translation of the *Testimonium*, which concludes his brief biography of Josephus, and which, in fact, appears at the beginning of Alb. The reading *uisus* is one of many examples of a clear relationship among Co, f, Pl, Prs, S, s, Sg, and Vct (Group 1 below).

**sed et in hodiernum.** The Greek text is uncertain at this point. εἰς ἔτι τε νῦν, εἰς ἔτι γε νῦν, and εἰς ἔτι νῦν are found in the manuscript tradition of Eus. *HE*, and εἰς τε νῦν and εἰς ἔτι καὶ νῦν (with τε written above καὶ) are found in the witnesses to Josephus' text reported by Niese. Unfortunately the Latin text at this point is not literal enough to be of value in establishing the Greek text. It is, however, much closer to the readings in Eus. *HE* and the *AJ* than to the δθεν εἰσέτι found in Eus. *DE*, which is clearly the Greek that lies behind the Syriac translation of the *Theophania*.

**hodiernum.** Six *LAJ* manuscripts and three Rufinus manuscripts have *hodiernum diem*, which, given the strong manuscript support for *hodiernum*, appears to be secondary.

## 2.5 *Josephus on John the Baptist*

2.5.1 The Latin Translation of *Antiquities* 18.116-119

116. A<sup>143</sup> quibusdam<sup>144</sup> autem<sup>145</sup> Iudaeorum uidebatur ideo<sup>146</sup> perisse Herodis<sup>147</sup> exercitum,<sup>148</sup> quod in eum<sup>149</sup> satis<sup>150</sup> iuste indignatio diuina<sup>151</sup> commota<sup>152</sup> sit<sup>153</sup> pro<sup>154</sup> uindicta Iohannis,<sup>155</sup> qui uocabatur<sup>156</sup> baptista.<sup>157</sup> 117. Hunc enim<sup>158</sup> Herodes occidit uirum ualde bonum, qui praecipiebat<sup>159</sup> Iudaeis uirtuti<sup>160</sup> operam dare, iustitiam<sup>161</sup> colere, in deum<sup>162</sup> seruare pietatem, et per<sup>163</sup> baptismum in unum<sup>164</sup> coire.<sup>165</sup> Tum<sup>166</sup> demum<sup>167</sup> enim<sup>168</sup> baptismum acceptabile<sup>169</sup>

- 
- 143 A] omitted by Ne pa par Pd Sa aug ven 1511par mil 1524, all Ruf. mss  
 144 quibusdam] quibus Cp  
 145 autem] autem sapientibus Pd  
 146 ideo] ideoque Ba L l pat Sr; ideoque corrected to ideo par  
 147 Herodis] omitted by lüb paris; corrected from herodes S  
 148 exercitum] exercitum herodis in pugna perisse Pd; exercitus Co Cor (the final s has a mark to the right making it look like an f) Cp f p s na1475; exercitum S (either an s corrected to an m or an m corrected to an s [there is a faint mark through the m, which could indicate it is to be deleted, but it might also be an imperfection in the microfilm])  
 149 eum] eo Pl  
 150 satis] sati f S  
 151 indignatio diuina] diuina indignatio Pd  
 152 commota] commotata par  
 153 line totally erased between sit and pro vindicta Ne  
 154 pro] de pro par  
 155 Iohannis] ioannis 1510ven 1524bas  
 156 uocabatur] uocatur par pat  
 157 baptista] corrected from baptistae S; batista l; after baptista, pat has homo iustus fuerat et timoratus (cf. Luke 2.25) et penitentiam asperam in deserto agens.  
 158 Hunc enim] hunc ergo iohannem Pd; cum lüb paris enim] omitted by l  
 159 praecipiebat] p(rae)ciebat f; p(rae)ciebat corrected to p(rae)cipiebat L  
 160 uirtuti] corrected from uirtute S; uirtutis Sr; omitted by Co s  
 161 iustitiam] et iusticiam lüb paris  
 162 deum] deo l  
 163 per] omitted by f S  
 164 unum] unum apparently corrected to uno S; in unum omitted by p  
 165 coire] coloere Ba; corpore S; corpori f  
 166 Tum] tunc al Cl cl Ld p Pd par pat Pl Prs Sg Sr Vct  
 167 demum] demon 1511par  
 168 demum enim] enim demum p  
 169 acceptabile] acceptabilem al Alb Cl cl Cor Cp d Ha Ld n Pa Pl Prs Sa Sg U Vct na1475 lüb paris

fore, si non solum ad<sup>170</sup> abluenda<sup>171</sup> peccata<sup>172</sup> sumatur, uerum<sup>173</sup> etiam ad castimoniam corporis atque<sup>174</sup> ad<sup>175</sup> animae iustitiam purificationemque<sup>176</sup> seruetur omniumque<sup>177</sup> pariter uirtutum uelut<sup>178</sup> signaculum et custodia quaedam<sup>179</sup> fidelis habeatur.<sup>180</sup> 118. Quae cum<sup>181</sup> ab eo<sup>182</sup> praecepta<sup>183</sup> huiusmodi<sup>184</sup> docerentur<sup>185</sup> atque<sup>186</sup> ad<sup>187</sup> audiendum eum<sup>188</sup> perplurima<sup>189</sup> multitudo<sup>190</sup> concurreret,<sup>191</sup> ueritus<sup>192</sup> Herodes, ne forte doctrinae<sup>193</sup> eius<sup>194</sup> persuasione<sup>195</sup>

- 
- 170 ad] above the line (only a of ad is clearly visible) S; omitted by Co; ab I  
 171 abluenda] abluendum f; alluenda l  
 172 peccata] corpora with peccata written in smaller letters above it Ha  
 173 uerum] sed f S  
 174 atque] omitted by f par pat Pl  
 175 ad] omitted by al Cl cl Co f l Ld par pat Prs S s Sg Vct, Ruf. ms C  
 176 purificationemque] purificationem pa  
 177 omniumque] omnium L l pa  
 178 uelut] corrected from ut uel Ne  
 179 custodia quaedam] quedam custodia Pd  
 180 habeatur] habebatur l pa; corrected to habebatur L n (later hand); habebatur corrected to habeatur pat  
 fidelis habeatur] pariter habebatur fidelis l  
 181 Quae cum] cumque al Arn Cl Ld Werd  
 182 eo] ipso Ne pa par pat Sr; ea f  
 ab eo] corrected from habeo L  
 183 praecepta] p(rae)cepta et pa  
 ab eo praecepta] praecepta ab eo Arn D Werd; praecepta cum ab eo Pd Sg  
 184 huiusmodi] omitted by Pd; huiuscemodi Co s, all Ruf. mss except Clm14040  
 185 docerentur] doceretur Ba  
 huiusmodi docerentur] docerentur huiusmodi na1475  
 186 atque] et pa  
 187 ad] omitted by Cl cl f l; adque for atque ad L  
 atque ad] omitted by Ne (et ad written above the line) pat par Sr  
 188 eum] omitted by lüb paris; corrected from ei Co; eum dum p  
 189 perplurima] perpluri corrected to perplurima Ne; plurima Ld pa pat; quam plurima 151par  
 190 multitudo] multitudo conueniretur et pat  
 191 concurreret] concureretur pat  
 192 ueritus] uerens cl Pl Prs Sg Vct  
 193 doctrinae] omitted by p  
 194 doctrinae eius] eius doctrinae al  
 195 persuasione] persuasionem f S, Ruf. ms Clm6381  
 doctrinae eius persuasione] persuasione doctrine eius Pd

populi a<sup>196</sup> suo regno<sup>197</sup> discederent,<sup>198</sup> uidebat<sup>199</sup> enim, quod praeceptis eius<sup>200</sup> ac monitis parata<sup>201</sup> esset plebs<sup>202</sup> in omnibus oboedire, melius<sup>203</sup> credit,<sup>204</sup> priusquam noui aliquid fieret,<sup>205</sup> praeuenire hominem nece,<sup>206</sup> quam postmodum turbatis<sup>207</sup> rebus seram paenitudinem<sup>208</sup> gerere.<sup>209</sup> Ex<sup>210</sup> sola<sup>211</sup> igitur<sup>212</sup> suspicione Herodis<sup>213</sup> uinctus<sup>214</sup> in castellum<sup>215</sup> Macherunta<sup>216</sup> abducitur<sup>217</sup> Iohannes<sup>218</sup> ibique<sup>219</sup> obruncatur.<sup>220</sup> Iudaeis autem<sup>221</sup> sicut<sup>222</sup>

- 
- 196 a] corrected from ad Sr  
 197 regno] corrected from reno Ne  
 198 discederent] decederent 1511par  
 199 uidebat] uidebatur f S  
 200 praeceptis eius] eius praeceptis par  
 201 parata] praeparata Co Ne pa; parabata l  
 202 plebs] s of plebs not visible (possibly represented by indistinct mark above and to right of b) S; above line Pl  
 203 melius] melius ergo Pd  
 204 credit] credit f S  
 205 fieret] faceret Sr  
 206 nece] letter between e and e is unreadable S  
 207 turbatis] turbatus Ba  
 208 paenitudinem] plenitudinem corrected to penitudinem Cp; plenitudinem 1519par  
 209 gerere] corrected from agerere l  
 gerere. Ex] gerere. Nam et ipsum redarguebat pro incesto conubio quod inierat cum uxore fratris ad huc uiuentis. Ex Pd  
 210 Ex] et ex p  
 211 sola] hac Pd; hac sola U; sola hac Sa aug ven 1511par mil 1524  
 212 igitur] itaque L Ne pa par pat Sr; omitted by Alb Ba Cor El Ha p Sa U aug ven 1524 na1475 lüb paris  
 213 Herodis] herodes l  
 214 uinctus] corrected from uinctis L; uinctus iohannes p Pd  
 215 castellum] castello U  
 216 Macherunta] macheruntha f S; macheruntam Ne pa; macheronta Alb Cp d Ha Pa U na1475; macheruncta al; marechonta lüb paris; machaerunta 1502ven 1510ven 1524.  
 217 abducitur] corrected from aducitur L; adducitur l pa pat Pd lüb paris; abductus Pl  
 218 Iohannes] omitted by p Pd; ioannes 1524bas  
 219 ibique] apparently corrected from ubique Ne; istique par  
 220 obruncatur] obrucatur Pd; obruncatur Ba  
 221 autem] igitur Pd  
 222 sicut] ut Co

iam diximus uidebatur<sup>223</sup> pro eius ultione<sup>224</sup> interitum illi<sup>225</sup> exercitui<sup>226</sup> deum importasse<sup>227</sup> quo<sup>228</sup> Herodes sumpsisset<sup>229</sup> digna supplicia.

2.5.2 Rufinus' Translation of *Ecclesiastical History* 1.11.4 (end)-6

4 (end). Quibusdam autem, inquit, Iudaeorum uidebatur ideo perisse Herodis exercitum, quod in eum<sup>230</sup> satis iuste ultio diuina commota sit<sup>231</sup> pro uindicta Iohannis, qui uocabatur baptista, 5. quem puniuit Herodes<sup>232</sup> uirum ualde<sup>233</sup> bonum, qui praecipiebat Iudaeis uirtuti<sup>234</sup> operam dare,<sup>235</sup> iustitiam inter se inuicem<sup>236</sup> custodire et in deum<sup>237</sup> seruare pietatem, per baptismum in unum coire.<sup>238</sup> Hoc enim pacto baptismum acceptabile fore,<sup>239</sup> si non solum ad ablunda peccata sumatur, uerum et<sup>240</sup> ad castimoniam corporis atque ad<sup>241</sup> animae iustitiam purificationemque seruetur omniumque<sup>242</sup> pariter uirtutum uelut signaculum et custodia quaedam fidelis habeatur.<sup>243</sup> 6. Quae<sup>244</sup> cum ab eo<sup>245</sup>

- 
- 223 uidebatur] omitted by d  
 224 ultione] ultionem Ba  
 eius ultione] ultione eius Cp  
 225 illi] illius al Cl L I Ne pa pat Sa Sr aug ven 1511par mil 1524; ei Pl  
 226 exercitui] exercitu corrected from exercituuum Sr  
 227 deum importasse] importasse deum Pa  
 interitum illi exercitui deum importasse] deum exercitui eius interitum intulisse Pd  
 228 quo] quod cl f Ld pa Pl Prs S  
 229 sumpsisset] sumpsisset Werd  
 230 eum] eo Clm6381 Clm14040 Sang  
 231 sit] est BN12526 P  
 232 Herodes] corrected from herodis Clm6381 Clm6383  
 233 ualde] autem N  
 234 uirtuti] ueritati Vat. Reg. 564 (cited by Cacciari, 45, note d)  
 235 operam dare] iustam rationem in lighter ink and smaller letters above operam dare Clm6381 (probably meant as a gloss)  
 236 inuicem] omitted by C G  
 237 deum] dominum N  
 238 unum coire] que above unum coire BN11738  
 239 hoc... fore] omitted by G  
 240 et] etiam Cacciari (without noting any variants), all LAJ mss  
 241 ad] omitted by C, LAJ mss al Cl cl Co f l Ld par pat Prs S s Sg Vct  
 242 omniumque] omnium Clm14040, LAJ mss L l pa  
 243 habeatur] adhibeatur G  
 244 quae] corrected from qui BN11738  
 245 eo] eodem BN12526 G P

per praecepta huiusmodi<sup>246</sup> docerentur<sup>247</sup> atque ad audiendum eum<sup>248</sup> plurima multitudo concurreret,<sup>249</sup> ueritus Herodes,<sup>250</sup> ne forte doctrinae eius persuasione<sup>251</sup> populi a<sup>252</sup> suo regno<sup>253</sup> desciscerent,<sup>254</sup> uidebat<sup>255</sup> enim, quod praeceptis eius ac monitis oboedire in omnibus<sup>256</sup> plebs esset parata, melius credidit, priusquam noui aliquid fieret, anticipare<sup>257</sup> hominem nece,<sup>258</sup> quam postmodum turbatis rebus seram<sup>259</sup> paenitudinem gerere. Ex<sup>260</sup> sola igitur suspicione Herodis<sup>261</sup> uinctus<sup>262</sup> in castellum<sup>263</sup> Macherunta<sup>264</sup> abducitur<sup>265</sup> Iohannes ibique obtruncatur.<sup>266</sup>

- 
- 246 huiusmodi] huiusmodi Clm14040, all *LAJ* mss except Co s  
 247 docerentur] dicerentur Clm14040  
 248 eum] omitted by G  
 249 concurreret] conueniret Cacciari (without noting any variants)  
 250 Herodes] corrected from herodis Clm6381  
 251 persuasione] persuasionem Clm6381 (apparently the mark above e is a macron, although this is not certain), *LAJ* mss f S  
 252 a] omitted by N  
 253 regno] rege F (according to Mommsen, who prints rege in his text) N; Cacciari prints rege without noting any variants.  
 suo regno] regno suo T  
 254 desciscerent] corrected from discederent BN12526; discederent T; discescerent Clm6383 (corrected from disciscerent); Clm6381 (corrected from desciscerent); deicerent (marginal note in different hand: "al discederent") C  
 255 uidebat] uidebant N  
 256 oboedire in omnibus] in omnibus oboedire N  
 257 anticipare] anticipari Clm6381  
 258 nece] probably nece, but possibly nece(m) if faint mark above e is a macron Clm6381  
 259 seram] nouissimam uel tardam above line glossing seram Clm6381  
 260 ex] ea Clm6381; hac BN11738  
 261 Herodis] corrected from herodes BN12526; herodes (corrected from herodis) Clm6381  
 262 uinctus] uinctos N  
 263 castellum] cas Clm14040; castello C, *LAJ* ms U; scabellum G  
 264 Macherunta] macheronta C Clm6381 Sang T, *LAJ* mss Alb Cp d Ha Pa U  
 265 abducitur] adducitur BN12526 Clm14040 P<sup>2</sup>, *LAJ* mss l pa pat Pd  
 266 obtruncatur] truncatur G; capite obtruncatur "in utroque Regio Exemplari [i.e., Vat. Reginae 563 and 564], atque in alio Vatic. Mss. Exemplari" Cacciari, 45, note e

2.5.3 Greek Text of *Antiquities* 18.116-119 (Differences from *HE* 1.11.4 (end)-6 are in bold.)

116. Τις δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐδόκει ὀλωλέναι τὸν Ἡρώδου<sup>267</sup> στρατὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μάλα<sup>268</sup> δικαίως τιννυμένου<sup>269</sup> κατὰ ποινὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου<sup>270</sup> βαπτιστοῦ. 117. κτείνει γὰρ δὴ<sup>271</sup> τοῦτον Ἡρώδης ἀγαθὸν<sup>272</sup> ἄνδρα καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις<sup>273</sup> κελεύοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦσιν<sup>274</sup> καὶ τὰ<sup>275</sup> πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνη καὶ πρὸς τὸν<sup>276</sup> θεὸν εὐσεβεῖα χρωμένοις<sup>277</sup> βαπτισμῶ<sup>278</sup> συνιέναι· οὕτω γὰρ δὴ<sup>279</sup> καὶ τὴν βἀπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῶ<sup>280</sup> φανείσθαι<sup>281</sup> μὴ ἐπὶ τινων ἀμαρτὰδων παραιτήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἀγνεία τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ<sup>282</sup> τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνη προεκκεκαθαρμένης.<sup>283</sup> 118. καὶ τῶν ἄλλων<sup>284</sup> συστρεφομένων,<sup>285</sup> καὶ

- 
- 267 Ἡρώδου] Ἰουδαίων Eus. *DE*  
 268 μάλα] μάλιστα Eus. *HE* mss T E R  
 269 τιννυμένου] τιννυμένου all manuscripts of *AJ*, *Epitome*, Eus. *HE*, Eus. *DE*, Feldman (LCL); τινυμένου Niese Naber  
 270 ἐπικαλουμένου] καλουμένου Eus. *HE* mss A T<sup>1</sup> B D M, Eus. *DE*  
 271 δὴ] omitted by M W *Epitome*, Eus. *HE* mss T E R B D M, Eus. *DE*, Naber  
 272 ἀγαθὸν] ἄγριον Eisler, *Messiah Jesus*, 248.  
 273 τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις] τοῦς Ἰουδαίους *Epitome*, Naber  
 274 ἐπασκοῦσιν] ἐπασκοῦντας *Epitome*, Naber  
 275 τὰ] omitted by Eus. *HE* ms A; τῆ Eus. *DE*  
 276 τὸν] omitted by Eus. *DE*  
 277 χρωμένοις] χρωμένους *Epitome*, Eus. *HE* mss A T B D (first hand) M, Eus. *DE*, Naber; χρομένοις *Exc.*  
 278 βαπτισμῶ] ἐπὶ βαπτισμῶ Richards and Shutt, *CQ* 31 (1937): 176  
 279 δὴ] omitted by M W *Epitome Exc.*  
 280 αὐτῶ] αὐτῶν Eus. *HE* ms T (more recent corrector)  
 281 φανείσθαι] φαίνεσθαι Eus. *DE*  
 282 ἅτε δὴ καὶ] suspected by J. H. Holwerda, *Emendationum Flavianarum specimen* (Gorinchem: Noorduyun, 1847), 138; καὶ omitted by *Exc.*  
 283 προεκκεκαθαρμένης] προκεκαθαρμένης *Exc*  
 284 ἄλλων] λαῶν corrector of A; *per plurima multitudo* Ruf., *LAJ*; ἀνθρώπων Niese ed. *maior* (apparatus) Niese ed. *minor* (text); Γαλιλαίων Schwartz (“vielleicht”)  
 285 συστρεφομένων] στρεφομένων Eus. *HE* ms B; Syriac *HE* (ܫܬܐܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܐܘܪܐܘܬܐ) [(and by other things) which grow with it], retroverted by Schwartz as συντρεφομένων).

γὰρ ἤρθησαν<sup>286</sup> ἐπὶ πλείστον τῇ ἀκροάσει<sup>287</sup> τῶν λόγων, δείσας<sup>288</sup> Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει<sup>289</sup> τινὶ φέροι, <sup>290</sup> πάντα γὰρ ἐώκεσαν<sup>291</sup> συμβουλή τῇ ἐκείνου<sup>292</sup> πράξοντες, πολὺ<sup>293</sup> κρεῖττον ἡγείται πρὶν τι<sup>294</sup> νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτοῦ<sup>295</sup> γενέσθαι προλαβὼν ἀνελεῖν<sup>296</sup> τοῦ<sup>297</sup> μεταβολῆς γενομένης [μὴ]<sup>298</sup> εἰς πράγματα ἐμπεισῶν μετανοεῖν. 119. καὶ ὁ μὲν ὑποψία τῆ<sup>299</sup> Ἡρώδου δέσμιος εἰς τὸν<sup>300</sup> Μαχαιρῶντα πεμφθεὶς τὸ<sup>301</sup> προειρημένον φρούριον ταύτῃ κτίννυται.<sup>302</sup> Τοῖς<sup>303</sup> δὲ Ἰουδαίοις δόξαν<sup>304</sup> ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ τῇ ἐκείνου τὸν ὄλεθρον ἐπὶ τῷ στρατεύματι γενέσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ κακῶσαι Ἡρώδην<sup>305</sup> θέλοντος.

- 286 ἤρθησαν] ἤρθησαν all mss of *AJ*, Eus. *HE* mss T (older corrector) E R B D (older corrector in margin), Syriac *HE* (ܐܘܪܗܝܡ ["were raised up"]), Naber Feldman Schwartz Lake (LCL Eus. vol. 1); ἤσθησαν Eus. *HE* mss A T (first hand); ἡρέσθησαν Eus. *HE* mss D (first hand) M Niese (text of both *ed. maior* and *ed. minor*). See commentary for discussion of conjectural emendations.
- 287 ἤρθησαν ἐπὶ πλείστον τῇ ἀκροάσει] συνήχθησαν πλείστοι <ἐπὶ> τῇ ἀκροάσει Richards and Shutt, *CQ* 31 (1937), 176
- 288 δείσας] δείσας δ' *A Epitome*, Eus. *HE* mss T (older corrector) E (first hand) Syriac *HE* (ܐܘܪܗܝܡ)
- 289 ἀποστάσει] στάσει M W *Epitome*, Naber Feldman
- 290 φέροι] φέρειν d W; φέροιτο Eus. *HE* mss A B D (first hand)
- 291 ἐώκεσαν] εἰόκασι M W *Epitome*; εἰόκεσαν Eus. *HE*
- 292 ἐκείνου] ἐκείνων M
- 293 πολὺ] πολὺ τι M (first hand)
- 294 τι] τινι Eus. *HE* ms M
- 295 ἐξ αὐτοῦ] ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Eus. *HE* mss A T E M Syriac (ܡܐܪܘܡ ["through him"]); ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Eus. *HE* mss R B D
- 296 ἀνελεῖν] ἀναιρεῖν Eus. *HE*
- 297 τοῦ] ἡ Eus. *HE*, Naber
- 298 μὴ] omitted by Eus. *HE*, Naber, Niese *ed. minor*; μάλλον H. Peterson cited by Feldman
- 299 τῆ] τοῦ Eus. *HE* mss T E R; τῆ τοῦ Eus. *HE* ms A
- 300 τὸν] omitted by *Epitome*, Naber
- 301 τὸ] εἰς τὸ Eus. *HE* mss D M
- 302 End of Eusebius' quotation of Josephus on John the Baptist.
- 303 τοῖς] τισὶ Eisler, *Messiah Jesus*, 248
- 304 δόξαν] δόξα *Epitome*; *uidebatur* Ruf., *LAF*; δόξαν παρέσχεν Holwerda, *Emendationum Flavianarum specimen*, 140; ἔδοξεν I. Bekker, *Flavii Iosephi opera omnia* (vol. 4; Leipzig: Teubner, 1856), Naber; δόξα ἦν Niese (in apparatus), Niese *ed. minor* (text)
- 305 κακῶσαι Ἡρώδην] *Epitome*; all *AJ* manuscripts have κακῶς Ἡρώδη [i.e., Ἡρώδη]

2.5.4 Synopsis of Eusebius, Rufinus, and *LAJ* (Non-orthographic differences between Rufinus and *LAJ* are italicized.)Eus. *HE* 1.11.4(end)-6

Rufinus

*LAJ* 18.116-119

4 (end). Τις δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐδόκει ὀλωλέναι τὸν Ἡρώδου στρατὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μάλα δικαίως τινυμένον κατὰ ποιήν Ἰωάννου τοῦ καλουμένου βαπτιστοῦ.

Quibusdam autem [inquit] Iudaeorum uidebatur ideo perisse Herodis exercitum, quod in eum satis iuste *ultio* diuina commota sit pro uindicta Iohannis, qui uocabatur baptista,

116. A quibusdam autem Iudaeorum uidebatur ideo perisse Herodis exercitum, quod in eum satis iuste *indignatio* diuina commota sit pro uindicta Iohannis, qui uocabatur baptista.

5. κτείνει γὰρ τοῦτον Ἡρώδης ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κελεύοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦσιν καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνη καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβεία χρωμένους βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι· οὕτω γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανεῖσθαι μὴ ἐπὶ τινῶν ἀμαρτάνων παραιτήσῃ χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἀγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνη προεκκεκαθαρμένης.

*quem puniuit* Herodes uirum ualde bonum, qui praecipiebat Iudaeis uirtuti operam dare, iustitiam *inter se inuicem custodire* et in deum seruare pietatem, per baptismum in unum coire. *Hoc enim pacto* baptismum acceptabile fore, si non solum ad abluenda peccata sumatur, uerum *et* ad castimoniam corporis atque ad animae iustitiam purificationemque seruetur omniumque pariter uirtutum uelut signaculum et custodia quaedam fidelis habeatur.

117. *Hunc enim* Herodes occidit uirum ualde bonum, qui praecipiebat Iudaeis uirtuti operam dare, iustitiam *colere*, in deum seruare pietatem, *et* per baptismum in unum coire. *Tum demum* enim baptismum acceptabile fore, si non solum ad abluenda peccata sumatur, uerum *etiam* ad castimoniam corporis atque ad animae iustitiam purificationemque seruetur omniumque pariter uirtutum uelut signaculum et custodia quaedam fidelis habeatur.

(Continued)

TABLE (Continued)

Eus. <i>HE</i> 1.11.4(end)-6	Rufinus	<i>LAJ</i> 18.116-119
<p>6. καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συστρεφομένων, (καὶ γὰρ ἤρθησαν ἐπὶ πλείστον τῇ ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων), δέισας Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φέροι, (πάντα γὰρ εἰκόεσαν συμβουλήν τῇ ἐκείνου πράσσοντες), πολὺ κρεῖττον ἡγείται πρὶν τι νεώτερον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι προλαβῶν ἀναίρειν, ἢ μεταβολῆς γενομένης εἰς πράγματα ἐμπεσῶν μετανοεῖν.</p>	<p>Quae cum ab eo <i>per</i> praecepta <i>huiusmodi</i> docerentur atque ad audiendum eum perplurima multitudo concurreret, ueritus Herodes, ne forte doctrinae eius persuasione populi a suo regno <i>desciscerent</i>, uidebat enim, quod praeceptis eius ac monitis <i>oboedire in omnibus plebs esset parata</i>, melius credidit, priusquam noui aliquid fieret, <i>anticipare</i> hominem nece, quam postmodum turbatis rebus seram paenitudinem gerere.</p>	<p>118. Quae cum ab eo praecepta <i>huiusmodi</i> docerentur atque ad audiendum eum perplurima multitudo concurreret, ueritus Herodes, ne forte doctrinae eius persuasione populi a suo regno <i>discederent</i>, uidebat enim, quod praeceptis eius ac monitis <i>parata esset plebs in omnibus oboedire</i>, melius credidit, priusquam noui aliquid fieret, <i>praeuenire</i> hominem nece, quam postmodum turbatis rebus seram paenitudinem gerere.</p>
<p>καὶ ὁ μὲν ὑποψία τῇ Ἡρώδου δέσμιος εἰς τὸν Μαχαίρουντα πεμφθεὶς τὸ προειρημένον φρούριον αὐτῆ κτίννυται. [τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις δόξαν ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ τῇ ἐκείνου τὸν ὄλεθρον ἐπὶ τῷ στρατεύματι γενέσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ κακῶσαι Ἡρώδην θέλοντος.]<sup>306</sup></p>	<p>Ex sola igitur suspicione Herodis uinctus in castellum Macherunta abducitur Iohannes ibique obtruncatur.</p>	<p>119. Ex sola igitur suspicione Herodis uinctus in castellum Macherunta abducitur Iohannes ibique obtruncatur. Iudaeis autem sicut iam diximus uidebatur pro eius ultione interitum illi exercitui deum importasse quo Herodes sumpsisset digna supplicia.</p>

306 Bracketed portion is supplied from *AJ* since it is not quoted by Eusebius.

2.5.5 Literal Translation of *LAJ* 18.116-119 with Variants from Rufinus in Footnotes

116. To some<sup>307</sup> of the Jews it seemed that the army of Herod had been destroyed for the reason that divine anger<sup>308</sup> was very justly carried out against him as punishment for John, who was called the baptizer. 117. For Herod killed this person,<sup>309</sup> a very good man, who admonished the Jews to give attention to virtue, to cultivate righteousness,<sup>310</sup> to observe piety toward God, and<sup>311</sup> through baptism to come together in unity. For then indeed<sup>312</sup> baptism would be acceptable, if it would be taken up not only for washing away misdeeds, but also<sup>313</sup> would be observed for the purpose of purity of the body and indeed for the purpose of righteousness and purification of the soul, and would be considered as a sign of all virtues equally and a certain faithful safeguard.<sup>314</sup> 118. When these injunctions of this kind were taught by him<sup>315</sup> and for the purpose of hearing him indeed a very great multitude came together, Herod feared that perhaps through the persuasiveness of his teaching, the populace might desert<sup>316</sup> from his kingdom. For since he [Herod] saw that the common people were prepared through his [John's] injunctions and warnings to obey [John] in all things, he believed that it was better, before something revolutionary happened, to anticipate<sup>317</sup> the man through murder, than, after affairs had been stirred up, afterwards to have a feeling of regret too late. 119. Therefore on the basis of Herod's suspicion alone, John was taken away in fetters to the fortress Macherunta and was there cut down. To the Jews, just as we have already said, it seemed that, as vengeance for him [John], God had brought destruction on his [Herod's] army, through which Herod had received fitting punishment.<sup>318</sup>

307 Ruf.: quibusdam; *LAJ*: a quibusdam; see commentary.

308 Ruf.: ultio ("vengeance"); *LAJ*: indignatio ("anger").

309 Ruf.: "Herod punished him."

310 Ruf.: "to maintain righteousness mutually among themselves."

311 et not in Ruf., which might then be translated: "in order to come together in baptism."

312 Ruf.: "For in this way."

313 Ruf.: et; *LAJ*: etiam.

314 "and would be considered as a sign of all virtues equally and a certain faithful safeguard" is not in the Greek.

315 Or "When they were taught by him these injunctions of this kind"; Ruf.: "When these things were taught by him through injunctions of this kind" (or "when they were taught by him through injunctions of this kind").

316 Ruf.: desciscerent ("break away"); *LAJ*: discederent ("desert, separate").

317 Ruf.: anticipare; *LAJ*: praeuenire.

318 Eusebius ends the quotation from Josephus with "... and was there cut down."

2.5.6 Commentary on *LAJ* 18.116-119 and Ruf. *HE* 1.11.4 (end)-6

116. **quibusdam** (Ruf.)/**a quibusdam** (*LAJ*). Rufinus' *quibusdam autem Iudaeorum uidebatur* is a precise translation of τισι δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐδόκει. Either *LAJ* or a later scribe has added the preposition *a*, without a change in the meaning. *Exp. Ps. 1* (PL 70, 25C) provides a parallel in Cassiodorus for the construction: *licet a quibusdam omni iusto uideatur aptatus*. There is some manuscript support for the reading without the preposition in *LAJ*, which would have the advantage of eliminating the discrepancy with the text of Rufinus. The preposition, however, is only missing in five related manuscripts (Ne pa par Pd Sa). It seems more likely, then, that the *LAJ* reading without the preposition is a scribal correction, which coincidentally happens to correspond to *LAJ*'s source.

**ultio diuina** (Ruf.)/**indignatio diuina** (*LAJ*). *quod in eum satis iuste ultio diuina commota sit* translates τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μάλα δικαίως τινυμένου. *LAJ*'s substitution of *indignatio* for *ultio* results in a translation that is farther from the original Greek. The change is perhaps motivated by a sense that an emotion would be a more fitting subject for the verb *commota sit*.

117. **quem puniuit Herodes** (Ruf.)/**hunc enim Herodes occidit** (*LAJ*). Translating κτείνει γὰρ τοῦτον Ἡρώδης. It is striking that, even though *LAJ* had the Greek text at hand, this is the only obvious place at which it changes what was found in Rufinus' version of the accounts of Jesus and John the Baptist to offer a translation that is closer to the Greek.

**uirum ualde bonum**. Translating ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα. Rufinus adds *ualde* to strengthen the adjective.

**uirtuti**. The only witness to the variant *ueritati* in Rufinus is Vat. Reg. 564, which we cite from Cacciari's 1740 edition (45, note d).

**qui praecipiebat . . . coire**. Eusebius makes a subtle change in Josephus' text, replacing ἐπασκοῦσιν . . . χρωμένοις with ἐπασκοῦσιν . . . χρωμένους (although it should be noted that the *Epitome* of *AJ* has the accusative χρωμένους and some manuscripts of Eusebius have the dative χρωμένοις). This change would seem to imply that the definition of virtue consists in employing justice toward others and piety toward God. Eusebius is, therefore, avoiding the possible implication in Josephus that practicing virtue, employing righteousness toward others, and piety toward God are three separate injunctions. Eusebius does not, however, change Josephus' point that baptism was for those who already practiced these virtues. Rufinus' sequence (1) *uirtuti operam dare*, (2) *iustitiam inter se inuicem custodire et* (3) *in deum seruare pietatem*, (4) *per baptismum in unum coire* with the second and third infinitive phrases arranged chiasmatically, seems, like Eusebius, to take the second and third infinitive phrases together

(“preserving justice among themselves and observing piety toward God”) as defining what practicing virtue entails. How the last clause connects to the first three is not clear. Since there is no conjunction introducing it, it is perhaps best to take *coire* as an infinitive of purpose, not uncommon in later Latin: John instructs the Jews to act righteously *in order* to come together in unity (or in one body) through baptism. *LAJ* simplifies matters by moving the conjunction before the last clause: *uirtuti operam dare, iustitiam . . . custodire, in deum seruare pietatem, et per baptismum in unum coire*, which has John simply instructing the Jews to do four things. Unlike Josephus, *LAJ*, perhaps influenced by Christian theology, does not suggest that doing righteous deeds is a prerequisite for baptism.

**iustitiam inter se inuicem custodire** (Ruf.)/**iustitiam colere** (*LAJ*). *LAJ* replaces Rufinus’ *iustitiam inter se inuicem custodire* with *iustitiam colere*. Since he does not elsewhere abbreviate Rufinus’ material, it is likely that there is a substantive reason for the change. Perhaps he implies that *iustitia* is to be understood as righteousness, a state characteristic of and to be cultivated by the pious, rather than simply understood as the social virtue of justice toward other members of society.

**per baptismum in unum coire**. Translating βαπτισμῶ συνιέναι. Our earliest manuscript, S, has *baptismum in uno corpore* (f: *corpore*), with *unum* apparently corrected to *uno*. The scribe has probably not understood the phrase *in unum coire* and has taken the last word as a mistake or abbreviation for *corpore*. He thus takes *baptismum* as the object of *seruare*, eliminating the preposition *per*. *LAJ* ms p avoids the potential problem of misunderstanding the phrase by omitting *in unum*.

**hoc enim pacto** (Ruf.)/**tum demum enim** (*LAJ*). Translating οὕτω γὰρ δὴ καί. Rufinus renders οὕτω γὰρ more literally than *LAJ*, but *LAJ* perhaps uses *tum* (or *tunc*) *demum* to represent the emphasis in δὴ καί.

**baptismum acceptabile fore**. Rufinus does not translate the αὐτῷ in the phrase τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ, perhaps because the Greek text does not make it clear whether the pronoun refers to God or John. The variant *acceptabilem* in a number of related manuscripts of *LAJ* takes the accusative *baptismum* to be masculine rather than neuter. Since the form is only found in the accusative in our text, either *acceptabile* or *acceptabilem* would be possible.

**si non solum ad abluenda peccata sumatur**. In Josephus (reproduced by Eusebius), John says that baptism cannot be used for asking forgiveness for misdeeds. Rufinus (reproduced by *LAJ*) reverses the meaning of the Greek by saying that baptism can serve to wash away sins, something that Josephus specifically excludes.

**et** (Ruf.)/**etiam** (*LAF*). Cacciari's text of Rufinus prints *etiam*, which is not reported by Mommsen and is not found in any of the manuscripts of Rufinus we have collated. We have not been able to check the five manuscripts Cacciari consulted for his edition in order to determine if this variant is based on a manuscript reading. If *etiam* in fact is not in the manuscripts of Rufinus, it is possible that Cacciari emended the text, influenced, like *LAF*, by the common expression *non solum . . . sed etiam*.

**omniumque pariter uirtutum uelut signaculum et custodia quaedam fidelis habeatur.** Rufinus (followed by *LAF*) adds a clause not found in the Greek to make the Christian theological point that baptism is a *signaculum* and *custodia quaedam fidelis* of all the virtues, in order to avoid the implication that baptism is a reward for good deeds. For the theological tendencies in Rufinus' translation, which often include significant changes of Eusebius' text, see J. E. L. Oulton, "Rufinus' Translation of the Church History of Eusebius," *JTS* 30 (1929): 150-73 (especially 153-56) and M. Humphries, "Rufinus's Eusebius: Translation, Continuation, and Edition in the Latin *Ecclesiastical History*," *J ECS* 16 (2008): 152-54. For his use of baptism as a *signaculum*, see *Apol.* 1.4, where he uses the word in connection with his own baptism.

**quae cum ab eo per** (*LAF* omits *per*) **praecepta huiusmodi** (or **huiusmodi**) **docerentur atque ad audiendum eum per plurima multitudo concurreret.** There is a considerable difference between Rufinus' translation and the Greek. The Greek text itself has several important variants and has also been emended in various ways. Since nothing in any extant Greek text corresponds to the clause *quae cum ab eo per praecepta huiusmodi docerentur* ("since they were taught by him through injunctions of this sort"), it is probably a transitional phrase introduced by the translator. The phrase *per plurima multitudo concurreret* apparently corresponds to *καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συστρεφόμενων*. (Cacciari has *conuenire* in his edition of Rufinus, but without having access to the manuscripts he used, we cannot know if this is found in a manuscript or is his conjecture.) In the apparatus to his *editio maior* Niese includes the note "per plurima multitudo Lat" along with the reading *λαῶν* from a corrector of ms A, and conjectures *ἀνθρώπων* for *ἄλλων*, an emendation he prints in the text of his *editio minor*. The emendation has not been generally accepted. Naber retains *ἄλλων* without comment, and Feldman in the LCL edition also prints *ἄλλων*. Utilizing evidence from the Latin, Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus*, 247 argues that Josephus wrote *ἄλλων*, which Christian scribes changed to *πολλῶν* (the reading translated as *per plurima multitudo*; according to Naber, Holwerda had originally suggested *πολλῶν*). On the basis of the Latin, Richards and Shutt ("Critical Notes on Josephus' *Antiquities*," *CQ* 31 [1937]: 176) emend the text

to συνήχθησαν πλείστοι <ἐπι> τῇ ἀκροάσει. Because their suggestion appears without any further discussion in a series of critical notes, it is unclear whether they understand their reconstruction (and hence the Latin) to correspond only to the phrase ἤρθησαν ἐπὶ πλείστον τῇ ἀκροάσει or also to καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συστρεφόμενων.

There is nothing in Rufinus' translation that corresponds to the reading ἤρθησαν, which appears in all manuscripts of the *Antiquities* and in a number of manuscripts in Eusebius, or that corresponds to the reading ἤσθησαν, which appears in several manuscripts of Eusebius. Like Heinichen's text of Eusebius, which puts ἤσθησαν in the text (Schwartz, whose text was published after Niese's, reads ἤρθησαν), Niese prints ἤσθησαν in the *AJ* text of both his *editio maior* and his *editio minor*, another emendation that has not been generally accepted. Both Feldman in the LCL edition and Naber have ἤρθησαν in the text. Feldman discusses the reading ἤσθησαν in a footnote, and Naber does not even include it in his critical notes.

**per praecepta** (Ruf.)/**praecepta** (*LAJ*). The lack of *per* in *LAJ* makes *praecepta* either the subject or object of *docerentur*: "When these injunctions of this kind were taught by him" or "When they were taught by him these injunctions of this kind" (*LAJ*), rather than "When these things were taught by him through injunctions of this kind" or "When they were taught by him through injunctions of this kind" (Ruf.).

**ne forte doctrinae eius persuasione populi a suo regno desciscerent** (Ruf.)/**discederent** (*LAJ*). Translating τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φέροι. The words *forte* and *doctrinae* do not obviously correspond to anything in the Greek, but add color and specificity to the narrative. Rufinus does not translate the phrase τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε. He departs significantly from the syntax of the Greek by translating ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ by the verbal clause *a suo regno desciscerent*.

**a suo regno**. Mommsen prints *a suo rege*, which is found in mss N and F of Rufinus. But the reading *regno* makes better sense and is found in Mommsen's ms P and all seven manuscripts we collated, including Clm 6383 from the end of the eighth century, Clm 6381 from the first half of the ninth century, and BN11738 from the mid-ninth century. Cocciari prints *rege* without a note. Given the fact that Cocciari cites so few variants, it would be hazardous to assume that *rege* necessarily appeared in all five Vatican manuscripts he used for his edition.

**desciscerent** (Ruf.)/ **discederent** (*LAJ*). *LAJ* substitutes a graphically similar word with a slightly different meaning, which is a bit farther from the Greek, since *descisco* is often used in the sense of "revolting from." It is also possible

that *LAJ* was reading a manuscript of Rufinus with *discederent*, since the variant is found in three of the manuscripts we collated.

**oboedire in omnibus plebs esset parata (Ruf.)/parata esset plebs in omnibus oboedire (*LAJ*).** This is the only example of *LAJ* changing Rufinus' word order, even though transpositions are common within the manuscript traditions of both texts.

**anticipare (Ruf.)/praeuenire (*LAJ*).** Translating προλαβών. The reason for substituting a synonym here is unclear.

**postmodum turbatis rebus seram paenitentiam gerere.** Translating μεταβολῆς γενομένης εἰς πράγματα ἐμπεισῶν μετανοεῖν. Probably in order to provide a more readable conclusion to an already very long sentence, Rufinus does not translate εἰς πράγματα ἐμπεισῶν. The addition of *postmodum* and *seram* also helps to clarify the line of thought.

119. **ex sola igitur suspicione.** *sola* does not correspond to anything in the Greek. It emphasizes the fact that Herod killed John through suspicion alone, and not because of any real threat. Immediately before this sentence Codex Gigas inserts into the text on the basis of information in the gospel accounts (Mk 6:17-18; Mt 14:3-4; cf. Lk 3:19): "For also he kept reproving him for an incestuous marriage, which he had entered into with the wife of his brother, who was still living." This is typical of the Codex Gigas, which is characterized by a large number of additions and omissions.

**obtruncatur.** Translating κτίννυται, a rare word Josephus uses four other times in this section of the *Antiquities* (15.118, 17.182, 18.99, 18.271) and nowhere else. Only here does *LAJ* translate it by *obtrunco*, suggesting that perhaps the word choice reflects the gospels' account of John's beheading. This connection is made explicit in three of the manuscripts of Rufinus, which according to Cacciari read *capite obtruncatur*. This is the end of Eusebius' (and therefore Rufinus') excerpt from Josephus on John.

**Iudaeis autem sicut iam diximus uidebatur pro eius ultione interitum illi exercitui.** Closely translating τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις δόξαν ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ τῆ ἐκείνου τὸν ὄλεθρον ἐπὶ τῷ στρατεύματι γενέσθαι.

**sicut iam diximus.** Added by *LAJ*.

**illi exercitui.** ἐπὶ τῷ στρατεύματι. *illi exercitui* is widely attested in manuscripts from different branches of the tradition. *Illi* could be used here to translate the definite article. The variant *illius exercitui* is also a possible reading, although it is found in only five manuscripts. It would make a nice parallel construction, *pro eius ultione|interitum illius exercitui*.

**deum importasse quo Herodes sumpsisset digna supplicia.** The first part of the sentence, commented on above, corresponds closely to the Greek. The

rest of the sentence, however, is significantly different. In place of τοῦ θεοῦ κακῶσαι Ἡρώδην (or, reading with all *AJ* mss τοῦ θεοῦ κακῶς Ἡρώδη θέλοντος), *LAJ* has *deum importasse quo Herodes sumpsisset digna supplicia*. *LAJ* is either departing here from a literal translation or is reading a different Greek text.

## 2.6 *Josephus on James*

### 2.6.1 The Latin Translation of *Antiquities* 20.199-203

199. Ananus autem iunior cum pontificatum<sup>319</sup> suscepisset,<sup>320</sup> erat<sup>321</sup> uehementer asperrimus<sup>322</sup> et audax<sup>323</sup> secta<sup>324</sup> Saduceus<sup>325</sup> qui<sup>326</sup> circa<sup>327</sup> iudicia<sup>328</sup> sunt<sup>329</sup> ultra<sup>330</sup> omnes<sup>331</sup> Iudaeos<sup>332</sup> ualde<sup>333</sup> crudeles,<sup>334</sup> sicuti<sup>335</sup> iam declarauimus.<sup>336</sup> 200. Cum<sup>337</sup> ergo huius sectae<sup>338</sup> Ananus esset,<sup>339</sup> credens<sup>340</sup>

- 
- 319 cum pontificatum] cum in pontificatum Sg Vct (in above line); conpontificatum f  
 320 suscepisset] successisset cl f S Sg Vct; sumpsisse p  
 321 erat] erit f (possibly misreading ra ligature in S)  
 322 asperrimus] acerrimus cl Co d Ld n s; arcerrimus Sg Vct  
 323 et audax] omitted by l  
 324 secta] sectans al Cl cl d Ld n Vct (corrected to secta); sectae Prs; secat f  
 325 Saduceus] sadduceus Ba Cor El Ha Sa aug mil; sadducaeus 1524; saduceos al Cl cl d f Ld n S Vct (corrected to saduceus); sadducens Iüb 1481ven 1486ven 1499ven; saceus 1519par  
 secta Saduceus] sectas adducens l Ne pa Sr (final S of sectas is capitalized and at end of line); cectas adducens par; sectas adduces corrected to sectas sadduces pat  
 326 qui] quae Ne pa par Sr  
 327 circa] erga p Prs  
 328 iudicia] iudacia apparently corrected to iudicia S  
 329 sunt] d(ict)i sunt Sg Vct  
 330 ultra] plusquam p Prs  
 331 omnes] omnis Ld  
 332 Iudaeos] iudei p Prs  
 333 ualde] indistinct word before ualde perhaps crossed out pat  
 334 crudeles] corrected from crudelis L Vct; crudelis Cl  
 335 sicuti] sicut al Cl p 1524; sicuti uti pat  
 336 declarauimus] declarabimus Arn par pat Werd 1524; sicuti iam declarauimus omitted by Pd  
 337 Cum] dum al cl Co d Ld n s Sg Vct  
 338 sectae] secatiae f (-tae in S can easily be read as -tie); septe pat  
 339 huius sectae Ananus esset] ananus huius esset secte Pd  
 340 credens] et credens Cp

se inuenisse<sup>341</sup> tempus oportunaum,<sup>342</sup> Festo<sup>343</sup> mortuo, et Albino<sup>344</sup> in<sup>345</sup> itinere<sup>346</sup> constituto,<sup>347</sup> concilium<sup>348</sup> fecit<sup>349</sup> iudicum,<sup>350</sup> et quosdam<sup>351</sup> deducens ad semetipsum<sup>352</sup> inter quos et fratrem<sup>353</sup> Ihesu,<sup>354</sup> qui<sup>355</sup> dicitur Christus,<sup>356</sup> nomine<sup>357</sup> Iacobum,<sup>358</sup> quasi contra legem<sup>359</sup> agentes<sup>360</sup> accusans,<sup>361</sup> tradidit lapidandos.<sup>362</sup> 201. Qui autem uidebantur esse<sup>363</sup> moderatissimi<sup>364</sup> ciuitatis,<sup>365</sup> et circa legis<sup>366</sup> integritatem<sup>367</sup> habere sollicitudinem,<sup>368</sup> grauius hoc<sup>369</sup> tulere;<sup>370</sup> miseruntque<sup>371</sup> latenter ad

- 
- 341 se inuenisse] inuenisse se al Cl cl Co d f L l Ld n s S Sg Vct  
 342 tempus oportunaum] oportunaum tempus Arn Pd  
 343 Festo] sexto mil  
 344 Albino] albino p(rae)fecto Pd  
 345 in] omitted by cl Co f Ld s s Sg  
 346 itinere] itenere l; corrected from itenere Cl  
 347 constituto] iam constituto Prs  
 348 concilium] consilium Alb Ba Cor El Ha p pa par Prs Sr U lüb paris; consilium pat  
 349 fecit] iniit p Prs  
 350 iudicum] iudicium d pat Prs Sr na1475 lüb; corrected from iudicium Co  
 fecit iudicum] iudicum fecit Pd  
 351 quosdam] glossed as x(rist)icolus Co  
 352 semetipsum] medium Pd  
 353 fratrem] fratre f S  
 354 ihesu] ihesu aug na1475 lüb; iesu ven 1511par mil paris 1524; yesu l; ihu all other mss  
 355 qui] que f S  
 356 christus] christus 1499ven 1502ven 1510ven mil 1524; cristus pat; crystus l; xpus aug; xpc  
 or xps all other mss na1475 lüb 1481ven 1486ven 1511par paris  
 357 nomine] omitted by al Arn Cl cl Co Ld s Sg Vct  
 358 Iacobum] iacob f S; iacobum cognominatum iustum Pd; corrected from iacoboum Sg  
 359 legem] leges Cp; legem in margin pa; omitted by U  
 360 agentes] agentem Sa  
 361 accusans] omitted by Arn  
 362 lapidandos] lapidandum Sa  
 363 esse] omitted by cl Co d s Sg Vct  
 364 moderatissimi] moderantissimi Co (corrected to moderatissimi) f L Ne S  
 esse moderatissimi] moderatissimi esse Sa (esse in margin with mark to insert after  
 moderatissimi) aug ven mil 1524  
 365 ciuitatis] corrected from ciuitas al  
 366 legis] legum Ne pa; legem par Sr; leges pat s; corrected from leges Cl  
 367 legis integritatem] integretatem legis Pd  
 368 sollicitudinem] sollicitudine f; solliciti erant in place of habere sollicitudinem Pd  
 369 hoc] haec Sa aug ven mil  
 370 tulere] tulerunt Pd  
 371 miseruntque] permiseruntque f

regem<sup>372</sup> rogantes<sup>373</sup> eum,<sup>374</sup> ut scriberet Anano,<sup>375</sup> ne<sup>376</sup> talia<sup>377</sup> perpetraret,<sup>378</sup> cum neque prius recte fecisset.<sup>379</sup> 202. Quidam<sup>380</sup> uero<sup>381</sup> eorum<sup>382</sup> etiam<sup>383</sup> Albino<sup>384</sup> occurrerunt,<sup>385</sup> ab Alexandria<sup>386</sup> uenienti, eumque docuerunt,<sup>387</sup> quia non licet<sup>388</sup> Anano<sup>389</sup> praeter illius uoluntatem congregare concilium.<sup>390</sup> 203. Albinus autem<sup>391</sup> eorum sermonibus<sup>392</sup> flexus,<sup>393</sup> cum iracundia scripsit Anano,<sup>394</sup> interminatus<sup>395</sup> eum poenas exsoluere. Quapropter et<sup>396</sup> rex

- 
- 372 regem] regem agrippam p Prs; rege agrippam Pd  
latenter ad regem] ad regem latenter Sa
- 373 rogantes] roganēs f S
- 374 eum] omitted by Sa
- 375 Anano] anano pontifici Pd
- 376 ne] cur al Cl cl Co Ld (cui possible, but not likely) s Sg Vct; quae f S; microfilm unreadable pat
- 377 talia] talio Ld
- 378 perpetraret] perpetrasset Co s; impetraret Cp
- 379 cum . . . fecisset] omitted by Pd
- 380 Quidam] corrected from quidem Ne
- 381 uero] omitted by Pd
- 382 eorum] horum Co s
- 383 eorum etiam] etiam eorum Pd
- 384 albino] only albin readable on microfilm S; albino p(rae)sidi Pd
- 385 occurrerunt] occurrentes albino p; occurreret 1486ven 1499ven  
Albino occurrerunt] occurrerunt albino Pd
- 386 Alexandria] alexadria f
- 387 eumque docuerunt] et docuerunt eum Pd; eumque insinuauerunt Prs; eique nunciauerunt p
- 388 licet] liceret al Arn Ba Cl Cp L l Ld Ne p pa par pat Pd Prs Sa Sg Sr Vct Werd aug ven mil 1524
- 389 Anano] ei anano corrected to anano Cp; anano pont(ifici) with unreadable correction in margin pat
- 390 concilium] consilium Alb Ba El Ha pa lüb paris
- 391 autem] autem p(rae)ses iudeae Pd
- 392 sermonibus] uerbis Pd
- 393 flexus] motus p Prs
- 394 praeter . . . Anano] omitted by cl Co f S s Sg Vct
- 395 interminatus] interminato cl Co s Sg Vct
- 396 quapropter et] omitted by Pd

Agrippas,<sup>397</sup> sublato ei pontificatu, quod<sup>398</sup> tribus<sup>399</sup> habuerat mensibus,<sup>400</sup> Iesum<sup>401</sup> Damnei<sup>402</sup> filium in<sup>403</sup> eius loco<sup>404</sup> constituit.<sup>405</sup>

2.6.2 Greek Text of *Antiquities* 20.199-203 (Differences from *HE* 2.23.21-24 are in bold.)<sup>406</sup>

199. ὁ δὲ νεώτερος Ἄνανος, ὃν τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἔφαμεν<sup>407</sup> εἰληφέναι,<sup>408</sup> θρασὺς ἦν τὸν τρόπον καὶ τολμητῆς διαφερόντως, αἴρεσιν δὲ<sup>409</sup> μετῆι τὴν<sup>410</sup> Σαδδουκαίων, οἵπερ εἰσὶ περὶ τὰς κρῖσεις ὥμοι παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καθὼς ἤδη δεδηλώκαμεν.  
200. ἅτε δὴ οὖν τοιοῦτος ὢν ὁ<sup>411</sup> Ἄνανος, νομίσας ἔχειν καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον διὰ τὸ τεθνάναι μὲν Φῆστον, Ἀλβίνον δ' ἔτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν, καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ,<sup>412</sup> Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ τινας ἑτέρους,<sup>413</sup> ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν<sup>414</sup> ποιησάμενος παρέδωκε λευσηθισομένους.<sup>415</sup> 201. ὅσοι δὲ ἐδόκουν ἐπιεικέστατοι<sup>416</sup>

- 
- 397 Agrippas] agrippas Am Ba D f Lau S Werd; agrippa al Alb Cl cl Co Cor Cp d El Ha L l Ld n Ne p Pa pa par pat Prs s Sa Sg Sr U Vct aug na1475 ven mil 1524; rex etiam agrippa Pd; omitted by lüb paris
- 398 quod] quem Alb d n Pa Sa U lüb paris 1524bas
- 399 tribus] tantum tribus p Prs
- 400 habuerat mensibus] mensibus habuerat al Cl U
- 401 Iesum] yesum l; hiesum cl f L Ld S Sg Vct na1475; ihm al Alb Cl Cp d n Ne p par pat Prs s Sa Sr U aug; ihesum Ha Lau lüb; ihum Ba
- 402 Damnei] da(m)nei Alb L 1481ven 1486ven 1499ven mil; damnei with e over mn Ne; damei lüb 1514par; dannei 1524; da(m)nati f; dampnei Cp Sr; damnēi Co; datoney p; demenei corrected to damemei pa; dampnet par
- 403 in] et Ha
- 404 loco] locum pa 1524
- 405 constituit] perhaps corrected to constitueret or constituerit pat
- 406 Eusebius' quotation from Josephus begins with the first sentence of 20.197 (Πέμπει δὲ Καίσαρ Ἀλβίνον εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἔπαρχον Φῆστου τὴν τελευταίην πυθόμενος) and then skips to 20.199 without an indication that there is intervening material.
- 407 ἔφαμεν] εἴπαμεν Eus. *HE*
- 408 εἰληφέναι] παρεληφέναι M W *Epitome* Eus. *HE*, Naber; παραλαβῶν Photius
- 409 δὲ] τε Eus. *HE* ms M
- 410 τὴν] τῶν Eus. *HE* mss B D M
- 411 ὁ] omitted by *Epitome*, Eus. *HE* mss T E R
- 412 λεγομένου Χριστοῦ] Χριστοῦ λεγομένου Eus. *HE* mss A T E R B, D corr: (first hand of D has λεγομένου Χριστοῦ), M, λεγόμενον Synkellos
- 413 ἑτέρους] omitted by W
- 414 κατηγορίαν] κατηγορίας Eus. *HE* ms A
- 415 λευσηθισομένους] καταλευσηθισομένους Eus. *HE* mss D M; καταλευσηθισόμενον Synkellos
- 416 ἐπιεικέστατοι] ἐπιεικότεροι ms A of Zonaras

τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἶναι<sup>417</sup> καὶ<sup>418</sup> περὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς βαρέως ἤνεγκαν ἐπὶ τοῦτῳ καὶ πέμπουσιν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα κρύφα παρακαλοῦντες αὐτὸν ἐπιστεῖλαι τῷ Ἀνάμφω μηκέτι τοιαῦτα πράσσειν· μηδὲ γὰρ<sup>419</sup> τὸ πρῶτον ὀρθῶς αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι. 202. τινὲς δ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν<sup>420</sup> Ἀλβίνον<sup>421</sup> ὑπαντιάζουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ὁδοιποροῦντα<sup>422</sup> καὶ διδάσκουσιν, ὡς οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν<sup>423</sup> Ἀνάμφω<sup>424</sup> χωρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου<sup>425</sup> γνώμης καθίσαι συνέδριον. 203. Ἀλβίνος δὲ πεισθεὶς τοῖς λεγομένοις γράφει μετ' ὀργῆς τῷ Ἀνάμφω λήψεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ δίκας ἀπειλῶν. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς<sup>426</sup> Ἀγρίππας διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἀφελόμενος αὐτὸν ἄρξαντα<sup>427</sup> μῆνας τρεῖς<sup>428</sup> Ἰησοῦν τὸν τοῦ Δαμναίου<sup>429</sup> κατέστησεν.

### 2.6.3 Synopsis of Josephus and *LAJ*<sup>430</sup>

#### Josephus *AJ* 20.199-203

#### *LAJ* 20.199-203

199. ὁ δὲ νεώτερος Ἄνανος, ὃν τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἔφαμεν εἰληφέναι, θρασὺς ἦν τὸν τρόπον καὶ τολμητὴς διαφερόντως, αἵρεσιν δὲ μετῆι τὴν Σαδδουκαίων, οἵπερ εἰσὶ περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὡμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καθὼς ἤδη δεδηλώκαμεν.

Ananus autem iunior cum pontificatum suscepisset, erat uehementer asperimus et audax secta Saduceus qui circa iudicia sunt ultra omnes Iudaeos ualde crudeles, sicuti iam declarauimus.

(Continued)

- 417 εἶναι] εἶναι τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν Eus. *HE* mss D M  
 418 καὶ] καὶ τὰ Eus. *HE*, Naber  
 419 γὰρ] omitted by *Epitome*  
 420 τὸν] corrected from τῶν in A  
 421 Ἀλβίνον] τῷ Ἀλβίνῳ *Epitome*, Naber  
 422 ὁδοιποροῦντα] ὁδοιποροῦντι *Epitome*, Naber  
 423 ἦν] omitted by *Epitome*  
 424 Ἀνάμφω] ἀνῶ (i.e., ἀνθρώπῳ) M  
 425 τῆς ἐκείνου] αὐτοῦ Eus. *HE* mss T E B D M; τῆς αὐτοῦ Eus. *HE* mss A R Synkellos  
 426 βασιλεὺς] omitted by *Epitome*; βασιλεὺς δὲ Eus. *HE* ms A  
 427 αὐτὸν ἄρξαντα] αὐτοῦ ἄρξαντος Eus. *HE* mss A T E R M; αὐτὸν ἄρξαντα Eus. *HE* ms D Synkellos; αὐτῷ ἄρξαντα Eus. *HE* ms B  
 428 τρεῖς] δέκα Eus. *HE* ms M  
 429 Δαμναίου] δαμνέου MW; Δαμμαίου Eus. *HE* mss A B D M; δαμναίου Eus. ms T (first hand); δαμναίου T (older corrector) E R; ἰδαμναίου Synkellos; Μνασέα Zonaras; damnaei *LAJ* (see above for other variants in *LAJ* apparatus); dammaei Ruf. mss N F; damaei Ruf. ms O; damei Ruf. ms P; Syriac *HE dmy* (ܕܡܝ); Ἰησοῦν τὸν Δαμναῖον Photius  
 430 Since *LAJ* does not use Rufinus' translation of the passage (*HE* 2.23.21-24), we do not include it in the synopsis. We have provided Mommsen's text in 5.2.

TABLE (Continued)

Josephus <i>AJ</i> 20.199-203	<i>LAJ</i> 20.199-203
200. ἄτε δὴ οὖν τοιοῦτος ὢν ὁ Ἄνανος, νομίσας ἔχειν καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον διὰ τὸ τεθνήσκειν μὲν Φῆστον, Ἀλβίνον δ' ἔτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν, καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ τινὰς ἐτέρους, ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος παρέδωκε λευσθησομένους.	Cum ergo huius sectae Ananus esset, credens se inuenisse tempus oportu-num, Festo mortuo, et Albino in itinere constituto, concilium fecit iudicum, et quosdam deducens ad semetipsum inter quos et fratrem Ihesu, qui dicitur Christus, nomine Iacobum, quasi contra legem agentes accusans, tradidit lapidandos.
201. ὅσοι δὲ ἐδόκουν ἐπεικίστατοι τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἶναι καὶ περὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς βαρέως ἠνεγκαν ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ πέμπουσιν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα κρύφα παρακαλοῦντες αὐτὸν ἐπιστεῖλαι τῷ Ἀνάνῳ μηκέτι τοιαῦτα πράσσειν· μηδὲ γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ὀρθῶς αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι.	Qui autem uidebantur esse moderatissimi ciuitatis, et circa legis integritatem habere sollicitudinem, grauiter hoc tulere; miseruntque latenter ad regem rogantes eum, ut scriberet Anano, ne talia perpetraret, cum neque prius recte fecisset.
202. τινὲς δ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν Ἀλβίνον ὑπαντιάζουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ὁδοιποροῦντα καὶ διδάσκουσιν, ὡς οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν Ἀνάνῳ χωρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης καθίσειν συνέδριον.	Quidam uero eorum etiam Albino occurrerunt, ab Alexandria uenienti, eumque docuerunt, quia non licet Anano praeter illius uoluntatem congregare concilium.
203. Ἀλβίνος δὲ πεισθεὶς τοῖς λεγομένοις γράφει μετ' ὀργῆς τῷ Ἀνάνῳ λήψεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ δίκας ἀπειλῶν. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἀφελόμενος αὐτὸν ἄρξαντα μῆνας τρεῖς Ἰησοῦν τὸν τοῦ Δαμναίου κατέστησεν.	Albinus autem eorum sermonibus flexus, cum iracundia scripsit Anano, interminatus eum poenas exsoluere. Quapropter et rex Agrippas, sublato ei pontificatu, quod tribus habuerat mensibus, Iesum Damnei filium in eius loco constituit.

2.6.4 Literal Translation of *LAJ* 20.199-203

199. The younger Ananus, when he had taken up the priesthood,<sup>431</sup> was exceedingly harsh and bold, by sect a Sadducee, who are very cruel concerning their

431 Greek: "who we said had taken up the priesthood."

judgments beyond all the Jews, just as we have already made clear above. 200. Since therefore Ananus was of this sect, believing that he had found an opportune time, with Festus dead and Albinus on the road, he convened a council of judges, and brought before himself certain ones, among whom [was] also the brother of Jesus, who is called Christ, James by name. Making the accusation of their having acted contrary to law, he handed them over to be stoned. 201. Those who seemed to be the most moderate of the city and concerned about the integrity of the law took offense at this. And they sent secretly to the king asking him to write to Ananus that he should not do such things, since he had also not before acted correctly. 202. But certain of them also went to meet Albinus coming from Alexandria and explained to him that Ananus was not allowed to convene a council apart from his approval. 203. Albinus, moved by their words, wrote in anger to Ananus, threatening that he would pay the penalty. Also King Agrippa on this account, with the priesthood taken away from him [Ananus] that he had held for three months, appointed Jesus the son of Damneus in his place.

#### 2.6.5 Commentary on *L AJ* 20.199-203

199. **suscepisset**. Translating εἰληφέναι. The variant *successisset* appears in the closely related manuscripts Cl, f, S, Sg, and Vct (Group 1 below). The distinctive subgroup Sg and Vct has also added the preposition *in* to *pontificatum*, a common construction with *succedo*.

**asperrimus**. The adjective *acerrimus* would also be an appropriate translation of θρασὺς τὸν τρόπον, but it appears only in the closely related mss Cl, Co, d, Ld, n, and s (Group 1 below; cf. *arcerrimus* in Sg and Vct). For Ananus the Sadducee, *asper* would certainly be an appropriate adjective, but whether the translator or a scribe introduced the word is uncertain. For the tendency to strengthen adjectives, see *ualde crudeles* for ὤμοι (*AJ* 18.117).

**secta Saduceus**. Although the related mss al, Cl, cl, d, Ld, n, and Vct have *sectans Saduceos* (“following the Sadducees”), which happens to have the same verbal idea as αἴρουν δὲ μετήει τὴν Σαδδουκαίων, nevertheless the broadly attested *secta* surely represents αἴρουν. The variant *sectas adducens*, found in the closely related l, Ne, pa, and Sr (cf. pa and pat) derives from dividing the words differently. Ne, pa, par, and Sr also change *qui* to *quae* to agree with *sectas*.

200. **huius sectae**. An interpretation of τοιοῦτος, which makes the Greek text seem to point more to his character than to his affiliation with a religious sect.

**deducens ad semetipsum**. Translating παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ, but making the object Ananus himself rather than the συνέδριον as in the Greek.

201. **ne talia perpetraret.** μηκέτι τοιαῦτα πράσσειν. Clearly *ne* is better than *cur talia* (*talio* in Ld) *perpetraret* found in the closely related mss al, Cl, cl, Co, Ld, s, Sg, and Vct.

202. **praeter illius uoluntatem.** Closer to the reading in the mss of *AJ* (χωρίς τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης) than to the reading in the majority of manuscripts of Eus. *HE* (χωρίς αὐτοῦ γνώμης). Niese notes that Eusebius has αὐτοῦ, but does not report that ἐκείνου is also found in some Eusebius manuscripts.

**praeter . . . Anano.** The omission of these fourteen words by Cl, Co, f, S, s, Sg, and Vct (skipping from the first *Anano* to the next) is the most dramatic example of the close relationship of these manuscripts (Group 1 below).

**licet.** Translating ἐξὸν. It is also plausible to read *liceret*, which is equally well attested.

203. **quod tribus habuerat mensibus.** Translating ἄρξαντα μῆνας τρεῖς. *LAJ* translates the participle ἄρξαντα with a subordinate clause. Five manuscripts read *quem* (Alb, d, l, n, Pa, U), which is grammatically correct, since it agrees with the masculine noun *pontificatus*. This, however, seems more likely to have been a correction of a difficult reading.

**in eius loco.** Not in the Greek, but obviously implied.

**Damnei.** Only the c. 1475 Lübeck edition (followed by the 1514 and 1519 Paris editions) has a reading (*damei*) that might support the reading Δαμμαίου found in the majority of the manuscripts of Eusebius (and in all manuscripts reported by Mommsen for Rufinus's translation). Niese notes only that Eusebius has Δαμμαίου, not reporting that some Eusebius manuscripts have the reading Δαμναίου.

## 2.7 *References to Jesus, John the Baptist, and James in the Table of Contents*

As can be seen below in 2.7.1 and 2.7.2, the Table of Contents in *LAJ* is generally based on the Greek text, a clear indication that the Table of Contents was part of the Greek text of the *Antiquities* before the time of Cassiodorus.<sup>432</sup> We report here the evidence from *LAJ*, based on the manuscripts and early

432 J. Sievers, "The Ancient Lists of Contents of Josephus' *Antiquities*," in *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism* (ed. S. J. D. Cohen and J. J. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 291. For the *AJ* Table of Contents generally, see Sievers, "Ancient Lists," 271-92, and, for the Table of Contents for *AJ* 18, see É. Nodet, "Josephus and Discrepant Sources," in *Flavius Josephus: Interpretation and History* (ed. J. Pastor, P. Stern, and M. Mor; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 266-71.

editions which include a Table of Contents.<sup>433</sup> Orthographic variants are usually not reported.<sup>434</sup>

It should be noted that of all the manuscripts and printed editions we have seen, only four, S, f, Pa, and Arn, omit the reference to Jesus in the Table of Contents. S and f are closely related (f might be a copy of S), and Arn is a copy of Werd, which does have the reference.<sup>435</sup> The appearance of the reference in all other manuscripts suggests that it was the Latin translators who introduced the reference to Jesus in the Table of Contents with the conjunction *et* (*et de ihesu christ*; see the apparatus for variants), just as they probably added *et de baptista iohanne*, which is found, with minor variants, in all the manuscripts we have seen except Arn.

Niese's apparatus is misleading and inadequate in several respects. As is generally the case, he cites only "Lat" without noting any of the significant number of variants in the order of entries, wording, and general content found in this section of the Table of Contents for *LAJ*. Of greatest significance, he fails to report the appearance of the reference to Jesus in the Table of Contents in any Latin manuscript.

### 2.7.1 The Reference to Jesus in the Table of Contents

ὡς Πόντιος Πιλάτος ἠθέλησε κρύφα εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰσενέγκαι προτομάς Καίσαρος, γνοὺς δὲ ὁ λαὸς ἐστασίασε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἄχρι ἐξεκόμοσεν αὐτάς ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων εἰς Καισάρειαν.<sup>436</sup>

433 BN Latin 5051 (par) and Codex Gigas (Pd) do not include a Table of Contents, and the pages of Plut. 66.3 (l) with the Table of Contents for *AJ* 18 (254v-255r) are missing from the online version.

434 ae/ε/e are reported as ae, th/t are reported as t, and variations in the name Jerusalem (*hierosolima*, *iherosolima*, *ierosolima*, *ierusolima*) are not reported (except for *iherusalem*). When one manuscript only is cited (e.g., Cl and Sa), the original orthography is retained.

435 Arn has blank spaces where the references to Jesus and John the Baptist should be. Perhaps these were left for a scribe or illustrator to fill in.

436 This is the reading in A M W. Niese prints the reading of P: ὡς Πόντιος Πιλάτος ἠθέλησε κρύφα εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰσενέγκαι προτομάς Καίσαρος, ὁ δὲ λαὸς οὐ κατεδέξατο στασιάσας. In his *editio minor* he does not even note the reading in A M W and *LAJ*.

IX.<sup>437</sup> Qualiter Pontius<sup>438</sup> uoluit latenter intromittere in Hierosolimam<sup>439</sup> statuas<sup>440</sup> Caesaris<sup>441</sup> cognoscens autem populus seditionem aduersus illum commouit<sup>442</sup> donec illas<sup>443</sup> ab<sup>444</sup> Hierosolimis<sup>445</sup> in Caesaream transmitteret.<sup>446</sup> et de Ihesu Christo.<sup>447</sup>

BL Royal 13 D vii (Alb) and the c. 1475 Lübeck edition, which is based on a manuscript closely related to Alb,<sup>448</sup> have the following:

Attestatio Iosephi in dominum nostrum Ihesum xpm. de eius sapientia<sup>449</sup> et miraculis. de passione eius sub Pilato et resurrectione.<sup>450</sup>

### 2.7.2 The Reference to John the Baptist in the Table of Contents

There is a wider variation in the numbering, order, and content of the entries in the Latin manuscript tradition of the section of the Table of Contents where the reference to John the Baptist appears. The Greek textual tradition of the Table of Contents is also problematic at this point. Greek mss P and A

437 For variants in the numbering of the chapters in the *AJ* 18 Table of Contents for the *Testimonium* entry, see 4.2 below. Of the Greek manuscripts used by Niese, only W has numbers ( $\alpha$ - $\chi\beta$ ), but Niese does not indicate the number associated with each entry in that manuscript. For a translation of the Greek Table of Contents, see Nodet, "Josephus and Discrepant Sources," 266-69, and Appendix A ("An Ancient Table of Contents") in Feldman's LCL edition (text and translation: vol. 9, 534-41, in the 1965 edition [= vol. 12, 390-97, in the 1998 edition]; the numbers of the entries appear to be supplied by the editor).

438 Pontius] pontius pilatus p Sa aug ven 1511par  
 439 in Hierosolimam] in hierosolima cl Co f Ld Pl s Sg Vct; hierosolimam Cp d L n Ne pat Sr U; iherusalem D Lau; ierosolimis Arn Werd  
 440 statuas] statua Ba; statuam p  
 441 in Hierosolimam statuas Caesaris] statuam cesaris in iherosolimam p  
 442 commouit] concitauit Arn D Lau Werd  
 443 illas] alias p  
 444 ab] ad L  
 445 Hierosolimis] hierosolimas f S  
 446 transmitteret] transmisit al cl Co f Ld Ne Pl Prs S s Sg Vct  
 447 et de Ihesu Christo] omitted by Arn (with blank space where these words might have gone) f Pa S; et de domino ihesu christo D d El Ha n p U (iesu) Werd; et commemoratio ihu x(pist)i s; et comemorat ihu xpi Co; de ihu xpo filio dei Sa; de ihesu xpo aug; de iesu christo ven 1511par; et de domino nostro ihu xpo Cor Cp; de domino ihesu christo na1475.

448 See 4.3 below.

449 sapientia] sapiencia lüb

450 Alb has accidentally reversed two lines with the result that the notice begins with *raculis* and ends the first line with *resurrectione*, while the second line begins with *attestatio* (*atte* is obscured in the microfilm image we used) and ends with *mi*.

(followed by Niese) depart from the order of the events described in the narrative of *AJ* 18. In the narrative the events are presented in the following order:

- A. Tiberius writes to Vitellius to persuade Artabanus to send hostages.
- B. Death of Philip the Tetrach and the conversion of the tetrarchy into an eparchy.
- C. War of Herod against Aretas in which Herod is defeated, but survives.
- D. Tiberius writes to Vitellius to make war on Aretas.
- E. Death of John the Baptist.

The Greek manuscripts of the Table of Contents offer two different traditions of the orders of entries, neither of which corresponds precisely to the narrative:

1. P and A record the entry for the war of Herod with Aretas (C) first and, in addition, conflate Tiberius' two letters (A and D), with the result that Tiberius' command to make war on Aretas (D) precedes the death of Philip (B) and the war of Herod (C);
2. M and W agree with the narrative (against P and A) in placing the war of Herod against Aretas (C) after the letter about Artabanus (A) and the death of Philip (B), but, like P and A, conflate the two letters of Tiberius.

Greek *AJ* manuscripts do not mention the death of John the Baptist in the Table of Contents.

In the Latin manuscript tradition four separate traditions can be recognized:

I. The vast majority of Latin manuscripts with a Table of Contents (all except al, Alb, Cl, Ne, pa, and Sa)<sup>451</sup> follow the order in P and A and the wording in mss A, M, and W. We print here the text of A to which the Latin is closest (Niese prints the text of P):

- C) πόλεμος Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετράρχου<sup>452</sup> πρὸς Ἀρέταν τὸν Ἀράβων βασιλέα καὶ ἦττα.  
 A and D) ὡς Τιβέριος Καῖσαρ ἔγραψεν Οὐίτελλίῳ Ἀρταβάνην μὲν τὸν Πάρθον<sup>453</sup> πείσαι ὁμήρους αὐτῷ πέμψαι,<sup>454</sup> πρὸς Ἀρέταν δὲ πολεμεῖν.  
 B) τελευτῆ Φιλίππου καὶ ὡς ἡ τετραρχία αὐτοῦ ἐπαρχία ἐγένετο.

451 Pd and par do not have a Table of Contents; the page with the *AJ* 18 Table of Contents is missing from the online version of l.

452 P omits τοῦ τετράρχου

453 W: τῶν πάρθων

454 P: πέμψειν

- A) pugna<sup>455</sup> Herodis tetrarchae<sup>456</sup> aduersus<sup>457</sup> Aretam<sup>458</sup> Araborum<sup>459</sup> regem et qualiter superatus<sup>460</sup> extiterit.<sup>461</sup>
- B) XIV.<sup>462</sup> Qualiter Tiberius Caesar scripsit<sup>463</sup> Vitellio<sup>464</sup> ut Artabani<sup>465</sup> Partho<sup>466</sup> persuaderet<sup>467</sup> obsides<sup>468</sup> mittere, aduersus Aretam<sup>469</sup> uero pugnare.<sup>470</sup>
- D and E) XV.<sup>471</sup> Qualiter Tiberius Caesar scripsit<sup>472</sup> morte<sup>473</sup> Philippi tetrarchae<sup>474</sup> et qualiter tetrarchia<sup>475</sup> eius<sup>476</sup> in praesidalem<sup>477</sup>

- 
- 455 pugna] et pugna cl Co Cor Cp d El Ha Ld n Pa Pl Prs s Sg U Vct  
 456 tetrarchae] tetarchae f S  
 457 aduersus] aduersum cl S  
 458 Aretam] aream L pat Sr; are Ne  
 459 Araborum] arabum al cl Co Cp d Ld n Pl Prs s Sg Vct; arabye p  
 460 superatus] suspiratus L  
 461 extiterit] extiterat Ne (original hand) Sr; abscesserit cl Ld Pl Prs Sg Vct; sit p; pugna herodis tetarche aduersus aretam araborum regem et qualiter superatus extiterat struck-through in Ne and omitted by Arn D Lau Werd na1475  
 462 For variations in the numbering of the entries, see 4.2 below.  
 463 scripsit] p(rae)cepit p  
 464 Vitellio] uitellius Ba; uitello L  
 465 Artabani] arthaban d n; arthabam p pat; archabam Sg Vct; arbabani Co; archabani cl; archebani Prs  
 466 Partho] pardio Ba; parthos L  
 467 persuaderet] persuaderet L  
 ut artabani partho persuaderet obsides mittere] et persuasit obsides mittere artabani partho U  
 468 obsides] obsidens S  
 469 Aretam] aretum Ba S; arecum L pat Sr; aretha s  
 470 aduersus Aretam uero pugnare] omitted by na1475  
 471 For variants in the numbering of the chapters in the *AJ* 18 Table of Contents for the entry on John the Baptist, see 4.2 below.  
 472 scripsit] assumpsit Arn D Lau Ne pa Werd  
 473 morte] more Cor El Ha p Pa U na1475; post mortem Arn Werd; amore D Lau; mortem cl Co Cp d Ld n Pl Prs s Sg Vct  
 474 tetrarchae] tetarchae f S; tetrarchias Arn Ba Cor D El Ha L Lau p Pa pat Sr U Werd na1475; tetrarchiam eius Ne pa  
 475 tetrarchia] tetarchiam f S; tetrarchias Lau; tetrarchie p  
 476 eius] omitted by Ne pa pat Prs  
 477 praesidalem] p(rae)sulatum uel p(rae)sularem pat

dispensationem<sup>478</sup> redacta sit<sup>479</sup> et<sup>480</sup> de<sup>481</sup> baptista<sup>482</sup>  
Iohanne.<sup>483</sup>

The translation is quite literal, but there is a clear problem with the beginning of the last entry, where the phrase *Qualiter Tiberius Caesar scripsit before morte* (variants: *mortem, more, amore*) *Philippi* does not correspond to the Greek, does not seem to make sense, and is almost certainly corrupt, repeating the opening of the previous entry.<sup>484</sup>

II. Strikingly, the Table of Contents in Troyes ms 137 (Cl) presents the same material in the same order as the narrative of *AJ* 18. BL 22860 (al) follows this closely, but includes the problematic phrase *Qualiter Tiberius Caesar scripsit (mortem Philippi)*. In correctly placing the war of Herod against Aretas (C) after the letter about Artabanus (A) and the death of Philip (B), Troyes 137 and BL 22860 agree with Greek mss M and W. Unlike these Greek manuscripts, however, they also correctly separate Tiberius' letter to Vitellius about Artabanus (A) and his letter to Vitellius to make war on Aretas (D).

- (A) Qualiter Tyberius<sup>485</sup> scripsit Vitellio ut Artabano<sup>486</sup> Partho persuaderet obsides mittere.<sup>487</sup>
- (B) Mors<sup>488</sup> Philippi tetrarche et qualiter thetrarchia<sup>489</sup> eius in presidalem dispensationem redacta sit.

---

478 dispensationem] dispositionem p  
479 redacta sit] redactae sunt p; redacta est Cp; entry inserted as new numbered line (XIII) in small letters after redacta sit: pugna herodis tetrarche aduersus aretam araborum regem et qualiter superatus extiterat et de baptista iohanne Ne  
480 et] omitted by Cp na1475  
481 de] omitted by pat  
482 baptista] baptisma f S  
483 baptista Iohanne] iohanne baptista al Cl cl Co D Ld Pl Prs s Sg U Vct Werd; iohanne omitted by Pa; sancto iohanne baptista Cp; et de baptista iohanne omitted by Arn (with blank space where it might have gone); et de baptisma iohanne corrected to et de baptista iohannis f  
484 The variant *Qualiter Tiberius Caesar assumpsit post mortem Philippi tetrarchias* (Arn Werd) is best explained as an attempt to correct the corrupt text found in the majority of manuscripts.  
485 Tyberius] tyberius cesar al  
486 Artabano] artabani al  
487 In both manuscripts *mittere* is written underneath *obsides*.  
488 Mors] qualiter tyberius cesar scripsit mortem al  
489 thetrarchia] tetrarchia al

- (C) ac pugna Herodis thetrarchae<sup>490</sup> aduersus Aretham regem Araborum.<sup>491</sup> et qualiter superatus extiterit.
- (D and E) et qualiter Tyberius Cesar scripsit Vitellio aduersus Aretham pugnare et de Iohanne baptista.

At least in the case of the entry about the death of Philip, this tradition represents an earlier form of the text because *mors Philippi* (Troyes 137), corresponding precisely to τελευτή Φιλίππου, is closer to the Greek than the clearly corrupt *Qualiter Tiberius (Caesar) scripsit mortem Philippi*. It is tempting to suggest that the other differences between this tradition and the one in the vast majority of manuscripts can be explained by the scribe's access to a Latin Table of Contents that would reflect a more correct Greek Table of Contents that does not happen to have survived. However, the fact that the Latin Table of Contents in the first tradition has the conflation of the two letters of Tiberius, an error found in the Table of Contents of all Greek manuscripts, strongly suggests that this mistake was already in the original translation sponsored by Cassiodorus and that therefore the text in the related manuscripts Cl and al represents a correction of the Table of Contents on the basis of the narrative of *AJ* 18.

III. An elaborated representative of the version in Cl and al is found in Clm 15841 (Sa), which is taken over by the *editio princeps* (aug), and from there by the Venice editions with only orthographic differences:

- (A) et qualiter Tyberius Cesar scripsit Vitellio ut amicitias componeret cum Artabano Parthorum imperatore.
- (B) Mors Philippi fratris Herodis iunioris et qualiter tetrarchia eius dispensationi Syriae regiminique coniuncta est.

*Not found elsewhere:* et de simulatione quae contigit inter Aretham Pethreum<sup>492</sup> et Herodem quia eiecit Herodes filiam Arethae quam duxerat uxorem. amore captus Herodiadis quam sub introduxit loco uxoris.

- (D) et quia Tyberius prouocatus scriptis Herodis. mandat Vitellio aduersus Aretham pugnare
- (E) De Iohanne baptista ab Herode passo.

490 thetrarchae] thetrache al

491 Araborum] arabum al

492 Pethreum] petraeum 1502ven 1510ven; pereum 151upar

IV. BL Royal 13 D vii (Alb) and the Lübeck printed edition (lüb) have a compressed Table of Contents here that, as in the case of the other entries, differs from all other manuscripts and early printed editions:

De morte Philippi et eius modestia. et de discordia Herodis et Arethe et de Iohanne baptista.

V. An interesting development in the Latin textual tradition is found in BN 5045 (Ne), which has item XIII as *pugna Herodis tetrarche aduersus Aretam Araborum regem et qualiter superatus extiterat et de baptista Iohanne* written in a very small hand after the notice of the death of Philip and the transfer of his tetrarchy (... *redacta sit*).<sup>493</sup> The same passage appears earlier at the end of number XI (with *Are* in place of *Aretam*), with a line through it indicating it is to be deleted. The deleted passage would correspond to the order in the majority of Latin manuscripts and Greek mss P and A. The correction would follow the order in the second Latin version of the Table of Contents, but the rest of the section is like the majority of manuscripts in that it conflates the two letters of Tiberius into one and does not have a separate sentence reporting the order to fight Aretas. Unlike any of the other versions, the phrase *et de baptista Iohanne* is attached to the notice of the defeat of Herod's army. Because the deleted sentence does not have a reference to John the Baptist, it is unclear whether *et de baptista Iohanne* appeared after *et qualiter superatus extiterat* in the manuscript the scribe was copying or right before the insertion (i.e., after *redacta sit*), where it is found in the vast majority of manuscripts.

### 2.7.3 The Reference to James in the Table of Contents

Of the manuscripts we have seen, only BL Royal 13 D vii (Alb) mentions James in the Table of Contents for *AJ* 20:

XVI. et Albinus Festo successit et Ananus accepto pontificatu Iacobum cum aliis ad lapidandum tradidit.

As is the case with the references to Jesus and John the Baptist in the Table of Contents for *AJ* 18, an identical notice about James is also found in the Table of Contents for *AJ* 20 of the c. 1475 Lübeck printed edition. Since the notices in this manuscript and printed edition depart significantly from all the other material in the Table of Contents about Jesus and John the Baptist, it seems clear that this was an innovation in one branch of the manuscript tradition and does not go back to the translation sponsored by Cassiodorus.

493 BN 5050 (pa), which probably derives from BN 5045, follows the corrected text.

### 3. Results and Conclusions

#### 3.1 *Regarding the Testimonium and the Passages about John the Baptist and James*

1. The passages about Jesus and John the Baptist in the Latin translation of the *Antiquities* are taken from Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, but the Latin translation of the *Antiquities* did not use Rufinus' translation of the *HE* for the story of James' death, as Alice Whealey has correctly observed. Therefore, for the *Testimonium* and the story of John the Baptist, *LAJ* is only a secondary witness to the text of Eusebius and not an independent witness to the Greek text of Josephus.
2. Unlike many other passages in his translation of Eusebius' *HE*, Rufinus' translation of the *Testimonium* is very literal. This characteristic might derive from a concern to transmit as accurately as possible the testimony of Josephus about Jesus. Rufinus' translation of the passage about John the Baptist has three places where the Latin is significantly different from the Greek. One is the addition of a sentence on baptism reflecting Rufinus' Christian theological interest and two are problematic passages in the Greek manuscript tradition, which Rufinus either did not understand or found in a Greek text that is not recoverable from his translation.
3. In the *Testimonium*, *LAJ* makes only two minor stylistic changes in Rufinus' text (*et* in place of *-que* and *gentibus* for *gentilibus*). *LAJ*'s decision to reproduce Rufinus' version of the *Testimonium* so precisely and the lack of any significant textual variation in the manuscript tradition of the *Testimonium* in *LAJ* might reflect a special regard for the exact wording of this passage. However, it should be noted that *LAJ* clearly depends on Rufinus in two other cases (*AJ* 17.168-170/*HE* 1.8.6-8 and *AJ* 18.34-35/*HE* 1.10.5). In the seven other extended *AJ* passages quoted by Eusebius there is no significant verbal overlap between *LAJ* and Rufinus.
4. In the account of John the Baptist, *LAJ* makes eleven relatively small changes to Rufinus' account: four words replaced by synonyms, one preposition added and one removed, a transposition of words within a phrase, the introduction of *et* in a series, two changes in a transitional phrase (*hunc* in place of *quem* and *tunc demum* in place of *hoc . . . pacto*), and a word in place of a phrase (*iustitiam colere* in place of *iustitiam inter se inuicem custodire*).
5. In only one case is there evidence that *LAJ* might have changed Rufinus' text in order to bring it closer to the Greek (changing *quem puniuit* to

*hunc enim occidit* on the basis of κτείνει γὰρ τοῦτον). LAJ's tendency to follow Rufinus' translation closely without correcting it in the light of the Greek is illustrated by his retaining the sentence about baptism that Rufinus introduced into the text.

6. The most interesting discovery contributing to the debate about the authenticity of the *Testimonium* is the appearance of the phrase *et credebatur esse Christus* in a late eighth- or early ninth-century manuscript of Rufinus and in a related ninth-century Rufinus manuscript. In the earlier manuscript (which is, in fact, the earliest one we have seen), this phrase is written at the bottom of the page correcting the standard reading *hic erat* in the text itself. The correction is almost certainly drawn from Jerome's translation of the *Testimonium* and, therefore, does not reflect a reading in a Greek text. It does, however, provide a clear case of a Christian writer changing the explicit claim that Jesus was the Christ to a more ambiguous assertion, a procedure some scholars have doubted a Christian writer would ever do.
7. Niese's *editio maior* has significant shortcomings in its treatment of the *Testimonium* and the passages on John the Baptist and James. Niese cites LAJ (which he designates Lat) as if it is a witness to the text of Josephus rather than Eusebius and does not indicate which Latin manuscript(s) he used for particular readings. For the Greek text, Niese's apparatus does not include readings from Eusebius' *Theophania*, cites versions of the *Testimonium* appended to the end of the *Bellum* without making it clear that these are drawn from Eusebius' *HE* and are therefore not direct witnesses to the text of Josephus, and has a number of misprints, the worst of which is the use of *praep.* (i.e., *Praeparatio evangelica*) for a number of readings in the *Ecclesiastical History*. Niese's report of readings in Eusebius' *HE* and his vague references to the manuscript tradition (e.g., *codd. quidam; codd. plurimi*) can be improved considerably by reference to Schwartz's GCS edition.
8. The apparatuses for the *Testimonium* and for the passage about John the Baptist in the Schwartz-Mommsen GCS edition of Eusebius and Rufinus also have deficiencies. Schwartz cites only (and not always accurately) retroverted Greek readings for the Syriac text of the *Theophania*. Moreover, he does not cite readings from Greek manuscripts of the *HE* that he considers secondary and therefore fails to provide full evidence for how widespread certain readings are. Mommsen's edition of Rufinus is even more problematic, since its apparatus at this point is based on only three manuscripts, and not even all the variant readings from these are reported. There is a clear need for a new edition of Rufinus, especially for those books translating Eusebius.

9. Analysis of the sections of the Table of Contents in which references to Jesus and John the Baptist are found in the Latin (but not the Greek) manuscript tradition confirms that the Latin is a generally faithful rendering of the Greek (closest to Greek ms A). This demonstrates that the Greek Table of Contents had become part of the Greek manuscript tradition of the *Antiquities* by the time of Cassiodorus and the translation of the *Antiquities* into Latin.
10. All manuscripts of the Table of Contents for the Latin *Antiquities* have a reference to John the Baptist not found in the Greek text (except Arn, which depends on a manuscript that does have the reference), indicating that this was added by the Latin translators, as Niese's apparatus suggests. Since all but four *AJ* manuscripts also have a reference to Jesus in the Table of Contents, it is likely that this too was added by the translators. Niese's apparatus unfortunately makes no reference to the appearance of Jesus in the Table of Contents in the Latin manuscript tradition. Only one manuscript (Alb) has a reference to James in the Table of Contents for *AJ* 20. Since the content of the Table of Contents in this manuscript is completely different from the rest of the manuscript tradition, it does not provide adequate grounds for positing the appearance of James in the Table of Contents of the original Latin translation of the *Antiquities*.

### 3.2 *Relationships Among the Latin Manuscripts for AJ 18.63-64, AJ 18.116, AJ 20.199-203, and AJ 18 Table of Contents*

The following charts and discussion present the evidence as found in our textual apparatus for the relationship among the manuscripts for the passages discussed in this article. This represents the first extensive presentation of the data in extended passages from the Latin translations of Josephus relevant for the analysis of the relationships among manuscripts.<sup>494</sup>

We present the evidence fully in order to provide a basis for further research that might analyze other sections of the *Antiquities* and investigate the nature of the relationships among manuscripts within a group.

The various relationships within the group can be seen in the following charts of the distribution of distinctive variants. Manuscripts that do not

---

494 Blatt assigns all but one of the manuscripts considered here to particular families, based primarily on an analysis of the first part of the *Antiquities* and other criteria, such as the form of the Greek quotation in *AJ* 19.92 and the lacuna in some manuscripts of *AJ* 20.26-38. In Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations," we classify 74 manuscripts of the *Antiquities* and *War* into 11 groups.

appear to belong to a group but happen to have the same reading are listed in the last column.

### 3.2.1 Group 1<sup>495</sup>

transmisit (transmitteret): 18 TOC	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s	Pl	Prs	al	Ld	Cl	S	f	
commemorat(io) <sup>496</sup> (de): 18 TOC				Co	s								
et pugna (pugna): 18 TOC	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s	Pl	Prs		Ld		d	n	Cp
arabum (araborum): 18 TOC	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s	Pl	Prs	al	Ld		d	n	Cp
abscesserit (extiterit, extiterat): 18 TOC	Vct	Sg	cl			Pl	Prs		Ld				
archabam (artabani): 18 TOC	Vct	Sg											
mortem (morte): 18 TOC	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s	Pl	Prs	al	Ld		d	n	Cp
iohanne baptista (baptista iohanne): 18 TOC	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s	Pl	Prs	al	Ld				
nominari (nominare): 18.63	Vct	Sg				Pl	Prs						
eorum hominum (hominum eorum): 18.63	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s	Pl	Prs		Ld			Cp	Sa Pd
ea quae (quae): 18.63	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s	Pl	Prs			Cl			
apparuit enim eis (apparuit enim): 18.64						Pl	Prs						
eis (eis tertio die): 18.64	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s	Pl	Prs			S	f		
uisus (uius): (18.64)	Vct	Sg		Co	s	Pl	Prs			S	f		
exercitus (exercitum): 18.116				Co	s					S <sup>497</sup>	f	Cp	Cor p
Iudaeis (Iudaeis virtuti): 18.117				Co	s								

(Continued)

495 Levenson-Martin Group E ("Ancient Latin Translations," Chart 1)

496 Co has *comemorat*, and s has *commemoratio*.

497 exercitum S

TABLE (Continued)

tunc (tum): 18.117	Vct	Sg	cl			Pl	Prs	al	Ld	Cl			
atque (atque ad): 18.117	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s		Prs	al	Ld	Cl	S	f	
uerens (ueritus): 18.118	Vct	Sg	cl			Pl	Prs						
quod (quo): 18.119			cl			Pl	Prs				S	f	pa
in pontificatum (pontificatum): 20.199	Vct	Sg											
successisset (suscepisset): 20.199	Vct	Sg	cl								S	f	
arcerrimus (accerimus; asperrimus): 20.199	Vct	Sg											
dicti sunt (sunt): 20.199	Vct	Sg											
sectans (secta): 20.199	Vct		cl					al	Ld	Cl		d n	
saduceos (sad[d]uceus): 20.199	Vct		cl					al	Ld	Cl	S	f d n	
dum (cum): 20.200	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s			al	Ld	Cl		d n	
inuenisse se (se inuenisse): 20.200	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s			al	Ld	Cl	S	f d n	Ll
itinere (in itinere): 20.200		Sg	cl	Co	s				Ld		S	f	
Iacobum (nomine Iacobum): 20.200	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s			al	Ld	Cl			L Arn
cur (ne): 20.201	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s			al	Ld	Cl			
perpetrasset (perpetraret): 20.201				Co	s								
horum (eorum): 20.202				Co	s								
omission of 20.202b-203a	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s						S	f	
interminato (interminatus): 20.203	Vct	Sg	cl	Co	s								

There are 18 variants found only in S and f:

TOC 18: *hierosolimas (hierosolimis)*, *tetarchae (tetrarchae)*, *tetarchiam (tetrarchia)*, *baptisma (baptista)*; 18.63: *hic erat (erat enim)*; 18.64: *apparuit (apparuit enim)*; AJ 18.116 *sati (satis)*; AJ 18.117: *baptismum (per baptismum)*; AJ 18.117: *sed (uerum)*; AJ 18.118: *persuasionem (persuasione)*;

*uidebatur (uidebat), credit (credidit); AJ 18.119; macheruntha (macher-  
unta); AJ 20.200: fratre (fratrem), que (qui), Iacob (Iacobum); AJ 20.201:  
roganes (rogantes), quae (ne).*

Several subgroups can be easily identified from group 1: S f; Vct Sg; Co s; Pl Prs (AJ 18 only); al Ld; Vct Sg; Vct Sg cl Co s + Pl Prs (AJ 18 only).

Manuscripts d, n, and Cp have a number of distinctive readings in common with Group 1, but considerably fewer than the other manuscripts in the Group. Manuscripts d and n are closely related to one another here as they are elsewhere in AJ and BJ (Levenson and Martin, “Ancient Latin Translations”).

There are six variants found only in Prs and p: AJ 20.199: *erga (circa), plusquam (ultra), Iudei (Iudaeos); AJ 20.200: iniit (fecit); AJ 20.201: regem agrippam (regem); AJ 20.203: tantum tribus (tribus)*. These manuscripts do not belong with Group 1 for AJ 20, because for AJ 19 and 20 Prs represents a textual tradition different from that found in AJ 18.<sup>498</sup>

### 3.2.2 Group 2<sup>499</sup>

aream (aretam): 18 TOC	Ne <sup>500</sup>		pat	Sr	L		
extiterat (extiterit): 18 TOC	Ne			Sr			
arecum (aretam): 18 TOC			pat	Sr	L		
tertrarchiam (tertrarchae): 18 TOC	Ne	pa					
et (et hic): 18.63	Ne	pa					
sunt nuncupati (nuncupati sunt): 18.64	Ne	pa	par	pat			
celebre nomen (et nomen): 18.64	Ne	pa					
restat (perseuerat): 18.64	Ne	pa	par	pat			
quibusdam (a quibusdam): 18.116	Ne	pa	par				Sa Pd
ideoque (ideo): 18.116				pat	Sr	L	l Ba
tunc (tum): 18.117		pa		pat	Sr		Pd p

(Continued)

498 Levenson and Martin, “Ancient Latin Translations”; Blatt, 62; online BnF catalogue with detailed description of different hands and other manuscript features demonstrating the diverse traditions represented in Prs (<http://archivesetmanuscripts.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000077172>).

499 Levenson-Martin Group C (“Ancient Latin Translations,” Chart 1).

500 are Ne

TABLE (Continued)

corporis (corporis atque ad): 18.117			par	pat			f
omnium (omniumque): 18.117		pa					l
habebatur (habeatur): 18.117		pa		pat		L <sup>corr</sup>	l
doceruntur (doceruntur atque ad): 18.118	Ne		par	pat	Sr		
parata (praeparata): 18.118	Ne	pa					Co
itaque (igitur): 18.119	Ne	pa	par	pat	Sr	L	
macheruntam (macherunta): 18.119	Ne	pa					
ad(d)ucitur (abducitur): 18.119		pa		pat		L	l Pd
illius (illi): 18.119	Ne	pa		pat	Sr	L	Sa Cl
sectas adducens (secta saduceus): 20.199	Ne	pa	par <sup>501</sup>	pat	Sr		l
quae (qui): 20.199	Ne	pa	par		Sr		
declarabimus (declarauimus): 20.199			par	pat			Werd
legum (legis): 20.201	Ne	pa					

Ne (11th/12th) and pa (14th) are particularly closely related for both *AJ* and *BJ*; both, for example, have the same abridged version of selected books from *BJ*. The simplest hypothesis is that pa depends directly on Ne.

### 3.2.3 Group 3<sup>502</sup>

omission of pugna . . . extiterit: 18 TOC	Werd	Arn	Lau	D	
concitauit (commouit): 18 TOC	Werd	Arn	Lau	D	
assumpsit (scripsit): 18 TOC	Werd	Arn	Lau	D	Ne pa
post mortem (more, mortem, morte): 18 TOC	Werd	Arn			
amore (more, mortem, morte): 18 TOC			Lau	D	
praecepta ab eo (ab eo praecepta): 18.118	Werd			D	

501 cectas adducens par

502 Levenson-Martin Group G ("Ancient Latin Translations," Chart 1).

The illustrations<sup>503</sup> as well as the variant readings clearly demonstrate that Arn (late 12th c.) depends directly on Werd (first half of 12th c.).

### 3.2.4 Other Relationships

1. Clear evidence of a close relationship between Cl (Troyes 137) and al (BL 22860) is provided by the Table of Contents for *AJ* 18, where these two manuscripts have the same order of entries (see 2.7.2 above). Two variants support this hypothesis: *hic erat* written above *enim* (18.63) in only these two manuscripts, and the word order *mensibus habuerat* instead of *habuerat mensibus* (20.203), an order found elsewhere only in U.
2. Although there do not happen to be variants found only in El (Valenciennes 546) and Ha (Valenciennes 547) in the passages analyzed in this article, there are no cases in these passages where the texts of these two manuscripts disagree. It can be concluded, therefore, that they are closely related to one another here as they are elsewhere in *AJ* and *BJ* (Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations").
3. For the remaining manuscripts, the evidence from the variants in the Table of Contents for *AJ* 18 and the passages on Jesus, John the Baptist, and James is too sparse to draw significant conclusions. In the catalogue of manuscripts in 4.1, we include for all manuscripts references both to the family into which Blatt places the manuscripts and to the groups (A-L) in which we locate the manuscripts based on the analysis of a number of passages in both *AJ* and *BJ* (Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations").

## Appendix I: Catalogues of Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions

### 4.1 *Manuscripts*

While Blatt's prodigious labor in collecting and describing the manuscripts has provided an indispensable foundation for our work, his grouping of them has been of only limited value for our purposes, because his classification of the manuscripts does not adequately explain clusters of distinctive variants shared by manuscripts that he puts in unrelated families. The following catalogue of manuscripts, therefore, includes a reference to Blatt's descriptions and the families into which he places the manuscripts but also supplements and

---

503 U. Liebl, *Die illustrierten Flavius-Josephus-Handschriften des Hochmittelalters* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997), 101-2.

corrects his work, both with respect to the relationship of the manuscripts to one another and to other details for which Blatt's description needs to be modified. Along with Blatt's classification of each manuscript, which designates each family with a Greek letter, we have included a reference to the group, designated by letters A-L, to which we assigned the manuscript in our recent survey of 74 manuscripts of Josephus' works (Levenson and Martin, "Ancient Latin Translations"). Unlike Blatt's classification, ours takes into account the fact that not all sections of a manuscript belong to only one family. This is particularly important for the texts analyzed here, because *AJ* 17-20 and *AJ* 18-20 often circulated independently. When relevant, we have also referred to the three groups (designated by Arabic numerals) presented in the charts in the preceding section.

The manuscripts are listed in chronological order. We use Blatt's sigla, adding the Latin name that is the basis for each siglum. For the date and provenance (where known) of each manuscript we have used the most recent catalogue we could find and have also consulted U. Liebl, *Die illustrierten Flavius-Josephus-Handschriften des Hochmittelalters* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997) for manuscripts appearing in her catalogue (166-259). It should be noted that the dates in our catalogue do not always correspond to Blatt's dates and in two cases (BN5763 and Plut. 66.5/6) are radically different from his.

1. S. Sangermanensis. Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, GKS 157 folio. 9th c.E. (1st half).<sup>504</sup> Saint-Germain-des-Près. Blatt no. 41 (family λ); Levenson-Martin Group E. *AJ* 1-12 and 17-20. 149r (Jesus); 151r (John); 178v (James). Although the earliest manuscript in our collection, it contains many errors. Most of these, including the omission of a sentence in the passage on James, are also found in a number of other members of Group E. Particularly close to f, with which it shares 18 unique variants. Earliest representative of Group 1 above.
2. Ba. Bambergensis. Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Msc. Class. 78. E. III.15. 9th c.E. (middle).<sup>505</sup> "Wohl Oberitalien."<sup>506</sup> Blatt no. 113 (Family φ);

504 B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts* (2 vols.: Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998-2004), 1:410, no. 1980. Blatt, 43 dates the manuscript to the 8th or 9th century, as does E. Jørgensen, *Catalogus Codicum Latinorum Medii Aevi Bibliothecae Regiae Hafniensis* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1926), 287.

505 Bischoff, *ibid.*, 1:49, no. 217. F. Leitschuh and H. Fischer, *Katalog der Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg* (Bamberg, 1885), 1.2.1:86. Blatt, 67: 10th c.E. Digital copy: <http://bsbsbb.bsb.lrz-muenchen.de/~db/0000/sb000000114/images/index.html>

506 Bischoff, *ibid.*, 1:49. Leitschuh and Fischer, 86: "Wohl aus Frankreich stammend." Blatt, 67: "origin unknown."

- Levenson-Martin Groups D (*AJ* 11) and H (*AJ* 13). *AJ*. 221v (Jesus); 223v-224r (John); 251r (James).
3. L. Laurentianus. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.2. 11th c.E.<sup>507</sup> Italian origin. Blatt no. 3 (Family  $\alpha$ ); Levenson-Martin Group C. *AJ*, *CAp*, *BJ* 1 (only to 1.276). 230r-230v (Jesus); 232r-232v (John); 257v-258r (James). Blatt and Boysen privilege L for *AJ* and *CAp*. Part of Group 2 above.
  4. Lau. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.5. 11th c.E. (end).<sup>508</sup> Northern Italy.<sup>509</sup> Blatt no. 149 (family  $\chi$ ); Levenson-Martin Group G. Liebl, 196-198. *AJ* 1-17 and first page of *AJ* 18. 177v (*AJ* 18 Table of Contents). Extremely close to Werd, D, and Arn. Blatt inexplicably does not group these in the same family. Earliest member of Group 3 above.
  5. Lau. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.6. 11th c.E. (end).<sup>510</sup> Blatt no. 149 (family  $\chi$ ). Liebl, 196-198. *AJ* 18-20, *BJ* (second volume of Plut. 66.5). 3v (Jesus); 5r-5v (John); 26v (James). See entry on Plut. 66.5.
  6. f. floriacensis. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5763. 11th (end) - 12th (beg).<sup>511</sup> Fleury Abbey in Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire. Blatt no. 44 (family  $\lambda$ ); Levenson-Martin Group E. Liebl, 240. Caesar, *De bello Gallico*; *AJ* 17-20 (designated 13-16). 124v-125r (Jesus); 127v-128r (John); 177r (James). This manuscript is a composite of two different manuscripts that have been sewn together. The first part, containing Caesar's *Gallic War*, is from the ninth century. Blatt, 44 mistakenly dates the entire manuscript to the ninth century. Closely related to S, which it possibly used directly. Part of Group 1 above.

507 Boysen, ii; Blatt, 28, 10th-11th; Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana online catalogue: 1001-1100 (<http://teca.bmlonline.it/TecaRicerca/showMag.jsp?RisIdr=TECA0000870826>). Digital copy: <http://teca.bmlonline.it/TecaViewer/index.jsp?RisIdr=TECA0000785571&keywords=Plut.66.02>

508 Digital copy: <http://teca.bmlonline.it/TecaViewer/index.jsp?RisIdr=TECA0000786945&keywords=plut.66.05>

509 For the date and provenance, see A.M. Alari, "Codici miniati inediti dei secoli XI e XII della biblioteca Laurenziana," *La Bibliofilia* 39 (1937): 98. See also Blatt, 85 (12th/13th c.E.), and Liebl, 196 (Maasland, 11th [end]/12th c.E.).

510 Digital copy: <http://teca.bmlonline.it/TecaViewer/index.jsp?RisIdr=TECA0000787677&keywords=plut.66.06>

511 Detailed catalogue entry at [http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000034029&c=FRBNFEAD000034029\\_e0000015&qid=sdx\\_q14](http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000034029&c=FRBNFEAD000034029_e0000015&qid=sdx_q14). Digital copy: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8426038x/f360.item>

7. El. Elnonensis. Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, ms. 546. 11th/12th c.E.<sup>512</sup> Monasterium St. Amandi Elnonense, Saint-Amand-les-Eaux (Elnon, France; NW of Calais on the Belgian border). Blatt no. 115 (family  $\phi$ ); Levenson-Martin Group H. *AJ*, *BJ*. 113v (Jesus); 114v (John); 128r (James). Closely related to Ha.
8. Pl. Pollingensis. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 11302. 11th/12th c.E.<sup>513</sup> Blatt no. 81 (family  $\pi$ ); Levenson-Martin Group E. *AJ* 1-12, *BJ* (designated 13-19), *AJ* 18 (up to 18.369).<sup>514</sup> 257r (Jesus); 258v (John). Closely related to Prs for *AJ* 18. Part of Group 1 above.
9. Ne. Neapolitanus. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5045. 12th c.E. (early).<sup>515</sup> Italian origin. Blatt no. 29 (Family  $\zeta$ ); Levenson-Martin Group C. Vol. 1: *AJ* 1-12; vol 2: *AJ* 13-20, *BJ* 1 (partial), *BJ* 4-7 (partial). 73r (Jesus); 75r (John); 101r-101v (James). Part of Group 2 above.
10. U. Uticensis. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, NAL 2453. 12th c.E. (early). Abbaye de Saint-Évroul (Normandy). Blatt no. 154 (family  $\omega$ ); Levenson-Martin Group J. *AJ*, *BJ*. 138r (Jesus); 139r (John); 156r (James).
11. Werd. Werdinensis. Berlin,<sup>516</sup> Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, ms. Lat. Fol. 226. 12th c.E. (first half).<sup>517</sup> Donated to St. Lüdger Benedictine Abbey, Werden (70 km North of Cologne) in 1159. Blatt no. 146 (family  $\chi$ ); Levenson-Martin Group G. Liebl, 168-172. *AJ*, *BJ*. 158v (Jesus); 160r (John); 180r-180v (James). Closely related to the other manuscripts of Group 3 above, Lau, D, and Arn (which is a copy of it). This manuscript is of particular importance because it was used by the editor of the 1524 Cologne edition to correct some (but not all) readings from earlier printed editions upon which he based his edition. (See the

512 Blatt, 68: 12th c.E. A. F. Lièvre et Auguste Molinier, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. Vol. 25: Poitiers, Valenciennes* (Paris: E. Plon, 1894), 433, which Blatt cites, dates the manuscript to the 11th c.E. Digital copy: <http://bookline-03.valenciennes.fr/bib/common/viewer/tifmpages.asp?TITRE=Ms+546&FILE=Mso546.tif>

513 Digital copy: <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0008/bsb00080533/images/>  
 514 *Amen* appears after 18.379 (266r). No number is assigned to *AJ* 18. Blatt, 83 does not indicate that only part of *AJ* 18 is in the manuscript.

515 Digital copy: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bt1v1b52000584z> (detailed catalogue entry at "Full Record" of digital manuscript site).

516 Blatt (in 1958) reports that the manuscript is in Tübingen. It is now back in Berlin.

517 A. Fingernagel, *Die Illuminierte Lateinischen Handschriften Deutscher Provenienz der Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Berlin*; Part 1: Text (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 116-18; W. Stüwer, "Zur Geschichte einer rheinischen Handschrift," in *Aus kölnischer und rheinischer Geschichte. Festgabe Arnold Güttsches zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet* (ed. H. Blum; Cologne: H. Wamper, 1969), 163-78.

- entry on the 1524 Cologne below.) It was also one of the manuscripts Niese used for the Latin text of both the *Antiquities* and the *Bellum*.
12. Alb. Albanensis. London, British Library, Royal 13 D vii. 12th C.E. (1st part). St. Albans.<sup>518</sup> Blatt no. 163 (family  $\omega$ ); Levenson-Martin Group J. Liebl, 209-212. Royal 13 D vii: *AJ* 15-20, *BJ* 1-7 (second volume of Royal 13 D vi, which contains *AJ* 1-14). No folio pages visible on the microfilm we used to collate this manuscript.
  13. Sr. Sorbonensis. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 15427. 12th C.E. "Of Italian origin."<sup>519</sup> Blatt no. 20 (family  $\gamma$ ); Levenson-Martin Group C. *AJ*.<sup>520</sup> The *Testimonium* is missing from the manuscript (239v ends in the middle of *AJ* 18.51 and 240r begins with *AJ* 18.98). 240v-241r (John); 270v-271r (James). Part of Group 2 above.
  14. n. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 16731. 12th C.E. Abbaye St-Pierre et St-Paul d'Hautmont. Blatt no. 71 (family  $\xi$ ); Levenson-Martin Groups J (*AJ* 11 and *AJ* 13) and E (*BJ*) *AJ*, *BJ*. 127r (Jesus); 128r-128v (John); 145v (James). Closely related to d. Many readings in common with Group 1 above.
  15. Vct. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 14361. 12th C.E. Abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris. Blatt no. 60 (family  $\nu$ ); Levenson-Martin Group E. *AJ* 1-12, *BJ* (designated 13-19), *AJ* 18-20.<sup>521</sup> 237r (Jesus); 239r (John); 262v (James). Closely related to Sg. Part of Group 1 above.
  16. Ha. Hasnoniensis. Valenciennes, France. Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, ms. 547. 12th C.E. Belonged to Hasnon Abbey (about 7 km from Saint-Amand-les-Eaux; see catalogue entry on El).<sup>522</sup> Blatt no. 116 (family  $\phi$ ); Levenson-Martin Group H. Liebl, 258. *AJ*, *BJ*. 137v (Jesus); 139r (John); 156v-157r (James). Closely related to El.
  17. Cl. Claravallensis. Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, ms. 137. 12th C.E.<sup>523</sup> Clairvaux. vol. 1: *AJ* 1-12; vol. 2: *AJ* 13-20. 132v-133r (Jesus); 137r

518 Detailed record at British Library, Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts: <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=5563&CollID=16&NSTart=130407>

519 Blatt, 35.

520 Blatt, 36 says the manuscript also contains *BJ*, but in fact only the first line of the *BJ* is cited at the end of *AJ* 20 (272r).

521 *AJ* 18 is not numbered at the beginning of the book and designated 20 at the end of the book; *AJ* 19 is designated 21 at the beginning and 19 at end of the book; *AJ* 20 is designated 20; cf. cl for this numbering of *AJ* 18-20.

522 Digital copy of volume 2: <http://bookline-03.valenciennes.fr/bib/common/viewer/tifmpages.asp?TITRE=Ms+547&FILE=Ms0547.tif>

523 Digital copy: <http://www.mediatheque.grand-troyes.fr/webmat/content/le-patrimoine-numerise>

- (John); 191v (James). Blatt no. 100 (family o); Levenson-Martin Groups E (*AJ* 11 and 18-20) and D (*AJ* 13). Blatt assigns the siglum Cl to this manuscript in his description of the manuscript (p. 63) but has cl in his list of sigla (p. 114). We use the siglum from his description. Part of Group 1 above.
18. cl. claravallensis. Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, ms. 701. 12th c.E.<sup>524</sup> Clairvaux. Blatt no. 62 (family v); Levenson-Martin Group E. *BJ*, *AJ* 18-20.<sup>525</sup> 149r (Jesus); 152r (John); 190v (James). Blatt assigns the siglum cl to this manuscript in his description of the manuscript (p. 51) but has Cl in his list of sigla (p. 114). We use the siglum from his description. Part of Group 1 above.
19. Prs. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 8959. c. 1160 c.E.<sup>526</sup> Troyes. Blatt no. 99 (family σ); Levenson-Martin Groups E (*AJ* 18) and D (*AJ* 20). Liebl, 241-244. *AJ*, *BJ*. 230r (Jesus); 231r (John); 250r (James). The manuscript was created in three stages by three different scribes: (1) *AJ* 1-12, *BJ*, *AJ* 18; (2) *AJ* 19-20; (3) *AJ* 13-17.<sup>527</sup> Part of Group 1 above for *AJ* 18, where it is closely related to Pl. Not with Group 1 for *AJ* 20, where it is closely related to p.
20. s. Sangermanensis. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 12511. 12th c.E. (2nd half). Saint-Germain-des-Près. Blatt no. 59 (family v); Levenson-Martin Group E. Liebl, 245-246. *AJ* 1-12, *BJ*, *AJ* 18-20. 195v (Jesus); 197r (John); 216v (James). Closely related to Co. Part of Group 1 above.
21. Cor. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 16730. 1170-1180 c.E.<sup>528</sup> Saint-Pierre de Corbie (?). Blatt no. 123 (family φ); Levenson-Martin Group H. *AJ*, *BJ*. Liebl, 247-250. 165v (Jesus); 167r-167v (John); 189r (James).
22. D. Darmstadinus. Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek, Cod. 163. Cologne (?). 12th c.E. (3rd quarter).<sup>529</sup> Blatt no. 107 (family σ);

524 Digital copy: <http://www.mediatheque.grand-troyes.fr/webmat/content/le-patri-moine-numerise>

525 *BJ* 6 (Latin *BJ* 7) is called book 9. *AJ* 18 is called book 20. *BJ* 19 is called book 21 at the beginning and book 19 at the end, and *AJ* 20 is designated as book 20; cf. Vct for this numbering of *AJ* 18-20.

526 Digital copy at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8510034c.r=latin+8959.langEN>

527 Detailed catalogue entry: <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000077172>

528 Detailed catalogue entry: <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD00001364>

529 Extensive online description and digital copy at Codices Electronici Ecclesiae Coloniensis site: <http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de/>. The first volume, Cod. 162, containing *AJ* 1-4 and 8-13, is also at this site.

- Levenson-Martin Group G. *AJ* 14-20 and *BJ*. 66r (Jesus); 68r-68v (John); 98v (James). Part of Group 3 above.
23. Arn. Cologne, Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln, Best 7010 (Wallraf 276). 12th c.E. (end).<sup>530</sup> Arnsberg, Kloster Wedinghausen. Not listed in Blatt; Levenson-Martin Group G. Liebl, 202-204. *AJ*, *BJ*. 154v (Jesus); 155v-156r (John); 173r (James). A direct copy of Werd.<sup>531</sup> Part of Group 3 above.
24. Co. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5046. 12th/13th c.E. Blatt no. 65 (family v); Levenson-Martin Group E. *AJ* 1-12, *BJ* (designated 13-17), *AJ* 18-20. 258r (Jesus); 260v (John); 288r (James). Closely related to s. Part of Group 1 above.
25. p. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5047. 12th/13th c.E. Blatt no. 103 (family σ); Levenson-Martin Groups D (*AJ* 20) and J (*AJ* 13). Liebl, 230-232. *AJ*, *BJ*. 113v (Jesus); 115r (John); 129r (James). Closely related to Prs in *AJ* 20.
26. Pa. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5049. 13th c.E.<sup>532</sup> Blatt no. 128 (family φ); Levenson-Martin Groups H (*AJ* 11) and J (*AJ* 14). Liebl, 233-234. *AJ*, *BJ*, *CAP*. 193v (Jesus); 195r (John); 218r (James).
27. Sa. Salisburgensis. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 15841. c. 1200 c.E.<sup>533</sup> Salzburg Cathedral. Blatt no. 89 (family ρ); Levenson-Martin Group C (*AJ* 11), Group L. Liebl, 216-218. *AJ*, *BJ*, Ps.-Hegisippus. 87r (Jesus); 87v-88r (John); 99r-99v (James). This manuscript, from the South German branch of the tradition (Blatt family ρ) or a manuscript very close to it, was the basis for the 1470 Augsburg *editio princeps* (see below). Related to Pd.
28. Cp. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 16941. 1200-1230 c.E. Blatt no. 73 (family ξ); Levenson-Martin Group H (*AJ* 13). *AJ*, *BJ*. 207r (Jesus); 209r (John); 238r-239v (James). Many readings in common with Group 1 above.
29. Pd. Podlaticensis. Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Ms. A 148 ("Codex Gigas"). Podlažice Monastery, Czech Republic. 1204-1230 c.E.<sup>534</sup> Blatt no.

530 Digital copy: [http://historischesarchivkoeln.de/de/lesesaal/verzeichnungseinheit/170253?sf\\_highlight=josephus](http://historischesarchivkoeln.de/de/lesesaal/verzeichnungseinheit/170253?sf_highlight=josephus)

531 Liebl, 101-2 notes that the illustrations depend on Werd. This also seems to be the case for all the texts we have analyzed.

532 BnF online catalogue: 13th c.E.; Liebl: 12th (2d half); Blatt, 75: "XII (more likely XIII)."

533 Date: E. Klemm, *Die Romanischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek. Part 1* (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1980), no. 283.

534 For date and provenance, see the section on "The History of the Codex" at the extensive website devoted to the Codex Gigas. The site also includes a digitized copy of the manuscript, which does not always allow enough magnification to read individual

- 93 (family ρ); Levenson-Martin Group L. Liebl, 253-254. *AJ*, *BJ*, and a number of other texts, including the Bible. 171v (Jesus); 172r (John); 178r (James). This famous manuscript, nicknamed “the Devil’s Bible” from one of its illustrations, frequently changes words and expressions into a more simplified Latin, abridges a great deal, and sometimes adds new material (see the apparatuses for many examples). Related to Sa.
30. Sg. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 11735. 13th c.E. (early). Saint-Germain-des-Près. Blatt no. 67 (family ν); Levenson-Martin Group E. *AJ* 1-12, *BJ*, *AJ* 18-20. 240v (Jesus); 242v (John); 267r (James). Closely related to Vct. Part of Group 1 above.
31. al. alcobacensis. London, British Library, Add. 22860. 13th c.E. St. Alcobaca, Portugal. Blatt no. 74 (family ξ); Levenson-Martin Groups E (*AJ* 18/20) and D (*AJ* 13). *AJ* 12-20. 158r (Jesus); 162v (John); 217v (James). Second volume of a large three-volume manuscript, designated Add. 22859, Add. 22860, and Add. 22861.<sup>535</sup> *AJ* 18-20 appears in both 22860 and 22861 with closely related but not identical readings. Closely related to Ld. Part of Group 1 above.
32. Ld. Londiniensis. London, British Library, Add. 22861. 13th c.E. St. Alcobaca, Portugal. Blatt no. 66 (family ν); Levenson-Martin Group E. *BJ* 1-7 (designated 1-8) and *AJ* 18-20 (designated as *BJ* 9-11). 211r-211v (Jesus); 215r-215v (John); 265r-265v (James). See entry on al to which it is closely related. Part of Group 1 above.
33. d. divionensis. New York, The Morgan Library and Museum, Pierpont Morgan Library Ms d 534. 13th c.E. (late)<sup>536</sup> Dijon. Blatt No. 68 (family ν); Levenson-Martin Groups J (*AJ* 11 and *AJ* 13) and E (*BJ*). Liebl, 222-226. *AJ* 16-20, *BJ*. 23r (Jesus); 25r (John); 57v (James). The first volume, ms d 533, has *AJ* 1-15. Closely related to n. Many readings in common with Group 1 above.
34. pa. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5050. 13th/14th c.E.<sup>537</sup> Blatt no. 30 (family ζ); Levenson-Martin Group C. *AJ*, *BJ* 1 (partial), *BJ* 4-7

---

letters with confidence: <http://www.kb.se/codex-gigas/eng/Browse-the-Manuscript/Iosephus-Flavius/Antiquitates-Iudaicae/?close=False&closechild=False&mode=0&page=233#content>

535 British Library Manuscript Catalogue: [http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo\\_library/libweb/action/dlDisplay.do?docId=IAMS032-002096800&vid=IAMS\\_VU2&indx=1&dym=false&dscent=1&onCampus=false&group=ALL&institution=BL&ct=search&v1%28freeText%29=032-002096800&vid=IAMS\\_VU2](http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/dlDisplay.do?docId=IAMS032-002096800&vid=IAMS_VU2&indx=1&dym=false&dscent=1&onCampus=false&group=ALL&institution=BL&ct=search&v1%28freeText%29=032-002096800&vid=IAMS_VU2)

536 According to online CORSAIR Collection Catalogue.

537 Digital copy: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bt1b9067675x.r=latin+5050.langEN>

- (partial). 340r (Jesus); 343v (John); 384v (James). Closely related to and quite possibly a copy of Ne. Part of Group 2 above.
35. par. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5051.<sup>538</sup> 1400-1450 C.E. North Italy. Blatt no. 22 (family  $\gamma$ ); Levenson-Martin Group C. *AJ*. 204v (Jesus); 206r-206v (John); 228v (James). Part of Group 2 above.
36. pat. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 8835. 1461 C.E.<sup>539</sup> Padua, Church of St. Daniel/Abbey of St. Justine. Blatt no. 25 (family  $\gamma$ ); Levenson-Martin Group C. *AJ*. 156r (Jesus); 157v (John); 177r (James). Part of Group 2 above.
37. l. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.3. 15th c.E.<sup>540</sup> Blatt no. 18 (family  $\gamma$ ); Levenson-Martin Group C. *AJ*, *CAp*. 267v (Jesus); 270v (John); 301v-302r (James). Part of Group 2 above.

#### 4.2 Chapter Locations in Manuscripts

In the *AJ* 18 Table of Contents, the great majority of manuscripts include the reference to Jesus in chapter 9 and the reference to John the Baptist in chapter 15. The reference to Jesus appears in chapter 8 in the Table of Contents for cl, Ne, pa, and Pl, and in chapter 10 in the Table of Contents for U. The reference to John the Baptist is in chapter 14 in the Table of Contents for Ha, L, n, Ne, pa, Pl, s, and Sa; in chapter 16 in U and p; and in chapter 12 in Alb. Seven manuscripts (Co, Cor, Cp, d, pat, Sg, and Vct) do not number the entries in the *AJ* Table of Contents. Pd and par do not include a Table of Contents.<sup>541</sup> There is no reference to Jesus in the *AJ* Table of Contents for Arn, f, Pa, and S. A number of the manuscripts that number the chapters in the Table of Contents do not have numbers in the text (al, Alb, El, L, Lau, Ld, n, Pl, p, Pa, S, s, Sr). Werd includes the reference to Jesus in chapter 9 in the Table of Contents and in chapter 10 in the text of *AJ* 18. With the exception of Alb (see above 2.7.3), James is not mentioned in the Table of Contents for *AJ* 20. The chapter in which it appears in the text of *AJ* 20 is numbered (usually beginning with *AJ* 20.200) as 19 in Arn, Cl, cl, Cor, D, Ld, Ne, pa, U, and Werd; as 18 in Ba, f, L, and S; as 16 in Alb and Ha; and as 21 in Sa.

538 Digital copy: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8446965g.r=flavius+josephus.langEN>

539 Detailed catalogue entry: <http://archivesetmanuscripts.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000062368>

540 Digital copy: <http://teca.bmlonline.it/TecaViewer/index.jsp?RisIdr=TECA0000870818&keywords=plut.66.03>

541 The pages of Plut. 66.3 (l) with the Table of Contents for *AJ* 18 (254v-255r) are missing from the online version.

### 4.3 *Early Printed Editions*

The early printed editions are important both as witnesses to manuscripts we have not been able to identify (two cases) and as examples of how these passages would have been known to most readers from the late fifteenth century until the advent of widely disseminated Greek texts in the eighteenth century. Given the authority accorded to Niese's edition, it is important to point out that Niese's description of the early printed editions is incomplete and inaccurate at a number of points.<sup>542</sup> Schreckenberg's lists are extremely helpful, but they do not offer any information about the texts of the individual editions and how they might be related.<sup>543</sup> We, therefore, include here a brief discussion of the text in each edition because, to our knowledge, there have been no analyses of the relationship of these editions to one another and no discussion of the manuscript bases of any of these editions except for W. Stüwer's important article on the use of Berlin Lat 226 (Werd) by the 1524 Cologne edition.<sup>544</sup>

1. 1470 *editio princeps* (aug). Augsburg: Johann Schüssler. Vol. 1: *AJ* (28 June 1470); vol. 2: *BJ* (23 August 1470).<sup>545</sup> British Library's Incunabula Short Title Catalogue (hereafter ISTC)<sup>546</sup> no. ij00481000. Based on a manuscript identical with or very close to Clm 15841 (Sa), with which it shares dozens of distinctive readings and a number of unique erroneous readings. Some relationship is clearly established by the fact that both the 1470 edition and Clm 15841 have at the end of the *Bellum* the treatise "Seven Miracles in the World," which only appears in two other manuscripts catalogued by Blatt (his nos. 87 and 92). In addition, the 1470 edition and Clm 15841 are the only manuscripts we have seen that have the same chapter numbers for the *Bellum* (which, unlike the *Antiquities*, often does not include chapter numbers at all). The relatively few readings that differ from Clm

542 For example, Niese, 1:1xx mentions only the 1470 *editio princeps*, the 1481 Venice edition (which he cites according to the mistaken date of 1400 in the colophon to the *AJ*), the 1499 Venice edition, the 1513/1514 Paris edition, and the 1524 Basel edition. R. J. H. Shutt's survey of the early printed editions follows Niese, but errs in understanding Niese to mean that the 1470 *editio princeps* contained only the *AJ* and in taking Niese's reference to the 1400 edition to be the 1486 edition (*Studies in Josephus* [London: SPCK, 1961], 110-11).

543 H. Schreckenberg, *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 1-7, and *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus: Supplementband mit Gesamtregister* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 163-68.

544 "Zur Geschichte einer rheinischen Handschrift."

545 Digital copy: <http://aleph.nli.org.il/nnl/dig/books/bk00184407.html>

546 <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/istc/index.html>

- 15841 can be explained as either (1) corrections from another manuscript or (2) the use of a manuscript that differs only slightly from Clm 15841.
2. “Not after 1475” (nai475). ISTC no. ij00482000. Date and publisher uncertain, but it must have been published by 1475, the date of an acquisition note in a copy described in a sale catalogue. *AJ, BJ*. The entry in the ISTC reads “[Southern Netherlands: printer of Flavius Josephus, not after 1475]. Also recorded as [Paris: Printer of Valerius Maximus], and [Strassburg: Johann Mentelin].” G. Colin concludes that a good case can be made for the place of publication as Valenciennes, Bruges, or Ghent.<sup>547</sup> We have found support for this hypothesis in the distinctive chapter divisions in the *Bellum*, which correspond to no other printed edition and to only two of the manuscripts we have seen: the twelfth-century ms 547 of the Valenciennes Bibliothèque Municipale from Hasnon Abbey (Ha) and the thirteenth-century BL Add. 15820 from the Abbey of St. Maria of Camberon (Cambrai). We have also been able to identify a number of distinctive readings shared by these two manuscripts and this edition.
  3. c. 1475 Lübeck (lüb). ISTC no. ij00483000.<sup>548</sup> No date or place of publication is given in the edition, but the well-documented career of the publisher Lucas Brandis makes it possible to identify him as the publisher. It is generally assumed that the book was published in 1475 or 1476 in Lübeck, but a date as early as 1473-1474 has also been suggested.<sup>549</sup> Of the manuscripts we have seen, this edition appears to be closest to three manuscripts of British origin: BL Harley 5116, BL Royal 13E viii, and Royal 13D vi and vii (Alb). See the discussion of the Table of Contents (sections 2.7.1-3) for examples of striking agreements between this edition and Royal 13D vii over against the rest of the texts we have seen. Note also the fact that lüb and Alb alone have the John the Baptist passage in chapter 12 and the James passage in chapter 16.
  4. 1481 Venice (1481ven). ISTC no. ij00485000. Edited by Hieronymus Squarzafricanus (Gerolamo Squarzafico) and printed by Reynaldus de

547 “L’imprimeur du Flavius Josèphe,” *Le cinquième centenaire de l’imprimerie dans les Anciens Pays-Bas. Exposition à la Bibliothèque royale Albert 1<sup>er</sup>. Bruxelles (du 11 septembre au 27 octobre 1973). Catalogue* (Brussels: Bibliothèque royale Albert 1<sup>er</sup>, 1973), 182-94.

548 Digital copy: [http://dfg-viewer.de/show/?set%5Bmets%5D=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digital-sammlungen.de%2F%2F7Edb%2Fmets%2Fbsb00032799\\_mets.xml](http://dfg-viewer.de/show/?set%5Bmets%5D=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digital-sammlungen.de%2F%2F7Edb%2Fmets%2Fbsb00032799_mets.xml)

549 T. Gerardy, “Gallizianimarke, Krone und Turm als Wasserzeichen in grossformatigen Frühdrucken,” *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 46 (1971): 11–23 at 22; U. Altmann, *Die Leistungen der Drucker mit Namen Brandis im Rahmen der Buchgeschichte des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Diss. Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1975), 31.

- Novimagio.<sup>550</sup> Vol. 1: *AJ* (10 May 1481; incorrectly given as 1400 in the colophon); Vol 2: *BJ* and *CAp* (31 March 1481). The text of the *Antiquities* is taken over from the 1470 Augsburg *editio princeps*. The *Bellum* and *Contra Apionem*, however, are copied from the 1480 Verona edition, edited by Ludovicus Cendrata and published by Peter Maufer, which follows closely Dresden MS A 111 (1438 C.E.).<sup>551</sup>
5. 1486 Venice (1486ven). ISTC no. ij00486000. Printed by Johannes Rubens Vercellensis, Oct. 23, 1486.<sup>552</sup> The text of this edition is taken from the 1481 Venice edition, including chapter divisions and punctuation.
  6. 1499 Venice (1499ven). ISTC no. ij00487000. Printed by Albertinus Vercellensis for Octavianus Scotus and his brother, 23 Oct. 1499.<sup>553</sup> The text is the same as in the 1486 edition with some corrections (and new printer's errors). The most significant change is the addition of chapter summaries by Franciscus de Macerata.
  7. 1502 Venice (1502ven). Printed by Bernardinus Vercellensis, 21 Oct. 1502.<sup>554</sup> The text is from the 1499 Venice edition with corrections of obvious errors. Notes at the beginning of Latin *BJ* 7 (Greek *BJ* 6/7) and at the point in Latin *BJ* 7 where Greek *BJ* 7 begins indicate that the author had access to Greek manuscripts, something that to our knowledge has not been noted in modern scholarship, which generally assumes that Greek manuscripts did not influence the Latin editions until the 1534 Basel edition.<sup>555</sup>
  8. 1510 Venice (1510ven). Printed by Gregorius de Gregoriis, 29 Oct. 1510.<sup>556</sup> Reproduces the text of the 1502 Venice edition.
  9. 1511 Paris (1511par). Printed by Nicholaus de Pratis.<sup>557</sup> Based on the text of the 1499 Venice edition.

---

550 Digital copy: [http://dfg-viewer.de/show/?set\[mets\]=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb00054779\\_mets.xml](http://dfg-viewer.de/show/?set[mets]=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb00054779_mets.xml)

551 See Boysen, xxi for the use of Dresden MS A 111 for *CAp*.

552 Digital copy: <http://diglib.hab.de/wdb.php?dir=inkunabeln/212-4-hist-2f>

553 Digital copy: [http://dfg-viewer.de/show/?set\[mets\]=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb00054706\\_mets.xml](http://dfg-viewer.de/show/?set[mets]=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb00054706_mets.xml)

554 <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10195572.html>

555 *Liber hic in graecis codicibus non septimus est sed vi* (p. ccxlvii); *Hoc est in graecis codicibus vii. libro principiu(m)* (p. ccliii).

556 Digital copy: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10139713.html>

557 Downloadable copy: [https://download.digitale-sammlungen.de/BOOKS/pdf\\_download.pl?id=bsb11054328](https://download.digitale-sammlungen.de/BOOKS/pdf_download.pl?id=bsb11054328)

10. 1513/1514 Milan (mil). Printed by Alexander Minutianus.<sup>558</sup> *AJ, BJ, CAp*, and ps-Hegesippus. Colophon at end of *AJ* is dated 10 Jan. 1514, but the colophon at the end of *CAp* (before ps-Heg.) reads “Mediolani Apud Alexandrum Minutianum. MDXIII.” New page numbers start with ps- Heg. The Josephus texts are taken over from the 1499 Venice edition.
11. 1513/1514 Paris (1514par). Edited by Robert Goulet and printed by Jean Barbier, François Regnault, and Jean Petit.<sup>559</sup> *AJ, BJ, CAp*, ps-Hegesippus. There are several colophons: 30 Jan. 1513 (after preface); 1513 (after *AJ*); 1 Dec. 1513 (after *CAp* and before supplementary material); 30 March 1514 (after supplementary material, but before ps-Heg.). The text of Josephus is based on the c. 1475 Lübeck edition, but there are some readings from the 1502 or 1510 Venice edition.
12. 1519 Paris (1519par). A reprint of the 1513/1514 Paris edition by the same editor and printers.<sup>560</sup> A few printer’s errors have been introduced.
13. 1524 Cologne (1524col). Edited by Jacob Sobius and published by Eucharius Cervicornus (Hirtzhorn) with the support of Gottfried Hittorp, Feb. 1, 1524.<sup>561</sup> *AJ, BJ, CAp, 4Macc*. Based on monastery records, Stüwer demonstrates that Berlin Lat 226 (Werd) was used in the production of this edition.<sup>562</sup> While we have found clear evidence of this, especially in *AJ*, there are many (often inferior) readings taken from one of the Venice editions.
14. 1524 Basel (1524bas). Printed by Johann Froben, September, 1524. *AJ, BJ, CAp, 4Macc*.<sup>563</sup> In the passages we have analyzed, this edition, which is widely reputed to be the best available, reproduces the text of the 1524 Cologne edition with occasional emendations.

The 1534 Basel edition, on which the 1534 Cologne edition was based, was thoroughly emended by Gelenius on the basis of Greek manuscript evidence. Since

---

558 Downloadable copy: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10139716.html>

559 Digital copy: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10195574.html>

560 Digital copy: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10139718.html>

561 Digital copy: <http://www.bsb-muenchen-digital.de/~web/web1013/bsb10139721/images/index.html?digID=bsb10139721&pimage=1&v=pdf&nav=0&l=de>

562 “Zur Geschichte einer rheinischen Handschrift.”

563 [http://books.google.com.mx/books/about/Flavii\\_Josephi\\_Opera\\_quaedam.html?id=-OQ9AAAAcAAJ](http://books.google.com.mx/books/about/Flavii_Josephi_Opera_quaedam.html?id=-OQ9AAAAcAAJ)

the 1534 editions became the basis for all later editions, no edition after 1524 provides a reliable witness to the Latin manuscript tradition.<sup>564</sup>

#### 4.4 Chapter Locations in Early Printed Editions

The *Testimonium* is found in *AJ* 18, ch. 5 in paris; ch. 6 in 1524; ch. 8 in lüb; ch. 9 in aug,<sup>565</sup> ven, 1511par, and mil; and ch. 10 in na1475. The John the Baptist passage is found in *AJ* 18, ch. 9 in paris; ch. 10 in 1524; ch. 12 in lüb; ch. 14 in aug,<sup>566</sup> ven, 1511par, and mil; and ch. 17 in na1475. The passage on James is found in bk. 20, ch. 7 in paris; ch. 16 in na 1475 and lüb; and ch. 21 in aug, ven, 1511par, and mil.

## 5 Appendix II: Texts of Jerome and Rufinus

### 5.1 *Jerome, De viris illustribus* 13<sup>567</sup>

1. Iosephus Matthiae filius, ex Hierosolymis sacerdos a Vespasiano captus, cum Tito filio eius relictus est . . . 4. Hic in octavo decimo *Antiquitatum* libro manifestissime confitetur propter magnitudinem signorum Christum a Pharisaeis interfectum et Iohannem Baptistam vere prophetam fuisse et propter interfectionem Iacobi apostoli Hierosolymam dirutam. 5. Scripsit autem de Domino in hunc modum: Eodem tempore fuit Iesus, sapiens vir, si tamen virum eum oportet dicere. Erat enim mirabilium patrator operum et doctor eorum qui libenter vera suscipiunt, plurimos quoque tam de Iudaeis quam de gentibus sui habuit sectatores et credebatur esse Christus. 6. Cumque invidia nostrorum principum cruci eum Pilatus addixisset, nihilo minus qui primum dilexerant perseveraverunt. Apparuit enim eis tertia die vivens, multa et haec et alia mirabilia carminibus prophetarum de eo vaticinantibus, et usque hodie Christianorum gens ab eo sortita vocabulum non defecit.

564 The 1528 Lyons edition (Lugdunum incorrectly identified as Leiden by Schreckenberg, *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus* [Leiden: Brill, 1968], 7) is a reprint of the 1524 Basel edition.

565 Chapter 8 in Table of Contents.

566 Chapter 13 in Table of Contents.

567 *Gerolamo. Gli uomini illustri. De viris illustribus*, ed. Aldo Ceresa-Gastaldo (Florence: Nardini Editore, 1988), 100-103 (with a critical apparatus and facing Italian translation). For an English translation, see T. P. Halton, *Saint Jerome: On Illustrious Men* (FC 100; Washington, D.C.: CUA Press, 1999), 28-29.

5.2. *Rufinus' Translation of Eusebius' Citation of Josephus' Account of the Death of James (HE 2.23.21-24)*<sup>568</sup>

Mittit autem Caesar Albinum Iudaeae praefectum Festi morte conperta. Ananias autem iunior, quem pontificatum suscepisse supra diximus, protervus admodum et insolens moribus haeresim defendebat Sadducaeorum, qui in iudiciis crudeliores ceteris Iudaeis videntur, sicut iam supra ostendimus. Hic insolentiae suae tempus datum credens ex morte Festi consessum iudicum convocat et introducit in medium fratrem Iesu, qui dicitur Christus, Iacobum nomine, et alios quam plurimos, quos velut contra legem gerere incusans tradidit lapidandos. Quod facinus si qui ex civibus modestior fuit et aequi ac legis observantior, gravissime tulit. Qui etiam occulte legationem ad Caesarem mittunt, orantes eum scribere Ananiae, ne haec agat, quia nec prius huiusmodi facinora recte commiserit. Quidam autem ex ipsis etiam Albino occurrunt de Alexandria ad ipsos iter agenti atque edocent, quod non licuerit Ananiae se inconsulto consessum iudicum convocare. At ille commotus ex his, quae dicta sunt, cum indignatione scribit ad Ananiam comminatus ablaturum se ab eo iudicandi potestatem, qua non recte utebatur, quia et Agrippa rex eum tribus solis mensibus functum hoc honore privaverit et Iesum Dammaei filium in locum eius subrogaverit.<sup>569</sup>

---

568 Schwartz-Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke* 2.1:173 and 175. Eusebius' quotation from Josephus begins with the first sentence of *AJ* 20.197 (Πέμπει δὲ Καίσαρ Ἀλβίνον εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἔπαρχον Φήστου τὴν τελευτὴν πυθόμενος) and then skips to *AJ* 20.199 without an indication that there is intervening material.

569 We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and members of the *JSJ* editorial board for their comments and suggestions. We are also deeply grateful to the following individuals and institutions for assistance in our research: Austin Lee Ard, Tara Baldrick-Morrone, Jennifer Collins-Elliott, Roberto De La Noval, François Dupuigrenet-Desroussilles, Kirk Essary, Michael Luesebrink, Chelsea Stutz, Ivy Sun, Shirley Sun, the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the British Library, the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library, the Huntington Library, the Pierpont Morgan Library, College of the Holy Cross, the Florida State University Library Interlibrary Loan Division, and the Florida State University Library Monograph Acquisitions staff, who obtained a number of microfilms with the help of a Faculty Research Library Materials Grant.