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INTRODUCTION

The Yosippon, or Sefer Yosef ben Gorion, as it is often referred to, is an early historical composition anonymously authored. The book begins with an account of the spread of the human race and the European peoples, giving a geographical description of the distribution of these nations. The author, however, concentrates his work on the historical narrative of the Second Temple era, beginning with the return from the Babylonian Exile and the rebuilding of the Temple through its destruction. He discusses the reign of Seleucus in Syria and Ptolemy in Egypt; he concentrates on the succession of the Hasmonaean rulers; he dwells on the reign of Herod, the war against Rome, the siege and the fall of Jerusalem and the Massada epic.

The Yosippon was widely read by both scholars and the masses. Its popularity is attested to by the many republications of its text - Mantua (1480), Constantinople (1510), Cracow (1588, 1599), Venice (1544), Frankfurt a. M. (1689), Gotha (1707, 1710), Amsterdam (1723), Prague (1784), Warsaw (1845, 1871), Jatomir (1851), Lemberg (1855), Berdichev (1896-1913) and, most recently, in Jerusalem (1961).
addition to the republication of the Hebrew text the
Yosippon was also translated into Latin by Sebastian
Munster, Arabic, Ethiopic and old Slavonic. An English
translation of this history by Peter Morvvyng was pub-
lished in 1558, entitled A Compendious and Most Marueilous
History of the Latter Tymes of the Jewes Commune Weale. 4

The Yosippon served as the prime authority on Jewish
history for the traditional biblical and Talmudic commen-
tators, who frequently quoted from it when they sought to
illustrate their interpretation with historic example and
precedent.

The Spanish Talmudist and biblical commentator, Moses
ben Nahman (RaMBaN, d. 1270), refers to the Yosippon
in his comment on Genesis 49.31. "And I found this recorded
in the book of Joseph ben Gorion as well as in other ancient
sources." 5 In his Talmudic commentary to B. Gittin, 36a,
regarding the sanctification of the Jubilee year, there is
the reference, "And evidence to this can be found in the
book of Joseph ben Gorion the Priest who says that the
Jubilee was sanctified in the days of one of the Hasmonean
Kings." 6

We similarly find the Yosippon referred to by David
Kimhi (ReDaK, 1160-1235), the French grammarian and
commentator. He used this history to explain a verse in
Ezekiel, 27.17, regarding a certain aromatic oil that was processed in Jericho. In his comment to Haggai, 2.6, he writes, "It is also recorded in the book of Joseph ben Gorion that in the days of Herod there was a severe hunger." To verse 9 of that chapter the ReDaK uses the Yosippon as a source for the Temple built by Herod. He identifies Meshech in Psalms, 120.4, as the Tushkanites, with a reference to the Yosippon.

The Spanish scholar, Abraham ibn Ezra (1092-1167), utilizes the Yosippon in his comments as well. Examples of his references can be found in Haggai, 2.9, regarding the duration of the Second Temple, and in Daniel, 9.24, concerning the daily sacrifices that were offered prior to the Temple destruction.

The Book of Joseph ben Gorion also served as a source for the French exegete, Rabbi Samuel ben Meir (RaSHBaM, 1085-1174). To the verse in Genesis, 36.1, that introduces the section dealing with the generations of Essau in Edom, the RaSHBaM refers to the Yosippon who records an additional forty kings to this listing.

Most extensive use of the Yosippon was made by the French biblical and Talmudic commentator par excellence, Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac (Rashi, 1040-1105). In Haggai, 2.6, for example, Rashi refers to this history for support that in the days of the Hasmonaeans the Judeans enjoyed the
blessings of God and divine providence. In his comment to Daniel, 8.21, he uses the *Yosippon* as evidence for Alexander's killing of Darius and for the identification of Darius as the son of Esther. To verse 11 of that chapter he speaks of the rejection of the sacrifice sent by Emperor Nero to the Temple, again referring to the *Book of Joseph ben Gorion*. In Daniel, 11.17, he again refers to the *Yosippon* regarding Antiochus' decrees against the Jews. In his commentary to Ezekiel, 27.17, Rashi also refers to the *Yosippon* in discussing the vegetation found in Jericho and the source for the name of this city.

In his interpretation of the Talmud, Rashi also utilizes the *Yosippon* for his historical comments. In B.Yoma, 23a, he refers to Joseph ben Gorion regarding Herod's extensive building programs.

An interesting reference to the *Yosippon* is found in Tosafot, B. Avoda Zara, 10b, where the nature and structure of the leadership in Rome is discussed. The term Caesar is explained and its source is referred to.

In addition to using the *Yosippon* as a source for the historical comments incorporated in their biblical and Talmudic interpretations, medieval scholars of note studied this historical text and redacted and abridged the narrative.
Abraham ibn Daud of Toledo (1110-1181) preserved an abridged text of the Yosippon which he called Divre Malche Yisrael be-Bayit Sheni. 21 Judah Leon ben Moses Mosconi, in his Hakdamah le-Yosippon, 22 written in Spain the 14th century, refers to this abbreviated edition and to another text that was in the possession of Samuel ha-Naggid. 23

That the Yosippon was used not only by scholars but was widely read by the people is indicated by the recorded legal opinions concerning its reading on certain days when secular literature was not to be read.

In the Shulchan Aruch (Laws of the Sabbath, ch. 307, paragraph 17), Rabbi Joseph Karo concludes a law that on the Sabbath and the Festivals it is prohibited to study anything but the Torah. 24 In his commentary on the four Turim of Rabbi Jacob ben Asher (1631-1640), entitled Bayit Hadash, Rabbi Joel ben Samuel Sirkes (the Bach, 1561-1640) writes that this rule does not include the reading of the Yosippon; that the Book of Joseph ben Gorion may be read on the Sabbath even in translation, for from its contents one can derive a measure of piety and the "fear of heaven." 25

Rabbi Mordecai Jaffe (1530-1612), the noted codifier of rabbinic law, author of the Lebush, similarly concludes that the Yosippon may be read on the ninth day of Ab (Tisha be-Ab), the day of mourning that commemorates the Temple's destruction, when biblical books, with few exceptions, may not be read. 26
The purpose for citing these various references and quotations is not merely to stress the prominence that the Yosippon enjoyed amongst the medieval commentators. There is a singular significance associated with this listing for it is referred to in the attempted determination of the date of the Yosippon's composition.

Although I. Baer insists that the earliest mention of the Yosippon is by Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac (Rashi) in the 11th century, there is much validity to an earlier dating of the Yosippon. Ibn Hazm, who died in the year 1063, was acquainted with an Arabic translation of this history made by a Jew in Yemen. In a Leyden MS (cat. # 1982) Ibn Hazm writes:

"Yusuf ibn Koryon lived until the time of Christ (on whom be peace) and gave an account of their kings and wars till the murder of Yahya son of Zecharia (on whom he speaks most favorably, and whom he praises highly, asserting that he was unjustly killed for speaking the truth. He also speaks favorably of baptism, which he does not disapprove nor regard as useless. Speaking of that king (Herod son of Herod), he says: 'This king put to death many of the Sages of Israel, and of their great and good men.' And he mentions no more than this of the history of Jesus Christ the Son of Mary (on whom be peace)."

Professor D. Chwolson deduces from this reference
that the Yosippon was composed in the 10th century. He argues that at least 150 years or 175 years must be allowed for from the time of the original composition in Italy until its translation from the Hebrew into Arabic in Yemen and its subsequent return to Spain where Ibn Hazm lived and wrote. This would lead to the conclusion that the Yosippon was written some time in the 10th century, probably in the earlier half of the century.

Jacob Mann published a fragment of a letter written by Rabbi Judah ben Jacob of Rome to concerning a certain Samuel who had prepared a copy of the Yosippon for him which was subsequently stolen. The letter refers to persecutions of the Jewish communities in Otranto and mentions Rabbi Abraham ben Yehoshaphat, the Rabbi of Oria, who managed to escape the vandalism. Mann suggests that this refers to the persecutions of Byzantine Jewry under Emperor Romanos Lekapenos (919-944), and specifically to the Saracen raid on Oria in 925. He rightly identifies with Hasdai ibn Shaprut (d.978), who may have been requested to intercede on behalf of his people. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt that in 925 Ibn Shaprut was already acquainted with the Yosippon, requesting that a copy be prepared for him.

An even earlier usage of the Yosippon is alluded to in the works of Saadia Gaon (892-942). H. Malter suggests the Saadia utilized the Yosippon for information regarding
the history of the Second Commonwealth in the eighth chapter of his *Emunot ve-Deot*. In his commentary to Daniel, 11.18, Saadia refers to the general, Joseph ben Gorion, who was designated to take part in the war against Rome. This, of course, is found in the *Yosippon* as well as in Josephus. It is, however, highly improbable to assume that Saadia used the Greek work of Josephus as a direct source. Saadia's historic reference would, therefore, represent the earliest recorded usage of the *Yosippon*. Internal evidence, however, indicates that this work was composed centuries earlier.

It is interesting to note that despite its wide usage and unquestioned acceptance by the medieval scholars, the very basics and fundamentals of the *Yosippon* are enveloped in mystery and the subjects of scholarly controversy. I already alluded to the question of the date of its composition, which will be fully discussed at a later portion of this study. Of equal importance are the questions relating to the identification of the author and his purpose for the composition.

In the Middle Ages it was assumed that Joseph ben Gorion was the name of the author of this Hebrew history, hence the title, *Safer Josef ben Gorion*, the Book of Joseph ben Gorion. Furthermore, Joseph ben Gorion was identified as Flavius Josephus, who led the revolution against Rome in the Galilee. It was believed that in addition to The
Jewish War that he wrote for the Romans in Greek he also wrote a history of the war for his own people in Hebrew, and that this is the Yosippon. The foundation for this assumption is a reference in The Jewish War, where Josephus writes: "(I) propose to provide the subjects of the Roman Empire with a narrative of the facts, by translating into Greek the account which I previously composed in my vernacular tongue....." The implication seems to be an obvious one, that the Greek work was based upon an already existing Hebrew composition. This was the prevalent opinion.

This approach becomes even more plausible if we find it explicitly expressed in the Yosippon itself. "And further information regarding him (Cyrus) is written in the Book of the Kings of the Medes and the Persians and in the book that I, Joseph the Priest, the son of Gorion the Priest, wrote for the Romans, and this book is called Josephus. And I am Joseph the son of Gorion whom Titus and Vespasian exiled from Jerusalem.....And, behold, this book I, Joseph the son of Gorion the Priest, wrote for Israel." Similarly we read: "And all six books I wrote in the Hebrew language, and all six are the writings of Joseph the Priest, son of Gorion, and the six were composed under the name Yosippon."

This opinion is stated by Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi, who compiled Sefer Zichronot in 1325: "And Joseph ben Gorion the Priest, his father's name was Mattias and his
surname, Gorion, this Joseph the son of Mattias the Priest wrote many books in Judaea.  

A similar approach is taken by Abraham Conat, the editor of the Mantua edition of the Yosippon (1480), in the epilogue to the book:

"Abraham Conat says:.....I saw fit to write this honorable book that was composed by a godly man, an appointed leader a Priest to the God above, who is named Joseph ben Gorion. In addition to the books of wisdom that he authored, for he was the foremost of authors since the days of King Solomon, peace be upon him.....regarding Joseph ben Gorion's bravery on behalf of the People of God and His Temple, and how, through his wisdom, he saved himself.....and of his debates with the people of Jerusalem in the days of Vespasian and his son, Titus.....and all that transpired until the destruction of our Temple, may it be speedily rebuilt in our own days, Amen."  

This opinion was also accepted by Peter Morvvyng who, on the title page of his English edition of 1558, writes that this book was written "in Hebrew by Joseph ben Gorion, a nobleman of the same countrey, who saw the most things himselfe, and was the author and doer of a great part of the same."

Mosconi, writing in Spain in the 14th century, identifies Joseph ben Gorion as the author of the Yosippon and places him in the period of the war against Rome. Joseph was from a prominent family in Jerusalem, Mosconi
Yosippon does not allude to an author. The references to Joseph ben Gorion do not imply that he was the author, but rather that he was the source for the author who remains anonymous. And, indeed, Josephus was the prime source for the composition of the Yosippon.

While there is general agreement that Josephus was not the author and that this Hebrew history was composed at a later period, the scholars are divided in their opinions regarding the Yosippon's date of composition and country of origin. Their conclusions, based upon investigations of the text, are diverse, ranging from the 4th century to the 10th century.

Not only is the person of the author questioned, but the purpose of the Yosippon is doubted as well. L. Zunz was probably the first to doubt the authenticity of the book. Such doubt and suspicion are openly expressed by S. Fraenkel who refers to the anonymous author as an imposter, whose only creation was to add dialogue and elaboration to Josephus' simple narrative. Fraenkel concludes that the author attempted to give his volume the appearance of antiquity by incorporating a biblical phraseology and by identifying himself as Flavius Josephus. He labels the author a fraud, whose sole purpose was to mislead the readers, and he suggests that the Yosippon has no validity as a historical source. A similar conclusion is reached by D. S. Margulluth, who rejects the historical
significance of the Yosippon, referring to it as "a spurious Hebrew book.....the futility of which was apparent to the first critical reader." 56

Having ascertained the status that the Yosippon enjoyed amongst the traditional commentators and philosophers of the Middle Ages, and having discussed the doubts and suspicions directed against this Hebrew history by some scholars, I will now present the purpose of this study and investigation.

Firstly we will attempt to validate the Yosippon as a historical source and to answer the arguments directed against its anonymous author and at the purpose for its composition. Part One of this dissertation is devoted to this task.

In order to discuss the problems related to the Yosippon properly and to determine the purpose of its author, we must first distinguish between the different editions and recensions of the Yosippon that are available to us. In Chapter One of Part One we discuss in full detail the Hebrew recensions of the Yosippon, the English Yosippon, the unpublished MS in Sefer Zichronot
of Jerahmeel ben Shelomoh (The Chronicle of Jerahmeel) and the abbreviated Yosippon text preserved by Abraham ibn Daud. The differences between these recensions will be discussed and their unique peculiarities will be examined and compared.

The analysis of these differences are presented in Chapter Two. In this discussion we will determine the line of transmission of the text of the Yosippon and we will attempt to isolate certain of the interpolations that were included in the narrative by later copyists and editors. In this study we will show that the factors that led some scholars to conclude a late dating for the Yosippon and to suspect the author of falsification are not reflected in the original text but are based upon these subsequent interpolations. This comparative study presents us with the general content of the Ur-Yosippon and, hence, with a direction to the approach of the author.

Part Two concerns itself with a second aspect of this study. Having discussed the background and the history of the Yosippon and having isolated the sections that were interpolated into its text, we proceed to compare the historical narrative of this Hebrew history with that of The Jewish War, by Flavius Josephus, its primary source.
In Chapter Two of Part Two we classify in detail the differences between the two narratives, both the technical differences and the respective variations in their reports of the historical experiences in the war of the Judaeans against the Romans. This comparative investigation covers the era from Florus through the burning of Masada.

In the subsequent chapters of Part Two these variations are discussed and critically analyzed. From this discussion the unique approach taken by the author of the Yosippon to the war becomes evident, distinguishing it from that of Josephus. The purpose of the author, expressed consistently throughout the Hebrew narrative, explains the many variations between the two respective texts. The chapters of Part Two discuss the various ramifications of these differences in approach regarding the expressed motivations for the Judaean war, the explanations and rationalizations offered for the defeat, the reverence that the Roman leadership expressed to the Temple and Jerusalem, and the image of the Judaean throughout the battles of the revolution. In the course of the narrative, the Yosippon makes frequent reference to certain theological and eschatological approaches. These are discussed and compared in the last chapter of Part Two.

In Part Three of this study we present a series of excurseses, consisting of representative sections of the
Yosippon that serve to illustrate the comparisons, the discussions and the conclusions of Part Two. The study is concluded with Part Four, consisting of the notes and the bibliography.

A special note of appreciation is expressed to my revered guide and teacher, Professor Solomon Zeitlin, for his constant interest and assistance. His encouragement was invaluable. My sincere thanks to Professor Solomon Grayzel and Professor Israel Efros for their critical comments and suggestion. My gratitude to Miss Sara Zausmer for her guidance, assistance and advice regarding the necessary requirements and procedures in the course of my affiliation with Dropsie University.
PART ONE
CHAPTER ONE

THE RECENSIONS OF THE YOSIPPON

THE HEBREW EDITIONS

The Hebrew text of the Yosippon is available in numerous editions. These, however, are to be classified into two major recensions.

The first of these is represented by the Mantua Edition (1480), edited by Abraham ben Solomon Conat. This is the earliest publication of the Yosippon that we have. The Basle edition of 1541, which includes a Latin translation of the first five books by Sebastian Munster, is based upon the narrative of the Mantua edition. The most recent republication of this text was edited by Gunzberg and Kahane in Berditchev (1896-1913). ¹

The second recension of the Yosippon is represented by the Constantinople edition of 1510, which was arranged with a preface by Tam ibn Yahya ben David. This edition is far more elaborate in its narrative than the Mantua text. It is, therefore, generally accepted as the more corrupt text, embellished with the elaborations and interpolations of later copyists. ² This text was republished in Venice in 1544, ³ and due to its clear form and perfected style, most of the subsequent republications of
the Yosippon are based upon the Constantinople text.

Whereas the Mantua text consists of a single narrative, without chapter subdivisions, the Constantinople edition is divided into six books and 97 chapters. From the text of the ed. C. it seems that this structure was not a later insertion but that it was the original intent of the author.

In the Third Book Joseph ben Gorion delineates the organization of the narrative. And I describe all the families, the nations and the countries mentioned therein (in the Yosippon) in the First Book. I do the same in the Second Book, and in it I begin to relate the stories of Alexander of Macedon. And in the Third Book I speak of what occurred after the death of Alexander and of the division of his Empire. I recorded all the experiences of our ancestors with the Roman Emperors, with the Greek Emperors and the Kings of other nations until the Kingdom of the Hasmonaean Priests. And in the Fourth Book I write of the occurrences from the beginning of the Hasmonaean until the end of Alexander's reign. And in the Fifth Book I write of our ancestors' experiences from the end of the rule of Alexander, the wife of Alexander, the son of Hyrcanus of the reign of her two sons over Israel, they are Hyrcanus and Aristobulus the sons of Alexander, until the time came when I was to fight the Wars of the Lord. And what I saw in my days and witnessed
with my eyes, as I fought the War of the Lord to the best of my ability, I recorded in the sixth book...

The differences between these recensions are, however, far beyond the structural organization of the narrative.

A comparison of the texts indicates that though both versions concern themselves with the same historical sequence and record the same historic experience, the ed.C introduces variations not found in the ed.M.

1. The ed.C. explains that Johanan, son of Simon, was given the name Hyrcanus in memory of his older brother who was killed by Ptolemy. The ed.M. does not record this explanation.

2. The Yosippon describes the joint campaign of Hyrcanus and Antiochus against Indates. We are informed that Hyrcanus stopped for two days to celebrate Shavuot, that was followed by the Sabbath that year. Ed.C. introduces a new explanation for Hyrcanus' halt, that he now became involved in an intrigue with Arsaces against Antiochus.

3. We find, too, that certain situations that are reported in an indecisive fashion in the ed.M are recorded as factual in the ed.C. The familial
ancestry of Antipater, for example, is questioned in the ed.M, with one opinion that he was of Edomite origin and another that he was of a Judaean extraction. The ed.C, however, reports it with certainty that he was of Judaean background.

The most obvious difference between the two recensions is the voluminous narrative of ed.C, far larger than the text preserved in the ed.M.

A comparative study of the two versions provides the explanation for this difference, the features that resulted in the larger text of the ed.C. Firstly, the ed.C includes in its narrative sections not recorded in the ed.M. The lavish description of the coronation ceremonies of Emperor Vespasian, for example, is found in ed.C but not in ed.M. We also find that the reports of certain historic episodes are recorded in ed.C in a more elaborate form, with monologues and dialogues not alluded to in the ed.M.

As the narrative in ed.C records the acts of Eleazar ben Ananus and the developing revolutionary spirit amongst the Judaeanis against the Romans, the author includes a soliloquy of consolation, expressing the faithful hope for the third rebuilding of the Temple.

When Emperor Nero wants to appease the Judaeanis, attempting to put a halt to the increased tensions, he
sent a sacrifice to the Temple in Jerusalem. The ed.C records this incident associated with a plea from the Emperor for peace and an assurance that Roman cruelty against the Judaeans will cease.\textsuperscript{13} This is not recorded in the ed.M.

In the same episode King Agrippa attempts to influence Elazar against the rejection of the Emperor's sacrifice and gift to the Temple. A dialogue between Agrippa and Elazar is included in the ed.C,\textsuperscript{14} but not recorded in the ed.M.

We find, too, that descriptions, conversations and speeches recorded in the ed.M in brevity are included in the ed.C with much elaboration, adding to the verbiage and the pages of the latter recension.

The Alexander Romance, for example, forms a large section in the ed.C,\textsuperscript{15} but is included in a more abbreviated fashion in the ed.M.\textsuperscript{16} The description of the Roman method of warfare and a detailed description of the battering ram is found in the ed.C,\textsuperscript{17} but it is only briefly described in the ed.M.\textsuperscript{18}

Not only are these major sections the examples of prolonged narrative in the ed.C, but elaboration is the rule throughout the volume. This is well illustrated by the text of Josephus' prayer to God in the cave in Jotapata,\textsuperscript{19} and his subsequent exhortation to his compan-
ions to submit to the drawing of lots. 20

There is, however, another characteristic true of the ed.C, differentiating it from the ed.M. Nowhere in the published Mantua text is the name of an individual mentioned who could be identified as the author of the Yosippon. The ed.C, however, does allude to the name of an author. In a number of biographical sketches, dispersed throughout the narrative, he is identified as Flavius Josephus, the Judaean general in the revolt against Rome, and this Hebrew work is explained to be the history that Josephus wrote for the Jews, in distinction to the Greek history that he wrote for the Romans. As a result of these inclusions, the Yosippon was viewed by many scholars as a valueless source, as a fraud, in which the author masqueraded and falsified Josephus’ works, imbuing his elaborations with a pseudepigraphic character, attempting to mislead his readers. 21

"And, behold, this book I, Joseph the son of Gorion the Priest, wrote for the Jews and its narrative I related.....And whatever I saw in my own days and witnessed with my eyes, fighting the War of the Lord to the best of my ability, I recording in the Sixth Book. And the Sixth Book is entitled Yosippon, in the Hebrew language; it is also called The War of the Lord. In Greek it is known as Josipum, and in the language of the Romans, Josephus, for
this is my name amongst them. And it is known by those names.....for what I related I saw and witnessed with my own eyes.....And all six books I wrote in the Hebrew language, and all six of them are the books of Joseph the Priest, the son of Gorion, and the six are known by the name Yosippon."22

The authorship of the Yosippon is again referred to in the introductory remarks to the Alexander Romance. "This is what Joseph ben Gorion the Priest states to those who read his books:.....my testimony regarding him (Alexander) is based upon that which I found in the works of Strabo and Nicolaus of Damascus and Titus, the Roman Scribe; and upon that which I found in the books regarding Alexander composed by the wise men of Egypt, well versed in nature and astrology....."23

"And in the 134th year.....I, Joseph the Priest, the son of Gorion the Priest, was born. And I am Joseph who is known as Josephus, the Jew, who is spoken of throughout the world because he wrote The War of the Lord, and this is the sixth section of this book....."24

This is further evident in the author's comments regarding the construction of Herod's Temple. "And Joseph the Priest, son of Gorion the Priest, said as follows: All that we have related here we have seen with our own eyes and we have rejoiced.....And what we have written
regarding the construction of the Temple is merely an abbreviation of a large relation. And in the book that we wrote for the Romans we recorded the full report of the work."25

The most explicit identification of the author of the Yosippon with Flavius Josephus is found in the report regarding the selection of generals for the revolution against Rome. "And when the Jews heard all these things, they selected three princes and warriors from the princes of Judaea and Jerusalem. I, Joseph ben Gorion, who with the help of God was a great warrior, and Ananus the Priest, and his son, Elazar the Priest. ... The whole Galilee, from the land of Naftali onwards, was (given) to Joseph the son of Gorion the Priest with respect and honor. And they called him Yosippon. ..."26

Similarly, when, toward the end of the narrative, the author speaks of the parents of Joseph ben Gorion, this identification is a forthright one. "And Gorion the Priest, the father of Joseph the Priest, who wrote this book for the Jews as a memorial and testimony, was at this time imprisoned."27

We find frequent references that serve to distinguish between the Hebrew and Greek works, implying that both were written by the same author. Regarding Alexander Jannai, for example, we read: "And more regarding his
power and achievement, is recorded in the book of Joseph ben Gorion that is with the Romans. 28 Similarly, regarding the reign of Salome Alexandra: "And further information regarding her achievement, her proper conduct, her righteousness and wisdom, her good relations with the kings of all the nations, the dignity and power that Israel enjoyed in her days, are recorded in the book that Joseph the Priest authored for the Roman Kings. 29

This is more explicitly stated as part of the author's exhortation regarding the honesty and integrity that are so necessary for historians. "And, behold, I, Joseph the Priest, collected many things from the books of other reliable authors who wrote of the tribulations suffered by our ancestors and which were lost, for the book that I wrote as a testimony and memorial for Israel. I did the same for my larger work that I wrote for the elders of Rome. 30

Similarly, in his description of the exemplary courage of the Priests the author writes: "And furthermore Joseph the Priest says: There are many things that I wrote in the book that was composed as a memorial for the Kings of Rome that are not recorded here, for they are not proper to be written for a holy people. 31

When the author refers to the wisdom of the Jews,
he writes: "And Joseph ben Gorion said in his book as follows: There are many things that we can record here regarding the wisdom of the Nation of God, for there were no wise people in the world to compare to the People of God, and wisdom did not reign amongst another people, only amongst the People of God. But of this we wrote in the book for the Romans, for that book required this type of testimony. But this book (the Yosippon), written for the Jews, does not require this, for the high standard of wisdom is well known amongst the Jews...."  

The implications of these differences between the recensions of the Yosippon regarding the authenticity of the work and the purpose of the author are discussed in a further section of this study.  

THE HEBREW YOSIPPON IN SEFER ZICHRONOT (JERAHMEEL)  

In the Bodleian Library in Oxford there is a Hebrew MS entitled Sefer Zichronot (The Book of Recollections), copied and added to by Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi in the Rhine Provinces in 1325, from a chronicle originally written and compiled by Jerahmeel ben Shelomoh in Southern Italy in the 11th century. This vast MS contains a continuous narrative from the creation of the
world until the destruction of the Second Temple.  

It also includes a Hebrew translation of the Book of Daniel, a text of the Alexander Romance, sections of the Apocrypha, treatises on biology, minerology, the calendar, poems and liturgical selections.

The section dealing with the history of the Second Jewish Commonwealth is divided by Jerahmeel into five books: The Book of Maccabees, The Book of Hasmonaean Kings, The Book of Herod, The Book of Agrippa and The Book of the Temple Destruction. This history is a preserved record of the Yosippon text and textual comparisons indicate that it is a close parallel to the recension published by Conat in the ed.M. The text is brief, as is the narrative of ed.M. The variations and interpolations of the ed.C, the examples which were cited above, are not found in the Jerahmeel MS. The elaborations and perfections of style which characterize the recension preserved in the ed.C are not found in the narrative of Jerahmeel as they are not found in the text of ed.M.

If we consider that the Jerahmeel Chronicle was written some 300 years before the editio princeps of the Yosippon (1480), a study of it becomes highly significant for it sheds light on the textual composition of the Yosippon and the purpose for its composition.

M. Waxman, in his discussion of the Jerahmeel
Chronicle, is highly critical of the incorporated Yosippon text, claiming that it was not included by Jerahmeel but rather by the later copyist, Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi. This contention, however, is completely unfounded. A close study of the text clearly indicates that Jerahmeel ben Shelomoh, the author of the Chronicle, was responsible for its inclusion.

1. On fol. 113a Jerahmeel put his name to a passage that he took from the Yosippon, indicating that he was the copyist. There is no reason to suspect that Eleazar included this passage and falsified it by placing Jerahmeel's name to it. "And now I deem it proper to relate the things that happened after. For I, Jerahmeel ben Shelomoh, say that every writer who authors books and who tells of ancient things should write in an orderly and clear fashion so as not to omit any of the things that had occurred. Furthermore, it is proper for an author of books to write the truth. For this was prescribed by Joseph ben Gorion the Priest, who was the foremost author of all the books that were written, excepting the twenty-four books of Scripture and the Book of Wisdom, written by Solomon, King of Israel, and by the Sages of Israel. And I, Jerahmeel ben Shelomoh, collected information from the book of
Joseph ben Gorion and from books of other authors who wrote about the deeds of our ancestors, and I recorded them in one scroll."48

2. There is no doubt that Eleazar, the copyist, also used the *Yosippon* and interpolated further portions of it into Jerahmeel's text when he felt there was a gap in the chronicle's narrative. But whenever he did so, he prefaced the interpolation with a comment noting his interruption. Thus on fol. 26a Eleazar writes: "I, Eleazar ha-Levi, deem it proper to write from the beginning of the Great *Yosippon*, for its subject matter pertains to the present topic, and this is the beginning of the Book of *Yosippon*."49 On fol. 26b, where this excerpt is concluded, Eleazar writes: "Until here were the words of the *Yosippon*.... Let us return to Jerahmeel's account."50 On fol. 35a Eleazar again interrupts Jerahmeel's narration, but again with an introduction: "Here, too, I deem it proper to return to the words of the *Yosippon*, at the point where I had left it, regarding the genealogy of Noah."51 On fol. 36b, where this quotation is closed, we again find Eleazar's comment: "Until here was the phraseology of the *Yosippon*. And after this the *Yosippon* writes of the kingdom of Darius and Cyrus and the
books of the Maccabees, and of the Second Temple until its destruction, and, God willing, I will write all of what is found in the Book of the Yosippon in its proper place." From this gloss it would seem, as suggested by Waxman, that it was Eleazar who copied the Yosippon text and included it in the chronicle. This statement, however, is qualified and explained in a later comment on fol. 72b where Eleazar writes: "I have endeavored to write the Book of the Yosippon as it was copied by Jerahmeel."53

These glosses and prefaces indicate without a doubt that with the exception of such isolated passages, the basic text of the Yosippon in this chronicle was included by Jerahmeel and not by Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi.

3. Furthermore, if we study the sections of the Yosippon that were interpolated by Eleazar we would find that he used a completely different text than did Jerahmeel. Jerahmeel copied a narrative which is a parallel to the text of the ed.M. Eleazar, however, used a text closer to the one preserved in the ed.C.
We can, therefore, conclude that the Yosippon text included in this chronicle was copied and inserted by Jerahmeel in the 11th century, based upon a narrative close to the Mantua recension. In 1325 Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi, the subsequent compiler, added interpolations of
his own from a Yosippon text similar to that in the ed.C.

Although, as mentioned, Jerahmeel's text of the Yosippon is close to the narrative published in the ed.M, it also includes similarities to the Constantinople version. We mentioned earlier that a primary difference between the two recensions was that the Constantinople text included many references to Joseph ben Gorion, identifying him with Flavius Josephus and referring to him as the author of this Hebrew history, whereas no mention of him is found in the ed.M. These references evoked much criticism, causing the Yosippon to be labelled a fraud. Interestingly, the Jerahmeel text also includes references to Joseph ben Gorion, but, unlike the ed.C, these references are always in the third person. They do not identify an author, but rather refer to a source.

Whenever the text in the ed.C refers to Joseph ben Gorion in the third person, the Jerahmeel narrative includes a parallel reference, in the same historic circumstance.

1. Regarding Mattathias and the permit to become involved in defensive warfare on the Sabbath:

   ed.C, p.80
   Jer., fol.96b

   נחמה חורב על טפר יוספ בן גוריון
   נוחמה חורב על טפר יוספ בן גוריון
   השם, חסן טפר יוספ בן גוריון
   העבא, חסן טפר יוספ בן גוריון
   והנהו בן גוריון המוהנים
   והנהו בן גוריון המוהנים
2. Regarding the rule of Simon:

**ed.C., p.102**

Regarding the rule of Simon and his rule regarding the interpretation of the law to the extent that they concluded that the interpretation of the law of the rabbis was the true interpretation, and that the scribes were not the interpreters of the law, they interpreted the law to the extent that the rabbis interpreted it.

**Jer., fol.104a**

Regarding the rule of Simon and his rule regarding the interpretation of the law to the extent that they concluded that the interpretation of the law of the scribes was the true interpretation, and that the rabbis were not the interpreters of the law, they interpreted the law to the extent that the scribes interpreted it.

3. Regarding Hyrcanus' assistance to Antiochus against the Parthians:

**ed.C., p.107**

Regarding Hyrcanus' assistance to Antiochus against the Parthians, the assistance was to assist in the war against the Parthians.

**Jer., fol.105b**

Regarding Hyrcanus' assistance to Antiochus against the Parthians, the assistance was to assist in the war against the Parthians.

4. Regarding the dissention amongst the Judeans:

**ed.C., p.112**

Regarding the dissention amongst the Judeans, the dissention was due to the differences in interpretation of the law among the rabbis and scribes.

**Jer., fol.107a**

Regarding the dissention amongst the Judeans, the dissention was due to the differences in interpretation of the law among the rabbis and scribes.

5. Regarding Hyrcanus' request for divine guidance concerning the choice of a successor:

**ed.C., p.112**

Regarding Hyrcanus' request for divine guidance concerning the choice of a successor, the request was due to the need for guidance as to who should succeed him.

**Jer., fol.107a**

Regarding Hyrcanus' request for divine guidance concerning the choice of a successor, the request was due to the need for guidance as to who should succeed him.
6. Regarding the achievements of Hyrcanus.

ed.C. p.113

Regarding the achievements of Hyrcanus.

Jer., fol.107a

Regarding the achievements of Hyrcanus.

7. Regarding the rule of Aristobulus:

ed.C. p.116

Regarding the rule of Aristobulus.

Jer., fol.108b

Regarding the rule of Aristobulus.

8. Regarding the evil consequences from the dissention between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus:

ed.C. p.138

Regarding the evil consequences from the dissention between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus.

Jer., fol.117b

Regarding the evil consequences from the dissention between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus.

9. Regarding the weight of a mina:

ed.C. p.142

Regarding the weight of a mina.

Jer., fol.119b

Regarding the weight of a mina.
10. Regarding the wealth of the Temple:

ed.C, pp.142-3

Jer., fol.119a

11. Regarding Antipater's power and authority:

ed.C, 150

Jer., fol.127a

12. Regarding Jericho and the origin of its name:

ed.C, p.135

Jer., fol.131a

13. In the description of Herod's Temple:

ed.C, p.194

Jer., fol.138b
If the above mentioned references to the book of Joseph ben Gorion in the ed.C are similarly included in the Jerahmeel text, all the biographical sketches and explicit statements of identification with Flavius Josephus are omitted in the Jerahmeel narrative. This certainly indicates that such references are interpolations introduced by later copyists and editors.

When in the ed.C the author differentiates between this Hebrew history and the work written for the Romans, implying that Josephus authored them both, there is no parallel to this in Jerahmeel. Similarly, Jerahmeel omits all reference to his biography, whereas in the ed.C the author speaks of his history, his extensive authorship, again identifying himself as Flavius Josephus.

At times Jerahmeel will include a parallel reference, but in a manner whereby all implication regarding identification is omitted.

When, for example, the author refers to the courage and the piety of the Priests, differentiating between the material included in this Hebrew work and the content of the book "written as a memorial for the Roman Kings," Jerahmeel includes a similar passage but without this
differentiation.

When a similar differentiation is attempted in the ed.C while exalting the wisdom of Israel, Jerahmeel will simply refer to the book of Joseph ben Gorion as a source and will also mention the existence of the other books composed by Joseph ben Gorion (Josephus).

Another attempt at such differentiation is made in the ed.C in the course of the description of Herod's Temple, again omitted in the Jerahmeel text, where Joseph ben Gorion is merely mentioned as a source.

verbs סופרים העצידיים כל אחד風險 bystanders and the reader, כשם זכר

verbs סופרים העצידיים כל אחד רויא את המפגשים, כשם הבורר

verbs סופרים העצידיים כל אחד רויא את המפגשים, כשם הבורר

verbs סופרים העצידיים כל одного רויא את המפגשים, כשם הבורר

verbs סופרים העצידיים כל אחד רויא את המפגשים, כשם הבורר

verbs סופרים העצידיים כל אחד רויא את המפגשים, כשם הבורר

verbs סופרים העצידיים כל אחד רויא את המפגשים, כשם הבורר

verbs סופרים העצידיים כל אחד רויא את המפגשים, כשם הבורר
When the ed.C concerns itself with the selection of the generals for the revolution against Rome, Joseph ben Gorion is referred to in the first person, again implying that the author of the Yosippon is Flavius Josephus.72

The passage in Jerahmeel is without such reference, similar to the parallel in the ed.M.73

Toward the end of the narrative, when the Yosippon concerns itself with the parents of Joseph ben Gorion and their imprisonment, the ed.C again uses the term "my father,"75 once again attempting to identify the author with Flavius. Here, too, Jerahmeel, like the ed.M,76 refers to him in the third person, without any implication regarding identification.

The implications of these differences between the Jerahmeel text and the Mantua and Constantinople recensions regarding the nature of the Ur-Yosippon and the intention of the anonymous author will be discussed in the next chapter.78
The History of the Kings of Israel during the Second Temple was composed by Abraham ibn Daud as the second appendix to his Sefer ha-Kabbala. It was first published with the Sefer ha-Kabbala in Mantua in 1513. Sebastian Munster’s Latin translation was published with it in Worms (1529) and in Basle (1559), entitled Historiarum Compendium Complectens.

At the very outset of this chapter ibn Daud refers to his extensive use of the Yosippon. "And these are the stories of the kings of the Jews in the Second Temple according to what we have found in the book of Joseph the Priest the son of Gorion and in other books." And, indeed, this brief history consists primarily of an abridgement of the Yosippon. This abridgement was referred to by Judah Leon ben Moses Mosconi who wrote an introduction to the Yosippon in Spain in the 14th century.

Ibn Daud's narrative is more extensive and descriptive in the first part of his record, until the revolution (pp. 36-56). His history of the revolution itself and the destruction of the Temple is brief (pp. 56-60), merely touching on the sequence of events, but eliminating all dialogue and elaboration found in the available recensions of the Yosippon. Ibn Daud does not refer to the incident in the
cave of Jotapata where, through a ruse, Josephus saved himself. No mention is made of the drawing of lots.

G. D. Cohen suggests that ibn Daud utilized the extensive text of the ed.C for his abridgment. This, however, is not at all conclusive. There is nothing in ibn Daud's text that indicates that it was based upon the narrative preserved in the ed.C. It contains no reference to the descriptive section regarding Vespasian's coronation, unique to the ed.C, nor does the abbreviated text indicate that it used a narrative that contained the Alexander Romance, found in both recensions of the Yosippon. It is more probable that ibn Daud utilized a text of the Yosippon no longer available, perhaps closer to the Ur-Yosippon than the published narratives that we have.

There is no doubt that ibn Daud identified Joseph ben Gorion, the supposed author of the Yosippon, as Flavius Josephus. In his report of the selection of generals for the revolution, ibn Daud is explicit in his statement that Joseph ben Gorion, the general of the Galilee, is the historian from whose books he gleaned, the Yosippon. The identifying passages peculiar to the ed.C, however, are nowhere alluded to in this abbreviated edition. Ibn Daud's comment is consistent with the accepted view of the Middle Ages, that Flavius Josephus was the author of the Yosippon, but this identification is his own, not a part of the Yosippon narrative.
Furthermore, there are certain peculiarities in ibn Daud's text that indicate that the Yosippon text that he used was one that was dissimilar to those available to us today.

Ibn Daud's description of the death of Simon, son of Mattathias, is unique. Josephus reports Simon's death "at a banquet, as a result of the plot against him by his son-in-law, Ptolemy...." This report is similarly recorded in both recensions of the Yosippon. Ibn Daud, however, reports it differently. Ptolemy was not Simon's son-in-law, but rather his father-in-law, the King of Egypt. Simon had married his daughter as an attempt for a political alliance with Egypt. This sacrilege was the cause for his untimely death.

In describing the siege of Jerusalem by Antiochus III Sidetes, Josephus reports that it took place in the first year of King Hyrcanus' reign, which corresponds to the fourth year of Antiochus' rule (135-134 B.C.E.). "But Antiochus, being resentful of the injuries he had received from Simon, invaded Judaea in the fourth year of his reign,
Peter Morvvyng, a fellow of Magdalen College in Oxford and a Canon of Lichfield, undertook to translate the Yosippon, "being moved and requested of a certain honest man, Printer of London (Richard Jugge), studious in his vocation of the commoditie of this our countrey." He accepted the commission, and his volume on the history of the Jews was completed in 1558.

On the title page we read that the author translated into English the work "written in Hebrew by Joseph ben Gorion, a Nobleman of the same Countrey, who sawe the most things himselfe, and was the Author and doer of a greater part of the Same." Morvvyng hence entertained the notion that was commonly accepted in the Middle Ages that Joseph ben Gorion was Flavius Josephus, the Judaean general in the revolt against Rome. The Yosippon, he writes in the "Epistle to the Reader," is the Hebrew work written by Josephus "unto his countreymen, the Jewes, or for them that desire no more but a just rehearsal of the things concerning that onely countrey: the other for the Romans, or for them that desire to understand of the feates of the Romanes in the time of that great age." The conflict in names - Josephus being referred to as the son of Mattathias in the Greek work, and as the son of Gorion in the Hebrew volume - is also answered by the translator: ".....although he name himself in this Ben Gorion (that is) the Son of Gorion, and in the other the son of Mattathias,
which is a thing so common in the Jewes genealogies, that men need not secke farre for the like, for one man to deduct his descent from divers names...."97

The first printing was obviously successful for Richard Jugge, a London publisher and printer for the Queen, subsequently republished three more editions, in 1561, 1567 and 1575. This same edition was again republished in 1579, 1593, 1596, 1602, 1608 and 1615 by John Wallie and Thomas Adams.

The translated text, in all its printings, is introduced with an "Epistle to the Reader" by Peter Morvyng, the translator. The historical narrative follows, relating the history of the Jews from the days of the Maccabees until the destruction of the Temple by Titus. This narrative is divided into three sections - "The State of the Machaebes," "The State of the Herodians," and "The Warres of the Jewes." This last section is subdivided into two parts - "The Warres of the Jewes" and "The Historie of the Siege of Jerusalem." The volume closes with a section entitled "The Ten Captivities of the Jewes," briefly describing the Jewish defeats from the days of Sanncherib until the final destruction of the Temple.

This translation was again republished by James Stafford in 1652 and 1662, edited by James Howell, a celebrated English author, with the title The Wonderful and Most Deplorable History of the Latter Times of the
Jews. Although the text of the translation remains the same, it is organized differently. The historical narrative is entitled "The Warres of the Jews," and it is divided into two books. The first of these contains seven chapters, and the second has five chapters. The narrative closes with the section concerning the Jewish captivities. This edition is introduced not merely with Morvyng's "Epistle to the Reader," but also with an "Epistle Dedicatory," signed with the initials "J.S." (James Stafford), and an introduction by the editor, James Howel. The volume concludes with a chapter discussing the "true character of the Jews, as they are this day; with the hopes and desires of all good men for their conversion," and a prayer, both written by Thomas Fuller, the Royal Chaplain.

Although, as mentioned earlier, Morvyng claimed to have translated the Yosippon from the Hebrew, Lucien Wolf doubts this to be true. "The book," he writes, "was a literal version of Munster, although its author pretended to derive it direct from the Hebrew." This view is shared by Moses Marx and Max Scholesinger. They refer to Sebastian Munster's translation of Abraham ibn Daud's abbreviated Yosippon, entitled Divre Malche Yisrael be-Bayit Shenih.

There is no doubt that the first section of Morvyng's translation is based upon ibn Daud's work, either having
utilized the original Hebrew or relying upon Munster's Latin translation, which is a literal parallel of the Hebrew narrative. The brevity of the text, the phraseology and the peculiarities that differentiate ibn Daud's version from the other available editions of the Yosippon characterize Morning's English translation as well.

The opening sentences of the English text (pp.1-2) are parallels to ibn Daud's introductory phrases (p.36).

"......according unto those things that we have found in the book of Joseph ben Gorion the Priest, and in other bookes written according to the most certain truth, we will draw forth some things for the comfort that many thence arise, especially seeing all the Prophets have bent, and directed their Prophecies and predictions to this point, that the Kingdom of the house of David should be restored and flourish in time to come. Therefore, if there had been any kings of the house of David during the time of the second Temple, then we should have been in suspense, yea, even now already our hope had bin dasht: but there was no Kingdom of the house of David in that age, save only a certain dominion that Zerubabel and Nehemia had."

כפי מה נאמרו прежде יוסיפון ו启示 נבואה שונות ומשפרים חיניהם: אחרים הסירו מה כתוב בשתי הגדתיו ו עקב מה שנכתב בכתובם, עבירה שנכתה גם על הקדמים המלכים מהד הולך דוד חכמים מצוה העבירה קדמונות, וכל מלכות לבל החזור לא יהוה במלכות, אלא שורד להרבות הנסימה.
The paragraph in Ibn Daud's recension describing Simon's political marriage, resulting in his untimely death, is found in Morvvyng's translation as well (p.17).

"Then sent Ptolomee King of Egypt, an Embassage to Simeon King of Israel, offering him his daughter in marriage. To this request when King Simeon had consented, Ptolomee came to Jerusalem, where was made for him a great feast, and they were allied together. Whereupon Antiochus King of the Grecians writ to Ptolomee King of Egypt, privily to murder Simeon King of Israel. Whom Ptolomee durst not but to obey, for at that time the King of Egypt was in subjection to the Greeks. Therefore when Simeon came into Egypt to see his father in law Ptolomee, he was received with great feastings but in the same time he had poison given, that he died thereof. Besides this also, his son which came with him, Ptolomee cast in prison. These things justly chanced unto Simeon, for that he had transgressed the word of the Lord, that forbade all alliance with the Gentiles."

Similarly, Ibn Daud's dating of Antiochus' siege of Jerusalem to the fourth year of Hyrcanus' reign rather than to the first year of his rule is found in the English translation as well (pp.18-19).

"In the fourth year of King Hyrcanus reign, Pius
King of Greece came and besieged Jerusalem with a great power and strength...."

The source for the translation, however, abruptly changes, indicating that Morvvyng based his translation upon a Hebrew text. With the narrative of Agrippa I's reign (p. 89) the brief reports of ibn Daud's text are set aside, and the elaborations, the long monologues, the extensive descriptions of the ed.C are translated. A closer textual comparison points to the possibility that a text similar to that of the Venice edition, first published in 1544, was used as the source. This edition, although close to the ed.C, has some variations that are included in the English translation as well.

1. Agrippa's exhortation to the Judeans that they refrain from revolting against Rome, offering to act as a mediator for a peaceful agreement, is not found in the ed.C. It is, however, included in the Venice edition of the Yosippon (pp. 367-369) and in the English translation (pp. 92-94).

2. Another example in the phraseology employed indicates a closeness between these texts. When Josephus' exhortation to the Judeans is reported in the ed.C (p. 299), and reference is made to the biblical Phineas, the reading employed is: גונות ומקוט無料 לכהור נ"אלוהיםификаци, הנה ורשקות זרחות בין תכשיטי שלמה. The Venice edition substitutes the word בורוכך for בּוּרְכָּךְ, as used in the ed.C. The
English translation reads: "Arise out of thy grave, thou Phineas, that moved with such fervency, didst revenge the glory and majesty of the Lord God of Israel; come and run through the Seditious in thy fury" (p.208).

We can, without hesitation, conclude that a Hebrew text of the Yosippon was translated by Morvvyng, for the only other Yosippon narrative that was available in Latin was Sebastian Munster's translation of the first five books of the Mantua recension.

Like ibn Daud's text, the English Yosippon omits the description of Vespasian's coronation and the section of the Alexander Romance.

Another interesting departure from the sources is the textual change in the Christ passage. In ibn Daud's narrative (p.42) we find the phrase כְּפִי יֵם יֶשֶׁת אֱלֹהִים a reading also included in Munster's translation. Morvvyng, however, omits this brief reference, but at a later point he includes an elaborate Christ passage (pp.88-89), using Josephus as his source, rather than the Hebrew or the Latin version of the Yosippon.

"There was at that time one Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a Man, for he was a worker of wonderfull works, and a teacjer of such men as gladly did hear the truth; and had many Disciples, both of the Jews, and also of the Gentiles. This man was Christ, whom, after he was
accused by the chief Rulers of our Nation, and condemned by Pilate to be crucified, was nevertheless much beloved by them, who loved him even from the beginning. To these he appeared the third day alive, according as the Prophets by Divine inspiration had told before, as well of this, as also of many other things, which should be done by him. And even to this day the Christian sect, which took their name of him, continueth."

Although the latter part of the historical narrative is based upon the Venice edition of the Yosippon, the English translation reverts back to the use of ibn Daud's text in the section entitled, "The Ten Captivities of the Jewes." This account is not found in any of the Yosippon recensions, but they are the final paragraphs of ibn Daud's narrative, which he introduces with the phrase "שְׁכֵן יַעֲנוֹגֵת בֵּל יֵזִיבּוֹ (p.61).

There is no doubt, therefore, that two sources were used in the preparation of the English Yosippon - ibn Daud's abbreviated text for the first part of the narrative, and the Hebrew text of the ed.C, more precisely, the Venice edition, for the latter part of the history.
CHAPTER TWO

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

From the discussion of the various available recensions it becomes evident that the Yosippon, in the course of its transmission, was subject to the whims and fancies of a series of editors and copyists. Interpolations were included in the original text when a particular editor felt that there was a gap in the narrative, and if the copyist had a text that he felt was pertinent to a given section, he included that as well. This was the customary procedure for the medieval chroniclers. Not only were interpolations added, but, as will be shown, the Yosippon was subject to deletions as well.

It becomes obvious that a serious study of the Yosippon, and certainly a judgement of its validity or an investigation of its purpose, must be based upon these various recensions, with a consideration of all their differences. To choose one recension of the Yosippon and to base all conclusions on this one chosen text is scholarly dishonest and unacceptable. This, however, has been the method employed by respected scholars, resulting in the degradation of the historical validity of a most honorable text.
We have already referred to the proclaimed judgement that the Yosippon belongs to the area of pseudepigraphic literature. This has the explicit implication that the author was a fraud; that he attempted to mislead his readers; that he masqueraded under a false name; that he wanted his readers to believe that the author of this book was Flavius Josephus, thereby adding antiquity and validity to a relatively late composition. Should this be so, then the Yosippon is certainly permeated with dishonesty, and if lacking this necessary ingredient of integrity, it cannot be viewed seriously as a valid source for so important an era in Jewish history as the Second Commonwealth.

This entire judgement, however, is founded upon a misinterpretation of the textual data of the Yosippon. It capitalizes upon the series of biographical sketches where Joseph ben Gorion, the supposed author of the Yosippon, identifies himself with Flavius Josephus, and upon the various references to Joseph ben Gorion in the first person.

It must be emphasized, however, that these biographies and first-person references are found only in the ed. C and its parallel recensions, i.e. Venice. This was clearly shown in the textual comparisons between the ed.M and the ed. C. In the former recension, not only are these identifying phraseologies not found, but all references to Joseph
ben Gorion, even in the third person, are absent. The same is true of the texts in the abbreviated *Yosippon* of ibn Daud and in the English recension.

Although I. Baer suggests that the larger text of the *ed.C* is the earlier one and the closer one to the *Ur-Yosippon*, which is no longer available, he does not attempt to substantiate this contention. And yet, all the conclusions he arrives at in his most scholarly study are based on references to this text alone. It is far more reasonable to assume that the elaborations that characterize this recension are the products of successive chroniclers and their respective interpolations. Their perfection of the style and their inclusion of new material have caused this recension to become the more popular one, resulting in its constant republication. But popularity and mass acceptance are by no means the criteria for originality of composition.

There is no doubt that all the identifying passages in the *ed.C* are later interpolations, not reflecting any pseudepigraphic attempt on the part of the author of the *Yosippon*. At the same time, if the copyists responsible for these inclusions in the *ed.C* are guilty of interpolation, then those involved in the transmission of the text preserved in the *ed.M* are guilty of deletion. That this recension of the *Yosippon* has been cleansed of all reference to Joseph ben Gorion is equally wrong, for it detracts from
the honesty of purpose that characterized the author and his composition.

I suggest that the Yosippon preserved in the Sefer Zichronot of Jerahmeel is the closest to the text of the Ur-Yosippon and that it had been spared from some of the tamperings of the copyists. From the textual comparisons cited earlier we see clearly that when Joseph ben Gorion is mentioned in the ed.C, be it biographical, first-person or third-person, a parallel reference to Joseph ben Gorion is found in the Jerahmeel text - but always in the third-person.

Joseph ben Gorion was not the name of the author of the Yosippon; the author never intended to associate himself with that name nor to be identified with it. The author of the Yosippon remains nameless, anonymous. And if the title of the work, Sefer Yosef ben Gorion, The Book of Joseph ben Gorion, implies that it is the book written by Joseph ben Gorion, then it is a misnomer. It should rather mean that it is the book based upon the information received from Joseph ben Gorion (Josephus).

The anonymous author of the Yosippon used the works of Josephus extensively as his prime source. And to him Flavius Josephus was known as Joseph ben Gorion.

This becomes obvious and factual if we study the text carefully. A close consideration of these references to
Joseph ben Gorion in the ed.C, their parallels in the Jerahmeel text, and a comparison of these with their respective sections in Josephus, indicates that whenever Flavius stopped his relation of history and paused to include a personal gloss, a reference to sources, a subjective explanation of a historic event, or to begin a new section in his narration, these passages, when quoted in the Yosippon (the ed.C and Jerahmeel) are introduced with the phrase "And Joseph ben Gorion said," or with any of its variations.

"Joseph ben Gorion" was not meant to name the author of the Yosippon, but to refer to its source, to Flavius Josephus.

1. When Josephus stops his narrative regarding Hyrcanus' assistance to Arsaces in his war against the Parthians, 6 this passage in the Yosippon and Jerahmeel is prefaced with "And Joseph ben Gorion said in his book." 7

2. After the clash between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees, Josephus pauses to comment on the controversies between the sects, 8 and this gloss is prefaced in the Yosippon and Jerahmeel with "And Joseph ben Gorion said." 9

3. When Josephus discusses the three divine gifts possessed by Hyrcanus and his ability to foretell the future of his children's rule, 10 the passage is included in the Yosippon with the introduction, "And Joseph said." 11
4. When Josephus brings testimony from Strabo regarding Aristobulus' achievements and accomplishments, this testimony is included in the Yosippon with the comment "And the balance of his deeds and feats are recorded in the book of Joseph ben Gorion."  

5. After the death of Alexandra Josephus discusses the serious duties and responsibilities of a historian. Elaborate exhortations regarding such responsibilities are found in the Yosippon and in Jerahmeel as well at this point in the narrative, with references to Joseph ben Gorion.  

6. When Josephus begins the section concerning Hyrcanus' assumption of power, this portion in the Yosippon is prefaced, "And Joseph ben Gorion spoke in his book."  

7. When Josephus describes Aristobulus' gift to the Romans, this description in the Yosippon is noted with "As it was shown to me, Joseph ben Gorion the Priest."  

8. When Josephus pauses in his narrative to discuss the opobalsamum and the other forms of vegetation in Jericho, the parallel description in the Yosippon is prefaced with "And Joseph ben Gorion said."  

9. When Josephus stops his discussion of the Priest's
courage during the siege of Jerusalem to bring testimony to the truth of his report, these statements are prefaced in the Yosippon with "And Joseph ben Gorion spoke in his book." 23

10. When Josephus expresses his opinion that the fall of Jerusalem was the result of a rivalry between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, this opinion is quoted in the Yosippon with the preface, "And Joseph ben Gorion said as follows." 25

11. When Josephus describes the weight of a mina, this description in the Yosippon is prefaced with "And I, Joseph the Priest, said." 27

12. When Josephus brings testimony regarding the wealth in the Temple, this testimony in the Yosippon is prefaced with "And Joseph ben Gorion the Priest also said." 29

His reliance upon Josephus is further evident from the fact that when the Yosippon refers to non-Jewish sources, these references are made in parallel instances in Josephus, indicating that the Yosippon fully accepted Josephus' testimony and sources. 30

Regarding the wars between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, both the Yosippon and Josephus refer to the writings of Nicolaus of Damascus. 31 Regarding the achievements of
Aristobulus, both works refer to Nicolaus and Timagenes. When describing the courage of the Priests, both sources incorporate the testimony of Strabo, Nicolaus and Titus.

The author of the Hebrew history did not hide the fact that he relied upon Josephus, but continually referred to him - as Joseph ben Gorion - whenever a personal comment of his was included in the Hebrew text. The biographical sketches were later interpolations. Although they are to be deemed falsifications of the text, they do not reflect upon the original narrative nor upon the intention of the anonymous author.

The same approach that caused the scholars to suspect the integrity of the author also resulted in the late dating of the Yosippon's composition.

Baer's conclusions that the Yosippon was written in the 10th century, in the time of the First Crusade, is based upon certain textual inclusions that are not consistently a part of the narrative in all the recensions. And here, too, Baer builds his entire thesis upon the unfounded assumption that the text of the ed.C is the closest to the Ur-Yosippon.

Baer suggests that the purpose for composing this Hebrew history was to provide the Jews of the Middle Ages with their own source, eliminating the necessity for them to turn to non-Jewish works in order for them to
understand their situation in a proper historic context.

According to Baer, the author changed certain textual elements in order to produce a consistency between the narrative and the Talmudic tradition, thereby able to undermine and to weaken the historical foundation upon which Christianity was based. Hence, he concludes, the Yosippon can well be classified in the area of theological historiography, an example of Jewish apologetics of the Middle Ages. 

Baer refers to the detailed description of Emperor Vespasian's coronation ceremony, identifying it with the proceedings of the rituals of Otto III the Great's consecration, held in 962. This clearly indicates, he concludes, that the Yosippon was composed in the late 10th century. He also emphasizes the fact that the Alexander Romance is an integral part of the narratives. Baer insists that this is not a late interpolation, but was included as part of the original composition, for in the Middle Ages the chroniclers believed the Alexander Romance to be factual history. It was not until the later Age of Humanism when its historicity was doubted. This, therefore, serves as an additional mark of a Hebrew composition.

As true as Baer's suggestion may be that there is a definite parallel between the description of Vespasian's coronation and Otto's consecration, and that this section is of late origin, it must be emphasized that this inclusion
is found only in the ed.C, The Mantua text, the Yosippon in Jerahmeel, ibn Daud's abridged narration and the English recension do not contain a trace of this description. There is no doubt that this is one of the interpolations that characterize the corrupt text of the ed.C.

That this descriptive section is an interpolation is further evident from the fact that the entire historical sequence in the ed.C was falsified in order to include the coronation ceremony. According to Josephus, he (Flavius) was freed by the Romans while en route to Alexandria. Vespasian was told of the news of his victory against Vitellius. While in Alexandria the report of his advancement to Emperor was told to him. He proceeded to Rome alone, leaving the balance of his party in Alexandria, while Titus proceeded on to war against Jerusalem.38 The similar report is found in Jerahmeel and in the ed.M.39 In the ed.C, however, the sequence is changed. The freeing of Josephus is postponed. Josephus accompanies Vespasian to Rome in irons, and after pleading to be permitted to observe the coronation ceremonies, his request is granted, and what follows is the interpolated description.40 It is only after the coronation, after the death of Agrippa and his sons, that Josephus is freed. An entire sequence is changed and falsified by a copyist in order to make room for this interpolation.41

The inclusion of the Alexander Romance is also no
evidence for the late composition of the Yosippon. Although it is found in both recensions, in ed. M $^{42}$ and in ed. C $^{43}$ neither of them is free of interpolation. As mentioned earlier, the Yosippon text in the Jerahmeel Chronicle is perhaps the closest to the Ur-Yosippon, relatively free of the falsifications of subsequent copyists and editors. In that preserved narrative there is no Alexander Romance, leading us to conclude that in the 11th century, when Jerahmeel compiled his chronicle, the Yosippon text that he used, a close parallel to the ed. M, did not yet include this interpolation.

That the Alexander Romance is a later interpolation is supported by Flusser $^{44}$ who points to a number of MSS of the Yosippon where the Alexander Romance does not appear.

L. Wallach suggests that the author of the Yosippon may have included part of the legendary history, but that the balance of the text was interpolated by Conat in his ed. M $^{45}$ Flusser, however, disputes this, maintaining that the Ur-Yosippon contained no part of the Alexander Romance, but that one section of it was interpolated before 1148 and a latter portion around 1160. He bases his suggestion on a gloss by Yehuda Hadassi, in Eshkol Hakofar, written in 1145, where he refers to the wonders that Alexander saw, as recorded in the book of Joseph ben Gorion.
Flusser interprets this to refer to the Alexander Romance in the Yosippon, and concludes that by 1145 this legendary narrative was already part of the medieval history.

The Jerahmeel text, however, indicates that in the mid 11th century, the Yosippon narrative was still free of this interpolation.

It is noteworthy to mention that although Jerahmeel did not have an Alexander Romance in his text of the Yosippon, the later copyist, Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi, did include this section, but not as part of the narrative, but rather as a distinctly separate chapter. Interestingly, this text of the Alexander Romance is not similar to the narratives found in the ed.M nor in the ed.C. The Alexander Romance in Sefer Zichronot is not a part of the Yosippon narrative that Eleazar took from Jerahmeel. 46

This legendary history is available in three recensions: the Parma version, published by Flusser: 47 this text is interpolated in both recensions of the Yosippon, the Modena version, published by I. Levi: 48 and a third recension, published by I. J. Kazis. 49

According to Levi, the Modena text is of no value.
because it is so different from the Parma version which was included in the Yosippon. The Chronicle of Jerahmeel, however, presents us with an interesting situation. The text of the Yosippon used by Jerahmeel, the author, did not include this section, and when the later copyist, Eleazar, sought to supplement the narrative with an Alexander Romance, he chose a text similar to the Modena version. This would seem to indicate that the Modena text is earlier and, hence, more valuable than the narrative preserved in the Parma MS.

Baer, in attempting to substantiate his contention, that the Yosippon is a late composition, refers to certain changes in name that are incorporated in the narrative, identifying these names as people who were contemporaries of the author, persons whom he wished to memorialize. Baer suggests that these people were well known in their day and the author placed their names into the narrative in order to create an impact upon his readers, another example of attempted fraud and falsification.

Baer refers to the section of the Yosippon that speaks of the number of dead in Jerusalem who were removed from the city through the "Gate of Menahem" for burial. The guard of that gate is named Menahem ben Saruk, leading Baer to conclude that he was a contemporary of the author of the Yosippon, hence concluding this text to be of late origin.
Baer also points to Amitai, the High Priest who brought Simeon b. Gioras to Jerusalem and who was subsequently killed. This Amitai is referred to in all the recensions of the Yosippon. Baer suggests that the name Amitai was used, rather than the true name, Mattias, because Amitai was a popular name in the Middle Ages in Southern Italy, again implying that the author of the Yosippon incorporated the name of a medieval contemporary into the narrative, pointing to a late origin.

Furthermore, the Roman official, Terentius Rufus, is identified in the Yosippon as "Rufus, the official, from the city of Trani." 53 Trani was an Italian city which, in the Middle Ages, served as a scholastic center from which many celebrated Talmudic luminaries emerged, known by the name of their city of origin. 54 Baer suggests that this city was mentioned in the Yosippon narrative because Rabbi Amitai was probably a resident of Trani, the location of his Yeshiva. Baer bases his contention on utter conjecture. 55

Here again Baer totally ignores all other recensions of the Yosippon, utilizing only the text of the ed.C. Neither the ed.M, nor the Yosippon in Jerahmeel, nor the Ibn Daud text, nor the English recension record the name Menhaem ben Saruk. 56 Nor do any of these texts identify Rufus as coming from the city of Trani. 57 These, too, are examples of interpolations that characterize the Yosippon
narrative peculiar to the ed.C.

It is true that for some reason the author of the Yosippon substituted the name Amitai for Mattias, but Amitai need not have its origin in medieval Italy. Dr. Zeitlin already pointed to the biblical origin of this name. "And the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the son of Amitai." 58

Baer dwells much on the expressions of faith pronounced by the Jewish martyrs throughout the narrative. He points to their emphasis upon the principle that their death represents a Kappara, an expiation for them and for Israel; the importance of dying for God and for His Law; that this type of death will lead them to "the light which is the light of life;" that their sacrifice will assure them of a future life. Baer suggests that all these pronouncements are reminiscent of the expressions of the martyrs in the time of the First Crusade, the period to which he dates the Yosippon. Baer insists that such principles are not found in Talmudic or rabbinic literature, but are medieval in nature, again concluding the late composition of the Yosippon. 59

When Joseph ben Gorion prepares the people in the Galilee for the war against Rome, he encourages them with the stress upon the sanctity of martyrdom, and of "the light of life in heaven" that awaits them.
When the people admonished Joseph ben Gorion for his intention to succumb to the Romans, they reminded him of his emphasis upon martyrdom, and these principles are again expressed.

When the people in Jerusalem defy the demands of Titus, they do so with a similar proclamation.

There is, however, no reason to assume as does Dr. Baer, that the source for these proclamations is the martyrdom of the Jews in the First Crusade. Such principles are not alien to early Jewish literature.
and Dr. Neumann have already substantiated their contention that the author of the **Yosippon** utilized the texts of II and IV Maccabees. The martyrdom of Eleazar and the mother and her seven sons are recorded in these apocryphal books, and the recorded exclamations in the **Yosippon**, so strange to Baer that he dates them to the 10th century, have their parallels in the martyrology in Maccabees.

"And when he (Eleazar) was now consumed to his very skeleton and on the point of perishing, he raised his eyes to God and said, 'Thou knowest, God, that though I might have saved myself, I die in fiery torment for the sake of the Law. Be merciful to Thy people and let my punishment be sufficient for their sake. Make my blood an expiation for them and take my life as a ransom for theirs."

"Proceed, then, with your trial, tyrant. And if you take our lives and inflict upon us a death for religion's sake, do not think that you are injuring us by your torments. We, by our suffering, shall obtain the prize of virtue, and we shall be with God, on Whose account we suffer."

"With all our hearts let us consecrate ourselves to God, Who gave us our souls.....Let us not fear him who thinks that he kills.....When we have died in such fashion Abraham and Isaac and Jacob will receive us and all the patriarchs will praise us."
"You accursed wretch, you may release us from our present existence, but the King of the Universe will raise us up to everlasting life because we have died for His Law." 70

"Better it is for people to be done to death by men if they have the hopeful expectation that they will again be raised up by God. 71

"Indeed, our brethren, after enduring brief trouble, are under God's covenant for everlasting life.....I, like my brothers, surrender body and soul for our paternal laws .....while it has devolved upon me and my brothers to stay the wrath of the Almighty which has justly been brought against the whole of our nation." 72

It is far more reasonable to assume that these early apocryphal expressions served as the sources for the proclamations in the Yosippon than the 10th century martyrdom, suggested by Baer.

There is sufficient foundation for the contention, offered by Dr. Zeitlin, that the Yosippon was composed in the 3rd or the early part of the 4th century.

Mention has already been made that the author of the Yosippon utilized the texts of II and IV Maccabees. Dr. Zeitlin, in discussing and comparing the various recensions of the martyrdom of the brothers, 73 shows that the Yosippon used the Book of the Maccabees directly, indicating its early
composition, and that the Talmud utilized the *Yosippon* for its text. The Midrash, a product of a later period, utilized the narrative of the martyrdom and applied it to the situation of its own time. 74

A comparison of the texts indicates this to be true. Both II Maccabees and IV Maccabees report the courage and martyrdom of Eleazar the Priest. 75 These texts report that Antiochus demaded of him that he partake of swine's flesh which is forbidden by Jewish law. Eleazar refused to comply with this demand, choosing rather to die than to desecrate the law of his people. Even when the demand was amended, that he eat permitted food, "prepared by himself," but to delude the people, leading them to believe that he was eating forbidden food, that, too, was refused by him, for such an act would lead his people astray. "They, because of my pretense, and for the sake of this short span of life, will be led astray through me, and I shall come to a stained and dishonored old age. 76

Nowhere in Josephus nor in rabbinic literature do we find a parallel to this incident of Eleazer's martyrdom. The *Yosippon*, however, reports it in full, in both recensions of the Hebrew history. 77 In these texts, like in the apocryphal reports, the initial demand made of Eleazar was that he eat forbidden food, which he refused to do. The alternate suggestion, that he pretend to eat
swine's flesh while actually partaking of his own food, is also refused, resulting in his martyrdom. There is no doubt that the Books of the Maccabees were the sources for the author of the Yosippon.

Both II and IV Maccabees continue on in their narratives with the incident of the martyrdom of the mother and her seven sons. Here, again, the demand made of them was that they desecrate their law by eating the forbidden meat of the swine, which they refused to do. The texts report in a detailed fashion the respective conversations with each of the sons, the demand of the Emperor and their individual refusals, resulting in their death. The mother, too, after witnessing the death of her sons, joins them in their destiny.

This incident, too, is not found in Josephus, but is reported in both recensions of the Yosippon. The details are the same. Antiochus demands that they eat swine's flesh; they refuse; they are tortured and killed. Whereas the mother remains anonymous in the apocryphal reports, ed.C refers to her as Hannah. Ed.M, however, like the Books of the Maccabees, refers to her as "the mother," without naming her.

Both the Yosippon and II Maccabees place the incident in Jerusalem in the days of Antiochus, and both
texts preserve the report that the mother died after her sons were killed. IV Maccabees places the incident in Antioch and reports that the mother threw herself into the flames so that no man would be able to touch her body. The text of the Yosippon seems to follow the report of II Maccabees in all of its details.

Interestingly, the martyrdom of the mother and her seven sons has a parallel in rabbinic literature as well, in the Talmud and in the Midrash. The rabbinic reports, however, are characterized with certain striking differences. Firstly, the incident is dated to a later period than that in Maccabees and the Yosippon. The Talmud and the Midrash associate the incident with the persecutions of Emperor Hadrian. Although the Talmud does not name the mother, in the Midrash she is called Miriam the daughter of Tanhum. In these rabbinic texts the demand made of the martyrs is reported differently. Whereas in the apocryphal books and in the Yosippon they are to partake of prohibited food, in the Talmud and in the Midrash they are asked to bow down before an idol, to publicly declare their reverence for this deity with an act of worship.

An additional difference in the rabbinic reports is the fate of the mother. According to the Talmud, she committed suicide by throwing herself from the roof.
According to the Midrash she became insane, and in that condition she fell from the roof and died. Both reports differ radically from the one in II Maccabees.

One cannot doubt the conclusion that the Yosippon used the Book of the Maccabees directly for his report, and the textual comparison indicates that it was II Maccabees that the author followed most precisely. We therefore find that the Yosippon includes both the episode of Eleazar as well as that of the mother and her seven sons. The rabbinic report, in turn, utilized the Yosippon for its source. The Rabbis, however, changed the nature of the demand, for in their day idolatry was the prime concern that threatened the Jewish population. That the Rabbis were aware of the Yosippon text, even of the incident regarding Eleazar, is evident from the report in the Midrash that the youngest of the sons was offered an alternative to actual idol worship; He was asked to bend down and pick up a ring dropped by the Emperor. His act would have been an innocent one, but he would have led the people to believe that he bowed down before the idol. This is an interesting parallel to the alternative offered to Eleazar both in the Books of the Maccabees and in Yosippon.

From the comparison of the texts it seems doubtless that the Yosippon preceded the rabbinic books; that the Yosippon was based upon the text of II Maccabees; that
the Talmud and the Midrash utilized the text of the Yosippon for the reports that they preserved.

That the Yosippon was written in a period prior to the final redaction of the Talmud, and that it could therefore have served as a source for this redaction is further evident from the fact that the Yosippon does not include the "miracle of the oil" as the explanation for the lights in the Chanukah commemoration. The Talmud associates the lights of Chanukah with the miracle that was experienced, whereby the cruse of oil that should have lasted for just one day sufficed for eight days. The Yosippon, however, refers rather to the holy fire that came from the stone upon the altar, based upon the similar narrative in II Maccabees.

Furthermore, Dr. Zeitlin stresses, internal textual evidence indicates an early dating for the Yosippon. The form of salutation in the letters recorded in the Yosippon is of a style used in the Greek and Roman periods. The formula used is the name of the sender and his title to the recipient. Salutations in the letters of the Middle Ages always began with the preposition "from," a form that is consistently absent in the Yosippon, indicating an early dating for its composition.

As the evidence cited by Baer for a late dating is
easily negated, the contention for an early dating is well founded. The text that was utilized by Baer as testimony for his suggestions, the narrative of the ed.C, is corrupt, filled with falsifications and interpolations. This is well substantiated by the Yosippon narrative preserved in the Chronicle of Jerahmeel, a parallel to the ed.M. All the references quoted by Baer are, therefore, to be disregarded, for they cannot be attributed to the author or the original composition of the Yosippon. That the author of the Yosippon used II and IV Maccabees directly, that he was unaware of certain Talmudic traditions, and that it could have served as a source of information for the Talmudic redactors, has been referred to and substantiated. All this points to an early dating of the Yosippon.

The purpose of the composition also becomes comprehensible. With some three centuries having passed since the razing of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, the story of the events had to be retold in a manner that would imbue the Jewish people with a hope for the future. This was the purpose of the author of the Yosippon: to utilize the factual material of that tragic epoch offered by Josephus and to imbue it with a pietistic optimism, with a hope for the rebuilding of the Temple and the renewal of independence and statehood. Essential
to the narrative is the emphasis upon the bravery of the Judaeans even in times of stress, the lofty expressions of faith expressed by the masses and leaders alike, and hopeful projections dispersed throughout the narrative. 87

The text closes with the simple note of faith that has been on the lips and in the hearts of our people, dispersed throughout the Diaspora, for some sixteen centuries since the composition of the Yosippon. "Here ends the history of Jerusalem, the Holy City. May it be the will of God, the Lord of the heavens, that He will gather the dispersed of His people Israel, speedily, in our own day. Amen." 88
PART II
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

As noted in the chapters of Part I, the historical narrative preserved in the Yosippon, in all of its editions, is based upon The Jewish War, the history authored by Flavius Josephus. Despite the existing variations in the sequence of events and, at times, in the events themselves, there is no doubt that Josephus was the primary source for the anonymous author of the Yosippon. As previously noted, the Yosippon adds little historical information regarding the Judaean revolution against Rome. Many of the variations, as will be shown can easily be discerned as scribal errors. Other differences represent exaggeration and even falsification on the part of the author who attempted to picture the revolution in a completely different framework than did his guide, Flavius Josephus.

The narrative, as it has been preserved, parallels that of The Jewish War. When Josephus pauses for a personal gloss, the narrative in the Yosippon pauses as well. When Josephus quotes from non-Jewish sources to emphasize the truth of his report, the author of the Yosippon, in like fashion, refers to the same sources. This, as stressed earlier, does not imply that the author of the Yosippon was dishonest in any way, for
he refers to Josephus by name when the situation warrants it. Joseph ben Gorion is the name used in the Yosippon in his references to Josephus. And, as noted, when a gloss of Josephus is inserted in the Yosippon, it is prefaced with a reference to the book of Joseph ben Gorion or in any of its variations. 4

Despite the similarity of the two narratives, when one reads The Jewish War and the Yosippon and critically compares the two texts a vast difference becomes evident, one that overpowers all parallels. And this difference results not from the structural or factual variations, as numerous as they may be, but rather from the respective themes of the books and from the purpose for their composition.

This all-encompassing variation is evident from the very titles by which the narratives are known. Josephus called his book The Jewish War, and he reports the unsuccessful attempt on the part of the Jewish Commonwealth to revolt against the mighty Roman Empire. The motives for this revolution were not unique in any way; the aspiration to regain liberty and independence from foreign rule was not experienced by the Judaeans alone. Uprisings in Parthia, Babylonia and the Adiabene posed constant threats to Rome. A purpose for the composition of The Jewish War was to dissuade such futile attempts, to dispel the idea of revolution from any nation or people, to impress upon them, using the Jewish war as the example, that any such attempt will result in defeat and destruction. "If I have dwelt at some length on this topic," writes Josephus, "my intention
was not so much to extoll the Romans as to console them whom they have vanquished and to deter others who may be tempted to revolt."\(^5\)

If _The Jewish War_ was a testimony to the great power of Rome and an admonition to all people to refrain from any manner of sedition, hence received with satisfaction in Rome and heartily approved by the Emperor himself,\(^6\) the _Yosippon_ was directed to the Jewish people and had a totally different purpose.

The author refers to this Hebrew history as the _Wars of God_.\(^7\) The Judaean revolution was not merely a war of an oppressed people seeking liberty. It was a Holy War waged by the people of God to preserve His laws, His city and His Temple. The narrative in the _Yosippon_ is permeated with a profound piety and religiosity. It glorifies and lauds the lofty spirit of the Jewish people. At the same time it is a lamentation at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and at the cause for this destruction - the alienation of the Judaean from the principles of their faith.

"Woe, woe, how I am pained," writes the _Yosippon_, "for now I begin to relate the destruction of our Holy Temple, which we have seen built and destroyed. Its verdict came; its perplexity is here. And of the wars that our eyes beheld, wars waged by God against the enemies that caused us anguish; for God strengthened their spirits to avenge our desecration of His Torah. And we called this book _The Wars of God_ for many of
the people of God chose death, the sanctification of their being, rather than to willingly agree to our enemies' desecration of His sanctuary, or to assist their enemies to defile the House of God in return for an escape from death. They chose rather to die according to the will of God. Regardless whether they were buried or if their corpses remained on the ground, their illumination became part of the light of the King of Life. And the memories of the righteous shall remain a blessing."  

More than a history, the Yosippon frequently assumes the garb of a theological treatise. The author does more than report a given sequence of events; he is interested in imparting a lesson. Utilizing the tragic events of the destruction, the author attempts to prevent the repetition of a similar tragedy in the millennia to come. Rather than providing a message for the nations of the world, as does Josephus, the Yosippon is concerned primarily with the Jewish people, stressing the iniquity that resulted in the futility of the revolution, and imploring his people to return to the teachings of their God. This destruction is not the end, writes the Yosippon, for when the people of God are cleansed of their transgression and return to the principles of their faith, they will experience the rebuilding of their Temple and the reestablishment of their independence. This hope for the future, emphasized by the Yosippon, is conspicuously absent in the lengthy narrative of Josephus.

This prime difference in the approach and the purpose
of the two histories explains many of the variations listed and classified in Chapter Two of this section. This part of the study is an attempt to explain and elucidate the differences between the histories and the ramifications of these differences in the context of their respective purposes.
CHAPTER TWO

THE VARIATIONS

From a critical comparison of the texts of Josephus and the Yosippon numerous variations become evident. These variations are of different types. We find that the Yosippon omits entire sections found in Josephus' relation. The Yosippon also introduces sections into its narrative that have no parallel in The Jewish War. At times the Yosippon will offer additional information regarding an episode reported in both texts. And frequently the author of the Hebrew history will transform the character of a historic occurrence by adding certain information or by deleting certain of the details reported in Josephus.

The ramifications of these variations in the context of the overall differences in approach and in purpose between Josephus and the Yosippon will be discussed in the forthcoming chapters.

The omissions in the Yosippon are of various sorts. The extensive geographical descriptions in The Jewish War are omitted in the Yosippon. As Vespasian prepares to take Sepphoris, the largest city of the Galilee, Josephus describes the entire area, thereby emphasizing the importance of that city for the Romans.¹ This description is omitted in the Yosippon. Similarly, when Josephus reports the Roman conquest of Jericho, he includes a lavish description of the city,² also omitted in the Yosippon.
As the Romans prepared to complete the siege of Jerusalem, Josephus describes the geography of the city in detail. This is omitted by the Yosippon, as well as the description of the Temple that follows. Similarly, when Josephus describes the geography of Masada, this section is omitted in the narrative of the Yosippon.

Whenever the opportunity presents itself Josephus describes the military power and might of Rome, stressing the discipline and the majesty of the legions. These descriptive sections have no parallels in the Yosippon. This category includes Josephus' description of the details of Roman military strategy; the description of the Roman march out of Ptolemais; the composition of Titus' army in Caesaria as he prepared to march toward Jerusalem; the description of this march, listing the order of the divisions and the military equipment; the description of Titus' expressions of appreciation to his soldiers and the formal recognition of their valor; and the detailed description of Titus' victory marches, commemorations and celebrations.

The Yosippon also omits Josephus' glorification of Vespasian, the detailed reports of how the legions everywhere accepted him as the emperor and the high esteem in which he was held by all.

The sections in the Josephus that are not directly related to the Judaean revolution are also omitted in the Yosippon. Included here are the report of the calamities
suffered by the Samaritans, the revolt of the Germans, the section discussing Macherus and Lucillus Bassus and the discussion of Antiochus, King of Commagene.

Certain other omissions in the Yosippon seem to indicate a compassion on the part of the author for his people, an attempt to preserve an image of dignity. In the preliminary stages of the revolution Josephus stresses Florus' attempts to instigate insurrection amongst the Judaeans, his interest in creating a turmoil and in firing the emotions of the people to war. At the same time Josephus emphasizes the restraint exercised by the Judaeans and the pacific influence of their leadership. In presenting this picture, Josephus describes the incidents in Caesarea and in Jerusalem wherein the Judaeans were degraded and embarrassed by Florus, and yet "they begged forgiveness for those that had spoken amiss." These incidents of degradation and expressions of subjection wherein, even for the sake of peace, the Judaeans permitted themselves to be cruelly humbled, are omitted in the Yosippon.

Similarly, when Josephus describes in detail the razing of Judaean cities and Jewish communities outside of Judaea and the cruelties brought upon the respective populations, such descriptions are noticeably absent in the narrative of the Yosippon. In this category we can refer to the Roman attacks on the Jewish communities in Agrippa's kingdom and in Alexandria; Vespasian's onslaught on Tiberias and Tarichae; the Roman capture of Gamala, fully described in Josephus, is
also omitted in the Yosippon. Josephus' description of the calamities suffered by the Jews in Antioch also finds no parallel in the Yosippon.

With the lofty image of the Judaeans ever present in the mind of the author of the Yosippon, this narrative significantly omits Josephus' vivid description of the death, the pain and the cries of anguish in Jotapata, the slaughter at Jopha and the deserter's description of the weakness and sedition in Jotapata.

Although the Yosippon is frequently outspoken against the excesses and sinfulness of the leadership of the seditious, the author attempts to spare the readers the vivid descriptions of their evils. The Yosippon, for example, does not describe Menachem's rise to power, his clashes with Eleazar and Eleazar's victory, a section that is filled with cruelty and bloodshed perpetrated upon the Judaeans by their own countrymen. He omits Josephus' stress that Eleazar massacred the Romans on the Sabbath day, thereby desecrating a principle of faith and bringing forth the wrath of God upon his people. The Yosippon does not refer to the constant plotting, accusation and threat posed by John of Gischala against Joseph ben Gorion (Josephus). Josephus' description of the evil character and misdeeds of Simon ben Glora is also omitted in the Yosippon.

In like manner the Yosippon omits the harsh results in the strife between Ananus and the Zealots, the massacre
accomplished by the Idumaeans and the Zealots on the citizenry of Jerusalem,35 nor does the author describe the evil of the Sicarii in Masada.36

A significant omission in the *Yosippon* is the power of prophecy ascribed to Josephus in *The Jewish War*.37 There are three such references to this divine trait of his, all omitted in the *Yosippon*. The first of these is associated with Josephus' reaction to Nicanor's proposal that he surrender. "And now, as Nicanor lay hard at Josephus to comply, and he understood how the multitude of the enemies threatened him, he called to mind the dreams which he had dreamed in the night time, whereby God had signified to him beforehand both the future calamities of the Jews and the events that concerned the Roman emperors.....and just then was he in an ecstasy; and setting before him the tremendous images of the dreams he had lately had, he put up a silent prayer to God....."38

Josephus also claims this power in his confrontation with Vespasian. "Thou, O Vespasian, thinkest no more than that thou hast taken Josephus himself captive; but I come to thee as a messenger of greater tidings; for had I not been sent by God to thee, I knew what was the law of the Jew in this case....."39 And when questioned by Vespasian regarding his silence in Jotapata, Josephus again insists that he foretold the future. "I did foretell to the people of Jotapata that they would be taken on the forty-seventh day and that I should be caught alive by the Romans."40
If the Yosippon omits certain sections of the narrative preserved by Josephus, then this Hebrew history is also marked with notable additions.

The Yosippon at times adds information to the historical sequence, details not found in Josephus. The incident of Nero's sacrifice that was refused in the Temple at the instigation of Eleazar ben Ananus is dated in the Yosippon to the ninth day of the fifth month (Ab) in the twentieth year of the reign of King Agrippa. When Titus sets his troops in order in Caesarea before beginning the war, this is dated in the Yosippon to the seventh day of the tenth month of the first year of Vespasian's rule. While Vespasian is in Rome, Titus gathers his soldiers and prepares to march on Jerusalem. This is dated in the Yosippon to the third day of the first month of the first year of his father's rule in Rome. When the fire in the Temple burned the doors and the Holy of Holies was exposed, this is dated in the Yosippon to the ninth day of the fifth month (Ab).

In the course of the siege Josephus reports a clash between the Romans and the Judaeans, resulting in a Roman retreat. The Yosippon adds the number of Roman casualties to have been 10,500. Josephus reports the strong policy taken by Titus against the Arabians and the Romans who dissected Judaean deserters to find gold in their stomachs. The Yosippon adds that as a result of his stern command, 320 men, found
guilty of this inhumanity, were killed and their bodies were burned in a mass grave. The 

Josephus reports the Judaean strategy against the Roman attackers, luring them into the western cloister and then surrounding them with flames. The also reports this Judaean victory, but adds that 22,000 Romans were killed. Adding to the description of the self incurred massacre in Masada, the informs us that all men over fifty years of age were put to death with the women and children. The also informs us that the total number of the dead in Jerusalem was 1,108,000, and that Titus captured 90,000 Judaean, of which he distributed 36,500. These figures have no parallels in Josephus.

The also informs us of certain appointments, or would-be appointments, made by Titus, not reported in Josephus. In one of Titus' exhortations to the Jews, pleading with them for peace, he promises them that he would appoint Joseph ben Gorion their governor, and, if they so desired, he would crown him their king. The reports the appointment of the priest Jesus, son of Thebuthus, as the chief of the priests, and Joseph ben Gorion as the high officer of the elders of Israel. The also informs us that as a result of Joseph's intervention, his brother, Bonim, was appointed the head of all the priests who remained in Jerusalem. This appointment is again referred to in a more encompassing fashion, that Bonim was the head over all the Jews who remained in Jerusalem, not only over the priests.

Incidents reported in Josephus are frequently embellished
with further information and elucidation in the Yosippon. When Josephus lists the many auxiliaries that joined with Titus in his war with the Judaeans, the Yosippon stresses the loyalty of the Idumaeans, that they did not assist the Romans but came rather to Jerusalem to protect the city against the attackers. Josephus reports that when Vespasian heard of the wide acclamation regarding his assumption of Roman leadership, he alone went to Rome. The Yosippon adds to the incident, that he took Agrippa and his son, Munbazz, with him, and that Joseph ben Gorion, too, accompanied him to Rome, but that he was chained as a prisoner. The Yosippon offers a dual explanation for Joseph's going to Rome — that he be prevented from organizing a further revolt and that he should be at Vespasian's side to serve as an advisor. After the coronation is over, Agrippa and his son, accused of treason, are killed. This, too, is not mentioned in Josephus. The Yosippon also reports the death of Ananus in the course of the sedition, a fact not mentioned in Josephus.

After Joseph's moving address to the Judaeans, urging them to make peace with the Romans, and to spare the Temple and Jerusalem, the Yosippon reports the compassionate reaction of the Romans — Titus frees the Judaean slaves that he purchased and returns the monies to the original owners.

Josephus writes that in order to convince the Judaeans of their folly, Titus permitted the capture of five hundred Judaeans each day and these were publicly crucified.
Yosippon adds that the Judaeans, under the leadership of Simon and John, responded in like fashion, crucifying five hundred Romans each day.\textsuperscript{72}

Josephus reports that his father was in prison, but does not specify the location.\textsuperscript{73} The Yosippon adds that he was held in one of the towers in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{74} A variation is found in ed.M, that he was imprisoned in Simon's home.\textsuperscript{75} Josephus writes that when he was going around the city he was wounded by a stone that was thrown at him,\textsuperscript{76} but he doesn't explain why he was walking so close to the city walls. The Yosippon states that he was close to the tower where his father was held prisoner, wanting to learn of his welfare.\textsuperscript{77}

Josephus reports how Titus pitied the starving Judaean deserters who arrived in his camp and how he generously fed them; due to a physiological reaction, however, they took sick.\textsuperscript{78} The Yosippon adds the advice that Joseph ben Gorion offered to Titus regarding a suitable menu for the survivors, and how this suggestion was readily accepted.\textsuperscript{79}

Josephus speaks of a young lad who was captured by Pedanius and of Jonathan who avenged his capture.\textsuperscript{80} The Yosippon identifies Jonathan as the lad's brother.\textsuperscript{81}

When the Temple was burned, Josephus reports that the Romans "brought their ensigns to the Temple and set them over against the eastern gate; and there did they offer sacrifices to them, and there did they make Titus imperatur with the
greatest acclamations of joy." The Yosippon is more emphatic in reporting these acts, that the Romans shamed the Jews and desecrated their Torah.

According to Josephus, when John surrendered to the Romans, he was condemned to permanent imprisonment. The Yosippon writes that after seven days he was killed by strangulation.

When the Holy of Holies had been desecrated, the ed.M reports that Joseph ben Gorion pleaded with Titus to remove the ensigns from the sanctified area so that he and the priests may enter to pray and to lament the destruction. This request was granted. This exchange has no parallel in Josephus nor in the other editions of the Yosippon. The ed.M. closes the narrative with the information that Titus gave Joseph an area for himself where he settled with his family, built homes, built a synagogue wherein to pray and a house of study wherein to learn. This report, too, is unique to the ed.M.

We frequently find that the Yosippon, while reporting the same incident as does Josephus, adds to the dialogue or elaborates upon the description, thereby changing the character of the incident.

When Josephus suggests the method of lot-drawing to the people in Jotapata as the selection procedure for suicide, this plan is expressed simply. "And now since it is resolved among you that you will die, come on, let us commit our mutual deaths to determination by lots. He whom the lot falls to first,
let him be killed by him that hath the second lot, and thus fortune shall make its progress through us all; nor shall any of us perish by his own right hand, for it would be unfair if, when the rest are gone, somebody should repent and save himself." 88

The plan, as reported in the Yosippon, is presented in a far more detailed fashion. "Listen to me, my friends and brothers, and I shall advise you. Being that you seek death and you wish to die by the sword of our brothers, it would be proper that we do so according to the selection of lots. We shall draw lots until we are divided into groups of two, who will be chosen to kill one another. Then we shall draw lots to determine which of these groups shall be first to die. And the two people in that group will draw lots, and the one who will draw the lot to die will be killed by the sword of his companion. And this one who killed will choose one from the next group to kill him. The two people of the second group will then draw lots which of them is to die first. He will be killed and the killer will choose one from the third group to kill him. And the members of the third group will then draw lots which of them is to die first by the sword of his brother, and he shall die first, while the killer will choose one from the fourth group to kill him. And this we shall do until all of us perish together and we shall die, as you say, and we shall not live to witness the desecration of the Sanctuary of our God and the dispersion of our people. And the last remaining group will embrace together, and each will thrust his sword into the
body of the other, and they shall die together. Or (an alternative) they, too, will draw lots, and whosoever draws the first lot to die by the sword of his brother will die first. And you should remain assured that the last remaining one will not escape death. And being that we are forty-one people, and we cannot be divided into equal groups of two, let us draw lots to determine which of us is to die first, and we shall remove him from our midst, and then we shall divide into the groups equally. And this person who will have been determined to die first will choose one from the first group who will kill him. And after this man's death, the first group will begin to draw lots as I have advised you to do.89 The Yosippon also informs us who was selected to die first, Yeholada the priest, the son of Eliakim the Galilaean, and that the procedure as suggested by Joseph was followed.

Josephus reports that he was left to the end with another. "And as he was desirous neither to be condemned by the lot, nor, if he had been left to the last, to imbrue his right hand in the blood of his countryman, he persuaded him to trust his fidelity to him, and to live as well as himself."90 The Yosippon reports this confrontation between Joseph and the other survivor in a most elaborate fashion, both in terms of Joseph's arguments for life as well as the suggestion that he was prepared to compel the other to submit to his wishes. The Yosippon also suggests that Joseph, through conscious design, arranged for his companion to be a weak person, one who will readily submit to his desire, even out of fear.91
Upon convincing his companion that they remain alive, Josephus goes to Rome. In The Jewish War this transition is assumed, and we immediately read of the reaction of the Romans to his arrival and of his introduction to Vespasian by Nicanor. In the Yosippon, however, we read of the initial encounter between Joseph and Nicanor, the assurance that Nicanor offers his for his safety, and the warmth and respect with which he was greeted.

"And Joseph said to him: Will you sign a treaty with me that neither you nor any of your men who are here nor any one of the Roman army will hurt us, until you bring us to Vespasian, who will be free to do with us as he wishes. And Nicanor answered Joseph and said to him: So shall God do with me, and even more, for I shall do as you speak, just come to me, you and those who are with you. And Joseph answered and said: I and those with me who are alive will come out to you, for should something occur to those with me in the cave that they should die, how shall they come out to you? And Nicanor answered as follows: Joseph, Joseph, don't think that I have come to fool you. Come out to me and trust in God and in me. Don't be afraid. And Joseph said: Swear to me by God, the Lord of Israel. And Nicanor answered: I swear to you by Him who created the world in wisdom that you need not fear and that you can trust me. And Nicanor signed a treaty and oath to Joseph and those with him. He put the oath to writing, as according to Roman law, and he sent the letter into the cave with a spear. He held the iron end of the spear and the other
end he sent into the cave. And Joseph took the letter with the oath and treaty and he read it and he trusted in Nicanor. He and his friends went out to him. As Nicanor saw Joseph coming to him, he sat on his throne. His people paid homage to him (Joseph) at the entrance to the cave. He (Nicanor) faced him, took hold of him and kissed him, placed him at his right and they both wept bitterly together. 93

Vespasian reminded himself of Josephus, of his prophecy and of his valor, and, realizing that he was still in captivity, said: "It is a shameful thing that this man, who hath foretold my coming to the empire beforehand, and being the minister of a Divine message to me, should still be restrained in the condition of a captive or prisoner." So he called for Josephus and commanded that he should be set at liberty. 94

In Yosippon the freeing of Joseph ben Gorion is a far more impressive event. It is associated with the freedom of all the Jews in Rome. And Joseph himself, not only is he freed, but he is assigned to Titus as a faithful advisor, with an admonition from Vespasian that Titus listen to Joseph as a father. The Yosippon records a lengthy conversation between the Emperor and Joseph, when Vespasian speaks of Agrippa's treachery while lauding the person and accomplishment of Joseph. His lofty opinion of Joseph is further expressed in the text of the letter that Vespasian wrote to Titus as he sent Joseph to Alexandria to be his advisor. 95

Both Josephus and the Yosippon report the heroism and
courage of the son of Antiochus, King of Commagene, and his fearless attack upon the Judaeans. 96 The Yosippon, however, adds a lengthy exposition on the part of Joseph to this young lad, extolling his bravery, comparing him to his ancestor, Alexander of Macedon, and associating his feat with that of King David of biblical days. 97

When Titus learned of the cruelty and inhumanity of the Atabians and the Romans, how, as a result of their greed for wealth, they killed the Judaean survivors and cut open their bodies in order to find hidden gold, Josephus reports that "Titus then threatened that he would put such men to death, if any of them were discovered to be insolvent as to do so again; moreover, he gave it in charge to the legions, that they should make a search after such as were suspected, and should bring them to him." 98

In the Yosippon Titus does more than merely threaten. In a lengthy report, the Yosippon records how this command was implemented, how many were arrested and punished, with the result that the survivors were able to live securely. 99 In Josephus, the command being no more than a threat, the Judaeans hesitate to continue to come to the Roman camp.

When the Yosippon reports the surrender of the priests, Phineas and Joshua, and describes how they brought the Temple implements to Titus as a symbol of their surrender, the author adds an admonition, that they were wrong in their action and that the method of their surrender represented a desecration.
"And Phineas and Joshua, whom we mentioned earlier, transgressed a law and desecrated a covenant and sinned to God, for they gave the prized possessions of God to an enemy and foe of God's people. And it was not proper for them to do this. It would have been better for them to die with their brethren, the priests, who died for the sake of their people and were consumed in the fire of the Sanctuary. And if they wanted to save their lives, and to live on after their brethren, why did they need to open the hidden treasures of the House of God and give them to Titus. This they were not compelled to do."\(^{100}\)

Josephus, too, reports the surrender of the priests and how they brought the Temple vessels to Titus, but does not associate any sort of admonition with it. This sentiment is peculiar to the Yosippon.

The Yosippon includes another addition without parallel in Josephus: the detailed description of the operation of the Roman battering ram,\(^{101}\) compared to a simple statement of definition in Josephus.\(^{102}\) Other additions in the Yosippon not found in Josephus include the battle at Seleucus and the Judean victory,\(^{103}\) and the report of the events immediately after the destruction, the mention of Johanan ben Zakkai and Jabne, the death of Titus and the praise of his person, his scholarship and his accomplishments.\(^{104}\) Another significant addition is the lavish description of Vespasian's coronation ceremony in Rome.\(^{105}\)
The **Yosippon** also includes a series of religious monologues, profound expressions of faith and hope in the salvation of the Judaeans and the rebuilding of the Temple. These sections attest to the religious nature of the history and the message of hope and optimism that the author attempted to convey to his readers.

In the midst of his narration, the **Yosippon** summarizes the activities of Mattathias and his sons as those who saved the children of Israel from the hands of their foes, relating that historic sequence to the dangers confronting the Judaeans in their present situation and implying that they, too, shall enjoy salvation. The **Yosippon** closes the summary with a hope for the rebuilding of the Third Temple. This hope in the future redemption is repeated in a later section, associated with the biblical prophecies regarding the destruction.

These religious expressions are further emphasized in the lamentations composed by the author. At one point Josephus turns to Jerusalem and laments the suffering of its inhabitants. "O most wretched city, what misery so great as this didst thou suffer from the Romans, when they came to purify thee from thy intestine hatred. For thou couldst be no longer a place fit for God, nor couldst thou long continue in being, after thou hadst been a sepulchre for the bodies of thy own people, and hadst made the holy house itself a burying place in the civil war of thine. Yet mayest thou ever grow better, if perchance thou wilt hereafter appease the anger of that God who is the
author of thy destruction."\(^{109}\) This is the closest that Josephus approaches to an expression of hope for the future. How different are the expressions of optimism and the lamentations of the *Yosippon* - both in terms of content and piety.\(^{110}\)
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If the variations between the *Yosippon* and Josephus are evident as omissions and additions, there are also fundamental differences in the reports of the historical occurrences, contradictions in the details of what had been experienced in the course of the revolution.

Some of these differences are technical in nature. Josephus reports that 3,000 horsemen were sent by King Agrippa to assist the leadership of Jerusalem against the seditious.\(^{111}\) *Ed.C* reports 6,000\(^{112}\) and *ed.M* agrees with Josephus.\(^{113}\)

Josephus reports that in an early confrontation between Cestius and Eleazar the Romans lost 515 soldiers.\(^{114}\) *Ed.C* reports a loss of 27,000 soldiers,\(^{115}\) while *ed.M* agrees with Josephus.\(^{116}\)

Josephus reports that when Cestius decided to retreat, he sent 400 of his most courageous soldiers forward in order to disguise his intentions to retreat.\(^{117}\) Both *ed.C* and *ed.M* report this number to be 40,000.\(^{118}\)

Josephus reports the number of Judaeans killed in the battle in Jopha to have been 4,200.\(^{119}\) The *Yosippon* reports
the number as 4,000.\textsuperscript{120}

Josephus reports the number of Idumaeans who came to assist John of Gischala as 20,000.\textsuperscript{121} The \textit{Yosippon} reports it as 22,000.\textsuperscript{122}

Josephus reports the number of Judeans killed in the battle at Gedara as 15,000.\textsuperscript{123} The \textit{Yosippon} reports it as 13,000.\textsuperscript{124}

Josephus reports the number of dead removed through the gate watched by Manneus as 115,880.\textsuperscript{125} Ed.C reports it as 115,808\textsuperscript{126} and ed.M records the number 115,000.\textsuperscript{127}

Josephus reports the total number of dead in Jerusalem as 600,000.\textsuperscript{128} Ed.C reports it as 601,575\textsuperscript{129} and ed.M offers the same total as does Josephus.\textsuperscript{130}

Josephus reports the number of Judeans captured in the war as 97,000.\textsuperscript{131} This total is not mentioned in the \textit{Yosippon}, but ed.C does report that Titus himself took with him 16,000 prisoners.\textsuperscript{132}

Josephus reports the number of people in Masada, including the women and children, to have been 960.\textsuperscript{133} Ed.C merely reports that there were "many" there,\textsuperscript{134} but ed.M gives a total of 40,000.\textsuperscript{135}

Josephus reports the name of the High Priest appointed by John of Gischala as Phannias, the son of Samuel, of the village Aptha.\textsuperscript{136} The \textit{Yosippon} reports his name as Pani, the
Josephus identifies Eleazar, the leader of the seditious, as the son of Simon, while in the Yosippon he is Eleazar, the son of Ananus, who had initially refused the sacrifice sent to the Temple by Emperor Nero.

Josephus identifies the name of the gatekeeper in Jerusalem as Manneus, the son of Lazarus. Ed.C refers to him as Menahem ben Saruk.

When a Judaean lad was taken captive by Pedanius, Jonathan (according to the Yosippon, the lad's brother) sought to avenge his capture. According to Josephus another Roman, Pudens, volunteered to battle against Jonathan. In the Yosippon, it was the same Pedanius who had captured the lad who now fought against Jonathan.

According to Josephus, Titus and one of his tribunes led the attack upon Jotapata. According to the Yosippon, it was Titus and Vespasian.

When the Idumaeans approached Jerusalem, in response to the request for assistance by John of Gischala, Josephus reports that "Jesus, the eldest of the high priests next to Ananus" pleaded with them that they return to their country. The Yosippon reports it to have been Ananus himself who addressed the Idumaeans.

According to Josephus, the High Priest who was sent to call for Simon ben Giomas and to invite him to assume leadership.
ship in Jerusalem was Matthias. According to the *Yosippon*, it was Amitai. The same variation recurs later in the text, in the High Priest's exhortation to his sons prior to his death.

In reporting the attempt to influence John of Gischala to refrain from further sedition and to submit to the Romans in return for peace, Josephus reports that he (Josephus) made this proposal to John. The *Yosippon* reports Titus to have addressed John, with Joseph ben Gorion as the interpreter.

According to Josephus, Titus sent the dignitaries from Jerusalem and the priests who deserted to him to Gophna "and desired them to remain there for the present, and told them, that when he was gotten clear of this war, he would restore each of them to his possessions again; so they cheerfully retired to that small city which was allotted them, without fear of danger." The *Yosippon* reports this city of refuge to have been Goshen, the settlement that the Israelites lived in in the biblical days of Jacob and Joseph.

Josephus reports that Titus ordered the preparations to destroy the Tower of Antonia and to besiege Jerusalem in the month of Panemus (Tammuz), and that on the seventeenth day of that month "the sacrifice called the daily sacrifice had failed, and had not been offered to God, for want of men to offer it." The *Yosippon* reports this to have occurred on the fifth day of Sivan, the day before Shavuot (Pentacost), and the sacrifice in question was the festival sacrifice and not the daily sacrifice.
In addition to these technical variations, we find that the *Yosippon* frequently reports the result of a military confrontation differently than does Josephus. When Josephus records a Roman victory or a stalemate, the *Yosippon* will at times classify it as a Judaean victory, attempting to elevate the image of the Judaeans and their military.

In reporting the clash between the Judaeans and the Syrians, Josephus writes that the "Syrians were even with the Jews in the multitude of men whom they slew." The *Yosippon* reports it as follows: "The Judaeans destroyed the whole land of Aram, and had it not been for Cestius, who saved the land of Aram from the Judaeans, every trace of Aram would have been lost."

Similarly, in *The Jewish War* when Josephus and his army battle against the city of Sapphoris, "he (Josephus) proved too weak, and failed of his hopes, both as to the forcing the place, and as to prevailing with the people of Sapphoris to deliver it up to him." According to the *Yosippon*, Sepphoris was razed, its population imprisoned and all Romans within the city were killed.

This approach of the *Yosippon* becomes evident in his report of another confrontation. Josephus writes that when Vespasian marched with his army to the border of the Galilee, showing his army to the Judaeans that they may become frightened, he "put them all into a consternation; for those that were in Josephus' camp, which was at the city called Garis,
not far from Sepphoris, when they heard that the war was come near them, and that the Romans would suddenly fight them hand to hand, dispersed themselves and fled, not only before they came to a battle, but before the enemy ever came to sight, while Josephus and a few others were left behind." According to the Υοσίππος, Joseph went out to meet the Roman army and routed them in an unprecedented fashion.

In like manner, Josephus reports that Jotapata was taken with only one Roman casualty. "And the Romans might have boasted that the conclusion of that siege was without blood (on their side) if there had not been a centurion, Antonius, who was slain at the taking of the city." Υοσίππος also reports the taking of the city, but at a heavy price, causing more Roman deaths than in previous battles.

Josephus describes the three towers, fifty cubits high, that the Romans built in their siege of Jerusalem. He then reports an accident, when one of these towers fell, causing the Romans to become frightened at the noise. "It so happened that one of these towers fell down about midnight; and as its fall made a very great noise, fear fell upon the army, and they, supposing that the enemy was coming to attack them, ran to their arms." The Υοσίππος reports it as an actual attack on the part of the Judaeans, wherein many Romans fell, and all three towers were destroyed.

A comparative study indicates that throughout the entire historical narrative, the Υοσίππος introduces major variations.
changing the nature of the occurrences as they were reportedly experienced in Josephus.

We have already discussed the omission in the Yosippon of the incidents prior to the commencement of sedition, wherein Josephus stresses Florus' designs to instigate Judaea to revolt. According to Josephus the Judaeans were successfully influenced by the leadership of Jerusalem and they exercised a restraint, still seeking peace with the Romans. "Accordingly the multitude complied immediately, out of reverence for those who had desired it of them, and out of the hope that they had that Florus would do them no more injuries." The Yosippon reports no such restraint. The spirit of revolution was in the air. The response to Florus' cruelty was an immediate one. Eleazar, the son of Ananus the High Priest, gathered his people, fell upon Florus, was victorious in this initial confrontation and Florus was put to flee from Jerusalem.

Florus, who according to Josephus was still in Jerusalem, thought of another way to instigate a war, and, in a delegation to Cestius, accused the Judaeans falsely of revolting. At the same time the Judaeans also sent a delegation to him, countering Florus' arguments. Cestius, in response, sent Neopolitanus, one of his intimate friends, to go to Jerusalem and to report to him on the situation as it actually existed. Neopolitanus met Agrippa, and together they went to Jerusalem, where they found the situation a peaceful one, and upon paying due respect to the Temple, he returned to Cestius with his report. This entire sequence is changed in the Yosippon. Florus, having
been driven out of Jerusalem by Eleazar, met Agrippa and in-
formed him of all that had occurred, of Eleazar's successful
attack upon his legions and of the revolution that was
imminent. Agrippa then went directly to Jerusalem to see if
he could calm the tempers of the people. All else is
omitted.

The variation continues regarding the Judaean demands of
Agrippa. Josephus, stressing that the Judaeans were intent on
peace, writes that they "desired that they might have leave
to sent ambassadors to Nero against Florus, and not by their
silence afford a suspicion that they had been the occasions
of such great slaughters as had been made (by Florus) and
were disposed to revolt." Their demand, as reported in the
Yosippon, was a totally different one. Their decision was to
revolt, and they demanded Agrippa's assistance. "Help us, O
King, come to our aid, for we shall no longer serve the
Romans."

This difference is also reflected in Agrippa's answer.
According to Josephus, Agrippa advises them not to accuse
Florus before Nero. "Your first occasion is the accusations
you have to make against your procurator; now here you ought
to be submissive to those in authority, and not give them
any provocation." According to the Yosippon, Agrippa is
prepared to petition to Nero that he remove Florus as the
procurator, but he pleads with the Judaeans that they refrain
from immediate revolution and exercise restraint.
Equally different are their reports regarding the Judaean reaction to Agrippa’s plea. According to Josephus, they heeded his advice. They began to rebuild the cloisters that they had broken and they began to collect the tribute that they had refused to pay. "And thus did Agrippa then put a stop to that war which was threatened." 178 This is not found in the Yosippon. Here we read of immediate insurrection, that Eleazar killed the Romans who had accompanied Agrippa to Jerusalem and fighting was begun. 179

Josephus reports as the first instance of insurrection the rejection of Nero’s sacrifice by Eleazar ben Ananus. Lengthy arguments and persuasions by the "men of power" are recorded, but they were of no avail and the sacrifice was rejected. 180 This incident is recorded in the Yosippon as well, but not as the first act of revolution, for, according to the Yosippon, warfare had already begun earlier. Here the incident of the sacrifice is recorded as an attempt by Nero to re-establish peace. The sacrifice was accompanied with a letter from the Emperor, assuring the Judaean that he would rectify the situation, that the Roman governor would be removed, that Agrippa would be declared as the leader of Judaea and that they would suffer no further cruelties. 181 Still, his assurance was not accepted and the sacrifice was rejected. We mentioned earlier that the Yosippon dates this incident to the ninth day of the month of Ab. 182

Josephus records the massacre at Scythopolis with the details of the treachery perpetrated against the Jewish popula-
tion of the city. Simon, "a man of reputation among the Jews," who had always sided with the citizenry against the besieging Judaeans, was also a victim of this massacre. When he saw the people of Scythopolis attacking him, "he drew his sword, but did not attack any of the enemy: for he saw that he could do nothing against such a multitude." Instead, he killed the members of his family and then committed suicide.\(^{183}\) The Yosippon also records this act of suicide, but with a variation, the nature of which recurs a number of times in the course of the narrative. The Yosippon never records a passive approach on the part of the Judaeans. Even when nothing can be accomplished, when defeat is certain, the Judaeans always fight against the Romans. The same was true with Simon. "And Simon saw the Roman army and the Syrian army coming at him, and he drew his sword and he ran against them and he killed many of them, forcing them to retreat." It was only when they returned against him with larger numbers that he killed his family and then himself.\(^{184}\)

An interesting variation is recorded regarding the confrontation between Cestius and the Judaeans at Gaboa. According to Josephus, this occurred during the Feast of Tabernacles when many Jews assembled in Jerusalem for the festival, and with the security and courage of having multitudes with them, they attacked and were victorious. Josephus notes that "without any consideration had of the rest of the seventh day, although the sabbath was the day to which they had the greatest regard; but that rage which made them forget the religious
observation (of the Sabbath) made them too hard for their enemies in the fight." The Yosippon does not let the incident by without noting that the victory took place not on the Sabbath, but after the Sabbath. This variation also represents the Yosippon's attempt to elevate the image of the Judaeans in their fight against the Romans.

A series of variations between the texts are found in the respective narratives concerning Josephus at Jotapata. In The Jewish War Josephus, upon realizing the severity of the situation, begins to deliberate upon the possibility of surrender and confronts the leadership in Jerusalem with the alternatives as he sees them. "For he saw whither the affairs of the Jews would tend at last, and was sensible that they had but one way of escaping, and that this was by repentance .... He determined, therefore, to give an exact account of affairs to the principal men at Jerusalem by a letter.... He also sent them word that if they thought of coming to terms they must suddenly write him an answer; or if they resolved upon war, they must send him an army sufficient to fight the Romans." In the Yosippon we read that a prominent delegation was sent by Vespasian to Joseph with a peace proposal, not only that he save himself but that all those with him would be free as well. Upon receiving this letter, he contacts the leadership in Jerusalem, who, of course, reject all these proposals.

Upon this rejection, there is a resumption of warfare,
and the battle against Jotapata is led by Titus himself. 

In the course of the fighting the Romans overpowered the Jews. Josephus reports that, upon being confronted with a sure defeat, they committed suicide. "This provoked a good many, even of those chosen men that were about Josephus, to kill themselves with their own hands; for when they saw that they could kill none of the Romans, they resolved to prevent being killed by the Romans, and got together in great numbers on the utmost part of the city, and killed themselves."190 The Yosippon, consistent in his approach, omits the report of this act of suicide and reports rather that they fought against the Romans until they were killed in battle, "for they said to one another, let us die in war rather than be captured alive." The thought of suicide as an alternative is not reported. 191

When Josephus, after having saved himself from death in the selection of lots, came to the Roman camp, the Roman response to him was a varied one - from rejoicing to anger. Josephus reports that Titus, appreciating his courage and valor, pitied him. Vespasian, however, viewed him with suspicion and he "gave strict orders that he should be kept with great caution, as though he would in a very little time send him to Nero."192 The Yosippon reports the reaction to have been a different one. Vespasian, influenced by Titus, forgave Josephus for all his activity against the Romans, and, together with Agrippa, Joseph accompanied Vespasian in his travels from one city to the next. 193
When Titus approached Gischala and besieged the city, he again attempted to communicate with John regarding a possible truce and surrender. Josephus reports John's reply, requesting additional time before he responds for the next day was the Sabbath, "on which it was unlawful not only to remove their arms but even to treat of peace also." The Yosippon reports this same ruse but with a variation. It was not the Sabbath that John used as an excuse, but it was the day before Pentecost and John requested a two-day stay before responding. According to both sources the request was granted.

Josephus and the Yosippon report John's treachery differently. According to Josephus, John was with Ananus, accepted by him as a trusted ally. As such, he had access to the most private of consultations and learned of the plans that were designed by Ananus. He then came to the Zealot camp, revealed these plans to them and fabricated additional ones, that Ananus had contacted Vespasian for assistance against them. With this revelation he advised them to call for foreign assistance as well, and a call went out to the Idumaeans for help. The Yosippon does not report this craft on the part of John at all. He was never accepted as an ally of Ananus, nor was he in his camp. The High Priest, not wanting to extend the battle into the Temple area, proposed a peace with John, which he refused, for he had already called for Idumaean assistance.

When Simon ben Gioras came to power, the Zealots, afraid
of potential opposition, clashed with him. "Whereupon the Zealots, out of the dread they were in of his attacking them, and being willing to prevent one that was growing up to oppose them, went out against him with their weapons. Simon met them, and joining battle with them, slew a considerable number of them." This clash, according to the Yosippon, was not with the Zealots, but rather with Ananus, with the ones who had initially invited Simon to Jerusalem to oppose the Zealots.

Josephus' report regarding Jacob's betrayal of the Idumaeans is a simple one. When Simon's troops attacked, Jacob, an Idumaean commander, descended from his horse and fled. This caused a terror among the troops and victory came easily to Simon. The report in the Yosippon is a far more elaborate one. Jacob presents Simon with two alternative plans for the proposed betrayal. The first suggestion was that he himself, with the assistance of Simon's troops, would gain control of the entrance to the city and permit the entry of Simon's army. The second alternative was the one that was followed, that Jacob would show weakness and that this would be emulated by the other Idumaeans. This, as is also reported by Josephus, occurred and Simon was the victor.

When Simon was invited by Ananus to enter Jerusalem and to assist him in his fight against the Zealots, Josephus reports that upon his entry he immediately proceeded to attack John and his men and prevented them from leaving the Temple.
The Yosippon, however, reports an immediate treachery. As soon as Simon entered Jerusalem he allied himself with John against Ananus. It was not until later, when the two leaders of the sedition began to argue regarding Eleazar's destiny, that Simon warred against John.

In The Jewish War, Josephus is freed before Vespasian's coronation. When Vespasian is in good spirits, thinking of the good fortune that he met with everywhere and how all the legions accepted him as the emperor, he reminded himself of Josephus' prophecy and commanded that he be set at liberty. Titus then suggested to his father that this freedom be a full one, that not only shall his hands be loosened but that the chains be cut into pieces. This was done and Josephus "received this testimony of his integrity for a reward, and was moreover esteemed a person of credit as to futurities also." In the Yosippon, Joseph ben Gorion is not freed until after the coronation. He accompanies Vespasian to Rome in chains.

Josephus writes that as Vespasian made his plans to go to Rome for the coronation, he sent Titus to destroy Jerusalem. Interesting is the variation in Yosippon, where Vespasian commands Titus not to move from Alexandria and not to besiege Jerusalem but rather to await further orders from Rome. The siege does not begin until after the coronation, when Vespasian sends Joseph to Titus to serve him as his advisor.

Upon the successful siege of Jerusalem and the burning of
the Temple, Josephus reports that the Romans burned everything in the area. "And now the Romans, judging that it was in vain to spare what was round about the holy house, burnt all those places, as also the remains of the cloisters and the gates, two excepted; the one on the east side, and the other on the south; both which, however, they burnt afterward." The Yosippon reports that when the Holy of Holies was burned the Jews themselves completed the burning of the Temple and all other homes and structures in the area, that the Romans should have no satisfaction from their spoils.

Josephus reports that when Simon surrendered to the Romans he was imprisoned and brought to Caesar in bonds, and that Caesar ordered "that he should be kept against that triumph which he was to celebrate at Rome upon this occasion." The Yosippon reports that he was imprisoned, shamed and mocked, and that Titus then ordered him killed. He was decapitated and his body was thrown to the dogs.

Variations are also to be noted regarding the revolutionary expeditions of the Alans. Josephus reports that the Alans plundered the country of the Medes without any opposition, and upon receiving one hundred talents, they freed the wife and the concubines of Pacorus, the King of the Medes. The Yosippon reports a far more humane approach. The Alans were not interested in plunder or thievery. Their people were suffering from an intense famine. All they wanted was to be fed until their crops would ripen. This was agreed to by the King...
of the Medes, and, after a month, the Alans left the country fully intact.\textsuperscript{214}

In a similar fashion Josephus reports their further expedition against the Armenians, that the Alans destroyed their entire country, and then returned to their own land with all their spoils of war.\textsuperscript{215} This is also denied in the Yosippon. Here, too, the Alans ask for nothing more than sustenance for a month's period, which is granted. A peace treaty is signed and Armenia is spared.\textsuperscript{216}

A significant variation is to be noted regarding the fall of Masada, the last Judaean stronghold in the revolution. We have already noted the technical differences between Josephus and the Yosippon regarding the number of people in the fortress.\textsuperscript{217} More significant, however, is the reported difference regarding Masada's opposition to the Romans. According to Josephus, there was no opposition. Ten men were chosen by lot to kill all the occupants. One of these ten was then chosen by lot to execute the remaining nine. He was then to set the palace afire and commit suicide. "So these people did with this intention, that they would not leave so much as one soul among them all alive to be subject to the Romans."\textsuperscript{218}

In the Yosippon the report is a different one. Eleazar ben Yair influences the people to put their respective families to death, and then to oppose the Romans and themselves to die in battle.\textsuperscript{219} This was adhered to. The Yosippon reports that 8,000 men remained to fight against the Romans. All were
killed in battle, but they caused 95,000 Romans to be killed as well. The people of Masada were a far more courageous group as depicted in the *Yosippon* than in Josephus.

In classifying the variations between the two narratives, the autobiographical references are noteworthy to mention. In the *Yosippon* we read that Gorlon, the father of Joseph (Josephus), was 103 years old at the time of the siege of Jerusalem, and his mother was 85 years old. The text also informs us that Gorlon lived 20 months after the destruction of Jerusalem. Joseph was one of eighteen children. His younger brother, Bonim, is referred to a number of times. He is described as having been a wise and pious man. We already mentioned that Bonim is reported to have been appointed to a high post as a result of Joseph's intervention and influence. All these references have no parallels in the text of Josephus.

It is also pertinent to note that there are a number of instances in the section of the *Yosippon* investigated in this study where Joseph ben Gorion (Josephus) refers to himself in the first person, identifying himself as the author of the *Yosippon*. He refers to the Temple that "we have seen built and destroyed." He refers to this book that "we have called the Wars of God." When reporting the generals who were selected to head the revolution he again refers to himself in the first person, "(they chose) me, Joseph the Priest...." In reference to the battles in the Galilee that he omitted in the Hebrew
history, he informs us that he recorded them in the book that he composed for the Romans. All the references to Joseph ben Gorion as he accompanied Vespasian to Rome for the coronation ceremony are in the first person. Similarly, when the Yosippon describes the freeing of Joseph, the entire account is in the first person. He refers to his emotions upon learning of the tragedies in Jerusalem in the first person. When reporting Titus' admonition to his soldiers, he again refers to the book that he composed for the Romans. When the text speaks of Joseph's father who was imprisoned, it explicitly identifies Joseph ben Gorion as the author of the Yosippon. The authorship of this history is associated with Joseph ben Gorion in a later section as well.

These identifying references caused scholars to conclude that the Yosippon is a pseudepigraphic work. It must be noted, however, that none of these phrases have parallels in the ed.M. They are unique to the ed.C., and they are to be classified with the other interpolated passages that characterize this edition. They are not to be viewed as a reflection on the author who was totally honest in his approach and in the purpose for his composition.

If we listed the omissions, the additions and the variations in the reports of the historic occurrences that appear as we critically compare and contrast the narratives of the
Yosippon and Josephus, we must also note the differences in tone and approach that characterize the addresses and monologues recorded in the respective texts. Although such addresses, admonitions and exhortations do not affect the actual course of history that is preserved, they do reflect the approach taken by the authors to the historic sequence that they recorded for posterity.

As will be shown in the forthcoming chapters, these differences in approach could well explain many of the variations listed in this chapter, and they present us with two contrasting pictures of the revolution in all of its ramifications.

When Agrippa arrives in Jerusalem to attempt to stop the seemingly inevitable insurrection against Rome, both Josephus and the Yosippon record a lengthy exhortation to the Judaeans.238

In the Josephus version, Agrippa attempts to influence the Judaeans against revolution by degrading them, by proving to them that they are totally unprepared for war, that defeat is a certainty; that they cannot rely on their own strength, which they have not, nor on their geographical security, nor on the assistance of any other nation; they cannot even aspire for Divine assistance, for God has left them to side with Rome. He, therefore, suggests patience, that they wait and hope that the situation would better itself and that Florus, who will not be with them forever, will be succeeded by one
who is more reasonable and more compassionate to their needs.

In the *Yosippon*, the dignity of the Judaeans is preserved. At no time are they degraded. Emphasis is placed on restraint from actual military confrontation, but an assurance is offered that other means for solving the situation would be resorted to; that a letter of protest would be sent to Nero who is certain to pay heed to it, for he is totally unaware of Florus' actions and excesses. Agrippa speaks far more compassionately to the Judaeans in the *Yosippon* than in Josephus; the Judaeans are a group to be reckoned with in the *Yosippon*, whereas in Josephus they are trivial in comparison with the other peoples subject to Rome. If we cannot point to differences in content between the two exhortations, we certainly find significant variations in tone and approach.

Interesting, too, is the variation in Josephus' admonition to the people of the Galilee when he arrives as the newly commissioned general of that area. In *The Jewish War* Josephus impresses upon them that they are to emulate the Romans; that they are to prepare themselves to fight against a courageous and disciplined people; that they are to refrain from crime and all other indulgences, for wars are managed best "when the warriors preserve a good conscience."

In the *Yosippon* this exhortation is of a completely different sort. Joseph inspires them to a religious war, to avenge the enemies of God, to preserve the Holy Temple for the people of God; not to fear death, but to fight courageously,
for death in this battle is considered martyrdom and would bring the soul to a higher form of life. 

It is an emotional exhortation, firing the people's energy and imagination to a Holy War.

When in Jotapata, Josephus is inclined to deliver himself to the Romans, and two lengthy exchanges are recorded - the arguments of his companions and his response to them.

In the first of these reported addresses, according to Josephus, the argument of the people is that should he surrender to the Romans he would be a hypocrite, for he always preached the importance of liberty and now he is prepared to accept slavery. He is also advised not to trust the Roman assurances for they are no more than a ruse. Furthermore, he ought not to blemish the reputation of his ancestors.

Here, too, the content of the address as preserved in Josephus is not changed in the Yosippon, but the tone alters the total approach. Joseph ben Gorion is addressed as the one who was invested with priesthood and leadership over a holy people. Biblical examples are cited to emphasize the approach that at times it is worthless to save oneself while witnessing the degradation of his people. Emphasis is placed on Joseph's piety, his religious preachings, in comparison with the stress upon national liberty and independence that characterizes the text of Josephus. Examples of such emotional and pious exhortations are cited in association with the hope for a world to come, and that martyrdom brings one to the "Great Light."
The battles and, indeed, the entire war is seen as a war of the people of God to preserve the land and the Temple of God.

In Josephus' reply to these arguments, The Jewish War also includes some aspects of theology, but with the preface (or apology), "So he began to talk like a philosopher to them in the distress he was then in." He preaches against suicide, that it is a transgression against God and also an expression of cowardice. He speaks about the soul, about escaping from God, about immortality, about a debt that they owe to God. But associated with these religious expressions is an acceptance of the Roman approach, that to die in battle is considered courageous; to die according to the laws of war is considered bravery; to die for liberty is proper. Suicide, however, is cowardice. While philosophizing he introduces certain theological notions, but when governed by logic and reason, his approach is essentially secular as he lauds the Roman ideal and aspiration.

The Yosippon, on the other hand, is totally imbued with religiosity. Joseph speaks as a religious teacher. He elaborates on how God created man and how all of life is to be governed by the Creator, as is death to be called forth by Him. Biblical examples are cited to prove that no tribulation is sufficient to influence man to take his own life, if it had not been prescribed so by God. He speaks of death as atonement for transgression. He speaks of faith in God, of the obligation to succumb to the will of God. He speaks as does a prophet, a religious preacher. The image of Joseph
is thus transformed as is the image of the people whom he addresses. 246

This difference is also evident in Ananus' plea with the Idumaeans that they refrain from assisting John of Gischala, 247 and in the Idumaean response. 248 While in Josephus Ananus stresses that John and his men are robbers "drinking themselves drunk in the Sanctuary," the Yosippon emphasizes their intent to transgress, that they are religiously polluted and perverted, that they stand contrary to all that the Torah teaches. Ananus tells the Idumaeans that their entry to Jerusalem should be rather with the purpose to approach the altar with sacrifices amidst prayer and worship.

This difference is even more explicit in the Idumaean reply. In Josephus it is reported as an angry outcry that Ananus and his following are betrayers of liberty and that "we that are Idumaean will preserve this house of God and will fight for our common country.....Here we will abide before the walls in our armour, until either the Romans grow weary in waiting for you, or you become friends to liberty....." In the Yosippon, the Idumaeans reply that they, indeed, did come to seek God, impressing upon Ananus how observant of all the principles they were from the moment they entered the covenant, and that it was a biblical imperative to fight against evil. 249

The same variation in emphasis is found in Josephus'
address to the Judaeans that they submit to the Romans.

In the first speech,\(^{250}\) Josephus, in *The Jewish War*, impresses upon them that it is not an indignity to be subject to Rome, that the Romans will not meddle in their domestic or religious affairs, that God is now in Italy, that even if the Romans were to lift the siege they would die from famine; whereas the Romans are prepared to forgive them and to grant them a mild rule. The *Yosippon*, on the other hand, again turns to religious principle, stressing how rulers are subject to God, and how the Creator, due to His own designs, elevates some above others for certain periods of time. He stresses how transgression plays an important role in Divine assistance, and how guilty Jerusalem's population had become. Even as Joseph ben Gorion suggests that they accept Roman rule, he preaches to them to be humble and he turns to biblical illustration to prove to them that for most of their existence as a nation they were subject to world powers.

In Josephus' second speech\(^{251}\) similar variations can be discerned, although the contents in *The Jewish War* also have religious connotation, the stress that in Battle God is the general. Biblical examples are cited showing that full faith must be placed on God's handling of war. Judaean transgression caused God to turn away from His people. Josephus, therefore, urges the Judaeans to recognize the hopelessness of their situation and to accept Roman authority, for that is the will of God.
The Yosippon, too, follows along a similar direction, but in a more intensely pietistic fashion. Joseph ben Gorion discusses the concept of prayer in distinction to military battle, stressing that the Jews have always placed their destiny in the hands of God, praying for His assistance, rather than attempting to solve their problems with war. Numerous biblical examples are cited to illustrate this approach. While the Yosippon also emphasizes the transgressions of the Judaeans, he also stresses the fundamental justice of God, and concludes with a hope for the future, that as they suffer now, they will once again be put to jubilation, an emphasis significantly absent in Josephus.

Amitai's speech is without a parallel in Josephus. Through his words the same emphasis is expressed. After blaming himself for bringing Simon ben Gioras to Jerusalem, his exhortation to his children is filled with religiosity and piety. He pictures the after-life that is reserved for the righteous, extolling martyrdom, and compares himself and his children to Hannah and her sons. He, too, stresses the fundamental justice of God, believing that ultimately the wicked will suffer their due punishment.

The address of Joseph's mother is equally expressive. This, too, has no parallel in Josephus. Her comments regarding suicide are a parallel to the words spoken by Joseph to his people at Jotapata. She describes the relationship between the soul and the body and stresses the importance of burial
for resurrection and the after-life. 256

Titus' admonition to his troops is recorded both in Josephus257 and in the Yosippon.258 The two records are basically parallels to one another. An interesting facet to the address recorded in Josephus is the Roman approach to after-life, to be discussed below.259 In Josephus, Titus stresses the superiority of the Roman army and the shame that the soldiers are bringing upon their country, a result of their defeat and cowardice. The Yosippon adds to this exhortation that Titus admonished them to learn from the courage of the Judeans, thereby adding to the stature of the Jewish fighters.260

Upon learning of the distress of the Judeans in Jerusalem, both sources include a monologue on the part of Titus,261 though the address in Yosippon is a far more elaborate one. Titus excuses himself before God that it was not his wish nor his doing that brought such bitterness upon the Judeans. In the Yosippon, Titus refers to the many wonders and miracles that God had brought upon the Israelites in their ancient history, comparing their past glory to their present tribulation. He prays for a quick victory, so that this suffering would come to an end. The Yosippon attributes a reverence and regard for God and the Judeans to Titus.262

A prominent variation both in content and tone is evident in the speech of Eleazar ben Yair to the people in Masada.263
In Josephus, Eleazar stresses the evil of servitude to the Romans and the privilege of dying in liberty. When he senses some hesitation to his plan for suicide, he exclaims: "Truly I was greatly mistaken when I thought to be assisting brave men who struggled hard for liberty, and to such as were resolved either to live with honor or to die." This is quite secular an approach in comparison with the pietistic exhortation preserved in the Yosippon. Here Eleazar stresses that their death would serve as sacrifices before God, bringing atonement upon themselves and their people. Josephus speaks of dying for liberty; the Yosippon speaks of the sanctity of martyrdom.

Josephus also discusses the relationship between the body and the soul, but not in the same fashion as does Yosippon who stresses the after-life, the "righteous world," the "Great Light," the "eternal life." The Yosippon again turns to biblical examples to illustrate the approach that at times one, in order to spare himself and his family from severe tribulation, may seek death, and that such death may be considered Kiddush Hashem, the sanctification of the Name of God, bringing the souls to Gan Eden, the blessed hereafter. The Yosippon closes Eleazar's remarks with a lamentation and prayer, steeped in profound religiosity.264

In addition to the difference in Eleazar's address between the texts of Josephus and the Yosippon, there is a significant variation regarding the approach taken by the
population of Masada. According to Josephus, Eleazar influenced them successfully to death and suicide and they died without any form of opposition to the Romans. The Yosippon, on the other hand, elevates the entire incident to the level of bravery and commitment. The men kill the members of their families to spare them the inevitable inhumanity and cruelty that they anticipated. They, however, battled against the Romans, dying in the midst of fighting the "War of God."^265
CHAPTER THREE

THE MOTIVATION FOR THE REVOLUTION

Having listed and classified the variations between the texts of Josephus and the Yosippon, we proceed on to discuss the most significant difference between the narratives, the nature of the war itself and its motivating forces. This difference, alluded to in the Introduction to Part II, is all-encompassing. It virtually differentiates the two texts to such an extent that though both are concerned with the same period of history, recording the same series of events, they are transformed into two different histories with contrasting pictures of the historical sequence. The nature of the revolution itself and the motivations of the revolutionaries participating in the insurrection are differently presented, giving rise to a variety of ramifications.

According to Josephus, the revolution represented an attempt on the part of a people subjected to Roman cruelty to regain independent nationhood and freedom from their subjection to a foreign power. It happened to have been the Judaeans who revolted, but it could have been any other conquered nation, as, indeed, others threatened to do the same. The motivation of the Judaeans was not unique to them; the quest for liberty and freedom is a universal one, experienced alike by all people.
The Jewish War is hence a record of an unsuccessful war waged by a small nation against the mightiest of powers, the unfortunate result of which, according to Josephus, was to serve as an example and admonition to all other nations that may be harboring the thought of revolution to exercise an effective restraint.

This nationalistic aspiration for freedom and liberty as the prime motive for the Judaean revolution is evident throughout the text of Josephus. From the very outset, when Agrippa attempts to dissuade them from a military confrontation, this notion is alluded to. "If you aim at avenging yourselves at those that have done you injury, why do you pretend this to be a war for recovering your liberty?"³

Agrippa continues on in his exhortation. "But because some are earnest to go to war because they are young, and without experience of the miseries it brings, and because some are for it out of an unreasonable expectation of regaining their liberty."⁴

That this aspiration was the prime motivation for the Judaean, according to Josephus, is evident from its expression by the various leaders involved in the revolution. It wasn't Agrippa alone who verbalized this as the purpose. The Judaean, too, according to The Jewish War, accepted this as their approach.

When they reacted to Josephus' intention to succumb to the Romans at Jotapata, they refer to their quest for liberty.
"O Josephus, art thou still fond of life? And canst thou bear to see the light in a state of slavery. How soon hast thou forgotten thyself. How many hast thou persuaded to lose their lives for liberty."5

When Ananus the High Priest addresses the people against the Zealots, he, too, stresses the same motif. "Is therefore that most honorable and most natural of our passions utterly lost. I mean the desire for liberty? Truly we are in love with slavery, and in love with those that lord it over us, as if we had received that principle of subjection from our ancestors; yet did they understand many and great wars for the sake of liberty."6 "And what occasion is there now for a war with the Romans? What pretense is there for it? Is it not that we may enjoy our liberty?"7 "And now I am persuaded that every one of you here comes satisfied before I speak that these overthrowers of our liberties (the Zealots) deserved to be destroyed."8

The same emphasis is found in Josephus’ report of the Idumaean response to Ananus after he attempts to dissuade them from assisting the Zealots.

"I can no longer wonder that the patrons of liberty are under custody in the Temple, since there are those that shut the gates to our common city to our own nation, and at the same time are prepared to admit the Romans into it; nay, perhaps are disposed to crown the gates with garlands at their
coming, while they speak to the Idumaeans from their own
towers, and enjoin them to throw down their arms which they
have taken up for the preservation of its liberty.... We have
indeed come in great haste to you, and to a war against our
own countrymen; and the reason why we have made such haste is
this, that we may preserve that freedom which you are so un-
happy as to betray."9

"We that are Idumaeans will preserve this house of God,
and will fight for our common country, and will oppose by war
as well those that attack them from abroad, as those that betray
them from within. Here we will abide before the walls in our
armour, until either the Romans grow weary in waiting for you,
or you become friends to liberty, and repent of what you have
done against it."10

When Josephus addresses the Judaeans in Jerusalem, pleadi-
ing with them to put a stop to the revolt, he again alludes to
the "fight for liberty," which was at that point fruitless. "... for,
that in case it be allowed a right thing to fight for liberty,
that ought to have been done at first. But for them that had
once fallen under the power of the Romans.....to pretend to
shake off that yoke afterward, was the work of such as had a
mind to die miserably, not of such as were lovers of liberty."11

The same factor is emphasized by Eleazar ben Yair in his
emotional exhortation to the people of Masada, impressing upon
them the worth of freedom and the glory of dying in a state of
freedom.
"Since we, long ago, my generous friends, resolved never to be servants to the Romans, nor to any other than to God himself, who alone is the true and just Lord of mankind, the time is now come that obliges us to make that resolution true in practice. And let us not at this time bring a reproach upon ourselves for self-contradiction, while we formerly would not undergo slavery, though it were then without danger, but must now, together with slavery, choose such punishments also as are intolerable......We were the very first that revolted from them, and we are the last to fight against them; and I cannot but esteem it as a favour that God hath granted us, that it is still in our power to die bravely, and in a state of freedom, which hath not been the case of others, who were conquered unexpectedly."^{12}

And when Eleazar's suggestion meets with hesitation, he again admonishes them that they are not lovers of liberty. "Truly, I was greatly mistaken when I thought to be assisting to brave men who struggled hard for their liberty, and to such as were resolved either to live with honour, or else to die."^{13}

But if Josephus stresses the quest for liberty, an essentially nationalistic concept, as the motivation for the revolution, the Yosippon emphasizes the religious motif, a motivation that was unique to the Judaeans. They fought not as any other people would have fought. Their purpose was a more profound one, and, hence, their sacrifice was a more extensive one. They fought not for liberty alone, but for God, for His land, for His Temple and
for His people. The Yosippon presents the Judaeans as a people totally identified with a religious concept, staunchly believing in their chosenness by God. Their life seemed to be revolving around this principle. Their very existence seemed to depend upon these accepted concepts. This was the impetus for their determination in the war. The motivation for their insurrection is presented in the Yosippon as a distinctly Jewish one, without parallel in the aspiration for independence experienced by other peoples.

This is evident in Joseph's exhortation to the people of the Galilee as he assumed command of that area. "Hear O Israel, today you are approaching the war against your enemies. Do not fear....but fight for the Sanctuary of God, for even death is good to us....for we shall choose to die for God and His covenant....and our souls shall be saved unto Him to the Light of Life." 14

The motivation for the war is that it is a battle for God. The Romans are viewed not only as the enemies of the Jews, but as the enemies of God Himself. Not only are the Romans viewed as such, but all people who will ally themselves with the Romans against the Judaeans, even if they be Jews themselves, they, too, are the enemies of God and are considered transgressors. The entire war and its participants are enveloped in this theological approach; they are either the defenders of God or His opponents.

When Joseph speaks to the people of Tiberias who had
revolted against him, this religious theme becomes the essence of his admonition. "What is this bond that you have tied... and you have transgressed the command of God that you have agreed to, and you have gone against the oath you have made to the God of Israel, that together we shall fight against our enemies and humble them." And the people of Tiberias answered, "O Lord, hear the words of your servants, we never intended to be of assistance to the Romans, only to the aid of the people of God, the God of Israel, His sanctuary, and the people of His choosing."^15

In a similar fashion does Joseph ben Gorion admonish the people of Taricheae. "How much better it would be for you to place your destiny with that of the Sanctuary of God and His choosing, rather than assist Agrippa, who has also joined our enemies to war against the Sanctuary of God and the people of His choosing."^16

Joseph's words are reiterated to him by the people of Jotapata when they oppose his suggestion that they surrender to the Romans. For them it was not just a war and they were not prepared to accept defeat, as is the accepted thing in a military confrontation. It was a Holy War, a battle for God, and in this context death is more acceptable than defeat.

"Beware and don't agree to peace with them," they tell Joseph. "But strengthen yourself to war against them until you weaken them or until you and all the people with you die in battle, and fight the War of God for His people, for our
Sanctuary and for the cities of our God. Come whatever may, but do not ally yourself with the Gentiles."17

The people had learned well from Josephus, to the exent that they now remind him of his earlier admonitions. Joseph was for them not merely a military commander; he was a religious teacher, a religious spokesman. "We are surprised at you, Prince Joseph, for you have been chosen from the multitudes of your people, a priestly and royal people, as a sanctified one to God, the God of Israel, and as such you were appointed a great military leader at the head of your people."18

"And where is the Holy Torah that was hidden in your heart? You are a priest an an appointed one. You taught us the Holy Torah, that we may know how to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, with all our soul and with all our wealth .... that we would die for the sake of His command, His Torah and His Sanctuary, together with His servants who were killed for the Oneness of His great name.....And it was you who assured us so many times that whoever dies in the war for God, for His Sanctuary and His Torah, he shall be part of the destiny of God and his portion, and he shall be worthy to go on to the Great Light, and he shall not perceive the darkness that darkens the souls.....And it was you, Joseph the Priest, who proclaimed it so many times amidst our camp in the course of the war, 'I am Joseph the Priest, the annointed for war, who has designated my soul to die for the nation of God, for His land and His people.....' And it was you who told the people, 'fight for the
nation of God until you die in the war, for if you die for the Sanctuary of God and for His Torah, your death shall be atonement for your souls, and you shall proceed on to the Light, which is the Light of Life.""\(^19\)

Joseph, in his reply, stresses the same motif. "I, too, know that if one dies in the War of God it is deemed a high honor, and he goes on to the Great Light......And if this is what you choose to do, let us attack our enemies and let us die in the War of God, and it shall be good for us, or perhaps God will deliver them unto us, and we shall overwhelm them and destroy them, for God has the power to assist both with a large army or with a small one......And in the city of Jotapata I remained constantly at my station, and I daily warred against the enemies of God......for I thought that I would be able to chase the enemies of God from our land, and to cause them to leave Jerusalem and to prevent them from destroying her,"\(^20\)

Such emphasis was similarly expressed by the combatants to one another in the midst of their battles, encouraging each other to fight on with strength and fortitude.

At the battle of Ascalon they exclaimed: "It is better for us to die in this war than to run from our enemies." They strengthened themselves "and they trusted in God, the God of Israel."\(^21\) At the battle in Jotapata the Judaean s confronted the Romans with determination. "Let us die now, all of us together, and in a zeal for the Sanctuary of our God, and let us not enable the impure, the uncircumcised, to defile it."\(^22\)
This religious motivation is attributed even to the common elements of the population that gathered to defend Jerusalem. "From all places in the land of Judaea and Jerusalem the fighters gathered to assist the Sanctuary of God." \(^{23}\)

Not only was this motivation recorded in the fight against the Romans, but even against the evil perpetrated by the Zealots. "And they decided to battle against the evil ones (the Zealots), and the people were zealous for the Lord God, and they confronted them and warred against them." \(^{24}\)

When the Yosippon admonishes Phineas and Joshue for delivering the priestly vestments and the Temple vessels to Titus as they surrendered to the Romans, the same emphasis is referred to. "It was not proper for them to do as they did, but rather to die for the people of God together with their brethren, the priests, who died for the people of God and were consumed in the flames of the Temple." \(^{25}\)

It is interesting to note that the same motif is at times incorporated in the arguments of those who were against the revolution, and who attempted the influence the revolutionaries to exercise restraint. King Agrippa, for example, exhorts the people at the very outset, "Remember your love for your land and your love of your Sanctuary, and your love of your priests; be concerned about them, lest you destroy everything with your deeds." \(^{26}\)

Agrippa addresses Eleazar ben Ananus in a similar fashion.
"How long will you be an obstacle to us, O foe of God and enemy of His people; why do you injure the vineyard of the God of hosts and destroy it?"^{27}

When Joseph addresses the Judaeans, pleading with them to stop the revolution, he, too, expresses his fear for the Temple, for the city and for the cessation of the sacrificial worship.^{28}

This emphasis upon fighting a War of God was not limited to verbal exhortation alone. It resulted in martyrdom, whereby death in battle was exalted and enveloped in sanctity. Those who were killed were not merely casualties in a war for liberty and independence, but holy people who gave their lives for the sanctified cause of their God, their land, their Sanctuary and their people, assured of the glories of the world to come.

In an elegy in the Yosippon, the author writes: "And many of the people of God chose to die in the sanctification of their souls rather than to accept the desecration to be perpetrated by their enemies upon His Sanctuary, or to assist their foes to defile the Temple of God in order to escape death. They died for God. They illuminated the brightness of the face of the Living King, regardless whether they were buried or if they remained uncovered corpses upon the ground. And the memory of the righteous shall remain a blessing."^{29}

Although on occasion Josephus, too, refers to this approach, to the death of the Judaeans for the sake of God's sanctuary, the instances are few and isolated. When Ananus, the High Priest,
addresses the Judaeans against the Zealots, this approach is included in his remarks. "It is a right thing.....to die before these holy gates and to spend our very lives, if not for the sake of our children and wives, yet for God's sake and for the sake of his sanctuary." But this sentiment is hardly comparable to the constant repetition of this principle in the Yosippon.

When the two companions avenge the death of Eleazar at Jotapata, the Yosippon writes: "And they were zealous for God, the God of Israel....and they died in the war for their God's sanctuary and for their land." The description of the death of Eleazar, son of Sameas, in Jotapata, is associated with the same approach. "And Eleazar the hero died from his wounds that day with a good reputation, for he fought for the Sanctuary of God, for His people and for the land of Israel as a hero who was loyal to God.....And all of Israel remembered him with blessing for his battles in the name of God and for His Torah, for he warred against God's enemies." When Gorlon was killed by the Zealots, the reason for his death was that he fought "for the sake of the House of God and His people." Although the Yosippon also alludes to liberty as a stimulus for war, that the people preferred death to servitude and enslavement, this approach is incidental to the constant stress of martyrdom, and death for religious principle and ideal. At Jotapata the people died "for the sanctification of God, the God of Israel." At Masada "they died for the sake
of God and His Sanctuary."^36

It should be noted that even the Zealots, referred to by the Yosippon as vermin, as enemies of the people of God and, indeed, of God Himself, and the destroyers of His sanctuary,^37 their zeal, too, is ascribed to religious motivation and martyrdom.

When Eleazar ben Ananus, the leader of the Zealots, refused Nero's sacrifice at the outset of the revolution, his argument was "we shall not contaminate the Temple of our God with the sacrifices of aliens."^38

When Titus offers the Zealots peace and pleads with them to cease their military activity, they reply, "It is better for us to die in hunger and in fire for the sake of the Sanctuary of God than to accept Roman servitude. For what worth would our lives have if we were to witness the destruction of God's Temple; it is better for us to die amidst this tribulation and to go on to the Great Light, the light of eternal life, and to the tranquility of Can Eden (Garden of Eden)."^39

When the Zealots battled against the Romans, the Yosippon writes, "And the four lads were filled with a zeal for the Temple of God, and they said to one another, let us offer ourselves for the Lord our God."^40 In a similar fashion do they respond to Roman provocation, "Who amongst you will offer to go out in battle against these dogs, to show them his strength for the honor of God's sanctuary and His city."^41
The Zealots, writes the Yosippon, did not run from battle, but insisted "to die for the Lord our God, for His Temple, and that we be considered as sacrifices this day."42

John of Gischala, though denounced in the Yosippon for his excesses, confronts Titus with an expression of piety and martyrdom. "We cannot offer a sacrifice in the Temple that will be better than our own flesh. Nor can we sprinkle in His Temple anything worthier than our own blood. For we die and fight for our God, and we shall be accepted before Him as sacrifices. And we shall die as free men in this Holy City and not be slaves in your hands."43

This profound identification with the Temple is constantly stressed in the Yosippon. So vital a role did the Sanctuary play in their lives, and so closely did they feel identified with it, that they preferred death to the anguish of living with the Temple destroyed. The priests readily die in the flames in the Temple, proclaiming that "there is no life after the burning of the Temple."44 The Zealots die in battle stating, "who desires to live after the burning of the Holy of Holies?"45

This same argument of shame and despair at the Temple destruction is employed by the people at Jotapata to dissuade Joseph from surrendering to the Romans, "for what desire have you to choose life after the destruction of your brethren and your people."46

Although their argument includes a stress of the difficulty
of living amidst shame, it is not the shame of an egotistical nature that they speak of, not a subjective form of embarrassment, but to the shame of a people of God. This is evident in Joseph's reply, "Let us die and not live, as you suggest, and we shall not witness the shame of our God's sanctuary and the exile of our nation." 47

The concepts of freedom and liberty in the Yosippon are always associated with the more important ideal, the existence of the Sanctuary. Without it there can be no freedom. "And now, my brothers and comrades," speaks Joseph, "as you say, let us die together and not serve the King of the nations, for death is better to us than life, and we shall be spared from witnessing our tribulation and the sorrow of our Sanctuary." 48

Although a similar notion is present in The Jewish War, spoken by Ananus to the Judaeans, it is but an isolated instance. "Certainly it had been good for me to die before I had seen the house of God full of so many abominations, or these sacred places, that ought not to be trodden upon at random, filled with the feet of these blood shedding villains....." 49

This statement is a precise parallel to the comment in the Yosippon, but hardly to be compared to its constant emphasis in the Hebrew history.

Amital, in addressing his sons, states: "It is better for us to die than to view God's city and His Temple as a house of slaughter, with the multitudes of the dead in its precincts." 50
When Joseph ben Gorlon speaks to his mother, he says, "O if I were to die this day rather than witness the burning of the Temple of God and the destruction of my people." Eleazar ben Yair at Masada echoes this same emotion, "for what need have we for life after our land and our Temple are destroyed."

It is interesting that even the Romans, according to the Yosippon, recognized this unusual religious determination on the part of the Judaeans as their motivation for the war. When, in battle, the Romans fled from a Judaean onslaught, they do so "for they saw that the Judaeans were prepared to give their lives and to die for the sake of their God and for their land, and that the Romans could not stand their ground against them." Similarly, when Titus admonishes his troops to remain strong in battle, he refers to the Judaean zeal. "And if the Judaeans offer to die for their land and for the Sanctuary of their God, why don't you offer to die in war with them for the sake of bravery and reputation."

This difference in approach between the Yosippon and Josephus presents us with two essentially different reports of the Judaean revolution. Though the incidents and confrontations recorded may be similar, and the tragic result is the same in both texts, their respective contexts vary from one another.

In Josephus the sequence is a relatively simple one. A subjugated nation is led to the brink of revolution against a mighty power by leaders who are able to command authority and to arouse the emotions of their following. Nothing can be done
to stem this advance toward a military confrontation. And the inevitable occurs, the weaker nation succumbs to the stronger. This incident of revolution, inspired by a quest for liberty, serves as a perfect example to all other peoples who may be entertaining the notion of revolution, and this, as stated earlier, is precisely the purpose for the composition of The Jewish War.

The Judaeacan revolution in the Yosippon is of a completely different nature. It is imbued with piety, with martyrdom, with a dedication to God and to the Temple that supercedes life itself. Even the Zealots, while admonished for their evil deeds, and blamed for the destruction, are engulfed in this religious fervor, and the impetus for their zeal against the Romans is that they are fighting the War of God and defending His sanctuary against the impure and the defiled.

As such, the Yosippon preserves for posterity an example of self sacrifice and determination for the sake of idealism. Rather than serving to laud the grandeur and glory of mighty Rome, as does Josephus, the Yosippon addresses itself to the Jews throughout the ages, presenting him with a picture of strength of spirit, determination and faith even when confronted with seemingly inevitable disaster.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE JUDAEN DEFEAT

Both Josephus and the Yosippon refer to God's role in history in the course of their respective narratives. Both conclude that the Roman victory over Jerusalem was the result of Divine intervention and that the defeat of the Judaeans is an example of God's will made manifest in the arena of human affairs.

The approach to why Providence was against the Judaeans, resulting in catastrophic destruction and death, is what differentiates the two narratives.

Josephus, as we mentioned earlier, does not view the confrontation between Judaea and Rome as a unique experience that could have occurred with the Judaeans alone. The same result would have been had in any other nation's attempt to revolt against this mighty power, and the Judaean defeat can, therefore, be used as a lesson and message for all other peoples, to exercise restraint and to discipline any emotion that may lead to revolution; for as Judaea was defeated, they, too, would meet the same fate.

Josephus approaches the Divine Providence that was assisting Rome in a similar fashion. It was not a situation wherein Rome confronted Judaea, and God sided with Rome in this war. It was a general situation that existed, unexplained by Josephus,
wherein Rome, in its confrontation with all nations, enjoyed Divine assistance, and the Judaean defeat was just one other manifestation of this.

The Judaeans were not the only people conquered by Rome. Rome had grown to become the world power, controlling virtually every major area and receiving tribute from countries that had previously enjoyed independence, power and jurisdiction. Agrippa stresses the vastness of the Roman Empire to the Judaeans when he attempts to dissuade them from revolt. The Roman successes in their confrontations with all nations is the indication of the Divine support that was theirs. Agrippa, therefore, tells the Judaeans, "What remains, therefore, is this, that you have recourse to Divine Assistance; but this is already on the side of the Romans; for it is impossible that so vast an empire be settled without God's providence." 

The Romans, according to Josephus, had God with them before their confrontation with the Judaeans in this revolution, hence the development of the Empire to its greatness. Josephus expresses this simply when he addresses the Judaeans. "And that God, when he had gone round the nations with this dominion, is now settled in Italy." 

This Divine Providence is referred to by Josephus in matters other than the Roman-Judaean confrontation. "So when a great part of the Germans had agreed to rebel....Vespasian, as guided by Divine providence....," squelched the insurrection. Josephus tells the Judaeans that their war against the Romans is futile
not only from a logical and reasonable approach, but that it represents an action against the will of God, for His wish is Roman dominion over the world. "You may be informed how you fight not only against the Romans, but against God Himself." 5

Josephus recounts how in the past this same Providence was with the Judaeans, causing them to be victorious and successful in their undertakings. "It was God who then became our General, and accomplished these great things for our fathers, and this because they did not meddle with war and fighting, but committed it to him to judge about their affairs.....And, to speak in general, we can produce no example wherein our fathers got any success by war, or failed of success when without war they committed themselves to God." 6

Now, however, it was God's wish that Judaea, like all other nations, be subject to Rome, and all their attempts to counter this tide would be of no avail. "But in reality it was God who condemned the whole nation, and turned every course that was taken for their preservation to their destruction." 7

It was due to this Divine Providence that the Roman Empire grew to the extent that it did, and all developments within that Empire were results of God's will. Vespasian's good fortune and assumption of power, for example, is attributed by Josephus to Providence. "Upon which he considered that he had not arrived at the government, without Divine Providence, but that a righteousness kind of fate had brought the empire under his power; for as he called to mind the other signals, which had been a great
many everywhere, that foretold he should obtain the government."

The Providence in Roman governmental development is alluded to elsewhere as well. "Nay, indeed, while he (Titus) was assisting his father (Vespasian) at Alexandria in settling that government which had been newly conferred upon them by God." 

Hence, the various occurrences in the Roman victory, the details that were significant in leading to the success of the Roman confrontation with Judaea, are attributed to God. "But Titus, by a Divine impulse, sailed back from Greece to Syria and came in great haste to Caesarea, to his father." Similarly, when Titus is attacked by the Judaeans and he is spared from all the darts that they threw at him, this is a result of Providence. "And hence we may principally learn that both the success of wars and the dangers that kings are in are under the Providence of God; for while such a number of darts were thrown at Titus, when he had neither his head-piece on, nor his breastplate, none of them touched his body." 

If this was characteristic of the Roman confrontation with all countries, resulting in their development into a world power, this same Divine Will made itself manifest regarding Judaea as well. Roman rule was to be extended over the Judaean nation, although it was God who created the Jewish nation. This is recognized by Josephus as he prays to God prior to his surrender to the Romans. "Since it pleaseth thee, who hast created the Jewish nation, to depress the same....."
The various events in the course of the war that led to the Judaean destruction are, therefore, explained as a result of the imminent Divine Providence that was now with the Romans.

When the siege lasts longer than anticipated, and the people in Jerusalem are put to extended suffering, it is due to God's aversion to the city. "But it was, I suppose, owing to the aversion God had already at the city, and the Sanctuary, that he (Titus) was hindered from putting an end to the war that day." When the attempt of the Zealots against the Romans failed, this, too, is the result of God's will. "Now it was God who turned their (the Zealots') opinions to the worst advice, and thence they devised such a remedy to get themselves free as was worse than the disease itself."  

The Roman punishment perpetrated in the Galilaeans and the destruction of Jopha is a result of Divine direction. "It was certainly God therefore who brought the Romans to punish the Galilaeans, and did then expose the people of the city every one of them manifestly to be destroyed by their bloody enemies."  

The authority enjoyed by John of Gischala, causing anguish to his countrymen, was part of a Divine plan. "Now this was the work of God, who therefore preserved this John, that he might bring on the destruction of Jerusalem; as also it was his work that Titus was prevailed with by this pretence for a delay..." The division amongst the Judaean, causing them to weaken and bringing them closer to the inevitable destruction, was the result of Divine justice. "Which partition in such evil cases
may be said to be a good thing and the effect of Divine justice.\textsuperscript{17}

At the close of the narrative, when the wind turned the flames against the walls of Masada, this was the result of the Divine Providence that was with the Romans. "But after this, on a sudden the wind changed into the south, as if it were done by Divine providence, and blew strongly the contrary way and carried the flames, and drove it against the wall...."\textsuperscript{18}

The Romans themselves recognized the Divine assistance that was theirs and they, too, viewed the various events leading to the destruction of Jerusalem as the result of Providence.

Hence, when Titus hears that Josephus and his men are in Jotapata, a city that he could easily take, he accepts this as a token of God's will. "So he (titus) took this news to be of the vastest advantage to him, and believed it to be brought about by the providence of God...."\textsuperscript{19}

This view is explicitly expressed by the Romans to Vespasian. "The providence of God is on our side; by setting our enemies at variance with one another.....that God acts as a general of the Romans better than he can do and is giving the Jews up to them without any pains of their own, and granting their army a victory without any danger."\textsuperscript{20}

When Titus speaks to his troops, admonishing them to be brave and courageous in their battles with the Judaeans, he refers to the fact that God is on their side and that victory will be
theirs. "Do not therefore desert me, but persuade yourselves that God will be assisting to my onset." On another occasion he tells them, "Fellow soldiers, now is the time; and why do we make any delay when God is giving up the Jews to us."

In rationalizing the misfortunes brought upon the Romans in the course of this war, Titus continues to assure his soldiers of the ultimate doom that will befall the Judeans and of the assistance of God that they may rely upon. "And this especially when you are at the conclusion of your victory, and are assisted by God himself; for as to our misfortunes, they have been owing to the madness of the Jews, while their sufferings have been owing to your valour, and to the assistance God hath afforded you; for as to the seditions they have been in, and the famine they are under, and the siege they now endure, and the fall of their walls without our engines, what can they all be but demonstrations of God's anger against them, and of his assistance afforded to us. It will not therefore be proper for you, either to show yourselves inferior to those to whom you are really superior, or to betray that Divine assistance which is afforded you." 23

Upon the destruction of Jerusalem and the burning of the Temple, Titus openly proclaims that this victory was the result of having God as an assistant in this war. "We have certainly had God for our assistant in this war, and it was no other than God who ejected the Jews out of these fortifications; for what could the hands of men or any machines do towards over-
throwing these towers?"24

There are times, to be sure, when Josephus alludes to the misdeeds of the Judaeans as a factor in their defeat and as a cause for God's rejection. This, however, is incidental to the general approach in The Jewish War that Providence was enjoyed by the Romans not specifically against the Judaeans, but against all the nations, within which scope Judaea was included.

Agrippa, for example, at the outset of the revolution, warns the Judaeans that war will bring them to inevitable transgression of religious law, and that they will therefore not be able to aspire to God's assistance, thereby linking such Providence with religious observance. "Reflect upon it, how impossible it is for your zealous observations of your religious customs to be here preserved, which are hard to be observed even when you fight with those whom you are able to conquer. And how can you then most of all hope for God's assistance, when by being forced to transgress his law, you will make him turn his face from you.....and how can you call upon God to assist you when you are voluntarily transgressing against his religion."25

There is another instance where Josephus explains punishment as a direct result of transgression. When the Jews in Caesarea are massacred on the Sabbath day, this is related to the murder of the Romans on the very same day. ".....for indeed it so happened that this murder was perpetrated on the Sabbath day, on which the Jews have a respite from their works on account of Divine worship..............
Now the people of Caesaria had slain the Jews that were among them on the very same day and hour, which one would think, must have come to pass by the direction of Providence."

Josephus refers to the oracles and prophecies that foretold the Judaean defeat, and explains that the Zealots, as a result of their misdeeds, made themselves the instruments for the fulfillment of these prophecies. "These men therefore trampled upon all the laws of men and laughed at the laws of God; and for the oracles of the prophets, they ridiculed them as the tricks of jugglers.....they made themselves the instruments of their accomplishment."27

On another occasion Josephus exclaims: And who is there who does not know what the writings of the ancient prophets contain in them.....It is God, therefore, it is God himself who is bringing on this fire, to purge that city and temple by means of the Romans, and is going to pluck up this city, which is full of your pollutions."28

When Josephus addresses the Judaens, he again refers to their lack of piety and asks them how they can, under these circumstances, aspire to Divine assistance. "How much more impius are you than those who were so quickly taken.....Nay, the Temple itself is become the receptacle of all, and this Divine place is polluted by the hands of those of our own country.....And, after all this, do you expect Him whom you have so impiously abused, to be your supporter?"29 And this impiety is, indeed, admitted to by Eleazar ben Yair in his
exhortation to the people in Masada. "This was the effect of God's anger against us for our manifold sins, which we have been guilty of in an most insolent and extravagant manner with regard to our own countrymen; the punishments of which let us not receive from the Romans, but from God himself, as executed by our own hands." 30

These expressions in Josephus, alluding to the misdeeds of the Judeans in relation to certain punishments, are not essential to the general approach assumed in The Jewish War. Their very ambiguity attests to their insignificance. Josephus speaks of impiety, rapine, pollution and evil, but does not explain them as religious offenses as such. The prime transgression of the Judeans, according to Josephus, was their insistence to fight against Rome, resulting in the destruction of the Temple and the death of their countrymen. It is true that Rome's victory over Judaea was a result of Providence even according to Josephus, but this Providence was not expressed precisely against the Jews, but was an asset to the Romans in their confrontations with all nations. As a result of Providence they conquered the Athenians, the Lacedemonians, the Macedonians, the Lycians, the Cilicians, the Thracians, the Dacians, the Dalmatians, the Gauls, the Germans, the Parthians, the Cyrenians - and the Judeans. Like all others, Judaea was rejected by God and was destined to be under Roman rule, for God was now in Italy. All other circumstances that may have existed in Judaea at the time - impiety, misdeed, transgression - true as they may have been, were incidental to the Judaean defeat, which was part of an overall Divine plan for the world under Roman dominion.
The Yosippon, too, speaks of Rome's achievement as a result of the Divine wish. In Agrippa's address to the Judaeans this is expressed explicitly: "For God assisted them in all the world, from one end of the world to the other, and all the nations are subjugated to them." This is further amplified by Joseph ben Gorlon as he tells his people that God causes Kings to rule just as He exercises jurisdiction in the heavenly spheres, and that Roman rule over the world is a part of the Divine plan.

Like Josephus, the Yosippon sees the Judaean defeat as an act of God. When the Yosippon reports that Joseph accompanied Titus to besiege Jerusalem, Joseph is resigned to the city's destruction "for Joseph knew that all this is from God and one cannot alter God's wish." The division in Jerusalem's population is viewed by the Yosippon as an act of God. "And He divided the people of the land into three factions." The intense suffering of the people in Jerusalem is the consequence of a Divine wish. "For God judged the people of Jerusalem at that time with sword, plague, hunger and fire." And in one of his elegies, Joseph ben Gorlon laments that God "poured out His wrath upon us."

The difference between the narratives of Josephus and the Yosippon is the cause of God's rejection of Judaea, the reason for the Jewish defeat. Whereas Josephus, with the few exceptions noted, does not view the destruction of Judaea as a direct Divine act against the Jews, but rather as part of the Divine plan for
Roman supremacy, the Yosippon views this episode as an act of Divine justice against the Judaeans proper. There is a reason for this Divine rejection, the author insists, and that reason is the sinfulness of the Jews, their transgression of religious rule and their desecration of the ancestral covenant with God.

"And all this evil befell your children because they left the Torah of God and because they desecrated His covenant with their ancestors; and because they transgressed to the God, the God of their ancestors, and they spilled the blood of the righteous and the innocent in the very precincts of the Temple of God. Because of all these.....this evil was brought upon us, an evil that seems endless."37

Ananus the High Priest refers to this as the cause of the calamity when he addresses the Idumaeans, "And they (the Zealots) spilled the blood of the pious, the righteous and the innocent from sin in this holy city of God. And because of their wickedness, the Romans overpowered us."38 It was only by accident of fate that the Romans were successful in destroying the city of Jerusalem. It was not because Providence was with them. They were victorious, writes the Yosippon, because of the transgression in the city.39

The Yosippon removes all the glory from Rome. He does not emphasize the Providence that Rome enjoyed in her encounters with all nations, as does Josephus. The author of the Yosippon views the Judaean defeat as a direct result of their iniquity.

Joseph ben Corion stresses just this to the Judaeans. "För
we have sinned to God and we have betrayed this Temple. And therefore He has turned away from us." 40 "And even if you are the children of the nation of God.... yet God turned His shadow away from you for you have sinned to Him and you have betrayed His Temple and His priests. And how can you hope that He will lift His countenance unto you to help you when He has hidden His face from you, and your transgressions have separated you from your God." 41 "And this day He is not with you, for He has concealed His countenance of salvation from you, because you have sinned unto Him." 42

Whereas Josephus, in his incidental references to Judaeans' sinfulness, speaks in platitudes, of pollution, of wickedness, of cruelty, the Yosippon is specific. He translates these misdeeds into religious offenses. Joseph ben Gorion, when addressing the Judaeans, referring to God's assistance to the Romans, calls their attention to the fact that "they (the Romans) revered His great name and were in awe of Him, whereas we betrayed Him. And because of this He assists them." 43

Emphasis is placed in the Yosippon on the treachery of the Zealots, on the needless murder that they committed, on the righteous and the innocent who were put to death. These acts assume an even greater proportion in that they were committed in the precincts of the Temple, thereby defiling what was most holy. These crimes were transgressions both to God and His Temple as well as to their fellow man, warranting retribution.

"And you continue to stray, you detestible people, who anger the God of Israel," admonishes Joseph ben Gorion. "You
murder your fellow man in the Temple of God, and how can God’s glory rest among you, you strayers and murderers." Joseph thanks God for sparing him from mingling with the evil doers, "who did not let me partake in your evil, for you kill those who are fully righteous.....And I shall not be a companion to destroyers such as you, to spill pure and innocent blood in the Temple of God." "How shall you be atoned for the evil that you perpetrated in His Temple, wherein you spilled innocent blood, where man did not consider his friend, nor one his brother, nor his relation. But you are guilty for you have fought in the Temple of God and His sanctuary, and you defiled it with the corpses of those whom you killed in its precincts, and you desecrated the name of God in your battles on the Sabbath and on the Festivals." 

The Judaean desoration of the holy days is further stressed in the Yosippon as the author compares their acts to the reverence of the Romans. "Titus stayed away from us on the Festival of God, refraining from battling us, for he told us to celebrate our festival in peace, and you (the Zealots) desecrated the Festival of God, and you extinguished the eternal flame with innocent blood,"

It is interesting to note the comparative descriptions of John’s misdeeds and the iniquity of his band, for here the different emphases of Josephus and the Yosippon become evident.

Josephus refers to the people whom John of Gischala had amassed as slaves whom he declared free. "So he proclaimed liberty to those in slavery and a reward to those already free,
and got together a set of wicked men from all quarters.\textsuperscript{48}

The \textit{Yosippon}, on the other hand, stresses the religious
deterioration of those who followed him. He sought after those
slaves who wanted to flee from their masters, those who were
guilty of rebellion against parents or against the Kingdom or
against the Jewish Court (\textit{Beth Din}); or those who were pursued
by debtors, or those guilty of murder, escaping from the law, or
of any other evil deeds for which they would be held responsible;
or those who wish to steal, to commit adultery, or to enjoy any
other sundry crimes. This was the nature of John's following,
according to the \textit{Yosippon}. They were people steeped in religious
transgression.\textsuperscript{49} John's people were "trained to seduce and to
rape Jewish women and spill innocent blood."\textsuperscript{50}

The \textit{Yosippon} explains this degeneration as the reason for
the detestation of John. Josephus explains the antagonism against
John to have been a completely different one; that the people
feared the steady growth of his power and wanted to put an end
to his quest for total leadership. "But the main reason that
moved men against him was the dread of monarchy, for they could
not hope easily to put an end to his power, if he had once
attained it."\textsuperscript{51}

This again emphasizes the totally different approaches of
the respective histories, the more secular approach of Josephus
and the intensely religious approach of the \textit{Yosippon}.

Even the Romans are aware of the many religious transgressions
of the Zealots, and they wonder at the pietistic proclamations
that they utter, seemingly inconsistent with their mode of behavior. Titus questions them regarding their belief that their death shall serve as sacrifices before God, when they are filled with every sort of transgression. Elsewhere Titus questions their hope in God's assistance, when, as a result of their misdeeds, God is no longer with them.

And the people themselves confess their guilt. "When the oppressed people beheld Joseph and Titus, they wept bitterly, and they said to him as follows: We are aware of our transgressions and the sins of our fathers, that we betrayed and sinned to the Lord our God."

The entire war and its consequences, according to the Yosippon, revolves around religious principle and the rejection of God as a result of religious deterioration. There is absolutely no relationship between this revolution and that of any other country. It was an experience unique to Judaea, serving as a lesson only for Jews, having no relevance or significance to any other nation or people.

That religious transgression was a focal point of the war is evident from the terminology that the Yosippon employs regarding the respective participants in the revolution.

The Romans are not merely the cruel masters and the national foes; they are "the defiled and uncircumcised ones," and the "enemies of God."

The seditious among the Judaeans are called "betrayers".
and "enemies of God." The leaders of the Zealots are referred to by terms indicating their religious iniquity. John of Gischala is called "vermin, the enemy of God and the enemy of His people." He is the "prince of the murderers and the captain of the sedition," "the head of the vermin and the murderers." When John is killed by strangulation, it is "the just death for all vermin and enemies of God and of His people." The Zealots are "the murderers, the evil ones, the seditious." Even Titus refers to them as such. "For you were impure, vermin and filth." "Tell me, O seditious ones, evil ones, who transgressed with your souls."

A contrasting terminology is employed in the references to the leadership of Jerusalem and the priests, emphasizing their righteousness and religiosity. When a Zealot killed an opponent, it was an "evil doer" who killed a "righteous one." Amanaus, the priests and the elders are referred to as "wise men, loyal men." When Titus admonished John and Simon when they pleaded with him for their lives, he reminds them that they killed "wise men, righteous ones, innocent ones, pious ones."

When Zecharias is killed by the Zealots, he is described in the Yosippon as a "righteous man, complete, pious, and very good; he feared God and acted well with the people of God and his fellow men......and his thoughts were directed in purity to the Lord, the Lord of Israel." Similarly, Gorion, who was killed by the Zealots, is characterized as a brave and courageous man in war, "wise, righteous and complete."
According to the Yosippon, it was not merely a war for liberty and freedom, but a conflict between the righteous and the wicked, and at stake were the city of God, the Temple of God and the people of God. It was not merely a confrontation between the Judaeans and the Romans on a national level, but a War of God, the term employed by the Yosippon as the title of his history.

This is further evidenced by the Yosippon's characterization of those who defended Jerusalem not merely as patriots but as those who were loyal to the covenant of God. The Idumaeans, for example, when they are singled out as those who did not ally with the Romans against Judaea, are referred to as upholding their covenant with God. 71

Similarly, when Ananus addresses the Idumaeans as they approached Jerusalem on John's invitation, exhorting them to ally with him rather than with the Zealots, his arguments are not political in nature, but rather religious ones. "You have not come to seek out God and His Temple and His people to assist them, but rather to aid John, the prince of the murderers and evil doers. Would it not have been better for you to come to the aid of God and His Temple, rather than helping the sinners, the seditious, who seek to destroy the House of God and His people." 72

The Idumaeans reply in like fashion, stressing their religious nature. "How can you believe that we have come to aid the wicked and the seditious who are with you. From the day that
we and our fathers were circumcised to God, the God of Israel, we have not strayed from the rules of the Torah and its commandments. Now, tell us, is there a command in the Torah to strengthen the wicked that we should now turn to assist sinners such as they are? We would not think of doing this, for all of us who are here and all the rest of the Idumeans, are servants of God and His people, who uphold His Torah, His honor and His nation."?

On the other hand, those who assisted the seditious were considered traitors not only to their country, but also to God and His Torah. Those who defended Jerusalem were the supporters of their faith. The clash between them and the Romans was a clash of principle and ideal. But the consequence of the widespread iniquity and transgression caused God to reject Judaea, resulting in catastrophe and destruction.

We must again stress this fundamental difference in approach between Josephus and the Yosippon. According to Josephus, Providence was with Rome, a factor that is unexplained, and has no relation to Judaea's sinfulness. The Jewish State had to succumb to Rome as did all other nations, for God was in Italy. According to the Yosippon, God's assistance to Rome was primarily in relation to Judaea, a direct corollary to His rejection of Judaea. As a result of this Providence, Rome grew to a great empire, but the reason for this Divine assistance was no special love for Rome, but the sin and misdeed of Judaea that had to be punished through Roman victory.

If this was a rejection with a cause, as specified by the
Yosippon, then it could be countered. The Yosippon never suggests, as does Josephus, that this represented a total and permanent rejection that the Judaeans experienced, but rather a retribution for their misdeeds. Despite their wrongs, the Jews were still the Chosen People, a title they never lost. There was still room for faith on their part; they were still able to aspire for God's assistance, for there was no total divorcement between them. The rejection was a temporary situation, one that could be remedied.

Whereas Josephus maintains that the Judaeans were in total despair, realizing that there was no hope for deliverance, the Yosippon records numerous occasions where faith and hope are expressed, and, indeed, where Providence was with the Judaeans despite the rejection that they experienced.

After the victorious battle at Ascalon, "they (the Zealots) strengthened themselves and trusted in God, the God of Israel." In the later stages of the conflict, after experiencing success, the Zealots return to their city with "thanks and hymns to God," in gratitude for His assistance.

When Niger was saved in the battle at Ascalon, this is reported in the Yosippon as an explicit act of Providence, a miracle. Niger prayed to God for help, beseeching Him to postpone any punishment that was due him, and he "was saved by the God in whom he trusted." He and his companions then returned to Jerusalem singing songs of praise and thanksgiving to God.

Joseph ben Gorion, too, attests to God's assistance in his victories in the Galilee. He was successful in his confrontations
"for his God was with him." In a similar fashion, John and Simon counsel Eleazar to go forth in his expedition against the Romans "for the God of the Temple and the Sanctuary in Jerusalem will assist you." Eleazar goes forth and prays for His providence, asking God to overlook his iniquity and to recall the righteousness of his father, Ananus, the High Priest.

This hope for deliverance is again expressed by the Zealots as they console themselves, "And now the multitude of the Romans will retire and shall no longer besiege Jerusalem; they shall leave and we shall remain, and we shall return to the Lord our God." This can well refer to the recognition of their transgression and their decision to repent.

In contrast to such sentiments, the only consolation offered by Josephus to the Judaeans is a surrender to the Romans. This would be the only hope for their preservation, for God is in Italy. "However there is a place left for your preservation, if you be willing to accept of it; and God is easily reconciled to those that confess their faults, and repent of them. O hard-hearted wretches as you are, cast away all your arms, and take pity on your country already going to ruin...."

With this concept stressed in the Yosippon, that God's rejection of Judaea was not without cause, but was a consequence of iniquity and transgression; nor was it permanent in nature; with this comes associated a hope for salvation. This is a factor ever present in the narrative of the Yosippon, but conspicuously absent in Josephus. The author of the Yosippon, while bewailing
and lamenting the tribulation, alludes to its end, whereas in Josephus it seems to be infinite in nature, without an end in sight. Nowhere does Josephus suggest that Divine Providence, presently on the side of the Romans, will ever return to the Judaeans, whereas the Yosippon frequently alludes to this.

Even when the Yosippon describes the tremendous might of the Roman Empire and how God caused them to subdue all others, and how He humbled all nations before Rome, the author associates this description with a narrative regarding the succession of such power from nation to nation. He recounts how this success and authority was first enjoyed by the Egyptians; how it was then transferred to the Assyrians and Persians; and how it was now possessed by the Romans. This has the implication that this sequence of transfer is not over, and that the glory now enjoyed by Rome will be returned to Judaea. This is stated explicitly in another section, when the description of Roman authority and success is closed with the phrase "until their end will come." 83

Being that sinfulness was the cause for their tribulation and rejection, the counter-measure of repentance can be resorted to in order to bring Providence back to Judaea. This is what Joseph ben Gorion counsel his people in the Yosippon. While suggesting that they succumb to the Romans, he assures them that "your time will come and you shall return to God with all your hearts, and then you, too, shall rule over nations according to your will." 84

Throughout the narrative, the Yosippon includes profound expressions of hope for the ultimate redemption of Judaea and
for its return to glory and to freedom. Joseph ben Gorion prays freely to God to hasten that day of salvation.

"And now, why do you see fit to conceal your countenance from them, and in whose hand did you entrust your flock. Look, O Lord our God, look upon your people, your possession, whom you took out from Egypt with great strength, with an outstretched arm, with miracles and wonders, and whom you guided to this day with the fairness of your faith; pity them with your loving-kindness, and do not consume them in your anger."85

"O Lord our God, our iniquities are above our heads and there is no counting the evil deeds we have done before you..... and therefore righteousness and justice are His as He poured His wrath out upon us, and we are ashamed this day; may He return and console us, and take hold of our sins and cast all our transgressions to the currents of the sea."86

"May the end, the redemption, be shown to you (daughter of Zion), and may your children return to your boundaries with the redemption of their redeemer.....and you shall then drink with your daughter from the cup of salvation and consolation."87

"And the day will come, the day of redemption, and our God will remember His oath to our ancestors, and He will rebuild our city, and He will cause our Temple to prosper, and He will gather our dispersed, and He will assemble our depressed, and He will return those who are captive, and He will hasten our Messiah, and He will speed our redemption, and He will humble our enemies, and
He will destroy our foes, and He shall elevate us as we were."

This prayer for independence and hope for redemption, stressed in the Yosippon, have no parallels in the narrative of Josephus. This is consistent with the factor that differentiates the two records, previously discussed. According to Josephus, the revolution was not religious in nature, but was motivated by the national instincts of liberty and freedom. Judaea was no different from any other nation that was subject to Rome. She had no more to hope for freedom than did the other. As a matter of fact, at this point, after the destruction of Jerusalem, her chances for regaining independence were inferior to the other peoples, for Judaea was virtually non-existent as a country.

The Yosippon, on the other hand, introduces piety into his narrative. Judaea, the chosen nation, may have been temporarily rejected as a result of her transgressions, but she still remains the nation chosen by God. And He, who rules over all, who commands and directs the kings upon earth, will bring redemption to His people and He will uplift them from the depths of their depression. This is the hope with which the Yosippon imbues the entire story of the revolution, the tragic Judaean defeat, and the future of God's people.
Both Josephus and the Yosippon refer to certain specific acts of humaneness on the part of the Romans in the course of the Judaean revolution. Titus is frequently reported to express pity at the calamity and suffering of the Judaeans in Jerusalem, and his reluctance to destroy at random and to kill is referred to in both texts.

Josephus, when reporting the activities of Simon ben Gioras and the Zealots, states that the cruelty perpetrated by them far exceeded the evil of the Romans. "Now this Simon...was a greater terror to the people than the Romans themselves, as were the Zealots who were within it more heavy upon them than both of the others."¹

The Yosippon, too, refers to the greater sense of reverence and regard expressed by the Romans than that of the Zealots, thereby explaining the presence of Divine Providence with the Romans.² The Yosippon reports that the Zealot masses attest to this humanity on the part of their enemies, as they say to Joseph ben Gorion, "We also recognize the compassion of Titus, the Emperor's son, who had compassion upon us and who pitied us for our tribulations."³

When Josephus arrived in Rome as a captive, the Yosippon
reports the reaction of a segment of the population, one of sadness and compassion. "And a portion of the people were mourning, weeping and saddened, and they said, "Is this not the hero who was glorified both in the Judaean camp and in the Roman camp; whose awe permeated the entire Roman camp; and whose reputation for bravery was spread throughout the land. How is it that a great warrior such as he, a prince and leader of his people, should be in captivity?" 4

Josephus reports that when Titus was about to capture Gischala he took many precautions to spare the city and its population, knowing that the people would be destroyed by his soldiers. "Now Titus, as he made up to Gischala, found it would be easy for him to take the city upon the first onset, and he knew withal that if he took it by force, the multitude would be destroyed by the soldiers without mercy. So he was rather desirous the city might be surrendered up to him on terms." 5

In a similar fashion does Josephus report how Vespasian pitied the tribulations that befell Jerusalem and its people, and how his siege was more of a deliverance than a conquest. "Vespasian did, indeed, already pity the calamities those men (in Jerusalem) were in and, arose, in appearance, as though he was going to besiege Jerusalem, but in reality to deliver them from a worse siege they were already under." 6

After Joseph ben Gorion addressed the Judaeans, pleading with them that they cease their insurrection and come to terms with the Romans, thereby sparing themselves and the city, the
Yosippon reports that Titus was so overcome with emotion that he freed all the Judaean slaves and returned their purchase monies to their original owners, an act of pity and humaneness.  

When the Judaean deserters arrived in the Roman camp, starved for food, they were fed by Titus and made comfortable. They, however, took sick. The Yosippon writes that Joseph suggested a different diet for them, a suggestion that was accepted by Titus. The Yosippon adds that Titus was very saddened at the plight of these Jews, attempting to help them in every fashion.

When Titus besieged Jerusalem, he was concerned about the welfare of its citizens. He ordered his soldiers to respect the peaceful inclinations of all people, not to kill at random, but to guarantee "tranquility, honor and life" to all who seek peace.

The Yosippon also reports that the Judaean who came to Titus were treated in a peaceful and respectful fashion; that he settled them in Goshen, in Egypt, and ordered the Egyptians to protect them, to maintain them and to provide them with all necessities.

After the destruction of Jerusalem and the burning of the Temple, the Yosippon records a request made by Joseph ben Gorion of Titus, that he remove the Roman ensign from the Temple area, so that he and his priests be able to assemble there to worship and to lament the destruction. Titus reportedly answered, "Do as you see fit."
This kindness was not a trait unique to Titus and Vespasian. Both texts refer to the Roman approach to conquered people, that it was one of mildness; that the Romans were not interested in destruction, but rather the tribute that would be paid to them. Josephus writes that "they (the Romans) were naturally mild in their conquests, and preferred what was profitable, before what their passions dictated to them."12

With this policy in mind, Josephus assures the Judaeans that "while the Romans do demand no more than that accustomed tribute which our fathers paid to their fathers; and if they may but once obtain that, they neither aim to destroy this city, nor to touch this Sanctuary; nay, they will grant you besides, that your posterity shall be free, and your possessions secured to you, and will preserve your holy laws inviolate to you."13

The Yosippon, too, attests to this, that Rome was interested only that the Judaeans consider themselves part of the Roman Empire, but that they would be permitted a measure of autonomy, and would be permitted to have their own leaders. The Yosippon notes that this policy was not introduced by Titus or Vespasian, but was followed by Augustus before them.14

Testifying that this approach is accepted by the Romans, and that the Judaeans would be granted amnesty from their part in the insurrection, Joseph ben Gorion points to himself as the example. Though he commanded the Judaean forces against Rome, he was now treated with respect and regard, being forgiven for all.15
This assurance was expressed to the Judaeans even before the revolution began. Though they had suffered from the cruelty of Florus, Agrippa assures them that this is not the Roman policy, but that Florus was acting as an individual, cruel as he was, and that the Emperor was totally unaware of the situation. 

This is explicitly noted in the Yosippon in association with the incident of Nero's sacrifice which was rejected in the Temple by Eleazar ben Ananus. According to the Yosippon, Nero sent a letter with his sacrifice beseeching the Judaeans for peace, expressing his regrets at what had occurred, explaining his ignorance of the cruelties that had been perpetrated by his governors, and assuring the Judaeans that such incidents shall not recur, and promising them autonomous rule.

This same assurance is recorded in the instructions that Vespasian gave to Titus regarding the status of Jerusalem and its population. According to the Yosippon, the people were to be freed from tribute for two years, should they accept the Roman terms. All he wanted was that they fly the Roman flag on the Temple tower during the three Pilgrimage Festivals, when the Jews gather in Jerusalem, that they realize that Judaea was part of the Roman Empire. Vespasian also requested that the customary sacrifice for the welfare of Rome and the Emperor be offered on these festivals. Other than that, the Judaeans would be able to enjoy autonomous communal life.

Titus, according to the Yosippon, accepted his father's instructions in good faith. He assured the Zealots that he was not interested in embarrassing them, nor in prohibiting them
from their religious practices, nor to destroy their cities. All he desired was their submission to Rome. He promised to protect them from all evil and to appoint a Jewish leader for Judaea, suggesting that Joseph ben Gorion be that leader, and that he was prepared to crown him their king, should this be their desire. 19

111

The Roman attempts for peace with Judaea are recorded in the narratives of both Josephus and the Yosippon.

The Yosippon reports that Titus ordered the siege stopped for a few days, hoping that in the interim the Judeans would agree to a peace treaty and that the city would be spared destruction.20 When they did not accept his offer, and he enters the city, Josephus reports his instructions to the soldiers that the city be spared.

"When therefore he came in, he did not permit his soldiers to kill any of those they caught, not to set fire to their houses neither; nay, he gave leave to the seditious, if they had a mind, to fight without any harm to the people, and promised to restore the people's effects to them; for he was very desirous to preserve the city for his own sake, and the Temple for the sake of the city."21

The compassion of Titus is emphasized in the Yosippon, when he, realizing that there was no hope for peace, turns to
God and prays for a speedy victory in order to spare the many casualties of a prolonged battle. Titus suggests that if the war will be prolonged he will leave, for he is afraid of total destruction. When John and Simon, the leaders of the seditious, escape to Titus and plead for their lives, he responds with anger. "I have pleaded with you for peace so many times and you refused me. I called upon you for peace on one occasion after another, for I had compassion for you and for the people subjected to starvation and to death without burial." 23

In the course of the destruction Titus experiences a remorse, and feels the need to excuse the calamity that he is bringing upon Jerusalem and its people, insisting that it is not his doing, but the fault of the citizenry.

Here we begin to discern a significant difference between Josephus and the *Yosippon*. In the *Yosippon*, Titus speaks with a reverence to God, His city, His Temple and even His people. His peaceful intentions are not merely those characteristic of an approach accepted by Rome to its conquered peoples, but are rather expressed as a profound interest in the sparing of the Holy City for its own sake. Titus speaks with a special respect and regard for the sanctified places in Judaea, not to be equated with the general mildness of Roman policy.

The *Yosippon* associates Titus' quest for peace with an explanation. "For Titus had pity on the city, on the Temple of God and on the people of God, not wanting to destroy them." 24 Amitai, in speaking to the Zealots, stresses the same motive.
"And Titus wanted to make peace with us because he had compassion on us, on our Temple, on the Sanctuary of God, on our sons, daughters, infants and wives, and on the city of our God....and Titus commanded his people not to touch the Sanctuary of God in the course of his war with John." 25

These expressions of reverence on the part of Titus are especially pronounced in his monologues before God. The content and tone of these addresses are unique to the Yosippon. Not only do their contents express a regard and concern for the Temple and for the city, but they also express a recognition of the greatness of God, a most unusual approach to ascribe to a Roman.

"And he (Titus) lifted his hands heavenward and said: Lord of the world, God of this House, all secrets are known to you, and you are aware of the innocent thoughts in my heart, and you know the thoughts in my heart, that I did not come to war against this city but rather to call unto her for peace, but the people did not agree to this. I continued to plead with them for peace, but they did not lend an ear. I wanted to be compassionate to her, perhaps she will live, and as they fought with one another I wanted to save them, but I found them to be as wild beasts to their own brothers, without mercy....." 26

Compare this compassionate outcry in the Yosippon with its parallel in Josephus, characterized by a coldness and an aloofness. "But for Caesar, he excuses himself before God as
to this matter, and said that he had proposed peace and liberty to the Jews, as well as an oblivion of all their former insolent practices; but that they, instead of concord, had chosen sedition; instead of peace, war;...and that therefore they deserved to eat such food as this was."²⁷

When Titus sees the intense suffering in Jerusalem, he again turns to God and says: "It should be known to you, O God of the heavens, that I am not guilty for all this, for I came to them with peace, but when I spoke of peace, the Zealots insisted upon war."²⁸

A similar monologue is spoken by him when he hears of the starvation in Jerusalem. "And Titus lifted his hands heavenward, and bowed down upon his knees, and said, O God, the God of the heavens and the earth, in whom the Israelites believe, cleanse me from this guilt, for I wanted peace from them but they did not agree; they accomplished this evil; they sinned with their very being. Do not consider the death of the Judaeans as my transgression."²⁹

When Joseph refers to Roman clemency, it is not a humaneness peculiar to their relationship with the Judaeans. The Roman approach to Jerusalem and the Temple, according to Josephus, was similar to the manner in which they approached the sacred places of all peoples. It was their policy to create as little disturbance as possible amongst a conquered population. Josephus suggests that the Romans kept their distance from the sacred rites and did not meddle in the area of religious observance.
"(the) Romans who had no relation to those things, had a reverence for their sacred rites and places, although they belonged to their enemies, and had till now kept their hands off from meddling with them." 30

There was a respect for these sacred places, to be sure. The Temple, writes Josephus, "hath yet been reverenced by the Romans when it was at a distance from them, when they have suffered many of their own customs to give place to our law." 31 As a matter of fact, Josephus reports that "there were none of the Roman soldiers who did not look with a sacred horror upon the holy house, and adored it, and wished that the robbers would repent before their miseries became incurable." 32

This respect, however, does not reflect a personal recognition of the sanctity of these sites, but a regard for what others consider sacred.

The Yosippon, however, introduces this innovation, that Titus himself saw the sanctity of the Temple, that he experienced the awe of the City of God, and that he himself revered the God of Israel. The very language employed by the author of the Yosippon has this implication. Titus' approach to Jerusalem and the Temple had no relation to the overall policy accepted by Rome to its subjected peoples. The language used by Titus, according to the Yosippon, is not one of kindness or humaneness or mildness. They are the words of one who is overwhelmed and overtaken by an awesome sanctity, an approach taken by Rome to Judaea alone.

When Titus pleads with the Judaeans to stop the war and to
Josephus explains it as part of the Roman reverence for magnificent architectural work. It would be wrong to destroy so magnificent a structure as the Temple; let it better be preserved as an ornament for Rome.

"But Titus said, that although the Jews should get upon that holy house and fight us thence, yet ought we not to revenge ourselves on things that are inanimate instead of the men themselves and that he was not in any case for burning down so vast a work as that was, because this would be a mischief to the Romans themselves, and it would be an ornament for the government while it existed."35

"Now although anyone would justly lament the destruction of such a work as this was, since it was the most admirable of all the works that we have ever seen or heard of, but for its curious structure and magnitude, as well as for the glorious reputation it had for its holiness."36

In the Yosippon, Titus speaks in a different fashion. He is not concerned with structural beauty or architectural magnificence. He speaks of sanctity. "This city is a holy city, and this Temple is a holy Temple, awesome in nature; and one may not speak of it except with respect....."37

Even more explicit is Titus' exclamation upon the burning of the Temple, as recorded in the Yosippon. "And Titus came to the Holy of Holies and saw the majesty of the House, its beauty and magnificence, and he believed that it was the House of God.....And Titus said: Now I know that this is the
House of God, the place of the God of the heavens and His Sanctuary. It was not for nothing that the Judaeans battled for it. I also understand why the Gentiles came from the ends of the earth with gold and silver and precious vessels to bow down before the God of this House. It is not for nothing that they came, for the honor of this House is great; the magnificence of this Temple is far above that of the Roman Temples and the temples of all other nations that I have seen. And the God of the heavens who is the God of this House will avenge His Temple from the Zealots who, through their wickedness, brought forth this evil."38

This reverence for God by the Romans is expressed elsewhere in the Yosippon as well. When Nicanor assures Joseph ben Gorion that he will be safe in the Roman camp, he takes an oath "by the One who created the world in wisdom."39 Titus' comments, however, are far more explicit. "For their God is the God of the heavens and the earth, and He judges all with righteousness, and He is awesome, and who is it who could escape from Him."40

At the close of the narrative, the Yosippon sums up Titus' character and his approach to the Judaeans. "And Emperor Titus was very wise.....And Titus was a righteous and just man, and all of his rulings were righteous."41

It may seem somewhat surprising that the Yosippon should laud and glorify Titus more so than does Josephus, whose history was written to please the Romans.
It, however, is quite consistent with the difference in approach between the two texts, as discussed in the previous chapters. There is no doubt that these expressions of faith, adoration, glorification and reverence were composed by the author of the Yosippon. Had these words, or similar phraseology, been uttered by Titus, Josephus would certainly have recorded them.

For the Yosippon, such unique statements of reverence on the part of the Romans for the Jews, their God and their faith, have great significance. As previously stated, the Yosippon views the revolution as a singular confrontation between Rome and Judaea, different from any other conceivable conflict. This revolution was not political or nationalistic in nature; it was the War of God, for His teachings and people were the object of this war.

The Judaean defeat and the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem do not represent defeat in the War of God, for it is inconceivable that God can lose a war. The converse of this is true; the defeat of the Judaeans was a victory for God's principles. The destruction represented a retribution for transgression, for iniquity, for treason against God. When wickedness is eliminated and the source of evil is uprooted, this is a victory for idealism and principle.

This is stressed in the Yosippon when the author, through the mouths of the historic characters, admonishes the Judaeans for their transgression and urges them on to repentance, to
recognize their wrongdoing and to return to their God. This approach is strengthened by the profound reverence expressed by Titus. Firstly, his respect for God and Jerusalem and the Temple emphasizes the sinfulness of the Judaeans and further explains the reason for the destruction. Secondly, this profound reverence for God by a Roman leader adds to the uniqueness of this war, differentiating it from all other possible conflicts. And this uniqueness is basic to the Yosippon's approach.

To Josephus this is totally superfluous. He, as was stated, does not view the revolution of the Judaeans as anything more than an aspiration for liberty. It was a revolution similar to all other revolutions. The entire question of Providence and Divine assistance is incidental to the episode, for Rome enjoyed God's help before its war with Judaea. Titus' regard for Jerusalem is the same concern that he had for the capital of any country that he conquered. If he was interested in sparing the city and the population, it was so that they would be able to pay tribute. A destroyed city and a dispersed population is of no use to the treasury of Rome. His admiration for the Temple was an expression of Roman appreciation for architectural achievement. There was no need to stress a special reverence on the part of Titus for Jerusalem, merely to report The War of the Jews.
CHAPTER SIX

THE JUDEAN IMAGE

In the course of our discussion we noted the unique approach taken by the Yosippon as to the nature of the Judaean revolution against Rome. It was not a political or national conflict with the sole purpose of attaining freedom from foreign dominion, but rather a religious war, a Holy War, the War of God. We stressed that according to the Yosippon, the motivation for the fighting was not political independence, but religious freedom and the supremacy of Judaean sanctity; that the forces were divided into the supporters of God and the enemies of God. Associated with this approach was an emphasis upon ethics and religious ideal, the notion that iniquity and transgression were the causes for the Judaean defeat and the destruction of the Temple. In conjunction with this, the Yosippon stresses the hope and faith for rebuilding the Temple and the reestablishment of statehood, to be preceded by a return to God and His principles.

This was the primary difference between the Yosippon and Josephus, resulting in the different ramifications of the respective narratives. To Josephus this was a war like all other wars, with nothing particularly unique associated with the Judaean confrontation. Though stating that Providence was with Rome, this was a simple deduction from the fact that Rome
was able to conquer the greater part of the world and to grow into the great empire that it was. The role of God in history and the rejection of the Judaeans, though accepted by Josephus, were only incidental to the record.

To the Yosippon, however, the role of God was central to the episode, and the entire sequence of events revolves around this principle. Though agreeing that the Judaeans, as a result of misdeed, suffered the loss of Divine presence, the Yosippon never accepts this as a total rejection by God, hence the hope for the future.

Throughout the narrative the Judaeans are referred to as the "People of God," "the nation of God" and "His possession." Even when the Judaeans were suffering defeat, they were still called the "people of God," implying that even them, while suffering punishment for iniquity, their unique chosenness was still theirs. "That night," the Yosippon reports, "they (the Romans) killed 8,500 men of the people of God." Similarly, when Simon ben Gioras perpetrated his cruelties, the Yosippon writes, "and he continued to increase his evil against the people of God." "And then he strengthened himself against the people of God.....and he struck a very great blow at them." He states this explicitly in an address to the Judaeans, telling them that though they are the people of God, they are not able to rely upon Him because of their sinfulness. This ongoing relationship between the Judaeans and God is the foundation for the expression of hope that is unique to the Yosippon, enabling the author to assure himself and his readers that "such
tribulation shall not recur to the people of God.⁶

With this approach the Yosippon, while recognizing the existing degeneration of the Judaeans, is concerned about their total image, and throughout the text the author endeavors to elevate the Judaean image despite his iniquity. This attempt explains the nature of many of the variations that we listed in chapter two of Part II.

Although the Judaeans are defeated and Jerusalem is destroyed, the Yosippon eliminates from his report those elements that would add to the degradation of the Judaeans and would tend to leave a permanent mark on their stature as a people.

The author therefore omits the events preceding the revolution, where the Judaeans are shamed and provoked by Florus, and yet are submissive, humbling themselves to a degraded level.⁷ While decrying and bewailing the cruelty of the Zealots, he frequently eliminates the detailed descriptions of their cruelty and the resultant weakness within the Judaean ranks.⁸

Titus’ exhortations to his troops wherein he expresses a devout reverence for God, the Temple and the Judaeans, tend to elevate the image of the Judaean.⁹ These exhortations and monologues are, therefore, elaborated upon in the Yosippon and are, indeed, unique to this Hebrew history, for the image of the Jew was a foremost concern to the author.

But the Yosippon is not satisfied with verbal platitudes alone; actual incidents are transformed to the benefit of the
Judeans, though having no real effect on the tragic outcome of the revolution and the Judean defeat. Military confrontations, the results of which are reported in Josephus as Judean defeats, are reported in the Yosippon as victories. The numbers of Roman casualties reported in Josephus are exaggerated in the Yosippon.

Even the religiosity of the Zealots and their leaders, whom the Yosippon deplores, is at times defended. When Josephus stresses their transgression, that they fought certain battles on the Sabbath, the Yosippon reports that those confrontations took place after the Sabbath. These same Zealots, whom the Yosippon refers to as "vermin and enemies of God," are also referred to as people of faith who place their full trust in God and pray for His assistance. They are men of courage, determination and commitment. When Simon of Scythopolis, who betrayed his countrymen and fought on the side of the Romans, died, the Yosippon refers to his death as that of heroism and loftiness of spirit. A similar comment is recorded in relation to Eleazar, the leader of the Zealots. Despite his cruel excesses, the Yosippon refers to him as a saviour of the Judeans who was able to battle successfully against the Roman attempts to destroy Jerusalem.

The Yosippon further attempts to stress the courageous spirit and the commitment of the Judeans in his omission of all reports that they succumbed to a tribulation and resorted to suicide without any form of military opposition against the Romans. Simon of Scythopolis fights and kills many of the
Romans before he takes his own life, a report not found in Josephus. At Jotapata, the Judaeans do not merely put each other to death, as cited by Josephus, but battle against the Romans and die in battle. And of marked significance, is the Yosippon's description of the fall of Masada, where the men of the fortress, after killing all the other occupants, confront the Romans in battle and die in commitment to their people and faith. This transforms the entire incident from an expressed reluctance to fight, as reported by Josephus, to a heroism and determination, in the Yosippon.

This characterization of the courage of the Judaeans and the nature of their fortitude is another instance where Josephus and the Yosippon are at variance with one another. And this variation, too, is not an independent one, but related to the overall difference in approach between the texts.

Josephus agrees that the Judaeans fought desperately in the revolution, frequently frustrating the plans and the efforts of the Roman legions. Even at the very end of the conflict, Josephus reports that the Romans were appalled at the strong defense and even offense posed by the Judaeans. "They found the Jews' courageous souls to be superior to the multitude of the miseries they were under by their sedition, their famine and the war itself; inasmuch that they were ready to imagine that the violence of their attacks was invincible...for what would not those be able to bear if they should be fortunate, who turned their very misfortunes to the improvement of their valour." The two approaches differ, however, as to the nature of
this courage, a variation that reflects upon their different approaches to the image of the Judaean revolutionary.

Although Josephus reports that the Romans recognized the extreme courage of the Jews and acknowledged the damage that they accomplished, they do not consider this fortitude as a threat to their victory. ".....(The Judaeans) do make sallies into the very midst of us frequently, not in hopes of conquering us, but merely for a demonstration of their courage."20

While lauding them for their courage, the Judaean onslaughts, accomplished without a regard for the lives of the soldiers, are termed madness by the Romans, for it represents a fighting without purpose, without a goal of victory. In this approach Josephus differentiates between the military tactics of the Judaeans from the strategy of the Romans. The Judaean attacks were characterized by an incautiousness whereas the Roman advances were handled with order and discipline.

"And now the Jews were unconcerned at what they suffered themselves from the Romans, and were only solicitous about what mischief they could do them; and death itself seemed a small matter to them, if at the same time they could but kill any one of their enemies."21

"The disorderly way of their fighting at first also put the Romans to a stand, who had been constantly used to fighting skillfully in good order, and obeying the orders that were given them; for which reason the Romans were caught unexpectedly,
and were obliged to give way to the assaults that were made upon them."22

"But this incautiousness in war, and their madness of zeal, is not a Roman maxim. While we perform all that we attempt by skill and good order, that procedure is the part of barbarians, and is what the Jews chiefly support themselves by."23

"These Jews who are conducted only by their madness do everything with care and circumspection; they continue stratagems, and lay ambushes, and fortune gives them success to their stratagems, because they are obedient, and preserve their good will and fidelity to one another."24

The reason for this mad zeal on the part of the Judaeans, characterized by an expressed unconcern for life or property, according to Josephus, was the despair that they felt. They had given up all hope for deliverance or victory, and hence they were bent on hurting the Romans as much as possible, though defeat for them was accepted as inevitable. This, according to Josephus, was the prime motive for their zealous courage.

Regarding the battle of Jotapata Josephus writes: "For as they (the Judaeans) despaired of either themselves or their city being able to escape, they preferred a death in battle before one by hunger or thirst."25

Josephus states the same view regarding the Judaean defense of Jerusalem. "For the war was not now gone on with as if they had any hope for victory; for they glorified after a brutish
manner in that despair of deliverance they were already in."26

Josephus differentiates between the Judaean courage, based upon despair and disillusion, and the zeal of the Romans, which was founded upon a glorious reputation, skill in warfare and a disciplined military strategy. The Romans had not lost a war, and their victory over Judaea would serve to reemphasize their glory.

"The Romans being encouraged by their power, joined to their skill - as were the Jews by their boldness, which was nourished by the fear they were in, and that hardiness which is natural to our nation under calamities."27

"Now among the Jews the ambition was who should undergo the first dangers, and thereby gratify their commanders -...... What made the Romans so courageous was their usual custom of conquering and disuse of being defeated, their constant wars, and perpetual warlike exercises, and the grandeur of their dominion; and what was now their chief encouragement, Titus who was present everywhere with them all."28

"However the Jews did not flinch, though not so much from their real strength, as from their despair of deliverance. The Romans also would not yield, by reason of the regard they had for glory, and to their reputation in war, and because Caesar himself went into the danger before them."29

Josephus introduces another motivation for the Romans in
their fight against the Judaeans, that of shame. How would the Roman Empire appear if it could not overcome Judaean resistance. "We who have gotten the possession of almost all the world that belong to either land or sea, to whom it will be a great shame if we do not conquer them."30

This Roman motive is the one emphasized by the Yosippon. Throughout the narrative the author presents Titus and his legions as concerned over the embarrassment they would suffer should they lose this war. This notion is of special significance to the Yosippon, for it adds to the grandeur of the Judaean image, that even the Romans entertained the thoughts of possible defeat and that it was the fear of the shameful consequences of such defeat that urged them on to concentrated battle.

Titus himself is reported as saying, "I am prepared to choose an honorable death rather than a life in shame."31 The Yosippon places a special stress on Titus' exhortation to his soldiers, emphasizing the shame they would bring upon themselves and their country if they were to be defeated. "Is it not a shame, an embarrassment to you, O Romans, that this day you flee from the starving Jews.... Woe on to you. Where will you bring your shame when the nations, whom you have conquered with your heroism, will hear that you fled from the Jews, many of whom are dying daily from starvation and from the lack of all sustenance.... They are few and we are many; no nation comes to their assistance and we enjoy the aid of all countries in the area. And now, what is it with you that you flee from them."32
On another occasion Titus scolds his troops. "Why do you still desire to live? Death would be better for you. In the days of Emperor Nero you came to this city to fight, not to bring shame upon him. And now, under Emperor Vespasian, who is far more liberal with you than Nero was, and who is far braver than was Nero, this (your cowardice) is an evil, and you bring shame upon yourselves this day."33

The Romans themselves, according to the Yosippon, resort to this motivation. "And they say to one another, let us strengthen ourselves in our battles, for it is a shame for us to flee from these starving Jews."34

The Yosippon reports that Titus had to bribe his soldiers, promising them gold and silver and honor should they fight in a brave fashion.35 This certainly adds to the image of the Judaean soldier and his commitment to his God and country.

The Yosippon lauds the courage of the Judaeans. And even if at one instance he alludes to their despair,36 their prime motive for fighting with such courage, stressed by the author, was their commitment to their land and their Sanctuary. Their death in battle was a form of martyrdom. Titus, according to the Yosippon, recognizes this as he speaks to his soldiers. "And if the Judaeans this day are prepared to die for their country and their Sanctuary, why should you not be prepared to die in war with them to create for yourselves a reputation of heroism."37

The courage of the Judaeans is continually contrasted with
the cowardice of the Romans in the Yosippon. The Zealots, whom
the Yosippon blames for much of the evil, are lauded for their
courage. "For those lads were heroes in war; one of them ran
after a thousand, and two of them would not flee from ten
thousand." When Joseph ben Gorion speaks to

to the young lad, a descendant of Alexander of Macedon,
and marvels at his courage, he tells him that only one who has
the fortitude of Alexander can be privileged to fight against so
strong and courageous a people as are the Judaeans. 39

According to the Yosippon, the Romans are amazed at this
strength and courage of the Jews, "And they didn't know what
to do with a people as strong as those in Jerusalem and how to
conquer them." 40

Titus notes the unusual abilities of the Judaeans as he
prepares his soldiers for battle. "You are now approaching a
war with a strong and courageous nation. Her people are as
brave as lions, as strong as tigers, as light as gazelles.....
to battle with them who are strong and brave in war. And they
are not like the people with whom you have fought in the past,
for I have studied them, and I know their strength and their
ability in war." 41

When he finds his soldiers lacking courage, Titus tells
them, "why don't you learn courage from these Judaeans, who
are being consumed by sword, hunger and plague, and yet they
fight us as do wild beasts." 42
Again referring to this sense of shame, Titus declares to the heads of the nations who were with him: "Advise us what we shall do that we should not be embarrassed when all of the kingdom will hear (of our defeat). For those who are far from us do not know the Judaeans nor their courage, and they will not believe this when they are told of it."43

So great was their awe of the Judaean courage, that Titus, in his attempt to spare Joseph ben Gorion's life, is reported to have warned the Romans, "who knows, perhaps we shall once be captured by the Judaeans just as their hero, Joseph, the great prince who understands the intricacies of warfare in proper advisement, is now prisoner with us."44

If according to Josephus the Judaeans fought wildly, in a frenzy of madness, against the mighty Roman legions, the Yosippon pictures them as a courageous people, fighting for an ideal in the War of God, characterized by deliberation, commitment and fortitude, able to put even the Roman Empire to tremble. Judaea may have been defeated and Jerusalem may have been destroyed, but the image of the Judaean remains unimpaired.

That this was a religious war, that its participants were not mere warriors and that the image of its leadership was not a purely militaristic one, is further evidenced in the Yosippon's depiction of Joseph ben Gorion (Josephus), the commander in the Galilee.

In The Jewish War, the characterization of Josephus is a dubious one. He is a general, a military commander. When he
admonishes his troops in the Galilee to be ethical,\textsuperscript{45} it is because such behavior is proper for soldiers and results in more effective action. Even his own motivation to fight seems to be a reflection of the Roman approach, the quest for glory and reputation for bravery. When, upon the threat of the people, Josephus decides to stay in Jotapata, he explicitly refers to these as his motivations, denying any further hope in deliverance. "Now is the time to begin to fight in earnest, when there is no hope for deliverance left. It is a brave thing to prefer glory before life, and to set about some such undertaking as may be remembered by late posterity."\textsuperscript{46}

There seems to be a great affection expressed by the people for him. He is a source of strength and security for them. His presence alone tranquillizes them into thinking that he can prevent calamity. This is reported in \textit{The Jewish War}, in the reaction of the people to Josephus. "Accordingly, both the children and the old men, and the women with their infants, came mourning to him, and all of them caught hold of his feet, and held him fast, and besought him with great lamentations that he would take his share with them in this fortune; and I think they did this, not as they envied his deliverance, but that they hoped for their own; for they could not think they should suffer any great misfortune, provided that Josephus would but stay with them."\textsuperscript{47} Even death would be easier for them if only he would share their fate. "For they thought death, if Josephus might but die with them, was sweeter than life."\textsuperscript{48}

But in \textit{The Jewish War}, despite the affection of the people, Josephus is presented as a general, a military commander. The
text speaks of ".....the reverence they have to their general." He does not personify certain ideals emulated by the people, nor is he looked upon as a religious teacher. He is their commander, leading them in a war for liberty and freedom.

The Yosippon, however, presents him in a completely different light. The people in Jotapata revered him because he was chosen as a priest over a people of priests, and because his designation and appointment was a sanctified one to the God of Israel. Not only did he have the holy task of commanding a War of God, but he is a religious teacher, referred to as having taught the people the meaning of the Torah. He is the transmitter of religious truths. After his discussions with the people in Jotapata, after suggesting to them that they submit to a selection by lots, and after the others are put to death, his surviving companion says to him, "I shall do as you wish, for you are a man of God."

This difference in his characterization is evident from the episode in Jotapata itself, with reference to the choosing of lots. After Josephus suggests the procedure to be followed, The Jewish War reports that "the proposal seemed to them to be very just." But in the Yosippon this response is qualified. The people were pleased with his plan "because it was from God, for God listened to the prayers of Joseph." And when they set about to implement this plan it is accomplished amidst assurances to the Divine that they will be loyal and faithful to its details.

The result of the selection by lots was that Joseph and his
comppanion were saved to the last, and, as a result of Josephus' persuasive powers, they agreed not to implement their part of the plan but to remain alive. In The Jewish War this result is reported as one of chance, or, perhaps, due to God's Providence. "Yet was he with one other left to the last, whether we must say it happened so by chance, or whether by the Providence of God."58

The Yosippon is more specific. The text suggests that Joseph saved himself as a result of an intrigue. When he presented his plan to the people in Jotapata, his suggestion is prefaced with the phrase, "and he said to them in deceit."59 Joseph himself refers to this as his own design, that it was an attempt to save himself from death.60 The Yosippon even suggests that the choice of his surviving companion was the result of his conscious planning; that he sought a weak person to remain with him, that he should easily succumb to his wishes.61

But the Yosippon also assures us that even this ruse on the part of Joseph was not a selfish design to save himself, but the result of divine direction. Prior to his suggesting the plan of the lots, Joseph prays to God in an elaborate fashion for guidance and providence that he may be spared such death.62 And upon the implementation of the plan and his survival, this Providence is acknowledged by Joseph's companion, as he thanks God "for the spirit of wisdom and understanding" with which He imbued Joseph.63

That Joseph ben Gorion was a God-fearing man is acknowledged by Titus as well, according to the Yosippon. The general expressed his joy when Joseph arrived in his camp, "for Joseph was
was filled with wisdom and understanding, with the spirit of proper advisement and bravery, and was a God-fearing man." Vespasian, too, recognizes this characteristic of Joseph's in his letter to Titus, exhorting him to listen to all of Joseph's suggestions and advice, "for he is wise.....and his God is with him." 

Joseph's sincerity is further emphasized in the Yosippon when the author reports that he refused freedom offered to him by Vespasian unless it included the freedom of all other Jews in Rome, a request that is granted by the Emperor. Joseph continues to maintain a close emotional bond with his brethren in Judaea. Even while in Rome, enjoying the comforts offered him by the ruling family, he mourns bitterly when he hears of the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem.

In this instance, too, the Yosippon preserves a proper image of the Judaeans by elevating the religious stature of their leader and by investing him with a piety, a faith, a religiosity and a profound concern for his countrymen at all times. This picture of Joseph ben Gorion is unique to the Yosippon.

This approach is further emphasized by the Yosippon as the author imbibes the lengthy conversations, exhortations and debates with a religious tone. Whenever the situation arises and a verbal attempt is made to influence the Judaeans, this attempt as well as the reply include various forms of religious argument and biblical illustration. In doing so, the author of
the Yosippon presents the picture of a people upon whom influence could be wielded of the argument is based upon biblical precedent or if it is founded upon religious principle. It presents the picture of a citizenry of Jerusalem that, despite an iniquity warranting punishment and retribution, is yet a people closely associated with a tradition that they consider biblical episodes sacred enough to warrant emulation. This represents a further attempt on the part of the Yosippon to preserve the image of the Judaeans.

This unique religious tone is found throughout the narrative. When the people in Jotapata attempt to dissuade Joseph from surrendering to the Romans they, in their argument, refer to Moses, Aaron, Jonathan and David. 68 Joseph, in his reply to them, refers to Moses, Aaron, Job, David, Hezekiah and Saul. 69 When Joseph attempts to persuade the Judaeans to stop the revolution, he refers to Jacob and to Joseph: and his brothers. 70 He continues his arguments with references to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Gideon, Hezekiah, Elisha, Saul, David, Asa, Deborah and Amaziah. 71 Amital, in his exhortations to his sons, refers to Jonathan, David, Moses, Aaron and Joshua. 72 Eleazar ben Yair, in speaking to the people at Masada, refers to Josiah, Can and Abel. 73

The Yosippon remains consistent in his approach. He views the revolution as a War of God and the revolutionaries, despite their misdeed, are the people of God, involved in preserving the principles of God. This is the image of the Judaeans and their leadership that the author attempts to preserve.
CHAPTER SEVEN

SOME THEOLOGICAL AND ESCHATOLOGICAL MOTIFS IN THE YOSIPPON

In the course of the preceding chapters we emphasized that a prime factor differentiating the narrative of the Yosippon from the one in Josephus, explaining many of the variations between the texts, is the different approach that each of them takes to the nature of the revolution and its motivations. We stressed that Josephus views this confrontation between the Judeans and the Romans as a war for national liberty and independence; as an attempt to eliminate Judean servitude to Rome by the use of military force. The Yosippon, on the other hand, pictures the revolution in a completely different light. The author of this Hebrew history views this war as a War of God, a Holy War, wherein liberty and freedom are not the major factors; at stake are Jerusalem, the City of God; the Temple, the House of God; and the Judeans, the People of God.

As such, the ramifications of the entire episode assume a religious garb, with many of the events and pronouncements associated with piety and principle. In this chapter we will note the various theological and eschatological motifs referred to and elaborated upon in the Yosippon, to show their relation to the historical sequence of events and to portray the approach taken by the author of the Yosippon in picturing the Judean revolution as the War of God.
We have already pointed to the difference between the Yosippon and Josephus regarding their respective approaches to the Judaean defeat and the reason for this catastrophe. According to Josephus it was the manifestation of God's rejection. God was no longer with the Judaeans. He was now in Italy, with the Romans. With this form of Divine assistance Josephus explains the tremendous growth of the Roman Empire and the power and authority that it enjoyed. The Yosippon, too, recognizes this reality, that God was not with the Judaeans in this revolution, for if He had been with them they would have been the victors. The Yosippon, however, refuses to accept the total rejection of the Jewish people by God. Despite their sinfulness and iniquity, resulting in tragic defeat, the Judaeans were still the Chosen People.

This principle of Chosenness is frequently alluded to in the Yosippon. When Joseph ben Gorion attempts to persuade his people to cease their military activity and to put a stop to the revolution, he reminds them that God is not with them, but at the same time he reminds them that "you are the people of God and His treasure." At Jotapata, Joseph, in speaking to the Judaeans, refers to "the bond of love that exists between us and God," and that "He chose us for His nation, for His treasure, for the sake of His sanctity." This chosenness despite transgression is explicitly expressed by Joseph ben Gorion in his prayer to God while at Jotapata. "And even if our iniquity
caused you to distance yourself from us, we are still the works of your hands, and we have always been accepted as your people."5

This concept of Chosenness is spoken of as a relationship between the Judaeans and God that never ceases to exist, resulting in a faith on the part of the Jews that is continually expressed in the Yosippon. It explains why even the sinful, the Zealots, of whom the Yosippon speaks harshly, that they, too, harbor a faith and hope in the future. We have already referred to the many examples of such expressions of faith by them, and the instances where the Yosippon indicates and records that God came to the assistance of the Judaeans and the Zealots in their revolution.6 This is the approach that the author attempts to convey. True, as a result of transgression defeat was to be suffered, but even amidst this defeat the chosenness of the Judaean nation was not eliminated, and the rejection of God was not total nor permanent.

This, too, explains the emphasis in the Yosippon on the hope for ultimate salvation and the rebuilding of the Temple.7 If this chosenness is ever present, and if Judaean defeat is a consequence of existing iniquity, then there is always the opportunity to repent, which would bring with it the resumption of Judaean supremacy. This optimism and hope, based upon an ongoing relationship between the Judaeans and God, is unique to the Yosippon, conspicuously absent in the narrative of Josephus who accepts the notion of a total rejection by God of His people.
This aspiration for ultimate redemption is associated with the concept of Divine Justice, that God is just in His ways, punishing the wicked and rewarding the righteous. At the same time it includes the approach that sinners and transgressors are not eternally doomed, but that a way is open for their return through repentance.

The *Yosippon* refers to this approach on a national level, that a sinful nation can repent its ways and return to former glory. Hence, Joseph ben Gorlon assures the Judaeans that should they return to God, "then you, too, shall rule over nations, if only you will follow after the ways of your God."8

The *Yosippon* also refers to repentance on an individual level. The concept that God accepts repentance even from the wicked, assuring them a place with the righteous, is expressed by Amital in his exhortation against Simon ben Gloras, who was responsible for his death and the death of his sons. Amital prays to God that Simon should die very suddenly; that he should not be given the opportunity to confess his sins and to repent before dying. For should he do so, then this repentance would be accepted, "for it is your way to accept sinners who repent."9 This approach speaks of a God who is not only just, but who is merciful, One who is prepared to forgive the iniquity of a person steeped in wickedness, such as Simon, should he sincerely repent and return to the ways of God.

This aspect of Divine Justice is a constant emphasis in
the Yosippon. The sole reason for the Judaean defeat was the judgement of God for their iniquity.\textsuperscript{10} If this was the Yosippon's approach regarding a Divine act against a nation, the authors refers to this concept of justice regarding individuals as well.

When Simon of Scythopolis is attacked by the citizens of his city and he realizes that he is to die, he accepts this as an act of justice on the part of God for his previous actions against his countrymen. He exclaims "that it is with justice and righteousness that God caused them to rise up against me to put me to death."\textsuperscript{11} He, however, decides not to let the Romans carry out this Divine judgement against him, but insists that it be implemented by himself. "And I shall avenge my brothers and dear ones whom I have killed and whose blood I have shed by taking my own life; I shall be for them their "avenger of blood" (go'el ha-dam). And I choose to take my own life in judgement.....I shall kill myself as a murderer who is guilty of death according to the Torah."\textsuperscript{12}

When Amital is threatened with death by Simon, he, too, recognizes this as an act of justice on the part of God. He admits his severe transgression for having invited Simon to Jerusalem, viewing all of Simon's cruelties and iniquities as his own doing, hence warranting such judgement. "But God does not want to evade justice, for my judgement is to die by your sword, for I invited you to come to this city, and I enabled you to perpetrate all that you did, and I sinned to God. And now this is God's revenge upon me....."\textsuperscript{13}

At the same time, while admitting his death to be a just
decision, Amitai prays for justice against Simon as well. And he prays to God, "Open your just eyes and judge between Simon and me, (for he is) the destroyer and the murderer....for your judgements are truly just." 14

Not only does Amitai demand justice, but the people of Jerusalem, too, wonder at God's sense of justice. "And one said to the other, how long will God be agreeable to the impurities of Simon, the destroyer and the murderer; (how long will) He watch what he is doing to the people of God in a holy place and not avenge the blood of the righteous and the pious of His nation." 15 "And they lifted their eyes to the heavens and they said, Lord, God of Israel, how long will you be patient with those who transgress your will?" 16

This concept of a fundamental justice as an attribute of God is used by the Yosippon to explain the Judaean defeat and the cruelties that they suffered. At the same time, however, it assures them that their enemies, too, will be judged, and that their destiny will bring them salvation and redemption.

This intense faith in God, causing the Judaeans to become involved in a War of God, with His principles and sanctifications as the prime motivations for their fighting, is expressed in the Yosippon in conjunction with the concept of an All-Powerful God, who not only created the world and all that is in it, but whose presence is made manifest in the affairs of the world of man.
Joseph ben Gorion expresses this belief at Jotapata, that all of mankind is the result of God's creative power. "You, O God, our Father, you created us in your grace and in your great goodness, and from clay did you form us."  

An extension of this concept is that God is the possessor and controller of all that is, and this, too, is expressed by Joseph. "For in your hand is the soul of every living being and the spirit of all."  

God is the one who created life, Joseph tells the Judaeans. "He deposited the souls...He is the one who encloses them (in the respective bodies) and opens them (releases them), for He is the Living God in whose hands are the souls of all living beings and the spirit of all flesh is His. He breathed the soul of living life into our nostrils; He gave us life; He caused us to live before Him. He deposited the living spirit within us and enclosed it therein." The soul in man's body is not to be considered his very own to do with as he wishes. It belongs to God who deposited it in man's body. "All of you know that the soul: that is within us is a deposit of His, and we are His servants, and He made for us this soul."  

Life and death are in the power of God. Just as He created life, so, too, does He judge the time of death. Just as He deposited the soul, so, too, is it within His province to release that soul from man's body. "Behold, all the souls of the Israelites belong to God. He, with His will and grace, gave them; and He, with His will and grace, shall take them when He desires to
everything was placed according to (the will) of the Creator of the world, may He be eternally praised; and all will return to the dust according to the will of the Creator, may His name be exalted." 23

Not only is God the Master over individuals, but He controls the destiny of nations. Joseph ben Gorion expresses this at Jotapata. "And you guided us conducted us in your faith." 24 Not only are the Judaeans subject to His will, but all nations are within His jurisdiction to control. Joseph turns to the annals of history and impresses his listeners with the fact that God causes certain nations to rule at certain times, that He determines the succession of power and leadership. First He was with the Egyptians when they ruled over all; then He was with the Israelites, when He freed them from Egyptian bondage; then He gave this leadership to the Assyrians and Persians, and then to the Romans. 25 "And God, He is the one who caused them (the Romans) to rule over all nations. And this is His way, for He rules over the heavenly spheres and He governs the Kings of the earth." 26 When the Athenians enjoyed such might and jurisdiction, "they were crowned from Heaven to rule over the nations." 27

This concept served as a consolation to the Judaeans, that this is not the first time in history that they lost independence. It is the way of God to removed the freedom of a nation at a given time and to make it subject to another. Due to iniquity, this was being experienced by the Judaeans. However, just as God removes freedom, He also has the power to return it, hence the profound hope for the future, for ultimate salvation and rebuilding.
But if this approach was used to console the Judaeans, it was also utilized to chastise them for their intention to battle against the Romans. Titus, according to the Yosippon, used this argument against the Judaeans. Realizing that it was God's will that you shall become subject to Rome, then your stubborn attempt to fight us represents an endeavor on your part to cancel God's will. Titus turns to God and says to Him, "I had thought that they (the Judaeans) trusted in you, but I see that they do not have faith in your salvation, but place their trust in their sword and in their wars, and they elevate themselves by their own strength."  

Joseph ben Gorion, too, admonishes the Judaeans in a similar fashion. In a lengthy exhortation he reminds them that in the past whenever the Israelites were confronted with tribulation, they never resorted to arms, but rather to prayer and worship. Illustrating his address with biblical episodes, Joseph stresses that God was always the General for His people; that they never attempted to solve their problems with the use of force; that the only effective method they utilized was that of prayer.

With the Yosippon's approach that the revolution was more than a national conflict representing a people's quest for liberty; that it was rather a religious war, and that the death in this conflict assumed a lofty significance, for the people gave their lives for the sake of God and His teachings; this results in the
ingroduction of certain eschatological motifs that we find referred to throughout the narrative of the Yosippon.

The Judaeans, in the course of the revolution, were confronted with a variety of influences. At times they were exhorted not to think of life, but to proceed on into battle against all odds and to subject themselves to death without fear, for they were to die for the sake of God, His land and His sanctuary. At times they were exhorted to take their own lives, or to put their companions and families to death. All these arguments had to be presented in conjunction with a certain concept of life and death and the meaning of death, for otherwise the attempts would remain ineffective. From these arguments and illustrations we obtain a glimpse of how the author of the Yosippon, through the mouths of others, approached these subjects.

Eleazar ben Yair, in trying to influence the people at Masada to kill their families and to die in battle, must first dispel all fears of death from their minds. He, therefore, includes the notion that the soul is secured in the body against its will. He likens the body of man to a King's dungeon, and the soul, to the king's slave. How happy is the slave when he is finally freed from his bondage; how happy is the soul when it is freed from the restraints of the body. 32

The Yosippom elevates the soul to the highest form of existence. It is the soul that gives life to the flesh. Without it the body cannot live; but the soul lives eternally. The body
cannot see the soul that is in it, but the soul sees every part, every organ, every tendon of the body that restrains it. As long as the soul is in the body it is put to tribulation, because it is restrained and restricted by the physical organs that surround it as is a prisoner by his chains. But when it regains its freedom, it rejoices.\footnote{33}

Not only is the very act of death sweet, for it frees the soul and causes it to rejoice from that freedom, but death also enables one to become a recipient of his due rewards. A person is not rewarded for his meritorious deeds in this world, stresses Eleazar ben Yair, but rather in the world to come. There he finds peace. The transition from this world to the next is as leaving darkness to come to light.\footnote{34}

Should the younger people be hesitant, for they have lived so short a time, having accomplished so little with so much left to do; to them, too, Eleazar stresses that this world is not important. All that remains to be accomplished can be done in the world to come. The length of years a person spends in this world is not significant. Eleazar turns to the biblical episode of Cain and Abel to illustrate this approach. Abel was killed when he was young, but he went on to the glory of eternal life. Can, on the other hand, lived much longer, but he accomplished nothing with his additional years, for his destiny was darkness and doom.\footnote{35}

With this type of approach death became glorified, something to be sought after, making the people susceptible to th
suggestions of Eleazar ben Yair.

Other details of death are introduced to counter the arguments for suicide. The approach to the glorification of death was used not only to influence people to die bravely in this war; it was also qualified by those who opposed the form of mass death perpetrated by themselves upon each other.

Joseph's mother, for example, when arguing against suicide, introduces a novel notion regarding the process of dying. She, too, does not despair of death. As her son, Joseph ben Gorron, said at Jotapata, "death in its due time is a fine thing." She agrees that freedom awaits man after death. But she suggests that the separation of the soul from the body does not just occur. For if it is to be separated properly, and if death is to direct the soul to the realm of eternal life, then a certain concentration on the part of the individual becomes necessary. The person in the process of dying must not concentrate his thoughts on his physical being, for this will impair the effective separation of body from soul. With the proper channelling of one's thoughts, the journey of the soul is planned, its direction is determined, and it will ultimately be joined with God. "Then," speaks Joseph's mother, "my soul will fly from my body until I reach the upper world, and there I shall rest, and shall be with God forever, a part of His pleasantness, with all the other souls of the righteous."

With this argument, she distinguishes between natural death and suicide. Natural death permits one to channel his thoughts
in the proper direction, enabling an effective separation of the soul from the body to be had, assuring him of the rewards that he will enjoy in the world to come.

If one is to commit suicide, however, his thoughts are preoccupied with the mode of death that he is about to inflict upon himself. As such, he is fully involved in his physical existence, concentrating on his living self, thereby deterring the effective separation of the soul. The result of such death is that while the body becomes useless, the soul has not begun its flight to the upper world, and its direction is a confused one.37

It is interesting that this notion is emphasized by Amitai in his suggestion that the journey of the soul of an elderly person is quicker than that of a young man. He explains this in terms the aforementioned separation of soul from body. An elderly man, whose time for death has approached, finds his soul prepared to leave the body, and it does so quickly. The soul of a young man, however, has difficulty in severing its ties with the body that hosts it, for, while not expecting to leave it, it is not fully prepared for the forthcoming journey.38

In addition to these difficulties, other arguments are recorded in the Yosippone against suicide. The taking of one's life in the face of tribulation of any sort is an indication of a lack of faith in God. As mentioned earlier, the affairs of mankind are subject to the will of God. Just as He punishes one with evil, He can also remove that evil from him. If one reacts
to a situation with so extreme a measure as the taking of his life, then obviously he has no faith in God's deliverance or salvation. This is expressed by Joseph ben Gorion on a number of occasions in his address to the Judaeans at Jotapata. With this approach comes the warning that by dying in such a fashion God will become angered, and that such death will not bring him to the province of eternal life.39

A third argument is emphasized against suicide. While death is good, bringing freedom and eternity to the soul, this is true only if death comes at its designated time. The accepted concept in the Yosippon, as mentioned, is that God, the Creator of life, is also the sole judge over the time for death. A second concept that we mentioned was that the soul, though with us, is not ours to meddle with; it was only deposited within us, and the depositor, God, is the only one who has the right to release it. Hence, by taking independent action, by committing suicide, we are acting contrary to the will of God. And this type of death does not bring with it the blessing of eternal life.40

The concept of an after-life is accepted throughout the narrative of the Yosippon. Regardless who it is in the narrative who speaks, the existence of an after-life is assumed and frequently referred to. There may be disagreement between Eleazar ben Yair, Joseph ben Gorion and his mother regarding the effect of suicide upon the soul, but all agree that death, in its due time, opens the door to another world wherein the
soul continues to live eternally. 41

This after-life is referred to in the Yosippon by a number of terms. Joseph ben Gorion calls it the "Light of Life," stating that whoever dies in his appointed time, his "soul leaves the darkness and goes on to life, and in the Light of Life it illumines the Lord our God." 42 When the Judaean mother, suffering from famine and starvation, kills her child for food, she tells him, "and now, go forth to your destiny that is given you through me, and let your destiny be in Gan Eden (garden of Eden)." 43 When Titus offers the Zealots peace if they will surrender, they are not interested in saving their lives, and they respond to his offer, that "it is better for us to die as free men in starvation and fire..... This tribulation is better for us, that we can go on to the Great Light, to illumine the light of the life of the world, and to the tranquility of Gan Eden (garden of Eden)." 44 Eleazar ben Yair refers to the after-world as the "Righteous World," "the Land of Life" and Gan Eden. 45 Amitai calls it "the world of life" 46 and "the World of the Light of Life." 47

Despite this continual emphasis upon the after-life, with all of the variations in reference, few details are offered in the Yosippon regarding an approach to the nature of this after-life, what it is that awaits the soul. Amitai vaguely alludes to certain divisions, certain levels, one more distinguished than the other, to which the souls are selectively admitted. The more righteous a person was, the more coveted is the level reserved for his soul. Amitai suggests that a very high level
in this after-world is reserved for those who died as martyrs. In speaking to his children, he refers to Hannah and her seven sons who, upon dying for the sanctification of God's name, have a prominent place in this world. And he assures his sons that their place will not be too far from that of Hannah, for they, too, are giving their lives as martyrs, for the sake of God and His Torah.  

Amitai suggests that in the after-world the souls of people become reunited. He tells Simon ben Gioras that though he may attempt to separate him from his children in life, after death their souls will be reunited. He offers the same assurance to his sons.  

Not only will the souls of familial relations be together, but there will be a reunion with our ancestors, with the biblical figures, and with all the righteous. Amitai instructs his sons what they are to tell Jonathan, the son of Saul, and Mattathias, when they meet them. Joseph's mother speaks of this reunion as she states, "And there.....I shall be with God forever.....with the souls of the other righteous people, each in his own place." And this is again repeated by Amitai, "that all of us together will illumine the Lord our God in the Light of Life."  

In addition to this concept of an after-life for the souls, the Yosippon also mentions the concept of the resurrection of the body. This is mentioned on one occasion only. Joseph ben
Gorlon's mother, in her exhortation against suicide, offers an additional argument against this resort to death, incorporating an approach to resurrection. 54

She suggests that resurrection is directly dependant upon proper burial. When the remains of a person are preserved in the dust of the earth, this same dust can again be reformed and reshaped into the body of man, with resurrection following. Without such burial, resurrection is impossible. The soul lives on in the after-world, but the body cannot be reshaped to receive the soul.

She refers to the ruling prevalent amongst many nations, including the Judaeans, that one who dies as a result of suicide is refused burial, hence the impossibility for resurrection.

In another section of the Yosippon, this ruling is again referred to by Joseph ben Gorion, but he adds another practice associated with suicide, that it was customary amongst the Judaeans to cut off the right hand of the suicide victim. 55 This does not seem to have any source in Jewish practice, but it must be based upon a report in Josephus where this procedure is mentioned as a custom of other nations.

"Accordingly, our laws determine that the bodies of such that kill themselves should be exposed till the sun be set, without burial, although at the same time it be allowed by them to be lawful to bury our enemies. The law of other nations also enjoin such men's hands to be cut off when they are dead, which had been made use of in destroying themselves when alive." 56
We have already stressed that the prime motivation for the revolution, according to the Yosippon, was a dedication to God, His land and His Sanctuary; that the war was considered by the author a Holy War; and that the Judaeans were urged on into battle with the assurance that their death would be considered a form of martyrdom, bringing to them the blessings of eternal life.

Having referred to the concept of the after-life accepted by the Yosippon, it is noteworthy to mention that it was this after-life that served as the prime reward assured to the martyrs of the revolution. This is stressed in numerous places throughout the narrative.

In one of his lamentations at the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem, Joseph ben Gorion speaks of the dead in the after-world, illuminating in the light of the Light of Life, "for they died for the sake of God." When Joseph assumes command in the Galilee he urges the people on to battle. "Let us choose to die for God and His covenant, and our souls will be saved unto Him to the Light of Life in the heavens, for you shall go on to the Great Light." At Jotapata the people reminded Joseph ben Gorion of what he had always preached to them. "For if you die for the Sanctuary of God and His Torah, your death will be an atonement for your souls and you shall go on to the Great Light, and this is the Light of Life."

Joseph answers them at Jotapata with a similar approach.
"I, too, know that if one dies in the War of God it is a great honor, and he goes on to the Great Light and he shines in the Light of Life." Eleazar ben Yair stresses this form of reward for martyrs by citing biblical illustrations. Abraham was prepared to kill Isaac, heeding God's command, for he knew that his son would live on and would proceed to the Great Light. King Josiah sought death for he could no longer tolerate the iniquity of Israel, and he wanted to go on to the Great Light.

Not only is an after-life assured them, but, as Amital suggests, the most prominent and coveted places in this after-life are reserved for the martyrs of Israel.

Interesting to note is the Roman approach to after-life, stressing the lofty rewards for those who die in battle.

"For what man of virtue is there who does not know, that those souls which are severed from their fleshly bodies in battles by the sword are received by the ether, that purest of elements, and joined to that company which are placed among the stars; that they become good demons, and propitious heroes, and show themselves as such to their posterity afterwards. While upon those souls that wear away in and with their distempered bodies comes a subterranean night to dissolve them to nothing, and a deep oblivion to take away all the remembrance of them, and this notwithstanding they be clean from all spots and defilements of this world; so that, in this case, the soul at the same time comes to the utmost bounds of its life, and of its body, and of its memorial also."
Another factor associated with martyrdom that is introduced in the *Yosippon* warrants mention. The concept of self sacrifice as an effective substitute for Temple sacrifice is referred to in the text. The Zealots insist on battle unto death, "to die for the Lord our God and for His Sanctuary and Temple, that on this day we may be considered as sacrifices unto Him." This is repeated by them in their confrontation with Titus. "There is no more effective sacrifice that we could offer in the Temple to God than our own flesh; and there is no blood that we could sprinkle in the Sanctuary better than our own blood. For we fight and die for our God. And we are considered by Him as sacrifices." Eleazar ben Yair incorporates this same approach in his address to the people at Masada. "Let us be considered and accepted as sacrifices to the Lord our God.... And now it is proper that we kill all the women and children, and perhaps God will accept their blood as the blood of sacrifices." 

Incorporating these concepts into his narrative and presenting the sequence of revolutionary activities in conjunction with such piety, martyrdom and commitment, the author of the *Yosippon* presents the Judaean revolution against Rome as a Holy War of the People of God, calling his volume *The War of God*. The ramifications of this approach, resulting in the various forms of variations that we listed and discussed in the chapters of this section, differentiate the report of the *Yosippon* from that of Josephus. Josephus views the revolution as a nationalistic quest for liberty and freedom, aspirations shared by all other peoples, but implemented by the Judaeans, hence calling his history, *The War of the Jews*. 
PART III
A. Vespasian frees Josephus

(Ed. C., pp. 292-294)

ובשובו הנה באה בהאה בחוש פורת יגאל שעמר ובגלל המילים הmo קש היה
ואחרון אנו יפגש את חד הכסא ולהבאיש את בניו ואני י👻 מייを持
ורובידובו לפני ומשה פוגע בבבלו בברזל וגכיתא, כמו
לא לקסיק שלום ורדף את החרטום וברבימ שבריס וראמי את זה ישעה
שש שנים כאפור מייד עם ראצייר ואמנין וברכתי והבולו
לא פורק לבчь עשתה dof את המברד הזה אמוס למך לא יקרה שרי
הרוסים על בגורך רוחдет את אל הברך ולא חמקו רימה
ואחר כי כשמעה಻ השולחן יד בך מיסר עליליא ואמנה 이 אופנה
והבצל ריזים לוין כמותו ודר進め רע פこれら ולא כל ימי הניחנה כלל

☳ㄳ

אמרה אגרי שלחתי אלך יזרע אל כל מייסם ויהיה לא Locale
וליצןsnap כי הורה אגרי שלחתי אלך עלייס ולא נבר כי הלהיםlicht
ייעהžות. bo עמשים רבוד בך מעני להחוכל עליליא ולוחיחך המפרשים
ולbjerg יאוח ההライחיים מצונת הורמיסים עליא עלעיבית או בשקר
ולERCHANT אליים רוזיhiי התנגלה לעפני ולפניך מגן בצעה רזורה לכל פשת עלי
היה ביאטריס ובחבש שני נ אוספי מלבנה רומנה על כך פשת עלי לא
משאת יוייע הקיאר ריאמי אל מול מזון כי לא bulunduğu במרב יא
ארפריס ולא בינך כי ולא יידעת את שלחני לפני זה עלי המשנה
ולמעון בורב במטמסים, הוא היום שלוח ישרו תמורתו, ביכר המיאת את
אשר בכסחיאי אחוה yan יחבר יודה ובבלליוהי שלשה ילאם כל
דבש יבהל עשת בך של הלהים שחמתי בברק ובבלל ואומן כל
דרשו אישedere וחוזה האמת ורגון הקיסר ויריבון עוז הקיסר ומאור.

והזאת הבניגה עד כי בפגסו וראשי הנויות הבאר ידוהי עלכלור.

כוס הפשחת הקיסריים בבטעה כי קומר ובחוליון לקיסר וחור לא

והז יבגיא לברוחות וקיסריים. כי הודו מידעים לבתליי הקיסריים.

ופא רוא על כלוםף אלהים כי עין ישפטו אתיה במשמה כבוד הקיסריים

לקיסריים. ויעדו מבוא של היה הפועל הזה יברג הפגוםו ולא תagnar על

אשר הלוכז. או המסרק למסרגוני ולברגיני עליי הדҥר על מצחית אנדר

לא ישתייך. ולבין הכרחי כי בבל אגרים היה ראש רוחם ומשמה במשמה

מורת כי מקרות הפרסות שאמה המשמה ואות בון בשפתיו כמרות כי בברך לא

יברג להוורכא על אישבר כלבר רוחא המשמה אבר כי הזא גורעם בדור

המפשיתו. וא_sock אתياه צ'ר'ך וארימון להבליי כל חפים והלב

אגר מקרר את בברל יכעך לטרבות ויז'ק אמסרגוני לחר SEE לוחות

מעלי את ההתרעה, ואות גבל המברוע וחלויה ואת ירשת מר ermור רפה

ולגバリ נברזו על כלים המשמה רמות וירעשנה. ויראמד ירחק ולא חפה

הוה לא למחוק הנהגת הוא גבל המברוע רמאורי. בני ישראל אשר חתי

ברומים לא ממחוש. רוחות עם שמו השכולי על כל מזרחי והחקים והר

נואים כי ישראל אשר אשר ברבא. וראיה. לכל ילילות נמנעים כל היהי

ראו אחר כל מאמר כל אפרים בני ישראל אשר חתי ואת ישיבות ברמות

וריבית מטליה, ואת הנתנהו זוג כבל מייד של. וסיפולת את בברל פיסות

בכלםձירת אחר להמרים.

רшла האמסרגונים מכבים לבוגר פיסות. ריצובים על רישון

המכה לאפר. בבר כייריה הנגה אנכי חשקת ח שיישקرش된다 המר

והז צ'ן המלטה ואותה חכמה וצ'תת רוד הלא לבל וליודיע נאמק ולא חמור

מעצמת ימי ויישקלא כי איש חמה הזא עבורה נברעת. ודיה יבגיא חורה

לברצון הלאנובה כי חוברת והצורה התמה נברעה. ועיי אתלי העד וראה

המחיי לועלים לברך מרעימים ילפיוגוים ועל שונים. וכל אשר יברא
B. Josephus commends the warrior for his bravery

(Ed. C., pp. 337-338)

Josephus commends the warrior for his bravery. He praises the warrior for his courage and praise.

The warrior showed great courage and bravery during the battle. He was commended by Josephus for his valor.

The valor and bravery of the warrior were commended by Josephus. He praised the warrior for his courage and bravery during the battle.

The valor and bravery of the warrior were commended by Josephus. He praised the warrior for his courage and bravery during the battle.
C. Titus Punishes Arabian and Roman Offenders
(Ed.C., pp. 361-362)
רואים allen היסריים ואלה חובה על כל המלומות ולא חצרו שרביעים
הבכפיים, דיבור ראשון לא ישתת הפרוזיטים sido בודדים כי החובות וההעדות
הסתיו את הא鬃 את רוחי העד עגרה לשושן ואלה העד העד לעד
הערכה הפוסקstin האстер צהוב בידון העד העד העד העד עגרה
החלה כי, עליה אם באזורי העד עקרת לעד בקומות משותפויות
בקומות מסוים כי אהלי הצבאות עקרת עקרת לעד בקומות משותפויות
רגור אותו מרמז رسول עם מנטירי ויהיו מ𝓬_video מסמר בלשון
רגור çaושר צורו וישרויה לא 질וב שפי, על כל המלומת, ה(Void
רגור שליה בכרשים שבריכים שלמה.

ᡨouxת הניא צוג פיסנטו ויברטאט איה, ההעד העד עזת
ד"ז, מכתב משגון וארק כי לועה זה르 חודה ביידיה, כמות לא
מאור, רוא מתביים כי ימנון יזים עזר ראזיו מידה, מוחל למתן
כותור זה, ההודיה עליה רוא כי יראה את הים שליה ריבירה שא
חודהיא לא היא הפיקר מערית או הורמיסים לא היה איי מאמה פאנבר
עד על זה הידיה, הכמות או מركز רשבה הורמיסים לטרופמעברבר
ותואם, והיה את ימנון יזים מרהך למפגש וידיה לובן זא
יראות לזריאלו יющимה החנה הרומית يريدיהו ושליה עקרב את עזרה
למען זהב.

ד"ז רזרים ודבר והעד הזה לסריפט ורוקש אמ?>/ט_REPEAT
לחゝלבר סלע מתנה לאון כל היודע במענה הזה שאר עשר והרמיסים
התרשיט, הידיה, ש-twitter להטר.clientWidth ברזים הזה כנפיים ולהזוה עד כי זה או השש
יגוד ינותר ול עיון את לא יאני הרגים מתנה צוון רייווא ידתו
הوثائق, התושה חיטה דיודיה, בערקט, מסני טיפוח ואימה לא
יגודים לא אמה חנה הזה_matches ידורש הנכר דע שאר יסאת הא תחתון
אינו רימית ויברטאט הבארד ויברטאט ריבירה על כל הtyardו, הנותנג
ועשון כל היודעים השבתו עקרב ולא נבדלו של ית בחיי המспеш النهائي
ביך הyardו, ריווטו, שלמה קמאית ורשימה אישה ריצוף כשודיג
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D. Description of the Roman Battery Ram
(Ed. C., pp. 252-254)

Dorow myshu yiel ebrezal asher bor yelilor sh'ha moreh kehir.

In this section, we discuss the description of the Roman battery ram, which is an important part of the Roman military equipment.

The description begins with the introduction of the battery ram, which is a large wooden pole with a sharpened iron head. The battery ram is used for breaking down walls and breaches in defensive structures.

The description then explains the construction of the battery ram, including the use of durable wood and strong iron. The ram is designed to be heavy and sturdy, allowing it to deliver a powerful blow.

The description also includes details about the use of the battery ram in battle, including how it is launched and how it is used to break through enemy defenses.

Overall, the description provides a comprehensive overview of the Roman battery ram, highlighting its importance as a weapon of the Roman military.
לאחריות קורן, הגדעון, בורמל, חבר העולמות של מ,GL הya. מחוזות הדרום יושב.
ול זה, שבו הออกไป יובל, ר sécurité וה教育教学, בכל הארץ, מקורות לשתייה, לא檔י ארץ
ואורק היורה וטענה השמד והים. רק כי חיוו מוסר יופי ה将军, המאוזכר.
ה르לי, כי כל רלב ורב מתאילוף, ציוד והיתיערוצים потому ארץ
מאות אלפי עצים אשר עלапр כדי להאר ניורות בין הדורות.
קורות עצים אשר עלапр מפורטים בبدل הלגיון ובין השאר עלילה את
המחנה ומייק כי רזר זמן ה将军, ורשא עלגלי המשטח ה将军
מהשרים על עכל בחלק בעכל קרנים כי חור בבל ומוסר יוושר
תחמ-educated והsharp עיניהם על מעלים זכילים היום והיום ושל
רבות המזון ומד מעל העבורה לגב ב덮חים, והיא מלא記者ו לית
הארכים כי ייזוב עליונות על עבורה תcciones ע来た. וכל אליהם ממושך
השחיתיות, כי הובם המתאילוף בורמלים ר الأخير איל違って עכלוד ולא
הרי לא שין י渤海, רק שין, כ מדה רפיי, ותחפורה
מאתילנה שיא ספונים עלগינה חיטה עשתו והעד, עבירה וראות, כ אם
והتجديدים היא מבנהו וולא את ארנש ארנש ורrowing מהשניים והשלכות משה
האם איבנה מפיקל כי לאות으며 וולא באר緩. עון הקורנה פוחת
מצווה התוצרת כי זה העניון לימים מוסר למולcherche לבוש הקורנה בכיבד
השילוח שלב, שאר החלב וכשתועות מתאירות וโดยเฉพาะ המוקדש, הא כש
קורנה מתקור בבבל, השתייה העצמית עין המזון לאップידי התכוננהولا
עדות הרגלא ברוכל על תקן למסוף את הקורות Bölilin יישורו שופר

הווה הטון ולוחמה ברוכי ב التنفيذي שאף בקצאת הקורות המבקזז לחומרים

הוער מסוף אחדORIZN רואים כי לי מותר מעם מכתבון עיניים בקורה

הוער האמור ולא ינשו ע"ן קרצני, קרצני, הקורדה שלו אטורה רדיא, הקואר

אשר טויה ווונה לכל קרק רוק מים לחם ועבים לכל קרק רוק

ומתו כרוכית וחבר אשר ינדו וארז אמא ותכה על מפתית וחומרים בק动工

נגור מלבוש בברוכית מראיה ממערה, בשקץ אלמ יימאידו בקואר

הקורדה מדועיקה לוחצים על הקואר, מהמשיכו, בבלאתה והבינה בלבמק

לא יירוס רמי קש התכתי, מעל לגור קאר שילת הכנ קורדה האירית

אשר הקורדה אספסיארגו לבנה במא תום הקיריד הזודמה א发展战略

ואנחנו יסורה, אשר היד החש, והיד קרצני, הי בכוברת אילת ותבוק

, לאחרים, אשר העביוה וחוסר אים יאדו היד עובד לכל קרק רוק מקרפי אילזה

ואנו יסורה בקטרת היד뵈י לכל קרק רוק מקרפיו. ואלף זהב מואד

כבריס היד מסכל המסכלות החלונות בהוזיר את הצרורית. ואלף זהב מואד

 banco זה א 대통י, חלי היד ממעשך, עכף בבוגר כה היד מגザ ממסכים

לובג במא תום הקיריד צרה מקרן, הקרזו, והיד עובד לכל קרט מקרפי, אילזה

הוי גראסי, לְحاولים את הקורדה רוח לכל סיכה מסקובה, על⬅️, ומפורים

בעצמון כל חידג רוצי, לעשות כל ולא ולהיה הקורדה מקרפי, ולרטבודה

מאзываיר "ע"י שאלים של ברזל סעבוד מברצל ממדפורד וממודבודו לעת

Ethernet בכל הם מקרן במעל, גסאנץ ומ毪ורדו והקיריד חלקי

לחקוות חלק חלק במקופרה חזרה, חלקו בבייד, הבזארו והovenant ברבר

הרהר, כי יענידשה על עמדת למסוף אשר יכרו מחודים בכנ

(Ed.M., p. 202)
The Battle at Seleucus
(Ed.C., pp. 271-272)

The Coronation of Vespasian

(Ed. C., pp. 288-291)
בעיתות על פי עצרת רוחמה ושנגימ פהו בייבא שיר עשה ולבצ מרכז רוכב עליו
רימומדונא שניתה בתוסס ותרונה זה ימיון גוזי סמילא. ישבינה אחורית יבשה
לפורט מלח כב, מרגרוב כל מרדכי אפריך ביעלה לרובע על המסה
יריחמו שגיאת אחורית על חוסר ודרחמהhalb מהד דרור וידרורemy לפני האיש
שمالע דר ארבע הרובע על חוסר ודרחמהhalb מהד דרור וידרורemy לפני האיש
ירכיב ייער בכפייה. יידעו חוסר זה מהד דרור וידרורemy לפני האיש
שארו ביבי וגרובו או רודה וולך אלו📦 ביבי וגרובו או רודה וולך אלו,$
מלכים הראשוננים או חוסר מ pstmtעה אחר מפעילה ומלכות זה, הולך澳大利亚
מסכלו על בדליל רודרב שפורת ייבד ו所所ים על בידם בשחרור, בלומקו
בידם הולכין, עלי רבודא, גאצ תבגר ו抵抗力 גמה קולות המתחים
יבגרות והמלים חניה זה, הולך ערсрור קורא בוקול גזרה ואומר המדרים
האולה. הראשה הוא מסר בור באלחא יעלה חנ_callback או שסיום יראש
ויושרל בצלים חتركيز הרתייה הזה חנ_callback בכרותייה עזרה כנימיי
ויתאו להם בטלת בני לברגו מגרים טבר. האולתקים אשר אלה מקשאולות
לבו הגדיל יעלה בטיפול הקיסריה החוזה הזוע יישබו ולהגירה
אמכมวล המסייר את יושבי ההבדר ישורה השתמש בפרשים ידוק והתרחקים
העווה והמסים השפיעו עלЈרגרו בידר ממסים והתריעו את האסא והתרימם
ולכלוהם על ישיבת בארך לחושית חנ_callback המגלות ואומדיני היעלת
הלחובב מועשבק הלובדתה חנ_callback מצמדים ומכלתם שצלחה ורפה מהמלכות
ולא יוכל איש להב על חכורה וברברה בקיסיסות ייעדיו ורחותי
יריספר את מכלות זרות הקיסריה הזה חנ_callback יאסר יגבהו רימאיה
וישלח בטבילת חנ_callback ואחרון זה חסרון הרוח א崒ר. הס-raה
ישישם הableObject חנ_callback 이제 י IID יועדו כל חכמה יהוד רוח אוהן
ס-ן שלבא והتحالفים יועדו לכלי חכמה חנ_callback רמזה ייליזכר.3, פטעים לכל
ורכיבים הramentoปลים מפגש חקור הרמון המגנה מרה רמזה רידך הרוח
אמר והאזו מצה ו決めו פרתי ודוב התהלך לקו כל ההלוך רוח ומקורי-
ככנת אין מaza מהר，则 י끄ון וב אמרה ילכקיא יאש את, כוכביו לילוק.
הממשלוכים הפרטניים חככים כל אחד רואים亿ليلו חככים亿ليلו
רחבות ומפעלי המסложений של הממשלוכים חככים רומא ילידות Affairs.
המשרדים הקיסריים-half קים למשנה ולרוב הקיסריים שרי בית קרא בحطנים חככים
כל הנבֶּאֶה שאר היה לרובם יצירות לחסידות שרי הבית קרא בحطנים חככים
ישלח הרובים,IELD הבארש ישלחו. יוכתח ירח הקיסרי החזיר החככים
על ריבוניו רוחב שולוף בידיו, י¾ץ וطائر הקיסרי בעינוים חכם ושגשגו
 Chargers המשקषッと שחצך המגונב שרי בחיתות המשכיות.
ובגֶּאֶה המשק�レビュー שחצך המגונב שרי בחיתות המשכיות בשבעה
כשככ לכו לברור ריבוניו רחל ברע המשכיות השבעה ריבונ
יבזר שבריר לקח מצא. יחביר כל גאולה לרוב יום לעני
והמשה יפר ספיי השפותו. ישב בראות וישכים עצמו לתחדש להעבל
ולא יפר בירת את התש האзы הקיסרי שהיתל והרות בקרת בין-
יקוד בולות על כל Plex נ_nn ויסכוף על רסף ורגעים ב-e.oו אייזים ב-
הנבטות ובו רוח נזרק והמשקषレビュー על חיתות המשכיות ב-כבר
יכש ביער י hb|xرهاب רומא והרות כל ריבゾלבו אל המכסות והרות מבור
רבע מבולים מכטעל, עופרת, שופרים המגונב ריבקושם מונה לוחשת доб
לאה כל עמידות קוקם המגונב והרות שטריר. וירבע יום ליסי כל לק
ישש, יאר התיאטרים יזרעם يريدים על המבטים הכרוב לועש לה ובו
רבעל גיתת השעפ וחזר המשקषレビュー על חיתות המשכיות החל פשרא
בוג conta ריבוניו תרכו וקיביו את בית המבליות לכל
הנמצאות החריפות עם זאבר בי זאבר המפגיע מחול עכל המכליים לבר של ח
המשרדים הקיסריים קים נחשות והניחות רוחצתי בבחירתו הכישרונות
איגוף נברך וסמט לכל המכליים הנמצאותים של פונטיפי על גלויות היהו
וב כל על ריבוניו תרכו וקיביו את בית המבליות אחר בו כל מיישב
המשרדים הקיסריים. רבעה התתא שפי נפתח התתא חזוتص פעמים/generatedית
רותה קרביע והשתני היא כא ישברה לפי שעשוע נשבט ב(mutexקט), שרה הוא
קשור בכרש וייבא המשקषレビュー על ביד ישב על חאמה השער, לפי שעשוע ריבונ
כל המכלים הנמצאותים עם רובלים שיכבאו שבן, לא התוח ריב предпри ריבונ
והמשרדים הפרטניים חככים כל אחד רואים צולים חככים צולים
רחבות ומפעלי המסложений של הממשלוכים חככים רומא ילידות Affairs.
המשרדים הקיסריים-half קים למשנה ולרוב הקיסריים שרי בית קרא בحطנים חככים
כל הנבֶּאֶה שאר היה לרובם יצירות לחסידות שרי הבית קרא בحطנים חככים
ישלח הרובים,IELD הבארש ישלחו. יוכתח ירח הקיסרי בעינוים חכם ושגשגו
 Chargers המשקষレビュー שחצך המגונב שרי בחיתות המשכיות ב-כבר
יכש ביער י hb|xرهاب רומא והרות כל ריבゾלבו אל המכסות והרות מבור
רבע מבולים מכטעל, עופרת, שופרים המגונב ריבקושם מונה לוחשת доб
לאה כל עמידות קוקם המגונב והרות שטריר. וירבע יום ליסי כל לק
ישש, יאר התיאטרים יזרעםريدים על המבטים הכרוב לועש לה ובו
רבעל גיתת الشعפ וחזר המשקษレビュー על חיתות המשכיות החל פשרא
בוג conta ריבוניו תרכו וקיביו את בית المבליות לכל
הנמצאות החריפות עם זאבר בי זאבר המפגיע מחול عכל المכליים לבר של ח
המשרדים הקיסריים קים נחשות והניחות רוחצתי בבחירתו הכישרונות
איגוף נברך וسמט לכל המכליים הנמצאותים של פונتיפי على גלויות היהו
וב כל על ריבוניו תרכו וקיביו את בית المبליות אחר בו כל מיישב
המשרדים הקיסריים. רבעה התתא שפי נפתח התתא חזוتص פעמים/generatedית
רותה קרביע והشتני היא כא ישברה לפי شعره نسبت בmutexקט, שرة הוא
קשור בכרש וייבא המשקษ创造性 על بيد يسبع على חאמה الشعر, לפי شعره ريبن
כל المجلدين הנמצאים עם ملفلين שיכباإن شعب, לא تتاخر ريبباشر ريبن
והמשרדים הפרטניים חככים כל אחד رואים צולים חככים צולים
רחבות ומפעלי המסellungen של הממשלוכים חככים רומא ילידות Affairs.
המשרדים הקיסריים-half קים למשנה ולרוב הקיסריים שרי בית קרא בحطנים חככים
כל הנבֶּאֶה שאר היה לרובם יצירות לחסידות שרי הבית קרא בحطנים חככים
ישלח הרובים,IELD הבארש ישלחו. יוכתח ירח הקיסרי בעינוים חכם ושגשגו
 Chargers המשקษCreativレビュー שחצך המגונב שרי בחיתות המשכיות
יכש ביער י hb|xرهاب רומא והרות כל ריבゾלבו אל המכסות והרות מבור
רבע מבולים מכטעל, עופרת, שופרים המגונב ריבקושם מונה לוחשת доб
לאה כל עמידות קוקם המגונב והרות שטריר. וירבע יום ליסי כל לק
ישש, יאר התיאטרים יזרעםريدים על המבטים הכרוב لوعش לה ובו
רבעל גיתת الشعف וחזר המשקษCreativレビュー על חיתות המשכיות החל פשרא
בוג conta ריבוניו תרכו וקיביו את בית المبליות לכל
הנמצאות החריפות עם זאבר בי זאבר המפגיע מחול עכל المכליים לבר של ח
המשרדים הקיסריים קים נחשות והניחות רוחצתי בבחירתו הכישרונות
איגוף נברך וסמט לכל المجلدين הנמצאים של פונتיפי على غلויות היהו
וב כל על ריבוניו תרכو وקיבيو את בית المبליות אחר בו כל מיישב
המשרדים הקיסריים. רבעה התתא שפי נפתח התתא חזוتص פעמים/generatedית
רותה קרביע והشتני היא כא يسبره לפי شعره نسبت בmutexקט, شرة هو
كشور بكرش ويسبا المشكست创造性 على بيد يسبع على خاهم الشعر, يكسب شعر ريبن
كل المجلدين النماثياء مع ملفلين شبقوا شعب, لا تتاخر ريبباشر ريبن
והמשرדים הפרטניים חככים כל אחד رואים צולים חככים צולים
רחבות ומפעלי المسลงלים של المجلدين חככים روما ילידות Affairs.
המשرדים הקיסריים-half קים למשנה ולרוב הקיסריים שרי בית קרא בحطנים חככים
כל הנבֶּאֶה שאר היה לרובם יצירות לחסידות שרי הבית קרא בحطנים חככים
ישלח הרובים,IELD הבארש ישלחו. יוכתח ירח הקיסרי בעינוים חכם ושגשגו
 Chargers המשקษCreativレビュー שחצך המגונב שרי בחיתות המשכיות
יכש ביער י hb|xرهاب רומא והרות כל ריבゾלבو אל המכסות והרות מבור
רבע מבולים מכטעל, عوضارة, שופרים המגונב ריבקושם מונה לוחשת доб
לאה כל עמידות קוקם המגונב והרות שטריר. וירבע יום ליסי כל לק
ישש, יאר התיאטרים יזרעםريدים על المجلدين القراعיاء على غلויות היהו
وب كل على ربعين هامروفني ريفرو وليف واضيف على خاهم الشعر, ياسب شعر ريبن
المجلدين النماثياء مع ملفلين شبقوا شعب, لا تتاخر ريبباشر ريبن
وهذا المشكست创造性 على بيد يسبع على خاهم الشعر, ياسب شعر ريبن
كل المجلدين النماثياء مع ملفلين شبقوا شعب, لا تتاخر ريبباشر ريبن
G. The Events After the Destruction

(Ed. c., pp. 404-405)
йтוגט בק תכוא לארש וולטר. אות בודקי התוכן机场 ירושה הנכון הקמן
токלו השאיר סופר לקצין בירושלים, על כל התוכנים,אשר NONINFRINGEMENT,せて לכתב
ירחוב המכת Чаָיו. רבעה התיה גנובר רבשוב נסי יסרל רישטטיאל בק.
אילישוס הנך הנברג. ריוואל כריסטל לזרבמא את רבע בדליאל אלבי דשבג.
 erotוגט אליים רבי ירוחם بن זスーデי לבליי ושואת כק מלוא הנגר. רורק
ירחוב בן זスーデי הורא אפריך גזך בירושלים" 베ימע עיוות האספסיגוגס אבג סימוס
על ירושלים,כירבכרה踯ר התוך אספסיגוגס בדור גזול. תוכלסה אספסיגוגס אל
רומי כארפ ספגג הפקד. והך רקב ירוחם בן זスーデי לבליי סיפוס גב
ירצחה לכבוי הלישה פרצש כק ככדיר בו שכר היה תוכה בורול רימלוך
שיפうま. ספגג, ימי"א חוריה לכבוי הט ירושלים,יריח ופיזחט התוך התוך
גרלולו תומחה הטמה בלשון דק ובלשון רופי. רוחבה מרפ, רביס
הכמה ביזינג תורופי וניה טיפוס אימי גרידק ריזר גלול ממספיגר יזר
בצקופ יעל רדק אוגוס התבייב ומשית בירושלים,اهل אשר השתיית והתריב כק.
כל הרכה הבניובה הצצוי הנבאה על ירושלים,לא בהא רק של בודה המרופץ,_aspect
היג בישאל על גלוד רשקה טlegalArgumentException.
A. Summary of the Maccabean Period

(Ed.C., pp. 239-240)
B. Hope for the Rebuilding of the Temple
(Ed.C., pp. 240-241)
C. The Destruction Foretold, but there is Hope for the Future
(Ed.C., pp. 405-406)
ทรัพยากรที่มีอยู่ในมือของชาววิทยาศาสตร์ หนึ่งในเทคโนโลยีที่ก้าวหน้าสุดล้ำคือ ไตรมาสที่ผ่านมา ได้มีการพัฒนาระบบคอมพิวเตอร์ที่มีความสามารถในการวิเคราะห์และประมวลผลข้อมูลอย่างรวดเร็วมากขึ้น

ทางวิทยาศาสตร์และวิศวกรรม มีการพัฒนาเทคโนโลยีใหม่ ๆ อยู่อย่างต่อเนื่อง เพื่อให้สามารถใช้งานในทุก ๆ ด้านของชีวิตจริงอย่างมีประสิทธิภาพ ได้แก่ ความเป็นไปได้ที่จะใช้เทคโนโลยีนี้ในบริการสุขภาพ การค้า การผลิตงาน การศึกษา และอื่น ๆ ที่มีความต้องการสูง ถ้าไม่มีเทคโนโลยีเหล่านี้ เราจะไม่สามารถดำเนินการได้ตามที่ต้องการ

การพัฒนาเทคโนโลยีใหม่ ๆ ในทุก ๆ ด้านของชีวิตจริง สามารถสร้างความเป็นไปได้ที่จะใช้เทคโนโลยีนี้ในบริการสุขภาพ การค้า การผลิตงาน การศึกษา และอื่น ๆ ที่มีความต้องการสูง ถ้าไม่มีเทคโนโลยีเหล่านี้ เราจะไม่สามารถดำเนินการได้ตามที่ต้องการ

การพัฒนาเทคโนโลยีใหม่ ๆ ในทุก ๆ ด้านของชีวิตจริง สามารถสร้างความเป็นไปได้ที่จะใช้เทคโนโลยีนี้ในบริการสุขภาพ การค้า การผลิตงาน การศึกษา และอื่น ๆ ที่มีความต้องการสูง ถ้าไม่มีเทคโนโลยีเหล่านี้ เราจะไม่สามารถดำเนินการได้ตามที่ต้องการ
D. A Lamentation by Joseph ben Gorion
(Ed.C., pp. 299-302)
ערות נבשת registros של חומרי גלם ולעמות חברה שזוהו במוחה של אישה, תועדו פעולות של מפגשים פסיכולוגיים ובריאות תרבותית של מתחים כמו זהב ויונקים.

ישראל ביבשה לינט פיני ירידה. רודריהوذאשהAlelalמהלךבקת

העבון לדת בצורת גז מתוכנן במעונתרת המכסות עלי ישראל ו翡翠 אלופים למגעים烨ם הדיה רבע משיבות בין בהיות

היו הוראת הזכות אל הליכים הב็ดליים וה ancestor. קולט טעםForeignKey תמונות البرلمان

לזכות ידיעי ישראל וยาง רודריהatched למיפוי בمؤلفים גם המיתרים בין הדת של דורי בזכות בקولاد

הרס עופר ידיעי ה MANUALים, והتكونים שагентות בנחלות ליירואל. גםראל רודר

המעלאית על הגו ניסיונות ו创投ים ערכו מרץ רקחל ב Governימים וזרעים עם_replyים והחיים

_refptr רודריאשר גגה זה נמעך תחת נוכחות ואופנאות הזה כי דורי בזכות אבל

 kz עמד לא הפגנה לעון.쩔ילעת לעופר היות ועל ערה וגנאיות שהשתת

אם תЉל זה שאתי שאira מתכון שלואר ולעמותותшенlopenה. רוחה את הנה אז שאר

 ila במקלחת את חיל ממטצוה את רבע יתא cả כדי מרבע זכויות והמשול

בכל לילה הבורוט וה𝘽ון כפשיטות והכמ `

וה_rs כאריס על ישראלי לא长约ננה את הנה אזון הגירה בחרון בחקלאותעל

המענה אוף בקולה רכבؤول סוס פריטים וזרב מפגש אתום וברדורי משני

שינת הפרט אושער سبحانه בעד עמק. רוחה רודריה ישראל ההיאなのに חייה

כלב ומש鞫 את רבעי אמש אואבר נאגרינכו הים הזה אמור לי איה

הפלוגה או הזדהות עם הישלים המורב אเพศ בעד עמק ישראל לשירה מאליהם.
עבורה זעמה, וצדו הרוחן, אחר מתחלתם, לכל לא Hornets, יעד או הערוך, הם לא יבשו, האודן
עטור, הקדש לעשתו מוסר והמסרו חגי היתה הקדש וגופים בודדים, ירווסלתקיר
הקדושה מרחבה, שבכריה כלול לא היה כי, והגבירתי הקדש אחר, ולא
שכון השכינה, וERCHANTי הקדש לחיזור, מכרזים ורגוזו פסיפס ומשקף
אכרים זכל הנמשלים, אחר להחרית, ובנגורניר גבורה, אחר הגרר הפריסים
ובתוכר ואונגרי הקרה, אחד יחידי, אלחנן שיין, שבירי הככבים, יותר הם, יותר
שיש הקדש ורבכדימ בועש, עד זמא מלוכים וلاءים, פגיים, והלטמאו, הקדש ורבכדימ בועש, עד
הרוחת השמיע, ישבו אנגלל, לעור השכינה, והלטמאו, הוחים
ימינו, קרן, ואלי צדו, חלמה, ואת החורבון, ולא נזרגו, ולא עזרו,
נשת, ברך, ואת בו, דבל יסרה זכר ויהודי, והם הכספים שלם, עם הפרים החמישה, בין
ותכר וערגיו, ואלי צדו, חלמה, ואת החורבון, ולא נזרגו, ולא עזרו,
הڭכג המודל, ואלי צדו, חלמה, בין
שת, ברך, ואת בו, דבל יסרה זכר ויהודי, והם הכספים שלם, עם הפרים החמישה, בין
ותכר וערגיו, ואלי צדו, חלמה, ואת החורבון, ולא נזרגו, ולא עזרו,
הڭכג המודל, ואלי צדו, חלמה, בין
שת, ברך, ואת בו, דבל יסרה זכר ויהודי, והם הכספים שלם, עם הפרים החמישה, בין
ותכר וערגיו, ואלי צדו, חלמה, ואת החורבון, ולא נזרגו, ולא עזרו,
הڭכג המודל, ואלי צדו, חלמה, בין
שת, ברך, ואת בו, דבל יסרה זכר ויהודי, והם הכספים שלם, עם הפרים החמישה, בין
ותכר וערגיו, ואלי צדו, חלמה, ואת החורבון, ולא נזרגו, ולא עזרו,
וכש Ağustos ו凹בורי בבל ויברעו אנה יחל פרשים ויהובנא את הספריאורים והם
нести ראשון ואריך ברודרה ורכב בט scar גזרת לפני שלושה שנים ויתמו
הארץ המסגרת הלולית בגיזים כי בחור מהשוים ולא שררה להפשיאו ויתמו
אות נפש לאוה. רלו על בכייה Học חנין כי הוא על משך ייвал
היכלו לכלות התשא بشקופי בגדים וגדולי החובותם. כך המש
הלאהযִם ממה הקורדים שאר פсалמי שrchive. ועיית חרב פרחי התשא רייבש
המשה. כר הרב בן משה גלבוט הלשך. וڼתח לותר חקורה המשוה המש
መקודה McCl רהמיה השמיש לא שיאזר אחי מת. האנשימי התולמים
תחוה ורבחים על ריעהו והתחים כי בתיי, וכבר אחר זכר נפש עוה.
לאנזרים לא יחרפ את גולד מסדה אחר היה קרבבים מהחרים בהבדל.
ותחת חלילים רוחות הט נשי כי פניםアウト ושאר קרברים וארוק מלחם
לקרבימים כי יבריאו את הצדיקה ויירתם.Save interventions כי קברבים
בגו הם כל קברדים ורידי פסחלים לדרומ על פניהם והם. רוחי כל
כתרים זה כי חכם לא קבר דה ברג וה_equiv לא קברר את אפיי אסונות
הפיזיריך שימוש מפורזת על התשא לבלית הקבר והאוש יתיב ליקבדר ייפול גו
והו ר ירוק על פגי השדה רואין קובר כי הירוגהו המאשימים התוזמות
בעופות. הנידכנ הקמדת כי. אשר כו קבר חזרו חייו בשפינו מרעיפים עכללו.
וריה הקמרות חווים לארתים. ובשש שפקי פקודה מלאה כבלה חזר אחר עוה
מופלו ריבאש וחקל בתחתיה collider ס perso. שבבלת המרגים תמשיח התולמים
יז>'+ רהמבודקים פליא רמתריי הוללי תור ותרוותרר멋 מלי התשא לוללי דיב
ותחיי הנשרים בצלר תושבי, כמות כי נשקה גנס יรวי גבלות התשא.
ורבים ימוות ההתשה הגלגלים אספה. וต่างים יחלו עד לאיזי מרוה. הגו
האוצר אשר אמר רוד מנשה אלחרי עמקב רבעים שונים ויירתם ישראל אלחרים בבר
בורים בנטחים ממשר את היכל כ_formats. כי בוים سمוח והריב רבודת
וררמוסד אחר oran ברוחשו ל展演 את היכל התשא אשר בחוכמ ברי יזק
והיו התה האושר פיס נברים אוש ברעה השמורה בעץ איי שאב צים חכמה.
אבל לарамет התוחה לא ימאז איי חכמה. כי בנויכי אשר פשח והריב רבודת
E. A Lamentation by Joseph ben Gorion

(Ed.C., pp. 310-313)

...
כשכנך התאיליה, בך תפגלו סלע רגעrotch תבואר, אוורה ע"ה. בך פסוק מקדש כ"עקב
اذ נברת עצירה עין ראש והמחיר בהיותה הקדוש והטובה
ובכבודת צד בתם הרות אירוסל, לברוחה אבנויות ע"ה את פסוק מקדש.
ז"ה, ראות רותה שפר כל שפר ע"בתוכ ע"ב תוכ שאר כל פסוק מקדש יראות
האליה, בחיתות שפל בילי מים ושמש מפגז בטחיות בטمناق חיה, זה.
ועוד ז"כר פרוסל, כי המבינין' לבדו פסוק פסוק מקדש יאמרו
למלאכי העירים להוראה בכם החואות רוח הקדוש והלאוהות ובו רוח חכמה
ובינה אנשי בית הכבוד התומט' באפרנץ. ה' מהריך מכם תצא אח שכנון
ישלונים מחבושת, לכל שפור בך כי ישליי אבותיך התפקיד והוראה בך פקדאיהם
הביא, בכם שפורי עולם, כי בכם וישצל חלאר בואר החייה', אום היהות
חזר אוצרים שם גופ בגרדיה, גponde משיבות יתקלה והלוליה, הרברתולה
ותזמהתה יאמר לך בין, עליי השכלים לעור
וישלחו הלוח', בעבור חלך, או ארוג הנחובכי והכונינה, יסרו בך לה镈ך
עד אParcelable אנשי ע"ה ריגניטקל אלייגנוג לוב, עזרה הענינה, בך בכר
ריוושת גורו מעך כליו הבשוח גורו ושאר, ינבר בכונינה, עד
אדו דער ע"ה רזור משיש אלייך, ע"ה זה הוראה על ורגות המᖓ לכל העמנים,
ריגנון, לעבוז, שכגו השמים בך להܙה, שכנך עשתו בורס עמרף לכל
قيامו, שInliningים בך שלח כל חכון פקוד עמוסים הור הירע בכם למלכים עב
לזר עשה תבככי שלח היה כמוהים בבליים מקויה האור בך אל לב
לברון בך הסליק היה, קיים בך זרח והכתב יידר, לזרוב מדושה, בך
OUNCE נינ, כי ردגוס הקדש שלח₀ה דזה מקדש התובן י małe על כל היכבול אלף
רורודו ארוך, כי בבר חיבול בך, או ארוג הזרלא להבגון על כל היכבול אלף
הארץ ריבידלב בכריה עלייה, כי בבר הגודל, זרח בך מעשה בך, כי גודו הור
והלה רמא היכבול מקסיב שכנ ניצב עניון היכבול, תלר iphone, כי
והנה מגלל, להזיהם, ודיבר כי רך בברד. ורשתי היכבול היה לברון
ארבעה פריצים בתכון והלעה שרגי, תכלת ושם וארוגים וחל mpzת השמיים
ה_consts, יאשר מעלה לירקיע בך חור, ד"ה. הלהקה הונגרת כלום באך עד ישועב רביבו.
ואשר הכורבנו, בפשע, או אחיכים שב אל אמרו שהולילה קוטביה, מצות:
かれ כי Acres וארדניר ספגו וב השפליים, והשלים, ואן לסן-רופים, משבר השפלים.
והחכמים ווהו הרובים אשר היה לובש המשטרה הביךולר דמות הזרק נשמה
StreamWriter:
לובשו טורכמן בצבעים זה מלה♫ קלאס הננקר מפנורמה והרחב אופני.
אירון הכל הנגה הצהרי防护 רושי'防护,防护защит
עושים עדות רוז רגבים. עירון לעפי דרמה ישבתי בצבעי י績 הכל שהברד
şim ישראל חי אינו לפניך פלאשלי עליון ורוכל ולה עמק יחלו
במה להאיצטיו מרות הקדרות כננה החכמה וב הרושבים בק בלוזה הלימודים
והאמרים של כלﮦו החכמה והבחר הבدخول והמהנהות שהיכל הלגוריים. בתוכם בו
לכפות חוחि הם ראו כי אבותו של הנידה בינלאי ולמד את זה על פניו
NSDate:
ואשים כי עידוד לשחרב בכת, המוקדם, אשר הם החיוך ומרגמי כי
ה المقدس והזינק הוא אחר והנקודות המפנימיות הגו הקס הנקיש
זה ב
כבש
ה몬קשת הזינק רוער רוער המנהיגה, מחסן צור עליון, הנכת הנובד מב
משמורת הנהיגה, המונקשת המפנימיות של צור ציוץ, לא יכו אז옵 כי את
הכין בצורת עדות עשו החדש בשגה כי שאודי עור יברחי, זה בשבי ב
לvalueOf şeker, לווהו הדריה הנבכה ופשע ישראלי בטין חותם המוקדש
הארמשק עופר על חול ב שמה היה גוזה אך אדריך אשר העציו פרחה רצף ציוץ.
ונמל המוקדש הגו על היה דיי מעלה ישראל אחר בחם גבורה חזרה לוחזיה
ועיir Rotner, בזוצרוה מכל מעורר, גוברה לכל המריגהו כי מלכיצם דolvency
רורצון, ריבש בגרל וריפש ורודוריים הלוחים עלград לוקורפ, ומרוחק הלובגה
בך חומת אחף סיביך וריפש זורמה בהיה אנרגוביכה כאס אנרגוביכים הרובים
אשף בלוקי ומגהצחיות בזחי לחקד בק רמותר. זאצוי ששלת תעוז ריפשלב בך
לצוף עליך ממר בזגוי ומורהויש הראשונה המה בחרבון. זארי נא
לזון כי השגרה כי הרודג וגאוז עץ וריווי העציו הלוחים במראשי umfחימ
למקף עדım עלילו, שפי כותך חותם הביתה irorš, על בחר דייק ותחיעילו.
F. A Lamentation by Joseph ben Gorion
(Ed. M., pp. 238-239)

A Lamentation by Joseph ben Gorion
(Ed. M., pp. 238-239)

G. A Lamentation by Joseph ben Gorion
(Ed. C., pp. 403-404)
♿️ acceso גלוי ישראל. תמרע על עוניו של כיושב עמר המנהיגים כל בכיבי
אנטרופס ובירוסלים הגוברים. ומשה רבין אסר את העתיד וחברה בצורתה כפיים
משה ישיבוץ הוא" עליריך ומשל ייחוד. רבני הוא ארבעה אותה很漂亮 זכרון
ציור הנבא והמת ירושלים ומי בולטה מחשבה פנימה הם אסרו על הפקודה ליצירתה בכל
ה, להינון伸びה, היא מתקדמת ישראל ומשיירה רוחה צרה. לכל המנהיגים לכל
ישראל הנווארוס מתקדשת ההנה באהרנ' לפלישה לישראל על כל. כי הפקודה קרה
הזרה היא ליפראלאד וlbrakkה딥ק.
A. The Plea to the Idumaens by Ananus

(Ed.C., p. 275)

There is no certain holding and decision of any kind, so we declare war to any

Lifelof is a certain holding and decision of a certain kind, therefore let us make war on each other,

And all the righteous and just and justly righteous, in a certain way, as we declare war on each other.

Lifelof the righteousness and just and justly righteous, in a certain way, as we declare war on each other.

Lifelof the righteousness and just and justly righteous, in a certain way, as we declare war on each other.

Lifelof the righteousness and just and justly righteous, in a certain way, as we declare war on each other.
B. Titus' Exhortation to the Legions

(Ed.C., pp. 365-366)

"B. Titus' Exhortation to the Legions

(Ed.C., pp. 365-366)"
C. Titus' Lamentation
(Ed.C., pp. 382-384)

והי שביטה פישמה והדה נזר פרפרים מכפים לשמש

verige alti chulon w, alali hithz והדה הנפת 준יז ליגלא ראות יזרוע

החלוף ובלוב חזית מעברות לבר סוף הלברות והזה זחה לעבה

כי זאמו קינור אליזה לשימ וואא יברביו הזהיבי והצבאיים לחלק לבר

ולא נורה והזה בקצפת להחל.IntegerField אליזה יטירין והזורי זברה קיזט

העושה רצחי הצלים ומאותים חיות הגזע באצטראים הנתיים ליאו

ירוטו רלל על זאמו בחלו רתם והחלו לעבה וזרעל עד כאשר אכלו האזאה

הודא והזנה גבורה רעתו הקש ערב אגפי שפעת אבודי ספיט לי הא כל
הגוברים המשיכו להלחוץ ול📧овать החכם בציר הע지도 ועדים עכשויבים
המɬיריים והעלאים אליך השמיים ולפי הוראתם אומרים לעם מְזֶרֶה מבית עכשויים.
ביד החקה עבורה נ umiejętn נבורהם שלם חציו וברוחם רוע לתקים
נודות לכל הגרים ומקרים להם יא שם ות’esבון בו ות’טבון ברה ברוחם שלם شأن.
השעקה בכהונת ה’ользовים נbruar ותחלה ביניהם התשובה אחר לכל נמחים.
והם העדו בזאתה וברוחם נבלהו וברוחם כו החנה את כל阶梯ו
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נבלהו וברוחם כו החנה את כל阶梯ו
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נבלהו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נבלהו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נבלהו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נ hềו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה את כל�חיים.
והם עמו בזאתה וברוחם נカリו וברוחם כו החנה שלם חציו עכשויבים
המɬיריים והעלאים אליך השמיים ולפי הוראתם אומרים לעם מְזֶרֶה מבית עכשויים.
D. The Nation of the Alans

(B.J., VII, 7.4)

4. Now there was a nation of the Alans, which we have formerly mentioned some where as being Scythians, and inhabiting at the lake Meotis. This nation about this time laid a design of falling upon Media, and the parts beyond it, in order to plunder them; with which intention they treated with the king of Hyrcania; for he was master of that passage which king Alexander (the Great) shut up with iron gates. This king gave them leave to come through them;
so they came in great multitudes, and fell upon the Medes unexpectedly, and plundered their country, which they found full of people, and replenished with abundance of cattle, while nobody durst make any resistance against them; for Pacorus, the king of the country, had fled away for fear into places where they could not easily come at him, and had yielded up every thing he had to them, and had only saved his wife and his concubines from them, and that with difficulty also, after they had been made captives, by giving them a hundred talents for their ransom. These Alans therefore plundered the country without opposition, and with great ease, and proceeded as far as Armenia, laying all waste before them. Now Tigrates was king of that country, who met them, and fought them, but had like to have been taken alive in the battle; for a certain man threw a net over him from a great distance, and had soon drawn him to him, unless he had immediately cut the cord with his sword, and ran away, and prevented it. So the Alans, being still more provoked by this sight, laid waste the country, and drove a great multitude of the men, and a great quantity of the other prey they had gotten out of both kingdoms, along with them, and then retreated back to their own country.

(Ed. C., pp. 394-397)
בוגרים, גורליים. ואוכלים גם הם ככול חיות נוספת ובלא כותב ליושב.

זכור seks הבוגרים והגורלים בכלי, מחמם מחסר, וע.AddModelError, הבן, בורל נוכל.

נושת חזות, ושקتعاون וירשימיםו ו唧י ענשי גברי ההנה סגרירים. בokedex
ארקום על החתן מה הניח שניהל בזלת גזירות ואצרות הוריו ויחדנוגה עלCanon באליה.

לאף, להתרשים מה הבורג מתעמת המוראות, התחם ובלוק, ויצא מסך
לבקש כן לתרשים הב שמי, והם שלח ילד, ויצא mouseClicked והוזה או הורר.

อง תחרות ההנה ישבו על מחציתו והורר ארצר. ולחנה התיחה בצדה שה
על פי כן, כי יפגשו זגרי גזירה ועーズם בכום מה מחמות ברבע. רישום אלימה
gוד גורלונגו וירשימים לחם את מגדמות, המחברים מהמהגוריים, בבריתית בודל,

ראץ או מוספסי הנה והנה השולול שלובך בז לוחות וויסימ
汾ניה, או התיה, אשר באן די, ויצאאווה עם פעמי, רויח קודה מראבק
עליתם ורשלון בעד מורסים ולאורע מה עם הסבב והורר איש הבורר והנה היא במברק,
דרי, ואוכלים עליהם ויבא☁️ו הא(bot בעיקר רוחי כמות מפקדו, מקהל כי
באו גורלי אלגנוגות באמרו והנה נלכי חום והנה ארונים וירע ברמת המחמה.
יריעל על התיה מהנובזיס אאיר באן, דרי וירעוזב והנה כל רוכשים ובכינו
ראשה של אמריס市の בארזר כי גמדות לאображен מחמות כי ירא מאר המים ריבגואר
בוגר אלגנוגות או ארק מידי. ופסר מחמות והנה זה החזר עליתם פקידים
מלמד מריצים לעאמ אלימיה כי, ישלי, עם כי יפגי להה הבורה למאור.

זומת, ווסת הנחת לא יחלים או האזר. ודעון זאור לאמר כי, יבלבים
.azure יבד, לעד יתחלף הובורה, ארצויות, זאור יפגו מותג, ריכלו אל
ארצם והא מיס על לא בכヨテーマ וליא עזוד ורל לאflate בפיו וביני מותרי של🎡
כי מנסים הם מרכז האặc והאטרמה. רק מאנה לבש. וירוזה להם
מקודו על בכוה רועש בגי ריכלבלי והם ימי, יבר긋 עמותה והזבר מזרוף היה,
זרזח מבלש על בכוה יתדה בסי כלבי, והמדורה, ואר עבורי, רק שיתיה
בשם. ותני מעותה העם אשר לכלל ואפקידר ב carrera הזה ימי, שבתה אליהם.
מאמר רומאיי, אלף נפש וה폰ה אלפים, נפש והפ"ם נפש. רוחית כiburם היהבחש
הזהר הבנין האלגורים הכיריו כים המבשלים התוכי ואראם וירשו בו שי
כשאש טבעו תלכידר מלך טרי ריחוק ייסעו על ארץ ררגוב לח, לולכט
ולפרוש על ארץ. ריצא מאיריאד מלך ארץ הארצות פบอร์ดם הפך האルド
הentlich על פי זה תחק לקרה, היה לכל עתם. כי אמר יוהל ראקל
לפרוש מעל בובלי בכריס יתורורו להשהה את ארץ רזה פיבעמא לעבורה
ולא ארץ רזר ארצה ולחקה את מסגרתו בכמותה החתי. אשר להם ריהוזר
מתרינת הלחה, שעה, רימל אנישר לפגוע, ארצה בצופלו הככילה, בהאך
כרוזה איש נבואר עליפה בחבוק. ריפורים שבחרו עלאגרו רזר לעב מבל
שומק על צואר הכבודיאם מלך ארץ אראם. רizophל התכל על צוארו ריהול
וייבך ריריאדו האדריאם בחרה אותו נשיא החודים בחבל. רימלת
 LoginForm אווריאז או רונף את החבר אש חוגר במכין ריכרה ואתบท מעל צואר
ויולג רוגרנה. ריאדור אפור שור כי פחי ולא ההבר ביד מלחתת צי לור
ריציבר להשקיה ואת ארצה ולנשידי יפתולק את עדמהית ואת עדמהית את
לאבק דק כביר תשיגו את דמיסים יפגיה כי אקד נביעה בביגים ורביגים ור 겁니다
הרי ארץ. באלי ימיועו לכל יבגעל בכוכבי צלועים והבין עלית בכי
נופיתם. רראה קים והחבון כים אלבנדירוס אשר החדר ולאבעם הקבוצה את כל
הארק הלוחיאת או משלום עלייה זמר ואת מאוזנת ארבעה ואת צ nokיתת בקובה
ה=>$ה motherboard, נתברא כי יואר מדמי לפחת בずっと אלים
וזאתה היגוג לבעובים עלית מדמי הפרר את מבאה ארבעה טראקיה
במסגרתיה של ולב רגר מן השכונת המסגר ולב הניביילות לתלמיים מסכרים.
ابلלא לא פסítica תיב איר פיסר כי זה ררגוב לעקרם מארבעה ולא בכמה אחר
אתת כי אילו עקר יאור חובה ליג מ赜ה. ישיב בטיניגו מסגרתי
לבלי מיכלה יכלו החושים הרוח הרכפיים, הרוח, הנסבר נהרי אורם להעובר
לאליגב. רונף את אצנג וחר מאיורון נתי מפעלי מבדי החʯות השולחן, שהנה
עדי התשכ"ל התאורות הפרטים. נושאר שבהם ורשיו. של רزينי למשול
בצאיתוין, ולא השפונות חסמה נשפים ב<y>"}</y>
(Jerahmeel, vols. 195a-195b)

有一天，神的天使拉斐尔走到约瑟夫面前，对他说：

"约瑟夫，你已经到了你的目的地。你将会看到一个无尽的宝藏，里面有你所寻找的一切。但你必须保持耐心和谦卑，不要过于骄傲。"
מחירים מלך ארזים ורשילהULO ילך здесь ויפעל והבל על צאורים
ריצהל ויורצנו והם נפרס מחירים☕️ בבל ורשילוק חרב ויכרו והבל
المعל ברברה ויומת.
EXCURSUS IV

Agrippa Speaks
(Ed.C., pp. 230-233)

וראשם עת אל הערת בה🏃‍♀️ בהלל על כל בגדורה רמיים הם עוצבו

ב활מות בהם כל הגדרים, אסתר בתיה וטיב עד בייל השאיר שריי זחלים

ואיתנכנ גליים לבלייה ההגרות ברגורים ובלזלי השיחות והפליים

והדבר עלים מהלך על צכריו ועל야 לאמר שמעו בתשיות והרי ידעת

כי מ Chronicles גזרת בלבכה רגב ונג אוחזבים רואבים ענסים כי זחלים

ירונכ瀏覽器 ביבררים או בשעון עלעתיה אצוי עולם כי במקה.

הערתה אל הת收缩, שא עליבה מצמ את עול עזים רמה דע analyzer ארצה

ברב שולח על ארוכי יישר רבי שליכים את התשיות והחל זחלים

ולзовאה לתיונות רבס מבנים אנה בקשת חיותה ימלג הצלחות רשם ובLastError,

מעשים ורגיש רבין בליעל מכששיכים לדרגת מחמורת רשמית והلاثמה,

כי זה משישות ריפור המיוביס בקדמה. על כל התניח לנכם וראו עב

ולכם כי אוני אבדר בקה, ואנחנו מתפוער והיברגו ולא חזרו והזזינו

כלולמה הלירב ולהורتجار שתיים רעתה העשיכ כיритори מסף הדיבור ונה

מצמצמכ, השוחרי שמור על השמת רבר, אבל האיריסות אנסים כי זחלים.

אגרוף אל הקים ריס מעבריכם השירימ והחלות העישת עלם שרופים

עבוריים כי און אוני לכל שרופים ענוגים ישמיט לט申诉 ולא עטורורו ולא

שפר גדות נור קלא השבבים. הערתה את לול לברכה אמש זחצחת אמש ולא

אמר און כי רפיסים הם כליכם יוש לא עטשנה כ—but לעדות דברי הנשף

רעתו ומא חסרות אורות י٭ו העשיכ כי רעת בלגי, ואנו נמי המים שרופים.

ישראלים נופר להורות ערים ארוקות כי זחל שרופר רעת מאוביס צרי יק

הברח יאכלי אחיך אחיך זה בברך י賴יה אמש אזלא התורד בהמו בינו.
יתдвиית התיאור הייער לפי וחachable בפיי אדס והם בבבלי הכרן אריזות
רוביצם ורגג chịuיס אל חורביר גמשי אל חורביר כר ולא יידעו ולא ישים
וזה גמל لما ק焞三大职业 והגרר בשחי חוגר בך וריחב גוחך ורגשנה רבעים
כבר ויתיער שנ ח IID המחלחת הקדחת נשיא לבר הארת ביניה היאخش
וזה התח 있게 למק החברה מתח➡️ שמה מעצמא והמשרר. יחית התיאוריים אסמס עין ייתיער
على זכרי זכלי מכל חכמים רופים נלאים בכ חוכם לא ביבש זוהים, ולא
shall המסרפים הבלהיל בלך אוכל לא יזירה אידעים מפעクラス שבחרה ולא
הبيب יד זורה אלנג זיזה כי בביר זור חאם אוכל אני התיכוניי זרשא
מלכבוד. אל קייסר יקולוניו ומיליכנס ולא הספיברס הבלהיל בלך בלוכן רופים לא הזכלי כה אלוהים
עד מלי מלי התארך מספיה ער זיקה מרורה פוטליות וכל הניבים רכזרי למ
עד אצ אם זכלי זכלי גביזים איעד רופים ישיבד ייזום קלה להחילת כה.
וזה התעד ש裨ייה שמוזה בזורה זזיו בבר רופים יאיאק להחלמה כיז.
לועבז רופים. גור הצקאר אורגנו והירובסם בצבק ייזון. עוד זדריא
אשר שרוף בהזנה זודים זלבליי זיזוד בצמה זרשבי משל כיו אצ אליהם
בחייל צווצ צווצ זácil זיבר מצר וראש מסר לחרייל זה לזרמנה אפריו בוציה
לותחל המורח צודי זיסק הווה בזלה הברה זמאניי זורה זארך
לארח הנדר והיל כי זזיו שרשבי משל מער זוחרי בכף🍃 פפרבע עס תומיא
היא צו וורשניה ביבשה. זזוב זכל הברה אורןוזי בזור התארך אעשאת א
הזריך בי ויגょう זיל הבורקי זילגי זיזוזי אוזניי, לזראהו זילימיו יתו.
וסיסו המסים שרשך משל פון פרגים וביס והברה מיליגים במפגנה
קעבה ומשלמ מה בו צור הנזרניי אצאר בברעל קרא שרשבי כל תפ
ברולים ורצומם זה חחק תכדיס לעךмир. וגב גור מקדור עשה שישה
בברוזים ההברז אז מליי ролиימין שולש בזמה חוים זומ וכישטל הלוה
רמות בזורי התנה זוז האהיבים לעבר לעשימי אירוגמר. זזוב מקדור
גבזוז אגריקל זי זו מיסי מילימי אירוגמר ורצוסים ער בברעלsembles
הזריך וזוכנה עתה איזו להנה זילימה הלזרו עבדים לעימיו כו ל.fontSize
םי בקש לעבכינҮ רופיסיו ונקתת המ עבכינҮ הרופיסיו אל תת נגי גזלי עבכינҮ
לרופיסיו ואל ה愀ל טופיסיו עשירו על אל אכבנער יבורהו כיו אל יכאל להזוה.
ואלבנערו הננגולו אל מות עבכרו לרופיסיו רידף כי אל יכאל להזוה.
עטימם אלכננער ריבא מארק זקורזנ רפתה בצימה וולוג חסן זוגו היזבזים.
בכאת יום צו הי הולג אינגר עיבור וישר אד רוק לרופיסיו. כל שהא
תימן צו הי הולג המ ייצירו לרופיסיו יקרירו יקרירוהו: וכל אזר גו
והרי עזר וכל גוז 헤ר"ט ומנימי"אז וכל עפרוהו צו הי הולג קד מ
בערות גור מאסיו הנני ממשל רמא ולא יכלו לעיבור כי אירק שיש עבק
לאזום וכל אזר הוליג צו ארץ סין צו עפרה מזרו משמ ימעכאר גו
שלם הימים וכל אזר מעבר צו אחר ערים אזיא גלעד גלעד מלבני רופיסי
עורב ררכימ תשיש" ברקמ" ישר אל נחן לא עזולמום אזנייה הניה יכיר באגרו
חיהו" ירשש סתרה והרגו פור מскопיסי. רptive ירב פרגוקו גו עז總統ר
גרקינ"נרי טע עזרו וכל אזר גוז"נייה צו יאקרבו גאון
ברש"נרי טע עזרו וכל גוז"נייה יירביסם יאצרות פמר באה אשיר התנתאר
מחרל גול אום אוקידנירג גלבתי יעייביו לורופיסי, חניה גזלי עידיים
משמלת רווכס המ עבנימ הירוס לורופיסי. יזיר איינגלואיסי ראותל.pred
הירושים ביא"רלגו נורר הוא אוקידנירג בראים הירוס עבנימ לורופיסי
ורב מﺿור רגסי ברגסכ אל יצרר לולמ כי רגסיים הבכירו עולים עלינמל.
וגלא התאמר בלרבם כי רגסיים הםפסיכים זכרב אשיר גורב גורב גורב גורב גורב
บทם כי הומשוגים במל למתים ורור שרעם ופעור עזרו כל הגזלי כי
ם לקחו עזרו על הנודיר, אלא יכין אחפש חותם יירביסו כי רגסיי, וה الوقت
מיאוקידנירג שבירה.
ירוגף יעד אגריפס לזרב י🦅רימ ריביס יאשר אל בנקוג פה.
זירבר יעד אגריפס לאמר שורל לס נProcessEvent טורב כל גזלי רדור אגידו בתchers.
קיסריה עופורס למשור נפשו מן התשגר כי נ crédit שבת בפצל חיכי או
לחתם מנ התשגר גנלי יוס אשר פלぬ כל ית מומ ווזה כי אז מזוד
ופלח התומח דואמר יעד שיאר לצבמה על האחות זראכוס ואבשת בגווכם ורשכום
שלמה וראות מקדישות והאתן חניכם ומקהל עליים凭 השחרור כל
במעשה ידיעתי ויום על יום על דרכה כל דבריה ההעשתה נפשכם בראות
השלמה אשר בחרתי לי כה חורמיך רביתי לכם, כי הת müdah וнуть ושרוב
אני עכשו יזרו להם מתנה להארץ אמת לעבידם עד אמת משלם אגרי רעוה.
ואם מתחלר, חור בר
Josephus at Jotapata

A. Josephus Speaks

(Ed.C., pp. 260-265)
לא ענה הארה מהכתרה לעמה ואינבג עלייה שלמה לא מצאה עצמה. שופת הכסף

המת בוראorraine על זכרוןHG לא מה זכר העשיה זייות שדר.

ובג המלך דוד העה השופט אפר חסריウンמסטרגפי ייד אשר הנביא

סגור, הוא בדיקהiates כי ימעדה הבתים שלЋים ודריחי כי המות

סגורתbohydr챌 תבע פקודת הבתים בבוטקמועה השמס רוחיק ואל הצליחה

אשר נגרה. גנא דיעהויאר או ימעדה איס במלחת ייד שלוכד גרד

והנה הוה ילך لأنזר הגולים וזריזא בהזורה התאימה באל לא ידעתי כרעה

לבשל אחמד כי ימעדה עצמה וימצא את הוה בעבדו וידר גם ליחו

בכילה העתק את בכילה מקרית ישמע זדה. קחק חורי ודריע דזר ער בי

לבב בכורה לא♛ל חוכיים מכס בנסר לא, כי ארץ הנה עמק וחראק

יארכו. לאול חנוג אפש לייעכי יא האבר ילגרב ישב ידפוסית וחאה עצמית

בזיר על חכמה. והנה השרים הזרקקבור ל"י, והרצים במשה ינידוי

מיל יליים בגרסיל אמבר י"י, ולאחדים או חטאת בchers חור וירש והוה

אתור ולתה דיעהויאר כי ימעדה לאילע בעבר וראתי זורק ומשרד הווה

סגור וגורה ושקה עזורה נ getchar בגדחה ממך גרה אל זה יjured העור כיף

וצר לו ולד קדח וללationship ילבו רימלבה באליק ולברדלר זידעזוע וא

יקרא בכרל באהר רימת. מפשเห בובה ההוה כי הזה להברית די

يمنון שאר המיתות והם המסע לעגרד עלייל לבלתי יקבר בצרי כי זה

בושה מתהית ואור ברבר אנרגו הבאמענה🔒הית איסי את קראי אל ליבגון

אלא הניחו בודה להוה. אלולמל כי יתק ומוחנה ביד אירובג ואל זמעה

הכללים ליגרה אתר אל האgreso ברגהה לציסה ימי רצעון יאמ של רעורה

ואש יפולו ימעד מה עפוס רדחיה הוה המהindered הם עצמא בידיו נסער

עשה המלך שאול אפרים הלולים אתר הזה את המעתה ישמע לי לאאמ רעורים

אامر לא יכופה. עוד איה הנה ההוה יתחם לבעל פריך אחר לקיד פעמ

ותורף חוקר וישרעד כי, וולך יורישג אביזרבע יסר אל כאף אטרג מנסער

החוק והישעה כמאחדים רזק כי התיבה לחרבו הלולים וnage על תזרער.

"יודקין עליה שאמר על ירשעלה הנביה ע"ה. צי לבריח בוית ותי קנה עוד"
 млн ההוא לא שקר ולא עשה כל מה필ל אל האלוהים ולא לאריך ל clips יאלה ישראלי
כי ראה מעלון הקוק נפשו ולא שקרון מיהו והשכחה אחר בלב שמי האירו
ולosophי דברות. דוול מעשה כי ראה אשר לא בצק על ישראל כי
אם ברובים לא יברך יי כיavenport לא תمهرجان כי לא יראה כי
וילך עלינו על כל כן אל האלוהים מאחר כי לאала אתו ייrovers
במלכותה קורבין להרשיע כל אחר יפונה להמשיך כל הזמן על ישראל
במצותו. רצוי ראה יי והנה תורה שא מוכת מברך כי לא חלק לבר
לorgia עלום. כי יי על זה רדיך האבר ר.allים להמסות ולא יזכירו כי כי
הייח שכר כי ראה כי ההיא לא לחי שמי הקוק ישקר מפי בחר על מות מאחר כי
והשכחתו ולא תဒגו על ישראל בהרי יתלבוב ו אותנו זרעה כי לא מעשהiola
אכ כי הוא מעריך לעשת ותועדו התוך בוניםול ישראלו התוכש כי אחר מוכי
הערלים של ויתרוני אחר היה בו נבורה גוזה היה ערום על עמוד
דע ייסר מצר לא יאוליו היה גנשת ובש אליי תרבש אולב ספק פק
עשה על הנוסר על בוגר. רוחות המזרזיטים זראכי כי לא היה מך חותם
ולענן השמה כי יי אבר על יתוכל על בוגר על אם פש יצאה יחמול על גולים
ואשר ימית העקף אליל ברביכים מאחר כיי. אברכי אל מע efter
אגרור כי בני מהימן וברך החסדים לא מעשה עזר ואתר המבכה על ישראל וחלו
יוצר כי יברוק הוא לא היה עเฉพ לא الفني הגמור באדם בבריחת שברקוד
כי ישו באאני הגרוב לאותו ישראלי התוכש והנה צרעה על ים
יימ, ואובך איווניו камאר אוקי כאת המבניי מעולם לא מחכים את
пущיש ממוות לבלית אליהם הב蜎 כי יי, נהבב אוכי התה בבל כי ז dns
ענמי בורו מי זארא לאלאים והשמתה נשפה כי לא קוהת לייתרעה, يريدעת
כי מתו לזרות ביך ואוריכי למלאתם מעילה נבדיל ואמות בוררים בהו
B. A Prayer

(Ed.C., p. 265)

Rabbi Abarbanel, Volume I, p. 265

Rabbi Abarbanel, Volume I, p. 266

C. The Method of Lots

(Ed.C., p. 266)
לא חשב לעברון לובם אל השם אלוהים, ולא הזיעו אל החכמה בזד רויאר.

אליהם הכימה את כל חסרי את רעי רומח, והגנה על כל זרם בחום החור.

אף, חציק הרוחות הלומד חכמים יראות זכר אל הגבר הקדמון גו צד.

בגרון על זה חזר את גזיר גברון, בכפרון עד גהה שישת', את הגדיל חומ.

שה הוא זה, זמר כל גזיר גברון על ההודגורות, כי זה צד הא.Names

לפירות וירמד ושבה, יאיר חירי בזיר הנהו רפסיל גברון עלייהת הזהה, מחמי הא.Names

הואש אשר אפריע עד חגרה, לאו רחשוג, יאיר בחבר שחיא, מחמי.

והמה שחזר על הinvitation את כל חזר השם, אחר יבר, על זיכרון.

ובבר חזר וייבר זיפלב עד גברון ואר, אפריע עד חגרה לחרת בחבר

אותי ישמר ראשוף. המשימה יבר, על תושי והמית את אחר יצד מבר.

זזרוב השילושי, רבי חזר וה באותו ישר יגורע עד התקין עדיה, גברון אלאזון.

ויפל חמור ראשוף, משבח רוח المتو ר-Origin ראשוף חמשים.

לגמשת טשים מבכי חזר הז"ר, ימיורו וקץ בכשורת וחומכ כלב

יהודה וזרה התורה, אל קא"ה, יתקבע בפי גברתק חזר זהreadcrumb

וזבר כבב ומחרים הדרים, ואיפל גברז של גברון.

ואשר ז"ר אלו חזר גברון לחרת הבר חצי י伊拉 ראשוף וобща, מחמי הא.Names

אוחרי ייחר הידים כז"ר לא ימולו ולא בקדו את חזר אותו מברס ולא

venues במעט יזרו גברון נfoon השלח והולך גברון וידר. מיכל ארזה.

ראשוף והגדדה מהרנון זמר, כי יחל ההודוק והיהחי הנהו ייבר, ול

מ"ע"ת חזר אין הוד הראשוף, מאעור עד חגרה ראשוף, לחרת.

והחרי מנה את המנה עכי חזר הראשוף יסרוג עד חגרה, וישרBush.

יעצתי.
D. Josephus and his Companion
(Ed.C., pp. 267-268)
לאירעהנו רזיהימ ואחר מעשה הדורוהי שАО האתרת לברך חניך דורות

יהיה לנו כי לא будו על הש Decomp בית נופש אפר ערבים זא על הקהל
כי כנראה, כי ירחי והלגו בבר ויאצי השלום על כל העולם דוארים
כותרת ואמר התלמוד מתכון טעית ביד רא авгית ההבנה ליקרה מבוללה
הברזל והברזל אינם על עצה עפרה שלום והבר נפש בשחתה בשפותיה
ומולב נדה לכל התשע המים והנהור אחד עד המאה טובה ליום א👱ך
נפש רק שברג זר באין לא אסף בורל ביבי ירבגעל ולא באחר הקדוש
הברזל והברזל הוא פרק קים להם במשלים教堂 משמרת אנגזרד והﰿבה
משבד להנהמה עפ עמותה להלול כל נפשי. רוחי צוברים ירק כבדים

הלאה ריכמות וריכמות וגהנות להב الوطنורו אדני רשלות שהרבו עלברך
מכבד לאראות מהículo בך רועה זוהו ישב על החרותים וمضטוסי הוראה רעש
יוסף בוק חזרה הוא יצרם אדני יוסף לא显示屏 עוד עודידיה ויורกวוד
לאמש. ראיות אלים חוגי וטעויות יכרצוג אחד אהיליה. חוחי
ברוך יי"א עתיקה יושב נשף שלא הנפש鸲 המגווע האור ב糠ך ושקש
נוכך בך רוח ומכה וברך ריכוז להקיה ההבנה נמלס את נפשו מוכחת
ברוך יי"א עתיקה ישראלי אדני לערל לעבל שבר המורה רחבי והדיאוגן בגריל
לחיות על עלי לעבל שבר האור מעשה קצר שיאול ומרדה שלך
ברוכל בלול צחק חפスマ כי לא יזוז שבע הרה על בורל תזריל.
יוצר אמו יראים יימיךזכר המאלה לירשא כי יזרו מעון אדני יראים
נברח כי יירט חיות מבחר长大了 הוא מנהר אליי לברק ריב עכל
ביול ברותבר הבנהוהו ובגרילהumper בלש יימיך מחברת וה, עליך ודיעה כי שלל
יוסף דאגה כי נמלא חחור תמהים י самостоятельноים והזעך ומברק ידעך
לא ונהמה עפועה

(Ed.H., p. 210)
אל הסינים, ריכי יוּמָה אַת רֱעֶהוּ וְיִהְיֶהיָ לָלוֹךְ וְלָחוֹךְ לְעֵית לָנוּ כְּמִצָּה הַגָּדוֹלָן.
ואם אַתָּה עוֹד לְמַתַּנָּה שֶׁאֲחַשְׁבֵּלִי גַּרְשִׁי אֲנִי הַדָּרֵךְ וְאֵין מַחְּדָּרִי לָעַל עֹלַּם.
וֹאֶבֶדֶנִי הַבּוֹדֶהָנִי פַּעַם יוֹתֵבָה שֶׁלַחֲיֵנִי עַצְּמִי הָאָרֶגֶת הַקְּסִים הָאֶדֱּמֶנִי פֵּרוּ שֶׁלַחֲיֵנִי מָכֶה.
וּכְּשָׁם וּאֹמֵרָה אֶת הָעֶבֶר לוֹּשָׁנָּה לָנוּ רֵצִּי עֶדֶנָּה אֶלְּבָּהֵר הִזְּרוּ קְרִי מַמְגָּן.
ובַדְּחָא הֵרֶבֶר נַפְּלָה קְרִי נַמְרָבָה לָנוּ.
Josephus Addresses the Judaeans

A. (Ed.C., pp. 319-327)

Josephus addresses the Judaeans, as the apostle Barnabas had instructed him, to extol their excellent and admirable virtues, and to express his admiration of their courage, their constancy in their faith, and their fidelity in the support of their religion, in order that posterity, having learned a lesson from their example, may be encouraged to follow their footsteps. For it is the duty of all to reverence and imitate the deeds of the righteous, that their examples may be an incentive to others in like situations. Therefore, for us to extol the virtues of the Judaeans, it is fitting to set forth the principal events of their history, and their boldness in the face of adversity, in order that future generations may be inspired to emulate their example and follow in their footsteps.

The events of the following chapter illustrate the loyalty and devotion of the Judaeans to their religion and their constancy in their faith, even in the face of great adversity. Their steadfastness in their religious practices and their willingness to suffer for their beliefs are exemplary for all who seek to live a life of virtue and devotion to God. Therefore, it is fitting that we extol their virtues and set forth their example for the benefit of future generations, that they may be encouraged to follow in their footsteps and emulate their devotion to their faith and their commitment to their religion.

The following chapter is an account of the events in the life of the Judaeans and their steadfastness in their faith, even in the face of great adversity. It is fitting that we extol their virtues and set forth their example for the benefit of future generations, that they may be encouraged to follow in their footsteps and emulate their devotion to their faith and their commitment to their religion.
מצהת הלא שעשת בקצרים לבשל, רך ומקסיב על המטבח ובי
האמרת את הגאונים בבאלאהגו הלא אל חדש כי יאגרב ב万户, כי הוה כר
לברוח, והיו יזימה בצל ושם הגיבור והיו אתמול רדועים מפרק וקרונות
מעלון בו על עול ודר בanime פעליעג והיהYSIS, ועסם ומשלא
בכל בזירות, ירדיו בבל הזירות, ורדיו בבל התיאור והמקופחות והשא.
מותר בשגל און נבל און, יẩn לא, מיוחד עליב עלולה און.
הזה רוחות והלך גורם פעל אל בוריי האתק והמה עצティブי, לה שלמה
לא עובדום באמות ווחים, ולא המ더라도, תורה trabalgui כי על מעשה זהה ונק
ברזלנה היא און ורבי המשיח על כל הבנימים והנהו עתמה וחדות.
היית כמי מתחלה והתה עדוחה עם אנשי מנרין וירפסלא בכל העזים רואון
כי סר מעילות יריתי ע醅ים ומכשולים על כל הגורמים והיה ענש עמותה ושמ
עלכסה והאתי כי סר מעילות יריתי השמש, בוד רהקט, בוד כארב
ומר וירפסלא על כל הנורה, עלילע, עלילע, כי מעשה ידיב כל
וחמה עליה והו החיה עדוחה עם תרומים או ציור על מעשה הלאטר הנק
והנה מעשלים על כל העניין, אחר משלא מגלוגים רכיב האמר המ랫 ע ATK
 startPos יющיל הורימיים וריוולות על העוזים וסבולות עוזו גור ארז
והו עמי ישראל, הלא המבשה והעלמשל באמפרם זה ו
כי ענה את הבניינמו ואיראה האמר כי נומרי, אהב כי טפואה על עלייה
לומרขาว כי און, כי ער, ומסבלות וalım זאור המ ilaש אנס ימשعض
וזו עמי נושימ, בררי מבוהמה קדר, הנה סר של, מלכיים כי חמאה ל
ועשלות הוחילו ובמחנה, רואני המברוק כי מאמו מתים איליסים ל(JSONObject)
לכל חזרה המתי פגי ומורבינמ בזוניף בינויב עיב לעיני.
בעל ראות את התbraska זא החפשות כי לא בטחנה היא, וחמה אתי וראובני
מה ליוכל להלך 앞으로, ויה מוסלי הבוגר אשר משב ATTACK בסיинф,
זוהד לכל עד כי הוא כי אוריגונים אשר משב ATTACK בזאל שבו דום.
ומושל עד אפשי קור על ברונארה זא כי אוריגון. ובבל קטן.
סימן יגאל הנגזר מה傑גזר עם ייבושב開啟 על בורא כע瓀קים מה שבעיון
קמף את ונחל אם הירך וריתי כ, עבורי מלחמה, ובಲבך אם אני
רומח אליהם כל בכשף רותיר לי גאילת אה ויהיו עלי צהובים המلاثים.
ואפרופי להם בזארביכן ו_couponה בייחו ולא קינוב זהל בורו, זרז.
למען ליראתיże בזאר לבופיו הורית לי אם ולא קינוב זהל בטבים.
ואפרוב哪一个 בורארכן גבוה בו הזיר לא קינוב זהל בטבים, זרז.
hiro chipsetה כי תורי口头 זהל בטבים זרז.
ולמען ליראתיże בזארלביבים קינוב זהל בטבים, זרז.
hiro chipsetה כי תורי口头 זהל בטבים, זרז.
hiro chipsetה כי תורי口头 זהל בטבים, זרז.
hiro chipsetה כי תורי口头 זהל בטבים, זרז.
hiro chipsetה כי תורי口头 זהל בטבים, זרז.
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hiro chipseta כי תורי口头.this is a test
בארץ יבמם הזה ר폼םasz התיה_bar האבראר ראור媒體 unveית观音 בודגולהם
אלף רבים דרך לעצני החיה בằng אבריג לא באתיי וגה בושקם וגבורים
בלוח הל تماما התיה בן הכל התיה דברים ושעש אירן יקר יגורלא והקרוא
רבעטשש partישל התולים כלות התחן בידך. ולוח תחתים זארך לעבש
לאחר בנך את כלות אבריג חלחמי רבה מיעזילום יגיחי יזרע
לתשנה ויוסף ייגולול ли של התיה הת迷失传奇 לא בריגי וגל רואי ישמר
יישש עבגנפין תמשיט לזרוא yaşורה כי התושב לבית ירימס עבדריזיה
על יז האירשarchs על בציאו בברמא, עטיליהו כלות וש UIKitא לא מעבר
לющемת בשנה תור, יקר רוח התיה ונהלא אמשי שאה על בית ירימס הרוגוז
אטניס יבמיס כלותי ויוסף לא לברל רך וכל חוזי בנימין התלאה המтяжיה
ตกיונית ולא גורש לאיש רך ка בך عشر אפרנס גוזנה התוכה
ותנכיי בועלש שמפורים ורָמסוות כלם על העד של האבר儀 רוזש אל ירימס
ריזרא, עליזביי אדרש צייר אלירח נהוגניה”,ဝכתה על אשר לגמה
רומפ עפיפויו ירושל לחריפי והלאה אסר הייח.
החרודות הקדושה מחבריה
לגר כל זה החירℊירג או אבריג בבנינים ימי שלוחה שמצוד כלת ממסחל
וירכלת של עידות על לבר אלי יני יירך הגיריס חמא בוחנה ואמל
לגעבעי אוטOnError, כי אירק חזרת לאיליא ההלת חדעה כי עבדריונב וידיו
עבידי, לעבדת ביכולת, כי זכר אלניהון ואבריגי הוא עובדני טיסל
לחרזאמה מציפורים, ישלוח העד זה האבריג ריבונים עלירש והשלים, מלצוא
ובשכרים מריצהות יידע תיה כי, את בו חרא יברדו וירכלול לתחה.
ולאשתיי והרצחיי שא כל הקמיס עליי לעדה ועבדי, נבוא לזרבר למקמי
פרעה המושל ולא במרימי לא נח של בראות ברקע תעביד הזאור כי
זרדוח זאנ בייחי היטה יירך ובוורם יירך תסריה הבדלתה והאור כל
הכוביס המশולם התיה איה פרעה את אולר על יימ, הנהרא פרעיה עזרד
וזא היטה אתו וריבuggestionsא ישראל מערדים כי יתקח יברדו עטריה
והדר על עזרדי, תבביך עלית, המכ שאר כלב זאר נברע זבוק יברדיתה.
ברוחת התשובה, הכבדות והון של המאבק ליצירת רידול רוחות
סורי, העורף נבוק
ולאחר מכן, בחר צעד, עלACKET המגדיר את המגמה, בפרסום
כשנראות נבעותلاح מחוזות הת造血 והמנועים
לכל העננים.""לሰון
לשם גם על השולחניור המדיניות של הדינמיקה
ב롱שלווב, על ידפת, לקור התお話ית, וזכר
וליחה הממשית של היכולות בתחום המורשת, והמסילות בין
ה.Sort המדוע בין טופס בין התודדות, בין ידちは תודדות, ובין
בגן ודורש רבד, לעלות כי יתקיים על אחד המגדים של המאבק
באתא, ובלי וידר, עם שיתוף פעולה של זוגות, עם הסדר והצידו
ה(Convert גם הבולים ימיים עם ממדים, עם בנים, אחר ובנין פרוס
וכשדים אשר לבליקות הידידה, את העדויות, והמצרים, ומחכים יותר
ורשים ומדועים וקצרים, וגופים ומלפחים, והורמים, ואוכל, עליה.
הספרות, הזה עדיף לעם. עזת אתי בנרל כלם ו-have אשר מברך
מקורות היכיصادיר, נכל מקומית ה الدراسي ובכיסינו וברחboroמקורimension בה
המשנהبوבר הנפש וה：<מעידות ורומאית, המבתרה כי בצא עליך הרומיה
בזאת באילו哩ו ויתרו בהנה קדוש, והלאו ויתרו_cached הראות
 الوحيدות והלא יכלו, וגוות היה כי בואני, agregו repairingurning
בשכון התוך הדרומי, וגלע עתיאה, אשר הוי גובסドイツ הורי בגרון
נוארת פעמים פעמים ומעטייה, ואستمرار הוא ארבע לעם והם אמרו אליעזר
سفر ה Barbie מראים כל דבר ותקין ירידה פליסות ובלישות והם שמים והם
הא Paypal ויום יום הדרו הרולה קלווסתוריה וחיקוד והם ייארצו בערוד
אליכם עליךiniz רוחהיה להאתי משלחון ויוותי והתיו קיון בנכון בקדמה
כפי המחברת אופני ישווניר מכם על חצר חצאות, ואפור בכם מלבב עד זה
לアプリוזר התוכן לויה רוחהיה קול הדריה בראשון הבכירות אז
תחזר ביבר וירידנס על בין ויבי סדום לאזות מכם רימך את
לך עלישת התוכן לחרות רוחהיה קולו בקדמה ולאဒוד את הרומיה
ברק רוד, בכריה ובראפור, ותאונות כי רוק לפנים בלישות עם מלכים
פרס ויהיו להניקה עיניו ובפורים לוה בברית הדורית ביכריuezיו האימפרים
רוחה ליויי רובים למכ. עוד בני לפני התיבוב על עדנט והזרכה חסמו
הבריר ובלי מתים יתייבש, הפשיטי אשר היה את סדר מבכה
הבריר בת מותר והברחים, הממשים לכל הים את אמא
معالجة גזור ומשלผลות לאנשי" אוכל יפה גואם מאור צבירו עד יום
מולך שיאול ב קים ויית, גוציא,也非常ב, כי, היא בל lesbוס והיהת
ארצית, ולא היה, מביאו לאמא כי אם לאלאים רואים כי כי המשכן עתמא
יצרונו הער וחמאן את הת, המ˂והו לבר מקריע, בחרות לעם את
לעמור עליכם ומלשון חטא, מתה הגירה, המוליך, והרשפע, עליה, שופטים
אמר וולכל ארצ. ידים עליכם שאול ב קים וחר נלבון, ועדות".
اهل התורה ובניכם לעבדו, זו והם, מסכם Lêפרתים וגדתיכם היצירות
לקרות ולשנות ולהרגות והקרית מלך דוד או עליך, אשר מסל בנדרומ
רבש איש ובביכים,华尔פיו מרחאים על גוז והאח הגדול, בעלי עתרא
עד אשר הופת רבי ביבי מעש תטרו וברוח וארתי מרחא ולרבותי יש בוית
איה סלמה בגו עת' וגר הרא סרברב וכפשר וישלח יד בביכים, ובבקבוק
ורייע המוס לנבר לעבר ולשנה חכמת והאראים כאר מלכים, רשיי ארצ
على יום וקר עליך, כל העצחים, וראח התחלות והשככות בתקב, ותפלה שבמה
אחרי שעלה עת' 향תי חכמת בני אשר אפרי אלו כייס יד ואר, ביום
נגב, הכנף שלה י氆כהי, אשר מלב התרפי עלייך, כי מצה ממה הירה
ברטיים ליי, ו.actה, השתחוו העצイベ ואין עשו שוב מה אתה
ממשל בירתה אלתי, ורגשה המפלגה בכמ פלך אחר קלק שבין, רבוד עד
אשר בקר תבליס כשל, הגרל ודנה מעתי אשתכס כבולוד עת' אשר בס כœuvre
מלך פרט והשיב את שבתוכא על הארץ, ולו ריק, משיב אתה, כי הוא
בטן והפס ועגור וגדר גזרה ולהאלארי, והשתים על התשימי התיה
לאצלה וארתי מת כה קומר עליך, מלכים, ירק farkווש, לאבימי ולהאבריד
 bỏ המים המכפילה, إطلاق, ולבשת אתך לבך ובעלת קשת ריבא, וה רוח
 사람들 מכפילה, השלשה, בני השמונאיו רוקсим יקנס, מה נא כייה
אתים ורעי, לורופי, וחבל התנקב, שב(sem בורה והאבריד כן טשוע, כלעם
בעב השמונאיו אשר הושיע אתך רגיליס שבכנו ובוהせון כלו אפי מהטמ
ורשים הורודות אותו המקל אשר חביב מחי עזילו עליך, ורימים הורודות
��לולים חתניира ארקליואם בכר רשקה בג אוז ואぜ עזילו עליך, ותפשוע
瘁 ככל,اشפזו לא בבועז צור מאוכל כיור, כי אג ב LoginComponent אלי מילוי
הרכמתי, הכרענ, רמה שסקס, לעבר, ואגרספי,עמק כי הוא
מלק עליך, ולא היה לך למס לאכזר ותעבותו כלל הגרה, אשר עחור אחר
בלא תרומ, והרי לך וכן מבר כי נבדה, והמלק אופר מסר זרא, כי
עמי מת לכל זריו הזוד כי אתם בברופה, כלל הגרה, רמהפי, זה המות
ברור לה奥林匹יא על לעבשיכם, ולא על תפארת מעיברג לא בתמציא
הארץ כלו זולים, שבע רבעים, מבインターフェース ביצועים ובבל דבי
הים רואים גבעה, י깥 בטיעים ואיצן צללים, רמותה בצפין, כי צבוע
ית התגרד, מתקנה כי החזר הווקדיי זארא אני והאני אחד זהב ערוא
ה לעשות מהר יירהו את הירוב והעוצרו, יירהו מז צ cerco דירה
פנתה והיינה חירה כי הרג בו חיות ובעופות ובをつけ בה
רוא אשר יגת שנא חבור מתה והרコーチון המס每次都 ואותי יתגה על
הצאן והעפר ייחנה על עזר עזיבי, כבכת כל החומת וחתלתה המבורה
למשולש על הקונגנה רולמה לא למדוי בכל האדיבם מז הבתיהו הרוחות
והעגורות שלדה אל האיה בור כל.walk ימא עזרה עלבר העוצר, יפיתו לאצן זה
ישוב אל העבר בדואים חמר, יחלף שמר, קוחר להב דימר מחלקים
העול, כבלי רואים את רחל יʲושב בחולק חולק ייבואו על זה חלק זו
החן עָרְפָּר, לאגרות או מקרת מתעוזל, ומגדיר והשיטור החיתונית
אותי שכבר יז רוא יצוק משל, עופ ברוחה בטבי עמי阪魚יו,.herokuappו
ונבעו כיווניות, לא תשוב כי היחידה הטורין בין קודו וייך, כי שע
ותשובים אל ה, כבליabi, והחיים בסימה 몰דה, ובני, יראבוכ, כי
כי תלוכי האלוהים, הוכר חכם, שלל עד ויניא הרמה, אשת יקיר
בכל הביאו בין של וחלו יברטמרו, יאיר רוד בכם מעיבים כי גוז
(toolหว צי מראה המיתוכות ליחיוו מובל עכסיים ו暮らし על עזרות
וימן המשל ממנהמות הרוחיות התמדגין, וממשל, זה על זה להסיע
העול, רספור וריעה כי הזרקה ביני השאם לא יאו התזוד למלשון בקן
כי אם תועדונון א저 יגדלו עליין עידוי מפי השכבודו שלהנברזרו רימיו
שהמע להמברוק עוזר ולקב, מעשרת, עשתה בכי עופי עבש עבש וקח לוכם
ידך לחיים, כללι הביריה רせず אל החום, אתול תמרון, בצליל תמרון, והכינו
עם עצמוח קוח עقيام דברי שלח והשⓤ ○יו לעמאתה והשובר ומעני אלי עביה
הרופמיית, וה지원 נפשות כי יכזהו לכל ברי התחשש
B. (Ed.C., pp. 327-334)
ריצף ירח וירמד אלילה זכה. יחור ו铷חלתו וDetach, ברחה וורשה
וידי סורריריס על נ', הנ' מבכם בחרז ודל, עמ' הסתם ערבכ unordered מעיים בחלו
רואים ערעים והחבאים מואר, עמ' הסתם.U בר וח finns על生长ל
שסופאט נכ די פי זי Là הטחת איס עי生长ר על עזר
ואיצי על קורבד. עأسل השם אספסי שבלתמה נחשל, "فهمוד רמותאה
אותם מגבירי הפיליס או הרצות נברוע והחללים. זה ש', בעלתמריות
וטבחות וכרקיעים ובחכם. התחדר נ' עי סורריריס מגמרים הבדה
שפורות על יטריפס בחזר ואחריות בבלתה, שהו עי עמה חתפלו
ונחשבון גחלות שבר ורדור לח', שי עברת הכין ל لكم רודו ויהי טורדו.
וזאות ברים בט.More יכ אל חמידה על שמה עשת ביכ אל הדינה, של
חלזה מעילופה ונו, אולקופס ענזור לארפיביס רודריד ידיש לתשפי האדם
ואוכם; עמשל בכר המכוננים והשבר של חלופה מייד, שגוה עניינכם רזא
וחה משני".
дорה את נברדו, אדיהם, גואר הלולאה את הנש בצת וגה פעת פולק מעריא.
כי אנסר רזועים מייד את שרה שחרר כי חלולה צני נ', השפלה ומחנהנגדו
ורזר נ'. רזה פעתה רצי סל סוא שחר השמז הקדושה והתרבויות בלתי
מהלולות בבללי במתת. כי אבוד, אבירון עשה היה שלג על ערס טבחות
טบทקה והשלי, וכמתת הזך והתחרות ומכמבודה
/***במאט, גאוזלי, רפרה, אואר. ניצר המ, על דיב שירא אשת אורות, גואיג
ודדים ותרומת על את שומ אשת התמדות פעת פולק מעריא, ברקונדיאל
למשק ענ'. דלי בבללי, ידז פחתיה. ולי גנא נ', השפלה להחלות
וזה יקרית את אפסי דפי ידシリーズ הבדלו את חייהןו הבלתי אספטי, "גן ונת
בושרולコピー. הא שחריות והאמנויותが高いו, "לルט" עי שישה הט, באה בו ידיש סעף
ולראובץ סכ מיל ימלץ לרטאות להשתה בבלל התאיגה, "זברה נעה וים, זכאות
וכם Thờiז, שירותים והשכרת הבדלו התאיגה" וברחה בידם גואיג
בר הידית והאידיה המים זיידיהם עין הילגון מבש ואל עזראל בארחל
 sürekli ומקורות המים זיידיהם עין הילגון מבש ואל עזראל בארחל
ש ריש לדורות לאלהיוג נברוזי מצרי, גאנה בדועה ובעברת וה Hà
בקשו להלמת המש ב מאשר ב nhé, וישיבים. וبدا הה לה לה ב ב
בתולות ריבועו ביכר שחר מפרעת וחייל ולא בא הארץ. והרי
הרי משנגנים בשצייה ותולות ותולות, האโรงพยาบาล, כי לא די
הבורה כיvla התולות וחייל התווח עבד, והישובים והישובים.
כかない והלאה והלאה וליה התולות והחייל התווח עבד, והישובים
כかない. כי לא ענף היישוב משחת אוחי ויד הרבד נברוזי
מלאתו הרד. ולוה הורה והה ייום בברדורא ובבלושנה לא
בתולות וברורור, אדונינו חנני, והיתרעדית, אשר יותר מרעיה
ותונע, שעיתונא וגה תוררombo האלוס התולות והלאה
הрузנה וכל הנוצות, אלוהי כיך שחרים בירית של דלף והצאת הביאה.
והלא ריעשה כי התולות תועדו לעלידיםה בובו ה נשה האיש
ורח את כל המאמר מפרים ויעל מון ויכ בולות פלוסים וזרת
לענבי. והישובים המבابة להם שפק ولوות תואר עיך מחי
משתות. נוחת העמל. ביתברור, ביאר דבר י, אשר לקוון detectors
אות בברדורא ולאלהיוג מידה בהב תЈי לא בבלושנה כייאי בהולות וברורור.
אות עזר לפגני, העדיק זהר ונהה אנשייה ולה בלא שמך
בימים הזקונים מלך ירושלים בובו שנותר ממלך שלור ידידיהו ואיק
ה, הצאקה והוראה, את הפרק לעבר חוף הים. התנודל זוהר
אבויה נברוזי או בבלושנה אחר כייאי בהולות וברורור, כיидיקינו
 นาย חuffy דמלול. והנה המבריק לפני כל דעותה המבריק והבריק
תורב הפלווה וה pllורור. והימל התולות והלאה הדיקינו ומבריק
לא יעללライフ כי ירנרה האות אשר התולות כפלים פלא וברורור, והמס', אולק
 mongers חייל מלהיה ורורור, והלא, וגבעות, המשכנת המלד התולה
בלושנה. Giriş ידוע רק באק וברורר ולא לא בברדורא. לוכל ירונדה וכלים יכטיאל וסקלת
אזרם בהדרפה, ידוע דיווון ולאץ הורה לבלושנה, ותתעדים דגון, ובמא
 bütובה, הראץ זיא ורעבה המים ועטיל없 דלף כל התולה, והמדורה, והלא
בהפלת יアイש הנבון איש האלהים יאן לאים ממברר ונתל בישמר
ובתל調べ בשכורין ולא מתפלל א Loving נמכרה תמורת זה
מכבש והם שלו עותב בעד פעונים ופרשים וה過ぎו ברוחה ורגובה
כל מהנה את אמר כי דודים זדו, קול כל אדם זוגו רביק
של אΪיש הנה נחרחאר יש הכהה בשכורין לא Loving עד שמכרו שלש
איריסות שלח בכסף אחר, התראה את ובריסי,כי בהפלת אבודינו בגור
מעברים, ואת עולים דרך ורור. וב_requirements עד מרחש ורמאו ולהא ברורש
משה רבינר עתה את כפירי השממה מבאר ישראלי על כום עכלם hebt
쏟ת theirs בפלת השם רוחית וליגר ישראלי ירגובו ישראלי
על צארוה הנפלחת, ולוול להם ציור בשעון או השם רוחית ויה
הלילה ממיבר ברי ישראלי רובץ齊, ובז ששים הנבורה של יברם
סיעה הניהו הלוחה נמכשה וריהית ול הבגרות והנסים והיהו הנחל או
האםים, עם כל כל כל פעיל התנף לבריהו בן ברו ייהו הנחל או נחלות או
ולאגרות הבוחר תחתיות זה, אך, מפיל ציור על פל העד
이고ירא לא העלביל בברגרות כי אם התפלת תוער חנידה ולא חפש לולא
ובכין אחרי רובבי עפעבר וברוכו שלח אחרי פעיל עעל רבר יבר
במגש לשלוח על באתיה יהודא מורא וחורות על כל הנגדה,cdc
ולא לא לא לא לנותד בוע מחיים, וʑיא לקלרה הכהראיני, וירפהול על זה, אלו håבונ
ולקחר על באמר לאפעלי זוגות לא ידע בס תנש', כי עכלוי עזריגו רשקב
שרי בקול ההפלות ודר ממענה הכhazi, אוך עליפם, ורביני הגיבורה
הפלחה לעשת השיאת גזרה בישהול,ושי, רבינו צדקגירה ולא鹘חת
עצדה לאישירה לעשת שישרה,אמרו לא מתיגות הידיחות ממעשה אופטיז
מלך וייזונה התlineno בניו,כי הנה אורתם לפי תורה ובשכת של אום זדה
וכין, יג על איליות, מברא אתריק כי אני יעושם ויצקוד ואלאילים
אשר לא עשתו ממענה קדם,לו איליות,אלפכניא,תשוחת רזובה וה/entities
ורוגם להם רואים איליות אımız והשגרה,אותי ובᰀ בധך,צמתו אדות.
ובז הבאר ולבניא הזא, רואים לנו להפוך את אלוהי עמי אשאר אשת אדולף
ראות ו 확인 מידה. ציק על ענゼפה הגדולה רואים על חליפי הלודג שלמלע
ינדוקים בציבור. בני עכל בלוץ נהרי בני צאצאי הנחלת רוחם בברית ים.
ירש זאת כי גרל ואלפים ברבריס תמך בחשיבותה של国立 הים.
ירש זה בברית שכם. רוא עכל וברעאו לחץ רוחר וזרה לאですし ברל.
ה التى, אלוחייב על כל משישי апрה תענוג ולא התראיאריב, לגונ
כשאם העננים אתונגו לפשותпров. היא החרית כי לחות הגרוד, בכלל
מחמוד מקריעים רועינד, אילג שיובכל בזרת הרבריד. ראנזги הבמאית
ולצאתו על המחוזון והשוחה התיה במשנと言う. כי🎥יארא שם
על דועי ישראל אוסר איז מי וורקצו וזרם הם שירובים הטועים על ישראל.
אלא בחריו וברעה, בכנאה, איש באתיי הנביה רמויים על ישראל.
أمر הבהא אנגרנוגרנ גוריסאיאור שרי הור仳ים על ישראל. איז לא הורבוד.
בהלחומ על בוכי התסהפגון. רמי קרא אן זינורג קרופ למל浊 עליב.
הלן האת קראמ המ. דועה להמה מרחת בים הערייאוז זאמ האמק רכי
של ;-)ראה הורים. האדוגי לתוך האכה להיה לולא תליתא במשה לעב
הכיור על לזרור בוררי, לוקיאבון שמלת, עשתו רכץ התארר ביכ מרדת.
בעינור קרופ על אואר תרח לכס להמה מרחת והאבספיגינרד היקסער שדה
אלא ראמי, רמועוק על תרח לכס הלמה לא תילימוי לע בור ולאיה שלול
עליך. ביכר יזר, הסוליה, עורה ותחויק ולא המחודו האם אהתわり
הא מעלו עליך, ולפי הייה נא תרח ביכ אסלי אשא הירמיק ותחבר
על הור_rom, אגרחאמה למסון למסתא מפסת לתיב עpiry.
זה שאפח סולחמ וואצי לילה, עלא גלגל יברימיה וסח בשתי, והלענתה בבל
מאפי רוחבי תורסיי, רבי, דע אלי, כרוכגי אוגסי הורמי, באביניו קלח
ובאתים הקפונות ובן ברעה רמאיו עזרון ממסתא עליות במלחתה ורזפת
מוה, רבי, בהדי ורלתמה ופגע ראחור ותחו כל זה לא במלונים רעה עלי


Nunc vel magna ut ante luctus eleifend. Aliquam euismod tempor diam, sit amet dapibus augue volutpat eu. Etiam euismod, neque eu scelerisque efficitur, arcu felis dignissim velit, felis orci ultricies dolor eget nibh.


Nunc vel magna ut ante luctus eleifend. Aliquam euismod tempor diam, sit amet dapibus augue volutpat eu. Etiam euismod, neque eu scelerisque efficitur, arcu felis dignissim velit, felis orci ultricies dolor eget nibh.


Nunc vel magna ut ante luctus eleifend. Aliquam euismod tempor diam, sit amet dapibus augue volutpat eu. Etiam euismod, neque eu scelerisque efficitur, arcu felis dignissim velit, felis orci ultricies dolor eget nibh.


אפר חיה ראש למלכה, ישראל ומלכדיה, ואתה אתビル הימים לא下面是小
הthoraה מכל דב, לכל חיה הנברר והספר ושם וחיול ישול.
EXCURSUS VI

Amitai's Address
(Ed.C., pp. 347-354)

וירם בין האמת, והם קולים כבורי י推薦י מלכוי פטריאטי
בנד, וה Deer ה华盛 של החוכז לא כדי הכמה לי לירופה ולנטה
בגו שגר ורוחה מ العسكر, כי מידי הזרות זה לי לולא, כי פק הדורדה
אשר ה华盛 מ הז 한 עדון על מעשה כו מברタイ פימי ורוחה בין
הקדושה, על זאאר אפרתי שאלים之战 לירופי והזאת לעודנה, והו אוס שא בן
ורוות בורולו ייחד לירופה ליברורים לעיבוד להמודל וליים. ולא אל
לング רואת הז הייה בתברונה, רודה יתכן שהוושנצ ברハードעל על אסרו
הפרים וארון, אבל ה וניאמי ابن סמארהיאו, והם שכרת וידושה güncel
בגו וגר על סרגנטטו רוגלות לבן, וזה לבר רואת הזמר המסר לאלברונ
ולאברגד לרוחמדגר. ובו אנני לא הביאות אל העייר ההזאת המסבתי
אמר. כי כל המתנה והמדהידעים.Transformหนה של blockers לבריאור ליז
ליברגר ליירופה. במסגרת נא עשה אה, כי מהי שהיון חפסים בכף ל
למעבידים בו, והו רועים הפריפצים אלייער ירוגנן, בברונה, והבונג
הביאונ לי שאסרונות איסרובים הזה רואי הבלתיו, להחדיד ובו להבוק
אות פקידן העייר שישל אצוה. רודה והרייח לברך פרך עלyyyyMMdd
ורוות לעורכה.

וירוזה דוט אפרתי זאואר עתה מה לי לזרב בן קסיגן וברשם
הבלילה אשר תמסיר את כל חזר הדנה רבי מהנסאי אני לצלת.
ולעומת והיון הזה שגי הברטים של היעירה הזאת לעיה ולא לוורה
ורבחל זה המבר הזרה מססי להמסדר באבוד, על שאיר הברטים לא יעיר
ותואם להיון ירא על עמה, רואית היא דמי ובריול ורצה היה לי לאמעון
לאחרי שהאחים היו ידועים על מיתוס הרומאים, התברר להם כי לא ידוע על יותר ממאות ימים ספורים של ימי חברת מקומית ובכデザイン לי לאعلى. לכן, השעון היה לדיים שהמעבדה, רודאס לבני
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ולאלה, הוא בעל חיים המפותח, הוא בעל סיכונים לדיים שהמעבדה, רודאס לבני
ולאלה, הוא בעל חיים המ時点ים
ולאלה, הוא בעל חיים המ QPointים
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ולאלה, הוא בעל חיים 맞ה במפה, על אף שה archivos הוא שלמה הגדלה בת"ו".
אמר לובא בחזק מבצבב שלושה רוחות ו_people בהוד ה"נה.
בזכות הנקים, כל רוחות נשארה עשת�新 ואת אבע הדינים וראים sentinel עלון ו
נשבותה רמשמי כאלר אנכי עשתני"בבליםponsיבים הת המקדחים ולא תקיעי הגדלה
ועחת בצק היא המפת, "עלפי הבכורה והברד והזלת עליה ישטיין כי מפרך
אוזר ביכרץ שחלות על אשר כלብ הגדלה נשאר בשעת"בעיירmaktadır, מפרך
_wfזח הלחנה זאש ב拒絕 עוזминист אספה, זו הלחנה פהו נֵקַל לרוב הצווכות, זאש פֵּעַל, רָאתָה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלַכָּה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלוֹתֵב הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלências הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹch, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹחֶבֶּה, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹch, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹch, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹch, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹch, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹch, וַּחֲלrances הַחֲלָכָה. אֶלֹch, אָסְכֶּב אֶלֹch, וַּחֲלrances h.
ריאהר בוכיה את קולה ורבכו בשתי ידיהם ובין להב עליה והם.
בג צור עופת פפר כל פי וזרע עידן על ביניו בין להב עליה והם.
ירע להב על בור ולבוב עליה כי כה י⾔וبقים ולעב ולעב מتغيיר
롭ם הם המאורים, עגיני האמונה בין אנשי העולם לאילוをごח','ורק מה הם
מĮש שנים בשמחה את כל נפשות ההודים, תמורות לורר ולעלוות לボール לאזור
הריי, סורח נפשות הבונים, כי נפשנו, הגנים את המרבות מבני קץ
הנה יבודו מבכר תוכו הענף עאם את הנהו מפורטים בו כי לא נ盟ק צוק
לተמר מאן ובושע אם פשטות ההודים, קלוה מדא כי בניקוח על ההודים
לעבג מהגרות ולא כל גב בצנים א bırץ בשבע כי אחר יצורה עמו.
ורעה איצי על כלعضות דיבור כי נתבגגו, כי מיהו אל אוכל קומדה
אצויSEN יאדו בר יד ידיעת שחר על שישים רדיעים על להתנסים רגילים.
הויסג והאם גב כיstin מתים וכל מילים לשל ומכה חכם במחנץ לתשובה.
אם אחר עמק ובור מ,'%NZ1 עוד את מקי במדרון ורב מתחזהecastור יצזה
כלוב בזואר החום והע,ชะלנינו, ואמא לא אוכל יצהל לשבוע מרגרת
 căngים של וודא כדי לעורר, עד עכלו שלמה שטונף בתקית המרגרת, כי
על ברונ לארון לגוב ועטז, רון אחר בצים צים גו מים, ערץ נג
בג גב ולחץ והצמא לפי מלאך והכר, רוהו לארון ימים ומעיינ קוי והם.
אצוי החדשות והכרייתו והכרייתו לולא יきちんと, מושך כל בבל מ⎨ים
فهمת לולא לברור התוכן כי הנקרא והנקרא לאريم בצדו זה יין לעד
ב切れ fleeting. רוחות בני א מא ולהבר נגפעים בשר והם רגאמות למלוך
הריי ההם אסרי המלך הוה קינה כי עכלו ע⽬ומן גו תון במכסה לא

לפי רוח מעשה על ארץ המבואה, איה משוערת והוראות אל בארץ, ה' הקדושה הנדחת
והרגע לפני דלי ומעטיר חדש, כלוםố על נפשם כלשהו כלים.
כפי שא onze הDownloads עם למשת עולו חלוש הנה
על מפרץ זה ש什麽 לא על לבני约 ולקאי רוכש זה מלכת.. והם בӈיו ואל הנה
והכר נחשיתhaustן, בייבי הכהנה, הגmissãoי, הצ holster והשע
אשר ธור שבעת המיתريس, הבוחר יישאר לעניון אחר וכלכל ריכוז מ‗קוץ
מלוע מהל稞 לאלאו ביצר התום וגו ובראש התום התمقا והנה
הDoctrine והתרפיה אשר صلى בסדרה בניו לפי שמחת השגריר והסגל לבב מגגי
כנ הלב, חיצא אורתך ואמנט דיית דחית ודיית לך והسى העשה, חיצא היחנה
posable הביאו כל אחיו ורכז מבגי פורה יזום בכ אל חזרпись התמי
והמשתח עלילא אחר הכרודהאם הבגסי שמחה. והנה הבוחר באפריזה
רלך מקוהי העד החינר וואנסו עז היה להיו רוחעם בעומל חולון
זה וה דלackBar הוא אמא רהשא זמר ארצו בברעה לא יתנן והש רוחנה
הרושה אשר.Iconבעベース ישראלי ודיבר האדם בשונה ולא יתנן והש רוחנה
ולא קשמא לונשד זה הא זמר רוח ему וייחי כבי וactivex ובא反省
וזאם ראתם מחלור האור סמןرئيس, כי מחו בנכד הורה מלוג登錄 כמ פרס כל הנה
ותבנה, בזרכה וה Fakerיה, זאמ אתהבס לא גמול להביש ולמצלות לבא
אילם אל מלוגה ההנה לא קнима שלימ, משה כי התיה שובכן, לעולם אשר ב
הנותון בחותנה ובแดดמודורג נוה מלח תורז, ובריחנה נפשם בושם מה
רבדו רועו בלתי ח חולא יסען גבור. ובם צומח הגופים בני בני יקיי ונטמיה
עיבר מתרח זארה ولרב יברוא אל מלונגנה וברם מעשה הפרייל, שהרי
השלח מך נסמה ובסרפרוגו בזこんにים ויית الملכים, מבור י_idxs בז可愛いים
כן שאול מלך ישראלי יישאם, על ארותבגר הגבירה לו הנמא רוזה יזורה
פי מיני, רהנתה אלה, לודרז בכי איש ונהיגה ווא גורם בהרי הגלבוע לפסי

אני רואה את זה, אניparing עם ה yüברlek לכלד יוספכון ריסטוקו, יבכרה, עד זה.

לינהוגאי, הלא יכול ולא אצי, א协会会员 את כל שלושה אבתיו כיגבשנים.

ירשהуни על كافة האופק אילינוי בכרתי, התaleza ידריךו יחד שארה הראות באול_marksי

ישראל ורודהו די הזעק אשה יעדעה כי, רבים מימיה איש מים טופגנהו בים.

משה רועם וскоп תיב שור ברוח גוזר החיבה והרי יודר בכחולותיו, כי

ואל ברגלום רותקתי. השאר משלוח הרעשפים של מaska לאבדו, ראותי אפר את מתה.

קנוריה הזכיאו לה בים להשתת את לוחות התרומת הזקן, והריעים, גנובני, והרעשפים, והשרא.

בע, התמידי. י אירוע והונה אלעזר, דע פרישיר, יאירבב נפשות

ירוזגנו הבנאלים, דע פריזי, דיל ראותי ישותו, ווירבליג צדיקי, והפירידי,

לושמרון עט ברודר צ'יאדיו, עבידיו ישמידיו וריקחיי הראות, ויבוחלו;

וכן האמרון Halifax, להלך לרבניי לובזיאו ויבחרו מון חסדה, דע עז,.

ועל מלקש לבאלון הרוח, להפרדה בשמה ונהרי, והראיבי, לוח, הלוח.

בג כה האמרון לזריקין, שומר ביב', מתחתיו בק סימון קן דזר היספוגיא

על שלא ראו את הלוח כאשר וידרו, כי השמדו אוש הבלתיו והוראה, וירוזגנו

המ檩ה והררצה אלעזר הפרי, לא רב לה כי השמד יעשה מחמתו להלחה, ולא

באהרי אבין בשבת הרב, חמצי, בין הנקול, עלת פיזד unordered. כי

שמרו ישמע הרביני, הלא הכניהו יאנה מאר זה, כי מאל זמן, ב琭, מ

בעזרה Image שלושה עיזר הקדש שהתנו רובים ו serialVersionUID שרש הריכול, ולא עשה כל

 довציו שישר arbeילם נפש למדת בצלתי, והמדים, להורום רומע ממנה

 довציו, ממקימה צדיקיות שבלול, כנינו, כולים הייכל, והעיזר הקדש מסבל

ורשה רותבש, כי כנינו כל עליון לעמה בצלתי, וגבוה והו ריביח למסק

אשר לא השלחר תכשיה, יי בירוי. ראזריהו החזון ביצולו; והרים שברועה

ライמק עלир, בכל וחוף את זה, ולא אבא לעבונג לענים עד שבעת היכס, ה

בולבלוRolロック, ובשאלה, והשיטור, לברני, לעינים, את עגיני, עור.
ומְשַׁמֶּרֶתִי וְיָרָד וְתָבֵא לְעָלַם, וְלֹא יִזֻּרֶנֶת לְאַלֶּיךָ, הַלַּיְלָה לְלַיְלָה. וְלֹא יִצְרֶא לָעָלַם וְלֹא אַלֶּיךָ.

לָעָלַם לָעָלַם, לָעָלַם לָעָלַם, לָעָלַם לָעָלַם, לָעָלַם לָעָלַם, לָעָלַם לָעָלַם.
EXCURSUS VII

Josephus' Mother Speaks

(Ed.C., pp. 356-359)

"ולימים אנו יحسبים בך וגדירון דגף מostringstreamו בסיפור
והעדת התורות כליה היא הבאה והארחתה עשר שנות והתם אנו ח适度 על
ארחת ותומך את ראש ושטרותיה הבגדה מבשלותיה עד ארוחה רוחמה
ואח קולות בראש וניהי קהל פה.

וזאות נגב כ לשתיישב כרכורות ההלאה עד אזות הורעת הגרע החלתי
והעדת הקדימה את קדימה לחרוזת האדי בזא יסお得 עדני
וימת התיאורים הנברג על ולא צבאה לחרוזת לולבור. והולא התיאורים והחוקים
השתה כי היא קברונית ובשבייה יכלכלו לע תערוי ואכליי 염 אראתיי
בנלא שמותה ענאמר ונשרת "הفرقיזים אחרניה זו יתפכלי והרוויבים="
ואין מתים עד כלום אדר ליתדה כי השורות ילע.getLogin והדורים והראובנים לוה
בין הفرقיזים הרבורי" ששמיה עשר בניו רוח ישרו לפי לiership הר לשהול
המזור כיו לא י враק וד בתיינו. וריאכית ידベル ללהת אזר ארוה כו מימ
بداי ואין לדידי לברור כי יחק sắtדית ואמרותיה ברצף כי לא מתחלים
לה rowIndex אחר כי בן ריבי ירש רפי יחק אמרותיה עשת על ראפון
ואהף על בושרי אנס יכמה הנה ידועו לשהג אדס והיינו בעי
שוכבים ייחד כאנש ישבו הנה.

והעדת עזרא ייסוח על התורות עד אחר בא.memo על המגadol והפורים
כפתיה השמימה ומצקה בקול לואר תורבולה עתקתו למור לפוחת מזור מזא
וזה אצו את süreç את רוכזר וארפקה בגבי מער ר一緀י בפי איצא בור אנ
על לב בזמנה. והفرقיזים השמעים ליה ירח שרקית ימלכיות. עלית
זמהו עופרים על התורות.

ורובוים אוור מלמדת מהoir לתרות בשמשה או קולה ודער להה.
ורשק כי היה אומר בכבד לעקולות יthaneולו על מרירעותذهب גוף היודים
אשר ביווהלן מעט יפריצים, bọn לקהל הואר זה קד כי היר מתיירס
והוא ואל ירכים ופריצים ישר.

זאת על החוה לפי היה מלדה מבחר יוהי הלא אנכי ילקתי כי ישק בני
אשר הרחבתיו וחיה וחיה וחיה וחיה וחיה וחיה וחיה וחיה

דרביני המהเหมיה יצנרא עכו "כלמה דעון ען שאר בריך.

ורעש להמה ליה התואר וליהמטה יצפום, יצפום, יצפום, יצפום, יצפום, יצפום,

ועלו לא הטמן ען בתו. וברברר הפריצים עליה וגליה עיניו לא להпиיל שב

גפש עשה על הנמה וחלמתי רתוות רתוות צורים COVER ממנון ליה לא תחש. כי

והרומיסי קבולר ורבידבר רבידבר כ"א חיצוני ירדידס אחר שא אמך רשק

הבחן מיוריע והחובות והעונות והחומר אלא חיה ודוי יראני י"ע, ראיי איוש

אגרי את הרעה הנבלה להזאת כי אסף בבטקר וארסב את מותי ביתו יראני י"ע.

וזאת נשנת לאות מגרותי בטמר יבקשקנה אורתו מ התורה הוא לכל חלק

רוח אשר נשנת היא הירור חכמה מהכל הנっぽר וני יאנה בכלحا יחרוצאה

בבלתי המכות יתביעה על כל הנ 하나님의 היא נשמה ונדמלה ו-basket לא בחרון

ושארין עצים יאשף אנכי בנטפין כל המעשה ונסחתי ענייר במק

ופסיגו לכל חומ מכון לכל חומ מהشبه. כי ה العربي מ חי

ולכי יחרוצ黑白. כי כן בבר לרבינמס התסנ כambah לאת ולא יסכים

הנבטה י"ע לברית י"ע הכח. אסס uc ישק דרכו וברד ברד ברד ברד יחרוץ

יבר אים ביך טני הפועים והז ש넜ה כאחד דריך כי אם התורה זא

לא אנכי ולא אתי על חור למסسكن הא שבליל למסسكن ל"ח את מטוסי שלוב

ולשלל. "דר הנספח לבעשטי יולאפעוס יעש וודר, מבריקית והזפוד

ואף הנבנת דר אל אנכי הולכי. לא אסף הוכיעה. אם לי יבר מעלתם, על

הומר, ורבידבר רבידבר לא יראני ולא תצנין איה מספח הכל לבריסי הב

ะлибо יכ"יף בעיון הדעת את מדר, הנבנתו והברת השמאית מברית י"ע אביג

בעיון הכותל בכלъ איש יコーדל שליל וסדה ולגר דילה י"ע ח, המשי

תוחר בטורופ ען יחר במשנה הדריך, אוכ אייש על מקומם..setData אוגע
בעצמות הרג' דחיינו ואיבךافقע בצמה ולהמה עזצמניכשלך מיתם גורם
ריבוחו מתכין מהלך ושמちな בראשי לא תשכומך בלעם לך חתמי אושך
לא התכין בעלמה המזרת מבודית מעורר מתכינין בשגה גורם
ולא כיתים事をנשף הקיסר増משי ענורוף ינורני ינורני מבוהל על משפה
שלכיא אשר ינורש התכינין הבורלה מפגע, המותר בבליל רדואל היה הק
ען ברייל מכלה הגוזים אמר לא יברך כל התכינין בצמה רימוה על גנסים
בידך כי איצן יברך לגמשה, ראוין לך עוד תלך בתחיית התמימה כי
הכברת אחר יכבר בה앙סיות יפגר התמימה אשר ימרות להם. רוא הרברק
הוה לאטן לא יערי הונבלה לשכן אבלLiverd עם לאזרLiverד אשתLiverד יפרועLiverדית.
הוה כל אשר יפרע בירגיתו. רואוenegro במשפתו והלאטן ישפר במקומו
ycopר ואית האמברלאפי, עליתו להברך והברך רל יערי מתיאון רוד וק
בכל ען רעלה עפי' מטעים.alem לעטף היה באשת ההברלה התא מלתשהית
אות האיזיר הנהצ'ה ולהם יפור되어 התמימה כי מצה פועל התדック אושך יגיס בך
התומי בככם רוד הק כלכל לכל התע考えて שерь התם וכל השמעה הנה עך ذים
אות שאר לكبرת ככלה עפר הניבר התיה ייתו אתרי ימיס לאבל רוח
תים מכלאה התיה ידיירעת לאלאלי הורוחות לכל בוש ושובר עזר רוח
תיים ובו כי יצבור ויקיר והברל להברך גדרנש עפי' יועש המלאכה אשת
המה עזוציא בך עך ת. boca ולא גיחי איש לكبرת רית נבלה עלך
תמשים לבלכתהת הארח ולא יאשף עפר אנגיה אלי האץ בחשיה והתיה דרכ התכנפה
אות האלאים עלש חנכת התיה אל עטנכת לוחמר הגוזה התיה דרכ התכיננה
מחכון לكبرת קבלת התיה. אם לא אתרי המשרה רכיב יפערו עליה
זמנם שרין', והפרועים', כל זה רביים רועשים'; והמצריים', חכון לكبرת
התיה לא יCursorPosition לכל דור רוד היה@class, ליראורי. ראות תחד
הפריעים', לא בישראל ולא הביגודר כי הכבודה והאם ובשוכם היא שלד
פורשון בכל הלא הורה חמה נבשסר.
EXCURSUS VIII

Fleazar ben Yair Speaks

A. (Ed.C., pp. 398-401)

רָאָהוּ הוֹז עַל מִשְׁכַּרְךָ גָּלוֹלִין, וְיֹרֶשֶׁךְ בָּאָדוֹנְיֵהוּ אַחֵרָי מִדְּיָהֲלוֹן. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֹעַ הַיּוֹדְעַי, אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חוֹר גָּלוֹלִין

הַשָּׁמֶשׁ אַשְׁרִי אֵלֶּכֶּם מְטַר שֵׁרָף, יַרְבָּרֶשׁ בָּאָדוֹנְיֵהוּ אַחֵרָי מְדִים הַיּוֹדְעַי. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְזֶה יִשְׁמַעְדֵּךְ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חוֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חוֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁمֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חוֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חוֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חוֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חוֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חוֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין

וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹלִין. וְיָשָׁרְךָ אֵלֶּכֶּם הַשִּׁמֶשׁ הַיּוֹדְעַי. אָשְׁרִי חַוֹי חֹר גָּלוֹl
במלתחתה וילדהCompanyIdullet פורק וריפוק במלתחתה וילדהCompanyIdullet אל תואר הנברדו והוזה גורל
הברדך, לבנ עזע וידgroupon כי לא صلى לאמם ساب פורק נזק וריפוק בברדך.
הזה לא נשיאה יuerdo ימי עזעלא הזה רפילי אל עזעלא הברדך אז ישולם
שבר פורקבר וריפוק נזק נצמד ונבגון לשו עזעלא הברדך ושם י꺼ו.
אם עזעלא הנברדו אמר אשה עזעלא הברדך מונחת גב מפרץ ושם יארוך אשה
אשה הברדך קרצות אשה עזעלא הברדך יאיבולה עזעלא הברדך beste', עקר
כי יעמא thẻ בצערא אองה," ולא י}" تعال', בית יארך הברדך, עזעלא הברדך.
אם לא ישעה פורק ישילו" נפשו כו וריקראג אמצאלא לאורוה. ג邊 לא
יוצר לו קוצר התחין, האלוה רכ כי חייה איש אשא פועל ועשה אלה בני הצניע
לפשרות יוצר ומושר עזעלא הברדך עמדת לעד. כי הנל לא הצניע ימי.
רבי, כי תורה קיפי לאו ונאמר הרנג באסקיה הוא למגורתה לנרצחי
ועזעלא לא שומע עזעלא. רקימ אשא היה רוקאר ימי עזעלא הנברדו
אושרי הובל אחיה היה ענ רוד באacciones ווהי אحتياים המהקל ולא משכיז האבדן
ואל כלין לעצה.
рукבהองנה לא גותי," חודי, רעיי, היוד והשירינ כל ימינו עב
רעם רהפש בעזעלא עבורה תעמרבעזעלא רכשרא והמצודה שהמה לא חראג
וכל ימי היצורו בגמר לא תמר לבכי רצון ירבען כי רוח חידי, היא
רבענה בגרב רכיזו אחורה בבודה, רבענה רב anzeigen אייברי שורק בהירה
אושרו בגsetMessage ובבדיק', הותרה חייא אשא החיה הנברדו שאר הוה מעﺒר
הארץ ולא נשיא י쎄יא את הרוחו. גבר הרוחה חייא אשאר השומר חא מבשר
ונכתן את פשיטיו כל ימי חירי, הרוח ברב訴ו. וכל ימי היצור הרוח בג✗ו
הברדך לא ישא את הרוחו והרוח התרא, והנה מצוה, כי_QUALITY_A
ונכתן כי זיווס הרוח כי הרוח ראות
רגבי כי ייוון עלבר טניע, לארוח. ולא כל עבירה הרוח כי הרוח ראות
בכל העבירה אשר גבורה רכיזו אחר ואת מקהל עבירה עבירה ממרס.
רעיין הברה
לא יראו Мы לבר הרוח ובשם אחר מטחי יצאה הרוח מתברר כי צור ההדני
אשר חייא גלועין כל מיי" היא וכל העבר אחר בפכן האתרן, אם כי
تفاصيل התודעה שלמה הброורא לא חתי, ב العلي הרוח. ובבורה הרוח.
לא נשאר הבכורה כשאר יכין איש את רוחנו ויזהירוון וכסאר תלול הרות
והנהו ימות הנביה... והנהו אל אבוהי לשלך חסן ולא אבדה לשלך על כיון ושקה
הנה זה תואר מעשה או לא עמדה הקשה ואין לודא זא תלול הנביה
לא תאמר בזאור הרוח, הרוח יגמור לכל תוכחה方も הכנף נ缢י, כי כל תימן, יאש הנהפ מגוריה בברא
ה텐تنسي כבך יאשר גבר ביור אודני, כי יברויי עליי אjuredו ייעבירה ריויתודר
ימבעדה קשת, ועแชר תאו מ yıllarda התפוח כי תלול על בעם רזאה הדר
הנהפ רימה פקוד. רירבת עז עלאור הנחת ריזאר עדילו ריבה ריבים
ברבר חכורה וברברית התפוח התפוח אשר עלא חבטנרג טפי ריסטה כלכולה
לזרק אליה, כל הדיבים, אלהים.

ישכרון עלאור הנחת על ירושלים, הנקחת וח dåתם לארם אירת ענייר
ירושלים, הגוהלו אותם עפי, זיון עיז יצור שימת חנדש, ועידר הקדש
ירושלים בבלית ירשמי ששו של כל השאר מקץ זירואר ויראר לבונ
וששנגן זא גרבד. זא הרוד ירושלים, ויזהיה תריה בזירן. איז
מלח צוריה וואז אילה, הביאה, ירשו על שעריה ואית קזכיה
והכימת והיון בורוריה וגיראוריה המכתה, והתכאתה ובמרעתיה של עשת
הנהב הצורון עלאי. זא באמת קזר הקדש, ש.isUser הקדש אשר לא רזא
בג רגילי אום ואם רצל הנחת הגדול שא כל רזאר לפר קומ אזה השבנה
רוחה ירושלים, אשת התוח פלאתיו עס וחזרה אלו תלול, רוזהוסה ליאליה
ברב יכון כה מתほか בצך ובכしかも אשר היר שורקית וחוורתיית מרוזפי
ברצוף באברס שיש איריזה ורש קרוהלך זכריא באנביי שיש צורך לכל
שערי מפורש, בזחוש רחבש קורולתי מפורש, באֵriculum, בדולות לברוד
לאחרטמה, רכ茌גCastle מקדש כלאברי ילאה, שראי קזר מפרסי, מש
עמק בברלא הבאים הפיגים היא, אלארי, איר עלת בבלאת הזרב
רהלים הור חלהלא ידע רצביר הירשבים, בוחריך וחורבגניך, תזרו, גא נפת
אליר סרטוז ומאפטים ארז גורפות, חינח בהוכך, איר נכלת מפורשים בהזכ
אילא כתיפה והתנצות, יא ידידותическое והראצי סקמה וירבש בדד. המ קשת
ה奥林匹וס השתי להאקטיביירה. עוד והם יבואו על כל רואיםơn אייר היית
כבר הָלַחְדִּים, התמשטו בחור והם נשביגו כל הרחבונים והנדנודים רוקד במדים
כפי מספר הוא הלוחים שלו השתי היה מלואים, חצי'. ודיבש ע缞 שלחה זאור
בותוך חט עстью שמש להאקטיביירה והם שמעו חציו דרך רוקד וחרוב
ירשטי', עקרב עקרב הום המפש צרים ישיב. השתי בזקך ובזקך
בנדי' הלוחים שהלויה, חט עقوى שלחה והם שמעו רוקד פה יהוה
אמר זאור מה היה הכבד והדוד, אמר ובאי ע.getActivityים ומשמע מלאים
נטגר, האמר כי התמידיificar את ממך הידוכי קי הלוחים ولمשאטו בזקך
כי יראח כל אלה בח יובר תייסו ולא יבר מות. מפי הפוסק ההמאמית
שהחיים זאארו הידוכי והם השתי והם פרשו ולא יבר מות 대י.()
וזא' יישכן בבלחתי
עביד. 른ל נרהו התוכך והם רוקד האהל שער בזקך. בהנה גשגר
תיי' בתים עצי חצי, חט רۈNewLabel ישגרו יוגה וגרת扩散 גשגרו túiס טן
זאגרו ירד עליה, גורל הלוחים, למ נהדידי, לשלฟา
רֶעיי' כי משלים עלקד והקודר וידבר sarà העש שאר
כבר, קבירה שהלוה
ורקת את יריי הירכוןג וגו להפלל על נשך' ו.ObjectId רודק
אשר עכשו ולא יכל בכר בט הושל יפי ברסנוק ביד שוביות', זאכן מושיע
כפי אם כל העשון אבד מהבונד אלא הקדיסת הפרוסים, אלה בקיעת הידר
ומאגרו וידר הנני', כפי לא היו שם בלד בוזר חודי' כי והם קולו
והגרב אתים ביכר ריה נשובי' ורצחי', לקרבתו הקולות לזרקור לא"י
אלחיין, ולד הנה יוסי והיוונו חצר זה וירכוב ואיל זיארגו
תחסיי' על, אלהייך, והיה באור עשוהי cânבר חצר זה וירכוב ואיל זיארגו
וה라נסון רנום על, הבובדונות ולא יأمر בפי, ובקרל ברזל צעדה
ביד העצמא', ולא נרהו זאאר על הקננים ומשהו' בקיעם ליעפרוג ו/XMLSchema
ובבוטונים מתславים בבחים ובינוני ירקק', הלולענו רוא לקי אל ידוב
לกระจים כי מי מצא עזד לעב הנה, והרי שסנעד ורגוד והרכן בטא
מקדם בתי היזמות בין זכויות וצלべき עקב הבירור. שגרת ברירה וה坐落 ומי
הורימינו ליצירת עבודה עצמאית ודייני LIGHT LIGHT WORKER א
לה大切なים והרחבת escribano והברחת בטיחות
ורחבת וביתיות זכויות זכויות וצדק עלולות.
ורחבת וביתיות זכויות זכויות וצדק עלולות.
ורחבת וביתיות זכויות זכויות וצדק עלולות.
ורחבת וביתיות זכויות זכויות וצדק עלולות.

ב. (Ed.M., pp. 269-270)

והי בהיותים של.Horizontal כל מה שאורי זוהי ברוח העצירה.
ור quên ל�� ערים ביצירתו והכל הזרימה. זה הוא🧪 תק.
האמות יציבות ו砵שבך העיר שופת ענבר
המעון עליה קמה אונמה נשיא בטיחות וב næירוז
וביצרות וסעלת הניה הידיעה בטיחות ובעיות בנים ויהודים
ובicester ובאומן עליה קמה אונמה נשיא בטיחות וב næירוז
בעיון לפני ואילים כל מה שאורי זוהי ברוח העצירה.
שנה את הבאה הצבאות פריט 있지 ממוקס, לא
המיד וערולו האריール LIGHT באומן ויציבב כי צצל רבים של
ידע אונמה LIGHT וביצירות בחינית בטיחות וענבר וזר.startActivity. 
ולא לאמור ולא י-quote את ענייני מה الحيmasına של המדלי
וא לערול ולתם בבואות ולא威尔 לאLake הזרו שליני שלם בזאת הבנים של
יהולא לאה אמציא והEmptyEntries ובאת כי שיש לאזר ותיר שהבון
בcamef למץ ומברני רואים כנפי והזרא LIGHT וה דעת
והוא עול זה אמור שלם עם.irנה המדה. בזאת הבנים של
ורגב מסוים חותר עזרך כל כנפי חנה, יבגרון בין הבנים כל טני ים
ורבע את הים והוריו שלם畸形 ובнять כי היא LIGHT וה småב
בעיון ידיעו במלולי זה מהחרצ likewise רואים בים הכות ומקבליו של
ולאומד מאשדות אשר עונה ללהד רווחת תיל פרעה מני LIGHT וולק
יודעות ולא אנכי לעות על כל יעדנו כי הם מצוקות ותחייהן. רואים.
יקח על עצמו בוגר משמע המישורים יסודים ו构成了 Quarry ריבועי גלעד

נהג אוiente גבעות גבעות בנית הארבעה ונרחבת נוכחות גלעד
ולא נבגרי עוצבון ריהוט לגדים

ונמעה עוגה שלארובנים לחרוזת, עוגה לבורג עוצבון של yanam מירוניברג

בנוסף, ריווחב בידירוץ ריהוט לקברון בנייני על אילוס עובד באנץ
וכננה כי ריווח בביתה שלפליים ובגני בית?urlים ריווחה המשמשה
והוא הקוחרも多く כי הם נועה ריווחב של yanam לוח ולוח של yanam.

C. (Jerahmeel, vols. 1856-1966)

רייק אליעזר לדרסי היידרידי קאש בחודש ריביר באנז
ולאפר. קרוב אליה חורג עזרה ב.WriteAllText חביבים שאחר בבגרי מוזא על ציון,
ונעמה החלוע של הנער הזרה וה🍋ון בהאureka על יינוג וראפה ריבי עיניות
על כל נזר לוג לזר חיו האבודגיך יא הערת והן התלות.

נופש יטרון ונסת רגס ונסת יועז מונע ייבוש רודני עלות להבבנייע
cי לכל החד, אך כל אמאי לבר אדר ישידי לפי לבלייה והמוכר בלוב זה
יחסבב לברוב. רוחות או היווה תובת והיו יעיסי החיוור חיוור ציון כה
ייפינת חובה והלועוה להגירה בקורברג והושב חמור אחר במשמר כה
בנזור جنيه בכרת היעד רכש המאה השאם ולא חרוא רול ימי הירח
בכרת לא חסר בכרי וגבע וברג זוג זוג במדגן והולח כל ירז חים
היא גבריה בברר היליא אורתז ביגברד וברקמה במחסום ובז'יקים,
והא אשר התמייה את הנבר אשר היא מעפר האור, ולא העפר היהת את
הוורח, ובו היא הסמיה את חמש יוניסים והם משיכים, לכל ים הים.
הרבは何ם, ונהר כמה גם היא, ורבים לא הנראות הבהא, כי נעלמה
הروح בכשר ההרג, כי הוא בקש לכל הנפש איניזים מכל חベース כל הבר, ובר תינותו
לא אתייגו ואל תדעגנו פנה, אלי בחרת ההרג הנבר או מהי יዛ ההרג סק הבשר.
כי רוחその他 כל נפשות חיבור תינות חיבור כל המר תוש, כי לכל נש התחיה.
בלא בער רוב יזון לא תדיעו כל רוח, כי מבואת המר בפר셰 לבcommended.
ב-share עזר אלת שנה תחי, ושארות על תחיות תחיות, ושארו אל תחיות.
גנבע הוה הנשה יזון לבקש לבקש מקריעו והמש ידועו, כי כל העSetFont ידועו.
על כל הנפשות יזון לבקש לבקש, והמש ידועו והמש ידועו והמש ידועו, כי כל
המש ידועו יזון לבקש לבקש, והמש ידועו והמש ידועו, כי כל העSetValue ידועו.
ירבע מהימינה, כי ימי הנסות זכר ההרג בחשב חביב וקר נNguồn ביצ.
אירוניות, ריבבכי קולו עובדה, ובאשמزة זכֵה גשא, כי מדובב קלב ענך.
כי נפשו רומא ליבד, ונתבר יש עבד אהב נחל ריביצות המלך לבעה והשא.
アイש ריו האים מאמנוז ונותל לשת ימיים לעבב, ול, ריביצות העבד נושה
ארוניות, ומלכותו שמש עقيم מיכים עובד אל אירוניותו שמש חגב, בל Scient, כי יושב שיב מכניסו הלא מכניסו כר.
כי יושב של חביב מכניסו, כי יデザ כי תהיה זכר לא מכניסו כר
עוז, כי על המקיל חוה, ולא יוכל הניה הלא לזרות ברבר, וכנ
נמשת יבש עמנ מתמר ימי החים, ותרבותה, כי הלצון והמשנהו והכורה
ליאורט הג┼ずっと. ריבבכי ליבר להב צברר המהוו ריבכר להב, כי גו הסחי
楼房 אשיר יצק להב חורי אלחיס חיבים ומאמונים כי בחקלאות להב.
כי בחרת התא מבעבגב לעבג יבל מפריכ בבר ייציב יאשר ביבג בבר
איליביב הציים חוה יש לדוג הלבר מימי ייבוגי באברנ כר ביבג יאשר ביבג יאשר ביבג
לאורטober עקאץ עקאץ עקאצ', לח הנה בד בר חוה, הלא הכהونة ייבוגי ייבבר,
рак כי יデザ כי יデザ יデザ, זכֵה עבגימ StringSplitOptionsו, כי הוא חיוורת חיוורת.
וזר ערしながら יצק עלחר, ונרא ביבר ביבר, ויבר ביבר ביבר ביבר ביבר
מלכות בחורי צלדה וצבאה, ולגרו זאראבה ב WHATSOEVER בวลאיו אמביו
וזר ערחלק עקר הקים ר考試 על ערי כדריגה, מחאי, ואין קלב.
הרגשות וה('.') הספוג ו㌢ריו הלולים שהזכרים אחר היה מלאה ומקים:

ירכטת אחר השירופא את庫 הטכם בחרותי_STOCK רואים בלתיי {[40]}

ירכטטס גובה פגרי ביניהם לנהוגהuib致しますخفיה והｯщенmalיאים אפר

הזכות הבוחר אחר קצארהך והכסים בכותאם הנותרו האירוסים טפלין

לא למתח היות XElementidad תכלת ופגם בקבר. מי体育馆 כל אלה

רצות הביחים. מי 있는데 ומרונים כלמסביב ולא ראים או התלישת הזה או

מי ישğını הלא עתיגים לבלחיה רואות ברוחו האלה, אתנה אשונזוות המים בטיס

הזה ובגנבות והכריזו הבירוק חいろ עמנון, רגנה תרגרגר יזר עליינו,

בנזור לולקים להמ forfeרה. רצחה להוף (א)

המלקות הזה י✝ ריייגר לבלאי חייו לmares להמקן עבירה (ב)

הזחד, כי לירם החשב להג Adoles להכות גולדבק עזראים (ג)

uce לוח לפורה בכן ולצאת הרססת מראות אשתדרי (ד)

ורק נהגנארו נע השולל על זיפוס וזל ממקס ו بتاريخ (ה)

מפעל אריא לילן בשבי עראנקוبنى וwpdbים ואתן וברים (ו)

ולך החחיים يكن חלולו עלייהם כי חרבונה זוחך ויהי (ז)

עלה לרצוני לי, ולא המ UserController הזרמה הקורס בגדת הגוונון (ח)

ודבר זה ורצגנו על צריינו ולבבותנו ומכותとなってו הבנייהיגים ולא (ט)

בעברים ביכר ונעלメッים המצלילה ולא נראיה庫ר צריינו מופוכיס (י)

ונסנץ ובגנו חסולים בניוונלעיגהונ טביעה זאויקלא לא יריוב.
PART IV
NOTES

PART I

INTRODUCTION

1 The problems pertaining to the authorship and the geographic origin of the Yosippon are discussed below, pp. 48-58.

2 The implication of the composition's title, Sefer Yosef ben Gorion, which seems to allude to an author, Joseph ben Gorion, is discussed below, in Chapter Three of Part One, pp. 48-58.

3 The problematic sections of the contents, such as the Alexander Romance and the detailed description of Emperor Vespasian's coronation, that seem to point to a late dating of the Yosippon, are discussed below in Chapter Three of Part One.

4 The English recension of the Yosippon and its republications are discussed below in Chapter One, Part I, pp. 42-50.
10. הלביכים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך.asListים, נתן המלך הלביכים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך.asListים.

11. ה젛ensity של עמי ערכו את השם, ברנדי ברני מזוהה, כישרון הבית.

12. בלא מספר ידוע של השם, ברנדי ברני מזוהה, כישרון הבית.

13. מזומות ביטויים נוספים המכריזים שונים של הליבים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך.asListים.

14. ג'אני פרפורת: בונס והנשיות בבניית השופטים. והשם: ריבונים

15. הלטף של חומרים של הליבים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך.asListים.

16. למגזר המנין המ démarche: "ברנדי ברני מזוהה, כישרון של המלך של הליבים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך.

17. האפרים אנשי שואול אנשיים אחרים של המלך, ברנדי ברני מזוהה, כישרון של הליבים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך.

18. ראיתם מספר ידוע התبعثן על אפרים אחר, ברנדי ברני מזוהה, כישרון.

19. בכר הבית את הליבים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך, מספר ידוע התبعثן על אפרים אחר.

20. B. Avoda Zara, 10b.

זאמרו לי, דנשיא נא רבים של הליבים של המלך ברנדי ברני מזוהה, כישרון של הליבים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך, מספר ידוע התبعثן על אפרים אחר, ברנדי ברני, כישרון של הליבים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך, מספר ידוע התبعثן על אפרים אחר, ברנדי ברני, כישרון של הליבים של הרקבה הביתה, רכש קורבנות ידידי המלך, מספר ידוע התبعثן על אפרים אחר.
This text was first published as the Third Chapter in Abraham ibn Daud's *Sefer ha-Kabbala*, in Mantua, in 1513. Sebastian Munster's Latin translation was published with it in Worms, 1529, and in Basle, in 1559, entitled *Historiarum Josephi Elegans Compendium Complectans*. A critical edition and translation of *Sefer ha-Kabbala* was published by Gerson D. Cohen, *The Book of Tradition* (Philadelphia: J.P.S., 1967). The relationship between ibn Daud's text and the English *Yosippon* is discussed below, pp. 42-50.

Mosconi's introduction to the *Yosippon* was published in *Ozar Tov*, the Hebrew section of the *Magazin fur die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* (Berlin: 1877-78), pp.017-023.

This opinion is quoted as decisive law by Rabbi Yisroel Meir Kagan (the *Chofetz Chayim*) in his *Mishne Berura*, The Laws of *Tisha b'Av*, ch. 534, paragraph 1.

J. Baer, "*Sefer Yosippon ha-Ivri*." *Sefer Dinnaburg* (Jerusalem: 1949), p. 178. p. 179, n.4
28
For a discussion of the various opinions regarding the
dating of the Yosippon and the textual evidence pointing
to an early dating of this composition, see below, Chapter
Two, pp. 51-67.

29
See A. Neubauer, "Pseudo-Josephus, Joseph ben Gorion,"
Jewish Quarterly Review, XI (April, 1899), p. 356. Baer,
op. cit., suggests that Ibn Hazm did not use the Yosippon,
but Josephus.

30
D. Chwolson, Samuel ben (1897)
שאולון, סמואל بن

31
J. Mann, Texts and Studies in Jewish History (Cincinnati:
1931), I, pp. 23-27.

97-110; E. N. Adler, "Un document sur l'histoire des
Juifs en Italie," Revue des etudes juives, LXVII (1914),
pp. 42-43.

32
Y. Baer, op. cit., p. 179, n. 1, discusses this reference to
אבדה מרד as evidence for an earlier dating of the
Yosippon. He suggests that this does not refer to Ibn
Shaprut but to some later personage.

See also H. Malter, Saadia Gaon, Hill Life and Works (Philadelphia: 1921), p. 51, n. 84.

35 B.J., II. xx.3 (563-64). "and, assembling in the Temple, appointed additional generals to conduct the war. Joseph, son of Gorion, and Ananus the High Priest were elected to the supreme control of affairs in the city, with a special charge to raise the height of the walls....."

36 Note that Josephus does not identify Joseph ben Gorion as a Priest, whereas the Yosippion does. Saadia's reference also refers to him as a Priest. See, however, Y. Baer, op. cit., who rejects this reference in Saadia, suggesting that the commentary on Daniel belongs to a Rabbi Saadia of a later period, not to the Gaon. H. J. Zimmels, op. cit., also chooses to disregard this source, insisting on a later dating of the Yosippion.

37 For a discussion of this internal evidence see below, Chapter Three of Part One.

38 See below, Chapter Two, pp.19-23.

39 B.J., I, 1.1.

40 These biographical references are found only in the Constantinople recension. The implications of these differences between the Constantinople and the Mantua versions are discussed below, pp.14-23.

41 Haminer, p.23.

42 Hamin, p.23.
The other biographical references in the Constantinople edition and their implications are discussed below, pp. 17-26.

Sefer Zichronot, fol. 197a.

For a discussion of the Yosippon in the Jerahmeel chronicle, compiled by Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi, see below, pp. 26-38.

Conat, Sefer Yosippon (Mantua: 1480), pp. 271-272.


Mosconi, op. cit., pp. 018-019.
Mosconi suggests that Bonim, Joseph's brother, is the Nakdimon ben Gorion who is mentioned in the Talmud. See B. Taanit, 20a; B. Gittin, 56a.

48

In the Constantinople recension of the Yosippon, Joseph ben Gorion refers to the purpose for his composition, that it serve as a lesson for his people, for the generations to come. (Hommier, ch. 36, p. 127)

49

Hommier, Sefer Yosippon, pp. 14-16.

50

Ibid., p. 17.

A. A. Neumann, Landmarks and Goals, p. 29, n. 24, quotes Abraham Zacuto as offering a similar explanation.

51 See below, Chapter Two, Part I.


54 L. Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden, p. 148; See also M. Waxman, A History of Jewish Literature, I, p. 419.


CHAPTER ONE

THE RECENSIONS OF THE YOSIPPON

1 The Berditchev publication of the Yosippon will be utilized in this study for all quotations from the Mantua recension. Henceforth it will be referred to as ed.M.

2 See A. A. Neumann, Landmarks and Goals, p. 28, n. 8, who bases his opinion on the fact that the Mantua edition is the smaller of the two and, therefore, the earlier one. See also S. Zeitlin, "Josippon," JQR, LIII (1963), p. 294, who asserts that "the closest to the Ur-Yosippon is the Mantua edition and this also has many interpolations." See also S. Hoenig, "Dorshe Halakot in the Pesher Nahum Scrolls," Journal of
Biblical Literature, LXXXIII(1964), Part II, p.133, who believes that this edition "is regarded as the closest to the lost Hebrew Vorlage, or Ur-Yosippon."

See, however, Y. Baer, Sefer Dinnaburg, pp.178-179, n.1, who accepts the Constantinople recension to be the more acceptable. Baer objects to the approach that the fuller text of this narrative attests to its corruption. He believes rather that the earlier Yosippon had a more elaborate text which was later abbreviated in the ed.M.

Flusser, op. cit., p.110, n.4, suggests that neither of these recensions can be utilized to determine the narrative as it was originally authored. He believes that only the fragments of the Yosippon found in MS form can be considered the closest to the original.


3 A recent republication of the Venice edition was edited by Ch. Homliner, Sefer Yosippon (Jerusalem: 1961). This edition will be utilized in this study for all references to the Constantinople recension. Henceforth this text will be referred to as ed.C.

4 Among the republications of the ed.C are: Cracow (1588-1599), Frankfurt an Main (1689), Gotha (1707, 1710), Amsterdam (1723), Prague (1784), Warsaw (1845, 1871), Jatomi (1851) and Lemberg (1855).

5 This delineation is unique to ed.C. The ed.M. does not include a parallel.

6 Ed.C, p.23.
לשמור על מספר סקיני כתיב, סקיני 쓰

7Ed.C, p. 102.

8Ibid., pp. 107-108.

9Ed.M, p. 106.
The implications of this inclusion regarding the dating of the *Yosippon* is discussed below, Chapter Three, pp. 56-58.

Chapter Three, pp. 56-58.

15 Ed. C, pp. 48-61.


17 Ed. C, p. 252.

18 Ed. M, p. 197.


![Image of a page of a document with text extracted](image-url)
A variation of this is found in the introduction to the sixth book. Ed.C, p. 145.

Compare the simple reference in Ed.M, p. 35, where no name is mentioned at all.

21 See above, p. 12.


23 Ed.C, p. 34.

24 Ed.C, p. 63.

Compare the text in **Ed.M.**, pp. 195-196, that contains no such direct reference.

26 **Ed.C.**, p. 244.

Compare this with the text in **Ed.M.**, p. 249.


29 Ed.C. p. 126.

...and he also had a hand in other editions and commentaries to works by other authors...

30 Ed.C. p. 127.

...and his works are still regarded as authoritative and are frequently quoted...


...and he also composed several commentaries to the works of other scholars...

32 Ed.C. p. 289.

...and some of Jerahmeel's poems and liturgical passages are also found in MS Number 2079, where Rabbi Solomon ben...
Isaac (Rashi, 1040-1105) is mentioned without the use of the traditional formula "of blessed memory". On fol. 53a we read: "בנין חסן ורומאהלא". On fol. 54b we have an additional reference: "ונאוסיאל לפורת התהלהמאייל".

On fol. 54a Jerahmeel mentions Rabbi Samuel (ben Meir), the grandson of Rashi.

It is therefore assumed that the author of this chronicle knew both these scholars and lived in the latter part of the 11th century. See A. Neubauer, "Collactaneen von Adolph Neubauer," Monatsschrift. (1887), pp. 498-508; M. Gaster, The Chronicles of Jerahmeel, p. Lii. Although it is generally accepted that Jerahmeel lived and wrote in Southern Italy, Gaster suggests that Spain was his home. See M. Gaster, ibid., pp. xlvii-li.

37. Gaster published the first part of the MS, Books 1-8 (fols. 1a-104a), in English translation, in The Chronicles of Jerahmeel.


41. Fols. 91b-104a.

42. Fols. 104a-124b.

43. Fols. 124b-151b.

44. Fols. 152a-169a.

The suggestion made by N. Bentwich, in Josephus (Philadelphia: 1914), p.251, and by A. Neubauer, "Jerahmeel ben Shelomoh," JQR, XI (1898-99), p.386, that Jerahmeel may have been a partial author of the Yosippon is an unfounded contention. There is nothing in the texts that indicates a common authorship. The only valid conclusion to be arrived at is that Jerahmeel meticulously copied the original Yosippon text and incorporated it into his chronicle.

The parallels to this passage are found in both recensions of the Yosippon.

Ed.M. p.104.

Ed.C. pp.126-127.
Note the features of this textual comparison: the similarity between the Jerahmeel text and the ed.C; the elaboration in the ed.C; and the mention of Joseph ben Gorion in the first person in the ed.C, identifying Joseph ben Gorion as the author of the Yosippon. See above, 8-11; below, pp. 51-58.

49 (fol. 26a)

The suggestion offered by M. Schloessinger, Jewish Encyclopedia, VII, pp. 259-260, that it was due to Jerahmeel that the book of Joseph ben Gorion became known as the Yosippon is probably based upon this passage. The conclusion, however, is unfounded. It was not Jerahmeel who wrote this passage, but Eleazar, the later copyist. It is more likely that the name Yosippon is derived from the biographical sketches preserved in the ed.C. See pp. 32-38.

50 (fol. 26b)

51 (fol. 35a)
52 (fol. 36b)

53 (fol. 72b)

54 Jerahmeel, fol. 35a.


56 Ed. M, p. 4.

57 Jerahmeel, fol. 35b.

58 Ed. C, p. 3.


60 Jerahmeel, fol. 35b.

61 Ed. C, p. 3.


63 For the texts of these references, see Chapter One of Part I, n. 22, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32.

64 For the texts of these references, See Chapter One, n.24, 48.

65 See above, n. 63.

66 Jerahmeel, fol. 117b.

67 See above, n. 32.

68 Jerahmeel, fol. 137a.
69 For the text of this passage, see above, n. 25.

70 Jerahmeel, fol. 138a.

71 Ibid., fol. 139a.

72 For the text of this reference, see above n. 26.

73 See above, n. 26.

74 Jerahmeel, fol. 157b.

75 See above, n. 27.

76 Ibid.

77 Jerahmeel, fol. 186b.

78 See below, Chapter Two of Part I, pp. 53-58.

79 Ibn Daud's Sefer ha-Kabbala was most recently republished in a critical edition and translation by Gerson D. Cohen, The Book of Tradition (Philadelphia: 1967).

80 The Venice Edition, 1545, p. 36:

Ibn Daud's reference to "other books" probably refers to his use of Midrash Eser Galuyot (Midrash of the Ten Exiles) which he incorporated at the end of his chapter. (p. 61) .......

81 Mosconi's Hakdamah le-Yosippon was published in Ozar Tov, the Hebrew section of the Magazin fur die Wissenschaft des Judenthums (Berlin: 1877-78). His reference to Ibn Daud's abridgement is found on p. 021, lines 7-11.

For the full text of this reference, see above, the Introduction, n. 21.

Flusser's contention that Ibn Daud used a Yosippon text that already had the interpolation of the Alexander Romance is unfounded. See D. Flusser, "An 'Alexander Geste' in a Parma MS," Tarbiz, XXVI(1956-57), p. 166.

For a discussion of Ibn Daud's brief history as the basis for the English Yosippon, see below, pp. 41-50. Regarding the potential value of this recension, see Zeitlin, Josephus on Jesus, p. 53; The First Book of the Maccabees, p. 251.

Flusser's contention that Ibn Daud used a Yosippon text that already had the interpolation of the Alexander Romance is unfounded. See D. Flusser, "An 'Alexander Geste' in a Parma MS," Tarbiz, XXVI(1956-57), p. 166.

For a discussion of Ibn Daud's brief history as the basis for the English Yosippon, see below, pp. 41-50. Regarding the potential value of this recension, see Zeitlin, Josephus on Jesus, p. 53; The First Book of the Maccabees, p. 251.

(p. 56)

1. אָנָה יִשְׁרָאֵל יִבְּרָא וְהַתּוֹלֶךְ הָאָרֶץ יְשָׁרֵי לֶב, הַכְּפִיעַר
2. הַקְּפִיעַר יָצָא עַל כָּל הָעַלְמָה בָּנֹרֶל. הַקְּפִיעַר עַצֵּי הַבָּנֹרֶל
3. הָאָלָלִיָּא בָנֹרֶל, רֹאִי הָתָרְכִיָּא, וִיסְחַר בָּנֹרֶל הָאָלָלִיָּא שָׁמַר מִלְחָמַת,
4. לְשָׁמַר טֵבָר בָּדֵרִיָּא בֵּית שָׁנַר, לֵאָדָּר קְדָמוּתָּא קָטָרַּה שָׁמַר בְּדִיר

Antiq., XIII, 7.4 (228).

Ed. C, p. 102.

See also Ed. M, p. 96.

Ibn Daud, p. 39.

Antiq., XIII, 8.2 (236).

Ed. C, p. 105.

See also Ed. M, p. 87.

92 This volume is listed as Number 14795 in A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640 (London: 1948), compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave. Subsequent editions of this translation include variations in the author's name: Morwyn (1567, 1575); Morvyn (1615, 1652, 1662); Morwyn (1579).

93 See S. Zeitlin, Josephus on Jesus, p. 53, where the author suggests that the term Maccabee was probably not used in the Ur-Yosippon, pointing to the fact that it is not found in the English text. See also The First Book of the Maccabees, p. 251, where Dr. Zeitlin discusses the omission of the coronation ceremony description in the English translation, concluding that this section was a later interpolation. As will be discussed below, this translation is based upon Ibn Daud's abridged text discussed earlier.


95 This reference to Richard Jugge is found in Morwyn's "Epistle to the Reader" in the editions of 1561, 1567 and 1575. The text of the first edition of 1558 merely has the reading: "Being moved and requested of a certayne honest man Prynther of London...." The 1615 edition has the reading: "Being moved and requested of a friend,.....," without mentioning Jugge. The same is true of the 1652 and 1662 editions.

96 See above, pp. 8-11.

97 Ibid.

98 L. Wolf, Transactions, p. 279.


101 Munster's translation was published with this section, a part of Sefer ha-Kabbala, in Worms, 1529, and in Basle, 1559, entitled Historiarum Josephi Elegans Compendium Complectens.
References to the historical narrative of the English translation are taken from the 1662 edition, published by James Stafford and edited by James Howel.

See above, p. 41.

See above, p. 42.

References to the Venice Edition of the Yosippon are quoted from its most recent republication by Ch. Hominer, Sefer Yosippon (Jerusalem: 1961).

See the Basle Edition, 1559, p. 82. "In illis diebus comprehesus est Iesus Nazarenus."

Antiq., XVIII, 3.3. "Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wnderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again on the third day; as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named after him, are not extinct at this day."

See S. Zeitlin, Josephus on Jesus, pp. 29-30.

CHAPTER TWO

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

See above, p. 12.

See above, pp. 9, 21-25.

See above, pp. 35-38.

Y. Baer, "Sefer Yosippon ha-Ivri" Sefer Dinnaburg, p. 178.

See above, pp. 41-45.
"There was also a league of friendship and mutual assistance made between them; upon which Hyrcanus admitted him into the city, and furnished him with whatever his army wanted in great plenty, and with great generosity, and marched along with him when he made an expedition against the Parthians; of which Nicolaus of Damascus is a witness for us...."

"For the texts in the ed.C and in Jerahmeel, see above, p. 32 (#3)."

"From this source arose that hatred which he (Hyrcanus) and his sons met with from the multitude."

"For the texts in the ed.C and in Jerahmeel, see above, p. 32 (#4)."

"He was esteemed by God worthy of three of the greatest privileges - the government of his nation, the dignity of the high priesthood, and prophecy - for God was with him and enabled him to know the futures; and to foretell this in particular that, as to his two eldest sons, he foretold that they would not long continue in the government of public affairs...."

"For the texts in the ed.C and in Jerahmeel, see above, p. 32 (#5)."

"He (Aristobulus) was naturally a man of candour, and of great modesty, as Strabo bears witness in the name of Timagenes."

"For the texts in the ed.C and in Jerahmeel, see above, p. 34 (#8)."

"declaring.....that we have nothing so much at heart as this, that we may omit no facts, either through ignorance or laziness; for we are upon the history and explication of such things as the greatest part are unacquainted withal, because of their distance from our times; and we aim to do it with a proper beauty of style, so far as that is derived from proper words harmonically disposed, and from such ornaments of speech also as may contribute to the pleasure of our readers, that they may entertain the knowledge of what we write with some agreeable satisfaction and pleasure. But the principal scope that authors ought to aim at above all the rest, is to
speak accurately, and to speak truly, for the satisfac-
tion of those that are otherwise unacquainted with such
transactions, and obliged to believe what these writers
inform them thereof."

15 For the texts of these exhortations and their variations
in the Yosippon and Jerahmeel, see above, Chapter One,
n. 48.

16 Antiq., XIV, 1.2. "Hyrkanus then began his high priest-
hood on the third year of the hundred and twenty-seventh
olympiad....."

17 For the text in the Yosippon, see ed.C, p. 128.

18 Antiq., XIV, 3.1. ".....we ourselves saw that present
depor ted at Rome, in the Temple of Jupiter Capito linus..."

19 For the text in the Yosippon, see Ed.C, p. 133.

20 Antiq., XIV, 4.1. "Now when Pompey had pitched his camp
at Jericho, where the palm tree grows and that balsam which
is an anointment of all the most precious....."

21 For the texts in ed.C and Jerahmeel
see above, p. 34 (#12).

22 Antiq., XIV, 4.3. "And that this is not a mere brag, or
an encomium to manifest a degree of our piety that was
false, but is the reall truth, I appeal to those who have
written of the acts of Pompey; and, among them, to Strabo
and Nicolaus; and besides these two, Titus Livius, the
writer of the Roman history, who will bear witness to
this thing."

23 For the text in the Yosippon, see ed.C, p. 138.

24 Antiq., XIV, 4.5. "Now the occasions of this misery
which came upon Jerusalem were Hyrcanus and Aristobulus,
by raising a sedition one against the other; for now we
lost our liberty and became subject to the Romans."

25 For the texts in the ed.C and in Jerahmeel, see above,
p. 33 (#8).
26 *Antig.*, XIV, 7.1. "... of the weight of three hundred minae, each of which weighed two pounds and a half...."

27 For the texts in the *ed.C* and in Jerahmeel, see above, p. 33 (#9).

28 *Antig.*, XIV, 7.2. "And let no one wonder that there was so much wealth in our Temple...."

29 For the texts in the *ed.C* and in Jerahmeel, see above, p. 34 (#10).

30 That the author of the *Yosippon* did not use non-Jewish sources independently is evident from the fact that whenever such sources are mentioned in the *Yosippon*, a parallel reference to them is found in Josephus. See B. Z. Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: 1962), pp. 10-12.

31 See above, p. 31 (#1).

32 See above, p. 32 (#4).


36 L. Zunz already referred to this lavish portrayal of the coronation, concluding that the *Yosippon* is a late composition. See L. Zunz, *Zeitschrift*, pp. 600-2; *Gottesdienstliche Vortrage*, pp. 154-162.

37 Baer, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

38 *B.J.*, IV, 11.3-5.


Ed.M., pp. 35-58.

Ed.C., pp. 34-61.


In Sefer Zichronot the Alexander Romance is found on fols. 265a-277b, listed as Book 21. It is not a part of the historical narrative of the Yosippon, but is found with the apocryphal books, The Book of Judith (Book 20) and Ben Sira (Book 22).

Flusser, "The Alexander Romance according to the Parma MS," Tarbiz, XXVI (1956).


Ed.C., p. 362.

Y. Baer, op. cit., p. 203.

54 Isaiah di Trani (the Younger), Isaiah di Trani (the Elder, d. 1250), etc.

55 Y. Baer, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

56 בימינו התמקם סירא משער וירשלים ו распрדו העירייה *

57 No other recension or text identifies Rufus with the city of Trani.


59 Y. Baer, *op. cit.*, pp. 192-203.

60 *Ed.C.*, p. 245; *Ed.M.*, p. 196.


63 *Ed.C.*, p. 370; *Ed.M.*, p. 256.


66 A discussion of this concept in the *Josippon* will be found in Part II of this study, pp. 217-219.


These recensions are found in II and IV Maccabees, in all the versions of the Yosippon, in B. Gittin, 57a, and in Midrash Lamentations, II.53.


II Macc., 6.18-6.30; IV Macc., 8.3-13.9.

II Macc., 6.25. See also IV Macc., 6.12-22.

Ed.M, p. 65; Ed.C, pp. 72-73.

II Macc., 7.1-7.42; IV Macc., 8.3-13.9.

Ed.M, pp. 65-68; Ed.C, pp. 73-78.

B. Gittin, 57b.

Midrash Echah (Lamentations), 1.50.


B. Sabbath, 21.
II Macc., 2.10-11. This report is part of a letter that was sent by the authorities in Jerusalem to their brethren in Egypt, urging them to commemorate Chanukah.


A full discussion of the purpose of the Josippon and the textual references illustrating this goal is found below, in Part II of this study, pp. 188-190.

Ed. M, p. 271.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. These differences and variations are classified and discussed in Ch. 2 of Part II.

2. See above, pp. 54-59.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. B.J., III. 108.

6. Vita, 361ff. "I presented the volumes to the emperors themselves, when the events had hardly passed out of sight, conscious as I was that I had presented the true story. I expected to receive testimony to my accuracy, and was not disappointed... Indeed, so anxious was the emperor Titus that my volumes should be the sole authority from which the world should learn the facts, that he affixed his own signature to them and gave orders for their publication."

7. "-half-naked"

8. For the full text of this passage, see Excurus II-B, pp. 235-236.

CHAPTER TWO

THE VARIATIONS

1. B.J., III, 3.3.

2. Ibid., IV, 8.2-4.

3. Ibid., V, 4.

4. Ibid., V, 5.

20. For a discussion of the image of the Judeans as presented in the *Yosippon*, see below, 183-199.


23. *Ibid.*, III, 10. Here, too, ed.C merely states (p.270) as follows:

25. Ed.C, p. 270, refers to this expedition but does not note the Roman victory.


27. Ibid., III, 7.24-27.

28. Ibid., III, 7.31.

29. Ibid., III, 7.33.

30. Ibid., II, 17.8-10.


32. Ibid., IV, 21.1-3.

33. Ibid., II, 22.

34. Ibid., IV, 3.11-12.

35. Ibid., IV, 5.1-3. The ed.C, p. 267, merely states:

The ed.M. makes no reference to this destruction at all.

36. B.J., IV, 7.2.

37. For the differences between Josephus and the Yosippon regarding the characterization of Joseph ben Gorion (Josephus), see below, pp. 217-222.

38. B.J., III, 8.3.

39. Ibid., III, 8.9.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid., II, 17.2.

42. Ed.C, p.241. This is not reported in ed.M or in the text of Jerahmeel.
43 B.J., V, 1.1.

44 Ed.C, p. 294. This is not reported in ed.M or in Jerahmeel.

45 B.J., V, 1.6.

46 Ed.C, p. 202. There is no parallel to this in ed.M or in Jerahmeel.

47 B.J., VI, 4.5.

48 Ed.C, p. 385. See also ed.M, p. 265. This date is not reported in Jerahmeel.

49 B.J., V, 11.6.

50 Ed.C, p. 340. There is no parallel to this report in ed.M or in the text of Jerahmeel.

51 B.J., V, 13.5.


53 B.J., VI, 3.1.

54 Ed.C, p. 378. There is no parallel to this in ed.M or in Jerahmeel.


56 Ed.M, p. 270. It is significant to note that this is a rarity, that the ed.M should offer information not found in the other editions.

57 Ed.M, Ibid.

58 Ed.C, p. 372. This is not reported in ed.M or in Jerahmeel.
There is no parallel to this in ed.M or in Jerahmeel.

This, too, is not reported in ed.M or in Jerahmeel.

This report is unique to the ed.C.

See also ed.M, p. 200.

There is no parallel to this in ed.M or in Jerahmeel.

This is not reported in ed.M or in Jerahmeel.
68 **Ed.C.**, p. 296. This is not found in **ed.M** or in Jerahmeel.


70 **Ed.C.**, p. 334. דְּרַשֵׁה הָרְפָמִים אֲשֶׁר כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים חָבָרָם לָאָרֶץ לִפְתַח בָּשֵׁבֶת תַּחְתָּיוֹן, וְיִקְרָאָה, בכל הַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ.

This is not found in **ed.M** or in Jerahmeel.

See also **ed.M.**, p. 238.


72 **Ed.C.**, pp. 335-336. בִּולְעִים מִבְּרוֹדֵי הָרְפָמִים בְּכָל הַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ תַּחְתָּיָן... וְיִכְוֶשׁ נַחֲשָׁן עַל יְדֵי הָפְרָאָדְם וְזָמִית מִנְבֶּן הָנָבָא וְשָׁר לֹא קָאַף.

See also **ed.M.**, p. 240, that reports a similar reaction, but does not report that 500 Romans were killed, equal to the number of Judeans who were put to death.


74 **Ed.C.**, p. 355. לִבְרֵעָה הָ<pathָּא יִשְׂפַּח הָנָבָא... וְלָיִתַּבְּדִית הָנָבָאָה

See also **ed.M.**, p. 249.

75 **Ed.M.**, p. 249.

76 **B.J.**, V, 13.3.


78 **B.J.**, V, 13.4.

79 **Ed.C.**, p. 360. לַיְּהוּדִים נֶחֱסָה בִּלְבֵּשֵׁם יִשְׂפַּחַר רַגּוֹת, אֲכַזָּה כְּלָכְכָּלָה, אֶלָּחֶם אֵשֶׁר אֲפִלּוּ נִסְיָנָה נַחֲשָׁן וַתִּרְאֶה אֵשֶׁר לֹא מְסִיָּה אֲבָלָה הָנָבָא.

See also **ed.M.**, p. 250.

80 **B.J.**, VI, 2.9-10.
This identification is not evident in the texts of \textit{ed.M} and Jerahmeel.

A similar reference is found on p. 389. This elaboration is not found in \textit{ed.M}. For the full text see below, Excurus V-C, pp. 266-268.
The ed. M does not include this elaboration, stating me-rely that his companion listed to Joseph out of fear. See ed. M, p. 210. The full text of this elaboration is recorded below, Excursus V-D, pp. 268-269.

92 B.J., III, 8.8.

93 Ed. C, pp. 268-269. There is no parallel to this in the other editions of the Yosippon.

94 B.J., IV, 10.7.

95 Ed. C, pp. 292-294. There is no parallel to this in the other editions.

96 B.J., V, 11.3.

97 Ed. C, pp. 337-338. Ed. M, p. 241, also includes this addition but in brevity. For the full text, see below, Excursus I-B, pp. 222-223.

98 B.J., V, 13.5.

99 Ed. C, pp. 361-362. Compare this report with its parallel in ed. M, p. 251, where many of the details are omitted. For the full text, see below, Excursus I-C, pp. 223-225.

100 Ed. C, p. 392. There is no parallel to this in any of the editions of the Yosippon.
103 Ed. C, pp. 271-272. See also ed. M, pp. 211-212. The text of this addition is recorded as Excursus I-E, pp. 228-229.

104 Ed. C, pp. 404-405. There is no parallel to this in ed. M. For the full text, see below, Excursus I-G, pp. 232-233.

105 Ed. C, pp. 288-291. There is no parallel to this in any of the editions of the Yosippon. This interpolation resulted in a later dating of the Yosippon, for the description seems to be a parallel to the coronation ceremonies of Otto I. See above, p. 60, for a full discussion of this factor. The text of the description of the coronation ceremony is recorded as Excursus I-F, pp. 229-232.


107 Ed. C, pp. 240-241. This has no parallel in ed. M. For the full text of this section, see below, Excursus II-B, pp. 235-236.

108 Ed. C, pp. 405-406. This, too, is without parallel in ed. M. For the text of this expression of hope, see below, Excursus II-C, pp. 236-238.

109 B.J., V, 1.3.

110 See Excursus II-D, pp. 238-242; II-E, pp. 242-245; II-F, pp. 245-246; See also the lamentation of Eleazar b. Yair, Excursus IX, A, B, C, pp. 298-305.

111 B.J., II, 17.4.

112 Ed. C, p. 233.

113 Ed. M, p. 189.

114 B.J., II, 19.2.

115 Ed. C, p. 239.


119 B. J., III, 9.3.
120 Ed. C, p. 269.
121 B. J., IV, 4.2.
122 Ed. C, p. 275.
123 B. J., IV, 7.6.
124 Ed. C, p. 280.
125 B. J., V, 13.7.
128 B. J., V, 13.7.
130 Ed. M, p. 251.
131 B. J., VI, 8.3.
133 B. J., VII, 9.1.
134 Ed. C, p. 397.
135 Ed. M, p. 269.
136 B. J., IV, 3.8.
137 Ed. C, p. 274.
138 B. J., V, 1.2.

140 B.J., V, 13.7.

141 Ed.C, p. 362. This identification resulted in a late dating of the Yosippon. It is significant to note that this identification is not found in the ed.M, where the name of the gatekeeper is not mentioned, but the gate is referred to as "the gate of Menahem." Menahem ben Saruk is probably a later interpolation into the text of ed.C. See above, pp. 63-64.
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