

DAVID'S PHILISTINE SERVICE

According to Josephus

Christopher Begg

School of Religious Studies
The Catholic University of America, Washington

1 Sam 27:1-28:2 recounts the period spent by the fugitive David in service to the Philistine King Achish of Gath.¹ This essay will investigate Josephus' rendition of the episode of David's Philistine service as found in his *Antiquitates Judaicarum* (hereafter *Ant.*) 6.319-326.² My investigation will involve a detailed comparison between the Josephan passage and its Biblical source as represented by the following major witnesses: MT (BHS), 4QSam^a,³ Codex Vaticanus (hereafter B)⁴

¹ For the above delimitation of the pericope, see the commentaries and the \boxtimes following 28:2 in MT.

² For the works of Josephus I use H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren and L. H. Feldman (eds.), *Josephus* (LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann, 1926-1965 [*Ant.* 6.319-326 is found in Vol. V, 327-31 where the translation and notes are by Marcus]). I have likewise consulted the text and apparatus of *Ant.* 6.319-326 in B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, II (Berlin: Weidmann, 1955), 74-75. On Josephus' overall treatment of the protagonist of *Ant.* 6.319-326, see L. H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of David," *HUCA* 60 (1989), 129-74.

³ 4QSam^a contains portions of 1 Sam 27:8-12; 28:1-2. For its readings see P. K. McCarter, *1 Samuel* (AB 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), 413-14. See also E. C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1978), 171-72.

⁴ For B I use A. E. Brooke, N. Maclean and H. St. J. Thackeray (eds.), *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*, II: I 1 and II Samuel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927). B 1 Reigns is part of one of the so-called "non-kaige" sections of that MS (1 Reigns- 2 Reigns 11:1) which have not undergone the same degree of assimilation to the text of (proto-) MT as have its *kaige* sections. Accordingly, B 1 Reigns is seen by many as preserving the Old Greek text of the book. See J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the*

and the Lucianic (hereafter L) or Antiochene MSS⁵ of the LXX, plus Targum Jonathan on the Former Prophets (hereafter TJ).⁶ I undertake this comparative study with a number of overarching questions in mind: Which text-form(s) of 1 Sam 27:1-28:2 did Josephus have available? What rewriting techniques does he apply to the source data? Are there noteworthy distinctive features to the "Gath interlude" as retold by him as compared with the *Vorlage's* account? Finally, what particular messages might Josephus' version be intended to convey to his Gentile and Jewish readers?

In proceeding now to my comparison, I divide up the relevant material into four component segments as follows: 1) David's Flight to Gath (1 Sam 27:1-4// *Ant.* 6.319-320); 2) David Given Ziklag (27:5-7// *Ant.* 6.321-322); 3) David's Raids (27:8-12// 6.323-324); and 4) David Mustered (28:1-2// 6.325-326).

David's Flight to Gath

The story of David's second sparing of Saul's life (1 Samuel 26// *Ant.* 6.310-318) concludes with the laconic notice "and Saul returned to his place (so MT L; B way)." In *Ant.* 6.319a an expanded version of this notice serves to introduce the following "Gath interlude" (// 1 Sam 27:1-28:2): "So Saul, *having for the second time escaped from David's hands,*⁷ returned to his palace (τὰ βασιλεία)⁸ and his country."⁹ 1 Sam 27:1 "quotes" in *oratio recta* David's reflection about his current

Greek Text of Kings (HSM 1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 7-8.

⁵ For L I use N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega, I. 1-2 Samuel* (TECC 50; Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1989). It has long been held that for the Books of Samuel, Josephus depended in the first place on a text like that of L. See L. H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1984), 166-70; S. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel* (Quaderni di Henoch 9; Turin: Zamorani, 1996), 210-16.

⁶ For TJ I use the text of A. Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic, II* (Leiden: Brill, 1959) and the translation of this by D. J. Harrington and A. J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets* (The Aramaic Bible 10; Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1989).

⁷ I italicize elements like the above of Josephus' presentation which lack a counterpart in the Biblical text (as I also do those items of the latter which have no equivalent in the former).

⁸ Previously, Josephus makes reference to Saul's hilltop "palace" (τὸ βασιλείον) in "Gaba" in *Ant.* 6.156 (// 1 Sam 15:34); 6.251 (// 1 Sam 22:6).

⁹ The above double indication concerning Saul's "destination" specifies the indeterminate reference to his returning "to his place" in MT L 1 Sam 26:25bβ; see above.

situation and what he should do about this. Josephus (6.319b) reformulates the source "quotation" as an editorial remark, while also condensing its content¹⁰: "but David, fearful (φοβηθείς) of being captured (συλληφθῆ) by Saul *if he remained where he was*,¹¹ deemed it wise to go down (καταβάς)¹² to the land of the Philistines (εἰς τὴν Παλαιστίνην) *and abide there*."¹³

David next (27:2) executes the design formulated by him in 27:1: he and six hundred men (so MT L; B 400) return to the king of Gath. Josephus' rendition (6.319c) agrees with the MT L figure for David's retainers: "With (his band of) six hundred¹⁴ who were with him he betook (παραγίνεται, L ἐπορεύθη, > B)¹⁵ himself to Anchūs (Ἀγχοῦς)¹⁶ king of Gitta (Γίττης, BL Γέθ),¹⁷ *which was one of their five cities*."¹⁸

1 Sam 27:3 relates the settlement of David and his entourage with Achish in Gath without, however, mentioning the latter's "reception" of

¹⁰ Specifically, he leaves aside David's affirmation of 27:1b concerning the anticipated result of his flight to Philistia: "then Saul will despair of seeking me any longer within the borders of Israel, and I shall escape out of his hand" which might appear presumptuous given Saul's energetic prior pursuit of him.

¹¹ Compare 27:1aβ "I shall one day perish by the hand of Saul." With the above italicized phrase Josephus spells out the condition ("if...") which would make his falling into Saul's hands likely.

¹² This is the conjecture of Niese inspired by the Latin translation (Lat), i.e. "descendere" and adopted by Marcus. The Greek witnesses read ἀναβάς.

¹³ Compare 27:1ba "there is nothing better for me than I should escape to the land of the Philistines (BL εἰς γῆν ἀλλοφύλων)."

¹⁴ In 6.274 Josephus mentions the 400 men who retire to Engedi with David. That figure agrees with the one found in BL 1 Sam 23:13 as against MT's 600.

¹⁵ On Josephus' penchant for the historic present in his Biblical paraphrase which, as here in 6.319, he often introduces into contexts where the LXX has a past form, see C. T. Begg, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (AJ 8, 212-420) (BETL 108; Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 1993), 10-11, n. 32.

¹⁶ This form of the name corresponds to that read by B in our pericope; compare MT "Achish"; L Ἀκχοῦς. Josephus leaves aside the name of the king's father, i.e. "Maoch" (MT); B Ἀμμάχ; L Ἀχιμάαν as cited in 27:2.

¹⁷ Both the Bible (1 Sam 21:11-16) and Josephus (*Ant.* 6.245-246) report an earlier seeking of asylum by the fugitive David from King Achish/Anchūs of Gath. Remarkably, however, neither makes any explicit allusion to that earlier episode at this juncture.

¹⁸ This appended notice concerning "Gitta" harks back to *Ant.* 6.8 (cf. 1 Sam 6:1) where Josephus enumerates the five cities making up the Philistine "Pentapolis."

the former. Accordingly, the historian takes care (6.320a) to first fill this lacuna: "the king welcomed him and his men¹⁹ and gave them a habitation...." He then continues with a modified version of the source verse itself: "and so, along with his two wives Achima (Ἀχιμάν)²⁰ and Abigaia (Ἀβιγαία),²¹ he settled in Gitta."

The first of the four segments making up the "Gath interlude" (27:1-4) concludes in v.4 with the statement that Saul did, in fact (see 27:1b), cease his pursuit of David upon hearing that the fugitive had gone to Gath. Josephus (6.320b) spells out the motivation for the king's calling off the pursuit: "Saul, on hearing of this, thought no more of sending or marching against him, *for twice already he had been in imminent danger of falling into his hands while striving to catch* (συλλαβεῖν, see συλληφθῆ, 6.319) *him*."²²

David Given Ziklag

1 Sam 27:5-7 (// *Ant.* 321-322) recounts how David -- and his descendants after him -- acquired the town of Ziklag as a possession. Matters are set in motion in 27:5 where David -- seemingly "out of the blue" -- requests Achish to give him a "country town" as a residence, this request being -- somewhat obscurely -- motivated by the question "*for why should your servant dwell in the royal city with you?*" Josephus' rendition prepares readers for David's appeal with an inserted transitional notice: "David, however, was not minded to remain in the city of Gitta...." It then continues with an indirect discourse²³ version of David's

¹⁹ In 27:3 there is mention of a settlement in Gath not only by David and his men but also by the latter's "households." Josephus passes over this third group -- perhaps in order not to make Achish's "refugee problem" appear too overwhelming.

²⁰ MT "Ahinoam"; B Ἀχεινάαμ, L Ἀχινάαμ. Josephus leaves aside the specification of 27:3 that she was "of Jezreel." He had already made allusion to this figure -- though without naming her--in his version of 1 Sam 25:43 in *Ant.* 6.309.

²¹ Josephus' form of the woman's name corresponds to that read by L 27:3; compare MT "Abigail"; B Ἀβειγαία. From the source verse Josephus omits both the name of Abigail's first husband ("Nabal") and her (so MT) or his (BL) place of origin ("the Carmelite"). On Josephus' rendering of 1 Samuel 25 in *Ant.* 6.295-309, see C. T. Begg, "The Abigail Story (1 Samuel 25) according to Josephus," *Estudios Bíblicos* 54 (1996), 5-34.

²² The above appended motivation for Saul's desisting echoes the wording of the -- likewise inserted -- reference to Saul's "having for the second time escaped from David's hands" in 6.319.

²³ On Josephus' penchant for turning the direct discourse speeches of Biblical characters into indirect discourse, see Begg, *Josephus' Account*, 12-13, n. 38 and the literature cited there.

request as "quoted" in the source: "...but besought its king, *since he had given him kindly welcome* (φιλανθρώπως ... ὑπεδέξατο),²⁴ *to grant* (χαρίσεται) *one favour more*²⁵ and give (δούς) him some place (τόπον) in his country to dwell in...."²⁶ Finally, Josephus rounds off David's request with an affirmation by him which clarifies the sense of the motivating question with which 27:5 concludes (see above): "he had scruples (αἰδεῖσθαι), he said, about being a burden (βαρύς) and encumbrance (φορτικός)²⁷ to him by continuing to live in that city."²⁸

The Biblical account continues in 27:6 with Achish's granting David "Ziklag," which city is said to have belonged "to the kings of Judah to this day." Given that by his own "day" the Judean monarchy had long ceased to exist, Josephus (6.322a) reformulates the etiological notice of 27:5b thusly: "So Anchūs gave (δίδωσι)²⁹ him *a certain village called Sekella (Σέκελλαν)*³⁰ *which David so well liked after becoming king that he regarded it as his private domain, as did his sons after him.*"³¹ To this notice Josephus appends the following editorial announcement

²⁴ This phrase picks up on Josephus' inserted reference to the king's "receiving (δεξαμένου) him and his men" in 6.320.

²⁵ The whole sequence italicized above takes the place of the conditional formulation with which David begins his request in 27:5, i.e. "if I (MT; BL your servant) have found favor (BL χάριν, cf. χαρίσεται, 6.321) in your eyes...." Given Josephus' own previous notice about Achish's welcome of David (6.320) the conditionality of this formula would seem inappropriate here, and so he makes the fact of the king's past "favor" to him the basis of ("since...") David's appeal for a further one.

²⁶ Compare 27:5αβ "...let a place (BL τόπον) be given (BL δότωσαν) me in one of the country towns, that I may dwell there."

²⁷ The above collocation occurs only here in Josephus. His remaining uses of the word φορτικός are in *Bellum Judaicum* (hereafter *BJ*) 2.602; *Ant.* 11.128; 16.1; 19.318.

²⁸ Josephus' above evocation of David's "scruple" about being a "burden" to his host serves implicitly to counter contemporary charges about the Jews as a nation of beggars. The concern with answering this charge surfaces elsewhere in the historian's depiction of David, see Feldman, "David," 138-39 and n. 24. See also nn. 49, 61.

²⁹ Note the historic present; compare BL 27:6 ἔδωκεν.

³⁰ MT "Ziklag"; Β Σεκελάκ; Λ Σεκελάγ. A. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), s.v. Σικελλα points to the possibility that Josephus might have derived this form of the city's name -- which Schalit reads with the codex P in preference to the form Σέκελλα favored by Niese and Marcus -- from the name as found in Codex Alexandrinus of 1 Rgns 30:14, i.e. Σικελά.

³¹ The above italicized phrase with its reference to the pleasure David took in "Ziklag" following his accession and his consequent viewing it as his personal property helps explain how it was that a site which Achish had simply granted to the fugitive David as a place of residence ended up "belonging" in perpetuity to the kings of Judah as affirmed in 27:6b.

"But of that we shall speak elsewhere." The "that" in this formulation seems to relate to the just-cited fact of David's (and his descendants') future view of Ziklag as their "private domain." Oddly, however, as Marcus points out,³² this point is not, as such, addressed in the continuation of *Ant.* where the only further references to the site are in the account of its sack by the Amalekites (6.356-367// 1 Samuel 30) and the allusions to David's presence there in 7.1 (// 2 Sam 1:1) and 7.7.³³

The segment 27:5-7 concludes with a notice on the duration of David's stay in Philistia which diverges in MT and BL. According to the former, his stay lasted "days (RSV a year) and four months,"³⁴ while the Greek witnesses make it simply "four months." In this instance, Josephus' rendition (6.322b) seems like an attempt at specifying the more expansive, but also more indeterminate reading of MT: "Now the time during which dwelt in Sekella in Philistia³⁵ was four months and twenty days."

David's Raids

The third of the four segments making up the complex 27:1-28:2, i.e. 27:8-12 (// 6.323-324), focuses on the raids conducted by David and his men and the former's (mis-) representation of this activity to his Philistine overlord. The new segment commences in v. 8a with mention

³² Josephus, V, 328, n.c.

³³ There are, it should be noted, other such "unfulfilled" editorial promises in *Ant.* See, e.g., 5.31 where Josephus, in connection with the curse pronounced by Joshua on any who would rebuild Jericho (Jos 6:26), announces that he will subsequently relate the realization of this curse. In his account of Ahab -- during whose reign Jericho was rebuilt with the resultant fulfillment of Joshua's curse (see 1 Kgs 16:34) -- Josephus, however, makes no mention of the matter (on the point, see further Begg, *Josephus' Account*, 154-55). See also 7.89: here Josephus promises to "treat in its proper place" the question of the children whom Michal bore to her second husband. As Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 407, n. d, points out, however, Michal is nowhere mentioned in the continuation of *Ant.* Josephus' occasional such failures to "deliver" on promised later treatments of a given topic are understandable given the prolonged span of time during which he worked on *Ant.* (according to L. H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Saul," *HUCA* 53 [1982], 45-99, 97, its composition occupied "at least a dozen years [79/81-93/94]").

³⁴ On the meaning of the MT reading here see the commentaries.

³⁵ Josephus' reference to "Sekella" here picks up on the mention of David's receiving that city in what precedes. It replaces the more general wording of 27:7, i.e. "in the field (so literally MT L; B in the way) of the Philistines."

of the peoples who were the victims of these raids. MT enumerates three such peoples, i.e. the Geshurite(s), Girzite(s)³⁶ and the Amalekite(s). L prefaces its equivalents to MT's three names with a generalizing reference to "everyone nearby (πάντα τὸν ἐγγίζοντα)," while B has a counterpart to only the first (Γεσειρί) and third peoples on MT's list. There follows (v. 8b) an obscure motivation ("for") referring to the territorial boundaries of the peoples just cited (RSV "for these were the inhabitants of the land from of old as far as Shur, to the land of Egypt"); here again, MT and BL go their own ways, this giving rise to much text-critical discussion.³⁷ Given both its obscurity and non-interest for Gentile readers, Josephus leaves aside the content of v. 8b. His rendition (6.323a) of v. 8a evidences affinities with the peculiar readings of both L and B: "He made clandestine raids (ἐπερχόμενος)³⁸ on the neighbors (τοῖς πλησιοχώριος; compare the L plus above) of the Philistines,³⁹ the Serrites (Σερρίταις)⁴⁰ and Amalekites...."⁴¹

The source next proceeds (27:9) to enumerate the results of David's expeditions: his smiting of the land, non-sparing of men and women, booty taken, and return to Achish. The second of these points is reiterated (and motivated) in v. 11α, following the "quotation" of a dialogue between Achish and David concerning the targets of the latter's raids in v. 10. The historian, for his part, places his single mention of David's dealings with the human population of the raided areas (// v. 11α, cf. v. 9αβ) prior to his rendering of the king-David conversation (// v. 10), but after the booty list he adapts from v. 9βα. His version of the sequence 27:9 + 11α thus reads: "...ravaging their country (διήπραζεν αὐτῶν

³⁶ Thus the *ketiv*; the *qere* reads "Gizrite(s)" as does TJ.

³⁷ On this discussion see the commentaries.

³⁸ In all the witnesses to 27:8a David and his men are the subjects of the raiding activity; Josephus keeps attention focussed on the former by making no mention of the latter in his rendition here.

³⁹ With the addition of this phrase Josephus clarifies of whom the "everybody near" spoken of L 27:8a were neighbors.

⁴⁰ There is disagreement as the origin of this people-name (which appears only here in Josephus). A. Schlatter, *Die hebräischen Namen bei Josephus* (BFCT 17:3; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1913), 40 traces it to a Hebrew form יִשְׂרָאֵל, while Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, s.v. Σερρίται sees it as reflecting rather the Γεσ(ε)ρί of B (compare L γεσουραῖον).

⁴¹ Like B 27:8a and against MT L, Josephus thus mentions only two peoples by name as objects of David's raids.

τὴν χάραν)⁴² and returning (ὑπέστρεψαν)⁴³ with abundant booty of cattle (κτηνῶν, BL βουκόλια) and camels (καμήλων, BL καμήλους)⁴⁴; he refrained from (taking captive) (ἀπέιχετο)⁴⁵ any men (ἀνθρώπων),⁴⁶ for fear (δεδιώς)⁴⁷ that they would denounce (καταμηνύσωσιν) him to King Anchūs....⁴⁸ To the foregoing mention of "Anchūs" Josephus proceeds to append a notice without basis in 1 Samuel 27 itself, i.e. "...to whom, however, he sent a present from a portion of the spoils." His likely inspiration for this item was the reference to David's dispatching portions of the booty taken by him from the Amalekites to the elders of various Judean cities in 1 Sam 30:26-31 (*// Ant.* 6.357). Here then Josephus represents David as sharing his gains, not only with his own tribesmen, but even with a foreign king as well.⁴⁹

Following the above insertion, Josephus (6.324a) picks up the Biblical story-line in order to relate the David-Achish exchange of 27:10. His "delayed" (see above), indirect discourse version of this item runs: "And when the king inquired whom he had attacked *to have*

⁴² Compare BL 27:9αα καὶ ἔτυπτε (B= MT; L ἔτυπτον) τὴν γῆν. Josephus thus agrees with MT and B against L in making David the sole subject of the ravaging of the land. See n. 38.

⁴³ 27:9bβ "they came (BL ἤρχοντο) to Achish."

⁴⁴ From the list of things carried off by David in 27:9bα Josephus omits three items, i.e. sheep, asses, and garments, retaining only the two items cited above, the quantity of which ("abundant booty of") he does, however, accentuate.

⁴⁵ BL 27:9αβ, 11αα οὐκ ἐζωογόνει. As Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 329, n.f. points out, the verb ἀπέιχετο as used above by Josephus with "humans" as its genitival object is ambiguous, since it might also be rendered as "he spared." Such a rendering would, however, contradict the source's statements on the matter. It would also not seem to make sense in the context which speaks of David's fear of being denounced to Achish in that his "sparing" of the populations of the territories plundered by him would not be likely to keep this from happening -- on the contrary.

⁴⁶ With his use of this general term Josephus avoids the source's explicit mentions (vv. 9αβ, 11αα) of the "women" killed by David along with the "males." Thereby, he tones down the Biblical image of a bloodthirsty David who butchers even defenceless women. See n. 48.

⁴⁷ Compare the reference to David "fearful (φοβηθεὶς) of being captured by Saul" in 6.319.

⁴⁸ Compare 27:11a "(And David saved neither man nor woman alive, to bring tidings to Gath), thinking, 'Lest they should tell about us, and say, "So David has done.'"" Josephus leaves aside the appended comment of v. 11b, i.e. "such [i.e. his annihilation of all adults] was his custom all the while he dwelt in the country of the Philistines." In so doing, he further attenuates the bloodthirsty image of David for whom massacre is "standard procedure" conveyed by the source. See n. 46.

⁴⁹ Thereby he further counters anti-Semitic claims about his people as "beggars" who only take from others (see nn. 28, 61), just as he tacitly rebuts charges of Jewish xenophobia (on this last point, see Feldman, "David," 150-51).

carried off all this booty (τὴν λείαν),⁵⁰ he said it was the people lying southward of the Judeans (πρὸς τὸν νότον τῶν Ἰουδαίων), inhabiting the plain....⁵¹

Having "anticipated" the "no prisoners" notice of 27:11α (see above), Josephus directly juxtaposes the dialogue between Achish and David (// 27:10) to mention of its outcome (// 27:12): "... (David) succeeded in making Anchūs believe (πείθει... φρονῆσαι) this.⁵² For the king had hopes⁵³ that David had come to hate (ἐμίσησε) his own people (τὸ ἴδιον ἔθνος)⁵⁴ and that he would have him for his servant (δοῦλον) so long as he lived, *settled among his own people*."⁵⁵

⁵⁰ The above italicized phrase harks back to the preceding insertion about David's sharing his "booty (τῆς λείας)" with Anchūs. The two phrases in combination supply a motivation, lacking in the Bible itself, for the king's questioning of David, i.e. seeing the booty sent him by David, he naturally is curious to know from whom David had acquired it. Compare the wording of 27:10a "When Achish asked, 'Against whom have you made a raid today...?'" Note, here again, Josephus' substitution of indirect for source direct address.

⁵¹ The above formulation concerning the object of David's raids represents a generalization/compression of the three-fold indication given in 27:10b, i.e. "against the Negeb of Judah (BL κατὰ νότον τῆς Ἰουδαίας)," "against the Negeb of the Jerahmeelites (so MT; B Ἰεσμεγὰ, L Ἀερμῶν)," and "against the Negeb of the Kenites (BL Κενεζί; TJ the Shalmaite)." Of these three indications the one that is of relevance for the continuation of the story is the reference to the "Negeb (BL south) of Judah" (see above); accordingly, Josephus confines himself to this item, not wanting to burden readers with extraneous geographical details -- compare his handling of the topographical particulars of 27:8b in 6.323. Note further that David's claim about having raiding "the people lying southward of the Judeans" here in 6.324 stands in tension with Josephus' previous statement (6.323) that his victims were "the neighbors of the Philistines." It thus appears that David is trying to mislead Anchūs about the identity of his victims -- successfully so, as will subsequently emerge, see above.

⁵² Note the historic present. Compare 27:12a "and Achish trusted (B ἐπιστεύθη, L ἐνεπιστεύθη) David." Josephus' formulation accentuates both the deliberateness of David's effort to persuade Anchūs that he had raided the neighbors of his (David's) own people, the Judeans, and the efficacy of that effort. See previous note.

⁵³ This phrase, introducing Achish's reflection, takes the place of the word "saying" which serves that function in 27:12. It makes more explicit the causal connection ("for") between the king's letting himself be persuaded by David and the expectations he will subsequently articulate about David's perpetual service to himself, i.e. he gave credence to David's claim in accord with his own wishful thinking about what he might look for from his liegeman.

⁵⁴ Compare 27:12bα "...he has made himself utterly abhorred (literally in bad odor, MT; BL ἡσχυνται αἰσχυνόμενος; TJ he had indeed attacked [יִשְׁחַרְחַר אֶת־הָאֵרָמֵאִים] by his people (BL ἐν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ) *Israel*." Josephus' wording, which highlights David's (putative) stance towards his people rather than their's towards him, lies in the line of the TJ rendition.

⁵⁵ Compare 27:12bβ "and he shall be my servant (BL δοῦλος) always." In rendering Achish's word to himself (27:12b) Josephus, here too, transposes direct into indirect discourse.

David Mustered

The account of David's Philistine service concludes in 28:1-2 (// 6.325-326) with a segment concerning his being "called up" for the Philistine army that is about to march against Israel. Josephus (6.325a) expands the source notice on the Philistines' assembling for battle (28:1a) with a formulation explaining how David came to be involved. His rendition reads: "About the same time the Philistines (τῶν Παλαιστίνων)⁵⁶ resolved to take the field against the Israelites⁵⁷ and sent word around to all their allies (συμμάχους) to join them at Rega (Ῥεγάν)⁵⁸ whence they would make a combined assault upon the Hebrews (Ἑβραίους)."⁵⁹

The source narrative continues in 28:1b with Achish informing David of his expectation that David and his men will accompany him as part of the Philistine army. Josephus' version (6.325b) underscores

⁵⁶ This is Josephus' standard designation for "the Philistines" as against the LXX's preferred (οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι (read, e.g., by BL in 28:1). See R. de Vaux, "Les Philistins dans la Septante," in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. Beiträge zur Septuaginta*, I, ed. J. Schreiner (FzB 1; Würzburg: Echter, 1972), 185-94.

⁵⁷ Compare 28:1a "In those days the Philistines gathered their forces for war, to fight against Israel."

⁵⁸ This is the reading adopted by Niese and Marcus; compare Ῥγάν (O); Ῥεγγάν (MS), Ῥέγγαν (P), *rellā* (Lat). Josephus' indication concerning the site of the Philistine assembly for battle has no equivalent in MT or BL. A. Mez (*Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie* [Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895]), 31-32 conjectures εἰς φάραγγα as Josephus' original reading; this form corresponds to the *Inhl'* of the Peshitta in 28:1 and would have been found by him in his (proto-) Lucianic text of Samuel. The reading "to the valley" of "L," Peshitta, and Josephus would, in turn, reflect the "ambiguous" term לְרֵיַלָּא of TJ which might be rendered both "for a host" and "to the valley." Mez's view is adopted by H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus, the Man and the Historian* (New York: Ktav, 1967), 88, n. 39. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, s.v. Ῥεγάν, on the other hand, traces Josephus' form ultimately back to the רֵיַרְרָא (רֵיַרְרָא) of MT 1 Sam 28, 3 (where the reference is to Samuel's being buried "in his city," i.e. Ramah). In the Greek text used by Josephus this Hebrew form was taken as the name of a city and rendered either by ἐν Γερω or, through metathesis, ἐν Πεγῶ (alternatively, this metathesis would have occurred in the transmission of the text of Josephus). Finally, a group of American scholars holds that the original Josephan reading (in majuscule letters) was ΕΙΣΡ(Α)ΕΛΛΑ, this reflecting the 4QSam^a plus in 1 Sam 28:1, i.e. רֵיַרְרָא (רֵיַרְרָא); cf. the *rellā* of Lat which attests to this original form *contra* the readings of the Greek codices which have a *gamma* as their second consonant. Thus F. M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964), 281-99, 293; Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 171; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 414.

⁵⁹ Compare "the Israelites" earlier in 6.325. On Josephus' oscillating designations for his people during their history, see G. Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (AGAJU 35; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 47-61, 124-29.

the command character of the royal word: "Accordingly, Anchūs, *king of Gitta*, bade (ἐκέλευσε) David to aid (συμμαχῆσαι, cf. συμμάχους, 6.325a) him with his own soldiers (ὄπλιτῶν)."⁶⁰

In 28:2 David responds to Achish's announcement with a brief, equivocal statement: "very well, you shall know what your servant can do." His Josephan counterpart is (6.326a) both more effusive and more forthright in his (indirect discourse) reply: "David *promptly* promised to do so, *declaring that here was an opportunity* (καιρόν) *for him to repay Anchus for his good offices and hospitality* (τῆς εὐεργεσίας καὶ τῆς ξενίας)...."⁶¹ Josephus expatiates as well (6.326b) on Achish's concluding response to David's assurance (// 28:2b): "whereupon the king undertook to make him his bodyguard (φύλακα τοῦ σώματος)⁶² *after the victory, if the outcome of the struggle against the enemy should be favourable to them.*"⁶³ Thereafter, he appends as self-generated remark concerning the motivation behind Achish's conditional offer: "By this promise of honour and confidence (τιμῆς καὶ πίστεως)⁶⁴ he hoped to increase David's ardour (πρόθυμον)⁶⁵ still more."⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Compare 28:1b "Understand that you and your men are to go with me in the army (MT; BL understand that with me you shall go forth to war, you and your men [ἀνδρες])." Note, once again, Josephus' transposition of direct into indirect address.

⁶¹ The above collocation occurs only here in Josephus. On the historian's amplification of the Biblical David's reply to Achish as designed to present Gentile readers with an example of Jewish generosity and gratitude directed to a "foreigner," see Feldman, "David," 154. Josephus' version of the reply likewise helps counteract the charge about Jews being mere beggars, see nn. 28, 49.

⁶² Compare 28:2b "And Achish said to David, 'Very well, I will make you my bodyguard (MT שָׂמַר לְרַאשֵׁי; BL ἀρχισωματακοφύλακα) for life (literally all the days).'"

⁶³ This qualification of Achish's unconditional promise as cited in 28:2b has in view the explanation of the king's motivation in making the promise, i.e. to stimulate David's fighting spirit in the upcoming battle, which Josephus appends in what follows, see above.

⁶⁴ This collocation occurs only here in Josephus.

⁶⁵ This noun echoes the adverb προθύμως used of David's responding "with alacrity" to Achish's bidding him join the Philistine campaign in 6.326a.

⁶⁶ By means of the above "appendix" to Achish's promise (// 28:2b) Josephus provides readers with an answer to the question of why the king should have been ready to offer so sensitive a post as that of royal bodyguard to a foreigner like David whose people had, moreover, long been at enmity with his own.

In both the Bible and *Ant.* the story of the Philistine campaign and David's (non-) involvement in it, begun in 28:1-2// 6.325-326, breaks off in what immediately follows, i.e. the interlude featuring Saul's visit to the Endor medium (28:3-25// 6.327-350), in order thereafter to resume in 29:1-11// 6.351-355 with an account of David's dismissal from the Philistine force.

Conclusion

Having completed my detailed comparison between *Ant.* 6.319-326 and its Biblical source, I wish now to sum up on my findings regarding the opening questions of this essay. On the issue of Josephus' text for 1 Sam 27:1-28:2, we noted evidence of his affinities with one of the textual witnesses surveyed, now with another. Thus his reference to the "days" as well as "months" David spent in Philistia (6.322) goes together with the reading of MT 27:7 against that of BL. Conversely, in his name for the Philistine king ("Anchūs") Josephus agrees with B as he does in his mentioning only two -- rather than three -- peoples raided by David (6.323; compare 27:8), even while his allusion to David's attacks on "the neighbors (of the Philistines)" in 6.323 seems to reflect the L plus in 27:8. Finally, the historian's specification of the site of the Philistine assembly ("Rega") might well attest to his familiarity with the peculiar reading of 4QSam^a in 28:2, i.e. "to Jezreel" (see n. 58). It appears then that one should reckon with Josephus' use of various text-forms of 1 Sam 27:1-28:2 in composing his own version.

Among the Josephan "rewriting techniques" spoken of in my second opening question, it is especially his additions to and amplifications of source data that stand out in *Ant.* 6.319-326. These expansions concern the following points: Saul's "return" (6.319a; compare 26:25bβ); Gitta's being one of the five Philistine cities (6.319c; compare 27:2); the royal welcome given David and his retinue (6.320a; compare 27:2-3); the reason for Saul's abandoning his pursuit of David (6.320b; compare 27:4); the transitional notice about David's not intending to stay on in Gitta (6.321a; compare 27:5); the (unfulfilled) editorial promise to speak later of Ziklag's status (6.322c; compare 27:6); David's presenting a portion of the booty to Anchūs (6.323b; compare 27:9); the king's reference to the booty in his query to David (6.324a; compare 27:10); the allusion to David's being settled permanently among the king's people (6.324c; compare 27:12); the Philistines' calling up of their allies (6.325a; compare 28:1a); David's reply to Anchūs' word about his participation in the upcoming campaign (6.326a; compare 28:2a); and the condition appended to Anchūs' promise together with his motive in making this (6.326bc; compare 28:2b).

Conversely, however, Josephus either compresses or omits entirely a whole series of source items. Instances of such abridgements concern the following matters: David's expression of confidence about Saul's

desisting from his pursuit (27:1b; compare 6.326a); the "households" of David's men which accompany them into Philistia according to 27:3 (compare 6.320a); the personal data for Achish (27:2) and David's two wives (27:3); the extent of the territory raided by David (27:8b; compare 6.323a); the double reference to his not sparing the human inhabitants (27:9aβ, 11aα; compare 6.323b); three of the five categories of booty listed in 27:9bα (compare 6.323a); the three regions which David claims to have raided (27:10; compare 6.324a); and David's "custom" of taking no prisoners (27:11b; compare 6.323b).

In his version of the "Gath interlude" Josephus also, on occasion, re-arranges the source's sequence. In particular, he conflates the *Vorlage's* twofold notice on David's not sparing the peoples raided by him (27:9bα, 11aα, see above) into a single one which he situates between his rendition of the booty list of 27:9aβ and his account of David's return to Anchūs and the ensuing exchange between them (27:9bβ-10) in 6.323-324a.

The historian modifies or adapts the source's style, wording and content as well. Stylistically, he invariably substitutes indirect for the Bible's direct address when reporting the speeches made by characters, just as he several times employs an historic present form where BL read a past form (compare, e.g., δίδωσι in 6.322 v.s. ἔδωκεν in BL 27:6).⁶⁷ On the terminological/contential level, he rewords (6.321) David's request to Anchūs (27:5) both in light of his earlier inserted mention of the "favor" the king had already shown the fugitive (6.320a) and to clarify David's rationale in asking for a residence of his own. Similarly, he recasts (6.323a) the etiological notice of 27:6 given the fact that by his own "day" there were no longer "kings of Judah" to possess Ziklag. Again, whereas the source speaks of both David and his men conducting raids (27:7aα), Josephus (6.323a) keeps attention focussed on David by making him the sole subject of the raiding activity (as, in fact, he appears in the continuation of the Biblical account itself). It is likewise David's (supposed) stance towards his own people, rather than the other way round (so MT BL 27:12) which Josephus highlights in 6.324 (see TJ and cf. n. 54). Finally, the Josephan David's

⁶⁷ Another instance of a stylistic change made by Josephus in 6.319-326 is his replacement of source parataxis by a better Greek hypotaxis. Compare, e.g., 6.324a "when the king inquired (πυθόμενου)...he said (εἰπών)...and succeeded (πέιθει) in making Anchūs believe this" and B 27:10, 12a "and Anchūs said (εἶπεν) to David...and said (εἶπεν) David to Anchūs...and David was greatly trusted (ἐπιστεύθη) by Anchūs...."

answer to Anchūs' directive (6.326a) is both more eager and unequivocal than is the one ascribed to his Biblical counterpart in 28:2a.

My third opening question asked about the "distinctiveness" of Josephus' story of David's Philistine service vis-à-vis its *Vorlage*. Here, I would call attention to the following distinctive features of *Ant.* 6.319-326. Josephus retells the story in "streamlined" fashion, eliminating or generalizing many of the source's particulars that would likely prove off-putting to initiated Gentile readers. The psychological states and motivations behind characters' actions receive more explicit attention (see, e.g., David's "fears" [6.319, 323] and the rationale for Anchūs' promising David the post of his bodyguard [6.326]). Throughout, Josephus highlights as well David's concern with being a "good guest" for his Gentile host, just as he downplays the hero's bloodthirstiness in his raiding activity (see nn. 46, 48).

The last of my initial questions had in view the particular messages Josephus' version of the Gath interlude might be intended to convey to his double audience, i.e. cultivated Gentiles and fellow Jews.⁶⁸ To the former group, Josephus' retelling of the story presents David as an exemplary Jew in his dealings with a Gentile ruler to whom he does not wish to be a burden and sends a portion of the booty acquired by him and whose favors to himself he enthusiastically promises to repay when the opportunity arises for him to do so. With Gentile sensibilities in mind, Josephus likewise attenuates the seemingly excessive, routine bloodthirstiness attributed to the Biblical David (see nn. 46, 48). In all these respects the David of Josephus' version serves to counteract the canards to which many among his Gentile readers had likely been exposed about the Jews as a beggarly, un-generous, xenophobic and wantonly violent people in their dealings with others than their own kind. Josephus' presentation also, however, offers his own compatriots a "model" in the person of David who contrives to ingratiate himself with a Gentile overlord, doing so, however, without actually harming Jewish interests and even, in fact, successfully hoodwinking that overlord about his activities. Such a model would have a obvious relevance for Jews of Josephus' own day, one of whose major challenges was precisely

⁶⁸ On *Ant.*'s double audience, see L. H. Feldman, "Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling (CRINT 2/1; Assen: van Gorcum, 1988), 455-518, 470-71.

to find a way of living with and prospering under their all-powerful Roman masters. In thus depicting the revered figure of David as a kind of *Hofjude*, Josephus would, in addition, be offering fellow Jews an implicit *apologia* for his own, so vehemently criticized dealings with the Romans -- if David himself had played the part of the grateful guest at a Gentile ruler's court why should Josephus be condemned for doing the same?⁶⁹

It is my hope that the forgoing close reading of a very small component of *Ant.* in relation to its Biblical source has disclosed something of the instructive potential of such an exercise and will encourage fellow researchers to undertake similar investigations of other portions of Josephus' *magnum opus*.

Abstract

1 Sam 27:1-28:2 tells the story of the fugitive David's time of service to the Philistine king Achish. This essay investigates Josephus' retelling of the Biblical episode in his *Jewish Antiquities* 6.319-326, comparing his version with the source account as attested by MT, 4QSam^a, Codex Vaticanus and the Lucianic/Antiochene MSS of the LXX, and Targum Jonathan on the Former Prophets. Topics addressed by the comparison include the text-form(s) of 1 Sam 27:1-28:2 available to Josephus, the rewriting techniques and distinctive features evidenced by his version, and the messages his retelling of the story might be intended to convey to his double audience, i.e. cultivated Gentiles and fellow Jews.

撮要

撒母耳記上二十七章1節至二十八章2節敘述了大衛逃亡時服侍腓利士王亞吉的故事。本文作者查究了《猶太古史》6.319~326中約西法對這段聖經故事的重述，並將之與瑪索拉版本（MT）、4QS a^m（死海古卷）、梵帝岡抄本（Vaticanus）、盧西恩／安提柯中古猶太手稿（Lucianic/Antiochene MSS）的希臘版

⁶⁹ On Josephus' modelling of his depiction of Biblical characters in *Ant.* in accord with his earlier self-presentation of his conduct during and after the Great Revolt in *BJ*, see, e.g., D. Daube, "Typology in Josephus," *JJS* 31 (1980), 18-36, esp. 28-29; G. L. Johnson, "Josephus: Heir Apparent to the Prophetic Tradition?" in *SBL 1983 Seminar Papers*, 337-46, esp. 346; C. T. Begg, "Daniel and Josephus: Tracing Connections," in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, ed. A. S. van der Woude (BETL 106; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1993), 539-45.

本及他拉根 (Targum) 約拿單的前先知書等作比較。文中所比較的範圍包括：約西法可參考的文本、其再述的技巧及特徵、重述的故事中約西法意圖傳遞給讀者——外邦人與猶太同胞——的信息。