

THE ZIKLAG INTERLUDE ACCORDING TO JOSEPHUS

CHRISTOPHER BEGG

Within a segment focussed on the circumstances surrounding the Philistine advance against Israel and its outcome (1 Samuel 28- 2 Samuel 1), 1 Samuel 30, the story of David's avenging the Amalekite raid on Ziklag, constitutes a self-contained interlude in which the Philistine threat temporarily recedes from view¹. My purpose in this essay is to examine Josephus' version of the Ziklag episode as found in his *Antiquitates Judaicae* (hereafter *Ant.*) 6.356-367² by comparing this with the following major witnesses for the text of 1 Samuel 30: MT (BHS)³, Codex Vaticanus (hereafter B)⁴ and the Lucianic (hereafter L) or Antiochene MSS⁵ of the LXX, and Targum Jonathan on the Former

¹ On 1 Samuel 30, see, in addition to the commentaries: F. FORESTI, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School: A Study of 1 Sm 15 and Related Texts* (Studia Theologica Teresianum, 5) Roma 1984, pp. 102-109; E. ROOZE, *Amalek geweldia verslagen: Een bijbels-theologisch onderzoek naar de viiandschap Israël-Amalek*, Gornichem 1995, pp. 125-144.

² For the text and translation of the works of Josephus I use H.ST.J. THACKERAY et al. *Josephus* (LCL), Cambridge, MA, London 1926-1965 [Ant. 6.356-367 is found in Vol. VI, pp. 347-351 where the translation and notes are by R. Marcus]. I have likewise consulted the text and apparatus of *Ant.* 6.356-367 in B. NIESE, *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, II, Berlin 1955, pp. 82-84. On Josephus' overall treatment of the protagonist of 1 Samuel 30// *Ant.* 6.356-367, see L.H. FELDMAN, "Josephus' Portrait of David", in *HUCA*, 60 (1989), pp. 129-174.

³ The Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel found in 4QSam^a preserves only fragments of 1 Sam 30,28-31, a list of place names not paralleled as such in Josephus; see E.C. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM, 19), Chico, CA 1978, p. 271. Accordingly, I leave this witness out of account in my discussion.

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:1 *I and II Samuel*, Cambridge 1927.

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 1989.

Prophets (hereafter TJ)⁶. My comparison aims to see what can be determined about a range of overarching questions: Which text-form(s) of 1 Samuel 30 did Josephus employ? What “rewriting techniques” does he apply to the data of his source(s)? Are there distinctive features to the Josephan Ziklag episode that result from his application of these techniques? Why did Josephus elect to include the episode, and what particular messages/emphases might his version be intended to convey to Gentile readers on the one hand and Jewish readers on the other?

To facilitate my comparison between them, I divide up the material of 1 Samuel 30// *Ant.* 6.356-367 into six segments as follows: 1) The Sack of Ziklag Discovered (30,1-6// 6.356-358); 2) Pursuit Initiated (30,7-10// 6.359-360a); 3) Egyptian Interrogated (30,11-15// 6.360b-361); 4) David’s Victory (30,16-20// 6.362-364); 5) Booty Dispute (30,21-25// 6.365-367a); and 6) Booty Distributed (30,26-31// 6.367bc).

Sack of Ziklag Discovered

The Ziklag episode opens in 1 Sam 30,1a with David and his men arriving at the city “on the third day”. To appreciate Josephus’ rendering of this notice, one needs to take into account the conclusion to the preceding story, i.e. 1 Samuel 29 (// *Ant.* 6.351-355) concerning David’s dismissal by his overlord, King Achish of Gath, at the insistence of the “lords of the Philistines” who are distrustful of the former’s loyalty in their upcoming campaign against Israel. BL 1 Sam 29,10-11 features several divergences from MT: Achish’s word of dismissal (v. 10) contains an extended plus, i.e. “go to the place (τόπον) which I have appointed (κατέστησα) for you (pl.) and entertain no evil thought in your heart”, while for MT’s v. 11a (“so David set out with his men early in the morning to return to the land of the Philistines”) they read “...to guard (φυλάσσειν) the land of the Philistines”. Josephus’ parallel to 29,10-11 in 6.355 represents a kind of conflation of the distinctive readings of BL in these two verses: “go,

⁶ For TJ I use the text of A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic*, II, Leiden 1959 and the translation of D.J. HARRINGTON and A.J. SALDARINI, *Targum Jonathan on the Former Prophets* (The Aramaic Bible, 10), Wilmington, DE 1987.

within a day's time to the place (τόπον) which I [Achish] have given (έδωκα) thee [David] and suspect nothing untoward [// 29,10 BL]. There keep guard (φύλασσε) for me over the country [cf. 29,11 BL], lest any of the enemy (πολεμίων) invade it⁷. That too is the part of an ally (συμμαχίας)⁸. Having thus made use of the BL rendition of 29,10-11, Josephus next (6.356a) combines into one the notice on David's departure of 29,11a⁹ and the mention of his arrival at his destination (30,1a): "So David as the king of Gitta [=Gath] ordered¹⁰, went to Sekella (Σέκελλαν)"¹¹. But at the very time when he left there [i.e. Gitta]¹² to lend aid to the Philistines (συμμαχήσων τοῖς Παλαιστίνοις)¹³...". He then continues with

⁷ This phrase lacks a counterpart in either MT or BL 29,10-11 (I italicize such items in my discussion as I do also Biblical elements without counterpart in Josephus). It does, however, serve to foreshadow the Amalekites' assault which will be narrated in what follows where Greek terms for "enemy" will repeatedly be applied to them, see below.

⁸ Also this element of Achish' word in Josephus' version lacks an equivalent in 29,11. Its formulation will, however, be picked up in what follows, see below.

⁹ He leaves aside the (seemingly extraneous) notice on the Philistines' advance to Jezreel that occurs simultaneously with David's leaving Achish (v. 11a) in 29,11b.

¹⁰ With this inserted *Rückverweis* to Achish's directive to David as cited in 6.355, Josephus underscores the latter's faithful execution of his overlord's command. Josephus likewise keeps attention focussed on David for the moment by leaving aside 30,1a's mention of those accompanying him to Ziklag (although their presence there with him will be presupposed in the continuation of his account, see below).

¹¹ This is the form read by the "Epitome" of Josephus and adopted by Marcus. Niese, on the contrary, reads Σίκελλαν with the codices, as does A. SCHALIT, *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*, Leiden 1968, s.v. Σίκελλα (cf. Schalit's suggestions concerning the source for this reading, *ibid.*). Compare MT *siglag* (BL designate David's destination in 30,1a as Κε(ε)ιλά, although in 30,1b they will speak of Σεκελακ (B) / Σεκελάγ (L) in accordance with MT).

¹² This chronological indication replaces that of 30:1, i.e. "(David... came to Ziklag) on the third day (and the Amalekites made a raid upon... Ziklag...)". It is perhaps intended to make clear(er) that David's arrival at Ziklag did not coincide with the Amalekite raid on the city which would raise the question of why David did nothing to impede their attack.

¹³ This indication concerning the purpose of David's going to Ziklag parallels the BL plus in 30:1 (φυλάσσειν τήν γῆν τῶν ἀλλοφύλων), see above. It further echoes Achish's concluding word to David as cited in 6.355 "that (i.e. guarding the country against enemy invasion) too is the part of an ally (συμμαχίας)". On the difference between Josephus' standard Greek term for the Philistines (Παλαιστίνοι) and that of the LXX (ἀλλοφύλοι), see R. DE VAUX,

his version of the account of the Amalekite raid given in 30,1b-2: "... the Amalekite nation (τὸ τῶν Ἀμαληκιτῶν ἔθνος)¹⁴ had made an invasion (ἐπελθόν, BL ἐπέθετο) and taken (ἀρετ)¹⁵ Sekella by storm (κατὰ κρατος, B ἐπάταξεν L ἐπάταξαν), and, after setting fire (ἐμπρήσαντες, L ἐνεπύρισαν [B sg.]... ἐν πυρὶ) and capturing (λαβόντες) much booty¹⁶ from that town and the rest of the Philistine territory (χώρας)¹⁷, had retired (ἀνεχώρησαν)"¹⁸.

"Les Philistins dans la Septante", in J. SCHREINER (ed.), *Wort, Lied. und Gottesprach. Beiträge zur Septuaginta*, (Festschrift J. Ziegler; FzB, 1), Würzburg 1972, pp. 185-194.

¹⁴ The above designation for the Amalekites echoes that used by Josephus in his account of Saul's war against this people in Ant. 6.131-155 (// 1 Samuel 15). Compare the defective form *mlqy* of MT and the Ἀμαλήκ of BL. The long-running conflict between Israel and Amalek finds numerous mentions in the Old Testament on which see ROOZE, *Amalek* (n. 1). That conflict continues to be an object of reflection and elaboration in post-Biblical Jewish tradition, Josephus included. On the "Amalek problematic" in Judaism overall, see A. SAGI, "The Punishment of Amalek in Jewish Tradition: Coping with the Moral Problem", in *HTR*, 87 (1994), pp. 323-346. On Josephus' treatment of the Biblical episodes featuring Amalek, see the survey of J. MAIER, "Amalek in the Writings of Josephus", in F. PARENTE and J. SIEVERS (eds.), *Josephus & the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (SPB, 41), Leiden 1994, pp. 109-126. For detailed comparisons between Josephus' versions of particular episodes involving Amalek and their Biblical sources, BEGG, "Amaziah of Judah according to Josephus (ANT. 9.186-204)", in *Antonianum*, 70 (1995), pp. 3-30; idem, "Saul's War with Amalek according to Josephus" (forthcoming in *Laurentianum*); idem, "Israel's Battle with Amalek according to Josephus" (forthcoming in *Jewish Studies Quarterly*).

¹⁵ Note the historic present, a form which Josephus often introduces in his Biblical paraphrase where the corresponding LXX passage reads a past form; see C.T. BEGG, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (AJ 8,212-420) (BETL, 108), Leuven 1993, pp. 10-11, n. 32 and the literature cited there.

¹⁶ With this brief reference to the "property" captured by the Amalekites Josephus prepares the mentions of their "booty" which will figure prominently in the continuation of the story. The reference is perhaps inspired by the reading peculiar to B in 30,2 which speaks of the Amalekites taking captive "all things (πάντα) that were in it [Ziklag]" (compare L all those [πάντας], > MT). See n. 20.

¹⁷ The above indication concerning the other "source" of the Amalekites' booty has no counterpart in 30:2 which speaks simply of their plundering of Ziklag. It might, however, be seen as an "anticipation" of the language of 30,16 which speaks of the booty taken by the Amalekites "from the land of the Philistines", cf. also 30,1a where the Amalekite raid is said to have been directed not only against Ziklag, but also "upon the Negeb" (so MT, BL ἐπὶ

1 Sam 30,3-6 describes, at considerable length, the initial reaction of David and his men to what they encounter at ravaged Ziklag; Josephus' parallel is 6.357-359a. The Biblical sequence interweaves mention of the finders' consternation (vv.4,6) with enumeration of the losses that prompts this (vv.5,6a). Josephus makes his (compressed) version of the latter item a transition to his (embellished) rendition of the former: "Now when David found that Sekella had been sacked (ἐκπεπορημένην)¹⁹ and everything therein pillaged (διηραγμένα πάντα)²⁰ and that his two wives²¹ and the wives of his comrades (ἐταίρων)²² along with their children (τέκνοις)²³ taken captive (ἡχμαλωτισμενας, BL ἡμαλωτευμένοι)". He then continues with a description of the initial moment of the finders' reaction to the Ziklag catastrophe

τὸν νότον). In any case the wording of the indication echoes that of Achish's command to David in 6.355 "keep guard for me over the country (χώρον)", just as it does the inserted indication earlier in 6.356 about David's leaving "to lend aid to the *Philistines*".

¹⁸ Compare BL 30,2bβ ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν. Josephus' substitution of hypertaxis ("setting fire... and capturing... they had retired") for the parataxis of 30,1b-2 ("they had burned... and carried out... and went their way") is in accord with his standard practice throughout his Biblical paraphrase. Thereby, he essays, with his cultivated Gentile readers in mind, to "improve" the Greek style of the LXX with its slavish imitation of Hebrew sentence structure.

¹⁹ Josephus' only other use of the verb ἐκπορθέω is in *Bellum Judaicum* (hereafter *BJ*) 6.339 (it is also conjectured in Ant. 18.176). Compare 30,3 "they found it [Ziklag] burnt with fire" which repeats the indication of 30,1b (// 6.356).

²⁰ This reference has no equivalent as such in the enumeration of Ziklag's human losses in 30,3,5. It does, however, pick up on the Josephus' mention of the "much booty" captured by the Amalekites in 6.356. See n. 16.

²¹ In mentioning David's wives before those of his companions, Josephus reverses the sequence of 30:3,5, just as he keeps together in a continuous sequence the listing of Ziklag's losses which in the source is "disrupted" by the reference to the lament of David and his men in v. 4. In contrast to 30,5 Josephus likewise leaves unnamed the wives of David in question, i.e. "Ahinoam of Jezreel and Abigail the widow of Naboth of Carmel".

²² In 30,3 it is the wives of David's "men" (B ἄνδρες) who are found to be missing. Josephus' term "comrades" emphasizes the closeness of the bond between David and those accompanying him to Ziklag, an emphasis that will resurface in the continuation of his version, see n. 26.

²³ Compare 30,3 "their sons and daughters" (so MT B; L reads the reverse order).

(// 30,4): "... he [David] *straightaway rent* (περιρρήγνυται)²⁴ *his clothes*²⁵, and wailing and lamenting with his friends (κλαίων... καὶ ὀδυρόμενος μετὰ τῶν φίλων [compare ἑταίρων, 6.357])²⁶, he was so utterly undone by this calamity (κακοῦς) that at length even tears failed him (ἐπιλιπεῖν... τὰ δάκρυα)"²⁷. In 30,6a one hears of David's men turning on the leader with whom they had been joint in mourning just previously. Josephus leaves aside the source's opening formulation ("and David was greatly distressed because...") in order to come immediately to the threat facing him: "Moreover he was not far from being stoned to death (ἐκινδυνεύδε²⁸... βληθεῖς) by his comrades (ἑταίρων, see 6.357), who were deeply grieved (ἀλγούντων) by the capture of their *wives and children*³⁰, and held him responsible for what had happened"³¹.

²⁴ Note the historic present.

²⁵ This element represents a Josephan embellishment of the mourning scene as described in 30,4. Josephus would have found inspiration 28 for the item in the many similiar Biblical contexts where rending the clothes is a standard gesture of consternation/sorrow (see, e.g., in the immediate context of 1 Sam 30,4, 2 Sam 1,11, David's reaction to the news of Saul's death).

²⁶ Josephus employs the above collocation as part of a very similar formulation - here too preceded by mention of a rending of the clothes (see above) - in his account of David's lament for Saul in *Ant.* 7.4 (// 2 Sam 1,11) κλαίων... καὶ ὀδυρόμενος μετὰ τῶν ἑταίπων. Compare 30,4a "Then David and the people (MT; BL men) who were with him raised their voices and wept (ἐκλαυσαν)...". Once again, Josephus substitutes a term ("friends") that underscores the attachment between David and his entourage for the more neutral language of the source, i.e. "people/men"; see n. 22.

²⁷ The phrase "tears fail" occurs only here in Josephus. With the above formulation compare the concluding words of 30,4 "... until they had no more strength to weep (BL κλαίειν)".

²⁸ This is the reading of the codices MSP as well as the Latin translation of Josephus (Lat) which Marcus follows. Niese reads κινδυνεύσαι with the codices RO.

²⁹ Compare 30,6a "... the people (BL ὁ λαός) spoke of stoning (BL λιθοβολῆσαι) him...". Josephus' substitution of the designation "his comrades" for those who are set to stone David accentuates the pathos of the scene; see nn. 22,26.

³⁰ Compare 30,6aβ "because all the people were bitter in soul (BL κατώδυνος ψυχῆ), each for his sons and daughters". As in the case of 30,3b (see 6.357) Josephus here generalizes the source's separate mention of the company's male and female progeny, while also inserting a reference to their missing "wives" in line with that preceding passage. Also in what follows Josephus will highlight these "wives", see below.

³¹ This concluding notice is without parallel in 30,6a; it serves to spell

The account of the group's reaction to the Ziklag calamity (30,36) ends up (v. 6b) by noting that David, confronted with his own distress and his men's threat to his life "strengthened himself in the Lord his God". Josephus' turns this concluding source item into an introductory transition to the following segment, see below.

Pursuit Initiated

The next section of the Biblical "Ziklag interlude" focusses on the initial steps taken by David and his men in pursuing the Amalekite raiders. Matters commence (v. 7a) with David's directing the priest Abimelech "bring me the ephod". Josephus (6.359) combines his renditions of vv. 6b and 7a into the following notice: "Recovering from his grief (ἀνασχών... ἐκ τῆς λύπης)³², however, and lifting his thoughts to God (διάνοιαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀναστήσας)³³, he besought (παρεκάλεσε, BL 30,7 εἶπε[v]) the high priest (ἀρχιερέα)³⁴ Abiathar to put on his priestly robe (ἱερατικὴν στολήν)³⁵...". 1 Sam 30,7b (MT L, > B) rela-

out the connection between the entourage's negative emotions and their intention of stoning David.

³² This construction occurs only here in Josephus.

³³ This construction occurs only here in Josephus. The above double phrase is Josephus' replacement for the single expression of 30,6b "But David strengthened himself in the Lord his God". From the source formulation, Josephus, in line with a consistent tendency, eliminates its "un-Greek" use of the title "Lord" (LXX κύριος) for God; see BEGG, *Josephus' Account*, p. 45, n. 218 and the literature cited there.

³⁴ In 30,7a Abiathar is designated simply as "priest" (BL ἱερέα). Josephus uses the title "high priest" for Abiathar- just as he does for the latter's father Abimelech/Ahimelech (see, e.g., *Ant.* 6.242) and great-great grandfather Eli (see, e.g., 6.261); see too his ("un-Biblical") notice in 5.361-362 that with Eli the descendants of Ithamar took over the high priestly office from the line of Eleazar which they then occupied down to the time of Solomon [who dismissed Abiathar from office, cf. 1 Kgs 2,27.35]. From 30,7a 3 Josephus omits the name of Abiathar's father, i.e. "Ahimelech", compare his non-mention of the names of David's two wives (30,5) in 6.357.

³⁵ This Greek phrase recurs in *Ant.* 3.107 (pl.), 279; 8.95 (*bis*, pl.); 9.223; 15.390,403. Compare 30,7a "bring me (MT, > BL) the ephod (BL τὸ εφὸδ). As his wont throughout his Biblical paraphrase, Josephus here replaces source direct with indirect discourse, see BEGG, *Josephus' Account*, p. 12-13, n. 38. Josephus' substitution of alternative language ("the priestly gar-

tes Abiathar's execution of David's directive (30,7a). In agreement with the shorter text of B here³⁶, Josephus moves immediately to the matter of David's "inquiry" (// v. 8a) which he reports with various modifications and expansions:

(he besought Abiathar)... to inquire of God (ἐπερωτήσῃσιν τὸν θεόν)³⁷ and to predict (προφητεῦσαι) whether if³⁸ he pursued (διώξονται) the Amalekites³⁹, He would grant him to overtake (δίδωσι καταλαβεῖν)⁴⁰, and to rescue (σῶσαι) the women and children [see 6.357,358] and avenge himself on his foes (τιμωρήσασθαι... τοὺς ἐχθρούς)⁴¹.

ment") for the source's "ephod" here in 6.359 is in line with his omission of Biblical references to the latter object in the immediately preceding context, see 1 Sam 21,10 (the ephod in Nob); 22,18 (the 85 Nob priests wearing the ephod); 23,6 (Abiathar carries an ephod with him in his flight to David); 23,9 (David directs Abiathar to bring the ephod, see 30,7a). In fact, Josephus' only reproductions of Biblical mentions of the "ephod" occur in Ant. 3.162,163,164,170, in the context of his parallel to Exodus 28, the divine directives concerning the priests' vesture. In avoiding the term there after, Josephus perhaps wishes to spare Gentile readers the trouble of having to recall the nature of the unfamiliar item (and himself the bother of having to explain it once again).

³⁶ On the text-critical problem of 1 Sam 30,7, see the discussion in S. PISANO, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel. The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO, 57), Freiburg, Göttingen 1984, pp. 88-89.

³⁷ Josephus' two remaining uses of this construction are in Ant. 6.162 (Samuel inquires of God); 13.322 (subject Hyrcanus). Compare 30,8a where David himself is the subject of the verb "inquire": "and David inquired (ἐπηρωτήσεν) of the Lord" (note, here too, Josephus' substitution of "God" for the source's "the Lord"; see n.33).

³⁸ The above phrase has no equivalent in 30,8a as such. Its inserted reference to "prophesying" reflects Josephus' wider tendency to introduce prophetic terminology where the Bible lacks such, on which see L.H. FELDMAN, "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus", in *JTS*, 41 (1990), 386-422, pp. 389-391, as well as his accentuation of prophetic activity on the part of priests (see *ibid.*, pp. 419-421).

³⁹ With the above conditional, indirect discourse formulation, compare the direct discourse question of 30,8a (BL; MT reads a statement here, "I shall pursue"): "Shall I pursue (BL καταδιώξω) after this band?"

⁴⁰ Compare David's second question in 30,8a: "Shall I overtake (BL καταλήψομαι) them"? Josephus' formulation highlights the divine enablement involved in David's overtaking the Amalekites.

⁴¹ This construction recurs in Ant. 11.294;14.369. See also 6.132 where Samuel directs Saul in God's name "I command thee to take vengeance

Abiathar's response to David's questions (v. 8a) comes in v. 8b: "He⁴² answered him, 'Pursue; for you shall surely overtake and shall surely rescue'". Josephus' compressed version of this response serves as a transition to David's following initiative: "and when the high priest bade him pursue (διώκειν)⁴³...".

David reacts to Abiathar's directive/assurance (v. 8b) by heading off forthwith, accompanied by 600 (so MT L, B 400) men (v. 9a). Josephus (6.360) slightly elaborates: "... he *rushed off* (ἐκπηδήσας) with his six hundred (so MT B) soldiers (ὁπλιτῶν, BL ἄνδρες) on the track (εἶπετο) of his enemies (πολεμίους, cf. ἐχθρούς, 6.359)"⁴⁴. In 30,9bα the pursuit reaches the "brook Besor" where 200 men remain while the rest of David's force pushes on (30,9bβ-10). Josephus passes over the development cited in 30,9bβ-10 (although he will presume its content in the continuation of his account, see below). Instead, he connects the arrival at Besor (v.9bα) directly with the source narrative on the finding and interrogation of the Egyptian fugitive (w. 11-15). In so doing, he moves the story forward to its climax at a brisker pace than is the case with its more "leisurely" Biblical counterpart.

(τιμωρησάμενον) on the Amalekites in war" (for another verbal link between the Josephus accounts of Saul's and David's Amalekite campaigns, see n. 14), as well as the Mosaic injunction cited in Ant. 4.304 (// Deut 25,19) according to which the Israelites are to "take vengeance (τιμωρίαν)" on the Amalekites for the wrongs done by them. The entire above sequence "and to rescue... on his foes" has no equivalent in the two short questions posed by David in 30,8a. In thus expatiating on David's "inquiry", Josephus represents him as a far-seeing general who is concerned to know, not simply whether he will overtake the Amalekites, but how things will turn out if he does so. At the same time, Josephus may have found inspiration for the expansion in the "plus" of Abiathar's answer in 30,8b as compared with David's actual questions in v. 8a, wherein the priest informs the latter that he will not only "overtake", but will also "surely rescue (Βέξαιρούμενος ἐξελεῖ)".

⁴² In MT B the subject here is Abiathar, whereas L specifies "the Lord" as the respondent.

⁴³ BL 30,8b καταδίωκε. Once again, Josephus reformulates direct as indirect address.

⁴⁴ Like the term ἐχθρούς of 6.359, the designation πολεμίους is employed several times by Josephus in reference to the Amalekites in his account of Saul's campaign against them (Ant. 6.131-155), the former in 6.137,142, the latter in 6.135,136,138,140,141. Cf. also Achish's order to David in 6.355 ("keep guard for me over the country), lest any of the enemy (πολεμίων) invade it" with its foreshadowing of the upcoming attack by the hostile Amalekites.

Egyptian Interrogated

As just noted, Josephus (6.360b) juxtaposes the expedition's arrival at Besor with the discovery of the Egyptian informant. His conjunction of the two items reads then: "On reaching (παράγενόμενος) a stream (χειμάρρου, so BL) called Baselos (Βάσελον)⁴⁵, he came upon (περιπεσών)⁴⁶ a straggler (πλανωμένω), an Egyptian by race⁴⁷...". To this mention of David's encountering the fugitive, Josephus appends a description of the latter's state, anticipated from 30,12bβ⁴⁸: "who was exhausted from want and hunger (ὕπ' ἐνδεας... καὶ λιμοῦ)⁴⁹, having endured three days wandering in the wilderness⁵⁰ without food (ἄσιτος)⁵¹".

The source relates – rather circumstantially – the care given the Egyptian fugitive by David's men and the effects of this on him, 30,11b12abα. Josephus compresses, while also continuing to highlight the personal initiative of David: "After he [David] first revived and restored (ἀναλαβών) him⁵² with food and drink

⁴⁵ Compare MT "Besor"; BL Βοσόρ (cf. Lat *bosor*).

⁴⁶ The subject of both the above sg. participles is David. Contrast 30,10ba.11aa where it is "they" (David's men) who both arrive at Besor (so MT B; L has the sg.= David) and who find the Egyptian. Josephus thus highlights the figure of David throughout the pursuit, see also n. 52.

⁴⁷ Josephus leaves aside the specification of 30,11aα about the Egyptian being found "in the open country" (BL ἐν ἀγρῶ). Given that he has David himself find the fugitive (see above), he likewise passes over the statement of 30,11aβ "they took him (BL + and brought him) to David (B + in the open country)".

⁴⁸ Here, the description functions as a-somewhat obscure- rationale ("for...") of the notice of v. 12a "and when he had eaten, his spirit revived".

⁴⁹ The collocation "want and hunger" recurs, though in reverse order, in *Ant.* 9.65.

⁵⁰ This phrase lacks an equivalent in the description of the Egyptian's state in 30,12bβ. It might, however, be seen as Josephus' "delayed" utilization of the mention of his being found "in the open country" (BL ἐν ἀγρῶ) of 30,11aα.

⁵¹ Josephus' only other use of this term is in *Ant.* 10.258. With the above description compare the more expansive wording of 30,12bβ "(because) he had not eaten or drunk water for three days and three nights".

⁵² Compare 30,12bα "and when he had eaten, his spirit (BL πνεῦμα) revived (BL κατέστη)". With his rendition, accentuating the active role of David (in 30,11b-12aα it is "they", i.e. David's men who feed the Egyptian), Josephus avoids, as often elsewhere, a source reference to the "spirit" (LXX πνεῦμα) - whether of God or man. On the point see E. BEST, "The Use and

(ποῦ καὶ τροφῆ)⁵³...". Following the Egyptian's revival, David poses him a double question: "to whom do you belong? And where are you from?" (v. 13a, MT B; L reverses the order of the questions). Josephus, here too, transposes into indirect address: "... David asked who he was (τίς)⁵⁴ and whence he came (καὶ πόθεν)⁵⁵". He employs indirect discourse as well in formulating (6.361) the fugitive's reply (which, as in the source, goes beyond the actual questions put by David):

He revealed that he was of Egyptian race (see 6.360)⁵⁶ and had been left behind by his master (καταλειφθῆναι... ὑπὸ τοῦ δεσπότου)⁵⁷, *being unable to follow* because of sickness (ἀρρωστίαν)⁵⁸; he further made known that he was one of those who had burnt (καταπρησάντων) and ravaged (διηρνακότων) Sekella as well as parts of Judea (Ἰουδαίας)⁵⁹.

Non-use of Pneuma by Josephus", in *NovT*, 3 (1959), pp. 218-225.

⁵³ This collocation recurs in *Ant.* 7.159 and in reverse order in *BJ* 7.278; *Ant.* 6.377; 7.224; 11.230. It takes the place of the extended catalogue of victuals in 30,11b-12a "bread... water... a piece of cake of figs and two clusters of raisins" (this last item is absent in B 30,12).

⁵⁴ The codices MSP plus Lat read τίνοϛ here in accord with BL 30,13a.

⁵⁵ BL πόθεν εἶ. Note that the order of David's questions in Josephus corresponds to that of MT B against L, see above.

⁵⁶ Having reformulated David's first question which in the source (30,13a) asks about the Egyptian's "owner" into one about his identity (see above), Josephus also leaves aside the corresponding indication the fugitive attaches to his initial reply ("I am a young man of Egypt"), i.e. "servant to an Amalekite". In the continuation of his version of the Egyptian's reply, Josephus will, however, take over the source's reference to the Amalekite master, see below.

⁵⁷ Compare 30,13bβ "my master (BL κύπιος) left me behind (B κατέλιπεν [thus Josephus], L ἐγκατέλιπε)..."

⁵⁸ Josephus' one other use of the term ἀρρωστία is in *Ant.* 15.246 (the word occurs as a variant in *BJ* 1.106). Compare 30,13 (*fine*) "because I fell sick (ἠνωχλήθην) *three days ago*". Josephus leaves aside the fugitive's source specification about when he fell sick, having just previously (see 6.360// 30,12b) cited his "three day fast". Conversely, by means of the inserted phrase "being unable to follow" (see above), he spells out the consequence of the fugitive's sickness which causes his master's to "abandon" him.

⁵⁹ Josephus' version of the Egyptian's admission here represents a simplifying abridgement of the complicated geographical indications of 30,14: "We have made a raid upon the Negeb of the Cherethites (so MT; B Χολθεί, L Χορρί) and upon that which belongs to Judah (BL Ἰουδαίας), and upon the Negeb of Caleb (so MT; B Γελοῦε, L Χελοῦβ) and we burned (BL ἐνεπυρίσα-

1 Sam 30,15 relates a further exchange between David and the Egyptian in which the former asks the latter if he will lead him against the Amalekites (v. 15a) and is told that he will do so, on the condition that David swear neither to kill him nor hand him over to his master (v. 15b)⁶⁰. In so doing, he steamlines the story's movement towards its climax, David's triumph over the Amalekites⁶¹. At the same time, however, he also eliminates any suggestion that David might be capable of those reprehensible acts his Biblical counterpart is asked to swear not to commit.

David's Victory

The climatic segment of the story of 1 Samuel 30 comes in vv. 16-20 where David finally overtakes the Amalekites and wreaks vengeance upon them. The segment opens with a notice (30,16aα) that looks back to the Egyptian's promise to guide David to his prey at the end of v. 15: "and he took him (David) down". Josephus' equivalent (6.362), once again, highlights David as the acting subject: "So David made use of this man to guide (ὀδηγῶ)⁶² him to the Amalekites...". He then continues with his parallel to the description (30,16aββ) of the Amalekites' state as David approaches: "... and came upon (καταλαβών)⁶³ them (αὐτούς)⁶⁴ lying around on the ground (ἐπὶ γῆς ἐρριμμένους)⁶⁵, some at their morning meal (ἀριστῶντας, BL ἐσθίοντες)⁶⁶, others already drunken (μεθύοντας) and relaxed with wine (λελυμένους

μεν) Ziklag with fire". He will deal similarly with the geographical indications of 30,26-31, see below.

⁶⁰ Thus MT B. L features a plus at the end of the verse stating that David did in fact "swear".

⁶¹ Compare his similar treatment of the notices of 30,9b-10 on those left behind at Besor.

⁶² Josephus' other uses of the noun ὀδηγός are in *Ant.* 1.217; 12.305; 15.348.

⁶³ This verbal form has no equivalent in 30,16; it serves to keep attention focussed on David's active role in the proceedings.

⁶⁴ This word is lacking in the codices RO; Niese prints it within brackets in his text.

⁶⁵ BL διακεχυμένοι ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς.

⁶⁶ Josephus' only other use of the verb ἀριστάω is in *Ant.* 8.240.

ὑπὸ τοῦ οἴνου)⁶⁷, regaling themselves (ἀπολαύοντας)⁶⁸ with their spoils and booty (τῶν λαφύρων καὶ τῆς λείας)⁶⁹.

The source account concerning David's massacre of the Amalekites comes in 30,17 (MT): "And David smote them from twilight until the evening of the next day; and not a man of them escaped, except four hundred young men, who mounted camels and fled". Josephus (6.362b-364a) vastly elaborates on this notice, citing first the exploits of David personally and then those of his men:

Falling *suddenly* (ἐπιπεσὼν ἀφνιδίως)⁷⁰ upon them⁷¹, he made a great slaughter of them (πολὺν αὐτῶν φόνον εἰργάσατο, BL ἐπάταξεν αὐτούς), *for being unarmed* (γυμνοί) *and expecting* (προσδοκῶντες) *no such thing*⁷² *but intent on drinking and revelry* (τὸ πλεῖν καὶ εὐωχεῖσθαι)⁷³, *they were all an easy prey* (εὐκατέργαστοι)⁷⁴.

⁶⁷ This phrase occurs only here in Josephus. The above dual reference to the Amalekites' "intoxication" is his elaboration of the simple mention of their "drinking" (BL πίνοντες) in 30,16. Also in what follows Josephus will emphasize the Amalekites' drunken state, see below.

⁶⁸ Compare MT *hog'gim* (RSV "dancing"), BL ἐορτάζοντες.

⁶⁹ This collocation occurs only here in Josephus. Compare 30,16 "because of all the great spoils (BL σκύλοις) *they had taken from the land of the Philistines and from the land of the Judah*". Josephus omits the source's concluding mention of the "origins" of the Amalekites' booty which appear superfluous after the indications on the matter given in 6.356 (// 30,1b) and 361 (// 30,14). Recall our suggestion that he has "anticipated" the reference to "the land of the Philistines" of 30,16 to his account of the Amalekite raid in 6.356, see n. 17.

⁷⁰ Josephus uses the above phrase in his accounts of Saul's victory over Nahash (*Ant.* 6.79) and of that of Ahab over the Syrians (8.377).

⁷¹ The above phrase corresponds to the opening BL plus in 30,17 "and David came (ἦλθεν) upon them".

⁷² This phrase continues the verbal echoing of Josephus' account of Saul's victory over Nahash, see *Ant.* 6.79 where he states that the latter's forces "looked for no such thing" (οὐ πτοσδοκῶσι) and of Ahab's defeat of the Syrians, see 8.377 "these (the Syrians) had not expected (οὐ προσεδόκων) them (the Israelites) to come out". Cf. n. 70.

⁷³ This collocation occurs only here in Josephus; it picks up on his earlier description (6.362a) of the Amalekites as "already drunken and relaxed with wine, regaling themselves...".

⁷⁴ The word εὐκατέργαστος is *hapax* in Josephus. The whole of the above "explanation" of how David could so easily rout the Amalekites in a free creation of Josephus which does, however, pick up on the description of their state in 30,16 (and elaborated by him in 6.362a).

Some being surprised (ἐπικαταλαμβανομενοι)⁷⁵ *were massacred* (ἀνηροῦντο) *beside them, and their streaming blood carried off* (παρέσυρεν)⁷⁶ *victuals and food* (σιτία καὶ... τροφήν [see 6.360]); *others were drinking* (προπόσει, see πιεῖν, 6.362) *each other's health when he slew* (διέφθειπεν) *them: still others, under the influence of strong (drink)* (ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀκράτου), *were plunged in sleep* (πρὸς ὕπνον... κατενηνεγμένους)⁷⁷, *while those who had been quick enough to put on their armour* (περιθέμενοι τὰς πανοπλίας)⁷⁸ *and make a stand against him- these too he cut to pieces* (ἀπέσφαττε)⁷⁹ *with no less ease* (εὐχερῶς)⁸⁰ *than those who lay defenceless* (γυμνῶν, see 6.362) *on the ground*⁸¹. *David's companions too* (καὶ αὐτοί)⁸² *continued the slaughter* (ἀναιροῦντες, see ἀνηροῦντο, 6.363)⁸³ *from the first hour until the evening* (ἀπὸ πρώτης ὥρας ἕως ἑσπέρας)⁸⁴, so that there were left of the Amalekites no more than

⁷⁵ Josephus' other uses of the verb ἐπικαταλαμβάνω are in *Ant.* 5.28 (here too in a battle context, of the inhabitants of Jericho); 18.340 (and in 16.17 as a variant).

⁷⁶ Josephus' other uses of the verb παρασύρω are in *BJ* 4.76,660 (and as a variant in *Vita* 147).

⁷⁷ A variant of this expression, using εἰς rather than πρὸς, occurs in *Ant.* 1.141 (here too in association with drunkenness, i.e. that of Noah); 2.82,171. See also the equivalent phrase, likewise used in a battle context, of *Ant.* 1.177 (Abraham's victory over the enemy coalition) πρὸς ὕπνον τετραμμένοι.

⁷⁸ This expression occurs only here in Josephus.

⁷⁹ Niese reads ἀπέσφαττον with the codices RO here.

⁸⁰ The word εὐπερῆς occurs also in *Vita* 167,346 and as a variant in *Ant.* 13.239 (it is conjectured as well in *BJ* 5.13). The emphasis on the "ease" with which David massacres the Amalekites here in echoes the reference to their being "an easy prey" (εὐκατέρηαστοι) in 6.362.

⁸¹ The whole of the above sequence, encompassing a paragraph and a half of Josephus' presentation (6.362b-363), represents the historian's embellishment of the summary mention of David's "smiting" the Amalekites in 30,17a. The embellishment serves both to dramatize the affair and to highlight David's prowess as a warrior. On the passage, see FELDMAN, "David", pp. 166-167 who suggests that it, like Josephus' comparable elaboration of the Biblical account of Abraham's victory over the enemy kings (Genesis 14) in *Ant.* 1.177 (see n. 77), was inspired by a battle scene in Herodotus' *Histories* (1.211).

⁸² Niese conjectures (καὶ) αὐτός (i.e. David) for the above reading of the codices which Marcus follows.

⁸³ 1 Sam 30,17 speaks only of David's "smiting" the Amalekites; Josephus here in 6.364a provides a role in the proceedings also for those accompanying him, even while highlighting (see 6. 362b-363) the military initiative of David himself.

⁸⁴ In 30, 17 the equivalent chronological indication relates to *David's*

four hundred⁸⁵; these, by mounting (ἐπιβάντες) swift camels (δρομάσι⁸⁷ καμήλοις), had escaped (διέφυγον)⁸⁷.

Josephus, as noted, vastly expands the summary battle account of 30,17 in 6.362-364a. By contrast he makes only selective use of the circumstantial enumeration of the booty recovered by David (30,18-20) in 6.364b⁸⁸: "So David recovered (ἀνέσωσε) not only the booty which the enemy (πολέμιοι, see 6.360) had carried off (δήπρασαν, see 6.357,361), but also his wives⁸⁹ and those of his companions (ἐταίρων see 6.357,358)"⁹⁰.

smiting of the Amalekites. MT reads there *mhnsp w'd-h'rb lnhrtm* (RSV "from twilight until the evening of the next day"), Β ἀπὸ ἑωσφόρου ἕως δειλης (L ἑσπέρας) καὶ τῆ (L τῆς) ἐπ' ἄρῳριον ("from the early morning until the evening and on the next day"); TJ *mgbl' w'd 'dn rms' dywm' dbtrwhy* ("from dark and unto the time of the evening of the day that was after it") . Rabbinic tradition (see *Lev. Rab.* 21.3; *Lam. Rab.* Proem 30; 4.15; *Midr. Tanhuma-Yelammedenu* 8.4) understands the MT chronological indication (see above) as affirming that David's massacre lasted two nights and one day with God providing illumination during the nocturnal hours by way of meteors and lightning-flashes. By contrast, Josephus' notice envisages the massacre as lasting only during the daylight hours of a single day.

⁸⁵ According to *Gen. Rab.* 88.15 God allowed the 400 Amalekites to escape as a reward for the fact that the 400 men accompanying Esau, ancestor of Amalek (see Gen 36,16), when he went to meet Jacob (see Gen 33,1) departed peacefully- as did Esau himself (33,16).

⁸⁶ The word δρομάς is *hapax* in Josephus.

⁸⁷ Compare 30,17b "not a man of them [the Amalekites] escaped (Β ἔσωθη, L διεσώθη), except four hundred young men, who mounted (Β ἐπιβεβηκότα, L ἐπέβη) camels (Β ἐπὶ τὰς καμήλους, L ἐπὶ καμήλων) and fled (Β ἔφυγον, L ἔφυγεν)".

⁸⁸ In particular, he has no equivalent to the notice of 30,20 "David also captured all the flocks and herds; and the people drove these before him, and said, 'This is David's spoil'" (RSV; on the text-critical problems of the verse, see the commentaries). His omission of this notice may be due to the fact that livestock were not specifically mentioned in what precedes as part of the Amalekites' plunder.

⁸⁹ Compare 30,18 "David recovered (Β ἀφείλατο, L ἔκομίσαντο) all that the Amalekites had taken; and David rescued (BL ἔξείλατο) his two wives".

⁹⁰ The wives of David's men are not cited specifically in the summary notice of 30,19 "Nothing was missing, whether small or great, sons or daughters, spoil or anything that had been taken; David brought back all". Josephus' singling them out for explicit mention here in 6.364 is understandable given the emphasis on their loss in what precedes, see 6.357 (// 30,3), 358 (here Josephus introduces a second mention of the men's wives where the source, 30,6, speaks only of their children). See n. 99.

Booty Dispute

As a first sequel to David's climactic triumph over the Amalekites,¹ Sam 30,21-24 (*// Ant.* 6.365-367a) relates a dispute over the division of the booty that is eventually resolved by the victor. This account is introduced by a notice (30,21) about David's return to those he had left behind (see 30,9b-10)⁹¹, their coming to meet him and his men and his greeting of them (thus MT L; in B it is those who stayed behind who greet David). Josephus (6.365) gives a shortened version of this notice, leaving aside the (extraneous) detail about the "greeting": "When, on their return, they arrived at the spot⁹² where they had left *in charge of the baggage* (ἐπι τῶν σκευῶν)⁹³ two hundred men who were unable to follow (μὴ δυναμένουσ... ἔπεσθα)⁹⁴...". To this (truncated) version of 30,21, he attaches his rendering of 30,22, the declaration made by those who had pressed on with David: "the other four hundred men⁹⁵ were unwilling (οὐκ ἤξισουν) to share (ἀπομερίζειν) with them in their gains and booty (ὠφειλείας... καὶ λείας)⁹⁶, saying that⁹⁷, as they had not gone along *but had been unequal to the pursuit* (δῶξιν)⁹⁸, they ought to be content

⁹¹ Recall that Josephus leaves this earlier segment aside in his version.

⁹² 30,21 specifies the site as the "brook Besor", echoing 30,9-10.

⁹³ This indication concerning those left behind has no equivalent in 30,21 (or in 30,9b-10 to which it alludes) as such. Josephus anticipates it from 30,24 where David's decision has to do with the share of those who "stay with the baggage", see n. 104.

⁹⁴ This phrase echoes that used of the Egyptian in 6.361 ἔπεσθα μὴ δυνάμενον. David, as it turns out, deals magnanimously with both groups of "stragglers", this in contrast to the 200's own fellows and the Egyptian's master.

⁹⁵ With this "neutral" designation for the speakers compare the negative qualification of them as "wicked and base fellows" (RSV) in 30,22a. Josephus does, however, seem to re-utilize this wording in his version of David's response, see n. 100.

⁹⁶ This collocation occurs only here in Josephus; cf. ἄκκην ὠφέλιαν ἐκ τῆς λείας in *Ant.* 1.182. The above notice is Josephus' transposition into a narrative introductory remark of part of the 400's declaration as cited in 30,22, i.e. "we will not give them any of the spoil (BL σκύλων) which we have recovered".

⁹⁷ Here again, Josephus renders Biblical direct with indirect discourse.

⁹⁸ Compare the shorter formulation of 30,22 "because they did not go out (BL κατεδίωξαν) with us...". The phrase italicized above underscores the "failure" of the 200 which, in the view of their fellows, should disqualify them from receiving any portion of the booty.

(ἀγαπήσειν) with getting back (ἀπολαμβάνοντας) their wives who had been rescued (ἀνασσεσωσμένας, see ἀνέσωσε, 6.364)⁹⁹.

David's emphatically negative response to the 400's declaration comes in 30,23-24 which Josephus reproduces in indirect discourse in 6.366: "*But David pronounced this view of theirs wicked and unjust* (πονηρὰν καὶ ἄδικον)¹⁰⁰; for he said, seeing that God had enabled them to avenge their enemies (δμύνασθαι... τοὺς πολεμίους [see 6.360,364])¹⁰¹ and to recover (κομίσασθαι) all their possessions (πάντα τὰ αὐτῶν)¹⁰², they were bound (ἀξίον) to give an equal share (μερίζεσθαι τῆν ὠφέλειαν)¹⁰³, espe-

⁹⁹ Compare the concluding words of the 400 in 30,22 "... except that each man may lead away his wife and children. and depart". Note that from the source's formulation here Josephus takes over only the reference to the 400's "wives", not also their "children". His doing so is in line with his previous explicit mention of David's recovering of the "wives" of his companions (6.364) in contrast to the source (30,19) which refers instead to "sons or daughters", see n. 90.

¹⁰⁰ Josephus' one other use of this collocation is in *Ant.* 6.279 (reverse order, of the men of Ziph who plot to hand David over to Saul). As suggested above (see n. 95), Josephus' reference to David's characterization of the 400's view here represents a "reapplication" by him of the phrase applied to the 400 themselves in 30,22, i.e. "wicked and base" (BL πονηρὸς [compare πονηρὰς, 6.366] καὶ λοιμὸς)". Thereby, Josephus mutes the source's (seemingly excessive) denigration of the 400: it is not they themselves who are "wicked and unjust", but only their "view" regarding the question at hand.

¹⁰¹ The phrase "avenge on enemies" recurs in BJ (1.139,320); 4.174 (5.14); 7.380; *Ant.* 12.284; 13.94; 20.90. Compare τιμωρήσασθαι... τοὺς ἐχθροὺς in David's question to Abiathar in 6.360. Josephus' explicit mention of God's enabling David and his men to take vengeance on their "enemies" here has a counterpart in the L plus in 30,23 "after the Lord has given us *the adversaries* (τοὺς ὑπεναντίους)..." (compare MT "that which (or with which) YHWH has given us..."; B "after (what) the Lord has given us"); cf. the discussion in P.K. McCARTER, *1 Samuel* (AB, 8), New York 1980, p. 433. 1 Sam 30,23b continues with an elucidation of the Lord's "giving" (so v. 23a), i.e. "he has preserved us and given into our hand the band that came against us". Josephus' mention of divinely-enabled "vengeance" compresses both elements of 30,23 into a single formula. Note finally that, here too, Josephus replaces a source use of "the Lord" as a divine title with "God".

¹⁰² The above phrase lacks an equivalent in 30,23-24 as such; it does, however, pick up on the notice of 6.364 "David recovered the booty (τά... πάντα) which the enemy had carried off...". It might further be seen as Josephus' substitution for the rhetorical question with which 30,24 opens: "Who would listen to you in this matter (BL + for they [the 200] are not inferior to you [B]/ to us [L])"? On the text-critical problem of 30,24, see the discussion in PISANO, *Additions or Omissions*, pp. 217-219.

¹⁰³ The wording of David's answer here picks up, while likewise empha-

cially as they had remained to guard the baggage (ἐπι φυλακῆ τῶν σκευῶν)¹⁰⁴. The Biblical account of the booty dispute ends up in 30,25 with the etiological notice that David's ad hoc decision (30,23-24) became a permanent military rule in Israel. Josephus' parallel (6.367a) runs: "And thenceforth this law (νόμος) has prevailed among them, that those who guard the baggage (τὰ σκεύη φυλασσοντες, see ἐπι φυλακῆ τῶν σκευῶν, 6.366) receive the same (share) as those who do the fighting (μαχομένοις)"¹⁰⁵.

Booty Distributed

The Ziklag interlude concludes in 1 Sam 30,26-31 with an enumeration of the various sites to whose leaders David sent portions of the booty recovered by him¹⁰⁶. Josephus (6.367b) drastically simplifies this presentation, eliminating all the source's proper site names¹⁰⁷: "Moreover on his return to Sekella (γενόμενος... ἐν Σεκέλλα), David sent round (διέπεμψε) portions of the spoils (ἀπομοίρας¹⁰⁸ τῶν λαφύρων [see 6.362]) to all his acquaintances and friends (συνήθεσι καὶ φίλοις)¹⁰⁹ in the tribe of

tically contradicting, what is reported of the 400 in 6.365 ὀφελείας... οὐκ ἤξιον... ἀπομερίζειω.

¹⁰⁴ Compare 30,24b "For as his share is who goes down to the battle, so shall his share be who stays by the baggage (BL ἐπὶ τὰ σκευῆ); they shall share (BL μερισθῆναι) alike". Recall that Josephus "sets up" his reference to the 200 as guardians of the baggage here by means of the inserted reference to them as those left "in charge of the baggage" (ἐπὶ τῶν σκευῶν) in 6.365 (compare 30,21). See n. 93.

¹⁰⁵ Compare 30,25 "And from that day forward he (David) made it [so MT, BL have a passive construction "it became...", see Josephus above] a statute and an ordinance (BL εἰς πρόσταγμα καὶ [εἰς, > B] δικαίωμα) for Israel to this day".

¹⁰⁶ The names of the sites in question differ from one witness to the other, see the commentaries.

¹⁰⁷ Compare his leaving aside of several of the sites mentioned in 30,14 in 6.361; see n. In both instances, the concern not to overwhelm Gentile readers with strange-sounding and unknown place names is likely at work.

¹⁰⁸ Josephus' remaining uses of the term ἀπόμοιρα are in Ant. 5.326; 15.133.

¹⁰⁹ The phrase "acquaintance(s) and friend(s)" recurs - in this or the reverse order - in *BJ* 1.544; *Ant.* 7.233; 11.41; 15.350; *Vita* 180, 192, 204, 419. The terminological pair here in 6.367 echoes the repeated designations of those accompanying David as his "companions" (ἐταῖροι, 6.357, 658, 364)

Judah”¹¹⁰. In place of the individual sites enumerated in w.27-31, Josephus rounds off the whole Ziklag episode with a formula (6.367c) that provides the episode with a clear closure, prior to the following account of Saul’s defeat the Philistines (1 Samuel 31): “Such then was the affair of the sacking (πόθησιν) of Sekella and the slaughter (ἀνοίρεσιν)¹¹¹ of the Amalekites”.

Conclusion

In the conclusion of this essay, I wish to briefly sum up on my findings regarding the series of overarching questions about the Ziklag interlude which I posed at the beginning. My first such question concerned the text-form(s) of 1 Samuel 30 utilized by Josephus. Here, the relevant evidence seems to point to his dependence on a text like that attested by BL as opposed to MT. Thus, e.g., 6.355-356 clearly reflects the wording of Achish’s directive peculiar to BL 29,10-11; the mention of David’s “falling suddenly upon them (the Amalekites)” in 6.362 parallels the BL plus at the start of 30,17, while the passive formulation concerning the establishment of the booty-division regulation (6.367) corresponds to BL’s impersonal rendition in 30,25 (“it became a statute and an ordinance”) in contrast to MT’s “he (David) made it a statute and an ordinance”¹¹². Conversely, the instances of Jo-

and “friends” (φίλοι, 6.358). By means of such terminology Josephus underscores David’s closeness both to those who go with him on his movements and those who stayed at home. Conversely, his repeated use of terms for “enemy” in reference to the Amalekites (see 6.359, 360, 364, 366) highlights the hostility existing between them and David.

¹¹⁰ Compare 30,26a “When David came to Ziklag, he sent (BL ἀπέστειλεν) part of the spoil (BL τῶν σκύλοων) to the elders of Judah, to his friend(s) (so MT; BL καὶ τοῖς πλησίον αὐτοῦ)”. Josephus leaves aside the word of David appended to mention of his gift-giving in 30,26b “Here is a present [literally “blessing”, so MT L, > B] from the spoil of the enemies of the Lord”.

¹¹¹ This noun echoes the cognate verb ἀνοίρεω in Ant. 6.363,364.

¹¹² This finding is in accord with the long-standing scholarly consensus that for the Books of Samuel Josephus’ Biblical text was more similar to the LXX than to our MT; see L.H. FELDMAN, “Il ritratto di Assalonne in Giuseppe Flavio”, in *Revista Biblica* 41, (1993), 3-30, p. 3, n. 2. On the other hand, Ant. 6.356-367 does not yield clear-cut evidence for the further, widely accepted opinion that the Greek text of Samuel used by Josephus was more specifically of the (proto-) Lucianic type as opposed to that represented by B. Thus, e.g., in 6.361 the sequence of David’s questions to the Egyptian accords with

sephus' agreeing with MT against BL in 6.356-367 are quite minor: David goes (6.356) to "Sekella" (= Ziklag) whereas the Greek witnesses have him proceeding rather to "Ke(e)ila" in first place (although they too later speak of "Ziklag"); like MT 30,24a he has no equivalent to the BL plus "for they are not inferior to you/us" in David's word to the 400 (recall, however, that he also omits the question of 30,24a "who would listen to you in this matter?" common to both MT and BL).

As to my opening question about the "rewriting techniques" used by Josephus in 6.356-367, my reading has disclosed a whole series of such, often interconnected, techniques. Most notable of them is perhaps his additions to/ elaborations of source data, as represented above all by his massive embellishment of the summary notice on the defeat of the Amalekites (30,17) in 6.362b-364a. Smaller-scale expansions also occur, however: David's going to Ziklag in accordance with Achish's order (6.356, compare 30,1), David's rending his clothes (6.358, compare 30,4), the reason why David's men are set to stone him (6.358, compare 30,6), his more expansive question(s) to Abiathar (6.359, compare 30,8a), the Egyptian's "inability to follow" that causes his master to abandon him (6.361, compare 30,13), explicit mention of the "wives" of David's men as also recovered by him (6.364b, compare 30,18-20), the 400's claim about their fellows' being "unequal to the pursuit" (6.365, compare 30,22) and the closing notice for the episode as a whole (6.357c).

On the other hand, Josephus, throughout 6.356-367, also omits or abridges many source items. This technique concerns in first place the various Biblical proper names (David's two wives, 30,6, compare 6.357; Abiathar's father, 30,8, compare 6.359) and place names (the areas ravaged by the Amalekites, 30,14, compare 6.361; the catalogue of sites which receive David's bounty, 30,27-31, compare 6.367b). It likewise, however, surfaces in connection with a number of the "retarding moments" in the movement of the narrative as related in 1 Samuel 30 which Josephus either passes over entirely or significantly reduces, i.e.

that of MT B 30,13 contra L. Again, Josephus (6.359) agrees with B against MT L 30,7 in not mentioning explicitly that Abiathar did in fact do what David asked him, just as he goes together (6.360) with MT and B 30,8b in making the priest the one to answer David whereas in L the Lord himself does this.

the staying behind of the 200 (30,9b-10, compare 6.360), the catalogue of victuals given the Egyptian (30,11b-12α, compare 6.360), the concluding exchange between him and David (30,15, compare 6.361b-362a), the list of items recovered by David (30,18-20, compare 6.364b), the “greeting” between David and the 200 (30,21, compare 6.365), mention of the 200’s getting back their “children” as well as their wives (30,22, compare 6.365), David’s rhetorical question to the 400 (30,24a, compare 6.366), and the word accompanying his gift to the Judahites (30,26b, compare 6.367b).

Another noteworthy Josephan rewriting technique in our pericope is his re-arrangement of the source’s sequence. I recall the following examples: mention of the “land of the Philistines” as having been plundered by the Amalekites (30,16) is anticipated to the start of Josephus’ account, see 6.356. He reproduces the content of 30,3-6a (listing of Ziklag’s losses and the lament for these) in the order vv. 5,3,4,6a. Similarly, he relates the finding and revival of the Egyptian (30,11-12) in the sequence vv. 11α,12bβ,12bα,11b-12α*. The reference in David’s word of 30,24 to those who “stay with the baggage” is anticipated in his mention of the 200 to whom David and the 400 return in 6.365 (compare 30,21). Under this heading might be noted as well Josephus’ “reapplication” of the characterization of the 400 themselves as “wicked and base fellows” (30,22) so as to have this qualify rather the “view” emitted by them (6.366).

A final rewriting technique that is much in evidence in 6.356-367 involves the historian’s modifications/adaptations of the source’s wording, style, and content. Terminologically, he replaces all Biblical references to “the Lord” with “God” (compare, e.g., 6.359 and 30,6b), just as he calls Abiathar “high priest” rather than simply “priest” (compare 6.359 and 30,8a) and substitutes mention of his “priestly robe” for the *Fachausdruck* “ephod” (ibid). To be recalled here too is his weaving of various *Leitworte* through his version, e.g., comrade/friend language for those accompanying David (see, e.g., 6.357-658) and “enemy” terminology for the Amalekites (see, e.g., 6.359-360). On the stylistic level we noted his introduction of several historic presents (15,22), use of hypertaxis for source parataxis (see n. 18), and invariable recasting of direct as indirect discourse (compare, e.g., 6.359b360a and 30,8). Examples of contentual modifications/adaptations in Josephus’ Ziklag story include the following: David himself finds the Egyptian, rather than his men doing so and

then bringing him to David (6.360a, compare 30,11a), just as it is David personally who feeds the captive (6.360b, compare 30,11b-12a). In interrogating the Egyptian, David asks who is he instead of to whom he belongs (6.360b, compare 30,13a). He uses the informant "as a guide" (6.362a), whereas 30,16a refers to the Egyptian's "taking them down".

The preceding discussion of Josephus' rewriting techniques in 6.356-367 leads into my third opening question, i.e. what is distinctive about Josephus' version of the Ziklag episode in comparison with its *Vorlage*? In responding to this question, I would call attention to the following points. Narratologically, Josephus presents us with a streamlined version of the whole affair in which many of the source's secondary details have been eliminated. At the same time, he also increases the story's pathos (it is David's "comrades" who are set to stone him, 6.358, compare 30,6a) and drama (see his vivid *Ausmalung* of the jejune notice on David's "smiting" the Amalekites, 30,17, in 6.362b-364a). The story is tied more closely both to the immediately preceding account of David's dismissal by Achish (6.351-355// 1 Samuel 29) and to the narrative of Saul's war against Amelek (6.131-155// 1 Samuel 15) via the terminology Josephus works into 6.356-367. On the level of characterization, Josephus takes pains to accentuate the active role of David throughout the proceedings.

The last of the questions with which I began this essay had to do with Josephus' reason for including the (parenthetical) Ziklag episode in his work and what he might have intended it to offer his two-fold readership, i.e. cultivated Gentiles and fellow Jews¹¹³. Here I suggest that Josephus saw in the story, as appropriately retouched by him, a vehicle for engaging and instructing both his publics. In Josephus' retelling, first of all, the story caters to the military interests of potential Gentile readers, doing this by featuring David as a energetic and effective general who, as such, gives the lie to contemporary claims about the lack of Jewish heroes and Jewish cowardice¹¹⁴. It is likewise with the expectations of Gentile readers in mind that Josephus, e.g.,

¹¹³ On Josephus' double audience, see L.H. FELDMAN, "Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Flavius Josephus", in M.J. MULDER and H. SYSLING (eds.), *Mikra* (CRINT, 2:1), Assen 1988, 455-518, pp. 470-471.

¹¹⁴ On Josephus' concern with the above points throughout his retelling of Biblical history in *Ant.*, see FELDMAN, "Mikra", pp. 490-491, 498.

essays to improve the source's style, to avoid unfamiliar (uses of words ("Lord", "ephod"), to streamline the story's overall movement and to exploit its dramatic potential¹¹⁵.

As for possible Jewish readers, Josephus' rendition of the Ziklag interlude offers them both an implicit exhortation for their present life and a (subliminal) hope for the future. The exhortation is conveyed through the depiction of David who twice acts to surmount intra-Jewish tensions, first between himself and his own entourage who blame him for the Ziklag disaster (6.358) and then among his followers themselves regarding the sharing of what has been recovered (6.365-367a)¹¹⁶. In his exercise of this task, David appears as a especially appropriate role model for Josephus' Jewish contemporaries who, a few years previously, had experienced first-hand the fatal consequences of unrestrained indulgence in civil strife¹¹⁷. The hope Josephus' Ziklag story is meant to offer his fellow Jews remains even more implicit and allusive- necessarily so given *Ant.*'s other (and primary) intended audience. If, however, God had both promised (see 6.359-360) and brought to dramatic realization (6.362b-364a, 366) their ancestors' long-for "vengeance" upon the Amalekites of old who had stormed, burned and looted Ziklag (see 6.356), might not contemporary Jews hope that the Deity would some day do the same to the Romans who recently perpetrated just these things upon Jerusalem¹¹⁸?

Throughout his retelling of the Ziklag episode then Josephus

¹¹⁵ On Josephus' overall enhancement of the dramatic possibilities of the Biblical David story, see FELDMAN, "David", pp. 166-171.

¹¹⁶ The point is further reinforced by Josephus' recurrent use of comrade/friendship terminology in connection with the relationship between David and his entourage: as mutual friends of David, his men ought also to be friends, rather than quarreling rivals, of one another.

¹¹⁷ On the recurrent reflexes of the Jewish civil war that, according to Josephus, contributed so largely to the failure of the Great Revolt throughout *Ant.*, see, e.g., L.H. FELDMAN, "Josephus' Portrait of Joab", in *Estudios Bibliocos* 51, (1993), 323-351, pp. 335-350.

¹¹⁸ In this connection it is further of interest to recall "Amalek's" long-standing status as a code-name within Jewish tradition for the oppressor power of the moment as well as Amalek's genealogical link with "Esau" (see Gen 36,15) who functions similarly within Judaism, being, e.g., used by the Rabbis as a cipher precisely for Rome. For more on the point, see the literature cited in n. 14.

is engaged in a delicate balancing act wherein he attempts, simultaneously, to address the expectations, desires, prejudices and needs of two antagonistic publics. It is this feature which gives, I propose, a particular piquancy, not only to the microcosm of *Ant.* 6.356-367, but also to the macrocosm of his entire Biblical paraphrase.