

THE EXPLOITS OF DAVID'S HEROES ACCORDING TO JOSEPHUS

C. T. Begg

Within the so-called "Appendix" of the Book of 2 Samuel, chaps. 21-24, one meets two segments, i.e. 21,15-22; 23,8-37 featuring the names and exploits of the military heroes of David's time. The Chronicler reproduces most of the material making up these two segments, but lacking a parallel to the complex of 2 Samuel 21-24 as such, places this at different points in his work. Specifically, he attaches his counterpart to 21,15-22, i.e. 1 Chr 20,4-8, to his (truncated) version, in 20,1-3, of 2 Samuel 11-12 (David's Ammonite War and sin with Bathsheba), while his rendition of 23,8-37, 1 Chr 11,10-47, appears as part of a passage, 1 Chronicles 11-12, recording the names of those who lent their support to David at the outset of his reign. In this essay I wish to investigate Josephus' treatment of the Biblical presentations concerning David's heroes in his *Antiquitates Judaicae* (hereafter *Ant.*) 7.298-317¹. My investigation will involve a detailed comparison between Josephus' version and its Biblical parallels as represented by the following major witnesses: MT (BHS)², Codex Vaticanus (hereafter B)³ and the Lucianic (hereafter L) or Antiochene MSS⁴ of the LXX, the *Vetus Latina* (hereafter VL)⁵, the Vulgate

1. For the text and translation of the works of Josephus I use the edition of H.St.J. Thackeray - R. Marcus - A. Wikgren - L.H. Feldman, *Josephus* (LCL), Cambridge MA - London 1926-1965 (*Ant.* 7.298-317 is found in Vol. V, 516-531, ed. by Marcus). I have likewise consulted the text and apparatus for 7.298-317 in B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, II, Berlin 1955², 155-159.

Within the "hero material" of *Ant.* 7.298-317, 7.305-306 represents, it may be noted here at the outset, an "excursus" concerning David's initiatives in the sphere of liturgical music, see below.

2. The Qumran finds have yielded a fragmentary Hebrew text of 2 Sam 21,16-18; 23,9-12 which does not differ notably from MT. See D. Barthélemy - J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD I), Oxford 1955, 65.

3. For B I use A.E. Brooke - N. Maclean - H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*, II:I, *I and II Samuel*, Cambridge 1927; II:III, *I and II Chronicles*, Cambridge 1932.

4. For L I use N. Fernández Marcos - J.R. Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega*, I, *1-2 Samuel* (TECC 50), Madrid 1989; III, *1-2 Crónicas* (TECC 60), Madrid 1996.

5. For the VL marginal glosses found in a number of medieval Spanish Vulgate MSS, I use C. Morano Rodríguez, *Glosas Marginales de Vetus Latina en las Biblias Vulgatas Españolas. 1-2 Samuel* (TECC 48), Madrid 1989, 49-51.

(hereafter Vulg.)⁶, Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets (hereafter TJ)⁷ and the Targum of Chronicles (hereafter TC)⁸. I undertake this comparison with a number of over-arching questions in mind: Has Josephus based his account of David's heroes on the – somewhat divergent – presentations of both Samuel and Chronicles, or did he follow one of these sources to the exclusion of the other? Which text-form(s) of Samuel and/or Chronicles were available to him in composing *Ant.* 7.298-317? What sort of rewriting techniques has he applied to the source data, and are there distinctive features to his version which result therefrom? Finally, why does he include this material at all, and what messages might his *relecture* be intended to convey to *Ant.*'s double target audience, i.e. cultivated Gentiles and fellow Jews?

In turning now to my comparison, I divide up the parallel material into five segments as follows: 1) David Endangered (2 Sam 21,15-17//*Ant.* 7.298-300); 2) A First Trio of Heroes (21,18-22//1 Chr 20,4-8//7.301-304 [305-306]); 3) A Second Trio/Duo of Heroes (23,8-12//11,10-14//7.307-311a); 4) David's Wish for Water (23,13-17//11,15-19//7.311b-314); and 5) Two Final Heroes (23,18-23//11,20-25//7.315-317).

David Endangered

2 Samuel opens its account of David's heroes with a narrative (21,15-17) – to which the Chronicler has no counterpart – of the king's mortal danger from which he is delivered by his retainer Abishai⁹. Clearly aligning himself with Samuel against Chronicles in this instance, Josephus does relate the incident of David's endangerment in 7.298-300¹⁰.

6. For the Vulg. I use *Biblia Sacra*, V, *Samuhel*, Rome 1943; VIII, *Verba Dierum*, Rome 1948.

7. For TJ I use the text of A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, II, Leiden 1959 and the translation of this by D.J. Harrington - A.J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets* (The Aramaic Bible 10), Wilmington DE 1987.

8. For TC I use the text of R. Le Déaut - J. Robert, *Targum des Chroniques*, II (AnBib 51), Rome 1971 and the translation of J.S. McIvor, *The Targum of Chronicles* (The Aramaic Bible 19), Collegeville MN 1994.

9. On a possible reason for the Chronicler's "omission" of the episode, see W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 1,21), Tübingen 1955, 139.

10. Like Samuel as well, he directly juxtaposes this incident (21,15-17//7.298-300) to the episode of the slaying of Saul's descendants under David, 2 Sam 21,1-14//7.294-297. On the latter episode, see C.T. Begg, "The Execution of the Saulides according to Josephus", *Sefarad* 56 (1996) 3-18.

As recounted in 21,15 the threat to David's life emerges when the king "grows weary" during a renewed conflict with the Philistines. Josephus' elaboration of this background information provides a (positive) explanation of the royal "weariness": "Not long after this (μετ' οὐ πολὺν)¹¹ the king took the field (στρατεύεται)¹² against the Philistines (Παλαιστίνους¹³)¹⁴ and, after joining battle (συνάψας μάχην) with them¹⁵, put them to flight; but in pursuing¹⁶, he found himself alone¹⁷, and in this weary state (γενόμενος ἔκλυτος)¹⁸..."

The various witnesses to 21,16 diverge in their designations for the foeman who assaults the weary David. MT calls him יִשְׁבִּי' 19 בְּנֵב אֲשֶׁר בִּילִידֵי הַרְפָּה ,

11. This is the reading of the Latin translation (hereafter Lat.) and the *editio princeps* which Niese and Marcus follow. The Greek codices read μετὰ πολὺν. Josephus' chronological indication here takes the place of the simple paratactic "and" with which 21,15 makes the transition between the foregoing account of the execution of the Saulides (21,1-14) and the new incident of David's endangerment (21,15-17), see previous note. (In this essay I italicize Josephus items like the above which have no parallel as such in his Biblical sources.)

12. Note the historic present, a form which Josephus very frequently introduces in *Ant.* where the corresponding LXX passage has some past form. See C.T. Begg, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (AJ 8,212-420) (BETL 108), Leuven 1993, 10-12, n. 32 and the literature cited there.

13. This is Josephus' favored designation for the "Philistines" in contrast to LXX's standard ἄλλόφυλοι. See R. De Vaux, "Les Philistins dans la Septante", in J. Schreiner (ed.), *Wort, Lied, Gottesspruch. Beiträge zur Septuaginta. Festschrift J. Ziegler* (FzB 1), Würzburg 1972, 185-194.

14. In contrast to the opening words of 21,15 ("The Philistines had war again with Israel, and David went down together with his servants", RSV), Josephus' above formulation highlights the sole initiative of David in setting the conflict in motion, an emphasis which is prolonged in the continuation of 7.298, see nn. 15, 16.

15. Compare 21,15bα "and they (i.e. David and his "servants", see 21,15a) fought against the Philistines". Josephus' formulation, here too, underscores David's sole initiative in the conflict.

16. The above indications have no counterpart in 21,15. They highlight not only David's solitary initiative, but also the success of that initiative: he personally "puts to flight" the whole Philistine force. On Josephus' accentuation of David's courage and military stature throughout his retelling of the Biblical account of the king, see L.H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of David", *HUCA* 60 (1989) 129-174, 141-147.

17. Also this indication is without parallel in 21,15. It has been "negatively prepared" in what precedes given Josephus' non-reproduction of the source verse's mention of David's "servants" who fight alongside him. Mention of David's "aleness" at this juncture likewise highlights the dramatic suspense concerning the outcome of the foeman's assault upon the king which will be narrated in what follows.

18. Josephus' one other use of the term ἔκλυτος is in *Bellum Judaicum* (hereafter *BJ*) 1.372. Compare L 21,15 ἐξελύθη (B ἐπορεύθη, "and [David] went").

19. So the *qere*; the *ketiv* has יִשְׁבִּי' .

Β Ἰεσβὶ ὅς ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις τοῦ Ῥαφά, L Δαδοῦ ὁ Ἰωὰς ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάντων (≡ VL Dan filius Ioaz, qui fuit ex genere gigantium), and TJ גברא בנב רבבני ישבני²⁰. Josephus' nomenclature (7.299) for the figure goes its own way – at least in part: "... he (David) was seen by one of the enemy (πολεμίῳν)²¹, whose name was Akmōn (Ἀκμονος)²², the son of Araphos (Ἀράφου)²³, and who was, at the same time, a descendant of the Giants (ἀπόγονος τῶν Γιγάντων)²⁴...".

The divergences among the witnesses for 21,16 continue in connection with the weaponry/vesture of David's assailant: MT speaks of קִינֹו ("spear?") and his being girded with a "new" (*sic*; there is no noun accompanying the adjective הַשֵּׁחַד here – RSV supplies "sword"); B gives him a "spear(-head)" and a "club" (κορύνην), L a "spear(-head)" and a "belt"

20. For more on the problem of the original reading of the name of David's assailant, see, in addition to the commentaries: H.M. Wiener, "The Text of II Samuel XXI 15-16", *JPOS* 8 (1928) 63-64; 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, 151-154.

21. The above introductory phrase has no equivalent in 21,16; its reference to the foe man's "seeing" of the exhausted David helps explain his resolve to "kill" the king as cited later in 21,16. Note further that the term πολέμιος constitutes a *Leitwort* in 7.298-317, occurring six times there, cf. ἐχθρῶν in 7.312.

22. This name is quite different from that given David's would-be killer in the various witnesses to 21,16 (see above). Scholars propose various suggestions with regard to the origin of Josephus' form of the name. According to A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie*, Basel 1895, 49 Josephus' "Akmōn" actually preserves the original name in 21,16. For Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 518, n. a the form is based on the indication attached to the name of David's retainer Jashobeam, i.e. "the Hachominite" (MT בְּרִי־הַחֹמִיטִי in 1 Chr 11,11, similarly A. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*, Leiden 1968, 7. In contrast to all these authors, A. Schlatter, *Die hebräischen Namen bei Josephus* (BFCT 17,3), Gütersloh 1913, 64 holds that Josephus did have the MT *ketiv* of 21,16, i.e. יִשְׁבִּי בְנָב before him, but took over only its second element as a proper name from which he proceeded to fashion his own form. The matter remains a mystery.

23. For this name of Akmōn's "father" Josephus seems to draw on the proper name of MT (הַרְרָפָה) / B (Ῥαφά) of 21,16. On the disputed meaning of the word *hārāpāh* in 21,16 ("the giant"?; the equivalent of the Greek word ἄρπη, "scimitar"?; the title of some Canaanite deity?; the name of the mother of David's assailant [so, e.g., b. *Soṭ.*42b; *Ruth Rab.* 2.20; *Tanhuma B* 11.8]?), see, in addition to the commentaries: F. Willesen, "The Philistine Corps of the Scimitar from Gath", *JSS* 3 (1958) 327-335; C.E. L'Heureux, "The *y^{elidē} hārāpā'* – A Cultic Association of Warriors", *BASOR* 221 (1976) 83-85.

24. The wording of this indication concerning Akmōn's ancestry corresponds closely to that of L 21,16 ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάντων, cf. also the reading of TJ as cited above. On the other hand, Josephus also combines this phrase, inspired by L, with the proper name of Akmōn's father, i.e. "Araphos" which has no equivalent in L (here "Dadou" is called rather "son of *Iōas*"), but does correspond with the name *hārāpā* / Ῥαφά found in MT and B 21,16, respectively; see Marcus, *Josephus*, 519, n. b and cf. previous note.

(παραζώνην), while TJ's reference is to a "spear-tip" and either a "belt" (so L) or a "sword"²⁵. In contrast to all these witnesses Josephus allots the assailant three – rather than merely two – military items: "he had a spear (ξυστόν, BL δόρατος), the haft (σταθμόν, BL σταθμός)²⁶ of which *was said* to weigh (φασιν ἔλκειν)²⁷ three hundred shekels (σίκλους τριακοσίους, BL τριακοσίων σίκλων)²⁸, a *breastplate of chainmail* (θώρακα ἀλυσιδωτόν)²⁹, and a sword (ρόμφαίαν, see TJ and VL, cf. n. 25)³⁰...".

2 Sam 21,16 ends up with the statement that the assailant "thought to kill (BL πατάξει) David". Josephus dramatizes both the enemy's energetic assault and the king's powerlessness in face of this: "... *and he turned about and rushed forward* with the intention of killing (ἀποκτενῶν)³¹ the enemy's (πολεμίων)³² king, *who was exhausted by his exertions*³³".

Deliverance for the endangered David comes through the intervention of the royal retainer Abishai as described in 21,17a. Here too, Josephus (7.299b) accentuates the drama of the situation: "*But suddenly there ap-*

25. On the Aramaic term (ܩܝܢܝܢܐ) behind these alternative translations, see R.P. Gordon, "The *Gladius Hispaniensis* and Aramaic 'ISPĀNÍQE'", VT 35 (1985) 496-500 who opts for the rendering "(Spanish) sword". Compare the indication of VL 21,16 that David's foe "was girt with a *spata* (sword)".

26. Josephus' specific reference to the man's "spear-haft" aligns him with BL and TJ against MT 21,16 which speaks simply of a "spear" (?), see above.

27. This is the conjecture of S. Naber which Marcus follows. The codices have συνέλκειν, while Niese conjectures συνέβη ἔλκειν. In his use of the term "weight" with reference to the assailant's weapon, Josephus goes together with MT and B (ὄλκῃ) 21,16 against L which lacks it.

28. Josephus leaves aside the specification, common to all witnesses of 21,16, that the foeman's spear(-head) was of "bronze".

29. The word ἀλυσιδωτός is hapax in Josephus.

30. Josephus' listing of three – as opposed to the two cited by the witnesses for 21,16 (see above) – items carried by David's assailant is quite reminiscent of the catalogue of Goliath's equipment which he places on the lips of David in 6.187//1 Sam 17,45 "(thou comest against me with) sword, spear and breastplate (ρόμφαία καὶ δόρατι καὶ θώρακα)". Note particularly that in both 6.187 and 7.299 Josephus introduces mention of the "breast-plate" (θώραξ) worn by David's opponent, doing so each time without Biblical warrant (in 17,45 Goliath carries, in addition to his sword and a spear, a "javelin" [MT] or "shield" [LXX]). See n. 37.

31. This is the reading proposed by Niese on the basis of Lat.'s *perempturus* and adopted by Marcus. The codices have ἀποκτείνων.

32. This term echoes the same word used of Akmōn himself in 7.298.

33. This Biblically unparalleled qualification of Akmōn's intended victim recalls the reference to the king's being "weary" as a result of his military initiatives in 7.298. It heightens the tension as to what will become of David who is no position to resist his fully armed and energized assailant.

peared (ἐπιφανείς... ἐξείφνης)³⁴ Abisai, the brother of Joab³⁵, who protected (ὑπερήσπισε)³⁶ the king *by standing astride over him as he lay there* (περιβὰς κείμενον)³⁷, and killed his enemy (ἀπέκτεινε... τὸν πολέμιον)³⁸.

The episode of David's endangerment and delivery (21,15-17a) has a sequel in 21,17b where David's men swear: "you shall no more go out with us to battle, lest you quench the lamp of Israel" (RSV).

In line with his tendency throughout his rendition of the affair, Josephus expatiates also on its sequel:

*But the people were distressed at the king's narrow escape from death*³⁹ and the leaders (ἡγεμόνες, BL οἱ ἄνδρες Δαυ[ε]ίδ) made him swear (ᾠρκῶσαν αὐτόν)⁴⁰ that he would never again go out with them to battle⁴¹, lest, through his bravery and zeal (ἀνδρείαν καὶ

34. This phrase echoes that used of David himself by Hushai in his warning to Absalom "your father will appear suddenly" in 7.218.

35. In 21,17a Abishai is identified rather as "the son of Zeruiah" (Josephus does employ this alternative designation for Abishai in 6.311//1 Sam 26,6).

36. Compare B ἐβροθήσεν, L ἔσωσε. Josephus' two remaining uses of the verb ὑπερασπίζω are in *BJ* 5.541; *Ant.* 16.326.

37. The above phrase has no equivalent in 21,17a; it accentuates David's helplessness at the moment of Abishai's appearance. The phrase might also be seen as an ironic reversal of Josephus' description in 6.187 (//1 Sam 17,51) of David's "standing over his prostrate foe (ἐπίσταται... κείμενῳ)", i.e. Goliath – now the one lying prostrate is David himself (for another terminological link between 7.298-300 and Josephus' Goliath story, see n. 30).

38. Josephus' wording here underscores the ironic reversal of Akmōn's previously cited intention of "killing the enemy's king" – instead of this, he himself gets "killed" as "the enemy" of David by Abishai.

Rabbinic tradition greatly elaborates on the story of David's endangerment and deliverance as told in 2 Sam 21,15-17, see *b. Sanh.* 95a; *Midr. Pss.* 18.30 and the variant, briefer treatment of the episode in *Tanhuma B* 7.8; *Gen. Rab.* 59.11. In the two former texts, e.g., David's assailant "Ishbi-benob" is identified as the brother of Goliath and the son of "Orpah" (cf. *hārāpāh*, MT 21,16) who is herself killed by Abishai while on his way to rescue David.

39. 2 Sam 21,17b makes no mention of a reaction of the "people" as a whole to David's misadventure; Josephus' inserted comment on the point underscores the extent of the solicitude for the king's welfare.

40. In 21,17 it is David's men who themselves do the "swearing" (BL ᾠμοσαν); Josephus' formulation underscores the pressure exerted on David by the "leaders" to refrain from campaigning in person henceforth.

41. Note Josephus' transposition of the direct discourse of the oath of 21,17b into indirect discourse – a very frequent feature of his rewriting of Biblical history; see Begg, *Josephus' Account*, 12-13, n. 38 and the literature cited there.

προθυμίαν)⁴², he should suffer some injury and so deprive the people of the benefits (ἀγαθῶν) he brought them, both those that he had already conferred, and those they might still enjoy if he lived for a long time⁴³.

A First Trio of Heroes

Following the *Sondergut* of 21,15-17 (//7.298-300), 2 Samuel (21,18-22) and 1 Chronicles (20,4-8) converge in relating the exploits of three heroes in a series of battles with the Philistines; Josephus' parallel comes in 7.301-304.

The first of the segments' heroes is introduced in 21,18a//20,4a with mention of a renewed conflict with the Philistines. Josephus' rendition (7.301) appends a reference to David's response to the threat: "Then the Philistines assembled at the city of Gazara (Γάζαρα)⁴⁴ and when the king heard of it, he sent an army against them (ἔπεμψεν ἐπ' αὐτοῦς στρατιάν)⁴⁵".

The sources continue in 21,18b//20,4b by naming, quite unadornedly, the hero of the episode, i.e. "Sibbecai the Hushathite" (so MT). Josephus' version highlights the figure and his upcoming achievement: "*On that oc-*

42. This collocation occurs only here in Josephus; his insertion of the indication into the wording of the oath imposed on David by the leaders intends to make clear that it is not for any lack of personal "courage and zeal" that David is now being restrained from going into battle in the future – on the contrary.

43. The entire sequence italicized above might be seen as Josephus' elaboration/elucidation of the concluding words of the men's oath as cited in 21,17b "lest you quench the lamp (MT נֶר, BL λύχνον; compare TJ's prosaic equivalent, i.e. מַלְכוּת, kingdom) of Israel". The expansion highlights David's status as a source of good for all those ruled by him (compare 7.291 [cf. 2 Sam 20,22] where in the speech he creates for the wise woman of Abel Bethmaachah to her fellow citizens Josephus has her refer to David as "your benefactor [εὐεργετήσαντος] in so many ways").

On Josephus' version of 21,17b as an *apologia* for David designed to preclude any suspicion that the king's non-participation in battle from this time on reflects a lack of courage on his part, see Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of David", 145-147.

44. This localization of the forthcoming conflict agrees with that given in 20,4 (MT [Gezer] BL [Γάζερ]); compare 21,18 (MT/TJ/Vulg. "Gob" [many Hebrew MSS read "Nob" here]; B Γέθ; L Γαζέθ; VL "Carzel").

45. This inserted indication makes clear that, even though, in accord with the oath taken by him at the leaders' insistence in 7.300, he no longer goes out to war in person, David does not at all neglect his responsibility of providing for the defense of his kingdom in the face of the renewed Philistine threat. See n. 54.

casation mighty deeds were performed (ἠρίστευσε) *and great glory was won* (ἠὺδοκίμησε)⁴⁶ *by Sabrēchēs* (Σαβρήχης)⁴⁷ *the Hittite* (ὁ Χετταίος)⁴⁸, *one of the bravest* (ἀνδρειοτάτων) *of David's men...*". The witnesses diverge with regard to the identity of Sibbecai's victim(s) as the following chart makes clear:

בִּילְרֵי הַרְפָּה ... סָךְ (MT 21,18)
 מִלְרֵי הַרְפָּה ... סָפִי (MT 20,4)
 Σὲφ τὸν ἐν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις τοῦ Ῥαφά (B 21,18)
 τοὺς ἐπισυνηγμένους τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάντων (L 21,18)
 Σαφούτ ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν τῶν γιγάντων (B 20,4)
 Σαπφεί " " " "" (L 20,4).

Aligning himself with the reading of L 21,18 here, Josephus attributes, not one, but multiple casualties to “Sabrēchēs”: “... for he killed (ἀπέκτεινε, BL ἐπάταξε[v]) many of those who boasted of having the Giants for ancestors (τῶν ἀρχούντων προγόνους τοὺς Γίγαντας)⁴⁹, *and thought much of their own courage* (ἀνδρεια)⁵⁰; and so he was responsible for the victory (αἴτιος... νίκης)⁵¹ of the Hebrews (Ἑβραίοις)⁵²”.

The sources introduce their notice on the exploit of a second Israelite hero in 21,19a//20,5a via a reference to renewed hostilities with the

46. The above collocation of the verbs ἀριστεύω and εὐδοκιμέω occurs only here in Josephus.

47. Schlatter, *Namen*, 82 and Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, 104 emend to Σαββήχης. Compare “Sibbecai” (MT 21,18//20,4), Ὀεβογά (B 21,18), Σοβοχαί (L 21,18), Σοβοκχί (B 20,4), Σοβακχί (L 20,4).

48. This is precisely the same designation found in L 21,18. Compare יְהִיָּה (MT 21,18//20,4), ὁ Ἀστατωθεῖ (B 21,18), Θεωσαθεῖ (B 20,4), Ἐσσαθεῖ (L 20,4).

49. Compare the phrase ἀπόγονος τῶν Γιγάντων used of “Akmōn” in 7.298.

50. In this appended qualification of the victims note the ironic wordplay with the preceding characterization of Sabrēchēs as “one of the bravest (ἀνδρειοτάτων) of David's men”. The superior “courage” of the one Israelite hero brings to naught that which his “many” opponents suppose themselves to possess.

51. The phrase “cause of victory” recurs in *Ant.* 6.128 (13.142); 14.139.

52. The above concluding reference to the Hebrews’ “victory” effected by Sabrēchēs seems to reflect the plus of 20,4: “and they (the Philistines) were subdued” (so MT; compare BL καὶ ἠταπείνωσεν αὐτόν [L + καὶ ἐνετράπησαν] where the implicit subject of the “humbling” is the Israelite hero himself). On Josephus’ use of the term “Hebrews” for his people at various moments of their history, see G. Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (AGJU 35), Leiden 1996, 124-129.

Philistines. In line with 20,5a Josephus (7.302) omits mention of the site of the conflict⁵³, even while otherwise expatiating on this new development: “*After this defeat the Philistines made war a second time and David sent an army against them* (στρατιάν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς... πέμψαντος)⁵⁴”.

Both the hero of the episode related in 21,19//20,5 and his victim bear widely differing designations in the various witnesses, as appears from the following table:

אֶלְחָנָן בֶּן־יִעֲרִי אֲרָגִים בֵּית הַלְחָמִי אֶת גִּלְיָת הַגִּתִּי (MT 21,19)

אֶלְחָנָן בֶּן־יִעֲרִי אֶת־לַחְמִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי (MT 20,5)

Ἐλεανὰν υἱὸς Ἀριωργεῖμ ὁ Βασιθλεεμμίτης τὸν Γοδολίαν τὸν Χετταῖον (B 21,19)

Ἐλλανὰν υἱὸς Ἰαδδεῖν υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἐλεμὶ τὸν Γολιάθ τὸν Γεθθαῖον (L 21,19)

Taman filius Addin de domo Helime Goliath (VL 21,19)

Adeodatus filius Saltus polymitarius bethleemites Goliath Gettheum (Vulg. 21,19)

אֶלְחָנָן בֶּן־יִעֲרִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי אֶת־יִעֲרִי (TJ 21,19)

Ἐλλὰν υἱὸς Ἰαεὶρ τὸν Ἐλεμεεὶ ἀδελφὸν Γολιάθ τοῦ Γεθθαίου (B 20,5)

Ἐλεανὰν υἱὸς Ἰαεῖρ τὸν Λοομμεῖ ἀδελφὸν Γολιάθ τοῦ Γεθθαίου (L 20,5)

Adeodatus filius Saltus Lehemites fratrem Goliath Getthei (Vulg. 20,5)

... ית לחמי אחוהי דגלית ... ישי... (TC 20,5)⁵⁷.

53. Compare MT (and TJ Vulg.) 21,19 “Gob” (many MSS read “Nob” as in 21,18); B Ῥόμ, L Ῥόβ.

54. The wording of this inserted phrase closely corresponds to the – likewise inserted – notice on David’s response to the first Philistine attack in 7.301 (ἔπεμψεν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς στρατιάν). In both instances Josephus goes beyond the sources in his insistence that, even though he no longer goes into battle himself, King David continues to take energetic measures to ensure the security of his country; see n. 45.

55. The *qere* has יעיר.

56. At this juncture the Targumist inserts an extended parenthetical characterization of David as “the pious man who awoke from his sleep in the middle of the night to offer praise before the Lord”. On the inspiration for this elaboration see McIvor, *Chronicles*, 113, *ad loc.*

57. The Targumist goes on to specify that David’s killing of “Lahmi” took place “on the (same) day that he killed Goliath who was from Gath”.

As is widely recognized, the variations as to the identity of both slayer and slain in 21,19//20,5 relate to the seeming contradiction between the statement of 21,19 (TJ excepted) according to which Elhanan killed Goliath and the story of 1 Samuel 17 where Goliath dies at the hands of David himself. This discrepancy is resolved in various ways by one or the other of the witnesses cited above: in 20,5 (TC excepted) the one killed by Elhanan is Goliath's brother "Lahmi" (MT); TJ 21,19 makes David Goliath's killer, as in 1 Samuel 17, while TC 20,5, conflating, as it were, the indications of TJ 21,19 and MT 20,5, has David kill Goliath's brother (doing this on the same day he slew Goliath himself, see n. 57)⁵⁸. Josephus too takes care to avoid the appearance of a "contradiction" between his Goliath story (*Ant.* 6.170-192) and his equivalent to the hero notice of 21,19//20,5 here in 7.302. He does this, however, in a way unique to himself, i.e. by leaving the name of the hero's victim unmentioned. His account of the matter thus reads: "(David sent an army against them) *of whom the most valiant* (ἡρίστεισεν)⁵⁹ *was his relative* (συγγενής)⁶⁰ Ephan (Ἐφάν)⁶¹, *for in single combat* (μονομαχίας)⁶² *with the bravest* (ἀνδρειοτάτῳ)⁶³ *of all the*

58. TJ and TC's substitution of "David" for the Elhanan of MT 21,19//20,5 has a counterpart elsewhere in Jewish-Christian tradition where the latter is said to be identical with David, see *Ruth Rab.* 2.20; Ps.-Jerome on 2 Sam 21,19 (PL 23,1361 [here the "Adeodatus" of Vulg.'s translation is said to be a title for David "quia a Deo est electus in regnum"]). Likewise a number of more recent authors have suggested that "Elhanan" was the personal name of King David, thus: A.M. Honeyman, "Regnal Names among the Hebrews", *JBL* 68 (1948) 13-25, 23-24; L.M. von Pákozdy, "'Elhanan – der frühere Name Davids?", *ZAW* 68 (1956) 257-59.

59. This verbal form is the same one used by Josephus of the previous hero, Sabrēchēs, in 7.301; see n. 65.

60. None of the Biblical witnesses qualify the hero of 21,19//20,5 as a "relative" of David. Josephus may have come to the idea of making him such on the basis of the designation of Elhanan as "the Bethlehemite" in 21,19 (MT B, cf. also the mention of "Elhanan the son of Dodo of Bethlehem" in the list of David's heroes in 2 Sam 23,24//1 Chr 11,26), i.e. one stemming from the same town as David himself.

61. This form of the hero's name does not correspond to any of those given by the Biblical witnesses. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, 43 maintains that it is a corruption of an original that would have accorded with the Biblical one, i.e. Ἐλεχανάν.

62. This term introduces an echo of Josephus' Goliath story; see 6.177 where it is used of David's volunteering to engage the giant alone (this verbal link could suggest that Josephus did, in fact, have the name "Goliath" before him in his source text(s) of 21,19//20,5, even though he does not reproduce the name as such here in 7.302; see above). His only other use of the verb μονομαχέω occurs later in our "hero-sequence", see 7.304.

63. This is the same term applied to the Israelite hero Sabrēchēs in 7.301; its use of Ephan's opponent here in 7.302 underscores the magnitude of his triumph over that "most courageous" opponent.

*Philistines*⁶⁴, he killed (ἀπέκτεινεν)⁶⁵ him and put the rest to flight, many (πολλοί)⁶⁶ of them being slain in battle (μαχόμενοι)⁶⁷”.

2 Sam 21,20a//1 Chr 20,6a introduce the exploit of a third Israelite hero with mention of there being war yet again, this time “at Gath”. As he did with the two previous episodes, Josephus (7.303) expatiates on this introductory notice: “*But after a brief interval of time they (the Philistines) encamped (ἔστρατοπεδεύσαντο)*⁶⁸ near Gitta (πρὸς Γίττη)⁶⁹, a city not far from the border of the Hebrews (see 7.301)⁷⁰...”.

The sources (21,20b//20,6b) next proceed to present Israel’s new opponent, i.e. a nameless descendant of *hārāpāh* (so MT), a “man of great stature” (so 20,6b [BL ἀνὴρ ὑπερμεγέθης])⁷¹ and possessing six toes and fingers. Josephus’ rendition delays reference to the foeman’s parentage, while supplying a “precise” indication of his height: “and there was among them a man of *six cubits*⁷², who had, on both of his feet and hands, one more toe and finger than nature usually provides⁷³”.

64. Josephus has no equivalent to the notice appended to the mention of Goliath at the end of both 21,19 and 20,5, i.e. “the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver’s beam”.

65. This verb constitutes another verbal parallel between Josephus’ account of the heroes Sabrēchēs and Ephan, being used of the former’s deed in 7.301; see n. 59. Compare BL 21,19//20,5 ἐπάταξεν.

66. Likewise this term serves to parallel Sabrēchēs and Ephan, the former being credited with killing “many” (πολλούς) of the descendants of the Giants in 7.301; see nn. 59, 65.

67. Note the word play with the term μονομαχίας earlier in 7.302. Josephus’ appended notice on the sequels to Ephan’s slaying of his opponent accentuates the import of his achievement.

68. On this reading see Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 520, n. 3.

69. This is the emendation proposed by Niese and adopted by Marcus for the codices’ πρὸς τῆ; it is based on the mention of “Gath” (BL Γέθ) in 21,20//20,6.

70. Such inserted geographical indications are a frequent feature of Josephus’ rewriting of Biblical history; another such occurs in our passage in 7.312.

71. Compare MT 21,20 שׂוֹרֵר (ketiv)/ שׂוֹרֵר (qere); the meaning of the *qere* form שׂוֹרֵר is disputed: it is rendered with both “quarrelsome man” and “man of stature” (so 20,6; cf. the readings of Vulg. [vir excelsus] and TJ [גבר רמשה] 21,20) by modern commentators. By contrast, B (ἀνὴρ Μαδών, cf. L ἀνὴρ ἐκ Παζήης) take it as a proper name, as does Rabbinic tradition (see *b. Sof.* 42b; *Midr. Pss.* 18.5) which identifies “Madon” as one of the four descendants of *hārāpāh* (who is further identified with Naomi’s daughter-in-law ‘*orpāh*, see n. 81) spoken of 21,22.

72. Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 521, n. g suggests that Josephus derives the figure “six” in the above phrase from the number of the giant’s toes and fingers as cited in the sources. I would further suggest that, in thus specifying the enemy’s size in cubits here, Josephus might have been inspired by the reference to the Egyptian whom Benaiah slew being “five cubits tall” in 1 Chr 11,23.

73. Compare 21,20//20,6: “... who had six fingers on each hand, and six toes on each foot, twenty-four in number”.

The Biblical notices on the enemy's overthrow (21,21//20,7) commence with mention of his "taunting" Israel, this evoking the intervention of another Israelite hero, i.e. Jonathan, who kills him. Josephus' equivalent (7.304) echoes the wording used by him in the two preceding hero stories: "Now of the army sent against them (πεμφθείσης ἐπ' αὐτούς... στρατιᾶς)⁷⁴, Jonathan (Ἰωνάθης, BL Ἰωναθάν)⁷⁵ the son of Sama (Σαμαῖ)⁷⁶, fought against this man in single combat (μονομαχίᾳ)⁷⁷, and by slaying (ἀνείλε, BL ἐπάταξεν) him, turned the battle into a complete victory (ὅλης νίκης)⁷⁸ and carried off the first prize for valour (δόξαν ἄριστείας)⁷⁹; this Philistine had also boasted of being a descendant of the Giants (ἡῤχει τῶν Γιγάντων ἀπόγονος)⁸⁰".

Josephus' sources round off (21,22//20,8) their preceding hero segment with a very similar closing formula: "These four (so 21,22, > 20,8)⁸¹ de-

74. Here for the third time in his version of 21,16-22//20,4-8 in 7.301-304, Josephus interjects a similarly worded mention of David's "dispatching an army" in the face of a Philistine advance; see nn. 45, 54.

75. Ps.-Jerome, commenting on 2 Sam 21,21, identifies "Jonathan" with the prophet Nathan (PL 23,1360).

76. This is the reading of the *editio princeps* which Marcus follows; Niese reads Σουμᾶ with the codices and Lat.'s sumae. Compare ןַשָּׁמַי (21,21, *ketiv*), הַשָּׁמַי (21,21 *qere*), שָׁמַי (MT 20,7), Σεμεί (B 21,21), Σαμαῖ (L 21,21, BL 20,7), Sammaa (Vulg. 21,21 and 20,7). Josephus leaves aside the indication, common to both sources, that Jonathan's father was the "brother" of David.

77. This is the same term used by Josephus in reference to "Ephan's" duel with "the bravest of all the Philistines" in 7.302. See n. 62.

78. The above appended indication on the wider sequels to Jonathan's deed magnifies the import of that deed. It further corresponds to similar indications inserted by Josephus with regard to the impact of the two previous heroes' deeds on the Philistines as a whole; see in particular 7.302 which speaks of Sabrêchês being "responsible for the victory (νίκης) of the Hebrews" in virtue of his slaying of the Giants' descendants.

79. Josephus' other uses of the noun ἀριστεία are in BJ 7.11; Ant. 11.249;19.325. The word echoes the verb ἀριστεύω used of the heroes Sabrêchês and Ephan in 7.301 and 302, respectively.

80. The above phrase echoes the expression τῶν ἀρχόντων προγόνους τοὺς Γιγάντας of 7.301. It likewise represents Josephus' "delayed" use of the notice on the ancestry of Jonathan's opponent of 21,20//20,6. In particular, its wording echoes that of BL 20,6 (οὗτος ἦν ἀπόγονος [τῶν] γιγάντων. Compare הַיְהוּדִים לְיָדָיו (MT 21,20), הַיְהוּדִים לְיָדָיו (MT 20,6), ἐτέχη τῷ Ῥαφᾶ (B 21,20), ἀπογόνος Τιτᾶνος (L 21,20).

81. The absence of the specification "four" of 21,22 in 20,8 is due to the fact that the Chronicler does not reproduce the first of the four hero episodes making up 2 Sam 21,15-22, i.e. the account of Abishai's delivery of David (21,15-17) such that in his presentation in 20,4-8 only three – rather than four – heroes are featured. By contrast, Rabbinic tradition goes behind 21,22 itself in identifying the four descendants of *hārāpāh* spoken of in that verse as the giant sons of Naomi's daughter-in-law 'orpāh, see *Midr. Pss.* 18.5; *b. Sof.* 42b

scended from the giants (MT *l'hārāpāh*); and they fell by the hand of David and by the hand of his servants". The historian, in line with his tendency to underscore the wider impact of the heroes' exploits throughout 7.301-304, replaces this closing formula with one of his own devising⁸², i.e. "But after this battle they (the Philistines) did not again make war on the Israelites⁸³".

Josephus follows his closing notice at the end of 7.304 with a segment (7.305-306) featuring David's initiatives in the sphere of sacred music, a matter to which the king could turn at this point "being", as stated at the start of 7.305, "now free from wars and dangers, and enjoying profound peace from this time on...". Since the content of this segment does not concern the exploits of David's heroes, I shall not comment on it in detail here⁸⁴.

A Second Trio/Duo of Heroes

David's heroes are also featured in another Biblical context, i.e. 2 Sam 23,8-39//1 Chr 11,10-47. Within this passage itself one may, in turn, distinguish between a segment relating the deeds of five (so 23,8-23) / four (so 11,10-25) named heroes, and an appended list (23,24-39//11,26-47) of further heroes that simply cites their names, with nothing being said of their exploits. Josephus, for his part, does not reproduce the name-list of 23,24-

(here the names of the four are given as Saph [2 Sam 21,18], Madon [21,20, see n. 71], Goliath [1 Samuel 17] and Ishbi-benob [21,16]); *Ruth Rab.* 2.20; *Tanhuma B* 11.8 (in these two passages various Rabbis are cited as affirming that because Orpah went four miles with her mother-in-law, she had the four mighty men spoken of in 21,22 as her descendants).

82. In thus replacing the notice of 21,22//20,8 Josephus likewise avoids its problematic reference to the descendants of the giants "falling by the hand of David", given that, in what precedes, it is, in fact, persons other than David who are responsible for their slayings in all instances.

83. Compare the designation "Hebrews" used in 7.301,303; such oscillations in Josephus' nomenclature for his people are frequent in *Ant.*

84. I confine myself to the following brief remarks about the content of the segment and its Biblical sources. In 7.305a Josephus speaks of David's "composing songs and hymns to God". This notice derives from the poetic materials attributed to David in the passage (2 Sam 22,1-23,7) which stands between the two "hero-sections" (21,15-22 and 23,8-39) in the "Appendix" of 2 Samuel. That passage, in turn, consists of David's thanksgiving song for his victories (2 Samuel 22//Psalm 18) and the "last words of David" (23,1-7). Thereafter, in 7.305b-306, Josephus proceeds to relate how David instructed the Levites in the use of various musical instruments on holyday occasions. Here, his source would seem to be the Chronicler's account of David's directives to the Levites concerning their role as liturgical instrumentalists, see 1 Chr 16,7-42; 25,1-8. Cf. Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 522-523, nn. a-e.

39//11,26-47 as such⁸⁵. On the other hand, the wording of his introduction to his parallel (7.307-317) to 23,8-39//11,10-47 in 7.307 clearly reflects both his familiarity with that list and his rationale for limiting himself to the narrative material of 23,8-23//11,10-25. This introduction reads:

As for the men about the king, all of them were brave (ἀνδρείοι)⁸⁶, but the most distinguished among them and famous (διασημότατοι καὶ λαμπροί)⁸⁷ for their deeds were thirty-eight in number⁸⁸; of these I shall relate (διηγῆσομαι) the exploits of only five⁸⁹, for they will serve to make clear the heroic virtues (ἀρετάς) of the rest, being powerful (δυνατοί)⁹⁰ enough to subdue countries and conquer great nations⁹¹.

85. His omission of the list accords with the historian's general tendency not to overwhelm Gentile readers with extended catalogues of strange-sounding Biblical names. Thus, e.g., in *Ant.* 8.395, when recounting Jehoshaphat's dispatch of a commission to teach the people the Law, Josephus leaves aside the names of the 17 members of that commission cited in 2 Chr 17,7-8.

86. This term echoes the words of the ἀνδρ- stem which permeate 7.298-304, see ἀνδρείαν (7.300), ἀνδρειοτάτων (7.301), ἀνδρεία (7.301), ἀνδρειοτάτω (7.302). With the above introductory formula compare the parallel notices of 23,8a ("these are the names of the mighty men [BL τῶν δυνατῶν] of David") and 11,11a ("this is an account of David's mighty men [BL τῶν δυνατῶν]"). The latter notice is itself preceded in 11,10 by a heading, "now these are the chiefs of David's mighty men, who gave him strong support in his kingdom, according to the word of the Lord concerning Israel", which serves to integrate the Chronicler's parallel, 11,11-47, to the hero-segment of 23,8-39 within the new context which he gives it in chaps. 11-12, namely, a complex of items concerning those who lend their support to David at the outset of his rule.

87. The above adjectival collocation occurs only here in Josephus.

88. Josephus appears to derive the above figure from the concluding tally of 2 Sam 23,39 which, however, speaks of *thirty-seven* heroes. (The problem of the discrepancy here is complicated by the fact that the segment 23,8-39 itself seems to give the names of only *thirty-six* individual heroes, the indication of 23,39 notwithstanding.) Josephus' total might then be based on his own (mis-) counting of the names he found before him in his text(s) of 23,8-39; alternatively, one or other of the additional names cited in 11,10-47 (where one finds no less than *fifty-one* names) may have stood in his text(s) of 23,8-39.

89. Also elsewhere in *Ant.* one finds Josephus interjecting himself into the account with such authorial statements of intent; see, e.g., 8.224 where, after recounting (8.212-223) the breakup of the united monarchy in accord with 1 Kgs 12,1-24//2 Chr 10,1-11,4, he pauses to announce: "I shall now relate (διηγῆσομαι), first the acts of Jeroboam... and then in what follows we shall tell what happened in the reign of Roboamos, the king of the two tribes". Such interjections alert readers about what to expect and underscore the purposefulness of Josephus' procedure as a historian. As for the "five" whose exploits Josephus proposes to relate, these, as will emerge, are the figures featured in the narrative section 23,8-23//11,10-25.

90. This term echoes the word used of David's heroes in BL 23,8//11,11, i.e. (τῶν) δυνατῶν.

91. The above specification concerning the "powerfulness" of the five heroes who are to be featured goes far beyond 23,8a//11,11a in accentuating the wider implications of their exploits, a tendency also evident in Josephus' version of 21,15-22//20,4-8 in 7.298-304, see above.

The first of the sources' new trio (duo) of heroes makes his appearance in 23,8b//11,11b. Here too, the various witnesses diverge notably with regard to the hero's name and the attached characterizations of him, compare:

יָשָׁב בְּשֹׁבַת תְּחִמְמוֹנֵי רֹאשׁ הַשְּׁלֹשִׁי הוּא עָרִינוּ הַעֲצָנוּ (MT 23,8)

יְשָׁבָעַם בְּתִחְמוֹנֵי רֹאשׁ הַשְּׁלֹשִׁים הוּא עוֹרֵר אֶת־תְּחִינֹתוֹ (MT 11,11)

Ἰεβόσε ὁ Χαναναῖος ἄρχων τοῦ τρίτου... Ἀδεινῶν ὁ

Ἄσωναῖος οὗτος ἐσπάσατο τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ (B 23,8)

Ἰεσβαὸλ υἱὸς Θεκεμανεὶ πρῶτος τῶν τριῶν οὗτος διεκόσμη
τὴν διασκευὴν αὐτῶν (L 23,8)

Isebael filius Thegamani primus de tribu; hic adornationem
suam (VL 23,8)

(David) sedens in cathedra sapientissimus princeps inter tres
ipse quasi tenerrimus ligni vermiculus (Vulg. 23,8)

גְּבֵרָא רִישׁ מְשֻׁרְתָּא...⁹² עַל יְדֵי מוֹרְנִיתָיָה (דויד) (TJ 23,8)

Ἰεσεβαδὰ υἱὸς Ἀχαμανεὶ πρῶτος τῶν τριάκοντα οὗτος
ἐσπάσατο τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ (B 11,11)

Ἰεσσεβαὰμ υἱὸς Ἀχαμανεὶ πρῶτος τῶν τριῶν οὗτος
ἐσπάσατο τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ (L 11,11)

Isebaam filius Achamoni princeps inter triginta iste levavit
hastam suam (Vulg. 11,11)

עַל יְדֵי דְמוֹרְנִיתָא...⁹³ גְּבֵרָא רִישׁ מְשֻׁרְתָּא... (דויד) (TC 11,11).

92. At this point in TJ's rendition of 23,8 there supervenes a long string of laudatory epithets for "David", i.e. the subject of the exploit related in what follows according to the Targumist. This reads in the translation of Harrington and Saldarini: "sitting on the thrones of judgment, and all the prophets and elders are surrounding him, anointed with the anointing of holiness, chosen and delicately reared, handsome in his form and fitting in his appearance, wise in wisdom and prudent in counsel, mighty in strength, head of the mighty men, he, prepared with armored equipment, goes forth with a loud shout and conquers in battle and cuts down...". See n. 93.

93. As in TJ 23,8 (see n. 92), TC follows the above reference to "David" as the hero of the exploit of 11,11 with a long sequence extolling the king. This reads in McIvor's translation: "... sitting on the judgment seat, anointed with holy oil, with all the prophets and wise men round about him. When he went forth to battle he received help from on high; when he sat down to give instruction in the Law, the correct decision came to his mind; select and fastidious, handsome in his appearance and comely in looks, skilled in wisdom, intelligent in counsel, mighty in strength, head of the academy, with a pleasant voice, an outstanding singer, officer in charge of all the warriors, equipped with weapons, carrying a spear on which was hung the sign of the formation of the camp of Judah, going forth on the instruction of the spirit of holiness, he was victorious in battle...". The identification of the hero of the exploit of 23,8b//11,11b with King David cited in 23,8a//11,11a made by Vulg TJ

Over against the above variations regarding the person of the hero, Josephus (7.308) limits himself to citing his name and paternity: “Now the first (i.e. of the “five” heroes spoken of in 7.307) was Isebos (Ἰσεβος)⁹⁴, the son of Achemaios (Ἀχεμαίου)⁹⁵...”. The historian does become more expansive in relating the hero’s actual exploit: “... *who sprang* (ἐμπηδῶν) *upon the enemy’s* (πολεμίων, see n. 21) *ranks and did not cease fighting* (μαχόμενος) *until*⁹⁶ *he had cut down* (καταβαλεῖν) *nine hundred*⁹⁷ *of them*”.

The sources introduce their second hero in 23,9a//11,12 as “Eleazar the son of Dodo”⁹⁸; Josephus follows suit in 7.308b: “After him was Eleazar the son of Dōdeios (Δωδείου)⁹⁹...”. The accounts of Eleazar’s exploit as found in 23,9b-10 and 11,13-14 differ notably in their wording, this being

23,8 and TC 11,11 (see above) has a counterpart elsewhere in Jewish-Christian tradition, see *b. Mo’ed Qat.* 16b; *Seder Elijah Rabbah* 3 (15); Ps.-Jerome on 1 Chr 11,11 (PL 23,1580); see further n. 97. Elsewhere in Rabbinic tradition the hero of 23,8b//11,11b is equated rather with Joab (whose name is conspicuously absent from the hero catalogue of 23,8-39//11,10-47), thus *y. Mak.* 2.6; *Pesiq. Rab.* 11.3; *Numb. Rab.* 23.13; *Midr. Sam.* 25.3.

94. According to Schlatter, *Namen*, 64 this form of the hero’s name goes back to a Hebrew (אֵיִשׁ בְּשֵׁת בְּרִיָּהּ), while for Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, 64 it reflects Hebrew אֵיִשׁ בְּשֵׁת.

95. According to Schlatter, *Namen*, 48 the original form of the name would have been Ἀχεμεναίου here; see previous note.

96. According to Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 524-525, n. c Josephus’ above phrase “sprang repeatedly” is “possibly derived” from TJ reading in 23,8, i.e. מורניתיה על ידי מורניתיה which he renders “weaving back and forth (?) with his spear”. As Marcus himself indicates, however, the meaning of the Targumic phrase is itself uncertain (Harrington and Saldarini render it “he cuts down with his spear”). It would seem best then to attribute Josephus’ formulation to the historian’s own penchant for dramatizing events. Compare his depiction of Akmon “rushing forward” to kill David in 7.299.

97. Josephus’ figure for the enemy casualties here agrees with given in L 23,8//11,11 and VL 23,8 against the 800 of MT and B 23,8 and the 300 of MT B 11,11. In Rabbinic tradition, e.g., *Seder Elijah Rabbah* 3 (16); *b. Mo’ed Qat.* 16b “David” (the hero of 23,8b//11,11b according to these sources – see n. 93) asks God why he was only allowed to kill 800 (so MT 23,8) of the enemy whereas in Deut 32,30 there is reference to one Israelite being able to rout a *thousand*. The Deity’s response is that David was kept from killing the full number of the foe because of his sin with Bethsheba. Compare Ps.-Jerome on 1 Chr 11,11 (PL 23,1580) who noting the discrepancy between the Vulg.’s figures in 23,8 and 11,11 for the number slain, i.e. 800 vs. 300, respectively, avers that the latter, lower figure is cited “propter ipsum peccatum” (namely that of David, the hero of 11,11, in the understanding of Ps.-Jerome).

98. In B 23,9 MT’s proper name “Dodo” is translated as υἱὸς πατραδέλφου; similarly TC 11,12 (“the son of his uncle”). L 11,12 and VL 23,9 conflate proper name and its translation.

99. He leaves aside the further source designations of Eleazar as “the son of Ahohi” (23,9) / “the Ahohite” (11,12) and as “among the three mighty men”.

due to the fact that the Chronicler has reapplied items associated with the deed of Samuel's third hero, i.e. Shammah (23,11-12, no parallel in Chronicles) to the figure of its second hero, Eleazar¹⁰⁰. Josephus, for his part, does reproduce the *Sondergut* of 23,11-12 concerning Shammah (see 7.309b-310). On the other hand, however, his account of Eleazar in 7.308b-309a seems to reflect elements of the Chronicler's Eleazar-Shammah conflation as seen in 11,13-14. The influence of 11,13-14 upon Josephus' presentation of Eleazar appears already in the immediate continuation of his introduction of the hero which, clearly, more closely parallels 11,13-14aα than it does 23,9b. The sequence in question reads: "... who was with the king in Erasmos (Ἐρασμοῦ)¹⁰¹, and who *on one occasion*, when the Israelites (see 7.304) fled *in terror* (καταπλαγέντων... φευγόντων) before *the host of the Philistines*¹⁰², *alone* (μόνος)¹⁰³ held his ground (ἔμεινε)¹⁰⁴..."

Having drawn on 11,13-14aα to describe the circumstances surrounding Eleazar's deed, Josephus now switches to the more expansive presentation of 23,10 – compare the summary notice of 11,14bα ("and he slew the Philistines") – in describing the deed itself, even while amplifying this still further. His rendition of the Samuel verse runs:

100. On the point, see the Chronicles commentaries.

101. In thus specifying the site of Eleazar's upcoming exploit, Josephus goes together with 11,13 against 23,9b which leaves this indeterminate. In MT (and TC) 11,13 the site is called "Pas-dammim", in B Φασαδομή, in L Σεράν, in Vulg. "Aphesdommim". Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 525, n. f opines that the Josephan place-name is a corruption of that found in L, whereas for Mez, *Bibel*, 51 L's form is the corruption, Josephus' the original. Schlatter, *Namen*, 51 and Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, 45 maintain that Josephus' form reflects rather a Hebrew פִּסְדָּמִים (compare פִּרְתָּיִם in MT 23,9b).

Josephus has no equivalent to the further indications concerning the site of Eleazar's exploit found in 11,13aβa: "and the Philistines gathered there (i.e. at Pas-dammim, MT 11,13aα) for battle and there was a plot of ground full of barley [this latter item is the Chronicler's reapplication/adaptation of the notice of 23,11 concerning the site of Shammah's exploit, see below]". See n. 104.

102. Compare 11,13bβ: "and the people fled (BL ἔφυγεν) from the face of the Philistines". (In MT L TJ 23,9bβ the reference is to the men of Israel "going up" in the face of the Philistines' assembling, while B speaks of their "crying out".)

103. This inserted term emphasizing Eleazar's "aloneness" in confronting "the host of the Philistines" accentuates the hero's valor. It likewise echoes the verb μονομαχέω used of the exploits of Ephan and Jonathan in 7.302 and 304, respectively.

104. In making the individual Eleazar the subject of this verb, Josephus agrees with BL 11,14aα against MT where "they [who?] take *their* stand in the midst of the plot (i.e. the one spoken of in 11,13bα, but not mentioned previously by Josephus, see n. 101)". Josephus likewise omits the reference to this "plot" found in 11,14aβ: "he (BL) / they (MT) defended it".

and, falling on the enemy (συμπεσὼν τοῖς πολεμίοις)¹⁰⁵, killed so many (ἀπέκτεινεν... πολλοῦς)¹⁰⁶ of them¹⁰⁷ that his sword (ρόμφαίαν) stuck (προσκολληθῆναι)¹⁰⁸ to his *right* hand (τῇ δεξιᾷ) *with their blood* (ὑπὸ τοῦ αἵματος)¹⁰⁹, and the Israelites (see 7.308), *seeing that the Philistines had been routed by him*¹¹⁰ returned to the contest (καταβάντας)¹¹¹ *and pursued* (διωκεῖν) *them* and thereupon gained a wonderful and celebrated (θαυμαστὴν καὶ διαβοήτων)¹¹² victory (νίκην), *with Eleazar dealing death*, and the host following him and despoiling the slain (σκυλεύοντος τοὺς ἀνηρημένους)¹¹³.

As noted, Josephus' sources diverge following their presentation of the hero Eleazar (23,9-10//11,12-14); Samuel thereafter tells (23,11-12) of a further hero, "Shammah" of whom the Chronicler says nothing. As also previously noted, Josephus (7.309 *fine* - 310) does reproduce Samuel's *Sondergut* on Shammah, introducing him with the formula "The third

105. Compare Josephus' description of Isebos' "springing repeatedly on the enemy's (πολεμίων) ranks" in 7.308.

106. This phrase echoes that used of the hero Sabrēchēs in 7.301, ἀπέκτεινε... πολλοῦς.

107. Compare 23,10α: "he (Eleazar) rose and struck down (BL ἐπάταξε[ν]) the Philistines".

108. Josephus' one other use of the verb προσκολλάω is in *Ant.* 9.183.

109. Compare 23,10αβ: "until his hand was weary and his hand cleaved (B προσεκολλήθη [cf. Josephus], L ἐκολλήθη) to the sword (L ρομφαίαν [so Josephus], B μάχαιραν)".

110. This interjected indication serves to motivate the "return" of the Israelite fugitives (see 7.309a) which Josephus will relate in what follows in dependence on 23,10ββ.

111. On the above specialized military rendering of the verb by Marcus here, see *Josephus*, V, 525, n. g where he points out that in codex P and in Lat. the word was (mis-)construed in its ordinary sense of "coming down", this leading to the addition of the phrase "from the mountains" in those witnesses.

112. The above adjectival collocation recurs in *Ant.* 8.284.

113. The above sequence "the Israelites... and despoiling the slain" represents a re-arranged and elaborated version of 23,10b: "and the Lord wrought a great victory (BL σωτηρίαν) that day; and the men returned (so MT L [ἐπέστρεψεν], B ἐκάθητο) after him only to strip (L σκυλεύειν [Josephus σκυλεύοντος], B ἐκδιόσκειν) the slain [this specification concerning the object of the Israelites' "stripping" is lacking in MT BL and supplied by RSV; it does, however, have an equivalent in TJ [סִׁלְתָּם], cf. Josephus' τοὺς ἀνηρημένους]". In Josephus' reformulation of 23,10b note especially his elimination of the reference – itself paralleled in 11,14ββ ("and the Lord saved them by a great victory") – to the Deity's role in the happening. Such "de-theologizing" of the Biblical narrative is a characteristic – though certainly not invariable – feature of Josephus' retelling of Scriptural history in *Ant.* On the point, see L.H. Feldman, "Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus", in M.J. Mulder - H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra* (CRINT 2:1), Assen 1988, 455-517, 503-507. See also n. 124.

[i.e. of the five individual heroes whom Josephus states he will treat by way of example in 7.307] was a son of Ēlos (Ἠλοῦ)¹¹⁴ named Sabaias (Σαβαΐας)¹¹⁵...”.

2 Sam 23,11b supplies background concerning Shammah's exploit, e.g., its taking place in “a plot of ground full of lentils” and the people's previous flight from the Philistines who had assembled there. Josephus' rendition (7.310a) leaves aside the former item, but expatiates on Israel's dispersal: “*In a battle (ἀγῶσιν) with the Philistines who were drawn up at a place called Siagon (Σιαγόνα)*¹¹⁶... the Hebrews (see 7.301,303) *were again afraid (φοβηθέντες) of their force*¹¹⁷ and failed to stand their ground (οὐχ ὑπέμειναν)¹¹⁸, but this man withstood them *alone (μόνος)*¹¹⁹, *being an army and battle line (στράτευμα καὶ τάξις)*¹²⁰ *in himself*¹²¹, some of them he felled (κατέβαλε)¹²², *while the rest, who could not face*

114. Compare נָשָׁן (MT 23,11), Ἄσά (B), Ἠλά (L), Helialaas (VL), Age (Vulg.). According to Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, 51 the name-forms in both Josephus and L with their middle consonant λ represent a mis-writing of an original Ηγα. Josephus has no equivalent to the further designation of the hero in 23,11, i.e. “the Hararite” (so MT).

115. The codices SP give the name as κησαβαΐος. Compare קֶשֶׁבַּ (MT 23,11), Σαμαΐά (B), Σαμαΐας (L), Sammeas (VL), Semma (Vulg.).

116. Josephus' above indication about the Philistines drawing up a site with a Greek name meaning “Jawbone” corresponds to the reading of L 23,11 (ἐπὶ σιαγόνα), as well as those of VL (ad Maxillam) and TJ (“at Lehi”). Compare MT's קֶשֶׁבַּ which B renders εἰς θηρία, cf. Vulg. “in statione”. Josephus leaves aside the mention, common to all witnesses for 23,11, “there was a plot of ground full of lentils”. His procedure in this regard corresponds to his omission of the Chronicler's reapplication/adaptation of this indication in connection with the exploit of the hero Eleazar in 11,13 (“there was a plot full of barley”), see above. (On the various Rabbinic proposals for harmonizing the notices of 23,11 and 11,13 as to the crop planted in the field [lentils vs. barley], see, e.g., y. *Sanh.* 2.5; b. B. *Qam.* 60b; *Midr. Sam.* 20.1.)

117. Josephus' inserted reference to the people's “fear” here echoes his – likewise inserted – allusion to their “fleeing in terror (καταπλαγέντων)” in 7.309 (compare 11,13//23,9). Such emphasis on the “fear” of the people as a whole before the Philistines serves to underscore the valor of the solitary hero (Eleazar, Sabaias) who is not intimidated by them.

118. Compare 23,11bβ: “and the people fled (BL ἔφυγεν) from the face of the Philistines”.

119. This is the same term applied by Josephus to Eleazar in 7.309.

120. This collocation is hapax in Josephus.

121. With the above elaborations concerning Sabaias' valor, compare the more jejune wording of 23,12a: “but he took his stand in the midst of the plot [recall Josephus' omission of the source's previous mention of this in 23,11, see n. 116] and defended it”.

122. This is the same term used of Isebos' slaughter of the enemy in 7.308.

his powerful attack (ισχὸν καὶ... βίαν)¹²³, turned to flee, and he pursued them¹²⁴.

Having now completed his account of the exploits of the trio Isebos, Eleazar and Sabaias (7.308-310) in dependence on 2 Sam 23,8b-12 (cf. 11,11b-14) Josephus, in the opening words of 7.311, rounds off the whole sequence with a closing formula which he likely anticipates from a later point in the sources' presentation: "These then were the mighty deeds (ἔργα, see 7.307) of war which the three performed", compare 23,17bβ//11,19bβ ("these things did the three mighty men"), see below.

David's Wish for Water

As this juncture the sources interrupt their series of vignettes focussed on the deeds of an individual, named hero done in defense of Israel as a whole in order to relate an exploit performed by an unnamed trio on behalf of David in particular. The latter "interlude" stands in 23,13-17//11,15-19 for which the Josephan counterpart is 7.311b-314.

The new Biblical episode opens in 23,13//11,15 which report the "descent" of three of his military leaders to David at the cave of Adullam, this occurring at a moment when the Philistines are encamped "in the valley of Rephaim" (so MT). Josephus modifies this opening in several respects, doing so in view of the following geographical indications (see 23,14//11,16) which seem to point to both David and the Philistines being situated at locales other than those cited in 23,13//11,15 as the action begins¹²⁵. Avoiding the "discrepancy" between the geographical notices in 23,13//11,15 and 23,14//11,16, respectively, the historian words his own introduction to the incident thus: "And once

123. The above hendiadys is hapax in Josephus. On his use of words of the βια-stem, etc. see E. Moore, "BIAZΩ, ΑΠΙΑΖΩ and Cognates in Josephus", *NTS* 21 (1974-1975) 519-543.

124. With the above conclusion to Josephus' account of "Sabaias", compare that of 23,12b: "and he slew (BL ἐπάταξε[ν]) the Philistines and the Lord wrought a great victory (BL σωτηρίαν)". Note that, also in this instance (see n. 113 on his treatment of the similar indication of 11,14//23,10 in 7.309) Josephus' rendition eliminates a theological element of the sources' presentation. Conversely, his introduction of mention of Sabaias' causing the Philistines to flee echoes his notice on the earlier hero Ephan in 7.302 ("he put the rest to flight [εἰς φυγὴν]") where the sources, 21,19//20,5 likewise lack an equivalent.

125. On the point, see Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 527, n. d.

when the king was *at Jerusalem*¹²⁶ and the Philistine force *came up to fight him*¹²⁷...”.

Thereafter, he picks up on the reference of 23,14a//11,16a to David's presence “in the stronghold”, amplifying this with mention of the reason for his repairing to that particular site at this moment: “... David went up to the citadel (ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, BL ἐν τῇ περιοχῇ), *as we have said before, to inquire of God* (πευσόμενος τοῦ θεοῦ)¹²⁸ *concerning the war*¹²⁹...”. To this notice he then attaches his equally amplified version (7.312a) of the statement of 23,14b//11,16b about the Philistines being “at Bethlehem”: “... and while the enemy (ἐχθρῶν) lay encamped in the plain (παρεμβολῆς ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι)¹³⁰ *which extends as far as the city of Bethlehem, twenty stades distant from Jerusalem* (see 7.311)¹³¹...”.

The trio's heroic deed is set in motion by David's expression of desire for a drink of water “from the well of Bethlehem which is by the gate” (23,15//11,17)¹³². Josephus (7.312b) both specifies the addressee of the royal word and expatiates on its content: “... he said *to his companions*

126. This indication reflects the mention in 23,14//11,16 of David's being “in the stronghold”, Josephus understanding the “stronghold” in question to be that of Zion, earlier conquered by David, see 2 Sam 5,6-10//1 Chr 11,4-9//*Ant.* 7.61-69.

127. This inserted phrase clarifies the purpose behind the Philistines' presence in Israelite territory as twice mentioned in 23,13-14//11,15-16. It takes the place of the reference to their being “in the valley of Rephaim” of 23,13//11,15. See n. 130.

128. Elsewhere Josephus uses the verb *πυνθάνομαι* with God as (genitival) object in *Ant.* 4.197 (subject Moses); 6.271 (subject David); compare 9.19,26 where the verb is used of King Amaziah's illegitimate “inquiring” of the “god of Ekron”.

129. As its *Rückverweis* makes clear, the above insertion concerning the purpose of David's repairing to the citadel harks back to the double mention of the king's consultation of the Deity in the face of earlier Philistine assaults as recorded in 6.71 (//2 Sam 5,19//1 Chr 11,10), 76 (//5,23//11,14). Josephus' interjection of a like royal initiative here in 7.311 serves to accentuate the king's piety, a characteristic feature of the historian's retelling of the Biblical David story overall, see Feldman, “Josephus' Portrait of David”, 156-164.

130. With the above wording Josephus makes delayed use of the terminology employed in the initial reference to the Philistines' position in 23,13b//11,15b “a band of Philistines was encamped in the valley (B 23,13 παρεμβολή... ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι) of Rephaim”, combining this with the mention of their presence “in Bethlehem” of 23,14b//11,16b.

131. Josephus' inserted indication of the distance between Bethelhem and Jerusalem here recalls his interjected notice about “Gitta” as “a city not far from the border of the Hebrews' country” in 7.303; see n. 70.

132. Rabbinic tradition (see *y. Mak.* 2.5; *b.B. Qam.* 61a) gives an allegorical interpretation of David's wish for “water” and its sequels according to which “water” would stand for the halakic decision about one or other legal issue facing him that the king desires to obtain at this juncture.

(ἑταίροις), ‘*We have such good water in my native place*¹³³’, *praising especially*¹³⁴ that in the cistern near the gate (ἐν τῷ λάκκῳ τῷ πρὸς τῇ πύλῃ, BL ἐκ τοῦ λάκκου... ἐν τῇ πύλῃ), *and added that he would be better pleased if someone brought him to drink* (τις... πιεῖν αὐτῷ, cf. BL τίς ποτιεῖ με) *from it than if he gave him a great deal of money*¹³⁵”.

2 Sam 23,16a//1 Chr 11,18a relate, with some circumstantiality, the procuring of the water for David by the three heroes cited in 23,13//11,15. Josephus’ version (7.313) embellishes this development as well, explaining in particular how it was that the Philistine force offered no resistance to their venture:

*As soon as they heard this*¹³⁶ the three men (οἱ τρεῖς ἄνδρες = L 23,16)¹³⁷ *immediately ran out* (ἐκδραμόντες) *and dashed* (ὀρμήσαντες) *through the midst of the enemy’s camp* (διὰ μέσου τοῦ... στρατοπέδου)¹³⁸, *until they had come to Bethlehem*, and, when they had drawn the water (τοῦ ὕδατος ἀρυσάμενοι)¹³⁹, *came back again through the (enemy’s) camp to the king*¹⁴⁰; *so amazed* (καταπλαγέντας)¹⁴¹ *were the Philistines at their audacity and courage*

133. This opening amplification of the king’s word serves to remind readers of the special link between David and Bethlehem, his home-town, see 1 Samuel 16 (//*Ant.* 6.156-165).

134. Note the above shift in Josephus’ version of David’s word from direct to indirect address, a feature that occurs not infrequently within speeches of one and the same character as reported by him, see Begg, *Josephus’ Account*, 123-124, n. 772.

135. This appended finale to David’s word underscores the intensity of the king’s desire for water from Bethlehem. Like MT B 23,15//MT BL 11,17 Josephus has no equivalent to the renewed reference (see 23,14b//11,16b) to the presence of the Philistine army at Bethlehem which follows the quotation of the royal utterance in L 23,15.

136. This opening amplification of the wording of 23,16a//11,18a picks up on Josephus’ previous specification (7.312) that David’s word (23,15//11,17) was addressed “to his companions”.

137. Recall that Josephus did not reproduce the initial mention of these figures at the opening of the episode in 23,13//11,15.

138. Compare 23,16a//11,18a: “(the three) broke through (διέρρηξαν, B 23,16//BL 11,18; διέκοψαν, L 23,16) the camp (τὴν παρεμβολήν, L 23,16//BL 11,18; ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ, B 23,16) of the Philistines”. Josephus’ wording is clearly more dramatic.

139. Compare 23,16aβ//11,18aβ: “and they drew water (BL ὑδρεύσαντο ὕδωρ) out of the well of Bethlehem which is by the gate”. Josephus’ two remaining uses of the above verb ἀρύω / ἀρτύω are in *BJ* 3.507; *Ant.* 9.287.

140. Compare 23,16aγ//11,18aγ: “they took (it, the water) and they came (> B 11,18) to David”.

141. This term echoes the participle καταπλαγέντων used of the Israelites’ reaction to the Philistine threat in 7.309; now it is the Philistines’ turn to be “confounded” by their foes.

(θράσος καὶ... εὐψυχίαν)¹⁴² *that they remained motionless and did not venture to attack them* (καὶ μηδὲν ἐπ' αὐτοῦς τολμήσαι)¹⁴³, *although they were contemptuous of their fewness* (καταφρονήσαντας τῆς ὀλιγότητος)¹⁴⁴.

The Biblical “water stories” conclude (23,16b-17bα//11,18b-19bα) with a complex of notices concerning David’s reaction to the three’s deed: he refuses to drink the water, pours it out before the Lord; makes a statement commenting upon his refusal, and, once again, is said to refuse to drink. Josephus (7.314) eliminates the duplication of the king’s “refusal”, reverses the sequence of the royal libation and accompanying statement, and expatiates upon the former item. His rendering reads accordingly: “But, *when the water was brought to him*¹⁴⁵, the king did not drink it (οὐκ ἔπιεν), saying that it had been brought at the risk of men’s lives (κινδύνῳ καὶ αἵματι¹⁴⁶ ἀνθρώπων) and that therefore it would not be right for him to drink it¹⁴⁷; then he poured some of it out as a libation (ἔσπεισε, BL ἔσπεισεν)¹⁴⁸ to God (τῷ θεῷ)¹⁴⁹ and gave Him thanks (εὐχαρίστησεν) for the safety (σωτηρίας) of his men¹⁵⁰”.

142. This collocation occurs only here in Josephus.

143. These words are absent in the codices RO and are printed by Niese within brackets.

144. The above construction recurs twice elsewhere in Josephus: *Ant.* 1.313 (Laban of Jacob); 5.143 (the Gibeahites of their visitors).

145. This inserted transitional formula resumes the phrase “they came back... to the king” of 7.313, following the intervening interlude concerning the Philistines’ non-resistance to the three’s initiative; see above.

146. This collocation occurs only here in Josephus.

147. Compare David’s direct discourse word as cited in 23,17a (RSV): “Far be it from me, O Lord [11,19 before my God], that I should do this. Shall I drink the blood of the men (BL αἶμα [τῶν] ἀνδρῶν) who went at (the risk of) their lives (BL ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς) [11,19 Shall I drink the lifeblood of these men (BL αἶμα τῶν ἀνδρῶν)? For at (the risk of) their lives (BL ἐν ψυχαῖς) they brought it]”. Note that here, in accord with his standard practice, Josephus leaves aside the wording of David’s initial “oath”; his doing so may reflect a concern to avoid any possible misuse of the divine name.

148. Both TJ 23,16 and TC 11,18 reflect a concern that David not appear to be abrogating the priestly prerogative of offering libations to the Lord; they speak accordingly of the king’s directing that the water be poured out, rather than of doing this himself as in MT.

149. In 23,16b//11,18b David pours the water out “to the Lord (BL τῷ κυρίῳ)”. On Josephus’ virtually total avoidance of the Biblical divine title “the Lord” given its lack of currency in secular Greek, see Begg, *Josephus’ Account*, 45, n. 218 and the literature cited there.

150. With the above “appendix” to the libation notice of 23,16bβ//11,18bβ, Josephus underscores both the king’s solicitude for his men and his acknowledgement of the Deity’s role in their preservation.

To their account of the water incident (23,13-17b α //11,15-19b α) the sources append a generalizing closing notice in 23,17b β //11,19b β , i.e. “these things did the three mighty men”. Josephus, who seems to have anticipated this notice at the beginning of 7.311 (see above), dispenses with an equivalent at this juncture.

Two Final Heroes

The complex of hero stories 23,8-23//11,10-25 ends up, in 23,18-23//11,20-25, by recounting the deeds of two further figures, i.e. Abishai and Benaiah; the Josephan counterpart is 7.315-317. Of the two heroes, Abishai, David’s rescuer in 2 Sam 21,15-17//*Ant.* 7.298-300, gets rather short shrift in 23,18-19//11,20-21. Josephus (7.315a) compresses the treatment given him still further, leaving aside in particular, the textually confused indications about Abishai’s relation to various military groupings (“the three, the thirty”)¹⁵¹. His parallel to 23,18*//11,20* confines itself to the statement: “After these (three men, i.e. those featured in 7.311-314) was Joab’s brother¹⁵² Abishai, who in a single day (μῦ ἡμέρα)¹⁵³ slew (ἀπέκτεινε) six hundred¹⁵⁴ of the enemy (τῶν πολεμίων)¹⁵⁵”.

The Biblical authors devote considerably more attention to the second hero, Benaiah¹⁵⁶. Josephus’ introduction of him in 7.315b substitutes mention of his sacerdotal status for the name of his father (“Jehoida”), home town (“Kazbeel”) and characterization as a “valiant man¹⁵⁷... a doer of

151. On the problem, see the commentaries.

152. Like L 23,18 and MT BL 11,20 Josephus lacks an equivalent to the further identification of Abishai as “son of Zeruiah” found in MT B 23,18.

153. This indication concerning the time-frame of Abishai’s exploit reflects the plus of BL 11,20 according to which his dispatch of the foe was accomplished ἐν καιρῷ ἐνί. Josephus has no equivalent to the further reference in 23,18//11,20 to Abishai’s “wielding his spear/sword” against the enemy.

154. The above figure for the casualties inflicted by Abishai agrees with that given in L and VL 23,18 as against the 300 cited by the other witnesses. Recall Josephus’ agreement with the distinctive figure (900) for Josheb-basshebeth / Jashobeam’s victims given by L VL 23,8b and L 11,11b in 7.308; see n. 97.

155. Josephus’ phrase for Abishai’s deed here in 7.315 (“he killed... of the enemy”) echoes that employed by him of the same figure in 7.300 ἀπέκτεινε... τὸν πολεμίον.

156. On him see A. Zeron, “Der Platz Benajahus in der Heldenliste Davids (II Sam 23,20-23)”, ZAW 90 (1978) 20-27.

157. So 11,22 and the *qere* of 23,20; the *ketiv* reads “(son of) a living man”.

greater deeds” cited in 23,20a//11,22a: “The fifth (i.e. of the five whose deeds Josephus undertook to relate in 7.307) was Banaïas (Βαναΐας = BL 23,20, L 11,20)¹⁵⁸, of priestly descent (ὁ ἱερεύς)¹⁵⁹...”.

2 Sam 23,20b-21//11,22b-23 proceed to relate three exploits done by Benaiah: his slaying of two “ariels”, of a lion, and of a (giant) Egyptian. Josephus narrates the same three deeds, though reversing the sources’ order for the second and third of them. In recounting the first of Benaiah’s achievements, he eliminates the mysterious term “ariels” used to designate the hero’s victims in MT 23,20ba//11,22ba: “... who *was challenged* (προκληθείς) *by*¹⁶⁰ *famous* (διασήμων)¹⁶¹ *brothers* (ἀδελφῶν) in the Moabite country¹⁶² and defeated (ἐκράτησεν, BL ἐπαταξε[ν]) them *by his prowess* (κατ’ ἀρετήν)¹⁶³”.

Having recorded Benaiah’s triumph over the Moabite “brothers”, Josephus, reversing the sources’ sequence (see above), next moves to the hero’s dispatch of another human opponent, i.e. the Egyptian (see 23,21 //11,23)¹⁶⁴. His account of this episode (7.315c) leaves aside some Biblical items, while amplifying other points. It runs: “*And on another occasion when a native Egyptian of extraordinary size* (θαυμαστοῦ τὸ

158. This is the reading of codex M; Niese reads rather Ναβαΐος. Josephus has already mentioned “Banaïas” as the commander of David’s bodyguard in 7.110 (//2 Sam 8,19//1 Chr 18,17).

159. Niese, and following him Mez, *Bibel*, 52, use the phrase “vid. corruptum” in reference to this qualification of Banaïas. As Marcus, *Josephus*, V, 528, n. b points out, however, it does have a Biblical precedent in 1 Chr 27,5 which speaks of “Benaïah, the son of Jehoiada the priest (LXX ὁ ἱερεύς)”.

160. This inserted phrase concerning those whom Benaiah will slay in what follows serves to motivate his taking action against them. See n. 166.

161. This term echoes the word διασημότατοι used in Josephus’ introduction of the five heroes in 7.307.

162. In thus identifying Benaiah’s victims as human beings Josephus follows the lead of BL 23,20 and L 11,22 (τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ἀριήλ Μωάβ) and TJ/TC (תריין רברבי מואב), “the two princes of Moab”) in their elucidatory renderings of the MT phrase שְׁנֵי אֲרָאֵל מוֹאָב . Compare Vulg. 23,20 “duos leones Moab” (cf. Ps.-Jerome on 11,22 [PL 23,1580] who glosses this translation with “duos viros fortes de Moab”); *b. Ber.* 18a “the two altar-hearths of Moab”. See also the commentaries.

163. This qualification of Benaiah’s deed echoes Josephus’ introductory notice in 7.307 where he states that the exploits of the five “will serve to make clear the heroic virtues (ἀρετάς) of the rest”. The qualification might also be seen as the historian’s delayed use of the characterization of Benaiah as “a doer of great deeds” in 23,20//11,22.

164. Ps.-Jerome on 23,21 [PL 23,1362] identifies this figure with Shemei, the man who cursed David during the latter’s flight before Absalom, see 2 Sam 16,5.

μέγεθος)¹⁶⁵ *challenged* (προκαλεσαμένου)¹⁶⁶ *him, though he was unarmed against an armed foe* (γυμνός ὄπλισμένον)¹⁶⁷, *he struck him with his own spear and killed him* (τῷ δόρατι τῷ ἐκείνου βαλὼν ἀπέκτεινε)¹⁶⁸, *that is he wrested the other's lance from him* (περιελόμενος... αὐτοῦ τὸν ἄκοντα)¹⁶⁹ *and, while he was still alive and fighting, stripped him (of his armour) and dispatched him with his own weapons* (ὄπλοις, cf. ὄπλισμένον earlier in 7.315)¹⁷⁰.

As noted, the sources relate as the second of Benaiah's three exploits his slaying of a lion, doing so very briefly in the compass of a half-verse (23,20b//11,22b: "he also went down and slew a lion in a pit on a day when snow had fallen")¹⁷¹. Josephus not only reserves the incident to the finale of his Benaiah segment, but also vastly embellishes this, turning the Bible half-verse into two extended paragraphs (7.316-317):

165. In citing this characterization of the Egyptian Josephus follows 11,23a against 23,21a where he is described rather as "a man of appearance" (so the *qere*), i.e. "a handsome man" (RSV). On the other hand, he leaves aside the Chronicler's further specification about his being "five cubits".

166. Josephus' interjection of this term establishes a verbal link between the episodes of Benaiah's Moabite and Egyptian opponents, both of whom are said to have "challenged" him – this serving to motivate his assault in each instance; see n. 160.

167. This verbal contrast highlights the total discrepancy in equipment between Benaiah and the Egyptian and so also the magnitude of the former's subsequent triumph over the latter. Compare MT 23,21 and MT BL 11,23 where Benaiah is said to have "a staff" with which he goes down to his adversary (BL 23,21 reads rather "and he [the Egyptian] went down to him [Benaiah] with the spear"). On Josephus' possible subsequent re-application of the mention of Benaiah's "staff" in the above witnesses, see n. 179. Josephus, like MT 23,21aβ, has no equivalent to the specification of MT BL 11,23aβ and BL 23,21aβ that the Egyptian's spear was "like a weaver's beam" (recall that he leaves aside the same phrase used of the spear of Elhanan's opponent in 21,19 //20,5 in 7.302; see n. 64).

168. Compare 23,21bβ//11,23bβ: "he slew him with his own spear (BL ἀπέκτεινε αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ δόρατι [αὐτοῦ])".

169. Josephus' one other use of the word ἄκον is in *BJ* 3.96. With the above notice compare 23,21bα//11,23bα: "and he snatched the spear (BL τὸ δόρυ) out of the Egyptian's hand".

170. The above appendix to the "slaying notice" with which 23,21 and 11,23 conclude accentuates the magnitude of Benaiah's triumph over his well-armed opponent who puts up such a stout resistance.

171. Ps.-Jerome in his comment on 11,20b (PL 23,1362) identifies the "lion" in question as David's general Joab and the "pit" in which he is slain as the house of the Lord wherein stood the altar upon which Benaiah killed Joab at the direction of Solomon, see 1 Kgs 2,28-34.

To the foregoing account of his deeds one might add another which shows greater, or not less (οὐ μείων)¹⁷² valour (εὐψυχίαν)¹⁷³ than these¹⁷⁴: once when God put down snow (νίφοντος τοῦ θεοῦ)¹⁷⁵, a lion (λέων, BL τὸν λέοντα) slipped and fell into a pit (εἰς τινα λάκκον, BL 23,20 ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ λάκκου, BL 11,22 ἐν τῷ λάκκῳ)¹⁷⁶, and as the mouth of the pit was narrow, the beast was clearly destined to perish when it should it have been blocked up by the snow, and so seeing no way of getting out or of being saved (σωτηρίας), he began to roar. But Banaias, who was just then passing by, heard the beast's noise and, going in the direction of the sound¹⁷⁷, went down (καταβάς) into the mouth of the pit and struck (πλήξας) the beast as it fought with him (μαχόμενον)¹⁷⁸, with the staff which he held in his hand (τῷ μετὰ χειρὰς ξύλῳ)¹⁷⁹ and immediately killed (ἀπέκτεινε, see 7.315 [bis]) it¹⁸⁰.

172. This is the emendation of Marcus, inspired by the “non dispar” of Lat. Niese reads ὁμοιον with the codices other than RO which have ἀλλοιον.

173. This same term is used of the three heroes in 7.313 where the Philistines' non-resistance to the trio's penetration of their camp is attributed to their amazement at the three's “audacity and courage (εὐψυχίαν)”.

174. Josephus' extended above preface to the Biblical “lion episode” heightens readers' interest in what is to be related.

175. Compare 23,20b//11,22b: “on a day of snow (BL ἐν [τῇ] ἡμέρᾳ [τῆς] χιόνος)”. Josephus' insertion of a reference to God as the origin of the snow here contrasts with his previous omissions of the sources references to the Deity's granting victory to the Israelites, 23,10//11,14; 23,12 in 7.309 (see n. 113) and 310 (see n. 124), respectively. The same construction (“God sent down snow”) recurs in *Ant.* 14.414, while the verb νίφω appears also in *BJ* 4.473 and *Ant.* 3.27.

176. Josephus' inserted reference to the lion's “slipping and falling” serves to account for its presence in the pit as presupposed by the sources.

177. The above extended insertion by Josephus accounts for Benaiah's being aware of the lion's presence in the pit, this being the presupposition for his moving against it in what follows.

178. The use of this term in reference to the lion establishes a verbal parallel between Benaiah's combat with the beast here and his earlier struggle with the Egyptian whom he is said to have dispatched “while he was still alive and fighting (μαχόμενον)”, 7.315.

179. The above phrase conceivably represents a re-application of the reference in MT 23,21 and MT BL 11,23 to Benaiah's “going down to him (the Egyptian) with a staff (BL ἐν ῥάβδῳ)”; see n. 167. Cf. also BL 23,21 where the word used for the “weaver's beam (ξύλον διαβάθρας)” with which the spear “in the hand” of the Egyptian is compared is the same employed by Josephus for the “staff” with which Benaiah approaches the lion here in 7.317.

180. With the above concluding sequence concerning Benaiah's deed, compare the verbal collocation of 23,20b//11,22b: “he went down and slew (BL κατέβη καὶ ἐπάταξε) a lion”. Josephus' elaboration of the “lion notice” of MT has a certain counterpart in TC which

The Biblical “Benaiah complex” concludes in 23,22-23//11,24-25 with a series of textually difficult remarks about the hero’s relationship to various military groupings¹⁸¹, comparable to those given for Abishai in 23,19//11,21. Just as he does in the case of the Abishai (see above), Josephus leaves aside the sources’ similar indications with regard to Benaiah. Moreover, as already mentioned, he passes over the entire supplementary list of Israelite heroes found in 23,24-39//11,26-47. In place then of the sequence 23,22-39//11,24-47, he offers, at the very end of 7.317, a short summation that itself constitutes an inclusion with his introduction to the segment on David’s heroes (3.707-317) of 7.307. This reads: “And as for the rest (of the warriors), they were just as valiant (τὰς ἀρετάς, compare “the heroic virtues [τὰς ἀρετάς] of the rest”, 7.307)¹⁸²”.

Conclusion

In the conclusion to this essay I shall now attempt to briefly summarize my findings with regard to the questions with which it opens. Concerning the first of those questions, i.e. did Josephus draw on both Samuel and Chronicles in 7.298-317?, our investigation yielded a clear affirmative response. The historian’s use of the former book is evident from his reproduction of its *Sondergut* segments 21,15-17 (//7.298-300, David’s endangerment) and 23,11-12 (//7.310, the exploit of Shammah). Conversely, his utilization also of Chronicles emerges from various peculiarities of his presentation which he has in common with that source against Samuel: the site of “Sibbecai’s” triumph (“Gazara” [7.301], compare 1 Chr 20,4 [Gezer] vs. 2 Sam 21,18 [Gob, etc.]) and the reference to that figure’s being “responsible for the Hebrews’ victory” (7.301) in accord with the plus “and the Philistines were subdued” of 20,4 (> 21,18). Similarly, his

follows its reproduction of 11,22b with the following complex of items regarding Benaiah: “He was a righteous man, great beyond compare in both the First Temple and the Second Temple. One day, when he stepped on a lizard which was dead, he went down to Shiloh, broke a piece of ice and washed himself. He then went up and expounded the Sifra debe Rab, that is the Book of the Law of the priests, during a short winter’s day, the tenth of the month Tebet”. On this sequence – which itself has a partial parallel in *b. Ber.* 18b – see McIvor, *Chronicles*, 88, n. 47.

181. On the varying readings of the witnesses in these verses, see the commentaries.

182. The immediate continuation of the above notice in *Ant.* is Josephus’ account of David’s ill-advised census, 7.318-334 (//2 Samuel 24//1 Chr 21,1-22,1) on which see C.T. Begg, “Josephus’ Version of David’s Census”, *Henoah* 16 (1994) 199-226.

notice on the background to Eleazar's deed (7.308b-309a) stands closer to the narration of 1 Chr 11,13-14a α than to that of 2 Sam 23,9b.

My second opening question – one closely connected with the preceding – concerned the text-forms of Samuel and/or Chronicles utilized by Josephus in his hero-segment. In this regard, the evidence of our study points decisively to the conclusion that Josephus had before him texts of Samuel and Chronicles whose affinities were more with “LXX” (L and the related VL in particular) than with “MT”. I recall the following data illustrative of this finding: Sibbechai/Sabrēchēs' status as a “Hittite” (7.301 and L 21,18) and his killing a collectivity of those descended from the giants rather than a single named individual (*ibid.*); the nine hundred casualties inflicted by “Isebos” (7.308 and L VL 23,8b//11,11b; see n. 97), Abishai's 600 victims (7.315 and L VL 23,18; see n. 154) and his dispatching of these “in a single day” (7.315 and BL 11,20; see n. 153). By contrast, clear-up indications of Josephus' familiarity with the peculiarities of (proto-) MT in the relevant passages appear to be lacking¹⁸³.

As to my further initial question about the rewriting techniques deployed by Josephus in our passage, this study has brought to light a number of (intimately interrelated) such techniques. Here, I confine myself to recalling noteworthy instances of four categories of these. Josephus, first of all, *embellishes* a number of source items, e.g., the circumstances of David's endangerment (7.298-299; compare 21,15-16), the king's refraining from going out to battle henceforth (7.300; compare 21,17), the introduction to the second main hero sequence (7.307; compare 23:8a//11,11a), and Benaiah's dispatch of the Egyptian (7.315c; compare 23,21//11,23) and of the lion (7.316-317; compare 23,20b//11,22b). At the same time, Josephus also totally *eliminates* various Biblical data, most notably the hero list of 23,24-39//11,26-47 and the indications on the relationship of Abishai and Benaiah to the military groupings of “the three” and “the thirty”, see 23,18-19//11,20-21 (compare 7.315a) and 23,22-23//11,24-25 (compare 7.315b-317), respectively. Thirdly, he several times *re-arranges* the sources' sequence, e.g., “anticipating” the closing notice on the three heroes of 23,17b β //11,19b β in 7.311a, while “reversing” the order in which Samuel and Chronicles recount Benaiah's smiting of the lion and of the Egyptian (see 23,20b-21//11,22b-23; and compare 7.315c-317). A last cat-

183. This finding specifically regarding *Ant.* 7.298-317 agrees with the more general conclusion of E. Ulrich, “Josephus' Biblical Text for the Books of Samuel”, in L.H. Feldman - G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, the Bible and History*, Detroit 1986, 81-96 concerning the text-form of Samuel employed by the historian.

egory of Josephan rewriting techniques illustrated by 7.298-317 are his *modifications / adaptations* of the sources' presentation. This technique affects matters of style (e.g., direct address is recast as indirect, see 7.300 [the army's remonstrance with David]; compare 21,17) and vocabulary ("God" replaces "the Lord", see 7.314; compare 23,16//11,18; and cf. n. 149). It also, however, extends to points of content: the proper name of "Ephan's" (Bible Elhanan) victim (Goliath [MT 21,19] / Lahmi [MT 20,6]) yields to an indeterminate reference to "the bravest of all the Philistines" (7.303); the summary notice of 21,22//20,8 concerning "these (four) who fell by the hand of David and by the hand of his servants" is replaced by the statement that, after the battle won by Jonathan, "they (the Philistines) did not again make war on the Philistines" (7.304, see n. 82), just as the phrase "and as the for rest (of the warriors), they were just as valiant" at the end of 7.317 substitutes for the name-list of 23,24-39//11,26-47.

At the outset of this essay I asked too about the possible "distinctiveness" of Josephus' account of David's heroes vis-à-vis the Biblical ones. In light of the foregoing comparison between them I would call attention to the following distinctive features of the Josephan version. The historian, for one thing, introduces a certain "streamlining" of the source material, particularly of its super-abundance of proper names, as well as its many minor details, duplications, and problematic features (see, e.g., the "discrepancy" between 23,13//11,15 and 23,14//11,16 as to the whereabouts of both David and the Philistines; compare Josephus' internally coherent indications on the matter in 7.312). Throughout, he accentuates the drama and difficulty surrounding the heroes' exploits, as also the affect of their deeds upon Israel's enemy, the Philistines as a whole. Consistently as well he highlights the stature of King David *in bonam partem*, i.e. his military initiatives (see on 7.298,301,302,304), courage (7.300), piety (see 7.311) and solicitude for his men (see 7.314). On occasion, the Scriptural narrative is "de-theologized" (see nn. 113,124), while at other times Josephus interjects a mention of the Deity on his own (see 7.316, cf. n. 175).

The last of my opening questions focussed on Josephus' reason for including the extensive Biblical hero materials – which, after all, constitute a digression within the overall movement of the David story – and the messages his *relecture* might be intended to convey to his double readership, i.e. cultivated Gentiles and fellow Jews¹⁸⁴. My suggestion with regard to this final query is that Josephus opted to retell the source story of David's

184. On *Ant.*'s twofold intended audience, see Feldman, "Use, Authority", 470-471.

heroes precisely because he recognized that story's potential to further his literary purposes vis-à-vis both audiences. Specifically, his recounting of the (suitably embellished) exploits of David's heroes would help counteract current anti-Semitic claims that the Jews had failed to produce men of (military) caliber comparable to those with which Greco-Roman history is replete¹⁸⁵. That same presentation could also, however, very well serve to convey an intimation of hope to Josephus' fellow Jews living in the aftermath of their recent trouncing by the Romans: in David's day there had been heroes who repeatedly and singlehandedly overthrew incomparably better equipped opponents, their doing so leading to the rout of the opponents' entire accompanying force. If then the Jews' God had provided his people with such efficacious heroes in the face of past threats, might they not hope that he would send them similar heroes to deliver them from their current plight? Thus, here, as so often elsewhere in *Ant.*, Josephus has contrived to develop a presentation which offers one message to Gentile readers and another, quite different one to Jewish perusers of his work¹⁸⁶.

Christopher T. Begg

185. On this claim and Josephus' concern to respond to it throughout his retelling of Biblical history in *Ant.*, see Feldman, "Use, Authority", 490-491.

186. For a similar case, i.e. Josephus' account of the prophet Nahum in *Ant.* 9.239-242, see C.T. Begg, "Josephus and Nahum Revisited", *REJ* 154 (1995) 5-22, esp. 18-22.

