

DAVID'S DOUBLE VICTORY ACCORDING TO JOSEPHUS

The Bible preserves two versions of the story of David's double victory, first over an Ammonite-Syrian coalition and then over a Syrian force, i.e. Samuel 10 and 1 Chronicles 19. This article studies a third version of David's two victories, namely, that of Josephus in *Ant.* VII 121-129, comparing this in detail with its Biblical source texts as represented by *MT*, *4QSam^a*, *Codex Vaticanus* and the Lucianic (or Antiochene) MSS of the LXX, and the Targums. The article devotes special attention to such questions as the text-form(s) of the sources available to Josephus, his various modifications of their data and the effects of these, and the messages his version might be intended to convey to his double audience, i. e. (Roman) Gentiles and fellow Jews.

2 Samuel 10 relates a double victory won by King David, first over an Ammonite-led coalition, and then over a Syrian force. 1 Chronicles 19 narrates the same two episodes, though with many differences in detail. In this essay, I wish to examine yet a third account of David's victories, i.e. that given by Josephus in his *Antiquitates Iudaicae* (hereafter *Ant.*) VII 117b-129a¹. My study will proceed by way of a detailed comparison between Josephus' version and its two Biblical sources as represented by the following major witnesses: *MT* (*BHS*), *4QSam^a*²,

¹ For the text and translation of the works of Josephus, I use H.St.J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren, and L.H. Feldman (eds.), *Josephus*, Cambridge, MA/ London, 1926-1965 (*Ant.* VII 117b-129a is found in Vol. V, pp. 422-431 ed. by Marcus). I have likewise consulted the text and apparatus for *Ant.* VII 117b-129a in B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi Opera* II, Berlin, 1955², pp. 115-119. On Josephus' overall treatment of the two Israelite protagonists of 2 Samuel 10, 1 Chronicles 19, see L.H. Feldman, «Josephus' Portrait of David», *Hebrew Union College Annual* 60, 1989, pp. 129-174; idem, «Josephus' Portrait of Joab», *Estudios Bíblicos* 51, 1993, pp. 323-351.

² *4QSam^a* contains (portions of) a Hebrew text of 2 *Sam.* 10,4-7, 18-19. For its readings I use: E.C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM, 19), Chico, CA 1978, pp. 85, 152-156. On the *4QSam^a* text of 2 *Samuel* 10 see also: P.K. McCarter, *II Samuel* (AB, 9), New York, 1984, pp. 267-270; 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. 107-112.

Codex Vaticanus (hereafter B) ³ and the Lucianic (hereafter L) or Antiochene MSS ⁴ of the LXX, the *Vetus Latina* (hereafter VL) ⁵, plus Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets (hereafter TJ) ⁶ and the Targum of Chronicles (hereafter TC) ⁷. This comparison aims to find answers to such overarching questions as the following: Which text-form(s) of 2 *Samuel* 10 and/or 1 *Chronicles* 19 did Josephus have available? What sort of rewriting techniques does he apply to the data of his sources and what are the distinctive features of his presentation which result from their application? Finally, what messages might Josephus' re-telling of the story of David's double victory be intended to convey to his double audience, i.e. (Roman) Gentiles and fellow Jews?

In turning now to my comparison, I divide up the Biblical and Josephan material into four parallel segments as follows: 1) The *Casus Belli* (2 *Sam.* 10,1-5, 1 *Chr.* 19,1-5, *Ant.* VII 117b-120); 2) Preparations for Battle (10,6-8, 19,6-9, *Ant.* VII 121-123); 3) First Victory (10,9-14, 19,10-15, *Ant.* VII 124-126); and 4) Second Victory (10,15-19, 19,16-19, *Ant.* VII 127-129a).

The Casus Belli

The remote occasion for the events narrated in the three accounts under consideration here is the death of Nahash, king of the Ammonites, as related at the start of each of them. In 2 *Samuel* 10 the relevant notice follows upon

³ 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; II:III *I and II Chronicles*, 1932. In recent scholarship there has been a division of opinion as to whether B's text of 2 *Reigns* 10 (+ 11,1) is the end of that MS's first long «Old Greek» segment (1 *Reigns* 1-2 *Reigns* 11,1) as earlier advocated by H. St.J. Thackeray or rather constitutes the opening of what D. Barthélemy calls the «kaige recension» in that MS. The latter position was advocated by J.D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM, 1), Cambridge, MA 1968, pp. 117-120 whom Ulrich, *Text*, p. 154 and McCarter, *II Samuel*, p. 267 follow. By contrast, Pisano, *Samuel*, p. 108 maintains the view of Thackeray.

⁴ 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; idem, III. 1-2 *Crónicas* (TECC, 60), 1996.

⁵ For VL's (fragmentary readings) of 2 *Samuel* 10 I use P. Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae seu vetus italica*, Pars II, Rheims, 1753, p. 554.

⁶ 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 and A.J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets* (The Aramaic Bible, 10), Wilmington 1987.

⁷ For TC I use the text of R. le Déaut and J. Robert, *Targum des Chroniques*, II (AnBib, 51), Rome 1971 and the translation of this by J.S. McIvor, *The Targum of Chronicles* (The Aramaic Bible, 19), Collegeville, MN 1994.

the story (2 *Samuel* 9) of David's beneficence towards the Saulide Mephibosheth. The Chronicler, who leaves aside the material of 2 *Samuel* 9, attaches his parallel to 2 *Samuel* 10, i.e. 1 *Chronicles* 19, to his rendition of 2 *Samuel* 8, a complex of notices on David's wars and officers, in 1 *Chronicles* 18. Josephus, for his part, clearly aligns himself with the sequence of 2 *Samuel*. Specifically, having given his rendition of 2 *Samuel* 9 (David and Mephibosheth) in VII 111-117a, he proceeds (VII 117b) to relate the developments in Ammon as told in 2 *Sam.* 10,1, 1 *Chr.* 19,1. His version of the latter item runs: «Now there died at this time the Ammanite king Naasēs (Ναάσου) ⁸ who was a friend (φίλος) of David ⁹, and his son Annōn (Ἀννών) ¹⁰ succeeded to his throne».

2 *Sam.* 10,2, 1 *Chr.* 19,2 begin by citing David's statement of his intentions, and then recount his dispatch of a delegation to «console» Hanun in accord with those intentions. Josephus turns David's prior statement into the content of the envoys' words to the Ammonite king ¹¹: «David thereupon sent and

⁸ This is the declined form of the name as read by *BL Reigns* (hereafter *Rgns.*) and *Paraleipomena* (hereafter *Par.*). Compare MT «Nahash». In citing the name of the Ammonite king in his mention of his death, Josephus agrees with *L* 10,1 and MT *L* 19,1 against MT *B* 10,1 and *B* 19,1 which do not give the name at this point. Commentators generally suppose that the «Nahash» referred to in 2 *Samuel* 10, 1 *Chronicles* 19 is the same figure as the Ammonite king against whom Saul won his first victory according to 1 *Samuel* 11. In any event, however, Josephus does clearly distinguish between the two kings since in his rendition of 1 *Samuel* 11 in *Ant.* VI 68-85 he introduces the (Biblically unparalleled) statement Saul «slew Naas himself» (VI 70). On the Josephan version of 1 *Samuel* 11, see C.T. Begg, «Saul's Royal Start according to Josephus», *Sacris Erudiri* 37, 1997, pp. 5-32.

⁹ The above indication has no counterpart in 2 *Samuel* 10 or 1 *Chronicles* 19 as such (I italicize such items in my presentation). It might, however, have been inspired by David's statement (to which Josephus lacks an equivalent, see above) in 10,2a, 19,2a, i.e. «(I will deal loyally with Hanun the son of Nahash for) his father dealt loyally with me». In any event, Josephus frequently introduces the Greco-Roman court term '(royal) friend' into contexts where the Bible lacks it, see C.T. Begg, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (*AJ* 8,212-420) (BETL, 108), Leuven 1993, p. 16, n. 54. Here in VII 117b, mention of Nahash's having been a «friend» of David provides an implicit motivation for the latter's subsequent initiative with regard to the former's son.

¹⁰ This is the form of the name read by *B* 10,1. Compare MT «Hanun», *L* 10,1 and 19,1 (Ἀννών), *B* 19,1 (Ἀνάβ).

¹¹ Josephus' handling of the wording of the Biblical David's statement with its reference to Nahash's past «loyalty» to himself could reflect the fact that the Bible contains no previous mention of any good offices done to David by Nahash to which the former might be referring here. Jewish tradition (see *Numb. Rab.* 14.1; *Midr. Tanhuma* 4.25) fills this «lacuna» with its story that Nahash had preserved the life of David's fugitive brother Elihu when the king of Moab (to whom David had confided his father and mother, see 1

comforted him ¹², *exhorting him to bear his father's death with resignation*, and bidding him to look for the continuance of the same friendship (φιλίαν) ¹³ that he had with his father ¹⁴».

At this juncture, the sources (10,3, 19,3) introduce a narrative complication, i.e. the Ammonite princes' claim that David's envoys are in fact spies. Josephus inserts into his parallel an editorial notice (VII 118a) which makes clear the groundlessness of that claim: «The Ammanite princes (ἄρχοντες, so *BL Rgns.* and *Par.*), however, received this message in an ugly spirit and not as David had intended it ¹⁵, and incited (παρώτρυναν) ¹⁶ the king against him by saying that ¹⁷ David had sent men to spy (κατασκοπούς) ¹⁸ on their country (χώρας) ¹⁹ and their forces (δυνάμεως) ²⁰, on the pretext of friendly offices (ἐπὶ προφάσει φιλανθρωπίας) ²¹....».

Sam. 22,3-4) butchered the remainder of his family. Compare the *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Libros Regum et Paralipomenon* (PL 23, c. 1352) attributed to Jerome which, in connection with David's statement in 10,2a, affirms that David himself had been kindly received by Nahash following his departure from the unwelcoming Achish, king of Gath (see 1 *Sam.* 21,13-22,1).

¹² In his rendition of 10,1-2, 19,1-2 in *Ant.* VII 117b Josephus, as so often elsewhere in his Biblical paraphrase, replaces source parataxis with hypotaxis. Compare the former's «dying (τελευτήσαντος) Naasēs... and Annōn receiving (διαδεξαμένου) the kingdom, David sending (πέμψας) comforted (παρεμυθήσατο)...» with the latter's «and the king of the Ammonites died... and his son reigned in his stead... and David sent to comfort...».

¹³ This term echoes the φίλος introduced by Josephus earlier in VII 117b.

¹⁴ Compare David's statement in 10,2a, 19,2a «I will deal loyally with Hanun...». From 10,2, 19,2 Josephus leaves aside the concluding notice on the envoys' actual arrival in Ammon as something which might well be taken for granted.

¹⁵ Via the above insertion Josephus counters, in advance, any suspicions readers might have about David's good faith in sending his delegation.

¹⁶ This is the only occurrence of the verb παρωτρύνω in the Josephan corpus; it is, however, conjectured by S. Naber in *Ant.* XV 55.

¹⁷ In reproducing the princes' words of 10,3, 19,3, Josephus, as so often elsewhere in his Biblical paraphrase, substitutes indirect for direct discourse. On the point see Begg, *Josephus' Account*, pp. 12-13, n. 38 and the literature cited there.

¹⁸ This noun form is the cognate of the verb κατασκοπέω which, in various forms, is used by *BL* 10,3, 19,3 in reporting the princes' claim.

¹⁹ In having the princes refer to the envoys' «spying» on «the country» here, Josephus aligns himself with MT TC 19,3 (as well as some Hebrew MSS and TJ of 10,3) which have «spy out the land» as opposed to MT *BL* 10,3 («to search out the city»). (*BL* 19,3 read the conflate expression «to search out the city and to spy out the land [τὴν γῆν]».)

²⁰ This indication concerning the «object» of the envoys' (alleged) spying has no equivalent in the sources. Its insertion by Josephus is prompted by the consideration that the spies would be interested above all in ascertaining Ammon's military capacities.

²¹ The above phrase occurs only here in Josephus. Also this element has no equivalent

Having cited the princes' charge in parallel to 10,3, 19,3, Josephus appends a conclusion of his own creation which he has them draw from that charge: «they advised him (Annōn) to be on his guard and pay no attention to David's words, lest he be tricked and meet with irremediable (ἀπαρηγορήτω) ²² disaster».

2 *Sam.* 10,4, 1 *Chr.* 19,4 next recount Hanun's response to the princes' charge: his humiliating treatment and dismissal of the envoys. The preface which Josephus affixes (VII 119a) to his parallel points up the wrongfulness of that response: «To these words of the princes Annōn, the king of the Ammanites, gave more credence than they actually deserved, and grievously misused (περίυβρισε) ²³...». Thereafter, the historian presents his (expanded) version of the sources' notice on Hanun's initiatives: «(he grievously misused) the envoys (πρέσβεις, compare παῖδας, B 10,4, *BL* 19,4; δούλους, L 10,4) sent by David by shaving off (ξυρήσας) ²⁴ a half of their beards ²⁵ and cutting off a half of their garments (ἱματιῶν, compare μανδύας, B 10,4; μανδυῶν, L 10,4, *BL* 19,4) ²⁶, and the dismissed them to bring back his answer in the form of acts rather than of words ²⁷».

The opening segment of the sources' narratives ends up in 10,5, 19,5 by relating David's dealings with his humiliated envoys. Josephus' version (VII

in the sources' speech of the Ammonite princes. Its insertion reinforces the baselessness of their claim in that Josephus has already made clear that David's intentions in dispatching the envoys were indeed honorable- contrary to what the princes assert here.

²² The term ἀπαρηγορήτος is hapax in Josephus.

²³ Terms of the ὑβρι- stem constitute a *Leitwort* in Josephus' version of 2 *Samuel* 10, 1 *Chronicles* 19 as we will be seeing. With the whole above insertion Josephus spells out the inner affect of the princes' words upon the king, just as he underscores the efficacy of their (false) charge.

²⁴ This is the participial form of the same verb which appears in the aorist indicative in *BL* 10,4 and 19,4.

²⁵ In specifying that Hanun shaved off «half» of the envoys' beards, Josephus agrees with MT (and TJ) 10,4 against *BL* («he shaved their beards») and 19,4 («he shaved them», MT *BL*).

²⁶ Josephus leaves aside the further, divergent specification concerning Hanun's «cutting» of the envoys' clothes, i.e. «to [+ the cloak, L] of their buttocks» (MT *B* 10,4, cf. «to their place of shame», TJ), «to their hips» (MT 19,4, cf. «to their private parts», TC), «to the cloak» (*BL* 19,4). His reason for this omission might be that he found the detail too graphic and one likely to inspire contemptuous derision for the Jews on the part of Gentile readers.

²⁷ Josephus' above appendix to the wording of 10,4, 19,4 underscores the deliberately provocative intent behind Hanun's acts. Like 10,4 Josephus has no equivalent to the (self-evident) plus at the end of 19,4, i.e. «and they (the envoys) departed».

120) focusses attention on David personally, accentuating his justified anger at what has happened and replacing his directive about what the envoys are to do with a statement by him about how he himself intends to deal with the perfidious Ammonites. It reads: «At sight of them ²⁸, the king of the Israelites was indignant (ἡγανάκτησε) ²⁹ and made it plain that he would not overlook this insult (ὑβρίν) ³⁰ and outrage (προπηλακισμόν) ³¹, but would make war on the Ammanites and exact satisfaction (τιμωρίαν) from their king for their lawless treatment (παρανομίας) of his envoys ³²».

Preparations for Battle

The sources' build-up (10,6-8, 19,6-9) to the subsequent account of the battle between the Israelites and the Ammonites begins with mention (10,6a, 19,6a) of the latter's «realization» that they had irremediably antagonized David ³³. Josephus (VII 121) gives a more definite content to the Ammonites' recognition: «then the relatives and chiefs (of the Ammanite king) ³⁴, realizing

²⁸ In Josephus' presentation the envoys thus appear in person before David, whereas in 10,5, 19,5 David «sends [others] to meet them», once he is «told» of what has happened. In accord with this change, Josephus likewise omits the sources' explanation («for the men were greatly ashamed») as to why the envoys did not themselves approach David, this making it necessary for the king «to send to meet them».

²⁹ Also elsewhere Josephus inserts references to the «indignation» David feels in the face of some wrong, see *Ant.* VI 177 (compare 1 *Sam.* 17,26, Goliath's boasting) and VII 206 (compare 2 *Sam.* 16,4, Ziba's charge about Mephibosheth's [purported] treason).

³⁰ This noun echoes the verb περιύβρισε used of Hanun's deed in VII 119.

³¹ The word προπηλακισμός is hapax in Josephus.

³² The above statement which Josephus attributes to David accentuates the wrongfulness of Hanun's deed, while also providing a clearer motivation for the Ammonites' «realization» (and resultant initiative) as described in what follows. That statement takes the place of David's directive to the envoys in 10,5b,19,5b «remain at Jericho until your beards have grown and then return (+ and they sat, *L* 19,5)». Josephus' non-utilization of this source item is understandable given his prior reference to the king's «seeing» the envoys. Such «seeing» would presumably take place in Jerusalem, David's capital, this entailing that the envoys had already «returned» there, advancing beyond Jericho in doing so.

³³ So MT 10,6, 19,6. *B* 10,6 and *BL* 19,6 speak rather of «the people of David», *L* 10,6 of «the servants of David», thus making David's envoys the ones whom the Ammonites realize that they have thus offended.

³⁴ This is Josephus' specification of the sources' undifferentiated reference to «the Ammonites» as the subject of the realization cited in 10,6a, 19,6a. The reference introduces an echo of the mention of the Ammonite «princes» in VII 118.

that they had violated the treaty (παρεσπονθήκασι) ³⁵ and were liable to punishment (δίκην) for this (offense) ³⁶...».

Pursuant to their «realization», the Ammonites proceed to «hire» foreigner troops, 10,6b, 19,6b-7. The various textual witnesses differ markedly regarding the sources for and numbers of these mercenaries as the following listing makes clear:

MT and *TJ* 10,6b: they hired Aram of Beth-rehob and Aram of Zobah (20,000 foot soliders) and the king of Maacah (1000 men) and Ish-tob [or the men of Tob] ³⁷ (12,000 men).

B 10,6b: they hired Syria and Roōb (20,000 foot soliders) and the king of Amalēk (1000 men) and Eistōb [Ειστώβ] (12,000 men).

L 10,6b: they hired the Syrian (τὸν σύρον) and Baithraam and the Syrian (σύρον) [of] Souba (20,000 foot soldiers) and the king of Maacha (1,000 men) and Istōb [Ἰστώβ] (12,000 men).

4QSam^a 10,6b: a thousand silver talents to hire for themselves from Aram Naharaim and from Aram Maacah and from Zobah chariots and horsemen, 32,000 chariots and the king of Maacah and Ishtob and the Ammonites were gathered from the cities. ³⁸

MT and *TJ* 19,6b-7: a thousand talents (*TJ centenaria*, a Latin loan word) of silver to hire for themselves chariots and horsemen from Aram-Naharaim [*TC* Aram which is on the Euphrates] from Aram-maacah [*TC* from Aram which is on Maacah] and from Zobah. They hired 32,000 chariots and the king of Maacah with his army, who came and encamped before Medeba. And the Ammonites were mustered from their cities and came to battle.

B 19,6b-7: a thousand talents of silver to hire for themselves from Syria of Mesopotamia and from Syria of Moocha and from Sōbal chariots and horsemen.

³⁵ Josephus' other uses of the verb παρασπονδέω are in *Bellum Judaicum* (hereafter *BJ*) 1.378; *Ant.* 14.28; *Vita* 305. The term, with its reference to an existing pact between Israel and Ammon, harks back to Josephus' previous mentions of Nahash as David's «friend» (VII 117) and to David's «friendship» (VII 117) with the former. All three terms serve to underscore the reprehensibility of the Ammonites' behavior.

³⁶ The above wording of the Ammonites' «realization» with its acknowledgement by them of their wrong-doing («they had violated the treaty») and «liability to punishment» echoes David's statement in VII 120 «he... would exact satisfaction (τιμωρίαν) from their king for their lawless treatment of his envoys». Thereby, Josephus represents the culprits themselves as agreeing with David in his assessment of their deed and the retribution it merits.

³⁷ The phrase *w'š tōb* of *MT* (and *TJ*) 10,6 is ambiguous: it might be interpreted as referring to the army of the land of Tob (so *RSV* «the men of Tob») or, alternatively, as the title of the ruler of that land, see the commentaries. In any case *BL 4QSam^a*, as well as the *qere*, all combine *MT*'s two words into a single one, thereby reading a proper name.

³⁸ The above is the translation of the Hebrew text of *4QSam^a* 10,6 as given by Ulrich, *Text*, p. 152. It should be kept in mind that Ulrich's text features several conjecturally supplied letters to fill lacunae found in the MS itself.

They hired for themselves chariots and horsemen, 32,000 chariots and the king of Mōcha and his people and they came and encamped before Maidaba. And the Ammonites were mustered from their cities and came to battle.

L 19,6b-7: a thousand talents of silver to hire for themselves from Syria of Mesopotamia and from Syria of Maacha and from Souba chariots and horsemen. They hired for themselves 32,000 chariots and the king of Maacha and his people and they came and encamped before Mēdaba. And the Ammonites were mustered from their cities and came to battle.³⁹

Vis-à-vis these varying texts forms for the sources' «hiring notice», Josephus' parallel evidences affinities now with one, now with another. It runs:

they sent⁴⁰ a thousand talents (χίλια τάλαντα = BL 19,6)⁴¹ to Syros (Σύρον)⁴², the king of the Mesopotamians (Μεσοποταμιτῶν)⁴³, and invited him to become their ally (σύμμαχον) for this payment (μισθῷ)⁴⁴ and (they also invited) Sūba (Σουβά)⁴⁵. These kings had twenty thousand infantry (πέζον)⁴⁶. In

³⁹ In the above listing note especially the striking affinities between 4QSam^a 10,6b and the readings of 19,6b-7 as against those of the other witnesses of 10,6b, this attesting to the existence of a pre-MT Hebrew text of Samuel with marked similarities to that of Chronicles.

⁴⁰ The subject of this action is the «relatives and chiefs» of Hanun as cited at the start of VII 121. By contrast, the hirers in MT 4QSam^a BL 10,6b and B 19,6b are «the Ammonites» *en bloc*, while in MT 19,6b they are «Hanun and the Ammonites» (cf. L the Ammonites and Annan their king).

⁴¹ This item of Josephus' presentation reflects the plus of 4QSam^a and 19,6b vis-à-vis the other witnesses of 2 Sam. 10,6 which lack it. Josephus leaves aside the former witnesses' specification that the talents were «of silver».

⁴² This form seems to reflect the reading of L 10,6 which has «the Syrian» (τὸν σύρον) for the Aram/Syria of the other Samuel/Chronicles witnesses. Josephus has, however, made L's gentilic into a proper name, as his appended phrase «(Syros), king of the Mesopotamians» (see above) indicates. His doing so likely stands under the influence of the mention of «the king of Maacah» as one of those hired by the Ammonites in the continuation of both Samuel and Chronicles.

⁴³ Josephus' reference to «the Mesopotamians» here has a counterpart in the phrase «(from Syria of) Mesopotamia» (= Aram Naharain, MT and 4QSam^a) of BL 19,6.

⁴⁴ With this inserted phrase Josephus spells out the purpose behind the «hiring» spoken of in the sources.

⁴⁵ This form reflects the reading Σουβά of L 10,6 and 19,6 (B 19,6 has Σοβάλ). As with «Syros» Josephus takes «Sūba,» not as a place but rather as a personal name, see his following reference to «these kings», i.e. Syros and Sūba. He does so perhaps under the influence of the ambiguous wording of L 10,6, i.e. τὸν σύρον Σουβά which might be understood to be referring to a «Syrian» named «Souba».

⁴⁶ The codices SPE read πεζῶν, the same form found in BL 10,6. For the above datum Josephus agrees with MT BL TJ 10,6 against 4QSam^a and 19,6 which lack it.

addition they engaged the king of the country called Micha (Μιχαῶς)⁴⁷, and a fourth named Istobos (Ἰστοβον)⁴⁸, these latter having twelve thousand armed men (δωδεκάχιλις)⁴⁹.

David's response to the Ammonite initiative comes in 10,7, 19,8: he dispatches his commander Joab along with a picked force to counter the threat. Josephus (VII 122) prefaces a reference — this taking the place of the opening words «and when David heard about it» of the sources — to the king's emotional stance vis-à-vis the menace facing him: «Undismayed either by this confederacy (συνμαχίαν, cf. σύμμαχον, VII 121) or by the Ammanite force, David put his trust in God and in the justice (δικαίως, cf. δίκην, VII 121) of his cause in going to war (πολεμεῖν) to avenge the insult he had suffered (ὑβρίσθη)⁵⁰, and, giving Joab, his commander-in chief (ἀρχιστρά-

⁴⁷ In *MT 4QSam^a TJ* 10,6 and *MT TC* 19,7 the name of the country is «Maacah» (*L* 10,6, 19,7 *Μααχά*), in *B* 10,6 Ἀμαλήκ and in *B* 19,7 *Μωαχά*. Josephus' form thus differs from those of all the Biblical textual witnesses surveyed.

⁴⁸ In reading a proper name here («Istobos») Josephus agrees with *BL* and *4QSam^a* 10,6 against both the witnesses of 19,7 which lack a corresponding indication and *MT (TJ)* whose reading (ἰὺ τὸβ) represents either a collectivity or a title for the ruler of «Tob»; see n. 37.

⁴⁹ In representing «the king of Micha» and «Istobos» as contributing a combined force of 12,000 men, Josephus diverges from the witnesses to 10,6 which cite a total of 13,000 men supplied by them, i.e. 1,000 by the former and 12,000 by the latter (these figures are lacking in *4QSam^a*). His (implicit) total of 32,000 men (20,000 from Syrus and Souba, 12,000 from the king of Micha and Istobos) agrees, as such, with the figure explicitly cited in 19,7 (and *4QSam^a*, as reconstructed). Whereas, however, in the latter witnesses that figure refers to the «chariots (+ and horsemen, so *BL* 19,7)» which the Ammonites procure for themselves, Josephus (like 10,6) speaks only of (foot) soliders. In addition, it should be noted that also the witnesses to 19,7, in fact, allude to a higher total figure for the forces than Josephus' 32,000, in that, having cited the 32,000 «chariots (and horsemen)» collected, they go on to refer to a additional contingent of unspecified size, i.e. «the king of Maacah and his people» (*4QSam^a* lacks the italicized words but evidences a lacuna after its sequence «and the king of Maacah and Ishtob» which might well have originally contained a figure for their contingent which would generate an overall total higher than the 32,000 previously cited in the MS). Thus as Pisano, *Samuel*, p. 111 remarks «(Josephus) appears to be the only one to speak of exactly 32,000 men in the army raised by the Ammonites».

In any event, Josephus, like 10,6, lacks a parallel to the plus of 19,7b (and, in part, *4QSam^a*), i.e. «and they (i.e. the king of Maacah and his people) came and encamped before Medebah (> *4QSam^a*). And the Ammonites were mustered from their cities and came to battle (in *4QSam^a* there is a lacuna after the mention of the Ammonites being mustered from their cities which the MS shares with 19,7b)».

⁵⁰ Compare the wording of the statement attributed to David in VII 120 «he would not overlook this insult (ὑβρίν) ... but would make war (πολεμήσων) ...», cf. also «(Hanun) grievously misused (περιὑβρίσε) the envoys sent by David...», VII 119. The entire sequence italicized above goes beyond the sources in accentuating David's possession of three of the

τηγον) ⁵¹, the flower of his army (τῆς στρατιᾶς τὸ ἀκμαϊότατον) ⁵², at once sent (ἔπεμψεν, *BL* 10,7, 19,8 ἀπέστειλε[ν]) him against them». To this expanded version of Joab's dispatch by David, Josephus further appends, with the subsequent source indications in view, a mention of the general's destination: «Joab pitched his camp close to the Ammanite capital Rabatha (Ῥαβαθα ⁵³) ⁵⁴».

The sources (10,8, 19,9) round off their account of the preparations for the upcoming battle with reference to the separate positions assumed by the Ammonites and their confederates. Josephus' rendition stands closer to the more general wording of Chronicles: «Then the enemy (10,8, 19,9 the Ammonites) issued forth (ἐξελθόντων; *L* 10,8 and *B* 19,9 ἐξῆλθον) with their men drawn up not in one body but in two, for ⁵⁵ the auxiliary force (τὸ ... ἐπικουρικόν) ⁵⁶ was stationed by itself (καθ' αὐτό, cf. καθ' ἑαυτούς, *L* 10,8, 19,9) in the plain (ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ = *L* 10,8, *BL* 19,9), and the Ammanite army at the gates (πρὸς ταῖς πύλαις), opposite the Hebrews (Ἑβραίων) ⁵⁷».

cardinal virtues, i.e. piety, justice and courage. On David's exemplification of these three virtues throughout Josephus' portrayal of him, see Feldman, «David», pp. 141-147 (courage), 150-156 (justice), 156-164 (piety).

⁵¹ This title for Joab has no equivalent in 10,7, 19,8. It reminds readers of Joab's status as cited in the list of David's officials in VII 110 (Joab «the general of his entire army [στρατηγὸν... ἀπάσης... τῆς στρατιᾶς] , 2 *Sam* 8,16= 1 *Chr* 18,15)» and so serves to motivate David's dispatch precisely of him to counter the enemy threat here in VII 122.

⁵² This phrase occurs only here in Josephus. Compare *L* 10,7 πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὰν τῶν δυνάτων.

⁵³ This is the conjecture of J. Hudson which Marcus follows. Niese reads Ῥαβαθαῶ. The codices ROMSE have Ῥαμαθαῶ, cf. lat. *aramatha*.

⁵⁴ Josephus apparently anticipates this reference to Joab's camp-site from 10,14, 19,15 which speak of the Ammonites fleeing to «the (which?) city» before the Israelites and 2 *Sam.* 11,1, 1 *Chr.* 20,1 where, in connection with a subsequent campaign, it is specified that Joab besieged «Rabbah» (so *MT*).

⁵⁵ The above explicit notice on the enemy's dividing his force into two contingents lacks a Biblical parallel; it underscores the purposefulness of the initiative taken by them in expectation of the upcoming battle.

⁵⁶ Josephus' other uses of this term are in *Ant.* XIV 48.128.447.469;17.286. In its generality the term corresponds to 1 *Chr.* 19,9's all-encompassing reference to «the kings who had come» in contrast to the specifying listing of 10,8 («the Syrians of Zobah and of Rehob, and the men of Tob and Maacah» [thus *MT*], cf. 10,6).

⁵⁷ The above reference «opposite the Hebrews» takes the place of the divergent indications concerning the point at which the Ammonites position themselves in the various Biblical witnesses: «at the entrance (door, B) of the gate» (*MT* 10,8); «at the gate (πυλῶνα) of the city» (*L* 10,8); «at the entrance (*BL* gate, πυλῶνα) of the city for war» (*MT* 19,9).

On Josephus' employment of the designation «Hebrews», 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, pp. 124-129. Compare «(king of the) Israelites» in VII 120.

First Victory

The initial battle account of 2 *Samuel* 10, 1 *Chronicles* 19 opens with Joab perceiving himself to be caught between the two enemy contingents (10,9a, 19,10a). Josephus' rendition (VII 124a) generalizes the sources' specification of what Joab «sees», while also appending an introductory notice on his response: «When Joab saw (ἰδὼν; εἶδεν *BL* 10,9,19,10) this [i.e. the enemy's dispositions as described in VII 123] he contrived counter-measures (ἀντιμαχανᾶται) ⁵⁸...». In the face of what he «sees», Joab proceeds (10,9b-10, 19,10b-11) to divide his own troops into two forces: the elite soliders under his command are to face the Syrians, the remainder are entrusted by him to his brother Abishai to confront the Ammonites. In reproducing these notices, Josephus elaborates on Joab's designated opponents: «he selected the bravest (ἀνδρειοτάτους) of his men and drew them up (ἀντιπαράσσεται) ⁵⁹ against Syros (τῷ Σύρῳ) ⁶⁰ and the kings with him ⁶¹; the rest he turned over to his brother Abisai (Ἀβισαίῳ, *B* 10,10 Ἀβεισά, *L* 10,10, *BL* 19,11 Ἀβεσσά) with orders to draw them up (ἀντιπαράταξασθαι) ⁶² over against the Ammanites...».

2 *Sam.* 10,11, 1 *Chr.* 19,12 «quote» Job's opening words to his brother, promising assistance should he be in danger of being overwhelmed by the Syrians, and directing Abishai to provide like support to himself if the Ammonites unduly press him. Here too, Josephus substitutes indirect for indirect address: «and, if he (Abishai) saw ⁶³ the Syrians (τοὺς Σύρους) ⁶⁴ pressing

⁵⁸ With the above introduction to Joab's specific initiatives as related in what follows, Josephus underscores the purposeful intent behind those initiatives. The historian's other uses of the verb ἀντιμαχανάομαι are in *BJ* 1.348;3.171; *Ant.* XII 127. Note the historic present form here in VII 124, a form which Josephus frequently introduces into his Biblical paraphrase, see Begg, *Josephus' Account*, pp. 10-11, n. 32.

⁵⁹ Note the historic present; see n. 58.

⁶⁰ This proper name echoes that used in VII 121; it likewise corresponds to the τοῦ σὺρω of *L* 10,9b, *BL* 19,10b (compare *B* 10,9 Συρίας = *MT* 10,9b, 19,10b «Aram»).

⁶¹ This inserted phrase picks up on the reference to three additional «kings» beyond «Syros» himself (Sūba, the king of Micha, and Istobos) whom the Ammonites hired according to VII 121. The insertion resolves the question of who on the Israelite side would be responsible for dealing with these other enemy mercenaries.

⁶² Cf. the finite form of this same verb (ἀντιπαράτασσει) earlier in VII 124.

⁶³ This inserted item spells out how Abishai is to know if Joab needs his assistance, i.e. he will «see» the Syrians getting the better of him.

⁶⁴ This collective plural form contrasts both with the «Syria» of *B* 10,11 (= *MT*) , *L* 19,12 (= *MT*) and «the Syrian» of *L* 10,11, *B* 19,12. The form seems to reflect Josephus' previous reference not simply to «Syros», but also to «the kings with him» earlier in VII 124.

him hard (βιάζομένους)⁶⁵ and getting the better of him (πλέον δυναμένους)⁶⁶ to bring over his division⁶⁷ and assist (βοηθεῖν) him⁶⁸; he himself would do the same⁶⁹ if he saw⁷⁰ Abishai being worn down (καταπονούμενον)⁷¹ by the Ammanites». Joab's address to Abishai continues in 10,12, 19,13 where, twice evoking God, he exhorts the Israelites to fight manfully, while at the same time placing the outcome in the Deity's hands. Josephus' (indirect discourse) rendition (VII 125a) eliminates Joab's theological allusion⁷²: «Then, after encouraging his brother and exhorting him to fight bravely (εὐψύχως ... ἀγωνίσασθαι)⁷³ and with an ardour expected of men (ἀνδράσιν)⁷⁴ who fear disgrace (αἰσχύνην φοβούμενους)⁷⁵...». The sources conclude their account of Joab's pre-battle initiatives with mention of his force approaching the Syrians (10,13a, 19,14a). Josephus prefaces a corresponding notice on the deployment of Abishai's contingent: «... he sent him (Abishai) off to face the Ammanites in battle, while he himself engaged the Syrians (see VII 124)⁷⁶».

⁶⁵ On this term and its *Wortfeld* in the Josephan corpus, see E. Moore, «BIAZΩ, AP-PIAZΩ and Cognates in Josephus», *NTS* 21, 1974-1975, pp. 519-543.

⁶⁶ With Josephus' two participial forms above, compare the single verb of 10,1, 19,1 «if the Syrians are too strong (*BL* with a form of the verb κρατέω) for me...».

⁶⁷ With this inserted phrase Josephus spells out how Abishai is to «assist» Joab as he is instructed to do in 10,11a, 19,12a.

⁶⁸ 10,11a, 19,12a read literally «you shall be for deliverance (*BL* εἰς σωτηρίαν) to me.»

⁶⁹ Compare 10,11b «I will come and help you (so *MT L*; *B* we will be to help you)» and 19,12b «I will help you».

⁷⁰ See n. 63.

⁷¹ Whereas 10,11 and 19,12 use the same verb (*BL* a form of κρατέω) to refer to the possible effect of the enemy forces upon the two Israelite contingents, Josephus takes care to vary his terminology on the matter, see above.

⁷² Feldman, «Joab», p. 330, 334, 351, sees Josephus' procedure as reflective of the historian's concern to downplay Joab's piety. (Note in this connection that *B* 19,13 reads only the closing words [«and may the Lord do what seems good to him»] attributed to Joab in the other witnesses of 19,13 and 10,12 [and in Josephus as well, see above], lacking an equivalent to the general's preceding exhortation as found in those witnesses «Be of good courage, and let us play the man for our people and for the cities of our God».)

⁷³ The above phrase occurs only here in Josephus.

⁷⁴ Compare the verbal form ἀνδρίζου employed by Joab in *BL* 10,12 and *L* 19,13. Josephus' noun echoes the adjective ἀνδρειστάτους used by him of Joab's elite troops in VII 124.

⁷⁵ This phrase is hapax in Josephus.

⁷⁶ Josephus' collective plural form here (see n. 64) corresponds to that read by *B* 19,14a (Σύρον) as against the «Aram/Syria» of *MT B* 10,13a, *MT L* 19,14a and «the Syrian» of *L* 10,13a. In contrast to both sources, Josephus makes no mention of «the people» who accompany Joab as he takes up his position.

The actual (first) battle account presented by the two sources in 10,13b-14a, 19,14b-15a is strikingly jejune, above all in comparison with the extended preceding build-up to this. All one hears, in fact, is that the Syrians fled before Joab and that the Ammonites, upon seeing this, did likewise, entering «the city». Josephus (VII 126) embellishes this non-descript narration considerably:

Although the latter [i.e. the Syrians] resisted stoutly for a short time, Joab slew (ἀπέκτεινεν) many of them ⁷⁷ and compelled all the rest to turn and flee ⁷⁸. At this sight the Ammonites, who were afraid of Abishai and his army ⁷⁹, waited no longer, but followed the example of their allies (συνμάχους, see VII 121.122) and fled to their city (εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἔφυγον) ⁸⁰.

The sources' opening battle account terminates in 10,14b, 19,15b with Joab's repairing to Jerusalem. Josephus' rendition aligns itself with the more expansive wording of Samuel for this item: «Having thus overcome (κρατήσας) the enemy ⁸¹, Joab returned in triumph (λαμπρῶς) ⁸² to the king ⁸³ at Jerusalem».

Second Victory

The Israelites' triumph over the enemy coalition as described in 10,9-14, 19,10-15 proves to be only a temporary one, since immediately thereafter another force is assembled which, however, itself meets defeat at David's

⁷⁷ The above inserted sequence serves to underscore the magnitude of Joab's courage and triumph: notwithstanding the «stout resistance» offered him, Joab personally «slays» numerous Syrians (Conceivably, Josephus found inspiration for the latter indication in the second battle account of his sources [10,18, 19,18] which relate that David «slew» [ἀπέκτεινε(v), L 10,18, BL 19,18= Josephus' verb here in VII 126]. Thereby, Josephus accentuates the parallelism between the two battle accounts; see n. 112.)

⁷⁸ According to 10,13b, 19,14b the Syrians fled at their own volition. Josephus' formulation («he compelled...») underscores Joab's role in causing them to do so. On Josephus' accentuation of Joab's military prowess, see Feldman, «Joab», pp. 326-328.

⁷⁹ This inserted phrase supplies a «motive» for the Ammonites' flight, one which, at the same time, accentuates the terror the Israelite forces inspire in their opponents.

⁸⁰ Compare 10,14aβ, 19,15aβ «they fled and entered the city (L 19,15 ἔφυγον ... εἰς τὴν πόλιν)». Recall that Josephus has supplied a previous identification of the city in question via his inserted notice on Joab's camping «close to the Ammanite capital Rabatha» in VII 123.

⁸¹ This formulation reads like an explication of the elliptical plus of 10,15b «Joab returned from the Ammonites».

⁸² This inserted descriptor of Joab's «return» underscores the magnitude of his victory.

⁸³ This reference to David harks back to VII 122 (= 10,7= 19,8) where it is he who appoints Joab commander.

hands (10,15-19, 19,16-19). The sources differ notably in their respective introductions to this latter development. 2 *Sam.* 10,15-16 reads «but when Aram/Syria (so *MT B*; *L VL* the Arameans) saw that it (so *MT B*; *L VL* the Syrian) had been defeated by Israel, they gathered themselves together. And Hadadezer sent and brought out Aram/Syria (so *MT B*; *L* the Syrian) who were beyond the river (so *MT*, *B* + Χαλαμάκ, *L* + Χαλααμά) and they came to Helam (*BL* Αϊλάμ [+ καὶ Σωβά, *L*]) with Shobach the commander of the army of Hadadezer at their head». 1 *Chr.* 19,16a is shorter and simpler: «But when Aram (so *MT*, *BL* the Syrian) saw that they had been defeated by Israel, they sent messengers and they brought out Aram (so *MT*, *BL* the Syrian) who were beyond the river with Shophach the commander of the army of Hadadezer at their head.» Josephus' parallel (VII 127a) has affinities with both source texts, but also peculiarities of its own: «This defeat did not persuade the Ammonites⁸⁴ to remain quiet or to keep the peace in the knowledge that their enemy was superior⁸⁵. Instead they sent⁸⁶ to Chalamas (Χαλαμάν)⁸⁷, the king of⁸⁸ the Syrians (Σύρων)⁸⁹ across the Euphrates⁹⁰ and hired him as an ally (μισ-

⁸⁴ In designating the Ammonites as the ones who respond to Joab's victory Josephus goes together with *L VL* 10,15 against *MT B* 10,15 and *MT BL* 19,16 which make Syria/the Syrian the subject. On the other hand, Josephus has no equivalent to the reference to «the Syrian» which one finds also in the wording of *L* (cf. *VL*) «when the Ammonites saw that the Syrian was defeated by the Israelites...». Thus in Josephus the Ammonites respond to their own defeat rather than to that of the Syrian(s).

⁸⁵ The above sequence has no equivalent as such in either source. It might however, be seen as a psychologizing explication of the reference to the Syrians (so *MT B*)/ the Arameans (so *L VL*) «gathering themselves together» in the concluding plus of 10,15b. In any event, the recognition of Israel's «superiority» by their enemies themselves as cited by Josephus here serves to reinforce the image of Israel as a significant military power.

⁸⁶ In making the Ammonites the subject of the «sending» Josephus diverges from all the Biblical witnesses where that subject is either Hadadezer (so *MT BL* 10,16) or Syria/the Syrian (*MT BL* 19,16).

⁸⁷ Josephus seems to draw this name for the one to whom the Ammonites send by anticipation from the *L* reading later in 10,16 where the reference is to «(the river) Chalamas (Χαλααμά [*MT* has simply «the river», while *B* reads Χαλαμάκ])», at the same time turning it into a proper name of a king (see above; compare his treatment of the *L* reading «the Syrian» of 10,6 in VII 121). See A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie*, Basel 1895, p. 43. In the sources, by contrast, the «sending» is to Syria/the Syrian.

⁸⁸ This inserted qualification of «Chalamas» (a river in *L* 10,16, see previous note) echoes Josephus' (also inserted) designation of Syrus, Sūba and Istobos as «kings» in VII 121.

⁸⁹ Compare *B* 10,16 «Syria»; *L* 10,16, *BL* 19,16 «the Syrian».

⁹⁰ In giving this name to «the river» of *MT* 10,16, *MT BL* 19,16 Josephus agrees with

θοῦνται ... ἐπὶ συμμαχίᾳ) ⁹¹ with his commander-in-chief (ἀρχιστράτηγον) ⁹² Sebekos (Σέβεκον) ⁹³ and eighty thousand infantry and ten thousand calvary ⁹⁴.

The sources (10,17-18αα,19,17-18αα) next relate David's initiatives in the face of the new enemy threat and the results of these. Josephus (VII 128a) elaborates both on what the king «hears» at this juncture and the difference between his response to this second as compared to the first assault by the foe. His version thus runs: «When the king of the Hebrews (see VII 123) ⁹⁵ learned that the Ammanites had again assembled a very large force against him ⁹⁶, he

TJ and *TC*. Recall that he has made *L* 10,16's name for the river in question, i.e. «Chalama» (*B* Χαλαμάκ) into the personal name of the «king of the Syrians», see n. 87.

⁹¹ This formulation represents Josephus' specification of the more general wording of 10,16, 19,16 which speak of a «bringing out» of the Trans-Euphratite Syrians. It is reminiscent of Josephus' own earlier phrase used in reference to the Ammonites' procuring the services of «King Syrus» in VII 121, «they invited him to become their ally for this payment (σύμμαχον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ γενέσθαι τῷ μισθῷ παρεκάλεσαν)». Like 19,16, Josephus has no equivalent to the plus of 10,16 according to which the brought-out Syrians «came to Helam (*BL* Αἰλάμ [+ καὶ Σωβά, *L*])».

⁹² This is the conjecture of Niese which Marcus follows, based on Lat's principem militiae and corresponding to the title found in *L* 10,16, *BL* 19,16 (as well as to the title used for Joab by Josephus himself in VII 122). The Greek codices have ἀντιστράτηγον.

⁹³ This form of the commander's name with a β as its second consonant stands closer to that found in 10,16 (*MT* Shobach, *B* Σωβάκ, *L* Σαβεε) than to the name given in 19,16 (*MT* Shophach, *B* Σωφάρ, *L* Σωφάκ). (*b. Sotah* 42b records diverging Rabbinic statements about the commander's «real» name and how he came to be called by the other one. According to Rab his true name was «Shophach» [so 19,16] but he got the nickname «Shobach» (so 10,16) because he stood as high as a dove-cote [*shobak*]. For R. Samuel, on the other hand, his actual name was «Shobach», as in 10,16, but he was nick-named «Shophach» given that anyone who saw him was «poured out [*nishpach*]» in terror before him.) In contrast to both 10,16 and 19,16, Josephus does not specify that «Sebekos» was the commander of *Hadadezer's* army. Also subsequently in his presentation, Hadadezer (who appears quite abruptly in 19,16) receives no mention.

⁹⁴ As Marcus, *Josephus*, V, p. 429, n. e. points out, these figures for Sebekos' force are simply «invented» by Josephus. This «invention» serves several purposes: it magnifies the threat facing Israel (and so also David's subsequent victory), just as it imparts an air of greater precision to Josephus' retelling of the Biblical story. Also elsewhere, the historian does not hesitate to provide precise figures for the forces involved in a given conflict where the Bible itself lacks such; see L.H. Feldman, «Josephus' Portrait of Saul», *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53, 1982, 45-99, p. 71 and n. 52 and Begg, *Josephus' Account*, p. 72, n. 246.

⁹⁵ Compare VII 120 where David is called «king of the Israelites».

⁹⁶ Compare 10,17,19,17 «and when it was told David...». Josephus' explication of what David «learns» reinforces the magnitude of the enemy threat that has already been highlighted by him via the insertion of the «precise» figures in his version of 10,16, 19,16 (see

decided not to conduct the war through generals (στρατηγῶν) any longer, but himself ⁹⁷ crossed the river Jordan with his entire force ⁹⁸ and, when he met them ⁹⁹, engaged them in a battle ¹⁰⁰ in which he was victorious (ἐνίκησε) ¹⁰¹...».

The continuation of 10,18, 19,18 recounts the casualties inflicted by David upon his foes. Both verses agree in having him slay Shobach/Shophach. They differ, however, as to the number and status of David's other victims. According to 10,18, David killed (the men of) 700 chariots and 40,000 horsemen (so *MT B*; *L* 700 horsemen and 40,000 foot soldiers), while 19,18 speaks rather of (the men of) 7000 chariots and 40,000 foot soldiers (so *MT BL*). Josephus' casualty figures as cited in VII 128b do not fully accord with those of either source: «... (David) slew (ἀναιρεῖ) ¹⁰² some forty thousand of their infantry (πεζῶν = *B* 19,18) ¹⁰³ and seven thousand of their cavalry

n. 94). Note further that in speaking of the «Ammonites» as the ones who have assembled the new coalition against David, Josephus is consistent with his own earlier presentation (see VII 127)- itself inspired by the *L* (*VL*) reading in 10,15a- whereas in the sources that coalition is assembled by Hadadezer (so 10,16) or by Syria/the Syrian (so 19,16), see n. 86.

⁹⁷ The above insertion contrasts David's procedure in the face of the new enemy threat with his response to the first such threat as described in VII 122 (= 10,7= 19,8) where he «gives Joab, his commander-in-chief (ἀρχιστράτηγον), the flower of his army...». The contrast insinuates that the new threat is even more serious than the earlier one and so requires the king's direct personal involvement in meeting it (his eventual success in doing so likewise stands out all the more given the heightened magnitude of the threat as suggested by Josephus here).

⁹⁸ Compare 10,17, 19,17 «(David) gathered all Israel together and crossed (διέβη *B* 10,17, *BL* 19,17; διαβαίνει *L* 10,17)». Like 19,17 Josephus has no equivalent to the plus which follows mention of David's crossing the Jordan in 10,17, i.e. «and he (so *MT L*, *B* they) came to Helam (so *MT*; *B* Αἰλάμ, *L* Χαλααμά)» (recall that he likewise lacks a parallel to the similar plus in 10,16 concerning the enemy's own advance to «Helam»).

⁹⁹ With this indication according to which it is David who makes contact with the enemy, Josephus aligns himself with the reading of 19,17b (and *B* 10,17b), i.e. «and when David set the battle in array against the Syrians» *contra* that of *MT L* 10,17b: «and the Syrians arrayed themselves against David».

¹⁰⁰ In making David the one to initiate the hostilities, Josephus diverges from both 10,17b, 19,17b according to which it is the Syrians who do so. Thereby he accentuates David's stature as a commander who takes the offensive himself rather than waiting to be attacked.

¹⁰¹ Compare 10,18a, 19,18a «and the Syrians fled before Israel (*B* 19,18 David)». Josephus' formulation continues to keep the focus on David and his (successful) initiatives.

¹⁰² Note the historic present; compare the aorist forms of *B* 10,18 (ἀνεῖλεν) and *L* 10,18, *BL* 19,18 (ἀπέκτεινε[v]).

¹⁰³ With this reference to the 40,000 «infantry» slain by David Josephus agrees with

(ἱππέων) ¹⁰⁴, while he also wounded (ἔτρωσε) Sebekos, Chalamas's commander (στρατηγόν, compare ἀρχιστρατήγον, VII 127) ¹⁰⁵, who afterwards died (ἀπέθανεν) of his wound ¹⁰⁶.

2 *Sam.* 10,19a, 1 *Chr.* 19,19a tell of the impact of Israel's victory upon Hadadezar's confederates: «seeing» this, they make peace with Israel (so 10,19a; David, 19,19a) and subject themselves thereto. Josephus (VII 129a) relates this development in equivalent terms: «Upon the conclusion of the battle in this manner, ¹⁰⁷ the Mesopotamians ¹⁰⁸ surrendered (παρέδοσαν) to

L 10,18 and *MT BL* 19,18 against *MT* and *B* 10,18 which do not mention Syrian infantry casualties.

¹⁰⁴ As far as the number cited goes (7000) the above indication agrees with 19,18 against 10,18 where the figure given is 700. On the other hand, in specifying that the 7000 slain were calvary, Josephus diverges from both sources where the 700 (so 10,18)/ 7000 (so 19,18) slain are chariot-men (literally «chariots»), a group not mentioned by Josephus (note further that while Josephus does share with *L* 10,18 its reference to infantry and horsemen as well as non-mention of «chariots», its casualty figure for the latter group, i.e. 7000, diverges from that given by *L* for the slain horsemen, namely 700). Finally, it should be recalled that Josephus «sets up» his reference to the slain Syrian infantry and calvary here in VII 128 via his inserted notice (VII 127) on the same two contingents of the Syrian force with which it advances against Israel, i.e. 80,000 and 10,000, respectively (comparison of the two sets of figures indicates that the Syrians lost precisely half of their infantry and well over half of their calvary to David- still another pointer to the magnitude of his victory in Josephus' presentation).

¹⁰⁵ Josephus' qualification of «Sebekos» as the commander of «Chalamas» here agrees with his previous indication in VII 127. Compare 10,18 where «Shobach» is designated commander of «his» (i.e. Hadadezer's, see 10,16) army, and 19,18 where «Shopach» is called simply «the commander».

¹⁰⁶ Josephus' above formulation concerning the demise of «Sebekos» stands closer to the more expansive wording of 10,18 («David wounded [*BL* ἐπάταξεν] Shobach... so that he died [*BL* ἀπέθανεν = Josephus] there») than to 19,18's compressed narration (David «killed [*BL* ἀπέκτεινεν] also Shopach...»).

¹⁰⁷ Compare 10,19a, 19,19a «when (Hadadezer's confederates) saw they had been defeated by Israel...». Like *MT* and *BL* 10,19, 19,19, Josephus has no equivalent to the plus which in *VL* (and the Vulgate) follows immediately upon mention of Hadadezer's allies seeing their defeat by Israel, i.e. «expaverunt et fugerunt quinquaginta et octo milia coram Israel».

¹⁰⁸ This designation for those who now submit to David picks up on the reference to «the Syrians across the Euphrates» of VII.127, cf. also the mention of «Syros, the king of the *Mesopotamians*» in VII.121. It takes the place of the divergent nomenclature of 10,19 («the kings who were servants of [so *MT B*, *L* going with] Hadadezer») and 19,19 («the servants of Hadadezer», so *MT BL*). Throughout his presentation then Josephus consistently eliminates the sources' reference to the role of «Hadadezer» in the second battle (This «elimination» might be based on the consideration that in 2 *Sam.* 8,3-9, 1 *Chr.* 18,3-8, *Ant.* VII 99 (100-103) David is represented as decisively defeating «Hadadezer» such that the

David ¹⁰⁹ and sent him gifts ¹¹⁰». Both sources round off their accounts of the ill-fated Syria-Ammon coalition which has resulted in a double defeat for the latter with a notice on the Syrians «fearing» (so 10,19b) / not be willing (so 19,19b) to assist the Ammonites any further. Perhaps thinking that this point would be obvious from what precedes, Josephus leaves it aside. In place thereof, he introduces a reference, designed to prepare to what follows where David will dispatch Joab against the Ammonites while he himself remains in Jerusalem (so 2 *Sam.* 11,1, 1 *Chr.* 20,1, cf. *Ant.* VII 129b), i.e. «Then as it was the winter season ¹¹¹, he returned (ἀνέστρεψεν) to Jerusalem ¹¹²».

Conclusion

By way of conclusion to this essay, I shall now briefly sum up on its findings regarding the overarching questions posed at the outset. The first of those questions had to do with the text-form(s) of 2 *Samuel* 10 and/or 1 *Chronicles* 19 utilized by Josephus for his presentation in VII 117b-129a. On this point, we noted indications — of which I confine myself to some noteworthy examples here — that the historian, in fact, worked with several different texts of his Biblical sources. First of all, the «personal» names «Syrus» (VII 121,124) and «Chalamas» (VII 127,128) as cited by him seem to reflect the distinctive readings of L 10,6 and 10,15, respectively. Similarly, his making the Ammonites the ones to initiate the second coalition (VII 127) appears to be inspired by the L text of 10,15 against that of the other witnesses where it is «Syria/the Syrian» who assumes this role (see n. 84). Again, his reference

latter's taking the lead in an anti-Israelite coalition shortly thereafter might appear implausible).

¹⁰⁹ In specifying that it was to David that the Mesopotamians surrendered Josephus agrees with 19,19 (*MT BL*) against 10,19 which has the submission being made to «Israel».

¹¹⁰ This indication takes the place of the first initiative undertaken by Hadezer's confederates according to the sources, i.e. their «making peace» with Israel (so 10,19)/ David (so 19,19). Josephus' formulation underscores the tangible benefits the Mesopotamians' submission brought to David.

¹¹¹ With this phrase Josephus supplies a motivation for the victorious David's not proceeding immediately to deal with the Ammonites who still remain to be duly punished for their outrage to his envoys. The indication is inspired by — while also serving to smooth the transition to — the wording of 11,1, 20,1 (cf. VII 129b) «in the spring of the year, the time when kings go forth to battle, David sent Joab ...».

¹¹² With this notice Josephus parallels the conclusion of his second battle account to that of his first, see VII 126 (= 10,14b, 19,15b) «... Joab returned (ὑπέστρεψε) in triumph to the king in Jerusalem». See n. 77 for another such parallel between the two Josephan battle accounts.

(VII 128) to the Syrian infantry and calvary slain by David (and non-mention of chariots in this context) has its only parallel in the L reading of 10,18 (see n. 104). On the other hand, the historian's mention of the thousand talents used to procure the first coalition (VII 121) and his total of 32,000 for the troops making up that coalition (VII 121) point to his use of a text like that shared by *4QSam^a* and *MT BL* 19,6b-7 as against the *MT BL* parallel in 10,6b (see nn. 41, 49) ¹¹³. Finally, his specifying that Hunan shaved «half» the beards of David's envoys attests to Josephus' familiarity with a reading peculiar to *MT* (and *TJ*) 2 *Sam.* 10,5, see n. 25. I conclude then that Josephus knew 2 *Samuel* 10, 1 *Chronicles* 19 in several different texts forms and freely alternated among these ¹¹⁴.

My second opening question related to Josephus' rewriting techniques in VII 117b-129a and the «distinctiveness» these impart to his account. Of such techniques, the most conspicuous throughout our passage are his additions to/expansions of source items. These bear on such matters as: the Ammonite princes' perverse reaction to David's well-intended overture (VII 118; compare 10,3, 19,3) and Hanun's equally perverse treatment of the Israelite envoys (VII 119; compare 10,4, 19,4); David's resolution in the face of the Syrian/Ammonite threat (VII 122; compare 10,7, 19,8); the course of the initial battle (VII 126; compare 10,13b-14a, 19,14b-15a); the enemy's response to its first defeat (VII 127a; compare 10,15b); the figures for the second force assembled by the enemy (VII 127b); David's response to the new enemy advance (VII 128a; compare 10,17, 19,17); and the king's subsequent return to Jerusalem (VII 129a).

Josephus' omissions/abridgements of source data common to both *Samuel* and *Chronicles* are few and rather minor. The following instances, may, however, be recalled: the arrival of the envoys in Ammon (10,2b, 19,2b); the details about the mutilation of their clothes (10,4, 19,4; see n. 26); Joab's double invocation of the Deity (10,12, 19,13; see n. 72); the role of Hadadezer in the second coalition (10,16-19, 19,16-19; see n. 108); and the ultimate cessation of Syrian aid to Ammon (10,19b, 19,19b) ¹¹⁵.

¹¹³ Conversely, however, Josephus' mention, also in VII 121, specifically of 20,000 foot soldiers as the initial component of the first coalition agrees with *MT BL* 10,6 against *4QSam^a* and the witnesses for 19,6b-7, see n. 46.

¹¹⁴ The whole question of Josephus' text-forms for 2 *Samuel* 10, 1 *Chronicles* 19 has, of course, been complicated by the discovery of the tantalizingly fragmentary *4QSam^a* for 2 *Samuel* 10 whose extant text (of 10,6 in particular) does, as we have seen, evidence affinities with 1 *Chr.* 19,6b-7 against 2 *Sam.* 10,6b, these also surfacing in Josephus' presentation.

¹¹⁵ As noted, Josephus had a variety of likely motivations for passing over the above items which he would have found, e.g., matters which readers might well supply for

In still other instances, Josephus rearranges the sources' sequence. Thus, he anticipates David's statement (10,2a, 19,2a) about Nahash's having «dealt loyally» with him in his opening allusion to the latter's being «a friend» of the former (VII 117b). In like manner, he makes use of subsequent Biblical references to «the city» (10,14a, 19,15a) and to Rabbah (11,1, 20,1) in his insertion concerning Joab's camping near «the Ammanite capital Rabatha» prior to the first battle (VII 123) ¹¹⁶.

A final Josephan rewriting technique identifiable in the passage under study is constituted by his modifications of source data. Under this head, one may distinguish between stylistic modifications and ones involving more matters of content. Under the former head, we have noted, his substitution of indirect for direct address (see n. 17) and of hypotaxis for parataxis (see n. 12), introduction of historic present forms (see n. 102), verbal variations where the Bible employs the same term twice (see n. 71), and use of terms from various Greek stems as *Leitwörter*, e.g., ὕβρις- (VII 119,120,122) and συμμαχ- (VII 121,122,126, 127). Contentual modifications are represented, *inter alia*, by his recasting of the interaction between David and the returned envoys (10,5, 19,5) in VII 120 so as to highlight the king's determination to right the wrong done, his having (VII 127) the Ammonites (so L 10,16) react to their own defeat rather than to that of the Syrians (compare L 10,16), and identifying (VII 127,128) «Sebekos» as commander of the army of «Chalamas», instead of «Hadadezer» (so 10,16,19,16) ¹¹⁷. Yet a third category of modifications evidences both a stylistic and contentual dimension, i.e. Josephus' frequent elucidation / clarification of source wording. This category is exemplified by his version of the Ammonites' realization of the implications of their treatment of David's envoys (VII 121; compare 10,6a, 19,6a, see n. 36) or his psychologizing explication (VII 127) of the reference to the Ammonites' «gathering together» after their first defeat (so L 10,15b; see n. 85).

My second opening question further asked about the «distinctive features» of Josephus' version which result from his application of an array of rewriting

themselves, liable to bring derision on his people, not in accord with the overall image of Joab he is trying to convey, or implausible in light of earlier happenings. Note too that in case of some of the above elements, e.g., the ending of Syrian assistance to Ammon, Josephus counterbalances his omission with an alternative item of his own.

¹¹⁶ Here, one has, in fact, an instance of both rearrangement and expansion of source data by Josephus, this pointing up the interconnectedness of the rewriting techniques applied by him.

¹¹⁷ Here too, one sees the interconnectedness of Josephus' rewriting techniques: leaving aside all mention of «Hadadezer» from his presentation, he assigns that figure's role to «Chalamas», thus modifying the sources' account.

techniques to the sources' data. With regard to this further question, I would call attention to the following points. Vis-à-vis the Biblical accounts, Josephus underscores the unjustifiability and reprehensibility of the Ammonites' response to David's well-intentioned overture (see VII 118-119) as well as their later recalcitrance in the face of initial defeat (see VII 127a) and the magnitude of the threat posed by the second coalition assembled by them (see VII 127b-128a). Conversely, the historian goes beyond his sources in highlighting David's good faith in dispatching his envoys (see VII 118), righteous indignation and determination to exact due retribution for the outrage done them (VII 120), resolution, itself grounded in his justice and piety, when confronting the initial enemy assault (VII 122), and the efficacy of his military leadership on the occasion of the second battle (VII 128). As for Joab, the key figure of the first battle account, Josephus accentuates his prowess as a general (see VII 125), while also downplaying his piety by eliminating the pre-battle invocations of the Deity the sources (10,12, 19,13) ascribe to him (see n. 72). Further distinctive features of Josephus' version are its heightening of the parallelism between the first and second battle accounts (see nn. 77, 112) and the smoother transition it effects between the latter and the subsequent episode, i.e. Joab's siege of Rabbah (see n. 111).

The last of my opening questions concerned the messages Josephus' retelling of 2 *Samuel* 10, 1 *Chronicles* 19 might be intended to convey to his double audience, i.e. (Roman) Gentiles and fellow Jews ¹¹⁸. With respect to Gentile readers, his version of the story of David's double victory serves to refute charges about his people that enjoyed wide currency among such readers at the time. In particular, whereas the Jews had been charged with lack-of-concern-for / hostility towards other peoples ¹¹⁹, the story represents David displaying good faith sympathy upon the death of a foreign king who had been his «friend» (see VII 119) and himself being on the receiving end of unjustified abuse by that king's people. Similarly, Josephus' rendition of the story effectively counters the charge that the Jews had produced no military leaders of distinction ¹²⁰ with its portrayal

¹¹⁸ On the double intended readership of *Ant.*, see L.H. Feldman, «Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus», in M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (*Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2/1), Assen, 1988, pp. 455-518, esp. 470-471.

¹¹⁹ On this charge and Josephus' efforts to combat it throughout his portrayal of David, see Feldman, «David», pp. 150-151.

¹²⁰ On this charge and Josephus' efforts to counter it throughout *Ant.*, see Feldman, «Joab», pp. 326-328.

of two such leaders, i.e. Joab and David, who both triumph spectacularly over the enemy coalitions arrayed against them.

What then might be the message of the Josephan story for Jewish readers? For one thing, its first battle account offers an instance of intra-Jewish solidarity in the face of enemy attack (see Joab's words to Abishai, VII 124-125) that could function as an antidote to the fratricidal conflicts which had so fatally affected the Jews' resistance to Rome during the recent Revolt ¹²¹. At the same time, Josephus' narrative of a double Jewish victory over massive enemy forces would also convey a message of hope to his contemporary compatriots: what God had done in the case of the Ammonites and Syrians of old, he could also do with their latter day equivalent, i.e. Rome itself, if only his people, like their ancestor David, would «put their trust» in him (see VII 122). I would suggest as well that there may be an element of «personal apologetic» in the message Josephus intends his rendition to convey to Jewish readers. In VII 118-119 he highlights, as we saw, the perverse misrepresentation of David's benign intentions by the Ammonite princes and the credit wrongly given their assertions by King Hunan. This Josephan emphasis takes on added significance, however, when one recalls that the historian concludes his autobiography with repeated reference to the false charges made against him by his fellow Jews (see *Vita* 425,428) to the emperors Vespasian, Titus and Domitian (none of whom credited those charges). In stressing the calumnies to which David himself was subject, Josephus might then be attempting to persuade fellow Jews not to lightly give credence to charges about himself that they might hear and so avoid the grievous mistake made by the Ammonite king in the case of David ¹²².

It is my hope that this detailed examination of one minute portion of *Ant.* will at least have provided some sense of the multi-faceted approach employed by Josephus in creating his «rewritten Bible».

CHRISTOPHER BEGG

¹²¹ On Josephus' continued preoccupation with his experiences of intra-Jewish conflict during the Revolt as reflected in *Ant.*, see Feldman, «Joab», pp. 335-350.

¹²² On Josephus' use of a whole series of Biblical figures for purposes of self-legitimation, see, e.g., D. Daube, «Typology in Josephus», *JJS* 31, 1980, 18-36, esp. pp. 28-29; C.T. Begg, «Daniel and Josephus: Tracing Connections», in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (BETL, 106), Leuven, 1993, pp. 539-545.