

Zeitschrift: Theologische Zeitschrift
Herausgeber: Theologische Fakultät der Universität Basel
Band: 54 (1998)
Heft: 2

Artikel: David's Dismissal by the Philistines according to Josephus
Autor: Begg, Christopher
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-878018>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 13.07.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

David's Dismissal by the Philistines according to Josephus

1 Samuel 29 tells of David's humiliating – though not unwelcome – dismissal from the Philistine expedition against Israel.¹ Despite its brevity, the chapter poses a variety of problems: divergences between MT and LXX, the oscillating designations for and relationship between the Philistine leadership groups spoken of, and the repetitious character of the concluding exchange between Achish and David (vv. 6-10). In this essay I wish to explore Josephus' rewriting of 1 Samuel 29 in his *Antiquitates Judaicae* (hereafter *Ant.*) 6.351-356a.² The investigation will proceed by way of a detailed comparison between the Josephan version and its Biblical source as represented by the following major witnesses: MT (BHS),³ Codex Vaticanus (hereafter B)⁴ and the Lucianic (hereafter L) or Antiochene MSS⁵ of the LXX, as well as Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets (hereafter TJ).⁶

To facilitate my comparison, I divide up the material of 1 Samuel 29 and *Ant.* 6.351-356a into two parallel segments, i.e. 1) David Challenged (29,1-5// 6.351-354a), and 2) David Dismissed (29,6-11// 6.354b-356a).

David Challenged

Following the long interlude (1 Sam 28,3-25// *Ant.* 6.327-350) focussed on Saul's visit to the Endor medium, 1 Sam 29,1 resumes at the point reached in 28,1-2 (// 6.325-326: the Philistines' assembling their forces for war against Israel) with its notice on the combatants' respective camp-sites. Josephus' version (6.351a) of this notice introduces an explicit *Rückverweis* to the content

¹ On the chapter, see, in addition to the commentaries, W. Brueggemann, Narrative Intentionality in 1 Samuel 29, JSOT 43 (1989) 21-35.

² For the works of Josephus I use H.St.J. Thackeray, *et al.* (eds.), Josephus (LCL), Cambridge, MA- London, 1926-1965 (*Ant.* 6.351-356a is found in Vol. V, 342-347 where the translation and notes are by R. Marcus). I have likewise consulted the text and apparatus of *Ant.* 6.351-356a in B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, II, Berlin ²1955, 81-82. On Josephus' overall treatment of the protagonist of 1 Samuel 29, see L.H. Feldman, Josephus' Portrait of David, HUCA 60 (1989) 129-174.

³ 4QSam^a and 4QSam^b lack any portion of 1 Samuel 29.

⁴ For B I use A.E. Brooke, N. Maclean, H.St.J. Thackeray (eds.), *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*, II:I I and II Samuel, Cambridge 1927.

⁵ For L I use N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega*, I. 1-2 Samuel (TECC, 50), Madrid 1989.

⁶ For TJ I use the text of A. Sperber (ed.), *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, DE 1987.

of 6.325-326 (// 28,1-2), while also leaving aside the (extraneous) source reference (29,1b) to Israel's camp: «The Philistines (τῶν Παλαιστίνων)⁷ had pitched their camp, *as I have said before....*»⁸ 1 Sam 29,2a portrays the «lords of the Philistines» (RSV; MT פִּלְשְׁתִּים סֶרְנֵי, BL οἱ σατράπαι τῶν ἀλλοφύλων) parading «by hundreds and by thousands.» Apparently wishing to avoid the source ambiguity as to who is «in charge» of the Philistine expedition (see below), Josephus reworks this formulation: «(the Philistines) were reviewing their forces (δύναμιν) by nations, kingdoms and satrapies (σατραπείας)....»⁹ He then continues with 29,2b's reference to those bringing up the rear: «... when last of all appeared *King Anchus* (Ἀγκοῦς)¹⁰ *with his own troops*,¹¹ followed by David with his *six hundred* soldiers (ὀπλιτῶν).»¹²

The story's complication surfaces in 29,3 where a (new) group of Philistine leaders (שָׂרֵי פִלְשְׁתִּים [RSV «the commanders of the Philistines»], B οἱ σατράπαι [L + καὶ στρατηγοί] τῶν ἀλλοφύλων) raise the laconic challenge «what (are) these Hebrews [so MT, BL οἱ διαπορευόμενοι,¹³ TJ these Jews] (doing here)?» Josephus (6.352a) attributes the challenge – whose content he explicates – to the one and only Philistine leadership group he mentions in our pericope (see above): «*On seeing him*,¹⁴ the Philistine generals (οἱ στρατηγοί [see the L plus above] τῶν Παλαιστίνων) *asked the king*¹⁵ whence these Hebrews (οἱ Ἑβραῖοι)¹⁶ had come *and who had summoned them.*»¹⁷

⁷ This is Josephus' standard designation for «the Philistines» which he uses in preference to LXX's normal form, i.e. οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι (so, e.g., BL 1 Sam 29,1). See R. de Vaux, *Les Philistins dans la Septante*, in Wort, Lied, Gottesspruch. Beiträge zur Septuginta, I, FS J. Ziegler, Würzburg 1972, 185-194.

⁸ *Rückverweise* like this are frequently introduced by Josephus in *Ant.*; they serve to tie together the sprawling work's component parts. (In this essay, I italicize elements of Josephus' presentation which have no counterpart in the source as such). From 29,1a Josephus leaves aside the specification that the Philistines camped «at Aphek.»

⁹ As Marcus, Josephus, V, 343, n. b, indicates, Josephus' (anachronistic) use of this term is likely inspired by LXX's σατράπαι (see above). The above reference to the three components of the Philistine «force» underscores its magnitude, while likewise harking back to 6.325 where the Philistines summon «all their allies» to join their expedition.

¹⁰ This form of the king's name corresponds to that read by B; compare MT («Achish») and L (Ἀκχούς).

¹¹ This contingent is not mentioned in 29,2b; by means of the inserted reference Josephus responds to the question of where Anchus' own forces were at the moment.

¹² Compare BL 29,2 οἱ ἄνδρες; Josephus' term echoes 6.325 where Anchus summons David to assembly his own «soldiers (ὀπλιτῶν).» The source gives no figure for David's contingent; Josephus' number is drawn from 6.319 (// 1 Sam 27,2) where David and his 600 repair to Achish.

¹³ As Marcus, Josephus, V, 345, n. a, points out, BL's reading here resulted from vocalizing the Hebrew consonantal form הַעֲבָרִים as הַעֲבָרִים.

¹⁴ This transitional phrase has no equivalent in the source which joins (29,3a) its citation of the leaders' challenge to what precedes with a simple «and».

¹⁵ Josephus introduces this specification concerning the addressee of the Philistine leaders' question in view of what follows (see 29,3b) where it is Achish who replies to them.

Achish responds to the leaders' challenge in 29,3b with an expansive identification of and assurance concerning David. Josephus' rendition (6.352b) modifies considerably: «The king replied that¹⁶ this was David who had fled from Saul, his master,¹⁷ and had come to him (πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα)²⁰; *he had received* (δέξασθαι) *him*,²¹ and now David, *wishing to repay that favor* (τῆς χάριτος ἀμοιβὴν ἐκτίσαι)²² *and to be avenged* (τιμωρήσασθαι) *on Saul, was fighting in their ranks* (συμμαχεῖν).»²³

The Biblical account of the reaction to Achish's assurances about David (29,3) begins in 29,4aa with mention of the Philistine commanders (so MT B, L satraps) being «angered» (so MT L, B grieved) at Achish. Josephus (6.353) spells out the object of the leaders' displeasure: «The generals, however, reproached him for having taken as an ally (ἐπὶ συμμαχίᾳ, see συμμαχεῖν, 6.352) one that was their enemy (πολέμιον)...»²⁴ The commanders' actual words to Achish begin in 29,4ab with their enjoining him to dismiss David to the «pla-

¹⁶ With this proper name Josephus agrees with MT against BL (see above). On the historian's use of the designation «the Hebrews» for his people, see G. Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (AGAJU, 35), Leiden 1996, 124-129.

¹⁷ As frequently elsewhere in his Biblical paraphrase, Josephus recasts the direct address of the leaders' question in 29,3a as indirect. See C.T. Begg, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (AJ 8,212-420) (BETL, 108), Leuven 1993, 12-13, n. 38 and the literature cited there.

¹⁸ Here again (see previous note), Josephus transposes direct into indirect address. He leaves aside the source's (superfluous) specification that Achish addressed himself to the Philistine «commanders» (so MT B)/ «satraps» (L).

¹⁹ Compare Achish's opening words in 29,3b «Is not this [so MT B; L reads a positive statement, i.e. this is...- cf. Josephus above] the servant of Saul king of Israel?» Josephus rewords so as to make clear that David, contrary to what the Biblical formulation seems to suggest, is not currently Saul's «servant.»

²⁰ Compare 29,3bβ «(from the day which) he deserted (so MT B; L εἰσῆλθε) to me (so BL [πρὸς μέ, see Josephus above], > MT).» Josephus leaves aside the obscure chronological indications concerning David's length of service with Achish as cited in 29,3ba on which see the commentaries.

²¹ This inserted reference to Anchus' «reception» of David harks back to the – likewise inserted – notice of 6.320 (cf. 27,2-3) «the king welcomed (δέξαμενον) him (David) and his men.» The reference likewise sets up Anchus' following statement about David's wanting now to «return the favour,» see above.

²² This phrase echoes the wording of David's response to Anchus as cited in 6.326 (cf. 28,2a): «David declared that here was an opportunity for him to repay (τὴν ἀμοιβὴν... ἀποδώσει) Anchus for his good offices and hospitality...»

²³ Forms of the συμμαχ- stem constitute a *Leitwort* in 6.351-356a, occurring four times in the segment (see 6.352,353,355,356). The above conclusion to Anchus' response with its double motivation of David's current status as «ally» of the Philistines takes the place of the king's closing words in 29,3b, i.e. «(since he has deserted to me), I have found no fault in him to this day.» Josephus' version which makes clear that David has his «good reasons» for wanting to be part of the expedition against Israel more effectively addresses the leaders' concerns about David's presence than does its Biblical counterpart.

ce,» i.e. Ziklag, previously assigned him by the king (see 27,6// 6.322). They then state that David is not to accompany them lest he turn against them in battle (MT)/ the camp (BL). From this sequence Josephus takes over – for the moment – only its opening directive to which he attaches a motivation of his own: «... they advised him to dismiss (ἀποπέμπειν, BL ἀπόστρεψον τὸν ἄνδρα) him *lest on David's account he should unwittingly do grave mischief* (κακόν) to his friends (φίλους).»²⁵ The generals continue their reply to Achish in 29,4b with a double question: «For how could this fellow reconcile himself to his lord? (Would it) not (be) with the heads of the men here?» Josephus' rendition (6.353b) transposes this two-part question into a statement which also spells out the meaning of its allusion to the Philistines' «heads»: «for he would be affording David (an opportunity) of becoming reconciled to his master (καταλλαγήναι πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην [see 6.352], BL διαλλαγῆσεται... τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ) by injuring (κακώσαντι)²⁶ their army (δύναμιν, see 6.351).» The commanders clinch their case against David (29,5) with a rhetorical question which cites the well-known couplet (see 1 Sam 18,7; 21,12) concerning the multitudes «slain» by Saul and David. The historian (6.354) precedes this with a reiteration (// 6.353) of the leaders' demand for David's dismissal, associating this now with the reference (see 29,4aβ) to his proposed «destination» which he had previously left aside: «Accordingly, they bade him *with this in mind* to send David *with his six hundred soliders* (see 6.351)²⁷ back (ἀποπέμπειν, see 6.353) to the place which he had given him *for his habitation* (τὸν τόπον ὃν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖν).»²⁸ Thereafter, he adduces – in statement rather than question form – the citation of 29,5, from which he leaves aside its (irrelevant) opening mention of Saul's exploits²⁹: «*for this was that same David of whom the virgins* (αἱ παρθένοι) *sang*³⁰ that he had slain many thousands of Philistines (πολλὰς μυριάδας Παλαιστίνων ἀπολέσαντα).»³¹

²⁴ The reference to David as the Philistines' «enemy» here might be seen as an anticipation of the commanders' subsequent allusion in 29,4 to the danger of David's «becoming an adversary (MT יָצֵא, BL ἐπίβουλος) in the battle (so MT, BL camp).»

²⁵ Note the verbal contrast in the Philistines' words between David, the «enemy» and themselves as «friends» of Achish.

²⁶ This is the conjecture of S. Naber which Marcus follows. Niese reads the accusative κακώσαντα with a number of the Greek codices (others of which have κακώσοντα). Note the word play with the noun κακόν used earlier in 6.353.

²⁷ Josephus' inserted reference to these answers the question of what was to be done with David's force as mentioned in 29,2// 6.351 when their leader is dismissed.

²⁸ Compare BL 29,4aβ εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ οὗ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ. The phrase points back to the notice on Achish's «giving» Ziklag to David in 27,6// 6.322.

²⁹ He does the same in his rendition of the second citation of the women's song (// 21,12) in 6.245 where Achish's retainers quote the song in reference to the fugitive David.

David Dismissed

The climatic interview between Achish and David (29,6-10) is linked to what precedes, i.e. the exchange between Achish and the Philistine leaders (29,3-5) by means of a simple «and» at the opening of v. 6. Josephus (6.354b) provides a more flowing transition between the two scenes: «*Having listened to these words and considering them well spoken*,³² the king of Gitta (29,6 Achish/Anchus) called David and said (καλέσας... εἶπε, BL ἐκάλεσεν... καὶ εἶπεν)³³....»

Achish's initial word to David (29,6) comprises an oath formula («as the Lord lives»), personal commendation of the latter, and mention of the leaders' negative view of him. Josephus' rendition (6.355a) retains, for once, the source's direct discourse: «For myself, I can testify (μαρτυρῶ)³⁴ to the great zeal and friendliness (σπουδὴν καὶ εὖνοιαν)³⁵ which thou hast shown to me³⁶ and it was for that reason that I brought thee as an ally (σύμμαχον, see συμμαχεῖν, 6.352; συμμαχία, 6.353)³⁷; but such is not the view of our chiefs (στρατῆγοις, see 6.352,353).»³⁸

³⁰ Compare 29,5a «(Is this not David) of whom they sing to one another in dances (BL ἐν χοροῖς)?» Josephus' introductory formula here echoes that used by him in connection with his first citation of the saying (// 1 Sam 18,7 [«the women sang to one another as they made merry»]) in 6.193 «the elder women (sang) how Saul had slain many thousands of the Philistines, but *the maidens* (οἱ παρθένοι) how David destroyed tens of thousands.»

³¹ This sequence reads like a conflation of Josephus' two previous citations of the women's song in 6.193,245: the phrase «many myriads of Philistines» appears in the latter passage while its verb form (ἀπολέσαντα) echoes the ἀπώλεσε in the former. Note further that in all three of his citations Josephus goes beyond the Biblical parallel in specifying that David's (and Saul's) victims were «Philistines.»

³² With this phrase Josephus also clarifies the effect made upon Achish by the leaders' arguments (and, by implication, his state of mind as he now addresses David, i.e. his personal conviction that David indeed must withdraw).

³³ Note Josephus' replacement – as frequently elsewhere – of Biblical parataxis with a better Greek hypotaxis here.

³⁴ This verb replaces the oath formula of 29,6 in line with Josephus' standard practice – one likely dictated by a concern to avoid any possible dishonoring of the divine name (that concern would be all the more in place here where a pagan is the speaker).

³⁵ This collocation occurs elsewhere in Josephus only in 6.263 (reverse order, in reference to the behavior of persons of modest station, like Saul, prior to their getting power).

³⁶ The above formulation reads like a conflation of Achish's two separate statements concerning David's past dealings with him in 29,6aββα, i.e. «you (have been) honest (BL εὐθής)... I have found nothing wrong in you from the day of your coming to me to this day.»

³⁷ In 29,6 Achish makes a declaration about his *present* view of David's participation in the expedition: «and to me it seems right that you should march out and in with me in the campaign.» Josephus' recasting of this as a statement concerning *the past* reflects his previous notice (6.354b) that Anchus considered the leaders' arguments against David's accompanying them now as «well spoken.»

In 29,7 Achish concludes his speech to David by urging him to take his leave peacefully lest he disturb the Philistine leaders. This injunction is reiterated by Achish in 29,10, following a question-complaint by David in 29,8 («what have you found in your servant...?») which, seemingly, has already been addressed by Achish's statement in 29,6 («I have found nothing wrong in you...») and which the king then effectively repeats in 29,9. Given the source's repetitiveness – as well as the apparent pointlessness of the exchange in 29,8-9 in light of what has been said in 29,6 – it is not surprising to find Josephus simply conflating (6.355b) Achish's double word of dismissal, 29,7a and 10. In so doing, however, he also draws on the more expansive version of the latter verse as found in BL. His rendition reads as follows: «Now then go within a day's time³⁹ to the place which I have given thee (εἰς ὃν ἔδωκά σοι τόπον),⁴⁰ and suspect nothing untoward (μηδὲν ὑπονοῶν ἄτοπον).»⁴¹ To this conflation of 29,7a and 10 (BL), Josephus appends a further injunction (plus motivation) by the king which has, as such, no counterpart in the source: «There keep guard (φύλασσε) for me over the country (χώραν),⁴² lest any of the enemy invade it.⁴³ That too is the part of an ally (συμμαχίας).»⁴⁴

³⁸ Compare BL 29,6bβ which reads literally «in the eyes of the lords (so MT מֵעֵינֵי הַיְּהוּדִים, BL satraps) you are not (so MT L, > B) good.» In his making Anchus oppose his own view of David to that of the leaders (see above), Josephus agrees with MT L against B which identifies these. On the problem of the reading in 29,6bβ, see D.G. Deboys, 1 Samuel XXIX 6, VT 39 (1989) 214-219 (he opts for the originality of the MT/L reading).

³⁹ With this phrase Josephus conflates the separate (and repetitious) chronological indications attached to Achish's dismissal order in 29,10 «rise up early in the morning... start early in the morning and depart as soon as you have light» (RSV translating MT).

⁴⁰ Compare 6.354 where the leaders call on Anchis to send David back εἰς τὸν τόπον ὃν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖν. Josephus' inclusion of the above specification concerning where David is to go corresponds to the plus which stands between Achish's double dismissal order of MT 29,10 in BL, i.e. (καὶ πορεύεσθε) εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗ κατέστησα ὑμᾶς ἐκεῖ. (The plural forms used here reflects the preceding reference, shared by both MT and BL 29,10, to «the servants of your lord who came with you»; Josephus' rendition omits mention of these, thereby eliminating the source's ambiguous phrase «the servants of your lord» – is this Saul or Achish himself?)

⁴¹ This phrase (which occurs only here in Josephus) reflects the continuation of the BL plus in 29,10 (see previous note), i.e. καὶ λόγον λοιμὸν μὴ θῆς ἐν καρδίᾳ σου. Josephus has no equivalent to the continuation of this plus, namely, «because you are good in my eyes (so B; L + like an angel of God)» with its repetition of the commendation given David earlier by Achish, see 29,6.9.

On the difference between the shorter MT and longer BL 29,10, see 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, 208-217 (he hesitantly concludes to the originality of the former).

⁴² As Marcus, Josephus, V, 346-347, n. a, points out, this added directive is likely inspired by the BL plus in 29,11 according to which David departs «to guard» (φύλασσειν) the land of the Philistines.

The source narrative of David's dismissal concludes in 29,11 with David and his men returning to «the land of the Philistines» (v. a), while the Philistines proceed to Jezreel (so MT, BL to fight against Israel, v. b). In view of the close connection he will establish in 6.356 between David's return (// 29,11a) and the Amalekite attack on Ziklag whose results David encounters upon his arrival there (// 30,1ff.), Josephus leaves aside the parenthetical datum of 29,11b. That upcoming connection likewise explains Josephus' specification of the source's vague designation of David's destination («to the land of the Philistines») in his rendition of 29,11a which runs «So David, *as the king of Gitta ordered*,⁴⁵ went to *Sekella* (Σέκελαν).»⁴⁶

Conclusions

Having completed my detailed reading of Josephus' account of David's dismissal, I wish now to call attention to some overarching points that have emerged from that reading. First, with regard to Josephus' text(s) for 1 Samuel 29, we noted significant indications of his utilization of a text like that of BL 29,10-11 with its various plusses vis-à-vis MT in 6.355.⁴⁷ On the other hand, in making the leaders refer to «the Hebrews» in their question of 6.352a Josephus goes together with MT 29,3a against BL's «passersby.» It thus appears likely that Josephus knew 1 Samuel 29 in several text forms.⁴⁸

A further question to be addressed here concerns the «distinctiveness» of Josephus' version vis-à-vis its *Vorlage*. Under this heading I would note the following features of the former. Josephus markedly «streamlines» the repetitious source exchange between Achish and David (29,6-10) in 6.354b-355. Further such streamlining is achieved by his omission of the parenthetical references to Israel's encampment at Jezreel (29,1b) and the Philistines' advan-

⁴³ With this phrase Josephus sets up the immediately following account (1 Samuel 30// *Ant.* 6.356b-367) of the Amalekite attack on Ziklag, the city which Achish had ceded to David.

⁴⁴ With this phrase Josephus makes his final use of a form of the συμμαχ- root with reference to David in our pericope, see n. 23.

⁴⁵ This inserted phrase underscores David's continued «submission» to his overlord, this even in the face of the «injustice» done him by the Philistines.

⁴⁶ Josephus anticipates this place name, his substitute for 29,11's «land of the Philistines,» from 30,1 (where MT reads «Ziklag,» Β Σεκελάκ, and L Σεκελάγ).

⁴⁷ Recall too that Josephus' name for David's overlord, i.e. «Anchus» agrees with B *contra* MT's «Achish.» Moreover, his use of the term «satrapies» in 6.351 seems inspired by the mention of the «satraps» in BL 29,2 (where MT speaks of the סַרְנִים). Finally, his specification (6.352) that David came «to him» (Anchus) agrees with the BL plus «to me» in the notice on David's desertion in 29,3b.

⁴⁸ On Josephus' use of both a MT-like and LXX-like text of 1 Samuel, see S.P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel* (Quaderni de Henoch, 9), Torino 1996, 210-216.

ce there (29,11b), as well as of the obscure chronological indications in Achish's statement to the leaders (29,3b). He likewise achieves a stylistically more flowing presentation with his insertion of transitional phrases (see the opening of 6.352 and 6.354b) and replacement of Biblical parataxis with hypotaxis (see n. 33). The historian's concern to closely integrate the dismissal narrative within its context is evident, e.g., in the opening *Rückverweis* of 6.351, the double specification, pointing back to 6.319// 1 Sam 27,2 of the number of David's men (6.351b, 354a), Anchus' reminiscence of his having «received» David (6.352b, see 6.320), alignment of the leaders' evocation of the women's song with his previous allusions to this (see nn. 30,31), and anticipation of items from 1 Samuel 30 (see nn. 43,46). He varies the source's invariable use of direct discourse, transposing the dialogue of 29,3-5 into indirect in 6.352-354a, while retaining direct address for the Achish/David exchange (29,6-10) in 6.354b-355. The Bible's seeming ambiguity/inconsistency as to which group of Philistine leaders is «running things» is resolved via Josephus' mention of only one such group, i.e. the «generals.» In a similar line, the sense of the leaders' question concerning the men's «heads» (29,5b) is clarified in the statement of 6.353, and their «anger» with Achish (29,4) explicated, see 6.353a. Again, in light of Josephus' inserted reference to Achish's finding the generals' words «well spoken» (6.354b), the king's statement about his current willingness to have David accompany the expedition (so 29,6) is «corrected» into one about the past (6.355a; see n. 37). The generals' disquietude about David's participation in the campaign against Israel is more effectively addressed via the double motivation for his wanting to fight with them which Achish attributes to him in Josephus' reformulation of the closing words of 29,3b in 6.352b. To preclude any possible dishonoring of the divine name, the use of an oath formula featuring mention of «the Lord» (29,6) is eliminated in 6.355 (see n. 34). One final distinguishing feature of Josephus' version identified above is his four-fold use of «ally terminology» in reference to David's relationship to the Philistines (see n. 23), with which his inserted reference to David's doing as Achish had «ordered» (6.356a) can be associated. With regard to these peculiarities of the Josephan dismissal account, I suggest that they are designed to insinuate to Roman readers that, the events of recent history to the contrary, Jews are indeed capable of being reliable «allies» of a foreign overlord. As for Jewish readers, the same elements could well be intended to serve an apologetic purpose on Josephus' own behalf, i.e. his «allying» himself with the Romans – a move regarded as treason by many of his compatriots – had a precedent in the actions of no one less than David himself.⁴⁹

In sum, the variety of purposes and interests operative in Josephus' retelling of 1 Samuel 29 makes, as I hope this essay will have indicated, a close reading of his version both fascinating and rewarding.

Christopher Begg, Washington

⁴⁹ On Josephus' double intended audience – Gentiles in first place, but Jews as well – for his *Ant.*, see L.H. Feldman, Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus, in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT, 2/1), Assen 1988, 455-518 (470-471). On his portraying Biblical characters in ways reminiscent of his own history as presented in the *Bellum* and the *Vita* for purposes of self-legitimation, see, e.g., D. Daube, Typology in Josephus, *JJS* 31 (1980) 18-36 (28-29); C.T. Begg, Daniel and Josephus: Tracing Connections, in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (BETL, 106), Leuven 1993, 539-545.