David's Dying Directives according to Josephus

Christopher BEGG *
The Catholic University of America

Just prior to his death, David delivers a series of instructions to his son and successor Solomon (1 Kgs 2,1-9) which, *inter alia*, evidence a striking shift of tone from the pious opening exhortations about Solomon's keeping the Law of 2,2-4 to the cold-blooded commands regarding the elimination of David's various enemies in 2,5-6(7)8-9 ¹. In this article I wish to examine the version of David's «testament» found in Josephus' *Antiquitates judaicae* 7.383-388 ². My investigation will focus on two wider questions: 1) The major ancient witnesses for the text of 1 Kgs 2,1-9, i.e. MT (BHS) ³, the Codex Vaticanus (hereafter B) ⁴ and

Sefarad 65 (2005) págs. 271-285 © CSIC ISSN 037-0894

^{*} Begg@cua.edu

¹ On 1 Kgs 2,1-9, see, in addition to the commentaries: W. T. KOOPMANS, «The Testament of David in 1 Kings ii 1-10», VT 41 (1991) pp. 429-449; B. E. SCOLNIC, «David's Final Testament: Morality or Expediency?», Judaism 43 (1994) pp. 19-26.

² For the text and translation of *Ant.* 7.383-388 I use: R. MARCUS, *Josephus V* (London - Cambridge, MA 1934) pp. 564-567. I have likewise consulted the text of the passage in B. NIESE, *Flavii Iosephi Opera II* (Berlin 1954) pp. 172-174 and the newer text and translation of E. NODET, *Flavius Josèphe III: Les Antiquités juives Livres VI et VII* (Paris 2001) pp. 240-241*.

 $^{^3}$ The Hebrew text of 1 Kgs 2,1-9 has not been found among the Qumran materials.

⁴ For B's text of 1 Kgs 2,1-9 I use A. E. BROOKE, N. MACLEAN and H. St. J. THACKERAY, *The Old Testament in Greek*, II:II. *I and II Kings* (Cambridge 1930) pp. 206-208.

the Antiochene or Lucianic (hereafter L) ⁵ manuscripts of the LXX, and Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets (hereafter Tg.) ⁶ evidence many differences among themselves. With which then of these witnesses do Josephus' textual affinities –to the extent these can be determined in so short a passage– in 7.383-388 lie? 2) How does Josephus rework the biblical data of 1 Kgs 2,1-9, and what is distinctive about his own version of David's words there?

To facilitate my comparison between them, I divide up the material of *Ant*. 7.383-388 and 1 Kgs 2,1-9 into 5 parallel segments: 1) Introduction (7.383a // 2:1); 2) Exhortation & promise (7.383b-385); 3) Joab to be punished (7.386 // 2:5-6); 4) Barzillai's sons to be rewarded (7.387 // 2:7); and 5) Shimei's requital (7.388 // 2:8-9).

INTRODUCTION

1 Kgs 2,1 introduces the two interlocutors, David, whose days to die have arrived, and Solomon his son whom he «charges» (LXX B: answers) at this point ⁷. Josephus (7.383a) elaborates on this presentation of the parties with various details about David's precarious condition that prompts him to speak to Solomon: «*Now a little while after this* [i.e. the enthronement of Solomon described in 7.382 // 1

⁵ For the Antiochene / Lucianic text of 1 Kgs 2,1-9 I use: N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS and J. R. BUSTO SAIZ, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega*, I. *1-2 Samuel* (Madrid 1989) pp. 171-72 (in this version 1 Kgs 2,1-9 appears at the end of «2 Reigns» as its 26,1-9).

⁶ For the targumic text of 1 Kgs 2,1-9 I use J. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic II* (Leiden 1959) pp. 215-216 and the translations of D. J. HARRINGTON and A. J. SALDARINI, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets* (Wilmington, DE 1987) pp. 214-215, and E. MARTÍNEZ BOROBIO, *Targum Jonatan de los Profetas Primeros en Tradición Babilónica*, III. *I-II Reyes* (Madrid 1998).

⁷ In place of MT's 1 Kgs 2,1a («when David's time to die drew near...»), LXX L (2 Rgns 26,1a) reads: «and it came to pass after these things that David died and slept with his fathers». Thereafter, it continues with the mention of (the already dead and buried king's!) «charging» his son Solomon (// MT 2,1b).

Kgs 1,46], David fell ill by reason of old age ⁸, and realizing that he was about to die ⁹, he called his son Solomon and spoke to him as follows...» ¹⁰.

EXHORTATION & PROMISE

The first (appropriately pious) half of David's address (1 Kgs 2,2-4 // Ant. 7.383b-385) consists of the following elements: statement by David about his condition (2,2a // 7.383a), a series of imperatives (2,2b-3 // 7.384-385a), and mention of the hoped-for outcome of Solomon's observance of these imperatives (2,4 // 7.385b).

In 1 Kgs 2,2a David, using figurative language, informs Solomon of what imminently awaits him (David): «I am about to go the way of all the earth». While retaining the source's figurative/euphemistic discourse, Josephus (7.383b) also expatiates on this, his David, e.g., insisting on the universality of his coming experience and its finality: «I am now, my son, going to my destiny (τὸ χρεών) ¹¹ and must depart to my fathers ¹² and travel the common road of all men ¹³ now

 $^{^{8}}$ This notice recalls Josephus' earlier mention of David's advanced age and debility in Ant. 7.343// 1 Kgs 1,1.

⁹ This editorial remark anticipates David's statement to Solomon about his imminent demise as reported in 1 Kgs 2,2// Ant. 7.383b.

¹⁰ Throughout this essay I italicize items of Josephus' text like the above which have no direct/explicit counterpart in the biblical account.

¹¹ The use of this term imparts a non-biblical, «pagan» tinge to David's words. On Josephus' use of the word, see A. SCHLATTER, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht von Flavius Josephus* (Gütersloh 1932) p. 32; G. STÄHLIN, «Das Schicksal im Neuen Testament und bei Josephus», in *Josephus-Studien: Festschrift Otto Michel*, eds. Otto BETZ *et al.* (Göttingen 1974) pp. 319-343; L. H. FELDMAN, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley, CA 1998) pp. 194-197.

¹² With this element of David's statement, compare the reference, peculiar to LXX L 2 Rgns 26,1a (see n. 7), to David's «sleeping with his fathers».

¹³ Josephus has David uses the same word for «road» or «way,» i.e. Greek $\dot{o}\delta\dot{o}\varsigma$, as do LXX BL 1 Kgs 2,2a. On the other hand, he transposes into an anthropological key («the road of all men») the Bible's cosmological formulation («the way of all the earth»).

alive or yet to be, from which no one can ever return to learn what is happening among the living». Continuing to elaborate on the Bible's presentation, Josephus proceeds (7.384a) to have David draw a conclusion about his current speaking to Solomon from his foregoing announcement which itself serves as a transition to the series of exhortations that follow: «Therefore, while I am still alive, through very close to death ¹⁴, I exhort you, in the same manner as when I counselled you once before...» ¹⁵.

David's exhortations to his son (2,2b-3) open in 2,2b with the summons «be strong and show yourself a man» 16 . Josephus' version spells out the meaning of this general admonition, using language reminiscent of David's earlier appeal to Solomon to which he has alluded just previously: «... to be just (δικαίφ) towards your subjects and pious (εὐσεβεῖ) towards God 17 , who has given you the kingship». 18

In 1 Kgs 2,3a, David calls on Solomon to observe the divine decrees as these are set down «in the law of Moses.» Whereas the

¹⁴ David's allusion to his state recalls Josephus' statement about the king «realizing he was about to die» in 7.383a and provides a prosaic «translation» of the poetic language of 7.383b.

¹⁵ With this *Rückverweis* David's alludes back to his earlier, biblically unparalleled, admonition to Solomon, prior to the latter's anointing as king in *Ant.* 7.356 that he be a pious and just ruler –two qualities which he will again emphasize in the words he is now about to address to Solomon.

¹⁶ LXX L specifies a «powerful man» (ἄνδρα δυνάμεως), while Tg. renders «be a man fearing sinners» (דחיל חטאין).

With this double exhortation, compare the content of David's previous appeal to Solomon as cited in 7.356: «He then gave instructions to Solomon concerning his kingdom, in order that he might rule with piety and justice (εὐσεβῶς καὶ δικαιῶς) over all the Hebrew nation and the tribe of Judah.» The repetition of the call to «piety» and «justice» here just prior to David's death highlights the importance of precisely these two attributes for Solomon's kingship. On «justice» as a component of Josephus' portrait of Solomon, see Feldman, *Interpretation*, pp. 590-593; on «piety», see pp. 593-602.

¹⁸ This appended phrase suggests a motive why Solomon should be «pious towards God,» i.e. because the latter has awarded him the kingship.

biblical David uses a plethora of terms to designate these decrees ¹⁹, Josephus limits himself to two such words, likewise underscoring the divine authority behind the lawgiver Moses: «... and to keep his commandments and laws (ἐντολὰς καὶ... νόμους) ²⁰ which He Himself sent down (κατέπεμψεν) ²¹ to us through Moses...» ²².

David rounds off his exhortations of 2,2b-3a with a series of indications (2,3b-4) concerning the benefits their observance may be expected to produce. Before presenting his version of the latter segment (see 7.385b), Josephus, in 7.384c-385a, has David solemnly warn Solomon about the negative consequences of his failure to heed the admonitions he has just given him: «do not neglect them [i.e. the commandments and laws] by yielding either to favour (χάριτι) or flattery (θωπεί α) ²³ or lust (ἐπιθυμί α) or any other passion (πάθει) ²⁴, for you will lose the goodwill (εὕνοιαν) of the Deity towards you, if you transgress any of His ordinances (νομίμων;

¹⁹ MT 1 Kgs 2,3a uses a total of six terms («charge,» «ways,» «statutes,» «commandments,» «ordinances,» and «testimonies») to designate the divine directives found in the «law of Moses.» LXX L has seven such terms, LXX B five.

²⁰ The first of the above Greek terms does appear in the LXX catalogue of legal terms in 1 Kgs 2,3a (see previous note), while the second lacks an equivalent there; cf., however, the singular form νόμος in the appended phrase «as it is written in the law (νόμ φ) of Moses.» On Josephus' terminology for «law», see SCHLATTER, *Theologie*, pp. 62-65.

²¹ Elsewhere Josephus uses the verb $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \omega$ with God as explicit or implicit subject in *Ant*. 3,26,31,32 (all of the manna); 4.45 (of the quail in the desert).

 $^{^{22}}$ The phrase «as is written in the law of Moses» of 1 Kgs 2,3a β highlights the figure of Moses in whose law the divine decrees spoken of in 2,3a α are «written.» Josephus' formulation focusses attention rather on the heavenly origin of the decrees, of which Moses is only a mediator, thereby underscoring the respect due them.

²³ The word θωπεία is *hapax* in Josephus.

²⁴ In fact, Solomon will end up «yielding to lust... and passion» in his old age when his infatuation with foreign women causes him to transgress the laws of Moses; see *Ant.* 8.190-191 (// 1 Kgs 11: 1-4). In issuing the youthful Solomon this warning the dying David thus appears as a prophet-like figure who foresees his son's later, fatal weakness and urges him to be on guard against this.

compare νόμους, 7.384), and you will turn his kind watchfulness $(\dot{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\dot{\eta}\nu...\pi\rho\dot{o}voi\alpha v^{25})$ into a hostile attitude $(\pi\rho\dot{o}\zeta\ \tau\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\nu\tau_1)^{26}$ ».

Having appended the above warning to David's exhortations, Josephus, in the continuation of 7.385, concludes the first part of the dying king's «testament» with a version of the «dynastic promise» of 2,4 ²⁷: «But, if you show yourself to be such as you should be and as I urge you to be, you will secure the kingdom to our line, and no other house than we shall be lords over the Hebrews ²⁸ for all time ²⁹».

²⁵ On πρόνοια («providence») as a key Josephan concept, see H. W. ATTRIDGE, The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus (Missoula, MT 1976) pp. 71-106 and P. SPILSBURY, The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible (Tübingen 1998) pp. 72-74.

This is the conjecture of Niese which Marcus adopts. Nodet retains the reading $\pi\rho \delta \zeta$ $\check{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\tau'$ of the codices and translates «en toutes choses tu t'aliéneras sa providence favorable». The above warning takes the place of the two opening statements (2,3b) concerning the intended purpose/result of the conduct David has been urging on Solomon: «that you may prosper in all that you do and wherever you turn» (MT LXX L); compare LXX B: «that you may be discerning in what you do according to all that I command you» (NODET, *ad loc.* suggests that the phrase «as I urge you» in the continuation of David's words in 7.385 is inspired by the concluding words of this LXX B reading.)

²⁷ The verse reads: «that the Lord may establish his word [MT LXX B; LXX L: words] which he spoke concerning me [LXX B lacks concerning me], saying, "If your sons take heed to their way [LXX L ways], to walk before me in faithfulness with all their heart and all their soul [LXX B lacks and with all their soul, but adds the word «saying» after all their heart], there shall not fail you a man on the throne of David"». This quotation by David of God's dynastic promise as cited in 2 Sam 7:11-16 (cf. *Ant.* 7.90-95) involves a «conditionalizing» of what is there an unconditional promise of a perpetual dynasty for the Davidids (see vv. 13,16).

²⁸ On Josephus' use of this designation at various moments of the people's history, see G. HARVEY, *The True Israel. Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Jewish Literature* (Leiden 1996) pp. 124-129.

²⁹ The above formulation is Josephus' adaptation of the (unconditional) dynastic promise of 2 Samuel 7 as this is recast in conditional terms in 2,4. Perhaps, the discrepancy between the two biblical forms of the promise prompted Josephus to substitute his own wording for that of 2,4. In any case, whereas 2,4 focusses on the right conduct expected of the whole succession of David's «sons»/successors, Josephus' David centers attention on the behavior of Solomon alone, making the perdurance of the Davidic dynasty dependent on his acting appropriately. Finally, it is worthy of note that here in 7.385, Josephus does reckon with the possibility

PUNISHMENT FOR JOAB

The second, *realpolitisch* portion of David's testament (2,5-9 // 7.386-388) opens with the king addressing the case of a first person with whom he wishes Solomon to deal with after his death, i.e. the general Joab (2,5-6 // 7.386). In 2,5 David first straightforwardly accuses Joab of a double murder (v. 5a), and then amplifies this charge in highly figurative (and obscure) language (v. 5b) ³⁰. Josephus resolves the difficulties of 2,5b by simply leaving it aside, while rendering (7.386a) 2,5a as follows: «Remember also *the crime* ($\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\nuo\mu$ i $\alpha\varsigma$) ³¹ of Joab ³², *the commander* ³³, *who because of envy* (διὰ ζελοτυ-

⁻nullified, it is true by Solomon's defection—of an «everlasting» dynasty for the Davidids, whereas elsewhere he leaves aside or rewords biblical allusions to the dynasty's enduring «for ever» (compare, e.g., 7.93 with 2 Sam 7:13, 16), doing so out of a concern not to provoke Roman sensibilities over resurgent Jewish messianism in his own time; on this Josephan concern, see FELDMAN, *Interpretation*, pp. 151-154.

³⁰ MT 1 Kgs 2,5b translates literally as «... and he (Joab) placed blood of war in peace and he put the blood of war on the belt which was on his loins and on the sandals which were on his feet». LXX L (largely followed by RSV) has: «and he avenged the blood of war in peace and he put innocent blood on my (David's) life and the girdle of my loins and on my sandals on my feet», while LXX B reads a shorter text: «... and he placed blood of war on the belt on his loins and on the sandals of his feet». Finally, Tg. provides a paraphrastic elaboration of the difficult MT text: «... and my blood which is reckoned to their blood (is) upon him like the blood of the wounded in battle; and he sat for them in ambush of peace and shed their blood on the belt that was on his loins and trampled by the boots that were on his feet».

³¹ Josephus introduces this explicitly evaluative element into his rendition of 2,5a which itself lacks such a qualification of Joab's deeds.

 $^{^{32}}$ Greek: Ἰώαβος. MT יואב (Eng.: Joab); LXX BL Ἰωάβ. On Josephus' portrait of Joab, whom, in contrast to rabbinic tradition, he presents in still more negative terms than the Bible itself, see L. H. FELDMAN, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Leiden 1998) pp. 201-214.

³³ In 1 Kgs 2,5a Joab is identified rather as «son of Zeruiah.» In the Bible David begins by referring to what Joab «did to me». Josephus leaves this reference aside, given that Joab's actions were directed, immediately and in first place, rather against the two generals he killed (as the continuation of the verse makes clear).

πίαν) ³⁴ killed two *just and brave* (δικαίους καὶ ἀγαθούς) ³⁵ generals ³⁶, Abenner ³⁷, the son of Ner³⁸ and Amasa ³⁹, the son of Jethras ⁴⁰».

Having made his charges against Joab in 2,5, David proceeds in 2,6 to urge Solomon: «act therefore according to your wisdom, but do not let his gray head go down to Sheol (LXX BL εἰς ἄδου, to Hades) in peace». Josephus avoids both the reference to Solomon's «wisdom» ⁴¹ and the figurative language ⁴² of this verse. In its place he substitutes an explanation (7.386b) as to why David must leave it to Solomon to requite the assassin Joab instead of having done this

³⁴ This reference to «envy» recalls Josephus' earlier accounts of Joab's murders where envy is presented as *the* motive for these crimes; see *Ant*. 7.31-38 (Abner) and 7.284-285 (Amasa). On «envy» as the driving force, not only of Joab's own career, but also of the rivals and opponents of Josephus himself, the «Joabs» of his day, see FELDMAN, *Studies*, pp. 209-213.

³⁵ This inserted positive characterization of the two generals underscores the enormity of Joab's murder of them.

³⁶ 1 Kgs 2,5a qualifies the pair, prior to naming them, as «commanders of the armies of Israel» (in its subsequent mention of Amasa, LXX L adds the designation of him as «commander-in-chief of Judah»).

 $^{^{37}}$ Greek: 'Αβεννῆρος. MT אבנר (Eng.: Abner); LXX BL 'Αβεννήρ. On Josephus' account of his murder by Joab who fears to lose his own command to him, see *Ant*. 7.31-38 (// 2 Sam 3:22-30).

 $^{^{38}}$ Greek: Νῆρος. MT το (Eng.: Ner); LXX BL Νήρ.

³⁹ Greek: 'Αμασᾶ. MT עמשא (Eng.: Amasa); LXX B 'Αμεσσαιά, LXX L 'Αμεσσά. On Joab's murder of him at the time of the revolt of Sheba, when both men are commissioned by David to repress the revolt, see *Ant*. 7.284-285 (// 2 Sam 20, 8-10).

 $^{^{40}}$ Greek: Ἰέθρας. MT יπר (Eng.: Jether); LXX BL Ἰεθέρ.

⁴¹ His non-utilization of David's allusion to his son's wisdom may be inspired by the fact that according to his subsequent indications Solomon was «still a mere youth» (*Ant*. 8.2), indeed only 14 years old (8.211) at this point. In addition, he has not yet received the divine gift of wisdom –this comes only in 8.22-25 (// 1 Kgs 3,3-15 // 2 Chr 1,2-13)– that made him Israel's preeminently wise man.

⁴² Josephus uses the word «Hades» (Greek: ἄδης), the term employed by LXX BL 2,6 for the underworld, only once in the entire *Antiquities*, i.e. 6.32 (in the story of the Endor medium [// 1 Samuel 28] who summons the spirit of Samuel from the realm of the death). Elsewhere the word appears four times in the *War* (1.596; 2.156,165; 3.375).

already himself: «... in whatever you may think best, avenge their deaths ⁴³, for Joab, being stronger and more powerful than I, has until now ($\mu \epsilon \gamma \rho \iota \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$) escaped punishment ⁴⁴».

BARZILLAI'S SONS TO BE REWARDED

At the center of David's enumeration of those whom he enjoins Solomon to deal appropriately with (2,5-9 // 7.386-388) stands (2,7) ⁴⁵ a positive mandate, i.e. that Solomon reward the sons of «Barzillai» who had assisted him in his flight from Absalom. The mandate consists of a double injunction concerning Solomon's treatment of Barzillai's sons (v. 7a), coupled with a motivation for this in terms of their father's past services (v. 7b). Josephus (7.387) reproduces both these elements, though using his own wording to do so: «But I commend to you the sons of Barzelos ⁴⁶ the Galadite ⁴⁷, whom you shall hold in all honor and care for (προνοία; see πρόνοιαν, 7.385) ⁴⁸, and

⁴³ Solomon acts on this mandate in *Ant*. 8.13-16 (1 Kgs 2,28-35) where he commissions Benaiah to execute the fugitive Joab.

⁴⁴ The above explanation of David's failure to move against Joab with its confession of his own impotence in the latter's regard echoes a similar statement by David to the people on the occasion of Joab's murder of Abner in *Ant.* 7.45: «As for me, you know that I can do nothing to Joab and Abisai, the sons of Saruia, who are more powerful $(\delta v v \alpha \mu \epsilon v v v c)$ than I...», which has its biblical equivalent in 2 Sam 3,39 «these men the sons of Zeruiah are too hard for me». On the significance of Josephus' temporal limitation («until now») of Joab's immunity, see n. 60 on 7.388.

⁴⁵ On this verse, see I. W. PROVAN, «Why Barzillai of Gilead (1 Kings 2:7)? Narrative Art and the Hermenuetics of Suspicion in 1 Kings 1-2», *Tyndale Bulletin* 46 (1995) pp. 103-116.

 $^{^{46}}$ Greek Βερζέλος. MT ברזלי (Eng.: Barzillai); LXX Β Βερζελλεί; LXX L Βερζελλί.

⁴⁷ MT 1 Kgs 2,7 calls Barzillai «the Gileadite»; Josephus' designation corresponds to that of LXX BL.

⁴⁸ In 1 Kgs 2,7a Solomon is called on to «show loyalty» (MT τση, LXX BL ἕλεος). Josephus leaves aside David's further, more specific directive that Barzillai's sons are to be among those who eat at Solomon's table.

thus gratify me ⁴⁹; for in* this matter we are not the first to show kindness, but are repaying the debt owed them ⁵⁰ for their father's service to me during my exile $(\pi\alpha\rho\dot{\alpha}\,\tau\dot{\eta}\nu\,\phi\nu\gamma\dot{\eta}\nu)$ ⁵¹».

SHIMEI'S REQUITAL

David concludes his catalogue (2,5-9 // 7.386-388) of those whom Solomon is to requite –whether negatively or positively– with the figure of Shimei. 1 Kgs 2,8 recalls various *personalia* about this figure and his interactions with David. Josephus (7.388a) has an equivalent to virtually all the items of information cited in the source verse: «And as for Sūmūis ⁵², the son of Gēra ⁵³, of the tribe of Ben-

⁴⁹ This inserted element provides an additional motivation for Solomon to obey his father's directive concerning Barzillai's sons, i.e. thereby, he will be doing something pleasing to his father.

This interjected phrase makes the transition from David's directive concerning Barzillai's sons to the motivation for that directive he is about to cite. The insertion makes clear that what David is instructing Solomon to do is not a matter of a whimsical favor which Solomon might or might not choose to bestow, but rather an obligation, given Barzillai's past services to David. As such, David's instruction on the matter is all the more something which Solomon is bound to carry out (although, in fact, it is not recorded that he did so; see next note).

⁵¹ Compare the more specific wording used by David in 1 Kgs 2,7b: «for with such loyalty they [i.e. Barzillai's sons] met me when I fled from Absalom your brother». Note too that whereas the Bible has David refer to services rendered by Barzillai's sons («they»), in Josephus the services are those of Barzillai himself. (The historian's formulation in this regard corresponds to the presentation in 2 Sam 18,27// Ant. 7.272 where it is Barzillai in person who welcomes the fugitive David). Curiously, however, neither the Bible nor Josephus himself mentions Solomon's carrying out of David's directive concerning Barzillai's sons –as they both do in the case of the two other persons whom the dying David instructs Solomon to deal with, i.e. Joab and Shimei.

⁵² Greek: Σουμουίς. MT שׁמעי (Eng.: Shimei); LXX BL Σεμεεί.

⁵³ Greek: Γηρᾶς. MT גרא (Eng.: Gera); LXX BL Γηρά.

jamin ⁵⁴, who cursed me repeatedly $(\pi o \lambda \lambda \acute{a})$ ⁵⁵ during my flight $(\pi \alpha \rho \grave{a} \ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \ \phi \upsilon \gamma \acute{\eta} \nu)$ ⁵⁶ on the way to the camps $(\Pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \beta o \lambda \acute{a} \zeta)$ ⁵⁷, and when he met me at the Jordan ⁵⁸, received a pledge that he would suffer no harm *for the time being* $(\tau \acute{o} \tau \epsilon)$... ⁵⁹».

David concludes his word concerning Shimei, in terms reminiscent of those used of Joab in 2,6, by urging Solomon (2,9) to use his «wisdom» to insure that the culprit go down «with blood to Sheol». As noted above, Josephus replaces the formulations of 2,6 with alternative phraseology in 7.386 (see nn. 41, 42); he does the same in

⁵⁴ Compare MT בן־הימיני (Eng.: the Benjamite); LXX B υίος τοῦ Ἰεμενεί; LXX L υίος τοῦ Ἰεμενεί. Josephus passes over the appended mention of Shimei's hometown, i.e. «Bahurim» (which Tg. translates with an Aramaic word, עלמת, meaning «youth»).

⁵⁵ NODET, *ad loc*. translates rather «férocement» in line with the wording of 1 Kgs 2,8 where David states that Shimei «cursed me with a grievous curse».

⁵⁶ This is the same phrase used by David in his word concerning Barzillai in 7.387. The shared expression serves to both associate and distinguish Barzillai and Shimei, one of whom assisted, the other of whom sought to bring harm on the fugitive David. The connection is obscured in Marcus' rendering where the same Greek phrase is translated «during my exile» in 7.387 and «during my flight» in 7.388.

⁵⁷ MT 1 Kgs 2,8 calls the end point of David's flight from Jerusalem «Mahanaim». Josephus uses the same common Greek noun, meaning «camps,» as do LXX BL to translate this proper place name. David's run-in with the curser Shimei during his flight is described in *Ant.* 7.207-210 // 2 Sam 16:5-14, while his arrival at Mahanaim/The Camps is mentioned in 7.230 // 2 Sam 17:24.

⁵⁸ The allusion here is to the encounter between the victorious David and the penitent supplicant Shimei following the crushing of Absalom's revolt in *Ant*. 7.264-266 // 2 Sam 19,18b-23.

⁵⁹ Compare David's citation of his earlier declaration to Shimei in 1 Kgs 2,8bβ: «I swore to him by the Lord, saying, "I will not put you to death with the sword"». Earlier, in 2 Sam 19,23, the king swears to Shimei «you shall not die», Josephus rendering this in 7.266 with «take courage and have no fear that you will be put to death»; thus neither the Bible nor Josephus has the dying David quote his previous words to Shimei exactly. Josephus' appending of the word τότε («at this time») to David's self-quotation in 7.388 is significant; by means of this addition he supplies an implicit explanation of how Shimei can justifiably be executed by Solomon –notwithstanding David's oath to the former that he would not be put to death; see next note.

the case of the analogous language of 2,9. His (shortened) version of this latter verse reads simply: «look now $(\nu\hat{\nu}\nu)^{60}$ for a reasonable pretext to punish him » 61 .

CONCLUSIONS

At the conclusion of my essay I return to the two questions with which it opened in order to summarize my findings concerning them. On the question of Josephus' textual affinities in 7.383-388, my investigation, in fact, did not generate any very definite results –not unexpectedly so given both the brevity of the segment and its highly paraphrastic character. The one item of relevance to emerge concerning Josephus' biblical text for «the testament of David» is the fact that he agrees (7.388) with LXX BL 1 Kgs 2,8 in his translation («[the] Camps») of MT's proper place name («Mahanaim»).

My second question concerned Josephus' handling of the data of 1 Kgs 2,1-9 and the effect of this on his own presentation. In *Ant*. 7.383-388, the historian utilizes three re-writing techniques in particular, i.e. amplifications, replacements, and omissions/abbreviations. Of these, the most prominent is his recurrent expansion of source elements. Examples include: the elaboration of the introduction to

⁶⁰ This particle sets up a contrast with the immediately preceding term τότε («for the time being») during which David pledged not to harm Shimei and the present time when that time has elapsed and Solomon is free to impose punishment on him without violating the terms of David's oath as just cited by the latter; see previous note. The particle likewise has a counterpart in 7.386 where David refers to Joab's having escaped punishment «until now» (μέχρι νῦν) –a state of affairs that is to be reversed under Solomon. The linguistic link serves to highlight the similarity between the offenders Joab and Shimei and the long-delayed punishment that imminently awaits them both.

⁶¹ Compare 1 Kgs 2,9 «Now therefore hold him not guiltless, for you are a wise man; you will know what you ought to do to him; and you shall bring his gray head down with blood to Sheol». In Josephus' generalized rendering of this injunction, the references to Solomon's «wisdom» and to «Sheol» both disappear, just as they do in his version of 2,6 in 7.386. Solomon's punishment of Shimei in accordance with his father's instructions is related in *Ant.* 8.17-20 // 1 Kgs 2,36-46a.

David's words (2,1) in 7.383a; the lengthening of the allusion to David's «going the way of all the earth» (2,2a) in 7.383b; the inserted warning of 7.384c-385a; the various details about Joab and his victims (7.386a; compare 2,5); and the phrase about the priority of benefit in 7.387 (compare 2,7).

In a whole series of instances throughout our passage Josephus likewise replaces source contents with his own. Thus, e.g., he turns the appeal to Solomon to «be strong and show himself a man» (2,2b) into a renewal of David's earlier admonition that he be «just» and «pious» (7.384a), just as recasts the conclusions to David's words about both Joab (7.386b; compare 2,6) and Shimei (7.388b; compare 2,9). Similarly, he gives his own content to the «dynastic promise» cited in 2,4 (see 7.385b), and represents Barzillai himself, rather than his sons (so 2,7), as the one who had assisted the fugitive David (7.387). Finally, omissions/abbreviations also surface in the unit: the lengthy catalogue of legal terms (2,3a) is reduced to a single pair (7.384), while the sequence of 2,5b with its figurative language is left aside completely.

What then are the distinctive features of Josephus' version of the «testament of David» that result from his utilization of the above rewriting techniques? In general, *Ant.* 7.383-388 is not, in fact, so different from its *Vorlage*: it features, e.g., the same two main parts (2,2-4 // 7.383-385; 2,5-9 // 7.386-388), and the same persons to be dealt with by Solomon appear in the same order in both, etc. On the other hand, the Josephan rendition is markedly paraphrastic and expansionistic in its handling of the biblical material. The Bible's figurative language (e.g., putting blood on a person's girdle and sandals [2,5b] and going down / bringing down to Sheol [2,6,9] is avoided for the most part ⁶². Implicit corrections (who assisted the fugitive David? [compare 7.387 and 2,7; and see n. 51]; the attribution of «wisdom» to the boy Solomon who has not yet received

⁶² On the other hand, Josephus actually elaborates on the figurative expression «to go the way of all the earth» of 2,2a in 7.383b.

that gift from God [see 2,6 and 9; cf. n. 41]) and clarifications (why has Joab not already been punished for his crimes? [see 7.386b and cf. n. 44]; how can Shimei be legitimately be punished by Solomon notwithstanding David's oath to spare him? [compare 2,9 and 7.388b and see n. 60]) of problematic source items are introduced. The reference to «fate» (τ ò $\chi \rho \epsilon \acute{\omega} v$) in 7.383 imparts a non-biblical, Hellenistic touch to the words of the Josephan David (see n. 11). And lastly, the interjected *Rückverweis* to David's earlier appeal to Solomon (7.356) in 7.384 furthers the coherence of Josephus' work and highlights the importance of the «justice» and «piety», to which the Josephan Solomon is twice called, for his rulership ⁶³.

The six paragraphs of 7.383-388 are a minuscule portion of the twenty books that make up the *Antiquities* in its entirety. Still, as this essay has tried to show, there is much of interest to be learned about Josephus' ways of dealing with his biblical source material by a close study even of so short a passage.

⁶³ One feature of his source text that Josephus does retain in 7.383-388 is its use of direct discourse throughout. This finding is of note given that elsewhere Josephus regularly recasts biblical direct discourse as indirect; on the phenomenon, see C. T. BEGG, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (AJ 8,212-420) (Leuven 1993) pp. 12-13, n. 38. By allowing David to speak in his own voice when delivering his testament, Josephus highlights the importance of that testament as something that deserves citation in the king's own words.

RESUMEN

1 Re 2,1-9, «el testamento de David», recoge las últimas instrucciones del rey para su hijo Salomón. Este artículo ofrece un detallado estudio de la versión de Josefo (*Ant.* 7.383-388) del testamento en relación con su fuente bíblica. El estudio se centra especialmente en las afinidades textuales de la presentación de Josefo, a la vista de las diferencias entre las distintas versiones antiguas del testamento (TM, LXX, Targum). Así mismo, el artículo examina las diferentes técnicas de reescritura empleadas por Josefo en *Ant.* 7.383-388 y su contribución a la producción de una versión diferenciada del testamento de David.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Josefo, David, testamento de David, Salomón.

SUMMARY

1 Kgs 2,1-9, «the testament of David», records the king's final instructions to his son Solomon. This article offers a detailed study of Josephus' version (*Ant.* 7.383-388) of the testament in relation to its biblical source. The study focusses particularly on the textual affinities of Josephus' presentation, given the differences among the various ancient versions (MT, LXX, Targum) of the testament. The article likewise examines the range of re-writing techniques utilized by Josephus in *Ant.* 7.383-388 and their contribution in generating a distinctive rendition of David's testament.

KEYWORDS: Josephus, David, David's testament, Solomon.