

THE «ROYAL LOTTERY» ACCORDING TO JOSEPHUS

Christopher T. BEGG

P.K. McCarter has aptly titled 1Sam 10,17-27, the story of Saul's public designation and acclamation as Israel's first king, «the royal lottery¹.» In this essay, I wish to investigate Josephus' retelling of the Biblical lottery episode in his *Antiquitates Judaicae* (hereafter *Ant.*) 6.60-67². My investigation will proceed by way of a detailed comparison between the Josephan version and source story as represented by the following major textual witnesses: MT (BHS)³, Codex Vaticanus (hereafter B)⁴, and the Lucianic (hereafter L) or Antiochene MSS⁵ of the LXX and Targum Jonathan on the Former Prophets (hereafter TJ)⁶. This comparison, in turn, seeks answers to such overarching questions as: Which text-form(s) of 1Sam 10,17-27 did Josephus have available? How and why has he modified the data of his source? What are the distinctive features of his version vis-à-vis the Bible's own account?

1. P.K. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel* (AB 8), New York 1980, p. 189.

2. For the text and translation of Josephus' works, I use the edition of H.ST.J. THACKERAY *et al.*, *Josephus* (LCL), Cambridge, MA/London 1926-1965 (*Ant.* 6.60-67 is found in Vol. V., pp. 197-201 where the translation and notes are by R. Marcus). I have likewise consulted the text and apparatus for *Ant.* 6.60-67 found in B. NIESE, *Flavii Josephi Opera*, II, Berlin 1955, pp. 18-19. On Josephus' overall treatment of the two main (human) characters in 1Sam 10,17-27 (*Ant.* 6.60-67) see: L.H. FELDMAN, *Josephus' Portrait of Saul*, in *HUCA* 60 (1989) 45-99; *idem*, *Josephus' Portrait of Samuel*, in *Abr-Nahrain* 30 (1992) 103-145.

3. Fragmentary portions of a distinctive Hebrew text of 1Sam 10,17-27 are preserved in 4QSam^a which has not yet been officially published. For the readings of this MS, see the «textual notes» in MCCARTER, *1 Samuel* 190-191.

4. For B I use the edition of A.E. BROOKE, N. MACLEAN and H.ST.J. THACKERAY, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*, II:1 *I and II Samuel*, Cambridge 1928.

5. For L I use the edition of 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, *The Bible in Aramaic*, II, Leiden 1959, and the translation of this by D.J. HARRINGTON and A.J. SALDARINI, *Targum Jonathan on the Former Prophets* (The Aramaic Bible 10), Wilmington, DE 1987.

In proceeding now to my comparison of 1Sam 10,17-27 and *Ant.* 6.60-67, I divide up the material to be studied as follows: 1) Samuel's Address (10,17-19//6.60-61); 2) Saul Designated (10,20-24//6.62-66a); and 3) Sequels (10,25-27//6.66b-67).

1. Samuel's Address

In 1Sam 10,17 Samuel (re-)convenes the people –who were dismissed by him in 8,22 from Ramah (see 8,4) where they had demanded that he give them a king, and who have been «off stage» throughout the segment 9,1-10,16 featuring the private interaction between Samuel and Saul– to Mizpah. Josephus' parallel to 10,17 at the opening of 6.60 follows upon a like preceding sequence. In 6.44 Samuel sends off the crowd which had earlier (6.35) assembled to him at «Armatha» (= Ramah)⁷, whereupon the «private» events of 9,1-10,16 unfold in 6.45-59. There then follows the notice at the start of 6.60 leading into the public lottery story: «Samuel now called (συγκαλει)⁸ the people (τὸν λαόν)⁹ together at the city of Masphatha (Μασφαθά).»¹⁰

Following the narrative notice introducing Samuel's speech of 10,18αα, his actual words to the people (vv. 18αβ-19) commence (v. 18αβ) with the *Botenformel*: «Thus says the Lord the God of Israel.» In line with his usual practice, Josephus replaces the Bible's «messenger formula» with an alternative formulation: «... and made them an address, which he delivered, as he told them, at the commandment of God (κατ' ἐντολήν... τοῦ θεοῦ)¹¹.» Samuel's «prophetic»

7. To his notice on this happening (//1Sam 8,22) Josephus appends an explicit foreshadowing of Samuel's eventual reconvening of the people here in 6.60, i.e. «Samuel said... "For the present, depart ye each to his home: I will summon you at need, when I shall have learnt from God whom he gives you for your king"» (here and throughout this essay I use italics to indicate elements of Josephus' presentation which have no Biblical counterpart as such, and vice versa).

8. With this historic present form, compare the past forms of B (παρήγγειλεν) and L (συνήγαγε) 1Sam 10,17. On Josephus' penchant for the historic present, see C.T. BEGG, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (AJ 8,212-420) (BETL 108), Leuven 1993, pp. 10-11, n. 32.

9. Josephus' word for «people» here, i.e. λαός is the same one used by BL in 10,17. Like MT, Josephus lacks BL's specification that Samuel summoned «all the people».

10. This is the reading of the codices MSP followed by Marcus; Niese reads rather Μασφά. Compare MT «Mizpah»; BL Μασσηφά. In *Ant.* 6.22 (//1Sam 7,5) Josephus uses the accusative form Μασφάτην in reference to the same site. From 10,17 Josephus omits the specification about Samuel's convening the people «to the Lord» at Mizpah, likely because its meaning/intent is not immediately apparent. See n. 25. It might be noted here that, in accordance with its «theological geography,» the «Samaritan Chronicle No. II» sets the scene of 1Sam 10,17-27, not at Mizpah, but at «Elon Moreh, by Shechem». See J. MACDONALD, *The Samaritan Chronicle No. II* (BZAW 107), Berlin 1969, p. 122.

11. Josephus' other uses of the phrase «according to the commandment of God» are in *Ant.* 3.16,104 (5.94; 6.146); 10.28 (178). His avoidance of the *Botenformel* goes together with his wider tendency to avoid the use of terms for «word» (λόγος, ῥῆμα) in reference to divine utter-

word to the people first (v. 18b) reminds them of God's initiatives in delivering them from the dominion of Egypt (MT; Pharaoh king of Egypt, BL) and of other oppressor «kingdoms». Josephus (6.60b) recasts Samuel's historical reminiscence in indirect discourse¹², likewise giving it a more a generalized character: «(He said that), albeit God had granted them freedom (ἐλευθερίαν)¹³ and enslaved (δουλώσαντος)¹⁴ their enemies (πολεμίους)...»¹⁵

Samuel's speech shifts from recalling the past to denunciation in the present at 10,19α where Israel is charged with «rejecting» (B ἐξουθενήκατε, L ἐξουθενώσατε) its deliverer God. Josephus amplifies the charge with a «motivation», i.e. ignorance, for the people's action: «...they had been unmindful of his benefits (ἀμνημοήσειαν τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν)¹⁶ and rejected His sovereignty (τόν... θεὸν ἀποχειροτονοῦσι τῆς βασιλείας)¹⁷, unaware that it was in their

rances; see BEGG, *Josephus' Account* 20, n. 90. Also to be noted in the above formulation is Josephus' use of «God» for the source's «Lord». Also this substitution reflects a wider Josephan tendency, i.e. his virtually total avoidance of the Biblical usage of «Lord» (LXX κύριος) as a divine title, a usage which was not current in secular Greek. See BEGG, *Josephus' Account* 45, n. 218 and the literature cited there.

12. This substitution of indirect for direct discourse is a recurring feature of Josephus' rewriting of the Bible; see BEGG, *Josephus' Account* 12-13, n. 38. At the conclusion of his version of Samuel's speech (6.61) Josephus will, however, have him switch to direct discourse, see below.

13. «Freedom» (ἐλευθερία) is a key religio-political term throughout Josephus' writings where it is used both positively (of a gift God gives his people) and negatively (particularly of the Zealots' effort to wrest independence for themselves from the Romans, contrary to God's will of the moment). The term as used here in 6.60 harks back to Josephus' version of Samuel's earlier address to the people at Mizpah (//1Samuel 7) where it is introduced by him several times, see 6.19,20. On Josephus' concept of «freedom» overall, see: D. NESTLE, *Freiheit*, in *RAC* 7 (1972) 269-289, cc. 287-289; R. HEILIGENTHAL, *Freiheit*, II.I. *Frühjudentum*, in *TRE* 11 (1983) 498-502, esp. pp. 500-501; F.S. JONES, *Freedom*, in *ABD* 2 (1992) 855-859, esp. p. 856; FELDMAN, *Samuel* 135-136.

14. This is Josephus' only use of the verb δουλόω with God as subject.

15. This is Josephus' generalizing equivalent for the source's mention of «Egypt» and the other «kingdoms» which had oppressed the Israelites. Note the wordplay of Josephus' formulation: God gave the people «freedom», while doing the opposite with their enemies, i.e. «enslaving» them.

16. The above phrase occurs only here in Josephus; its reference to God's «benefits» might be seen as his adaptation of the expression used to qualify God in 10,19α, i.e. «who saves you from all your calamities and distresses». In his version of God's word to Samuel on the occasion of the people's initial demand for a king (//1Sam 8,7-9) in *Ant.* 6.38 Josephus also undercores the ingratitude towards their divine benefactor implied by that demand: the people will be overcome by remorse once they receive their king «which will convict them of adopting a course ungrateful (οὐκ εὐχαρίστους) towards Me (God) and thy (Samuel's) prophetic office».

17. Josephus' only other use of the verb ἀποχειροτονέω is in *Bellum Judaicum* (hereafter *BJ*) 2.52. The above phrase represents Josephus' specification of the charge about Israel's «rejecting God» of 10,19. From the source charge Josephus omits the problematic chronological indication «you have *this day* rejected...» which seems to ignore the fact that a considerable time would have to have elapsed between the people's initial demand for a king (1Samuel 8) and the current assembly (1Sam 10,17ff.) during which the events narrated in 9,1-10,16 occurred.

*highest interest to have the best (ἀρίστου) of all rulers, and that the best (ἄριστος) of all was God». 1Sam 10,19aβ quotes the people's previous word expressive of their reprobate demand: «No!¹⁸ but set a king set over us» (see 1Sam 8,4). Josephus' version embellishes the source's mention of the human king with a lengthy reminiscence of Samuel's earlier warnings (1Sam 8,10-18//*Ant.* 6.40-42) about that king's despotism:*

«... (nay), they chose to have a man (ἄνθρωπον)¹⁹ for their king, *who would treat his subjects as chattels at his will and pleasure (κατὰ βούλησιν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν)²⁰ and at the impulse of his other passions, indulging his power to the full; one who not being the author and creator (ἔργον καὶ κατασκευάσμα)²¹ of the human race, would not study to preserve it, while God, for that very reason would cherish it with care (κῆδοιτο).*»²²

The Biblical Samuel's word to the people concludes with the injunction «present yourselves before the Lord by your tribes and by your thousands» (so MT L) in 10,19b. Josephus (6.61c) prefaces command with an additional, parting reproach: «Howbeit, he added, *since it pleases you²³ thus and this intent to outrage God (ἢ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὕβρις)²⁴ has prevailed, range yourselves (παχήθητε, BL κατάστητε) all of you²⁵ by tribes and families (κατὰ φυλάς τε καὶ σκήπτρα)²⁶ and cast lots (κλήρους βάλετε).*»²⁷

18. So BL (οὐχι); compare MT ה («to him», i.e. God). Cf. further BHS and the commentaries.

19. By use of this term, Josephus introduces an ironic wordplay with his mention of «God» in what precedes: the people could have had God as their king; instead they opted for a mere «man».

20. This collocation is *hapax* in Josephus.

21. This collocation is *hapax* in Josephus.

22. Josephus uses the verb κῆδω with God as subject also in *BJ* 6.310; *Ant.* 1.209; 3.191; 4.2; 5.31; 6.9, 187, 305. The above appendix to the source mention of the human king asked for by Israel with its continued contrast between that figure and the all-beneficent God underscores the people's foolishness in demanding a human king when they could have a divine one. The insertion likewise gives expression to Josephus' own distaste for (human) monarchy, a distaste that accorded with a long-standing tradition of his intended Roman readers. See FELD-MAN, *Samuel* 130-132.

23. Note the shift from the indirect discourse, used up till this point in Josephus' version of Samuel's speech, to direct. Such shifts occur with some regularity in the speeches of Josephus' corpus. See BEGG, *Josephus' Account* 123-124, n. 772.

24. Josephus uses (variations of) the above construction also in *BJ* 4.150; *Ant.* 1.113; 3.133; 4.206; 5.200, 255; 8.253, 316; 9.154; 10.241.

25. Just as he does with the similar indication in 10,17 (see n. 10), Josephus leaves aside the specification that the people are to present themselves «before the Lord» of 10,19b.

26. Josephus' wording here represents a reversal of the sequence of B 10,19b (κατὰ τὰ σκήπτρα... καὶ κατὰ τὰς φυλάς). Compare L κατὰ φυλάς... καὶ κατὰ χιλιάδας (= MT).

27. Josephus «anticipates» this addition to the Biblical Samuel's directive from the continuation of the account in 10,20-21. Thereby, he prepares readers for the lot-casting procedure which follows.

2. Saul Designated

The core of the narrative in 1Sam 10,17-27 is the account of the process which eventuates in Saul being recognized as king by the people, vv. 20-24 (//6.62-66a). The process commences with a three-fold «(lot-)taking», first of a tribe, then of a family, and finally of an individual, vv. 20-21²⁸. Josephus gives his compressed version of the three-stage procedure in 6.62: «The Hebrews having done so²⁹, the lot fell to the (tribe) of Benjamin³⁰, and when lots had been cast for it the family (πατριά)³¹ called Matris (Ματρις)³² was successful; and lots being cast for the individuals of that family (κατ' ἄνδρα)³³ Saul son of Kish (Κεισαίου, Β Κεῖς, Λ Κίς) obtained (λαγχάνει)³⁴ the kingship (βασιλεύειν).»

The narrative movement from 1Sam 10,20-21a to 21b poses a problem in that, whereas according to the former sequence Saul would presumably have to be present in order to be «taken» by the lot, in the latter he appears, in fact, to have been absent, so that the crowd must (unsuccessfully) «seek» for him³⁵. Josephus (6.63) implicitly resolves the difficulty by evoking Saul's «flight» upon hearing of his choice. To that notice, in turn, he attaches a long psychologizing comment concerning the king elect's action. The inserted segment reads thus:

«Learning thereof, the young man promptly took himself away, not wishing, I imagine (οἶμαι), to appear eager to take the sovereignty³⁶. Nay, such was the restraint and mo-

28. BL 10,21a feature a plus, absent in MT, i.e. «so he (= Samuel, thus L; B «they») brought the family of the Matrites near man by man», which is generally held to have been part of the original text whence it was lost in MT by haplography. So MCCARTER, *1Samuel*, *ad loc.*

29. Compare 10,20a: «Then Samuel brought all the tribes of Israel near.» Josephus' wording connects up more smoothly with Samuel's command to the people «to range yourselves» at the end of 6.61. On Josephus' oscillating designations for the chosen people at various moments of their history, see A. ARAZY, *The Appellations of the Jews (Ioudaios, Hebraios, Israel) in the Literature from Alexander to Justinian*, Diss. New York University 1973, pp. 170-181.

30. Josephus has no equivalent to the –easily to be supplied– notice of 10,21a: «he (Samuel) brought near the tribe of Benjamin by families».

31. This is the same term used by L in 10,21aβ to designate Saul's «family»; compare B φυλή.

32. Compare MT מַטְרִיָּה: B Ματταρις; L Ἀματταρι.

33. The above phrase might be seen as Josephus' equivalent to the (B)L plus in 10,21a (see n. 28): «and he brought the family of the Matrites near man by man (κατ' ἄνδρα).»

34. Note the historic present.

35. On the point see the commentaries.

36. With the above inserted, «explanation» of the motive behind Saul's «flight», compare Josephus' long appended comment concerning the reason for Saul's not telling his uncle that he had been anointed king (1Sam 10,16), likewise featuring the use of the term οἶμαι in *Ant.* 6.59. The latter passage reads: «But concerning the kingdom and all relating thereto, *deeming that the recital thereof would excite jealousy and distrust*, he held his peace; *nay, even to one who seemed most loyal of friends and whom he loved more affectionately than all those of his blood*, he

*desty (ἐγκράτειαν καὶ σωφροσύνην)*³⁷ *displayed by him that, whereas most persons are unable to contain their joy over the slightest success (οὐδ' ἐπὶ μικραῖς εὐπραγίαις τὴν χαρὰν κατασχεῖν δυναμένων)*³⁸ *but rush (προσιπτόντων)*³⁹ *to display (γενέσθαι φανερούς) themselves before all the world, he, far from showing such (pride) on (obtaining) a kingdom (βασιλεία) and being appointed lord (δεσπότης) of all those mighty peoples (ἔθνων)*⁴⁰ *actually stole away (ἔξέκλεψεν)*⁴¹ *from the view of his future subjects and forced them to search (ζητεῖν) for him*⁴² *, not without trouble*⁴³.

The designation process takes a new turn in 10,22a where, in view of the fruitlessness of the search for Saul (10,21b), inquiry is made of the Lord. MT and BL differ with regard to both the subject of the inquiring and the actual question posed. According to MT «they» (the people as a whole) again ask the Lord «is there yet a man to come hither»?⁴⁴ By contrast BL represent Samuel

judged it neither safe nor prudent to disclose this secret, reflecting, I ween (οἶμαι), on what human nature in truth is, and how no one, be he friend or kinsman, shows unwavering loyalty or preserves his affection when brilliant distinctions are bestowed by God, but all men straightway regard these eminences with malice and envy.»

37. This collocation occurs only here in Josephus.

38. This maxim finds an echo in Josephus' (likewise interpolated) comment concerning King Amaziah of Judah who, puffed up by his victory over the Edomites, challenges King Joash of Israel to combat (//2Chron 25,17, cf. 2Kgs 14,7) in *Ant.* 9.196 «Amasias, however, was not able to contain himself at his good fortune (κατέχειν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐπραγίαις οὐ δυνάμενος) ...» On Josephus' treatment of Amaziah, see C.T. BEGG, *Amaziah of Judah according to Josephus* (*Ant.* 9.186-204), in *Antonianum* 70 (1995) 3-30.

39. This is the reading of the codices RE which Niese and Marcus follow; the other codices have rather προσιπτόντων.

40. The referent of this plural term, which in the LXX and in Josephus himself (see, e.g., *Ant.* 11.194; 13.196) characteristically denotes the other peoples in contrast to the Jews, is not immediately obvious. In its seeming indication that Saul is destined to rule over, not only his own people, but others as well, the term might have in view *Ant.* 6.129 (//1Sam 14,47-48) which lists six neighboring nations subjugated by Saul.

41. Josephus' two other uses of the verb ἐκκλέπτω are in *BJ* 2.102; 3.341.

42. With this phrase Josephus finally reconnects with the Biblical story line, see 10,21bα «and they sought (BL ἐζήτει) him...»

43. Subsequently, Josephus will note that Saul's «modesty», which he highlights in the above notice, was not, after all, an innate quality and in fact turned into its opposite once Saul assumed power. See Josephus' reflection appended to his version of the story of the massacre of the priests of Nob (1Samuel 21-22) instigated by Saul in *Ant.* 6.262-268 where (6.263-264) he speaks of Saul as one of those people who, as long as they remain in a humble station, appear «kindly and moderate (μέτρωι) and pursue only what is right», but once come into power, «stripping off all those qualities and laying aside their habits and ways, as if they were stage masks,... assume in their place audacity, recklessness, contempt for things human and divine...» On Josephus' portrayal of Saul's (initial) modesty in relation both to the similar emphasis of Rabbinic tradition (see, e.g., *b. Meg.* 13b; *Tanh. B.* 3.5) and to Aristotle's denigration of false modesty, see FELDMAN, *Saul* 79-82.

44. I.e. someone in addition to Saul who might be chosen by the lot procedure.

alone putting the Lord the question: «did *the* man⁴⁵ come hither?»⁴⁶ Josephus follows BL with regard to the identity of the inquirer, while also replacing the rather allusive question of both MT and BL with a definite request of the Deity. His formulation (6.64) runs: «*These* (i.e. the people, see 6.63) *being baffled and perplexed* (ἀμυχανούντων καὶ φροντιζόντων)⁴⁷ *at Saul's disappearance* (ἀφανής),⁴⁸ the prophet (προφήτης)⁴⁹ besought God (ἰκέτευε⁵⁰ τὸν θεόν)⁵¹ *to show where the young man*⁵² *and to bring him before their eyes* (ἐμφανής).»⁵³ 1Sam 10,22b «quotes» the Lord's reply in direct address: «Behold, he has hidden (BL κέκρυπται) himself among the baggage (BL σκεύεσιν).» Josephus (6.65) transposes quotation into a transitional narrative notice which likewise leaves aside the source specification about Saul's hiding-place: «and having learned from God the place where Saul lay hiding (κέκρυπται = BL)...»⁵⁴

MT and BL once again diverge in relating the reaction to the divine oracle: in the former (10,23αα) «they» (the people) «run and take» Saul, while in the

45. I.e. Saul himself who is here thought to have been absent during the preceding lot-procedure.

46. On the differences between MT and BL 1Sam 10,22a, see the commentaries (which generally assign the textual priority to the latter).

47. This collocation occurs only here in Josephus.

48. The above transitional notice has, as such, no equivalent in 1Sam 10,21b-22a. It might, however, be seen as Josephus' «psychological transposition» of the closing words of 10,21b, i.e. «(they sought him) but could not find (him)».

49. This designation takes the place of the proper name «Samuel» in BL 10,22a. As FELDMAN, *Samuel* 109 points out, one of the most distinctive features of Josephus' portrait of Samuel is the fact that whereas the Bible itself (1Sam 3,20) uses the term «prophet» only once in reference to him, Josephus does so no less than 45x. This feature, in turn, reflects the historian's more general tendency to introduce the terms «prophet» and «prophecy» in contexts where his Biblical source lacks such. See L.H. FELDMAN, *Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus*, in *JTS*, NS 41 (1990) 386-422, esp. pp. 389-391.

50. Note the historic present.

51. Josephus employs the above construction over 30x in *Ant.*: 1.58.186,188,199,268,303; 2.334; 3.6.310; 5.159,276,280,344,345; 6.24,42,64; 7.154,294,321,327; 8.234.255; 10.11,26,64,199; 11.229,231,234; 12.300,407; 19.341. Compare BL 10,22a ἐπηρώτησεν... ἐν Κυρίῳ. Here again (see n. 11), Josephus avoids the source's use of the divine title «Lord».

52. Like BL 10,22b Josephus has the inquiry concern «*the* (young) man»; compare MT «a man», i.e. one additional to Saul himself. See nn. 44-45.

53. Note the wordplay with various derivates of the φα(ι)ν- stem: φανερός (6.63), ἐνέφηνε (6.63); ἀφανής (6.64), ἐμφανής (6.64). *Ant.* 6.60-67 features a like wordplay with forms of the βασιλ- root: βασιλεία (*bis*: 6.60,63); βασιλεύς (6.61,66[*ter*],67); βασιλεύω (*bis*: 6.62,63); βασιλικός (6.65).

54. This is the reading of the codices MSP which Marcus follows. Niese reads κρύπτεται with ROE. FELDMAN, *Saul* 81-82 suggests that Josephus omitted the source's specification about Saul hiding «among the baggage» on the consideration that the image conveyed thereby would have appeared unbecoming of a king-designate in the eyes of Gentile readers. One might likewise suggest that the omission could also reflect the fact that there has been no previous reference to the presence of «baggage» at the *ad hoc* Mizpah assembly and so it remains unclear to what the term is referring here. See the commentaries.

latter the subject, here too, is Samuel. Josephus' rendition represents a kind of «middle way» between the two conflicting presentations: «... he sent (πέμπει)⁵⁵ to fetch him...» In 10,23aβ Saul himself «takes his stand» (BL κατέστησεν) in the midst of the people. Josephus emphasizes the continued initiative of Samuel by having him «cause Saul to stand»: «... and when he was come, set (ἵστησι)⁵⁶ him in the midst of the throng (μέσον τοῦ πλήθους, BL ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ λαοῦ).» The account of Saul's fetching is rounded off in 10,23b with mention of his conspicuous height, «he was taller than any of the people from his shoulders upward». Josephus expatiates on the king-designate's distinguished appearance: «And he overtopped them all *and in stature was indeed most kingly* (ὑψος... βασιλικώτατος).»⁵⁷

The «designation process» recounted in 10,20-24 culminates with Samuel's presentation of Saul to the people (v. 24a) and their acclamation of him (v. 24b). Josephus' rendition of Samuel's word (6.66a) spells out the implication of Saul's «uniqueness» as affirmed by his Biblical counterpart: «Then said (λέγει)⁵⁸ the prophet (προφήτης)⁵⁹: "This is he whom God has given you for king (ὑμῖν ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκε βασιλέα)⁶⁰; see how he both excels all (κρείττων... πάντων)⁶¹ and is worthy of the sovereignty (τῆς ἀρχῆς ἄξιος).»⁶² Thereafter, Josephus makes the notice of 10,24b, the people's acclamation of Saul, the transition to his account of further initiatives by Samuel (//10,25): «But after the acclamations (ἐπευφήμησε)⁶³ of the people (ὁ λαός = BL): "Long live the king (τῷ βασιλεῖ σωτηρίαν)...»⁶⁴

55. Note the historic present.

56. Note the historic present.

57. The phrase «kingly stature» is *hapax* in Josephus. On Josephus' accentuation of the physical attractiveness of Saul (and other Biblical figures) in accord with the conventions of Greco-Roman literature, see FELDMAN, *Saul* 62-63.

58. Note the historic present. BL 10,24 εἶπε(v).

59. 10,24a reads «Samuel». Josephus makes the same substitution of title for proper name in his rendition of 10,22 (BL) in 6.64, see n. 49.

60. Samuel's reference to «God's giving a king» here closely echoes the announcement which Josephus attributes to him when dismissing the earlier Ramah assembly (//1Sam 8,22) in 6.44: «I will summon you at need when I shall have learnt from God whom he gives you for your king (τοῦ θεοῦ... διδῶσιν ὑμῖν βασιλέα).» Compare 10,24aβ: «Do you see whom the Lord (BL Κύριος) has chosen?» Here again, Josephus avoids the source's use of «Lord» as a divine title.

61. Compare 10,24aγ: «there is none like him among all the people» (MT)/«among all of you» (BL). Note too the above phrase's echo of 6.65 where Saul is said to «overtop them all» (ἔξειχε ἀπάντων).

62. This declaration by «the prophet» accentuates Saul's fitness for kingship in the eyes of God.

63. In his use of this term, Josephus stands closer to MT 10,24b «all the people shouted (שררו)» then to BL which read «all the people knew (ἔγνωσαν = שררו) and said (εἶπαν B / εἶπον L)». The LXX reading «knew» is generally attributed to a confusion of the consonants *resh* and *dalet*, see, e.g., MCCARTER, *1Samuel* 191.

64. Compare BL ζήτω ὁ βασιλεύς.

3. *Sequels*

The concluding section of 1Sam 10,17-27, vv. 25-27, relates initiatives taken by Samuel, Saul, and various groups among the people subsequent to the king's presentation/acclamation (v. 24). The sequence opens in v. 25 with mention of four actions on the part of Samuel: he informs the people of «the מַלְכוּת of the kingship», writes in a book, deposits this before the Lord, and, finally, dismisses the people. Josephus' version (6.66b) modifies and expands this presentation in a whole series of respects:

«...the prophet (προφήτης)⁶⁵ having put in writing (καταγράφας)⁶⁶ for them *all that should come to pass* (τὰ μέλλοντα συμβήσεσθαι)⁶⁷, *read* (it)⁶⁸ *in the hearing of the king*⁶⁹ and then laid up (τίθησιν)⁷⁰ the book (βιβλίον = BL) *in the tabernacle of God* (ἐν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ σκηνῇ)⁷¹ *as a testimony* (μαρτύριον)⁷² *to after generations of what*

65. This is Josephus' third substitution of the title «prophet» for the source's proper name «Samuel» in 6.60-67, see nn. 49,59.

66. BL ἔγραψεν. In Josephus' rendition this «writing» is Samuel's first action whereas in 10,25 it comes after his speaking to the people.

67. Josephus not only «anticipates» Samuel's act of writing from second (so 10,25) to first place in his series of actions (see previous note); he also gives a content of his own to what it is Samuel writes, i.e. not «the מַלְכוּת (BL τὸ δίκαιωμα) of the kingship», but rather predictions of coming events. The later change accords with Josephus' conception of the (true) prophet as one who accurately predicts the future. See FELDMAN, *Prophets* 407-411. Josephus leaves aside here the specification of 10,25aβ about Samuel's writing «in a book»; he will, however, make use of that indication subsequently, see below.

68. 1Sam 10,25 does not speak of a «reading» by Samuel who, rather, first proclaims the «מַלְכוּת of the kingdom» to the people without a text, and only then sets this in writing. Josephus' introduction of a reference to «reading» holds together with his having Samuel begin by «writing» a text which he then proceeds to read.

69. Contrast 10,25α where Samuel proclaims «the מַלְכוּת of the kingdom» to «the people» generally, no mention being made of Saul in particular. Josephus' making Saul the addressee of Samuel's discourse accentuates the king's stature, this in accord with a tendency observable elsewhere in his rewriting of 1Sam 10,17-27, see, e.g., n. 62. I further suggest that, in his modifying of both the content and the addressee of «the מַלְכוּת of the kingdom» which Samuel tells the people according to 10,25α, Josephus aims to avoid the apparent duplication between this passage and 1Sam 8,10-18 (//6.40-42) where, at God's command, Samuel tells the people «the ways of the king». In light of the presentation there, one might suppose that the people were already aware of what kingship will entail and so have no need to hear it again. Accordingly, Josephus makes the newly elected Saul the addressee of Samuel's words here in 6.66. Perhaps too, Josephus found inspiration for his adaptation of 10,25α in 2Kgs 22,10/2Chron 34,18 where King Josiah has the «book» found in the Temple read to him by Shaphan.

70. Note the historic present. BL 10,25αγ ἔθηκεν.

71. Josephus uses the phrase «tabernacle of God» elsewhere in *Ant.* 4.22,64,79;5.343; 7.156, cf. *Contra Apionem* 2.12. Josephus' formulation here represents a specification of the vague indication found in 10,25αγ: «he laid it (the book) up before the Lord» (note again Josephus' avoidance of the Bible's divine title). The reference coheres as well with other (non-Biblical) references made by him to documents stored «in the temple», see: *Ant.* 3.38 («a writing deposited in the temple attests that God foretold to Moses that water would thus spring forth from the

he had foretold⁷³. That task accomplished, Samuel dismissed the multitude (ἀπολύει⁷⁴ τὴν πληθύν)⁷⁵ and betook (παραινέται)⁷⁶ himself to the city of Armatha (Ἀρμαθά), his native place (πατρίς).»⁷⁷

In 10,26 attention shifts to Saul who goes home to Gibeah, accompanied by a «God-touched» retinue. Josephus' rendering (6.67b) seems to align itself with the reading of BL 4QSam^a against MT, while also eliminating the «theological allusion» common to all the Biblical witnesses. This goes: «Saul, for his part, departed for Gabatha (Γαβαθήν)⁷⁸, whence he was sprung⁷⁹; he was

rock»); 4.303 (Moses «bequeathed his Song [see Deuteronomy 32] in a book preserved in the temple containing a prediction of future events, in accordance with which all has come and his coming to pass [see 6.66 where Samuel puts in writing “all that shall come to pass”]); 5.61 (the lengthening of day in the time of Joshua «is attested by Scriptures that are laid up in the temple»). Samuel's book would thus be one of a whole series of writings which were deposited in the tabernacle or its successor, the Temple.

72. Josephus uses this term only thrice elsewhere: *Ant.* 12.153; 16.157,161.

73. This appended indication spells out the purpose behind Samuel's depositing of the book. It picks up on Josephus' earlier specification of the book's content, i.e. «all that should come to pass». Here again (see n. 67), Josephus' conception of the «prophet» as one who delivers true predictions makes itself felt. At the same time, the designation of Samuel's book as a «witness» might be inspired by Biblical references to other such «witnesses» in the people's history, see, e.g., Deut 31,26 (Moses' book of the law is to be «witness» [LXX μαρτύριον = 6.66] against them); Jos 24,22 (*bis*; the people are to be «witnesses» against themselves). 27 (the «hearing stone» at Shechem will be a «witness» [LXX μαρτύριον] against the people).

74. Note the historic present.

75. BL ἐξαπέστειλεν... πάντα τὸν λαόν. Josephus lacks an equivalent to the (self-evident) concluding words of either MT or BL (and 4QSam^a) 10,25b. The former reads: «(Samuel sent all the people away), *each one to his home*», while the latter have: «(Samuel sent all the people away) *and each one went to his place*». On his «substitution» for this element of the source, see above in the text.

76. Note the historic present.

77. The above notice takes the place of the conclusion(s) of MT/BL 10,25b omitted by Josephus (see n. 75). It answers the question of what Samuel himself did upon the termination of the assembly. For the notice's association of Samuel with «Armatha» (= Ramah), see 1Sam 1,1 (Samuel's father Elkanah is from «Ramathaim-zpohim» [//*Ant.* 5.342 «Armatha»]), 19 (Samuel's parents-to-be return to «their house in Ramah» [//5.346 the couple returns to «their native place» (πατρίδα, see πατρίς, 6.67)]); 2,11 (Elkanah goes home to Ramah [no Josephan parallel]); 7,17 (following his judicial circuit, Samuel returns to Ramah «for his home was there [no Josephan parallel]»); 8,4 (the Israelite elders come to Samuel at Ramah [//6.35 «Armatha»]); 19,18 (David repairs to Samuel at Ramah [6.221 «Armatha»]); 25,1 (Samuel is buried in his house in Ramah [6.293 «they bury him in his native (πατρίδι) Armatha»]); 28,3 (Samuel buried in Ramah his own city [no Josephan parallel]). See also *Ant.* 6.47 (the unidentified «city» referred to in 1Sam 9,6 to which Saul and servant come and where Samuel is resident is identified as «Armatha»)

78. MT גַּבְתָּה: B Γαβαθά; L «translates» εἰς τὸν βουνόν. Josephus has previously mentioned «Gabatha» in connection with Saul in *Ant.* 6.56 (//1Sam 10,5 where MT reads «Gibeath-elohim», and BL translate εἰς τὸν βουνόν τοῦ θεοῦ) as the site of Saul's predicted encounter with a «band of prophets». Cf. also the «fulfillment notice» of 10,10 (no parallel in Josephus); here Saul does meet the prophets upon coming to «Gib'atha» (MT)/εἰς τὸν Βαμὰ (>B) βουνόν (BL).

79. 10,26a «to his house».

accompanied by many honest folk (ἀγαθοί)⁸⁰, *tendering him the homage* (τιμήν) *due to a king...*⁸¹ The sequels to Saul's designation conclude (10,27abα) with mention of a group of malcontents who openly express their contempt for the new king. Josephus introduces a variety of modifications in his version (6.67c): «... but by knaves (πονηροί)⁸² yet more⁸³, who, holding him in contempt (καταφρονοῦντες αὐτοῦ)⁸⁴, *derided* (ἐχλεύαζον) *the rest*⁸⁵ and neither offered him presents (οὔτε δῶρα προσέφερον)⁸⁶ nor took any pains or care (σπουδῆ καὶ λόγῳ)⁸⁷ to gain the favour (τὸ ἀρέσκεισθαι) of Saul.»⁸⁸

The textual witnesses diverge at the end of 1Sam 10,27. MT (and L TJ) read that Saul «held his peace» (RSV, MT וַיִּהְיֶה כַּמְּחֹרָת) before his detractors. B, on the contrary, breaks off its version of 10,27 with mention of the reprobates' failure

80. This is Josephus' moralizing equivalent for the designation υἱοὶ δυνάμεων («valiant men», RSV) of BL which it has in common with 4QSam^a (בני הַחַיִל). MT, by contrast, reads הַחַיִל («the army»). With Josephus' term compare TJ «(there went with him) part of the people, men fearing sin (חַשְׁתָּח וְיִרְאָה)».

81. This is Josephus' substitution for the qualification of Saul's retinue as those «whose hearts God (so MT; BL 4QSam^a the Lord/Yahweh) had touched». Josephus' «de-theologizing» here might have been prompted by the consideration that a divine intervention would hardly seem necessary for people to attach themselves to a popular new king. His formulation itself is worded as a contrast to what will be said about a second group around Saul who are said to have «have held him in contempt» in what follows. See below.

82. This rendition has obviously been chosen by Josephus as the contrast term to the ἀγαθοί spoken of in what precedes. MT בני בליעל; BL υἱοὶ λομποί. Again (see previous note), Josephus' wording has a counterpart in TJ which renders «men of wickedness» (גברי רשעים).

83. This indication has no counterpart in 10,27; it underscores the difficult situation facing Saul at the beginning of his kingship when the majority of his people were against him.

84. BL ἠτίμωσαν αὐτόν. Josephus' leaves aside the mocking question of the malcontents as cited in 10,27 (MT) «how can this man save us?»

85. Also this indication has no equivalent in 10,27. It underscores the aggressivity of the «knives» who not only despise the king but likewise ridicule the minority that is giving him due recognition.

86. BL οὐκ ἤνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα. Compare TJ «they did not come to ask for his peace». HARRINGTON and SALDARINI, *Targum Jonathan* 120, n. 43 comment: «Tg removes any suggestion that Saul might have been seeking gain. It may refer to the Roman custom of clients paying a daily call to their patrons.»

87. This collocation occurs only here in Josephus.

88. This appended notice has no source equivalent; it further underscores the insolence of the contemptuous majority towards Saul. As such, it throws into relief the reversal which occurs in the immediately following passage (6.68-85//1Samuel 11) where Saul's victory over Nahash so solidifies his reputation among the people that his detractors have their lives threatened by the crowd. It likewise serves to accentuate Saul's own subsequent magnimity in resisting the crowd's demand for his opponents' death (see 1Sam 11,13//Ant. 6.82). The «Samaritan Chronicle No. II» (see Macdonald, p. 123) offers the following noteworthy identification of those who reject Saul's rule according to 10,27: «Now the Phinehasites and the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, the Josephites, and those attached to them from the Levites and the rest of the tribes –those called the Congregation of Israel, the Samaritans– did not accept the rule of Saul over them.» As this formulation indicates, the Chronicle, in attributing the rejection of Saul's kingship to the Samaritans views that rejection, in contrast to the Bible itself, as something positive.

to bring Saul presents (v. 27b α). Thereafter, it commences chap. 11 with a chronological indication ($\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\mu\eta\eta\nu\alpha$) which is viewed by McCarter as the original reading, reflecting a Hebrew $\text{וַיְהִי כִּי חָדַשׁ הָיָה}$ ⁸⁹. Finally, 4QSam^a goes its own way with respect to all these witnesses. While agreeing with B in having no equivalent to MT's concluding words in 10,27, it precedes the chronological indication it shares with B at the start of chap. 11, with an extended *Sondergut* item concerning Nahash's earlier exploits.⁹⁰ Given these divergences, it is of interest to note that Josephus, in fact, stands closest to the reading of 4QSam^a. Specifically, he lacks a counterpart to MT's closing reference to Saul's stance in 10,27. At the opening of 6.68 he gives a chronological indication («however a month later...») corresponding to that of B and 4QSam^a to which he attaches an account of Nahash's doings reminiscent of what one reads in 4QSam^a. In other words, Josephus and 4QSam^a are the only extant witnesses to preserve the material concerning Nahash's previous misdeeds. At the same time, Josephus, in contrast to the Qumran MS, does present his chronological indication prior to recounting those activities of Nahash.⁹¹

4. Conclusions

By way of conclusion to this essay I shall now briefly summarize my findings on the questions with which it began. Concerning the question of Josephus' Biblical text(s) in *Ant.* 6.60-67, we saw considerable evidence that, for this segment, Josephus depends in first place, not on (proto-) MT, but rather on a text like that of BL 4QSam^a. The evidence includes the following: In line with B 10,19 Josephus (6.61) has Samuel enjoin the people to group themselves «by tribes and families», rather than by «tribes and thousands» (so MT L). He has a counterpart (6.62) to the BL plus regarding the «bringing near» of the Matrites «man by man» in 10,21. Like BL 10,22, he (6.64) makes Samuel, not the people (so MT), the one to turn to God in the face of Saul's absence and includes a definite reference to the missing Saul in the word which Samuel addresses to God (compare MT 10,22 «is there yet a man to come hither?») which lacks that reference). His qualification of Saul's supporters as «honest (literally good) folk» (6.67) seems to reflect the BL 4QSam^a reading «men of valor» in 10,26 as opposed to MT's «the army». Finally, Josephus' conclusion to the lot-

89. MCCARTER, *1Samuel* 191, 199-200. L, for its part, has a conflate text, reading an equivalent to MT at the end of 10,27, but also a chronological indication ($\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\mu\eta\eta\nu\alpha$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$) comparable to that of B at the opening of 11,1.

90. For the translation and text of this sequence, see MCCARTER, *1Samuel* 198-199.

91. For more on this agreement between Josephus and 4QSam^a, see E.C. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text and Josephus* (HSM 19), Chico, CA 1978, pp. 166-170; S. PISANO, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Plusses or Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57), Freiburg/Göttingen 1984, pp. 91-98.

tery account and opening of the following story of Saul's victory over Nahash (6.67-68) clearly aligns itself with the readings of B and, in particular, 4QSam^a against MT to whose closing notice in 10,27 about Saul's «holding his peace» he has no equivalent, see above. These indications of Josephus' (primary) dependence on a «non-MT» text of 1Sam 10,17-27 accord with the long-standing scholarly consensus regarding the historian's text for the Books of Samuel overall.⁹² At the same time, we did come upon several, admittedly minor, points of agreement between Josephus' version and MT against BL: like MT he lacks BL's specification that Samuel assembled «all» the people to Mizpah (6.60//10,17), while his reference to the people's «acclamations» stands closer to MT's mention of their «shouting» than to BL's notice on their «knowing» (6.66//10,24b, see n. 63).

My second opening question concerned the (interconnected) «rewriting techniques» applied by Josephus to the source account in 6.60-67. Of these, the most conspicuous are his *additions to/expansions of* the Biblical story. These, in turn, may be further differentiated in terms of their extent and likely purpose. Some are rather extensive: in 6.60-61 he elaborates considerably upon Samuel's speech as cited in 10,18-19, underscoring the wrongheadedness of the people's demand for a king, while in 6.63 he appends a long explanation concerning the fact of Saul's absence (10,21b) which casts the king-elect in a highly positive light. The remaining Josephan additions in 6.60-67 involve more small-scale insertions into the narrative flow of the source. Thus, e.g., he prepares for what follows (see 10,20-21) by having Samuel enjoin the people to «cast lots» (6.61 *fine*, compare 10,19b). In several instances, transitional phrases are introduced to make the story's narrative flow more smoothly, see «the Hebrews having done so...» (6.62, compare 10,20) and «that task accomplished» (6.67, compare 10,25b). A reference to the people's emotional response to Saul's absence is introduced (6.64), and the youth's «kingliness» accentuated (6.64 [Saul's «most kingly stature»], compare 10,23b β ; 6.65 [Samuel declares Saul to be «worthy of sovereignty»], compare 10,24a). Josephus likewise inserts a specification concerning the purpose of Samuel's «depositing» of the book (6.66, compare 10,25a) along with mention of his own return home following his dismissal of the assembly (6.67, compare 10,25b). Lastly, by means of various minor expansions of the Bible's presentation of the malcontents (10,27), in 6.67b he highlights both their numbers and their insolence, this with a viewing to setting up a more emphatic contrast with what follows (see n. 88).

In contrast to his handling of Biblical material elsewhere in *Ant.*, Josephus' *omissions* of source data common to all textual witnesses in 1Sam 10,17-27 are quite minor. He has no equivalent to the indication –of uncertain import– that

92. On this point, see, E.C. ULRICH, *Josephus' Biblical Text for the Books of Samuel*, in *Josephus, the Bible and History*, L.H. Feldman and G. Hata (edd.), Detroit 1989, pp. 81-96.

it was «to the Lord» that Samuel assembled the people at Mizpah (10,17, compare 6.60) or his related injunction about their presenting themselves «before the Lord» (10,19, compare 6.61). The problematic chronological indication that the people have rejected the Lord «this day» (10,19, compare 6.61) is jettisoned (see n. 17). He drops as well the «undignified» specification of 10,22 that Saul was hiding «among the baggage» (compare 6.65, see n. 54) along with the «quotation» of the malcontents' question about the king from 10,27 (compare 6.67). Josephus' one noteworthy *re-arrangement* within 6.60-67 comes in 6.66b where, in contrast to the sequence of 10,25a, he has Samuel first write his words and only then proclaim these orally.

In contrast to Josephus' limited use of omission and re-arrangement in 6.60-67, stand his numerous and varied *modifications/adaptations* of the source's wording, style and content. Terminologically, we noted his invariable avoidance/rewording of the Vorlage's many uses of the divine title «the Lord» (see, e.g., 6.66a//10,24a), as well as of its Botenformel (10,17, compare 6.60). Positively, Josephus thrice substitutes the title «the prophet» for the source's use of the proper name «Samuel» (6.64//10,22b BL; 6.66a//10,24a; 6.66b//10,25). On the stylistic level, Josephus, e.g., several times replaces Biblical direct discourse with indirect (see 6.60-61a, compare 10,18-19a⁹³; 6.64, compare 10,22a; cf. also 6.65 where the quotation of God's reply to Samuel's [thus BL 10,22] inquiry is transposed into the narrative notice «and having learnt from God where Saul was hiding»). He repeatedly (8x) introduces historic present forms and wordplays on various forms of Greek roots, i.e. φα(ι)ν- and βασιλ- (see n. 53). As elsewhere in *Ant.*, the source's ubiquitous parataxis yields to a «better Greek» hypertaxis (compare, e.g., 6.67 and 10,25b-27).

A final class of Josephus' modifications/adaptations in 6.60-67 bears on matters of content. Samuel's invocation of God's past mighty deeds against Egypt and other oppressor kingdoms (10,18) is recast in more general terms with use of the Josephan *Lieblingswort* ἐλευθερία in 6.60. The problem of Saul's absence from a procedure which seems to presuppose his presence for its functioning (see 10,21-22) is implicitly resolved by Josephus' notice, at the opening of 6.63, on Saul's «flight» once he learns that he has been selected by lot.⁹⁴ Samuel's somewhat vague question to the Deity (10,22a BL) is reformulated as a definite request (6.65). The account of Saul's «fetching» (10,23a) is modified (6.65): Samuel sends others after him, whereas in MT the people take the initiative in «running» to his hiding place and in BL Samuel himself goes in pursuit of the reluctant monarch. Similarly, Saul, on coming to the assembly, is

93. Recall, however, that at the end of his version of Samuel's speech in 6.61b (//10,19b) Josephus does have him switch to direct discourse.

94. This notice, in turn, occasions Josephus' extended «commentary» on Saul's action to which the remainder of 6.63 is devoted. Here then, one notes the interplay among Josephus' various rewriting techniques.

«set» by Samuel in its midst, instead of himself «taking his stand» there. Especially noteworthy are Josephus' multiple modifications (6.66b) of the notices of 10,25a concerning Samuel's initiatives following the acclamation of Saul. Here, the historian represents Samuel as «reading» words about «all that will come to pass» with the king as his hearer and then depositing the book containing those words «in the tabernacle of the Lord» as compared with the source notice that Samuel proclaimed (i.e. without use of a text which he will only compose subsequently) to the people «the *טוב* of the kingship» and eventually laid his book up «before the Lord». As suggested above (see nn. 69, 71), Josephus' modifications in this instance serve, e.g., to eliminate the seeming duplication of 1Sam 8,10-18 in 10,25a, just as they recall his repeated invocations elsewhere of «documents» of various sorts preserved in «the temple». A final Josephan modification of source content surfaces in 6.67b where he replaces the (otiose, see n. 81) «theological» reference of 10,26 to those accompanying Saul as having their «hearts touched by God» with a mention, designed to accentuate the contrast between them and the malcontents of 6.67c//10,27, of their «tendering him the homage due a king».

The last of my opening questions had to do with the overall «distinctiveness» of Josephus' lottery story vis-à-vis the Biblical one. On this point, I would make the following summary observations. Josephus' rendition represents a stylistically «improved» version of the original, one which likewise reflects his own linguistic preferences. Contentually, it aims to resolve difficulties posed by the source (e.g., Saul's absence from the lot-casting procedure and the duplication of 1Sam 8,10-18 in 10,25a) and to provide answers to questions that are left without such in the Bible itself (what did Samuel do once he dismissed the assembly?). Characters' psychology and motivations receive much greater attention. The «anti-monarchism» of Samuel's speech (10,18-19) is considerably accentuated (see 6.60-61) in accord with Josephus' own dislike of kingship, just as the historian's favorable interest in prophecy finds expression in his three-fold designation of Samuel with the prophet title (6.64,66 [*bis*]). The positive stature of Saul is highlighted in a variety of respects; conversely, the threat posed by the insolent malcontents gets underscored as well, the latter with a view to setting up a more dramatic contrast with what follows. On the other hand, the «de-theologizing» tendency evident in Josephus' retellings of many other Biblical episodes⁹⁵ remains muted in our pericope (see his elimination of the reference to the «God-touched hearts» of Saul's supporters of 10,26 in 6.67).

95. On the point, 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*, J. Mulder and H. Sysling (edd.) (CRINT 2,1), Assen 1988, pp. 455-518, 503-506.

The foregoing presentation has, I hope, at least conveyed a sense of the wide variety of means employed by Josephus in re-shaping a particular Biblical narrative in line with his own aims and interests. I hope as well that it might serve to stimulate comparable «close readings» of Josephus' renditions of other Scriptural episodes.

Christopher T. BEGG
Catholic University
WASHINGTON, P. C. 20064
U.S.A.

RESUM

1Sm 10,17-27 narra la «loteria reial» que va donar lloc al reconeixement públic de Saül com a primer rei d'Israel. Aquest article presenta una comparació detallada entre el relat bíblic (tal com el trobem en MT, 4Sam^a, Codex Vaticanus, el MSS Luciànic dels LXX, i en el Targum Jonatan) i la versió de Flavi Josep d'aquest esdeveniment en *Ant.* 6.60-67. Entre les qüestions específiques que es tracten hi ha: la versió (versions) de 1Sm 10,17-27 utilitzades per Flavi Josep, les tècniques de reformulació que ell aplica (afegits, omissions, reordenacions, modificacions) i les característiques distintives que resulten de la seva presentació.