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The witness of Josephus to the Greek text of Samuel/Kings has for a long time been a matter of interest to scholars. In 1895 Adam Mez concluded that Josephus had used for this section of the Bible a text which agreed in the main with the Lucanian Recension.¹

H. St. J. Thackeray, in his study of Josephus during his work on the Larger Cambridge Septuagint, came to the same conclusion. In a “Note on the Evidence of Josephus” which he published in the Samuel volume of the Cambridge edition he said:

With the books of Samuel (more strictly from IS. viii onwards), Josephus becomes a witness of first-rate importance for the text of the Greek Bible.... Throughout the later historical books... his main source is a Greek Bible containing a text closely allied to that of the “Lucanian” group of MSS., but anterior by more than two centuries to the date of Lucian, and preserving in I Sam. occasional parallels with the text of Symmachus (IS. xiii, 20, xv. 23, 30, xvi. 21, xvii. 39, 53, xxxi. 4).²

Two years later in the Hilda Stich Strook Lectures Thackeray further explained the nature of Josephus’ Biblical text.³ According to him Josephus used as his main authority for the Pentateuch a Semitic text with little dependence on the Septuagint. From Samuel to the end of the historical books he found the reverse to be true. There it appeared that Josephus relied heavily on a Lucanian text of the Greek Bible preserved in the late minuscules boc₂e₂ while

he employed his Semitic text only as a subsidiary source. "The Josephan Biblical text", Thackeray said, "is uniformly (emphasis Thackeray's) of this Lucanian type from I Samuel to I Maccabees. He has, for this large portion of Scripture, used a single Bible, not two or more."

Since Thackeray's time most scholars have relied on this judgment. In fact Josephus' witness to the Lucanian Bible has come to play a rather significant role in current recensional criticism of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. Frank Cross, in particular, uses the witness of Josephus to help isolate his so-called "proto-Lucanian" recension and to date it to an early time. In his latest discussion he refers to a dissertation which apparently tries to demonstrate that Josephus uses this recension. Cross says the dissertation "shows clearly, I believe, that there is no reason to suppose that Josephus made use of a Hebrew text. Rather, he simply used a Greek text of Samuel of proto-Lucanian type (emphasis mine — GH)."

One who has taken exception to the idea of the Lucanian character of the Josephan text is D. Barthélemy. In 1963 he attempted to demonstrate that there are basically two textual traditions preserved in the extant manuscripts of Samuel and Kings. According to him minuscules boc₂e₂ represent not a "Lucanian Recension" but the Old Septuagint in a relatively pure form while

---

4 Ibid., 85.


8 In his recent publication, "A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam. 11:2", 1 KI. 2:11 in the Light of Certain Criticisms of *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 1972 *Proceedings IOSCS Pseudepigrapha*, R. A. Kraft, ed. (SCS 2; Society of Biblical Literature 1972), 16–89, Barthélemy continues to reject the notion of a "Lucanian Recension", although he now concedes that the text preserved in boc₂e₂ is more corrupt than he thought at first. As he says, "I acknowledge that I was wrong in making pronouncements on the 'Lucanian recension', given that my study of the Antiochian text dealt only with the βγ section of Reigns. In this section I had not found any evident indication of a hebraising recension in the Antiochian text. But examination of other parts of the Bible would have proved the existence of what seems to be a hebraising recension, characteristic of the Antiochian text" (65). In view of this concession it is surprising to see him so vehemently reject my demonstration that his Ant text is often closer to MT than his Pal; see my "Frank Cross and Recensional Criticism", *VT* 21 (1971), 443–448, and compare Barthélemy's reactions in *Proceedings*, 31–55. One of Barthélemy's reasons for rejecting my evidence is his unhappy misunderstanding of my English when I say "we offer here a number of typical cases... where Ant is closer to MT than Pal"; *VT* 21 (1971), 446. Barthélemy takes me to mean "we offer here a number of typical Antio-
Codex B and the majority of other witnesses in the βγ (2 Sam. 11:2–1 Ki. 2:11) and the γδ (1 Ki. 22:1–2 Ki. 25:30) sections of Reigns represent a revision of it, known in his terminology as the kaige recension, made in order to bring the Greek text into harmony with an early form of MT. Barthélemy believes that Josephus corresponds closely to the text of boce₂e₂ not because he used a Lucianic text but because he used the Old Septuagint which is basically preserved in these late minuscules.⁹

Without discussing in detail the accuracy of Cross and Barthélemy at this time it is sufficient to say that the biblical text reflected in Josephus is by no means confined to the so-called “Lucianic” type. The present study will show that Josephus relies on at least two text types, those preserved in boce₂e₂ and in Kaige. Just why modern scholarship has failed to observe this is unclear, especially in view of the amount of attention given to the Kaige text in recent years. As for Thackeray, even though his work was done before the recent developments in recensional criticism, he had himself clearly noted the differences in style between the majority of mss in the βγ and γδ sections of Reigns and their style elsewhere. He had concluded that more than one translator had worked on this part of the Greek Bible.¹⁰ Occasionally when Josephus varies from boce₂e₂ in favor of MT he suggested that Josephus had used a Semitic source. Thackeray showed little interest in the Semitic source, however, apparently because it often agreed with MT. He rarely noted in the Cambridge

⁹ chian readings” for he proceeds to eliminate several of my examples as not being typically Antiochian. I of course used the word “typical” only because the examples were so numerous. In no way did I imply that they were typically Antiochian in nature. Again Barthélemy rejects my evidence because some of my examples of the Ant text were supported by more witnesses than boce₂e₂. What he did not realize was that I was simply following his example which he set forth in DΑ. Thus his Ant text for τῶν ἐκ τῆς συνέλευσις in 2 Sam. 15:6 is supported not only by boce₂e₂ but also by MNagjnuvβ₂. His Ant reading of φύλασσαν τὸν άθικον αβραό in 2 Sam. 16:21 is supported by every ms noted in the Cambridge apparatus except B. Again in 2 Sam. 18:32 his Pal text for σι is unsupported by a great host of witnesses including the important mss a₂ and γ, i.e., ANa-fhjmnpt-twxyz(t)x₁a₂b₂. In general his analysis of my demonstration reflects a misunderstanding of the issue and will receive full and formal attention in another publication.

apparatus or in the Loeb edition of Josephus\footnote{H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus, *Josephus* (Loeb; Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1934), V.} those readings of Josephus which vary from the Lucianic minuscules $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$.

In order to demonstrate the two sources of Josephus’ paraphrase of the narrative recorded in Samuel/Kings we will begin with a list of readings where his text agrees with $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ against Kaige. We will then give readings where his text agrees with Kaige against $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$. For the sake of brevity we will use “Luc” for $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ (or their majority) and “Jos” for Josephus *Antiquities*.

A. JOS = LUC

1. Jos Luc $\neq$ MT $\neq$ Kaige

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{2 Sam. 12:6}
\begin{tabular}{l}
MT יָֽשִׁיבּ
Luc τετραπλασίουνα
Jos vii 150 τετραπλήν
Kaige ἐπταπλασίουνα
\end{tabular}

\item \textit{2 Sam. 12:30}
\begin{tabular}{l}
MT בְּמִלָּה
Luc τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν
Jos vii 161 τοῦ βασιλέως
Kaige μελχόλ τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν
\end{tabular}

\item \textit{2 Ki. 12:1(2)}
\begin{tabular}{l}
MT יְבֵן
Luc σαβία [σαβηα]
Jos ix 157 Σαβία
Kaige 'Αβιά
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

2. Jos Luc $\neq$ Kaige MT

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{2 Sam. 23:8}
\begin{tabular}{l}
MT רַחָא מַמִּנָּה
Kaige ὁκ τακοσίους
Luc ἐννακοσίους
Jos vii 308 ἐννακοσίους
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}
2 Sam. 24:9
MT ἑκατόν μείζονα ἐκκαθαιρεῖται...οὐκ εἰς τό τεράτων ταῖς δύναμεσιν
Kaige δικτύος δια μισθούς...πεντάκοσία πεντάκοσίας
Luc ἑπτακόσια πεντάκοσία...τετρακόσια τετρακόσιας
Jos vii 320 ἐπενήκοντα μυριάδες...τεσσαράκοντα μυριάδες

1 Ki. 1:20
MT ליהב ים
Kaige παντὸς Ἰσραήλ
Luc παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ
Jos vii 350 πάντα τὸν λαὸν

1 Ki. 1:25
MT חָסֵר יָדָו
Kaige τοὺς ἁρχοντας τῆς δυνάμεως
Luc τὸν ἀρχιστράτηγον Ἰωάβ
Jos vii 352 τὸν στρατηγὸν Ἰωάβον

3. Jos Luc / MT / Kaige
2 Sam. 12:3
MT לָבָן
Kaige ἑδρύνθη
Luc συνετράφη
Jos vii 149 ἀνέτρεψε

2 Sam. 12:19
MT בַעַר
Kaige ἐνόησεν
Luc ἠσθένεο
Jos vii 156 αἰσθόμενος

2 Sam. 13:19
MT πρύθω
Kaige κράζουσα
Luc βοῶσα
Jos vii 171 βοῶσα

2 Sam. 15:16
MT בְּנוֹי
Kaige ἀφῆκεν
Luc κατέλιπεν
Jos vii 199 καταλιπών

2 Sam. 18:9
MT הַנַּטֵת
Kaige δρυός
Luc δένδρου
Jos vii 239 δένδρῳ

2 Sam. 18:9
MT רַע
Kaige ἐκκρεμάσθη
Luc ἀνεκκρεμάσθη
Jos vii 239 ἀνεκκρεμνάται

2 Sam. 20:12
MT הַלְּשׁוֹנָה
Kaige τρίβου
Luc δήφ
Jos vii 287 δήφ

2 Sam. 20:13
MT שִׁבָּלָה
Kaige πᾶς ἀνήρ Ἰσραήλ
Luc πᾶς ὁ λαὸς
Jos vii 287 πᾶς ὁ λαὸς

B. JOS = KAIGE

We have seen that Jos often agrees with Luc against Kaige. Now we will see that in much the same way Jos often agrees with Kaige against Luc. In the matter of synonymous words this is very clear since this textual element is little effected by his paraphrastic style of writing. Thus in 2 Sam. 11:2 Luc reads καλὴ τῇ ἰδίᾳ, Kaige καλὴ τῇ εἰδέ, Jos vii 130 καλλίστην τῷ εἰδώς. In 2 Sam. 12:7 Luc reads ἐξειλάμην, Kaige ἐρυθάμην, Jos vii 151 ἐρυθαμένον. In 2 Sam. 16:5 Luc reads πατρίας, Kaige συγγενείας, Jos vii 207 συγγενής. In 2 Sam. 19:38 Luc reads τὸ ἄρεστὸν, Kaige τὸ ἄγαθόν, Jos vii 274 τὸν ἄγαθὸν. In 2 Sam. 21:7 Luc reads περιποιήσατο, Kaige ἔφεσάτο, Jos vii 296 ἐφεσάμενος. In 2 Sam. 24:22 Luc reads μόσχοι, Kaige βόες, Jos vii 331 βόας. In 2 Ki. 6:9 Luc reads πρόσεχε, Kaige φύλαξαι, Jos ix 51 φυλάττεσθαι.
At times Jos agrees with Kaige in reading a different compound form of the verb than Luc, or reading a compound form against Luc's simple, or a simple form against Luc's compound. Thus in 2 Ki. 8:12 Luc reads διαρρήξεις, Kaige ἀναρρήξεις, Jos ix 91 ἀναρρήξεις. In 2 Sam. 20:9 Luc reads φιλήσαι, Kaige καταφιλήσαι, Jos vii 284 καταφιλήσαιον. In 2 Sam. 20:13 Luc reads καταδίκασαι, Kaige τού διώξαι, Jos vii 288 διώξαντι.

Quite often Jos agrees with Kaige in reading an aorist tense when Luc reads a present tense. In 2 Sam. 11:14 Luc reads γράφει, Kaige ἐγραψεν, Jos vii 135 ἐγγαψε. In 2 Sam. 11:9 Luc reads κοιμαται, Kaige ἐκοιμήθη, Jos vii 132 παρεκοιμήθη. In 2 Sam. 13:28 Luc reads φοβεῖσθε, Kaige φοβηθῆτε, Jos vii 175 φοβηθέντες. In 2 Ki. 4:7 Luc reads παραγίνεται, Kaige ἠλθεν, Jos ix 49 ἐλθοῦσαν.12

At times other tenses are involved in Josephus’ agreement with Kaige against Luc. Thus in 2 Sam. 13:22 Luc reads ἐμίσησεν, Kaige ἐμίσει, Jos vii 173 ἐμίσετο. In 2 Sam. 18:21 Luc reads ἔφοβας, Kaige εἰδες, Jos vii 246 εἶδε. In 2 Sam. 19:20 Luc reads παραγέγονα, Kaige ἠλθον, Jos vii 264 ἐλθεν. In 1 Ki. 1:26 Luc reads κάκληκε, Kaige ἐκάλεσεν, Jos vii 352 ἐκάλεσε.

Sometimes Jos clearly aligns himself with the Kaige/MT chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah. One significant instance is 2 Ki. 3:7. There Luc reads καὶ ἀπέσταλεν Ιωρίμ πρὸς Ὀχοζίαν, Kaige καὶ ἐξαπέσταλεν πρὸς Ἰωσαφάθ, Jos ix 30 ἔσεμεν πρὸς Ἰωσάφατον, MT יְשֵׁי בִּישׁוֹרֵד.13

Perhaps the most significant parallels between Jos and Kaige occur when their text base represents a Vorlage which differs from that of the Lucianic witnesses irrespective of whether Jos and Kaige or Luc concur with MT.

1. Jos Kaige ≠ Luc MT
2 Sam. 12:4
MT יָשִׁירֵי שֵׁי בִּישׁוֹרֵד
Luc τοῦ ἀνδρός τοῦ πένητος
Kaige τοῦ πένητος
Jos vii 149 τοῦ πένητος

12 It is argued that one of the characteristics of Kaige is to replace the historical present in the Old Greek with the aorist tense; see Barthélemy, DA, 63–65; J. D. Shenko, Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1968), 51–53. Without the cowitness of Josephus, however, one cannot know for sure whether the historical present represents a text earlier or later than Josephus.

13 For a discussion of the differences between the so-called Old Greek and proto-Lucian on the one hand and the Kaige/MT chronologies on the other see Shenko, Chronology, 68–86.
2 Ki. 6:9

2 Ki. 10:1

3. Jos Kaige = MT ≠ Luc

2 Sam. 13:11

2 Sam. 14:26

2 Sam. 15:14

2 Sam. 16:22

2 Sam. 17:16

MT ἔδω
Kaige τῷ Δαυίδ
Jos vii 222 Δαυίδη
Luc τῷ βασιλεί

2 Sam. 18:28
MT יָשָׁר יִשָּׁר
Kaige προσεκύνησεν τῷ βασιλεί
Jos vii 250 προσκυνεῖ τὸν βασιλέα
Luc προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ

2 Sam. 20:1
MT יֹבָכֶה
Kaige βοχορεί
Jos vii 278 βοχορίου (Lat. Beddadi)
Luc βεθδαδί

2 Sam. 20:1
MT בָּל
Kaige ἡμῖν
Jos vii 278 ἡμῶν
Luc μοι

1 Ki. 1:10
MT וְאָבֵנָה
Kaige τόν Ναθάν τόν προφήτην
Jos vii 347 Νάθαν τὸν προφήτην
Luc τὸν Ναθάν

1 Ki. 1:19
MT מִרְכָּל ...עַל יָשָׁר
Kaige καὶ τὸν Σαλωμῶν ... σύκ ἐκάλεσεν
Jos vii 350 χωρὶς Σολωμώνος
Luc omit

2 Ki. 1:9
MT חַלּוֹ הָלֶשֶׁר
Kaige καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτόν
Jos ix 22 πέμψας πρὸς αὐτόν
Luc καὶ ἀποστέλλει Ὀχοζίας πρὸς Ἡλίαν
2 Κι. 3:9
MT יִשְׁמַעְתָּנ שֵׁבְשֶׁת יָמִים
Kaige καὶ ἐκύκλωσαν δόδον ἡπτὰ ἡμερῶν
Jos ix 32 καὶ κυκλεύσαντες ἡπτὰ ἡμερῶν δόδον
Luc καὶ ἐπορεύοντο κύκλουντες δόδον ἡπτὰ ἡμερῶν

2 Κι. 10:24
MT שָׁמוּט שָׁבֵן אֵשׁ
Kaige ἔξω ὁγδοθ'κοντα ἄνδρας
Jos ix 137 ἔξωθεν ὁγδοθ'κοντα τὸν ἄριστον ἄνδρας
Luc τρισχίλιους ἄνδρας ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ