

KAIGE READINGS IN JOSEPHUS

GEORGE HOWARD

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 Lucianic 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 "Lucianic" 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 Lucianic text of the Greek Bible preserved in the late minuscules boc_2e_2 while

- 1 *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie* (Basel 1895).
- 2 A. E. Brooke, N. McLean, H. St. J. Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek; The Later Historical Books Part I, I and II Samuel* (Cambridge: University Press 1927), ix. Alfred Rahlfs reached another conclusion concerning the relationship of Josephus to the Lucianic Recension. After sharply criticising Lagarde's edition of Lucian he concluded that the agreements between Lucian and Josephus were minimal. *Septuaginta-Studien 3: Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher* (Göttingen 1911). In my judgment Paul Kahle has sufficiently disclosed the fallacies of Rahlfs' reasoning. *The Cairo Geniza* (2 ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1959), 231-233.
- 3 H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (New York: Ktav Pub. House, Reprint 1967).

he employed his Semitic text only as a subsidiary source. "The Josephan Biblical text", Thackeray said, "is *uniformly* (emphasis Thackeray's) of this Lucianic type from I Samuel to I Maccabees. He has, for this large portion of Scripture, used a single Bible, not two or more."⁴

Since Thackeray's time most scholars have relied on this judgment. In fact Josephus' witness to the Lucianic 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-Lucianic" recension and to date it to an early time.⁵ 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-Lucianic type* (emphasis mine — GH)."⁶

One who has taken exception to the idea of the Lucianic 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.⁷ According to him minuscules boc₂e₂ represent not a "Lucianic Recension" but the Old Septuagint in a relatively pure form⁸ while

4 *Ibid.*, 85.

5 "The History of the Biblical Text in Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert", *HTR*, 57 (1964), 295; "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text", *IEJ*, 16 (1966), 84.

6 "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts", 1972 *Proceedings IOSCS Pseudepigrapha*, R. A. Kraft, ed. (SCS 2; Society of Biblical Literature 1972), 123 n. 17.

7 *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (Leiden: E. J. Brill 1963).

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 "Lucianic 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 'Lucianic 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 boc_2e_2 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 boc_2e_2 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 boc_2e_2 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

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 boc_2e_2 . What he did not realize was that I was simply following his example which he set forth in *DA*. Thus his Ant text for τὰς καρδίας in 2 Sam. 15:6 is supported not only by boc_2e_2 but also by MNagijnub₂. His Ant reading of φυλάσσειν τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ 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 εἰ is unsupported by a great host of witnesses including the important mss a₂ and y, i.e., ANa-fhjmnnp-twxyz(txt)a₂b₂. In general his analysis of my demonstration reflects a misunderstanding of the issue and will receive full and formal attention in another publication.

⁹ *DA*, 139–140.

¹⁰ “The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings”, *JTS* 8 (1906), 262–278. For a view halfway between Thackeray and Barthélemy see T. Muraoka, “The Greek Texts of Samuel–Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity”, 1972 *Proceedings IOSCS Pseudepigrapha*, R. A. Kraft, ed. (SCS 2; Society of Biblical Literature 1972), 90–107.

apparatus or in the Loeb edition of Josephus¹¹ those readings of Josephus which vary from the Lucianic minuscules boc_2e_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 boc_2e_2 against Kaige. We will then give readings where his text agrees with Kaige against boc_2e_2 . For the sake of brevity we will use "Luc" for boc_2e_2 (or their majority) and "Jos" for Josephus *Antiquities*.

A. JOS = LUC

1. Jos Luc = MT \neq Kaige

2 Sam. 12:6

MT ארבעתים

Luc τετραπλασίονα

Jos vii 150 τετραπλήν

Kaige ἑπταπλασίονα

2 Sam. 12:30

MT מלכם

Luc τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν

Jos vii 161 τοῦ βασιλέως

Kaige μελχὸλ τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν

2 Ki. 12:1(2)

MT צביה

Luc σαβία [σαβήα]

Jos ix 157 Σαβία

Kaige Ἀβιά

2. Jos Luc \neq Kaige MT

2 Sam. 23:8

MT שמנה מאות

Kaige ὄκ τακοσίους

Luc ἑνακοσίους

Jos vii 308 ἑνακοσίους

11 H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus, *Josephus* (Loeb; Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1934), V.

2 Sam. 24:9

MT **שמנה מאות אלף ... שמה מאות אלף**

Kaige **ὄκτακόσιοι χιλιάδες ... πεντακόσιοι χιλιάδες**

Luc **ἐννακόσιοι χιλιάδες ... τετρακόσιοι χιλιάδες**

Jos vii 320 **ἐνενήκοντα μυριάδες ... τεσσαράκοντα μυριάδες**

1 Ki. 1:20

MT **כל-ישראל**

Kaige **παντὸς Ἰσραήλ**

Luc **παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ**

Jos vii 350 **πάντα τὸν λαόν**

1 Ki. 1:25

MT **שרי הצבא**

Kaige **τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῆς δυνάμεως**

Luc **τὸν ἀρχιστράτηγον Ἰωάβ**

Jos vii 352 **τὸν στρατηγὸν Ἰωάβον**

3. Jos Luc / MT / Kaige

2 Sam. 12:3

MT **ותגדל**

Kaige **ἠδρύνθη**

Luc **συνετράφη**

Jos vii 149 **ἀνέτρεφε**

2 Sam. 12:19

MT **ויבן**

Kaige **ἐνόησεν**

Luc **ἤσθετο**

Jos vii 156 **αἰσθόμενος**

2 Sam. 13:19

MT **והקא**

Kaige **κράζουσα**

Luc **βοῶσα**

Jos vii 171 **βοῶσα**

2 Sam. 15:16

MT **ויעזב**

Kaige **ἀφήκεν**

Luc κατέλιπεν
Jos vii 199 καταλιπών

2 Sam. 18:9
MT הָלַק
Kaige δρυός
Luc δένδρου
Jos vii 239 δένδρω

2 Sam. 18:9
MT הָתַי
Kaige ἐκρεμάσθη
Luc ἀνεκρεμάσθη
Jos vii 239 ἀνακρεμνᾶται

2 Sam. 20:12
MT הָלַסַּח
Kaige τρίβου
Luc ὁδῶ
Jos vii 287 ὁδοῦ

2 Sam. 20:13
MT כִּי-אֵלֶּיךָ
Kaige πᾶς ἀνὴρ Ἰσραήλ
Luc πᾶς ὁ λαός
Jos vii 287 πᾶς ὁ λαός

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 καλή τῆ ὄψει, Kaige καλή τῷ εἶδει, Jos vii 130 καλλίστην τὸ εἶδος. In 2 Sam. 12:7 Luc reads ἐξειλάμην, Kaige ἐρυσάμην, Jos vii 151 ῥυσαμένον. In 2 Sam. 16:5 Luc reads πατρίας, Kaige συγγενείας, Jos vii 207 συγγενής. In 2 Sam. 19:38 Luc reads τὸ ἀρεστόν, Kaige τὸ ἀγαθόν, Jos vii 274 τῶν ἀγαθῶν. In 2 Sam. 21:7 Luc reads περιεποιήσατο, Kaige ἐφείσατο, Jos vii 296 φεισάμενος. 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 καταφιλήσων. In 2 Sam. 20:13 Luc reads καταδιώκειν, Kaige τοῦ διώξει, 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 ἔγραψεν, Jos vii 135 ἔγγαψε. In 2 Sam. 11:9 Luc reads κοίμαται, 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 ἦλθεν, Jos ix 49 ἔλθοῦσα.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 ἐμίσει. In 2 Sam. 18:21 Luc reads ἑώρακας, Kaige εἶδες, Jos vii 246 εἶδε. In 2 Sam. 19:20 Luc reads παραγένονα, Kaige ἦλθον, Jos vii 264 ἔλθειν. In 1 Ki. 1:26 Luc reads κέκληκε, 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 ἀπέστειλεν Ἰωρὰμ πρὸς Ὀχοζίαν, Kaige καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν πρὸς Ἰωσαφάθ, Jos ix 30 ἔπεμψε πρὸς Ἰωσαφατον, MT **בשמיטה-לא הלשי**.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 **שאר השנה**

Luc τοῦ ἀνδρὸς 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. Shenkel, *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 Shenkel, *Chronology*, 68–86.

2 *Ki.* 6:9

MT **וישלח איש אל**

Luc και ἀπέστειλεν ὁ ἀνὸς τοῦ θῦ

Kaige και ἀπέστειλεν Ἐλισταίε

Jos ix 51 Ἐλισσαῖος δὲ... ἐξαπέστειλε

2. Jos Kaige ≠ Luc ≠ MT

2 *Ki.* 10:1

MT **ואיש יהודה**

Kaige πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας Σαμαρείας

Jos ix 125 τοῖς ἄρχουσι τῶν Σαμαρέων

Luc πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς τῆς πόλεως

3. Jos Kaige = MT ≠ Luc

2 *Sam.* 13:11

MT **ויקח**

Kaige και ἐπελάβετο αὐτῆς

Jos vii 168 λαβόμενος αὐτῆς

Luc και ἐκράτησεν αὐτὴν Ἀμνών

2 *Sam.* 14:26

MT **מאמשי**

Kaige διακοσίους σίκλους

Jos vii 189 σίκλους διακοσίους

Luc ἑκατὸν σίκλων

2 *Sam.* 15:14

MT **ונברח**

Kaige φύγωμεν

Jos vii 198 φεύγειν

Luc ἐξέλθωμεν

2 *Sam.* 16:22

MT **אל-פלגשי**

Kaige πρὸς τὰς παλλακάς

Jos vii 214 ταῖς ... παλλακαῖς

Luc πρὸς πάσας τὰς παλλακάς

2 *Sam.* 17:16

MT **לדל**

Kaige τῷ Δαυεῖδ
 Jos vii 222 Δαυίδη
 Luc τῷ βασιλεῖ

2 Sam. 18:28

MT **ךלמל יקחשי**
 Kaige προσεκύνησεν τῷ βασιλεῖ
 Jos vii 250 προσκυνεῖ τὸν βασιλέα
 Luc προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ

2 Sam. 20:1

MT **בכרי**
 Kaige βοχορεί
 Jos vii 278 βοχορίου (Lat. *Beddadi*)
 Luc βεδδαδί

2 Sam. 20:1

MT **לנ**
 Kaige ἡμῖν
 Jos vii 278 ἡμῶν
 Luc μοῖ

1 Ki. 1:10

MT **אנבניא תגנ-תא**
 Kaige τὸν Ναθάν τὸν προφήτην
 Jos vii 347 Νάθαν τὸν προφήτην
 Luc τὸν Ναθάν

1 Ki. 1:19

MT **א לא ...הלמל**
 Kaige καὶ τὸν Σαλωμών ... οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν
 Jos vii 350 χωρὶς Σολομώνος
 Luc omit

2 Ki. 1:9

MT **אלין הלשי**
 Kaige καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτόν
 Jos ix 22 πέμψας πρὸς αὐτόν
 Luc καὶ ἀποστέλλει Ὁχοζίας πρὸς Ἡλίαν

2 Ki. 3:9

MT ויסבו דרך שבעת ימים

Kaige και ἐκύκλωσαν ὁδὸν ἑπτὰ ἡμερῶν

Jos ix 32 και κυκλεύσαντες ἑπτὰ ἡμερῶν ὁδόν

Luc και ἐπορεύοντο κύκλουντες ὁδὸν ἑπτὰ ἡμερῶν

2 Ki. 10:24

MT בחק שמונים איש

Kaige ἔξω ὀγδοήκοντα ἄνδρας

Jos ix 137 ἔξωθεν ὀγδοήκοντα τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἄνδρας

Luc τρισχίλιους ἄνδρας ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ