

## CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

### THE METHODOLOGY OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM IN JEWISH GREEK SCRIPTURES, WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE PROBLEMS IN SAMUEL–KINGS—THE STATE OF THE QUESTION<sup>1</sup>

Samuel–Kings have always drawn the special attention of scholars interested in textual problems. In few books does the 'LXX' reflect so many interesting Hebrew readings, very often superior to MT, as in 1–2 Samuel, and in addition 1–4 Reigns offer the student of the LXX a wealth of inner-Greek problems.

Interest in 1–4 Reigns increased when the find of 8HevXIIgr drew Barthélemy's attention to the different hands discovered by Thackeray in 1–4 Reigns, and when Hebrew manuscripts of Samuel from Qumran provided Cross with new insights into textual problems of both the Hebrew and Greek Bible.

The publication of Barthélemy, *Dévaciers* (1963) and Cross, "Biblical Text" (1964) inaugurated a new period of understanding of the problems of the Greek 1–4 Reigns, and of the whole Greek Bible. Both studies have provided us with a wealth of new data as well as with stimulating new theories.

Beyond the problems discussed with regard to all the books of the LXX, the four books of Reigns have raised several major issues, mainly in the field of recensional activity.

1. The distinction between different translation units in 1–4 Reigns and a description of their character.
2. The relationship between the *kaige*-Th sections in Reigns and other witnesses of the *kaige*-Th group.
3. The characteristic features of the *kaige*-Th revision.
4. The relationship between Aquila, Symmachus, and *kaige*-Th.
5. The analysis of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , the Old Greek, Lucian, and proto-Lucian.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at a symposium at the SBL congress in Los Angeles in 1971 on "The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attention to the Problems in Samuel–Kings."

6. The relationship between the Greek and Hebrew texts in 1–4 Reigns.

7. The synoptic problem of the Greek texts of 1–4 Reigns and 1–2 Paralipomena.

8. The nature of the sixth column of the Hexapla in 1–4 Reigns.

9. Text and midrash in the third book of Reigns.

### 1. *The unity of 1–4 Reigns*

After Thackeray had discovered that different translators were involved in the translation of the prophetic books,<sup>2</sup> his attention was drawn to 1–4 Reigns where he uncovered a similar pattern.<sup>3</sup> In both cases Thackeray pointed to manifold Hebrew words, roots and expressions which are represented differently in two or three sections of the same book, indicating, according to Thackeray, that different translators had rendered these sections. In 1–4 Reigns, Thackeray distinguished five such sections, of which the third ( $\beta\gamma$ ) and the fifth ( $\gamma\delta$ ) were rendered by one translator. Contemporary scholarship is still much indebted to Thackeray's pioneering studies, at first formulated in the separate articles mentioned in notes 2–3, and later in a monograph.<sup>4</sup>

Thackeray's examples of differences in translation equivalents between the various sections are, as a rule, correct. His description is also valuable as it contains many insights, such as his conclusion that the translator of  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$  was a faithful translator, close to Theodotion—Barthélemy went one step further, suggesting that the two are, in fact, identical.

In his study of 1–4 Reigns, Thackeray noticed important differences in translation technique between the individual sections of 1–4 Reigns. He did not pay attention to important agreements between the different sections, i.e. translation options that are characteristic of the four books of Reigns.<sup>5</sup> One should be able to uncover such agreements between the OG sections of Reigns and the OG substratum of the *kaige*-Th sections when the text has remained untouched by the *kaige*-Th reviser. Since Thackeray did not define any idiosyncratic agreements between the individual sections of 1–4 Reigns, he did not suggest that the relationship

<sup>2</sup> "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah," *JTS* 4 (1902/3) 245–266; "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," *ibid.*, 398–411; "The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books," *ibid.*, 578–585. See also "The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuaginta Manuscripts," *JTS* 9 (1907–8) 88–98.

<sup>3</sup> "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1906–1907) 262–278.

<sup>4</sup> *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures 1920; London 1923).

<sup>5</sup> In Jeremiah, on the other hand, Thackeray noticed some agreements between the two sections of that book, cf. *JTS* 4 (1902/1903) 253–254.

between the different sections is one of translations and revision. Barthélemy, however, did suggest such a view, and it therefore appears that his study ought to have investigated the problem of the agreements in order to establish a relationship of 'source' - 'revision.'

By approaching the problem from a completely different angle, Barthélemy provided a partial answer to the above-mentioned problem. By suggesting that *kaige*-Th revised the tradition embodied in *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* and that the latter tradition is the OG, Barthélemy established the 'source' - 'revision' relationship in a different manner. The same applies to my own suggestion (Tov, "Lucian"\*) that *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* do not incorporate the OG in a pure form, but that their substratum contains the OG upon which Lucian's revisions were superimposed.

Most scholars agree that 1–4 Reigns do not form a unity and that the extant manuscripts are composed of juxtaposed sections of the OG and *kaige*-Th. In view of the mentioned complications it is not impossible that Thackeray's views are still supported by some scholars (see T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts of Samuel–Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity?" presented together with the present paper [see n. 1]).

The attention of scholars has been directed to the question of why our manuscripts display a mixed text, at times original and at times revised. Thus, why does section  $\beta\gamma$  start in the middle of a book (at 2 Sam 11:2 according to Thackeray and Barthélemy) and end at 1 Kgs 2:11, and why does section  $\gamma\delta$  start at 1 Kings 22 and not at 2 Kings 1?

As for the *incipit* of section  $\beta\gamma$ , Thackeray, "Kings," 263, asserted that it had been purposely omitted by the first translator because of its contents ('the story of David's sin and the subsequent disasters of his reign') and filled in by a later translator. Barthélemy, *Dévançiers*, 141, similarly suggested that *kaige*-Th retouched only this section because of his interest in its contents. Shenkel, *Chronology*, on the other hand, started section  $\beta\gamma$  at 2 Sam 10:1, and not at 11:2, on the basis of textual evidence rather than the contents of the chapters, admitting that 'the reason for beginning the KR at 10:1 is not yet apparent' (*ibid.*, 118).

Similarly, no plausible solution has been suggested for the *incipit* of section  $\gamma\delta$ . Thackeray again ascribed the change of text type to theological factors, while Barthélemy, *Dévançiers*, 42, followed by Shenkel, *Chronology*, 63, suggested that section  $\gamma\delta$  started at 1 Kings 22 because the LXX inverted the order of the preceding two chapters.

Since previous theories could not explain adequately the alternation of unrevised and revised sections in the manuscripts of the LXX, it may be suggested that the phenomenon originated for purely mechanical

reasons. The OG translation of Jewish Scriptures required several scrolls, and large books like Samuel–Kings were usually not written in a single scroll (see the Qumran evidence). Supposedly the archetype of the extant manuscripts of 1–4 Reigns was composed of scrolls consisting of different text types,<sup>6</sup> probably because the compiler of this archetype was unable to obtain scrolls of the same type, or was unaware of their mixture. Various parallels and arguments may be adduced in support of this suggestion (see Tov, *Jeremiah and Baruch*, 162).

## 2. *The relationship between the kaige-Th sections in Reigns and other witnesses of kaige-Th*

Barthélemy, *Dévanciers*, 47, lists the various members of the *kaige-Th* group. The list is very impressive indeed, including, among other things, the various attestations of Theodotion, 8HevXIIgr, the third and fifth sections of the 'LXX' of Reigns, and the so-called *Quinta* column of the Hexapla. The group should probably be called *kaige-Th* rather than simply *kaige* because in antiquity Theodotion's name was attached to this anonymous revision.

Monographs have been devoted to the different members of this group. Barthélemy, *Dévanciers*, 89 ff., offered a start in providing a detailed study of the  $\beta\gamma$  sections of Reigns. Subsequently Shenkel, *Chronology* described the Greek text of 1–2 Kings and O'Connell, *Exodus*, investigated Theodotion's revision of Exodus. Among other things, Shenkel supported Barthélemy's suggestion that the  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$  sections are part of the *kaige-Th* revision. A similar conclusion was reached by O'Connell with regard to the Theodotonic version of Exodus chosen because of the relatively large number of attested readings of Theodotion. W. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges—Recensional Developments* (HSM 23; Chico, CA, 1980) established that the B text of Judges is a member of the *kaige-Th* group. These monographs added a wealth of new data and views. Shenkel, for example, described *in extenso* the chronological system of MT reflected in Greek in *kaige-Th*, as opposed to the Greek system of chronology, embodied in the OG translation and in the  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  text in the  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$  sections.

The various attestations of *kaige-Th* are presently dispersed, but Barthélemy believes that all witnesses display one and the same

---

<sup>6</sup> 2 Reigns was contained in two different scrolls (2 Sam 1:1–10:1; 2 Sam 10:2–1 Kgs 2:11). The Greek 4 Reigns may have started at 1 Kings 22, but it is not impossible that the division between 3 Reigns and 4 Reigns was determined by the length of the scrolls. For a similar suggestion, see R.A. Kraft, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 282–283.

revision.<sup>7</sup> It is hard to determine whether the group indeed forms a unity, as Barthélemy claims.

Schmitt, *Theodotion* (1966) provides data for undermining the hypothesis that the *kaige*-Th group forms a homogeneous unit. Since Schmitt has convincingly demonstrated that the sixth column of the Hexapla derived from a different source from the so-called Theodotion translation of Daniel, the *kaige*-Th group must have been composed of at least two layers.

### 3. *The characteristic features of kaige-Th*

As a means of determining the identity of supposed members of the *kaige*-Th group, Barthélemy described several translation equivalents characterizing this group. The most characteristic translation equivalent of this group is that of כִּי with καίγε, explained by Barthélemy in accordance with the hermeneutical rule of *ribbûy ûmi'ut*, 'inclusion and exclusion,' which refers to certain Hebrew particles that are always presumed to include at least one element in addition to the word(s) mentioned after it. All other characteristic translations of *kaige*-Th are also explained by Barthélemy in the light of rabbinical sayings or hermeneutical traditions, mainly from the Mekhilta, e.g. the translation of שׂא - 'everyone' with ἀνὴρ, אנכי with ἐγώ εἰμι, and the etymological translation of the roots יצב/נצב. Barthélemy probably went too far in his desire to explain all renditions of *kaige*-Th in accordance with rabbinic exegesis. It may very well be that all the renditions he discussed—with the possible exception of כִּי - καίγε—simply represent a very literal, root-linked translation technique in which each Hebrew root is represented by its fixed translation equivalent. While the translational approach may have been influenced by certain hermeneutical rules of the Rabbis—cf. rather the school of Aqiba than the school of Ishmael frequently quoted by Barthélemy as an illustration for *kaige*-Th—an attempt to explain all the characteristic renditions of *kaige*-Th in accordance with rabbinical sayings seems far-fetched. Thus, no quotation from rabbinical sources is needed to explain the stereotyped rendition of שׂא with ἀνὴρ including those cases in which the Hebrew is used in the sense of 'everyone.'

After Barthélemy's list, additional translation equivalents characterizing *kaige*-Th have been described by Shenkel, *Chronology*, 13 ff., 113 ff.; Smith,<sup>8</sup> Grindel,<sup>9</sup> O'Connell, *Exodus*, 286–291, and Tov, "Trans-

<sup>7</sup> Barthélemy, *Dévançiers*, 47 mentions, however, a few witnesses to a later revision of the LXX which is closely related to *kaige*-Th.

<sup>8</sup> M. Smith, "Another Criterion for the *Kaige* Recension," *Bib* 48 (1967) 443–445.

criptions,"\* and "Lucian."\* Earlier studies of Driver, *Samuel*, iv ff., de Boer, Schmid,<sup>10</sup> Kelly,<sup>11</sup> Gehman,<sup>12</sup> and Wevers<sup>13</sup> provide general descriptions of the translation technique of the different sections of 1–4 Reigns.

#### 4. *The relationship between Aquila, Symmachus, and kaige-Th*

In two different sections of *Dévanciers*, Barthélemy refers to the relationship between Aquila, Symmachus, and *kaige-Th*. First, he provided examples of Aquila's dependence upon *kaige-Th* in the choice of certain translation equivalents (*Dévanciers*, 81–88). Secondly, together with his description of 8HevXIIgr, Barthélemy describes the relationship between this scroll (belonging to the *kaige-Th* group), Aquila, and Symmachus (pp. 246 ff). He arrives at the conclusion that Aquila and Symmachus did not revise the OG translation of the Bible, as expected, but revised *kaige-Th*. *Kaige-Th* was thus not simply a forerunner of Aquila, but provided the very text upon which Aquila and Symmachus made their improvements. Barthélemy's conclusion thus explains a feature which has not been dealt with previously: why do the margins of several LXX manuscripts contain so many readings common to the 'Three' or two of them? The agreements cannot have been coincidental, and some kind of close relationship must have existed between the 'Three.' We now realize that *kaige-Th* was the source for both Aquila and Symmachus, and when this source was left unchanged by these translators, the reading could have been annotated in the margin of a manuscript as 'the Three.'

At the time, Barthélemy's conclusions were not completely convincing since they were based on isolated readings of the 'Three' which could not be judged within the context of whole sentences and

---

<sup>9</sup> J.A. Grindel, "Another Characteristic of the *kaige* Recension: *nsh* - *nikos*," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 499–513.

<sup>10</sup> P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of I Samuel I-XXI* (Amsterdam 1938); idem, "I Samuel XVII. Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions," *OTS* 1 (1942) 79–103; idem, "Research into the Text of I Samuel XVIII-XXXI," *OTS* 6 (1949) 1–100; J. Schmid, *Septuaginta-geschichtliche Studien z. 1. Samuelbuch*, unpubl. diss. Kath.-Theol. Fakult. (Breslau 1941).

<sup>11</sup> B.H. Kelly, *The Septuagint Translators of I Samuel and II Samuel I:1-II:1*, unpubl. diss. Princeton Theological Seminary (Princeton, N.J. 1948).

<sup>12</sup> H.S. Gehman, "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of I Samuel," *JAOS* 70 (1950) 292–296.

<sup>13</sup> J. Wevers, "Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms," *CBQ* 14 (1952) 40–56; id., "A Study in the Exegetical Principles Underlying the Greek Text of 2 Sam 11:2—1 Kings 2:11," *CBQ* 15 (1953) 30–45.

sections. However, complete sentences and sections of Theodotion do form the basis of O'Connell, *Exodus* which has shown convincingly that Aquila's revision of that book was based on Th-Exodus. The same can be demonstrated for 1-4 Reigns since the running text of Aquila, published by Burkitt,<sup>14</sup> can now be compared with *kaige*-Th in section  $\gamma\delta$ .<sup>15</sup> The relationship between the 'Three' can further be studied in the Hexaplaric Psalms fragments published by Mercati.<sup>16</sup>

##### 5. Manuscripts *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>*, the OG, Lucian, and proto-Lucian

There is no consensus about the nature of *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* in Reigns. This question is significant for the understanding of 1-4 Reigns, its manuscripts, and in fact, for the whole LXX. While the problem of the nature of *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* is not limited to the four books of Reigns, it is most obvious in these books. The present comments are limited to the nature of *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* in the four books of Reigns, because the evidence found in these books differs from that in the other books. This limitation is further justified for practical reasons because the greater part of previous pilot studies on *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* and the Lucianic problem have been carried out on 1-4 Reigns. All conclusions reached should be applied to these four books only, with subsequent investigation determining how far these conclusions are applicable to other books.

Barthélemy, *Dévanciers*, not only offered new insights on *kaige*-Th, but also dealt in length with the relationship between *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* and the other manuscripts in the  $\beta\gamma$  section of Reigns. The second issue was reopened by Barthélemy. Tov, "Lucian"\* describes four positions on this issue: A. Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension* (1911); Barthélemy, *Dévanciers* (1963); Cross, "Biblical Text" (1964); Tov, "Lucian"\* (1972).

The nature of the tradition(s) embodied in *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* need to be further examined, especially with the aid of concordances of those manuscripts:

1. The nature and quantity of pre-Lucianic elements in *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>*.
2. A description of the many sources reflecting pre-Lucianic elements. Each source provides a number of specific problems, e.g. La and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.
3. Criteria for isolating the revisional layer of *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* and a description of its nature.

<sup>14</sup> F.C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge 1897).

<sup>15</sup> Pilot studies performed on the Burkitt text support Barthélemy's assumptions.

<sup>16</sup> G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae* (Vatican 1958); cf. also J. Venetz, *Die Quinta des Psalteriums. Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforchung* (Massorah, Série 1, vol. 2; Hildesheim 1974).

4. The nature of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  in the *kaige* sections ( $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$ ) as compared with its nature in the non-*kaige* sections.

6. *The relationship between the Greek and Hebrew texts in 1–4 Reigns*

Traditionally, 1–2 Samuel is referred to as the Septuagintal source of greatest value for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible as it contains a relatively high number of variant readings which are superior to MT. It also contains valuable material for the literary criticism of that book, such as the LXX's shorter account of the story of David and Goliath (see Tov, "Samuel"\*). Much important data are also found in the LXX of 1–2 Kings, especially in manuscripts  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  whose chronological system is preferred by some scholars (see Shenkel, *Chronology*; Miller<sup>17</sup>).

The Qumran manuscripts support some of the emendations previously suggested. While the studies of Wellhausen, *Samuel*, Thenius,<sup>18</sup> and Driver, *Samuel*, have not been superseded, the overall picture of the value of the LXX for the textual criticism of these books will be reconsidered in light of the Qumran manuscripts (see Tov, "Qumran"\*).

For the question of which text is reflected by 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, 4QSam<sup>b</sup>, and 4QSam<sup>c</sup>, all of which show some form of proximity to the LXX—see Tov, "Qumran."\*

7. *The synoptic problem of the Greek texts of 1–4 Reigns and 1–2 Paralipomena*

The synoptic problem of the Greek texts in the historical books refers to the synoptic texts in the so-called 'LXX' and in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , with regard to their relationship to the Greek and Hebrew texts *ad loc.* and in the parallel passage.

Differences between the Greek translations in the parallel sections cause no surprise since we are faced with different translations of different Hebrew *Vorlagen*. Noteworthy are special agreements between the two Greek translations, both in vocabulary and in the details of the Hebrew text (against MT). It has therefore been suggested that one of the two translators used the parallel translation, or that one of the two translations has been secondarily harmonized.

---

<sup>17</sup> J.M. Miller, "The Elisha Cycle and the Accounts of the Omride Wars," *JBL* 85 (1966) 441–454; "Another Look at the Chronology of the Early Divided Monarchy," *JBL* 86 (1967) 276–288.

<sup>18</sup> O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt* (Leipzig 1898).



The former opinion is supported by Rehm<sup>19</sup> who provided much plausible evidence that the Greek translator of Chronicles used the OG of Samuel in the non-*kaige* sections and the *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* text in the *kaige* sections. This shows (see Tov, "Lucian"\*) that the Greek translator of Chronicles always used the OG of Samuel, which, in the *kaige* sections, is reflected in the substratum of *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>*. The latter opinion is reflected in studies by Gerleman<sup>20</sup> and Allen.<sup>21</sup> The problem of the relationship between the Greek texts of 1–4 Reigns and 1–2 Chronicles needs further investigation.

A special problem is raised by the harmonistic additions to the Greek text of Chronicles, adding elements from the parallel passages in 2 Kings. Klein has rightly shown that these additions follow the textual tradition of *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* in 2 Kings rather than *kaige*-Th.<sup>22</sup> He concluded: 'This pre-*kaige* text, which served as the source for the Paralipomena supplements, could be either the OG hitherto unknown, or as seems more likely, the proto-Lucianic recension.'<sup>23</sup> Despite Allen's counter-arguments (n. 21) attempting to demonstrate an inner-Lucianic harmonization in the parallel texts, it seems that Klein is right in assuming that the translator of Chronicles used the tradition embodied in *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* in the *kaige* section in 2 Kings, which reflects the OG rather than a proto-Lucianic revision.

In addition to the specific problems mentioned above, the overall problem of the relationship between the synoptic texts in *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* needs to be reinvestigated beyond the study by Rehm (n. 19) which demonstrated the close relationship between the 'Lucianic' parallel texts.

#### 8. *The nature of the sixth column of the Hexapla in 1–4 Reigns*

It has been recognized that the Hexapla's sixth column ('Th') in Reigns βγ is close to *boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>*. For Barthélemy, *Dévaciers*, 128–136, the sixth column thus contains the OG, while the other manuscripts in that section contain the *kaige*-Th revision. For Cross, "Biblical Text," 295, it contains the proto-Lucianic revision 'in relatively pure form.' The nature of the sixth column in Reigns needs to be studied in detail, especially for

<sup>19</sup> M. Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (ATAbh 13:3; Münster i. W. 1937) 34ff.

<sup>20</sup> G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint II, Chronicles* (Lund 1946) 37 ff.; *Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament* (Lund 1948) 30 ff.

<sup>21</sup> L.C. Allen, "Further Thoughts on an Old Recension of Reigns in Paralipomena," *HThR* 61 (1968) 483–491.

<sup>22</sup> R.W. Klein, *Studies in the Greek Text of the Chronicler*, unpubl. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 1966.

<sup>23</sup> R.W. Klein, "New Evidence for an Old Recension of Reigns," *HThR* 60 (1967) 93–105; 61 (1968) 492–495. The quotation is from *HThR* 60 (1967) 104.

sections  $\beta\gamma$  (described in general terms by Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 142–143) and  $\gamma\delta$ .

At the same time, renewed attention needs to be directed to the so-called *Quinta* of 2 Kings for which Burkitt suggested in 1902 that it contains the OG.<sup>24</sup>

### 9. Text and midrash in the third book of Reigns

The Greek text of 1 Kings differs greatly from its Hebrew counterpart: it omits parts, adds elements, contains important duplicate translations (cf. especially 1 Kings 2), its text is differently arranged and its chronological system differs from that of MT. Gooding has described these discrepancies,<sup>25</sup> trying to demonstrate that they are not isolated phenomena, but are part of a deliberate scheme of re-ordering. Gooding's summarizing article ("Text and Midrash") discusses the question at which level the changes entered the LXX. He concludes that the majority of the changes were probably inserted by a reviser of the LXX: 'This revision was probably based, at least in part, on written Hebrew (or Aramaic) traditions of one kind or another' (p. 2). These traditions may be pinpointed in some cases in rabbinic sources and Gooding provisionally calls them 'haggadic midrash.' Gooding's monograph on 1 Kings (Gooding, *Relics*) further described the deviating tradition of the Greek text of 1 Kings.<sup>26</sup>

The methodological problems and the new facts about 1–4 Reigns have wide implications for study of the LXX as a whole and for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible:

1. The complexity of the relationship between the various Hebrew textual traditions and the Greek traditions, with special attention being paid to the existence of non-MT manuscripts underlying Greek traditions, is emphasized.

2. An analysis of *kaige*-Th and *boc*<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> further clarifies the growth, composition, and transmission of the LXX.

<sup>24</sup> F.C. Burkitt, "The So-called Quinta of 4 Kings," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 24 (1902) 216–219.

<sup>25</sup> "Ahab according to the Septuagint," *ZAW* 35 (1964) 269–280; "Pedantic Time-tabling in the 3rd Book of Reigns," *VT* 15 (1965) 153–166; "The Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct," *VT* 15 (1965) 324–335; "An Impossible Shrine," *VT* 15 (1965) 405–420; "Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the MT and the LXX," *VT* 17 (1967) 143–172; "The Septuagint's Rival Version of Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *VT* 17 (1967) 173–189; "Text-Sequence and Translation-Revision in 3 Reigns IX 10 – X 33," *VT* 19 (1969) 448–469.

<sup>26</sup> See also Z. Talshir, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom—3 Kingdoms 12:24 a-z* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6; Jerusalem 1993).

3. The alternation of different text types in the Greek manuscripts of 1–4 Reigns underscores the impression that the present collection of LXX books is an amalgam of different text types, late and early, original and revised.