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Abstract
This study examines and reconstructs the textual history of 2 Kings 17 both in light of the preserved textual evidence and in light of the literary-critical method. The analysis of textual differences between Septuagint (LXX), the Old Latin (OL), and the Masoretic text (MT) and the reconstruction of the oldest text attainable forms the backdrop to the more hypothetical aspects of text-historical study.

The text-critical study of the Greek and Latin witnesses shows that the Old Greek (OG) version of 2 Kings 17 was translated from a Hebrew Vorlage often even radically differing from the MT. In most cases it can be shown that the MT in fact exhibits signs of later editing. Many of the cases have both historiographical and redaction critical repercussions. Literary critically, LXX can help us reconstruct multiple text-historical layers otherwise out of our reach. Many of the proto-Masoretic changes can likely be dated to the Hellenistic period or even later.

The literary critical study of the chapter proves in many ways more complex than the comparison of many of the text-critical variants. It can be concluded without a doubt that the text has grown through the centuries even in passages where there is no text-critical evidence of this growth. However, the methodological limitations of literary criticism become clear when discerning such a complex chapter as 2 Kings 17: in many cases the textual evolution may have happened in multiple different ways. Furthermore, differing conclusions on certain text-critical cases can have far-reaching consequences on the literary-critical analysis.

Thus, as supposed by the literary critics for well over a century, the textual data shows beyond doubt that there has happened vast editing and rewriting of 2 Kings 17 even at a very late date. Text-critical considerations are therefore not only useful, but likely invaluable to all scholarly work on 2 Kings 17, and Books of Kings as a whole.
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1. Introduction

1.1 The outline and aims of this study

This study will examine in detail the textual history of 2 Kings 17 both in light of the preserved textual evidence (“documented evidence”) and in light of the literary-critical method (“undocumented evidence”). After the Introduction, in section 2, I will analyze the often widely differing textual witnesses in verses 1–23, and aim to find and reconstruct the oldest text attainable. In this section the text-critical comparison of different Septuagint witnesses (and especially the Old Latin witness Palimpsestus Vindobonensis) with each other and with the text of the MT will take up the largest part of the discussion.¹ After this, in section 3, I will delve deeper into the undocumented textual history of verses 7–23 (“the editorial prehistory” of these verses) from the viewpoint of both the MT and OG edition. A synthesis of the insights of the two editions will be given. In section 4, the textual history of verses 24–41 will be examined. While the different textual witnesses will also be analyzed here, the argumentation will be mainly literary critical since major textual differences between the main witnesses greatly decrease in the second half of the chapter. Despite this there are nevertheless certain readings in the Septuagint that need to be heeded in the text-historical study of these verses. At the end of the study a discussion on the Conclusions and their Methodological Repercussions will be provided, together with three Appendices.

The research question of this study may be posed as follows: “How has 2 Kings 17 been edited through its long transmission process, both in the light of the documented (textual) evidence, and the literary-redactional models, and can some textual stratum be posited through this study of different text forms as the earliest textual layer on top of which the later textual growth (via continuous Fortschreibung) took place?” The study of the text will thus be in general conducted through two interrelated phases, i.e., text critical and literary critical, as further explicated under the next heading, “Methodological considerations.”

¹ For the Greek text materials, I am greatly indebted to the kindness of professors Julio Trebolle and Pablo Torijano of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid for giving me access to their preliminary apparatus of the forthcoming Göttingen Septuagint edition of Kings. I want to thank them for this most heartily.
This study of the textual history of 2 Kgs 17 is important because no such systematical study that takes into account all the documented evidence has yet been conducted on the chapter. Moreover, especially in “historical” books such as Kings, the text-historical study has the potential to also enlighten the scholarship concerning the historiographical issues of the text. Most different theories concerning the destruction and exile of the Northern Kingdom are based on this chapter (especially verses 1–6 and 24–30). However, these theories are usually based only on the Masoretic form of the text, and therefore it is necessary to assess whether there are any text-critically important readings in these verses. It is argued that through the study of the textual material we are able to find more clues concerning the historical situation—and that, on the other hand, we have to abandon some former clues that become too doubtful through this inquiry.

1.2 Methodological considerations

1.2.1 In the search for “documented evidence”

Chapter 2 Kings 17 contains significant literary-/redaction-critical (Literarkritik) problems that have seen numerous proposed solutions in modern research. Nevertheless, most of this research does not make use of textual criticism and the evidence of other textual witnesses. Even some, if not most, of the most influential literary-critical and redaction-critical theories concerning the textual evolution of Kings have been proposed solely on the basis of the Masoretic text (MT). There are, however, serious questions to be raised about this approach when investigating these often highly problematic texts and their witnesses.

The biggest reason to doubt such an approach is the re-emergence of the appreciation of the so-called “documented evidence” of the evolution of different textual witnesses in the recent research. In the wake of the Dead Sea Scrolls findings,

---

2 The appreciation of documented evidence is a “re-emergence” in the sense that at the end of the 19th century and in the early 20th century it was still more or less customary to take into account at least the Greek and Syriac variants of the texts, and sometimes even the available Latin variants. The best-known proponent of this method was Julius Wellhausen. This can also be seen in the fact that after such eminent commentators as those of Immanuel Benzinger (1899), Charles Fox Burney (1903), and Bernhard Stade (1904), to name just a few, there have not been (to my knowledge) any modern text-critical commentaries written on the books of Kings (apart from Martin Mulder’s partial work on 1 Kgs 1–11). Some modern commentaries, such as the ones by Mordechai Cogan, Simon DeVries, or Marvin Sweeney, to name only a few, make minimal use of the textual evidence provided by the Septuagint.
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it has become evident that documented evidence has to be taken into account on an even larger scale: all textual evidence now has to be assessed on its own terms, without any presumptions about the priority of certain text forms or manuscripts. The text of the MT is, using the words of Eugene Ulrich, simply “a chance collection from a wide pool of circulating texts,” and cannot thus be taken as the sole basis of the research. The plurality and multiplicity of texts, even as late as during the first century CE, have to be accepted and truly appreciated in the contemporary research. Thus, there is a high demand for text-critical assessment of the evidence – all of it.

The methodological problems – or possibilities – do not end here, however. The need for a new evaluation of the textual evidence also has its impact on the redaction-critical theories of Kings. If it can be shown, for example, that, at least in some passages, the MT seems to reflect a textual stage posterior to that of the Septuagint (LXX), this would in turn necessitate a reassessment of the usually completely MT-based redactional theories concerning such passages as well. Or, if the passage in

---

3 The term “empirical evidence” is used by some as practically synonymously with “documented evidence” and was popularized by the now classic volume Tigay (ed.), Empirical Models. The term “documented” will be used in this study since it strictly refers to the evidence we have in our possession, i.e., differing readings between manuscripts, against the somewhat broader idea of empiricism in Tigay’s usage.

4 Ulrich, “Text of Hebrew Scriptures,” 98. Ulrich (92) stresses even more radically: “... there is a need for a revised mentality and for a paradigmatic revision in our categories and criteria. ... The common default mentality of biblical scholars (or, our faulty mentality) is that the Masoretic Text is the standard text and canon of the Hebrew bible, and that the texts (or books) which are not identical to the Masoretic Text are sectarian, or vulgar, or nonbiblical. But the problem is not the scrolls, but rather (a) the presuppositions of scholars and students, and (b) the theories regarding the history of the biblical text.” See similarly also Brooke, Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls, 13–15. In other words, there is a grave need for a new theoretical and methodological understanding of not only the material we are working with, but the basics of the field of biblical studies as a whole.

5 Lemmelijn, “Text-Critically Studying,” 152, emphasizes: “... the MT should not be considered the text without a prior critical study of the other textual material at our disposal. The MT is merely a text.” Indeed, this is an ever more important caution, as the scholarship is starting to also doubt the usefulness of the other commonplace categories such as the “rewritten Bible” in Qumran studies; see Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’,” 169–96.

6 This sort of methodology is also called for by Jan Joosten, “Hebrew Bible/Old Testament,” 5. His criticism about the textual evidence not being taken sufficiently into account when discussing the redaction history of the Hebrew Bible is correct, but at the same time not completely justified: most of the scholars working on either field (or even both) are not yet even aware of all the textual material in our possession (such as the Old Latin). In the case of Kings this is largely due to the fact that there is still no critical edition available of either the Greek or the Hebrew text. There is also another reason for caution: as practically all the redaction-critical models have been constructed on the basis of the MT, it is only natural that they would not seem to work as well with the text of the LXX, which may end up in circular reasoning. Similarly Brooke, “What is Editing?” 27: “In the light of the scrolls from the Qumran caves it has become increasingly clear that it is no longer appropriate to distinguish sharply between the practices of text criticism and those other approaches that might be deemed as forms of so-called higher criticism to reveal the literary character of texts. Textual variants are not to be described solely in terms of scribal errors, but more often reflect editorial intervention in the transmission of texts.” See also the discussion of Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 4–15.
question is integral to the foundations of these theories, a reassessment of the whole redactional picture of Kings might be in order.\textsuperscript{7} The establishment of the most ancient text is thereby not only a purely theoretical matter of textual preferentiality, but it also has much more far-reaching consequences.

Indeed, with the re-emergence of the appreciation of text-critical evidence it has also become clear that the classic redactional model that assumes overarching redactional strata that encompass entire books may no longer be sustainable as such;\textsuperscript{8} from a methodological standpoint, all the evidence in our possession seems to speak against such vast and overarching, unified redactional strata in whole books – and even more so in series of books – as has traditionally been proposed.\textsuperscript{9} The evidenced changes, even when larger in scale, are much more local, usually concerning only certain passages, chapters, or characters.\textsuperscript{10} At least concerning the evidence in our

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{7} Some passages and formulaic notices often determined as “Deuteronomistic” may be especially in need of reassessment. In the words of Philippe Hugo, “Text History as Research Tool,” 16: “… text history enters into dialogue with redaction criticism on two levels. Firstly, the establishment of the most ancient textual form immediately leads us to reexamine certain conclusions of the redactional analysis. The primitive or later character of certain terms, formulas or verses …, as well as the attributions of certain rhetorical or theological expressions to some Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic redactors, is sometimes contradicted by the textual witness … Then, on the level of the comparison of literary forms, text history is methodologically close to redaction criticism.” The whole Elisha narrative, for instance, seems to have been quite extensively revised for the MT edition, and the picture emerging from the older OG tradition changes the narrative quite remarkably; see in more depth Tekoniemi, “Enhancing the Depiction.”

\textsuperscript{8} See similarly Stipp, “Semi-Empirical Example,” 312–13: “Finally, the crucial question may be asked: What do the findings in Jeremiah say about the power of our methodological tools designed for recovering the history of growth of our biblical books? Would our applicable criteria allow us to predict the common ancestor of the Masoretic and Alexandrian Jeremiah if the latter was not at our disposal? The answer is a resounding no. … The relevant cases are those where textual and literary criticism clearly intersect ….”

\textsuperscript{9} The occurrence and stratification of “(deutero-)nomistic” phraseology in particular has proved extremely problematic, as it is clear from the textual evidence that it was imitated long after the “actual” Deuteronomistic redactions would have taken place; for a few examples, see Ulrich, “Deuteronomistically Inspired,” 489–506; and Appendix B for some cases in Kings. The Cross and Smend “schools” of redactional criticism are, however, useful as basic guidelines to the overall evolution of the underlying Deuteronomistic thought; it is quite clear that the original edition(s) of Kings must have been more or less Davidic and pro-monarchy, and that later on in the nomistic and/or priestly current these ideals had become obsolete. While these two or three currents are, at least at some points, still quite easy to distinguish from one another, detailed stratification of different nomistic texts (to DtrN\textsuperscript{1}, DtrN\textsuperscript{2}, etc.) becomes an unsurmountable task since what is called “nomistic” editing usually falls under the label of \textit{Fortschreibung}: small corrections made by dozens of editorial hands. In such cases it is often easy to see \textit{what} has been added, but not by \textit{whom} – unless one has documented evidence at their disposal. See similarly Person & Rezetko, “Introduction,” 18: “… the empirical models of the current volume, when taken together, caution against the kind of excessive conclusions often reached by source and redaction critics in the absence of such empirical controls and rather advocate for a much more modest expectation of the historical critical methods.”

\textsuperscript{10} The Masoretic edition of 1 Sam 16–18 might be the best-known example of a \textit{verifiable redaction}: the additions are clearly linked to each other, but mainly limited to only these chapters; see Seppänen, \textit{Hebrew Text of Samuel}, 117–53. Similar revisional layers can also be found elsewhere in Samuel–
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possession, “revision” (or a steady cumulation of individual scribal revisions on top of each other)\textsuperscript{11} would be a more apt term to use than “redaction” – arguably this applies even to the massive differences introduced to the one-seventh longer proto-MT edition of Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{12}

This is, of course, not to say that the classic idea of overarching redactions is wrong per se. Vast reforming and rewriting of the text may have (and likely even must have) still taken place, especially during the so-called “paradigm shifts” when the text had to be substantially changed due to contemporary events, such as the exile to Babylon.\textsuperscript{13} If a text was comprehensively revised, it is questionable to what extent it is possible to reconstruct the earlier redaction history since this kind of radical and possibly clearly stratified reforming of the text (and possibly also the cult at the same time) would have superseded much, if not most, of the earlier cultic and theological ideals of the preceding text, which would have been seen as no longer appropriate.\textsuperscript{14}

Indeed, the textual evidence now in our possession is simply evidence of this/these very last revision(s), where the very few remains of the earlier conceptions were often even omitted from the text.\textsuperscript{15} As Müller and Pakkala emphasize, “the possible existence of undetectable editorial changes is certainly an aspect that has been

\textsuperscript{11} One must take into account that the role of the scribes most likely differed during different periods – they were not always simply pedantic copyists of the texts like the Masoretes. In fact, in earlier times every scribe would have been a fully competent reviser of his/her own, with both the skills and the freedom to make at least minor corrections and changes to the texts; see similarly, for instance, Brooke, “What is Editing?,” 32: “There now seems to be less emphasis on scribes as mechanical copyists, possibly an anachronistic view from a later post-canonical time ... In the light of the evidence from the Qumran caves I consider that the normal behaviour of Jewish scribes at the time was to consider themselves as active participants in the transmission of texts.”

\textsuperscript{12} Thusly Stipp, “Semi-Empirical Example,” 316: “... the growth of the book of Jeremiah did not come to a sudden halt with some sort of definite final redaction. It rather tapered out slowly, with the tradents feeling less and less entitled to interfere with their text. So the redactors gradually gave way to copyists. This is the reason why I tend to avoid the term “redaction” ... preferring less specific labels like “revision” or “recension” instead.”

\textsuperscript{13} For the term, see Pakkala, “Textual Development,” 333–42. Müller & Pakkala, “Introduction,” 12, emphasize: “It is increasingly probable that the literary history of biblical texts contains radical phases of editing comparable to the so-called Rewritten-Scripture texts in relation to their sources.”

\textsuperscript{14} Similarly Pakkala, “Textual Development,” 334–9.

\textsuperscript{15} For many such still observable omissions, see Pakkala, God’s Word Omitted; and the case of 2 Kgs 17:17 in 2.6.8. If even the later, probably more conservative, scribe-editors were able to omit text, one can only imagine what happened during earlier times when the textual transmission appears to have been much freer (as shown partly by the Qumran evidence), and especially during the more radical paradigm shifts.

Kings. For such a revision in Elisha stories, see Tekoniemi, “Enhancing the Picture”; for the broader proto-Masoretic revision of Kings, see Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte; for the proto-MT editing of 2 Sam 7, see Kauhanen, “Yahweh’s Promise to David”; for the Masoretic editing of 1 Kgs 17–18, see Hugo, Deux Visages.
neglected in conventional redaction critical methodologies.”¹⁶ This challenge now has to be taken seriously.

While taking heed of textual evidence may therefore shake some methods or theories, it can also be used to support others. Some literary-critical findings and theories highlighting the stratified nature of the texts have often been criticized (and rightfully so) for their overly hypothetical nature. While it has often been argued that the “higher” literary and “lower” textual criticisms should be kept apart,¹⁷ this division is somewhat, if not completely, artificial.¹⁸ These two can in fact be beneficial to each other: while textual findings can be used to back up literary-critical models, literary criticism has much to give to the methodology of textual criticism as well.¹⁹ It has been rightly suggested that in a text with such a complex textual and literary history as the Hebrew Bible these two methods are in fact inseparable.²⁰ Despite its significance to the research, this kind of methodological discussion has been surprisingly scant until only very recently.²¹

Therefore, when we find notable differences between witnesses, the first question to be posed should be whether or not the difference can be explained by an accidental textual process (copying mistake, etc.). If there are no clear signs of an accidental change, we may proceed to take note of the possible literary ramifications of this difference: does the difference change the logic of the narrative, for instance?

¹⁶ Müller & Pakkala, “Introduction,” 9. As an undetectable editorial intervention one may also mention here the technique of transposition, which is practically undeducible without textual evidence; see further Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale transposition,” 1–16.
¹⁷ Thus Natalio Fernández, Scribes and Translators, 37: “In my opinion there is a danger in our days not only of combining different methods of low and high criticism, but of confusing them also even in terminology ... Only in a few cases when we dispose of abundant material ... can we catch a glimpse of the real text history.”
¹⁸ Similarly Brooke, “What is Editing?” 27: “In the light of the scrolls from the Qumran caves it has become increasingly clear that it is no longer appropriate to distinguish sharply between the practices of text criticism and those other approaches that might be deemed as forms of so-called higher criticism to reveal the literary character of texts. Textual variants are not to be described solely in terms of scribal errors, but more often reflect editorial intervention in the transmission of texts.”
¹⁹ It could also prove beneficial to search for parallels of biblical editing from completely differing fields. Film studies, for instance, deals with very similar editorial questions as biblical scholarship does, and can likely help us understand editing in a more nuanced manner; see Tekoniemi, “Editorial In(ter)ventions,” 1–30, for an attempt at bringing these fields together.
²⁰ Often conventional text-critical arguments alone will not be able to offer an unambiguous solution to the textual differences between different witnesses, but quite the contrary. The same goes for purely literary-critical arguments as well. The interesting part is that when used together, these two methods actually seem to complement each other instead of contradicting the findings of one another. Müller & Pakkala, “Introduction,” 12, put this very aptly in one of their headings: “Redaction Criticism Should Be Conducted by the Study of Documented Evidence.”
²¹ Similarly Ulrich, “Empirical Evidence,” 41–2. For a discussion of the most recent work in the field, see Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 4–15.
Oftentimes this is indeed the case: a challenging narrative logic is simply eased by a correction. The case is even clearer if the portrayed ideology/theology or function of the narrative changes with the difference: we are probably dealing with a literary variant,\(^{22}\) and, with significantly large variants, probably even differing editions of the text.\(^{23}\)

Oftentimes, of course, the cases are not this straightforward since many differences between the texts can usually be argued to have happened either via accidental omission or deliberate addition. To give just one (but highly relevant) example, the editorial technique of Wiederaufnahme (also known as resumptive repetition or reprise),\(^{24}\) where part of the older text is repeated at either the beginning or, more typically, the end of the addition, can produce two opposite results: a textual tradition missing such a passage may either be the older one, not yet affected by a later addition, or the text may have simply dropped via a homoioioteleuton/-archton mistake.

In cases like this, where the textual arguments are completely reversible with respect to each other,\(^{25}\) the scholar has to look for cumulative evidence: which option starts to seem more likely when the possible ideological flavor of the enframed text is taken into account, for instance?\(^{26}\) The literary-critical possibilities born from accidental

---

\(^{22}\) Julio Trebolle, “Textual Criticism and the Literary Structure,” 76–7: “Textual variants ... pile up at the junctures of the literary units. ... When two pericopae get yuxtaposed or when one is introduced inside the other, their text undergoes an adaptation. ... Therefore after having analyzed the variants according to their typology (omission, additions, transpositions, etc.), it is necessary to assess them according to the function they accomplish in the context.” However, the cautions of Andrés Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 237–8 n.30, should be heeded here: “Of course, the main problem lies in determining whether these elements were part of an ‘editio’ in the strict sense of the word or shorter single-instance glosses-changes introduced later in a given edition. An answer to this question requires, of course, isolating and analyzing similar tendencies throughout the whole book.” Considering the isolating of these tendencies “throughout the whole book,” the research is only at the very beginning of this task. A small step and contribution to this direction can be found in Appendix B.

\(^{23}\) While the discussion on the exact definition of such terms as “edition” is still ongoing, the model of Ulrich, “Empirical Evidence,” 46, may be applied here: “In contrast to a new composition, a new or variant edition is a revised, or updated, or improved version of the same work. It intends to be a form of the same book, simply revised. The scope, structure, and theological agenda remain the same.” It is important to note, however, as does Ulrich, “Empirical Evidence, 53, that “... there is something of a continuum, a spectrum of developmental additions produced by the multiple editors and scribes who contributed to the biblical texts.” This is why a strict line between editions, on one hand, and layers of additions/changes, possibly created by single scribes, on the other, can at times be extremely challenging to draw – as also stressed by Piquer in the preceding note.

\(^{24}\) On this editorial technique, see the classic study of Kuhl, “Die Wiederaufnahme,” 1–11; and for further discussion von Wahlde, “Wiederaufnahme,” 542–9. For a number of case studies on this technique, see Trebolle, Centena.

\(^{25}\) For a discussion on the reversibility of arguments, see Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 13–16.

\(^{26}\) This is in line with the critique of Person & Rezetko, “Introduction,” 23–30, concerning the use of Wiederaufnahme as a literary critical criterion – a construct simply resembling this technique alone is
omission should not and cannot be used, quite self-evidently, as evidence for a deliberate change in the text. However, even though the text-critical evidence might indeed allow us to simply close a case as a mere copyist’s mishap, the literary-critical possibilities can—indeed have to—be taken into account as well.27 In such complex cases the literary and textual arguments converge, as they should—and as they have done in the text-critical method since the very beginning.28

One more methodological notion rising from these remarks of textual and literary criticism converging concerns plurality, albeit not of a textual sort, but rather the plurality of tenable conclusions, particularly when talking about the redactional end results. There is of course nothing new about redaction critics coming to (completely) differing conclusions with each other. However, now that the literary-textual sphere of arguments (which are, furthermore, at times more or less reversible) has to be taken into account as well, the redactional work will also inevitably be affected. One of the best examples discussed in this study is the case of 2 Kgs 17:2, a text usually deemed to come from the earliest (DtrH) layer(s) in Kings. Since the ideologies and possibly even the theologies of this verse are completely opposite to each other in the MT and OG editions (and the arguments for either reading are, for the most part, reversible), and since the ideology of this verse may have its bearing on the further evaluation of the redactional strata in 2 Kgs 17, a responsible redaction

not yet sufficient evidence for a later addition, but needs further evidence to be convincing. A good case example is 1 Kgs 8:41–42, where a large portion of text containing (post-)Deuteronomistic language use is missing from the LXX. While for instance Mulder, *Kings*, 436, and Stade, *Kings*, 106, consider the text to have dropped from the LXX due to homoioarchton (🖌…🖌), it seems more likely that the somewhat awkwardly positioned MT plus is in fact a later interpolation via *Wiederaufnahme* to a grammatically pristine text of the LXX: the plus severs the original connection of 41 and 42 in order to mention the epithet of Yahweh and his powerful “name” (a late theological concept). Similar Deuteronomistic additions are found in the MT vis-à-vis the LXX throughout Kings (see, for instance, Appendix B).

27 Methodologically, this is, admittedly, always debatable. The biggest question concerns the probability of the textual reasons (corruption, etc.) for the change: how high or low should we set the bar for accepting purely textual reasoning on the text? A sort of middle ground, as presented here, would be to first consider the various textual possibilities and assess their probabilities. If after this the situation is unclear or in a “50–50 state,” literary-critical arguments may be taken into account. In most of the cases the textual reasons can never be completely ruled out, but at some point on the probability scale we have to start asking: is the change really purely textual?

28 In the words of Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, xi: “… es ist schwierig die Grenze zu finden, wo die Literarkritik aufhört und die Textkritik beginnt.” The “new” methodological finding also propagated by this thesis is simply the fact that this border is, after all, (near to) inexistent, since, as Mäkipelto, *Uncovering*, 296, sums up: “… it can probably be assumed that the editorial processes explored in textual, literary, and redaction criticisms are essentially similar.” Similarly Aejmelaeus, “What Happened,” 10: “In my view, this kind of a text [= Jer 25:1–7, TT] demonstrates the outdatedness of the dichotomy between textual criticism and literary criticism and the need for a more comprehensive view on the critical study of biblical texts.”
critic would admit that there are seemingly at least two potential and, possibly, even equally viable, reconstructions of even the text’s earliest history. The plurality and multiplicity, which we have for decades now had to take for granted in textual studies, must also be expanded to what would have been earlier thought of as the “higher” planes of argumentation – the literary and redactional are to step down to the “lower” plane of diversity and uncertainty.

The methodology to be used in this study will therefore follow the “two-step approach” of the broader framework of text-historical research,29 thus far best described by Ville Mäkipelto. The venture begins with the simple question: “What happened to the text?”30 The first step in the study will and has to be as meticulous a study of all the available textual evidence as possible since with this procedure one is already often able to detect at least two genetically linked main textual forms (sometimes different enough to be even called differing editions), of which one usually evidences a more original, i.e., oldest attainable, version.31 It is then important to describe as precisely as possible the reasons for the direction of change. This often helps the scholar with the next, vastly more hypothetical and uncertain, step since oftentimes the major differences between the versions have been introduced as deliberately (and for the exact same ideological reasons) as the undocumented changes.

After this text-critical (or rather, documented) phase the scholar comes to the undocumented phase and the literary-critical arguments mainly based on inner-textual considerations/ observations.32 With the oldest text attainable, the scholar may now

29 The term was to my knowledge first coined by Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 297.
30 Aejmelaeus, “What happened,” 3, 5. It is good to note that with the emergence of the so-called “New Philology,” one could in fact add to this scheme a preceding “step 0.5” so to speak, i.e., the study of the manuscripts as material, meaningful objects as such (which they were also to their original creators, and in some cases still are to some groups or individuals), without particular interest in their “abstract” textual forms themselves; for this method, see Lied & Lundhaug, Snapshots. Undoubtedly, in many cases the observations made by the “New Philologists” can also help text critics better understand the text(s) they are dealing with.
31 Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 297: “Text-historical research begins with a careful examination of all available textual witnesses. Once the unique features of specific textual witnesses … have been established, one can proceed to sorting out the relationship between various witnesses to a text. The aim is not just to discover the earliest textual form, but to explain the history of a text as extensively as possible.” In books like Exodus, for which there are vast amounts of material found at Qumran, the relationships between different witnesses can of course become extremely tangled and complex; see Hendel, Steps, 198. Nevertheless, it is the duty of a scholar to take these challenges head-on instead of shying away to using just one textual witness as one’s base text.
32 As noted by Aejmelaeus, “What Happened,” 10: “… the analysis of the extant text-forms can only take us halfway, being able to describe only the final stages of the development of the text while at the
pursue the uncovering of the earlier stages, and in some cases even the very origins of the text. This encompasses not only the more locally minded literary-critical observations, but also the larger redactional sphere of arguments. While more debatable, this undocumented study of the earlier editorial history of the text is equally important, since by conducting it the scholar is able to find and understand different currents of ideological changes that also often manifest in the later, documented phases of the editorial history. After this step, the scholar may take a second look at the textual material: (how) does the text-critical understanding of the text change or become clearer after the literary considerations (and vice versa)?

The differentiation between the terms “textual criticism” and “pure” literary/redaction criticism is, as argued above, somewhat arbitrary, but will nevertheless be used throughout this study. There is, however, a (self-evident?) difference between what is done with the material – that is, textual – evidence, and the purely “un-material” aspirations, i.e., “purely” literary and redactional studies. While “textual criticism,” as a term, includes the literary and, up to a point, redactional sphere of arguments, of which there is, in a way, thus no “pure” form, the literary and redactional research can (and in most cases has to) be conducted on its own, with no available textual evidence. Nevertheless, one has to keep in mind that these “criticisms” are simply two steps encompassed in one larger text-historical method. Their arguably arbitrary differentiation is therefore mainly practical.

33 It is important to note that, in most cases, the search for “the Urtext” of the Hebrew Bible is no longer viable, methodologically or otherwise; see Brooke, Reading, 7–16. At the same time, however, the cautions of Pakkala, “Can we reconstruct,” 4–7, have to be kept in mind: “Although historical criticism should take the challenges into consideration, so far, there is no methodologically coherent alternative for how to use the information contained in the Hebrew Bible for the early periods” (6).

34 Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 297, also stresses the equally important aspect of historiographical study: “… both stages of text-historical research are necessary if one wishes to use texts critically in literary research, or utilize them as sources for studying historical events behind the texts.”

35 Thus also Aejmelaeus, “What happened,” 3, 10.
1.2.2 Where to find this “documented evidence,” and what is it good for in the case of 2 Kings 17?

As already mentioned, the original translation of the Septuagint, or “Old Greek”\(^{36}\) (OG), is the most important variant (edition) when compared to the MT. Since the OG translator of Kings was quite literal (but by no means slavish) with his work,\(^{37}\) often even using set word-for-word translation equivalents, it is very probable that when the OG substantially differs from the wording of the MT, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG must already have had a differing text.\(^{38}\)

However, in parts of 1–2 Kings the use of the Greek evidence is complicated by the so-called *kaige*-revision, originally detected by Dominique Barthélémy in 1963.\(^{39}\) The main trait of *kaige* is that it strives to conform the Greek text to that of the MT in a very literal and often even slavish manner.\(^{40}\) This is above all achieved by omissions and additions of varying length (from additions of Greek articles to omissions of whole verses), by changing some translation equivalents to more literal ones, and by transpositions, all made according to the proto-Masoretic *Vorlage(n)* of the reviser(s). This means that most Greek manuscripts of 2 Kings usually give not the readings of the OG, but a text that seeks to conform to the MT.

---

\(^{36}\) Apart from this meaning, the term “Old Greek” is sometimes used as a synonym for the textual form found in the non-*kaige* sections of Codex Vaticanus, that is, manuscript B. This usage is problematic, however, since it mixes two distinct phenomena, the abstract (the idea of the original text of the translation), and the physical (an actual manuscript, which has inevitably suffered different kinds of corruptions). It is thus best to separate the use of the term “Old Greek” to its abstract meaning, i.e., the ideal of the original translation as it left the pen of the very first scribe.

\(^{37}\) Sollamo, “Study of Translation Technique,” 152.

\(^{38}\) Tov, “Three Strange Books,” 372–4. It is nowadays clear that no “Greek reviser,” and especially not the OG translator, would have produced such deviations from MT text form, as argued by the earlier scholarship. Such an argument may have been possible (albeit not even then very tenable) prior to the Qumran finds, but after the un-earthing of the massive textual plurality in the Dead Sea Scrolls, this view has become absolutely obsolete. This is not to say, however, that the translator(s), even of Samuel-Kings, made no contextual or theological interpretations in their translations. These interpretations were just simply made while also being faithful to the underlying Hebrew *Vorlage*. The study of the translation technique is thus the best instrument when trying to unearth these subtly conveyed theological ideas held by the translators of Samuel-Kings. For a comprehensive presentation of the methodology and challenges of translation technical research, see Aeijmalaeus, *On the Trail*.

\(^{39}\) Barthélémy, *Les Devanciers*; for a recent evaluation of the impact of this major finding of his on biblical scholarship, see Aeijmelaeus & Kauhanen (eds.), *Legacy of Barthélémy*. In the books of Kings, the *kaige*-portion consists of 1 Kgs 1:1–2:11 and 1 Kgs 22–2 Kgs. The name *kaige* comes from the idiosyncratic rendition of Hebrew גא and και in Greek. Recently it has been noted that *kaige* was likely not a uniform “movement,” but rather a more or less sporadic tendency to harmonize the textual forms, hardly being a very centralized action, and even made over several centuries.

\(^{40}\) For further information on the *kaige* revision, see Aitken, “Origins of ΚΑΙ ΓΕ,” 21–40; McLean, *Greek Kaige Version*; Gentry, “Pre-Hexaplaric Translations.” Who the *kaige* revisers were, exactly when and where the revision(s) took place, and why the revision was considered important enough to be made, are still questions without completely adequate answers.
A partial answer to this problem is the Lucianic or Antiochian text \( (L) \),\(^{41}\) which often retains the OG text when B and every other Greek witness have been revised towards the (proto-)MT, or at least one very close to it (proto-Lucianic text). \( L \) also has some notable sequential differences from the majority text of the LXX.\(^{42}\) Even \( L \), however, is not that straightforward a witness: it actually bears traits of three different recensions (Lucianic, Hexaplaric, and \( \text{kaige} \)).\(^{43}\)

This is where the daughter translations of the LXX into other languages come into the picture. In the books of Kings the most important daughter versions are the Old Latin (OL) witnesses.\(^{44}\) The OL manuscript of most interest for 2 Kings 17 is the fragmentary \textit{Palimpsestus Vindobonensis} (La\(^{115}\)), which has, however, not received much attention in the research.\(^{45}\) The translation technique of this manuscript is very literal, and its Greek base text/exemplar or “\textit{Vorlage}” from which it was translated seems to have been very close to the OG text.\(^{46}\) Therefore it is a valuable witness for textual criticism, for when \( L \) and La\(^{115}\) coincide with their readings, we can be fairly sure that the reading is old and reliable since for the most part the two witnesses appear to be independent of each other in Kings (see 1.2.2.2 below). However, the caveats of Kauhanen have to be kept in mind: since La\(^{115}\), as a manuscript, postdates the Lucianic recension, an agreement between \( L \) and La\(^{115}\) does not yet, as such, ensure an OG reading. As in all textual criticism, one needs to proceed on a case-by-case basis.\(^{47}\)

\( ^{41} \) This text-type in 2 Kings can be found in manuscripts 19’-82-93-108-127 and 700 (\( L \)-700), called \textit{boc2e2r} in the Brooke-McLean/Cambridge edition. The Antiochian text-type has also greatly influenced some other manuscripts, most notably 158 (\( g \)), 554 (\( z \)) and 460 (not used by Brooke-McLean). For an edition of this text see Fernández & Busto, \textit{Texto Antioqueno}.

\( ^{42} \) Most of these differences are found in 2 Kings. Sometimes there are other witnesses coinciding with \( L \), but mostly it has these differences alone. For example, \( L \) is the only witness not to give Jehoshaphat’s regnal narrative in 1 Kings 22:41–51; it also has notable sequential differences in 2 Kings 13–14. However, the big plus of \( L \) in 10:36+ (Ahaziah’s regnal narrative), for instance, is supported by an Old Latin witness La\(^{M}\).

\( ^{43} \) On the Lucianic recension, see Sebastian Brock, \textit{Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel}. That \( L \) also contains features of \( \text{kaige} \) has been disputed, but this is pretty clear even in 2 Kings 17:19, 41, where \( L \) gives attestations of the famous phrase \( \text{και γε} \) itself.

\( ^{44} \) In some cases, the Ethiopian translation is also of use since it is quite an early witness to the B-text. The Armenian and Georgian versions have been influenced heavily by the Hexaplaric materials, and are thus usually only of marginal value.

\( ^{45} \) On the fragmentary state of this palimpsest, see the edition of the codex by Bonifatius Fischer et al., “\textit{Palimpsestus Vindobonensis},” 20–2. Only about 9% of the text of Kings is now extant. In addition to the already scant research, most of the studies on the manuscript have been written in languages other than English (mainly in Spanish and German).

\( ^{46} \) Trebolle, “Textual Criticism and the Literary Structure,” 56. The text of La\(^{115}\) has remained little studied, and the possible limitations of using it as an OG witness are not yet completely clear; see the discussion below.

\( ^{47} \) Kauhanen, “Septuagint in the West,” 310–11.
The witnesses that usually follow the MT should not be overlooked either. Most importantly, Peshitta and Targums are sometimes valuable witnesses to a text form different from the MT, albeit usually in quite small details. Since these witnesses usually agree with the MT, possible disagreements (especially when they simultaneously agree with LXX readings) can be highly important and interesting from a text-historical point of view.48

While 2 Kings 17 has rarely, if ever, been subjected to a comprehensive text-critical survey, the possible repercussions of such an investigation could be considerable, as will be shown in this study. Especially in the first half of the chapter, there are multiple large-scale and substantial textual variations and variants that may even completely change our view of this text and its transmission history. A systematic text-historical analysis of the chapter is thus in order.

1.2.2.1 On the Septuagint, the Antiochian text, and the problematics of (detecting) kaige revision in 2 Kings

Since the original translation of the LXX has not been preserved as such in any of the manuscripts, there is already a need for intra-Greek textual criticism before a scholar can start with the comparison of the Greek and Hebrew text forms. Most customarily this first round of textual criticism, in the context of Samuel-Kings, is to be conducted between the B-text (Vaticanus), the L-text (the Antiochian text), and, when differing from these two, the majority text. At times the Syrohexapla and the daughter translations of the LXX (most specifically the Old Latin, see below) may help in finding the oldest Greek attainable, which may then be compared with the MT. At times witnesses like the Peshitta and Vulgate can be of help as well.

In 2 Kings, however, this work is made much more problematic because of the abovementioned kaige revision since, according to the traditional view, all witnesses apart from L have been mostly corrupted by it, and the B-text49 is the main witness of kaige.50 However, it has recently become clear that even L may not be as

48 Since these witnesses are quite marginal, in this study they will be taken into account only when applicable. Here one may also mention the readings of medieval Hebrew Masoretic manuscripts collected and collated by Benjamin Kennicott and Giovanni Bernardo De Rossi, which occasionally seem to attest a (Masoretic) textual tradition (slightly) different from the Leningrad Codex.
49 Often found in the “kaige inner-group,” consisting of manuscripts A B O b 64’ 55; on this grouping, see Kauhanen, “Best Greek Witnesses” (forthcoming).
50 Law, “3–4 Kingdoms,” 148: “The Antiochian, or Lucianic, recension plays an important part in the textual history since it contains older – and often the oldest – readings in the kaige sections. Thus, some claim that in the non-kaige sections (γγ) B is the best witness to the OG, and in the kaige sections (βγ
unproblematic a witness as has previously been thought since even it attests many *kaige* readings in addition to its Hexaplaric and Lucianic substrata. While the Lucianic and Hexaplaric influences can be recognized quite easily and filtered off, the problem of possible *kaige* influence in *L* remains. When *L* agrees with the rest of the Greek manuscript tradition, we cannot be certain whether this was the OG reading or, as the text usually agrees with the MT, just later adaptation towards the MT. Overall, *L* therefore remains – provably – our single most valuable Greek witness to the OG readings in 2 Kings, especially when the rest of the witnesses have been influenced by *kaige*. However, this is not the case in some, or possibly even in most, parts of the book – without further studies in the textual characteristics of *L* we do not yet have sufficient knowledge of the matter. Often *L* gives its *kaige* readings as doublets besides the OG text, in which cases it is usually possible to quite easily reconstruct the OG, but these cases seem to form a (distinct?) minority.

What, then, constitutes a *kaige* reading? The most basic way to identify such readings is of course to use the “Lagardean principle”: the text closer to the MT is more likely to be a Hebraizing reading, and the one most different from the MT, the OG. However, especially in cases where there are no differing readings, much

---

51 Similarly Joosten, “Value of the Septuagint,” 230: “The text of minuscules 19, 82, 93, 108, 127 is supposed to be impermeable to the *kaige* recension throughout 1–4 Kingdoms, but it is not: several *kaige* readings are found in it.” How, when, and at what stage of the Lucianic revision this corruption happened is not clear, however. Were the readings, or at least some of them, found already in the exemplar of *L*, or were they added only by the Lucianic revisers? Were they taken from strictly Hexaplaric manuscripts or could there have been contamination from manuscripts bearing only *kaige* revision? It has lately been noticed by Kauhanen, “Best Greek Witnesses,” (forthcoming), that there seem to be two more or less distinct strata of *kaige* revision in 2 Samuel: while most manuscripts give more general Hebraizations, the “*kaige* inner-group” (see note 49 above) gives an even more exact Hebraization. It is possible that such slight stratification could also play a role when discussing the different textual layers of *L*. More research on this phenomenon would seem to be in order.

52 Before this *kaige* influence may in any way be measured, a comprehensive study of the text of *L* and its affiliations in Kings has to be conducted. There are thus clear avenues for future research in this respect.

53 For the already detected *kaige* readings, see McLay, “*Kaige* and Septuagint,” 131–4, who lists the best-known 96 suggested equivalents. However, to this list may be added some 16 new equivalents found after this, as seen in the list of Appendix C; see, for instance, Avalos, “ΔΕΥΡΟ/ΔΕΥΤΕ,” 165–76; Kauhanen, “Lucifer of Cagliari,” 146–68; Muraoka, “Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings,” 28–49; Deboys, “Recensional Criteria,” 135–9; Trebolle, *Jehu y Joas*, 48–70; and sections 2.6.3 and 2.6.6 in this book.

54 The “Lagardean principle” cannot be used as an absolute rule, of course, since there are multiple cases where the text agreeing with the MT is the likeliest option for OG, and the *kaige* text is in fact more distanced from the MT, likely having been Hebraized towards a slightly differing proto-Masoretic text form.
subtler characterizations and criteria are needed. The list provided by Kauhanen might be the most precise characterization to date of the procedure best used to detect kai ge readings:

**Lexicographical criteria.**
1. The Greek word produces the basic meaning of the Hebrew word or a rendering that might be theologically meaningful.
2. The same rendering is found more often in the kai ge sections than outside them.
3. The same rendering can be found in Aquila’s or Theodotion’s translation or in the Nahal Hever Minor Prophets scroll.
4. The reading produces the same number of elements (particles and lexemes) as the corresponding Hebrew reading.
5. The competing reading in L is likely to be the Old Greek reading or a slightly revised version of it.

**External criteria.**
1. In the kai ge sections, the reading is found in the B text and the vast majority of the witnesses, but not in L.
2. In the non-kai ge sections the reading is typically found in the B text with some support in the minuscules, but not in L and the majority.
3. The reading in L is supported by pre-Lucianic witnesses or other witnesses that are known for being mostly free from kai ge influence.  

However, as will be shown during this study, even Kauhanen’s list of the external criteria proves problematic, at least in some cases, since even L seems to have been influenced, at least sporadically, by kai ge. Exactly why and how this happens is not yet clear (only through Hexaplaric corruption?), but already the three attestations of και γε in 2 Kings 17:19, 41, without any variants, speak quite clearly for this.  

Nevertheless, the external criteria are for the most part likely met by the OL witness La115, even when L attests secondary readings.

1.2.2.2 Old Latin: Palimpsestus Vindobonensis (La115) and other witnesses
The study of the Old Latin (OL) witnesses of the books of Samuel–Kings has lately become a topic of increasing interest. Thanks to the many seminal writings of Julio Trebolle, Adrian Schenker, and a few others, such as Tuukka Kauhanen, Matthieu Richelle, and Eugene Ulrich, it has been now firmly established that when one considers the text-critical challenges of Samuel–Kings, the OL witnesses cannot be

---

57 It is hard to say what the source for the kai ge readings in L was, or whether the very exemplar of the Lucianic reviser(s) was a text already partially influenced by kai ge. It is not hard to see, however, that this could have happened: already at the time of the Lucianic revision. The kai ge manuscripts were likely the most prominent textual forms of Kings in the east and thus possibly even in Antioch, and thus it is no real wonder that the revisers would have at least had the chance to come by some of their readings. Furthermore, since no systematic study of the Lucianic/Antiochian text of (Samuel–)Kings has yet been conducted, it is impossible to say anything more particular on the matter.
overlooked. Not only can they oftentimes be used to confirm Old Greek readings in both non-\textit{kaige} and especially in the \textit{kaige} sections, it has been argued – rightly in my opinion – that in many cases these witnesses remain the only ones to otherwise lost OG readings.\textsuperscript{58} Their help in the study of the (proto-)Lucanian\textsuperscript{59} readings is similarly indispensable since it is likely that, at least for the most part, the OL witnesses have not been contaminated by Lucanian recensional readings.

However, while growing interest towards OL witnesses has been manifested in recent decades, thus far no complete systematic studies have been published of the most important witnesses in order to map their textual affiliations in Kings.\textsuperscript{60} Kauhanen is the first to have conducted such a comprehensive study in his investigation on the text of \textit{Lucifer of Cagliari} (2018). His conclusion that “Lucifer’s quotations from the Books of Kings form a good and old textual witness” is important, and shows that there well may be much more to discover in the OL texts.\textsuperscript{61}

Apart from Lucifer, there are two other specifically important and studied OL witnesses to Kings, namely the marginal readings in a group of Spanish Vulgate

\textsuperscript{58} For Lucifer, see Kauhanen, \textit{Lucifer}, 318–22; for La\textsuperscript{115}, see some of the cases and the bibliography in Tekoniemi, “Identifying \textit{kaige}.” While La\textsuperscript{M} is much more mixed in its text type, it certainly preserves some OG readings from time to time as well; see Trebolle, “Readings of the Old Latin,” 120–45.

\textsuperscript{59} The term “proto-Lucianic reading” is often used as a synonym for an Old Greek reading (especially in the context of 2 Kings). However, this term is better used simply as denoting a reading that was extant in the base text of the Lucianic reviser(s), whether OG or not. Not all readings in this text form could have been original Old Greek readings – at least some corruption (accidental mistakes, pluses/minuses of varying length, etc.) must have taken place. Proto-Lucianic readings should therefore be divided into two groups: the original Old Greek readings and proto-Lucianic secondary readings.

\textsuperscript{60} On the question of whether there was originally only one Old Latin translation, as with the Septuagint, as assumed by many scholars, or rather there were multiple translations, I would be inclined to agree with Kauhanen, “Septuagint in the West,” 324: “The large amount of variation between the witnesses [i.e., La\textsuperscript{115}, La\textsuperscript{M}, and Lucifer, TT] in details in which there is very hard to see any reason for possible inner-Latin revision strongly suggests that these three Latin witnesses for Kings do not go back to a single Old Latin translation.” This is hardly surprising, since the provenance of La\textsuperscript{M} is enigmatic to say the least, and Lucifer most likely translated some of the passages himself. See similarly Mulder, \textit{Kings}, 7: “Because the old-Latin Bible translation is not uniform, one often finds different text types in the same Bible books.” The method of Haelewyck, “Relevance of the Old Latin,” 440, is questionable when he asserts: “Until we find proof to the contrary, we may indeed say that, for each book or collection of books, there was originally only one Latin version.” In order to come to such a conclusion, one would need to have evidence as well – the burden of proof rests on the one making the claim. Kauhanen, \textit{Lucifer}, 371–8, convincingly shows that the different Latin witnesses do not go back to only one translation.

\textsuperscript{61} Kauhanen, \textit{Lucifer}, 318, further asserts: “The good quality of Lucifer’s Greek text is evident from the fact that he follows almost none of the \textit{kaige} readings found in B or the Hexaplaric readings found mainly in A. In addition, in most of the numerous Lucianic recensional readings found in L, Lucifer follows the OG as found in B … It is possible that the hypothetical OG text witnessed by Lucifer may occasionally have preserved the reading of the Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} of the Septuagint against most or all of the other Greek witnesses.”
manuscripts (known as LaM or La91-95), and, more importantly, the fragmentary 5th century Vindobonensis palimpsest (La115). While the marginal readings (LaM) are textually quite pluriform (at times preserving OG readings), they also clearly attest readings from Hexaplaric, Lucianic, and even kaige recensions, and thus can help the text critic only up to a certain point, the Vindobonensis palimpsest seems to have originally consisted of a complete translation of Samuel–Kings as a full codex, similar to the (just as under-studied) Codex Lugdunensis, which preserves an OL translation of Deuteronomy–Judges.

As part of my dissertation project it was my aim to conduct an overall study of the text of La115, not only in 2 Kgs 17, but also in 1–2 Kings in general. The results of this study concerning the textual affiliations of La115 in 1–2 Kings have been presented in two SBL papers (2016, 2017), and may be summarized here in the two tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The textual affiliations of La115 in 1 Kings</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Cases68 in 1 Kgs</th>
<th>Cases in 2 Kgs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La115 = B ≠ L</td>
<td>51 (27%)</td>
<td>35 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La115 = L ≠ B</td>
<td>50 (26%)</td>
<td>87 (35%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La115 = B L ≠ A</td>
<td>16 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La115 = A ≠ B L</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62 See Moreno, Las Glosas Marginales, for an edition and study of LaM.
63 For the edition of this manuscript, see Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 13–87. Only about 9% of the text of Kings is preserved in La115.
64 As aptly shown in the table of Trebolle, “Readings of the Old Latin,” 122. See also Fernández, Scribes and Translators, 49–51. At times there are even to be found Hebraizing readings in LaM we know from nowhere else.
65 As emphasized by Kauhanen, “Septuagint in the West,” 312: “… we do not know on which Greek tradition(s) the translations were based on … it is not possible to construct a theoretical framework within which it might be actually tested whether the marginal readings witness genuine Old Latin translation or translations, or whether they witness something else, probably of later origin.” In my mind we need not go this far, and may and should adopt the cautiously hopeful attitude of Ulrich, “The Old Latin Translation,” 361, who calls the marginal readings “plausible evidence.” At least in one major case, namely 2 Kgs 10:36+, where LaM agrees with L on a large plus, LaM likely independently (the differences between the two text forms seem significant enough to deem that the text has not simply been taken from a [known] purely Lucianic source – although it is not certain where this gloss would have been taken from) preserves an OG vestige.
66 For an edition of the Lugdunensis codex, see Ulysse Robert, Heptateuchi Partis Posterioris.
67 Tekoniemi, “Is there a (proto-)Lucianic stratum,” (forthcoming); and idem, “Identifying kaige,” 1–14. Both articles include multiple case studies, and can be downloaded at https://helsinki.academia.edu/TimoTekoniemi. The full data and case lists can similarly be downloaded at the said site.
68 One “case” usually corresponds to a word or a short series of 2–3 words that appear in one tradition but not in another (according to the patterns given). However, in some rare cases (especially concerning the Hexaplaric material) one case can also consist of parts of or even a whole verse. See note 67 above for the database of the collected cases.
The numbers in 1 Kgs point to similar affiliations as noted by Kauhanen in his study of the text of La\textsuperscript{115} in 1 Samuel\textsuperscript{69} showing that La\textsuperscript{115} appears to provide a good and reliable witness to the OG there. The affiliations of La\textsuperscript{115} in 2 Kgs form a different, but certainly interesting, pattern: the agreements with L against B increase. While the emerging difference is not statistically significant, the numbers attested do still conform to the expected main pattern between B and L in Kings: in the \textit{kaige} section the agreements between La\textsuperscript{115} and B decrease, while the agreements between L and La\textsuperscript{115} increase. Interestingly, however, the number of unique readings in La\textsuperscript{115} also grows in 2 Kings. While this rise in unique readings may be only incidental, it would seem to me that there is one quite simple reason for this – namely that La\textsuperscript{115} preserves the OG as the sole witness in many of these cases.\textsuperscript{70}

It has indeed been found in the previous studies of La\textsuperscript{115} that its text does transmit quite reliably a text form close to OG, with little to no contamination from Hexaplaric, \textit{kaige}, or Vulgate readings.\textsuperscript{71} While the possibility of very sporadic recensional Lucianic contamination cannot be completely ruled out (albeit many of the cases are anything but certain), it seems most probable that the translation does indeed originally go back to a proto-Lucianic text form that was very close to the OG.\textsuperscript{72}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
La\textsuperscript{115} = other MSS ≠ A B L & 21 (11\%) & 28 (11\%) \\
\hline
Unique readings & 48 (25\%) & 92 (38\%) \\
\hline
TOTAL & 190 (100\%) & 248 (100\%) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{69} See Kauhanen, \textit{Proto-Lucianic}, 140.
\textsuperscript{70} Ulrich, “The Old Latin Translation,” 270: “But the fundamental importance of the Old Latin ... is that it often takes us back with controllable reliability to the text of Samuel as it was when the Greek was first translated from the Hebrew.” On the specific importance of La\textsuperscript{115} in Kings, see Fernández, “Antiochene Edition,” 10: “… the \textit{Papyrus Vindobonensis} of the \textit{Vetus Latina} also contains a series of changes which are no doubt related to an earlier stage of the transmission in the Greek model.”
\textsuperscript{71} Haelewuyck, “Relevance of the Old Latin,” 442. Kauhanen, \textit{Proto-Lucianic Problem}, 158–63, argues for a few possibly Hexaplaric readings in 1 Samuel. There seems to be no Hexaplaric contamination in 1–2 Kings, however, Trebolle, “Textos ‘\textit{kaige},’” 198–209, has argued that the “doubling” of the Jehu narrative in 2 Kgs 10:25–28 is due to some kind of \textit{kaige} influence on La\textsuperscript{115}. However, it is more likely that this doubling, in fact, forms part of the more original Hebrew composition of the story, thus going back to OG; similarly Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 149–66.
\textsuperscript{72} According to Kauhanen, \textit{Proto-Lucianic Problem}, 164, the manuscript may have caught some sporadic Lucianic contamination, but is overall quite a good witness; in Tekoniemi, “Is there a (proto-)Lucianic stratum,” 1–14, I have argued that in 1 Kings this is the case as well. Kauhanen (158–63) finds altogether 15 readings shared by La\textsuperscript{115} and L in 1 Samuel that, to his mind, go back to the Lucianic recension, albeit, as he asserts, “none of the cases, however, is particularly striking.” While I agree with most of his assessments, I would contest 6 of his analyses (1 Sam 4:4, 7, 6:12, 10:21, 14:34 \textit{bis}), which would drop the amount of recensional Lucianic contamination in 1 Samuel to only 9 cases. First, in 1 Sam 4:4 Kauhanen and Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 46, see the case καθήμενου χερουβιμ
The translation technique of La\textsuperscript{115} is highly literal, albeit not slavish: most of the time the translator has aspired to translate his *Vorlage* word for word, and he usually uses set translation equivalents. Even the word order follows Greek most of the time. Therefore it is a quite well-founded assumption that the pluses and minuses found in La\textsuperscript{115} – when not suspect of haplography or other mistakes – were in most cases already found in its Greek *Vorlage*.\textsuperscript{73} This literalness is not due to the incompetence of the translator, however, and quite often he shows his proficiency in both Greek and Latin.

Apart from 1–2 Kings, one major textual case in La\textsuperscript{115} may be recounted here, as it quite nicely shows the probable worth of the manuscript. The verses 2 Sam 5:4–5, which deal with the chronology of David’s kingship, have often been seen as later additions in the literary-critical scholarship, and this is a very tenable viewpoint – the verses are later interpolations between 5:3 and 5:6.\textsuperscript{74} The idealized chronological information (40 year reign)\textsuperscript{75} has likely been taken from 1 Kgs 2:11, and added here

---

\textsuperscript{73} Kauhanen, “Septuagint in the West,” 311, asserts: “What is left and can be read, however, is a fairly accurate Latin translation that, for the most parts, can be back-translated to Greek.” La\textsuperscript{115} does however have a slight tendency to independently add to the text names and their explications, verbs of being, and *and*-conjunctions – all “clarifying” tendencies it shares with the Lucianic text. This tendency has been noted already by Fischer, *Beiträge*, 16.

\textsuperscript{74} According to Anderson, 2 *Samuel*, 75, “most scholars regard them [vv. 4–5] as a later Deuteronomistic addition.” The information given in 4–5 is anachronistic, since David is yet to conquer Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{75} For a discussion of the susceptibility of such idealized chronological numbers in Israel and in the Ancient Near East generally (especially 7 and 40 years), see Liverant, “Chronology,” 73–88.
as a sort of beginning formula to David’s reign.\textsuperscript{76} The verses are also missing from the parallel account of Chronicles and Josephus. There is, however, extremely interesting textual evidence for this addition as well: both 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and La\textsuperscript{115} lack the verses against every other witness.\textsuperscript{77} This is hardly a pure coincidence, since the text cannot be explained as having dropped due to any simple haplography in either witness. It is even more unlikely that both witnesses would have independently omitted the text for whatever reason.\textsuperscript{78} The easiest and likeliest option for the agreement of La\textsuperscript{115} (= OG) and the Qumran manuscript here would be to see their minus as the most original text.\textsuperscript{79}

This passage is somewhat problematic from a methodological viewpoint, however, since in such a case we would have to concede that every other Greek witness – that is, even L – was at a later date influenced here by a considerably large \textit{kaige}-type correction towards the fuller MT. While this by itself is not in any way unthinkable, the biggest problem would be the fact that nothing in the Greek text of 2 Sam 5:4–5, a passage outside the traditionally thought bounds of the \textit{kaige} revision,\textsuperscript{80} would seem to warrant the \textit{kaige} label. There are no typical \textit{kaige} readings/renderings, and since the OG translation is already very literal, the \textit{kaige} text here could easily pass as the OG translation (and certainly \textit{has} done so). This is by no means surprising, since \textit{kaige}, for the most part, seems to have used the very same phraseology as the OG translator did. It is only the “proto-Hexaplaric” idiosyncrasies of \textit{kaige} that we

\textsuperscript{76} See Anderson, \textit{2 Samuel}, 75; Auld \textit{I & II Samuel}, 395. See also 2 Sam 2:10–11, where similar information is given. These verses are similarly very disruptive in the context, and quite clearly later additions; see McCarter, \textit{II Samuel}, 88–9.

\textsuperscript{77} The text of 4QSama is fragmentary, and has to be reconstructed. Nevertheless, the text of 4–5 cannot fit in the manuscript, and thus must clearly have been missing from it.

\textsuperscript{78} While the “midrashic” rewriting tendencies of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} might to a certain degree be accepted (whatever this midrashicism might mean), such tendencies cannot be found in La\textsuperscript{115}, which aspires to recreate its Greek exemplar very faithfully. Omissions of text would furthermore seem unexpected in both witnesses, even in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, which usually rather strives for as \textit{full} a text as possible, at times by collecting and conflating readings from different sources. We cannot be completely certain, of course, whether these verses were found in some other position in the manuscript, but, either way, such a transposition would likely tell just as much about the secondary nature of the verses as the current minus.

\textsuperscript{79} McCarter, \textit{II Samuel}, 131, also considers this to be the OG reading, and thus the oldest reading attainable. Similarly Trebolle, “Textual Criticism and the Composition History,” 263. Thus, redactional reconstructions, where this passage may be seen for instance as original “DtrH” text, such as by Kratz, \textit{Composition}, 184, are evidently wrong.

\textsuperscript{80} It is nowadays clear that the \textit{kaige} phenomenon is not strictly limited to just the \textit{kaige} sections; see Aejmelaeus, “\textit{Kaige} Readings in a Non-\textit{Kaige} Section in 1 Samuel,” 169–84. This is another paradigm that will need to be rethought: while \textit{kaige} (or: \textit{kaige}-like proto-rabbinic harmonizing tendency) is most abundantly found in the \textit{kaige} sections, it is by no means restricted to it.
usually comfortably assign to later Hebraizing hands. Cases such as this, however, break the usual pattern in the harshest way possible, and, even more unsettling, this intrusion of *kaige*-like revision would be completely unrecognizable without textual evidence. Cases like 2 Sam 5:4–5 show that many texts we are dealing with as “Old Greek” may in fact not be such.\(^{81}\)

In addition to this large OG minus, La\(^{115}\) has another highly peculiar trait: it has (or preserves?) some transpositions of textual units that are nowhere else recorded. First, the death narrative of Elisha in 2 Kgs 13:14–21 is in La\(^{115}\) found already after 2 Kings 10:30, which is likely the OG, and, furthermore, the most ancient location of said narrative.\(^{82}\) Second, the whole chapter 2 Kgs 16 is now missing from between 15:38 and 17:1 – whether accidentally or deliberately, has not yet been resolved (see 2.1 below). The third major transposition happens in 2 Kgs 17, where verses 9(–14)\(^{83}\) and 15–19 are transposed. When it is taken into account that in 1 Kings such sequential differences between the MT and LXX (of which some are preserved in La\(^{115}\) as well) are not only frequent, but even characterize the OG edition vis-à-vis the MT,\(^{84}\) the question arises: could La\(^{115}\) have preserved the OG order (and text) of the narratives here? If the answer is yes, could this OG text have further repercussions on the textual

---

81 Another very similar case is that of 1 Kgs 16:34 (non-*kaige* section), a very late interpolation where only L lacks the whole verse, likely as the sole OG witness (and the earliest text attainable). The verse cannot have dropped via a simple haplography. Nothing in the text of other Greek witnesses would seem to warrant the *kaige* label. A deliberate omission in L is thus not likely.


83 The preserved text of La\(^{115}\) breaks off after verse 9ba. Therefore, it is impossible to say whether or not the codex had the rest of the chapter originally, or even any of the other verses of the unit 9–14 in it. As Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 215 n. 7, notes, this was, however, “quite likely” so. As verse 9 can be found in the text, it is quite safe to assume that at least some of verses 10–14 were also located after it. Thus also Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 239.

84 Good examples of these in 1 Kings are the so-called “Miscellanies I and II” in 2:35a–o and 2:46a–l, the very different order of verses 11:14–25, the differing Jeroboam narrative in 12:24a–z, transposition of the Jehoshaphat narrative of 22:41–51 to 16:28a-h, transposition of chapters 20 and 21; in 2 Kings, the transposition of Joram’s regnal formula in 3:1–3 to 1:18a–d may be the most notable difference shared by practically the whole of the Greek tradition. Of these, the preserved portions of La\(^{115}\) share 1 Kings 12:24a–z and 16:28a–h. Because of the *kaige* revision in 2 Kings, not that many differences can be found in most manuscripts, although the composition of 2 Kgs 13 is somewhat different in L when compared to the other witnesses. It is therefore noteworthy that great differences of this kind are not extant just in 1 Kings/3 Kingdoms, but in 2 Kings/4 Kingdoms as well. This runs counter to the opinion of Tov, “Three Strange Books,” 377–9, who argues that because of the lack of such large-scale differences in 2 Kings, the scrolls from which the Greek translations were made differed greatly in their type: the scroll containing 1 Kings contained a rewritten version of the book, and the scroll of 2 Kings contained the original, unaltered, version. When the evidence from both Antiochian and Old Latin manuscripts in 2 Kgs is gathered, the picture changes drastically, much closer to the “rewritten” situation found in 1 Kgs.
history of Kings? In the case of 2 Kings 17, as will be argued, the answer to both may well be positive.

1.2.2.3 The Samaritan Chronicle II (Sepher ha-Yamim): a brief text-critical survey

Apart from the Old Latin, an even less-known textual source of 1–2 Kings is the so-called Samaritan Chronicle (Sepher ha-Yamim). While the oldest manuscript of Sepher ha-Yamim comes from the 17th century, and the text is written in classical (albeit possibly dialectal) Hebrew, the text itself cannot be dated.

This interpretative work recounts the historical books through Joshua–Kings, occasionally adding materials from 1–2 Chronicles. The text of Kings is recounted only very partially (leaving out, for instance, most of the Elijah-Elisha stories, clearly for ideological reasons) in a polemical fashion against both the kings of Judah and the kings of Israel – and their religious misdeeds. While it is clear that the manuscript and its text are late and of mixed quality (having mainly MT and occasional LXX readings together with a plethora of its own unique readings), it has been argued by Macdonald and a few others that some old traditions may lie in the book. However, for the most part the text of Kings in Sepher ha-Yamim is very close to, usually even verbatim, that of the MT, although a more thorough study of its text would be in order. In any case, the manuscript is not simply a forgery or a chance collection of

---

85 I want to thank Ville Mäkipelto for bringing this interesting text to my attention.
86 For an edition and translation of this text, see Macdonald, The Samaritan Chronicle. To my knowledge, no commentator – or even scholar – has, extensively or otherwise, yet discussed this textual form of 2 Kings 17, or Samuel–Kings, in general.
87 Macdonald, The Samaritan Chronicle, 5–6. Cohen, A Samaritan Chronicle, 175, notes that the classical style cannot alone be used for dating, since in the ninth century CE there happened a renaissance of classical Hebrew. See also Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 45–50, for discussion.
88 Sepher ha-Yamim differentiates the Samaritan community from the inhabitants of both kingdoms, and thus also the cardinal sin of Jeroboam – and Solomon, who similarly commits the sin of decentralization from Shechem and Mount Gerizim. We are thus to understand Samaritans as a third major (Yahwistic) religious group in the area, and the only ones who stayed true to the original cult.
89 Macdonald, The Samaritan Chronicle, 8, asserts: “Chron.II … is basically a very old chron. of unknown date, possibly derived from a pre-MT version of the BT [= Biblical Text, TT] …” See also Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 45–50, on the Chronicle’s text of Joshua 22–24.
90 Macdonald, The Samaritan Chronicle, 208–9, lists some minuses (“omissions”), which are shared by the Chronicle and the LXX in 1–2 Kgs: 1 Kgs 10:17, 12:3, 18, 15:19, 16:10, 11–12, 15, 29, 20:2, 21:5; 2 Kgs 3:7 (=L), 17:15 (lacking only in manuscripts A V). While some of these similarities are most probably independent of each other, the cases 1 Kgs 16:10αβ, 11b, 15αα, 29, 20:2, and 2 Kgs 3:7 are so peculiarly similar that they do indeed likely go back to a similar, slightly shorter Hebrew text, which was later expanded by the (proto-)MT. On the other hand, most of the “variants” listed by Macdonald, while possibly true agreements, do not seem significant.
passages from the MT as we know it.\textsuperscript{91} It seems likely that the Samaritans (have) had a collection of texts of the historical books that differ from the (proto-)MT to varying degrees.

In his 2017 SBL presentation of the Samaritan book of Joshua, which is also for the most part found in the Chronicle in question, Mäkipelto lists five reasons for taking the differing readings of the Samaritan versions seriously into account: 1) since the textual plurality was in a very fluid state before the fixation of the MT, it is not at all impossible that some of the Samaritan readings go back to a (proto-MT) textual form that circulated in these times; 2) the short form of the Samaritan text raises questions since it was much more common for the ancient texts to be expanded (as is also regularly the case with the Samaritan text) than shortened; 3) its agreements with Josephus make it likely that the Samaritan version had, at least at points, a common source text with Josephus; 4) many additions (especially harmonizations with the Pentateuch) found in the Samaritan version are in no way clearly Samaritan in their tendencies, and could have been made at any point of the transmission process, similar to the additions found in Qumran manuscripts; 5) the fact that the Samaritan version

\textsuperscript{91} The following 19 cases, not mentioned by Macdonald, show that the writer or copyist had before him a Hebrew text slightly differing from the final text of the MT, and which sporadically agreed with the OG. This is especially the case when the Chronicle agrees with \textit{L} (\textit{OG}) against the rest of the traditions, since it is extremely unlikely that the writers/editors/composers of the Chronicle (marked as “Sam” in the list below) would have been aware of readings in a (late recensional) Greek text:

1 Kgs
1:5  הָיֹתָה דִּיוֹק Sam = διή L 318 158 460
10:17  הָרְנְקָה Sam = B L 509 107 246 460
11:26  הָרָּכִּים MT = A 247 (Hexaplaric) > Sam = LXX
12:16  הָרָּכִּים MT = A 247 (Hexaplaric) > Sam = LXX
15:18  הָרָּכִּים MT > Sam = LXX
20:2  הָרָּכִּים MT > Sam = LXX
20:3  הָרָּכִּים MT > Sam = LXX
21:15 הָרָּכִּים MT = A L (Hexaplaric?) > Sam = LXX

2 Kgs
3:7  הָרְנְקָה MT/LXX > Sam = L-700
3:8  הָרְנְקָה MT = L-700 אָנַהְוֹןָיָא (Hexaplaric?) > Sam; אָנַהוֹנָו LXX
3:10  הָרְנְקָה MT = L-700] > Sam = LXX
6:12  הָרְנְקָה MT/LXX > Sam = LXX
10:18  הָרְנְקָה MT/LXX > Sam = L-700 460 (Vulgate: \textit{ego autem colam})
10:27  הָרְנְקָה MT = ~ \textit{εἰς τὸν} δῆμον ταύτῃ LXX (kaige?) > Sam = La\textsuperscript{15} (!)
13:5  הָרְנְקָה MT/LXX > Sam = LXX
14:23  הָרְנְקָה MT = A L-700 328 460 (Hexaplaric) > Sam = LXX \textit{ἐν τῷ} Ἰσραήλ
15:10  הָרְנְקָה MT/LXX > Sam = L-700 460
15:30  הָרְנְקָה MT > Sam = L-700 460
25:10  הָרְנְקָה MT > Sam = LXX
of Joshua sometimes agrees with the LXX clearly shows that their Hebrew source texts went back to a similar form.  

Indeed, the fact that Sepher ha-Yamim and the LXX occasionally agree in substantial readings (especially minuses) indicates that both go, at least partly, back to similar Hebrew text forms. This is especially the case with its text of Joshua-Judges, where the Samaritan materials may have preserved the earliest version of the books altogether, but possibly also in Samuel-Kings – albeit evidently to a much lesser degree. While the text of the Chronicle is exceedingly polemical in Samuel-Kings and shows signs of a very late reception history, it should be taken into account in the text-critical assessment – especially because it is, after all, the only other known (classical) Hebrew source apart from the MT to the text of 2 Kings 17.

There are indeed some interesting features in Sepher ha-Yamim’s text of Kings. The first to be noted is its chronological order of the text: while the chronology presented by the book, recounted according to the terms of Samaritan high priests rather than the regnal years of the kings of Israel and Judah, seems to be erratic and inconsistent, the order and layout of the regnal narratives has, at times, similarities with the LXX order of the text. For instance, the regnal narrative of Jehoshaphat (in the 8th year of the high priest Zadok) is recorded twice, first before Ahab (who accedes to the throne in the 9th year of Zadok), and then once more after him (again in the 8th year of Zadok) – exactly as happens in the LXX kaige text. This indicates that the underlying chronology (and thus order) of the Chronicle’s source text may have been, at least at some points, similar to that of the OG, where Jehoshaphat also accedes to the throne before Ahab, and that the source text of Sepher ha-Yamim may have had a text similar to the kaige. Most intriguingly, according to Sepher ha-Yamim, the

92 Mäkipelto, “Does the Samaritan.”
93 Macdonald, The Samaritan Chronicle, 36–8. See also the listings of readings and omissions in the notes above.
94 Thus Mäkipelto, “Does the Samaritan.” Cf. I.R.M. Bóid, “Transmission of Samaritan,” 22–4: “… Samaritan is a very developed form of a short text that is more primitive in its recensional origin than MT/LXX. This fact has implications for the question of systematic recensional development and its purpose, in both traditions” (23).
95 The order of the text seems disturbed at the times of Jehoshaphat-Ahab, Jehoram-Jehu-Ahazyah, Amazyah-Joash, and Jotham-Pekahyah-Pekah – indeed, all contexts where there is either text-critical evidence of transpositions or different order of the text (Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Jehu, Amazyah), or where there are grave chronological problems (Pekah, Jotham), very likely evidencing textual changes.
96 The current order (Jehoshaphat–Ahab–Jehoshaphat) is also similar to the one in Chronicles and the majority Greek text (kaige), where Jehoshaphat is brought into the story twice. For this phenomenon, see Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 6–7.
Judean king Ahaz (34th of Akbiah) acceded to the throne after Hoshea (33rd of Akbiah), as also seems to be the case in La115, where chapter 16 is now missing between chapters 15 and 17.97

The second interesting feature of Sepher ha-Yamim is the many intriguing minuses of several verses that are not found in other witnesses but have been, at least partly, seen as late additions in the literary-critical scholarship.98 While many of these minuses are almost certainly due to the Samaritan redactors/composers, it is probable that at least some shorter passages do indeed preserve an original, unexpanded text – otherwise, we would need to conclude that the writers of the Chronicle worked in many cases on the same basis as modern literary critics, omitting some of the very same passages we moderns too would consider somehow problematic. In either case it seems that the literary-critical scholarship is generally on the right track when it comes to understanding the thought of the ancients.

Thirdly, it needs to be noted that in 2 Kings 17 Sepher ha-Yamim may indeed reflect an underlying Hebrew tradition that differed somewhat from that of both the MT and LXX versions. While it mostly agrees with the MT until verse 16α, after which the direct quotation of the chapter ceases,99 its text is, apart from the lengthy addition from Deut 4:34 in verse 7, much shorter than that of either the MT, the LXX, or any other witness: it lacks verses 4β100, 8b, 9a, 13, 14b, and 15α. Most of these passages – if not all – are also literary- or redaction-critically suspect, constituting late additions.101 While it is again possible, and even likely, that some parts of the text

97 See the discussion of this phenomenon in La115 above. Böid, “Transmission of Samaritan,” 23–24, notes intriguingly enough that the chronology of the Samaritan book of Judges would in fact work best as the basis of both MT and LXX chronologies for 1 Kgs 6:1: “The figure of 480 years [in MT, TT] will only work with a recension of the book of Judges that supposes an orderly succession with no breaks in between and no periods of apostasy in between, i.e. without all the pseudo-Deuteronomistic additions. We have just described the Samaritan book in these words … The figure of 440 in the original Greek of I Kings would fit the Samaritan chronology exactly.”


99 The source text of Sepher ha-Yamim likely consisted of at least verses 7–20, since verses 18 and 20 are echoed at the end of the passage (marked as “H$ K*” in the system of Macdonald) dealing with the destruction of Samaria (the text reading אַשּׁוּרְנָה ↓ יְהוָה תִּתְנוּל נְבֵיהֶל יִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל יָבֹא בֶּן אַשִּׁי 20α). It is impossible to say whether the text of 21–41 was known to the writer of the Chronicle. The Chronicle never mentions the “sin of Jeroboam,” and therefore it understandably omits verses 21–23.

100 This lack may be simply due to a homoioteleuton mistake from the second יִשְׂרָאֵל לְלֹא בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל to the third, and will therefore not be taken into account in the survey below.

101 Furthermore, there are even good text-critical reasons to omit 8b as a gloss; see 2.5.1.
have been intentionally omitted by the Samaritan redactors, some of these minuses probably go back to a textual situation anterior to that of the MT or LXX. These minuses, when relevant to the discussion, will be evaluated in the further assessments of the respective verses.

Below, a table consisting of a comparison between verses 17:7–16a of the MT and *Sepher ha-Yamim* is provided, together with a brief text-critical analysis of its unique readings. As can be seen, the most notable characteristic of the Samaritan text, apart from its brevity, is that it has been quite extensively harmonized towards Deuteronomy. Such extensive harmonization with and towards Deuteronomy is also typical of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 17:7–16a</th>
<th><em>Sepher ha-Yamim</em> 17:7–16a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>וַיְהִי כִּי־חָטְאוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לַיהוָה הֵיהֶם אֱלֹהִים וַיִּתְאַנְּף מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִתַּחַת יַד פַּרְעֹה־מִצְרָיִם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>וַיִּירְאוּ הִים אֲחֵרִים מֵאֶרֶץ אֶתָם הֵיהֶם אֱלֹהִים וַיָּעַבְדוּ יְהוָה הוֹרִישׁ אֲשֶׁר הַגּוֹיִם קּוֹת בְּח</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

102 This is very likely the case with verse 13, which deals with prophets, and possibly also with the grammatically and semantically problematic 9a. The Chronicle is very critical of both Israelite and Judahite prophets throughout, calling Elijah and Elisha frauds (1 Kgs §M P*), and Hosea, Joel, and Amos “sorcerers” (2 Kgs §F B*). On the other hand, verses 4b and parts of 15 may have been dropped via haplography; see the analysis below.

103 Tov, “Proto-Samaritan Texts,” 400–3. Such nomistic harmonization towards Deuteronomy was a very common and recurrent phenomenon in later times when Deuteronomy was more and more considered a sacred and prominent book.

104 The **bolded** words are those that have been changed between the witnesses (in each case secondary to the MT); the lengthy Samaritan addition in verse 7 is marked with [square brackets and italics].

105 The highly problematic protatic verb וַיְהִי of the MT (see 2.4.3.2 for further analysis) is rendered pointless in the Samaritan version, since its apodosis in verse 18 (or even the До in 13) is not included in the Samaritan text, and is therefore omitted.

106 A quotation taken almost verbatim from Deut 4:34a: בְּאֹתֹת בְּמַסֹּת גּוֹי מִקֶּרֶב גּוֹי לוֹ לָקַחַת לָבוֹא הִים אֲחֵרִים. Macdonald, *The Samaritan Chronicle*, 177, calls this an addition “from the Priestly source in typical (liturgical) style.” In any case, this does not seem in any way a distinctively Samaritan addition since such a harmonization towards Deuteronomy could have been made at any point in the transmission process.

107 The use of יִרְאָה instead of יָרָא is probably due to a harmonization of the very unusual language use of the MT to a more common phrase (cf. Deut 7:4, 11:16, 13:7, 14, 17:3, 29:25; Josh 23:16, 24:2, 16; Judg 10:13; 1 Sam 8:8, 26:19; 1 Kgs 9:6 = 2 Chr 7:19; Jer 16:13). Such a change could have easily happened at any point in the scribal tradition and is again in no way distinctively Samaritan.

108 The change from MT “sons of Israel” to “their fathers” is likely due to a later smoothening of the sense of this verse, which is otherwise quite problematic, and due to several literary layers present in verses 7–9; see 2.5, 3.1.3, and 3.2.3 for further analysis. It is also possible that a Samaritan reviser would here have wanted to distance the Samaritan community, who were also part of “the sons of Israel,” from the exiled Israelites. The lack of 8b is possibly due to the Chronicle here having an earlier textual tradition of the proto-MT text, where this likely proto-Masoretic addition had not yet been incorporated.
possible that this mention was deliberately moved to verse 11 and subsequently omitted here; see note 110 above.

109 Independent scribal additions of small clarifying words, such as את here, are exceedingly common in all traditions.

110 The idea that (all) the peoples are “around” the Israelites is likely taken over from verse 15, where the same information is now lacking, possibly omitted by a Samaritan reviser (or accidentally dropped in 15 via homoiooteleuton). This may be an attempt to harmonize the somewhat contradictory information of verses 11 and 15, which, indeed, is one of the reasons to consider these verses to come from two different editorial hands; see 3.2.3–4 for further discussion.

111 The phrase “they did every abomination in the eyes of Yahweh” does not seem to directly echo any known biblical passage, but is, as a denunciation, even harsher than the one in the MT. This change may be somehow connected with the harmonization in the next verse, where similar language (and as may be the case in the Greek manuscripts A V (independently of each other), this minus could also be a true witness to a Hebrew text form which still lacked this interpolation from Jer 2:5 via Wiederaufnahme; see 3.2.4.

112 Independent scribal additions of small clarifying words, such as את here, are exceedingly common in all traditions.

113 The minus of כָּל־בְּרִיתוֹ may have dropped here via homoioteleuton; see 3.2.4.

114 Harmonization towards Deut 18:9b: Apparently, the scribe responsible for the change thought that a direct quotation from Deut 18:9 would better suit the text here than an indirect allusion to Deut 12:4. In any case, this harmonization could have again been made independently of the Samaritans/the writers of the Chronicle themselves.

115 The minus of כָּל־בְּרִיתוֹ may have dropped here via homoioteleuton; see 3.2.4. Although it is also possible that this mention was deliberately moved to verse 11 and subsequently omitted here; see note 110 above.
1.3 The sin(s) of Jeroboam? The quest for the Deuteronomistic Historian and the oldest text form of 2 Kings 17

One of the main aims of this study is to find the most likely textual layer of the History writer in the chapter, i.e., the “original author” of Kings and its basic composition. This is best accomplished by first reconstructing the earliest text attainable (through textual criticism) and then followed by purely literary- and redaction-critical aspirations. In order to extract the later additions and layers, one has to understandably have a picture of what constitutes the (more or less) solid textual basis on top of which the additions were cumulatively made. This basis is the original first edition of what is customarily called the “Deuteronomistic Historian” or History writer, who worked his annalistic source materials into a new, theologically meaningful composition.

What is meant by the “Deuteronomistic History (DtrH)”\(^{116}\) in the research is, however, at the moment in a state of flux. While the earlier scholarship, in the footsteps of Martin Noth, saw the Deuteronomistic History as spanning all the way from Deuteronomy to Kings,\(^{117}\) the more recent redactional critics have started to doubt this idea: not only does it look very improbable that such a major work was originally penned by only one individual or scribal circle, but there is an ever-growing doubt about even finding any materials penned by this “Deuteronomistic Historian” in Joshua through Samuel.\(^{118}\) This is for the simple reason that the central idea of the Urdeuteronomium,\(^{119}\) the centralization of cult to one place only (i.e., Jerusalem\(^ {120}\)), elsewhere only clearly resounds in Kings – indeed, in Kings decentralization appears

---

\(^{116}\) DtrH is to be understood as practically identical to the German equivalent “DtrG.”

\(^{117}\) Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 4–25.

\(^{118}\) Thus Würthwein, *Studien*, 9–10: “… die Bücher Jos – II Reg kein einheitliches Werk bilden, das auf einen einzelnen Autor zurückgeführt werden kann”; Nelson, “Deuteronomistic Historian in Samuel,” 17: “The hypothesis of a Deuteronomistic History in anything like the version proposed by Martin Noth may be in the last stages of decay.” See also Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1-2 Kings,” 147–8: “All kings in Kings are judged by evaluating their position toward the cult. The framing of Deuteronomy and the main laws primarily deal with the cult. In view of its centrality in Deuteronomy and 1-2 Kings, the limited interest in the same theme in Joshua–2 Samuel is significant. … If assumed to be part of the same composition, it is peculiar that even after successive editors, the apparent tension with the cult centralization has not been harmonized in these books.” This is of course not to say there is no Deuteronomistic ideology to be found in these books, though these “deuteronomisms” are evidently quite scant in Samuel; see especially the collected volume of Cynthia Edenburg & Juha Pakkala (eds.), *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists*.

\(^{119}\) See Pakkala, “The Date,” 388–401, and Veijola, *Fünfte Buch Mose*, 2–6, for an overview of this document.

\(^{120}\) Or, as in the possibly more original understanding of the Samarian Pentateuch, Mount Gerizim; see Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, 220–5, and Schenker, “Textgeschichtliches,” 105–20.
as the main sin of both kingdoms. DtrH – or rather, DtrH theology – has thus shrunk to something found, at best, only sporadically in Joshua–Samuel and, mostly, in Kings and (Ur-)Deuteronomy. It seems thus nowadays best to reserve the use of the term “DtrH” only to the discussion of 1–2 Kings, which is undoubtedly the work of a deuteronomistically minded historian – or, even better, abstain from using the term altogether because of the aforementioned problems (as will be done in this study).

The main sin the Northern Kingdom of Israel is accused of is the “sin of Jeroboam” (1 Kgs 12:26–33), the first king of the Northern Kingdom. Since this sin plays such a major role in the evaluations of the northern kings throughout the work, it is quite safe to assume that this, and most of the passages referring to Jeroboam’s sin in Kings, was one of the parts penned already by the History writer, and thus seen as the main reason for the fall of the Northern Kingdom. However, as may be expected, there is a vigorous discussion on what in fact constitutes this sin in the passage in question. The traditional approach has been to take the constitution of the golden calves in 12:28–30 as the original stratum, with verses 31–33 as later explications and expansions of Jeroboam’s actions. Such a setting of calves (as some kind of representations of the divinity), however, must have originally been thought of as part of a still Yahwistic cult since the exclamation of Jeroboam in 12:28, “behold: your gods, Israel, who brought you up (pl. הֶעֱלוּ) from the land of Egypt,” even if in the plural, can only refer to Yahweh. The idea that this new-born cult was forthrightly idolatrous can only be found in the texts and interpretations of

---

121 Similarly Kratz, Composition, 157–8: “Whereas in Samuel-Kings the First Commandment has become the criterion for assessing the kings only at a secondary stage and has replaced … the criterion of the unity of the kingdom and the cult, in Deuteronomy itself as in Joshua and Judges, more or less from the beginning it is the criterion of ‘Deuteronomistic’ (prophetic, priestly, and other) revisions. … Furthermore we must rid ourselves of the notion of a Deuteronomistic history extending from Deuteronomy to Kings … The connection first exists at the latest literary stages.” See also Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1-2 Kings,” 141–61.

122 This is also partly verified by the fact that the later revisers and redactors seem not to have cared much about Jeroboam, or even his sin; see Pakkala, “Jeroboam’s Sin,” 87.


124 Gomes, Sanctuary of Bethel, 25: “Most scholars agree that the calves were pedestals for Yahweh, a counterpart to the cherubim in the Jerusalem Temple.”

125 Similarly Cross, Canaanite Myth, 73–4 (“It is inconceivable that the national cult of Jeroboam was other than Yahwistic”); Pakkala, “Jeroboam’s Sin,” 88; Gomes, Sanctuary of Bethel, 220 (“For the Deuteronomists, Bethel was the sanctuary where Yahweh was ‘worshipped at the wrong place, at the wrong time, by the wrong priests and with the wrong iconography.’”); It is not impossible by any means that this exclamation should be interpreted as a sarcastic remark by the writer, especially considering the plural verb – calves were of course not the ones bringing Israel out of Egypt, but rather the first real threat to Yahwism.
the later revisers,\textsuperscript{126} and it is clear from the many literary-critical challenges that the passage has attracted the interest of multiple revisers.\textsuperscript{127} The sin of Jeroboam was, as implied by his internal dialogue in 12:27, first and foremost the \textit{de-centralization} of the newly constituted Yahwistic Jerusalemite cult.

However, it has recently been put forward by Juha Pakkala that this traditional interpretation of the calves as the main sin may not have been the original understanding of the text: even the calves, and the whole of 28–30, may be a later addition to the text, exactly by a later nomistically minded reviser who thought that the sin should consist of strictly idolatrous behavior.\textsuperscript{128} Pakkala provides an ample number of literary-critical arguments for his proposal, some of which may be briefly recounted here:\textsuperscript{129}

1) Instead of simply offering an alternative location for making sacrifices, which is the major theme in verse 27, Jeroboam instead instates a completely new calf cult in Bethel and Dan in 28–30, concerning which no sacrifices are mentioned – the texts appear to have two differing and independent themes;

2) The subject of 31a is now ambiguous, if not even problematic, since the verse-beginning singular verb \(וַיַּעַשׂ\) now actually refers to \(הָעָם\) in 30b, and not to Jeroboam – such grammatical problems are customarily caused by secondary interpolations;\textsuperscript{130}

3) Verses 28–30 create a closed narrative unit of their own, with a clear-cut albeit premature conclusion, “and this thing became a sin” (\(יָרָבְעָם בֵּית לְחַטָּאת\)), which explicates the exact sin Jeroboam should be denounced for from here on, even though the list of sins continues. The same phrase can be found in 13:34, where it denotes, more appropriately, the sins of the \textit{house} of Jeroboam, “and (MT: in this fashion) this thing became a sin of the house of Jeroboam” (\(יָרָבְעָם בֵּית לְחַטָּאת\));\textsuperscript{131} and

\textsuperscript{126} Petry, \textit{Entgrenzung YHWHs}, 51–4.
\textsuperscript{127} See Pakkala, “Jeroboam Without Bulls,” 501–25, for an enumeration of all the complexities of the passage 12:26–33 as well as a bibliography of the earlier work done on the issue.
\textsuperscript{128} Pakkala, “Jeroboam Without Bulls,” 501–25.
\textsuperscript{129} Pakkala, “Jeroboam Without Bulls,” 505–7, 516–17.
\textsuperscript{130} Verse 30b could, nevertheless, be a gloss-like addition as well. In such a case the subject would still be Jeroboam, as expected.
\textsuperscript{131} Indeed, the fact that the sin is only vaguely presented in 12:30, as if concerning as much or even more the \textit{people} than the king and his house – which is more customary in the context of Kings – makes
4) The main problem with the calves is the fact that they disappear practically completely from the text after 1 Kgs 12 – only in 2 Kgs 10:29 and 17:16 are they again taken up, and both of these mentions are literary-critically suspicious, and most probably did not constitute part of the text of the History writer (both mentions are likely glosses). If the calves were indeed an important part of the original writer’s text, one would expect them – or at least their destruction – to be mentioned more often, at the very least by the later nomistic hands who could certainly have used this idolatrous aspect of Israelite religion against them. Pakkala therefore proposes that the original unity of the text should be seen as continuing directly from verse 27a to 31a, where Jeroboam instates not calves, but (houses of) high places as the “new” cultic venues where sacrifices should be made instead of Jerusalem. Verses 32–33 are to be seen as later additions, and there is practically universal agreement on this point. Thus, the sin of Jeroboam should be seen simply in his decentralizing actions and, consequently, his new priesthood. Thus, in the oldest layer(s) of 2 Kgs 17 one would also expect this – namely the decentralizing sin of Jeroboam – to be the base upon which later scribes then built their argumentation. Of course, the high places are very rarely mentioned (and mostly in late passages) in the north as well, but it is important to note that in Judah they

12:30 ideologically suspicious as well; for this idea of “democratization of sin,” see Rösel, “Why 2 Kings 17,” 85–90, and Appendix B. If verses 31–33 are seen as later additions, however, there is naturally no problem with the narrative concluding already in 30.

132 2 Kgs 10:29b is grammatically very problematic, denoting a gloss; similarly Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 342–3. This mention of calves also has some text-critical issues, which may further indicate its later origin; see Tekoniemi, “Identifying kaige,” 7–8. On the mention in 17:16, see 3.2.4 below.

133 Pakkala, “Jeroboam’s Sin,” 89.

134 It is important to note that Jeroboam instates temples (as in the OG) on the high places, not only high places themselves. Pakkala (personal communication) suggests that this emphasis may signify a permanent institution, which would add to the sacrilege of Jeroboam – at least the high places are without outright temples in the South! (See, however, Appendix B for cases where other temples – possibly even on high places – are also mentioned in Judah in the likely earlier OG edition.) It is also important to note that the preceding chapters have just described the building of the temple in Jerusalem, which Jeroboam now challenges by building new temples around the country.

135 According to Pakkala, “Jeroboam Without Bulls,” 508–9, the textual link between 12:31a and 13:33 should be seen as a case of Wiederaufnahme, so that 31b, which already speaks of the clearly later Levitical priests, is left outside the original text, which spoke only of the “high place priests” (13:33).

136 For their attestation, see the table in 3.2.4. It is similarly enigmatic why the high places are so rarely found in Deuteronomy, and only in its redactionally later portions, even though it is clear that the earliest versions of Deuteronomy and Kings, which are theologically so close to each other, must have been somehow linked concerning their (early) compositional history, and possibly even partly written by the same circle(s); see Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings,” 135–7, 141–7. One must, apparently, take the attack against high places in Kings as somehow reflecting a historical reality: the writer(s) (a small
are reprimanded time and time again – for the History writer they seem to be at the very least the main transgression of the people of the Southern Kingdom. It is thus very likely that something similar would be the case for the northerners as well.137

Furthermore, one may take into account the text-critical evidence in the passage since it corroborates some of Pakkala’s arguments. For instance, the whole of 27b, “and they will kill me and turn to Rehoboam, the king of Judah” (אֶל־רְחַבְעָם אֶל־יְהוּדָה, with its peculiar repetition of אֶל־יְהוּדָה אֶל־רְחַבְעָם, from 27a, is a late addition in the MT tradition since the text of 27b is completely missing from the OG, preserved in L19 and Lucifer, and even six Medieval Masoretic manuscripts.138 The priestly circle working at a central sanctuary in Jerusalem) was most likely really concerned about them and the influence (whether real or projected) they had on the politics of the time. Such an attack is otherwise extremely hard to understand since the construction of such a “strawman” argument would seem quite bizarre if directed at anything else (unless “high places” are to be understood as [post-]exilic competitors of Jerusalem, which is quite unlikely as well). Such a document would thus be best seen as reflecting pre-exilic concerns (this would also explain the prime role kings have in the book, but possibly also the slight priestly jab aimed at them: the Davidic rulers are doing well, of course, but the people are nevertheless still allowed to sacrifice on the high places). Somewhat similarly also Römer, So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 43: “... their literary activity must be linked in one way or another to the concerns of the royal court: it was not, therefore, a sophisticated exercise in history writing, but rather a literature of propaganda.” The question, of course, pertains to whether this base text would have to then be “Josianic,” for instance. While possible, this does not need to be the case since such a document, likely of only very marginal importance even in its own time among perhaps only a small, specific circle of priests, may well have been forgotten or fallen out of use after these historical realities had somehow changed (2 Kgs 23:8a, possibly from the History writer, may have indeed been the high point after which the original document and its elementary agenda was practically abandoned as “finished” – with no high places/competing cults there was no more need for such an edition of Kings). In this case, the quite compact and practically since forgotten (pre-exilic) History writer’s edition may have been seen during/after the exile as an apt place to spread the now-better-formed (and more abstract-minded) (ur-)Deuteronomic ideology, which would understandably have no longer been interested in the already long abolished high places. Thus, the earlier “proto-Deuteronomic” edition of Kings now fell under broader editing, which started to have a more and more nomistic flavor. At the same time the attack on high places of the original document was seemingly for the most part preserved. Of course, the books of Kings, as shown by the disinterest of even early rabbinic circles, appears never to have been much more than simply a historical curiosity, almost a relic of sorts. One further argument for this is the LXX edition of Kings, which, if indeed mostly older than the MT edition, shows through its crude compositional layout that the book was in many ways considered almost like a depository of textual materials, and, similar to the many sectarian Qumran texts, originally not meant for broader use.

While extremely hypothetical, this model of the “proto-Deuteronomic” transmission of Kings and Deuteronomy takes into account the very complex history of textual transmission in ancient Israel, of which Qumran has given us only (the first?) glimpses: the history/ies of the texts are likely so complex that only by ample amounts of imagination may one even try to find answers to the hardest questions – such as the relationship of (Ur-)Deuteronomy and the History writer’s edition of Kings. For a few attempts at better understanding this plurality in modern terms, see Borchardt, “Daniel’s Court Tales,” 1–9; and Tekoniemi, “Editorial In(ter)ventions,” 1–30.

137 Indeed, if the original textual layer of the History writer – whatever its extent may have been – is taken as a Judahite document, written after 720 BCE but before the exile, it only makes sense that the destruction of the Northern Kingdom would be used as an example of what happens if the high places are not taken care of.

138 Pakkala, “Jeroboam without Bulls,” 504, discusses the majority LXX reading, but does not take the full textual evidence into account. The text is missing from the Kennicott MSS 1, 70, 85, 115, 158, and
addition, made apparently via *Wiederaufnahme*, adds to the text the disparaging idea that Jeroboam was a coward, afraid of the people lynching him. More importantly, however, similar proto-Masoretic editing can also be found in verse 30 where, according to the MT, Jeroboam built “a house of high places,” יתבת – a term that was already thought to be somehow corrupt by the earliest commentators. According to the LXX, however, Jeroboam built “houses on high places,” οἴκους ἐφ᾽ ύψηλον (*במות בית אל בתים*). It has been argued by Schenker that this shift from plural sanctuaries to a singular one, a change which, interestingly enough, also appears later in 2 Kgs 17:29, 31, is part of an anti-Samaritan revision in the proto-MT: even though the exact location of this singular “house of high places” is nowhere mentioned, the text-critical analysis of 2 Kgs 17:29 in particular strongly suggests that the place is to be understood as none other than Samaria, and the temple on Mount Gerizim. This change is quite likely connected to the very similar proto-Masoretic changes in 2 Kgs 23:8b, 11, and 13a, where in the OG Josiah destroys non-Yahwistic temples in Jerusalem instead of mere high places of the MT. The MT can thus be shown overall to be particularly interested in the correct interpretation of sanctuaries in Israel-Judah (which, once again, naturally makes its use as the sole base document for redaction criticism problematic).

Thus, in the more original LXX version, Jeroboam builds not a “sanctuary of high places,” but “sanctuaries on/of the high places”, thus completely reversing the

187. The text has apparently been added to the Greek witnesses in two stages: καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσίν με was added in a *kaige*-like manner, while και επιστραφησονται προς Ροβοαμ βασιλεα Ιουδα is only found in the Hexaplaric A 247; similarly Kauhanen, *Lucifer*, 66. See also Trebolle, “Text-critical Use,” 292–3.
139 Pakkala, “Jeroboam without Bulls,” 504. At the end of verse 30 there is also a considerable plus in the majority text of the LXX, “and they forsook the house of the Lord” (και εἴασαν τὸν οἶκον κυρίου), reminiscent of 2 Chr 24:18, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τὰ οἴκα του Βεθελ. The plus is missing from the OG witnesses A B V 247 L 82 509 71 245 318 460 Luc. This is, apparently, a *kaige* correction (no Hexaplaric evidence) towards a (proto-MT?) Hebrew text form now known from nowhere else.
141 Stade, *Kings*, 131, disagrees on also retroverting the preposition, and while this is by no means necessary, it seems more likely that the preposition was indeed found in the OG *Vorlage*. Even the Vulgate is similar: *et fecit fana (pl.)* in *excelsis*. Klostermann, *Könige*, 348, gives an interesting proposition that the *Vorlage* would have read *
143 See Appendix B. All the verses in question are unlikely to originate from the History writer; see Levin, “Joschija,” 351–71, for the extremely complicated literary history of 2 Kgs 23.
previous situation of only one temple in one place in Jerusalem. This temple-building activity, effectively, turns the cult into what it will be constantly reprimanded for in the south as well (and what the cult is in fact said to have been before Solomon’s temple building in 1 Kgs 3:2–4), namely the people sacrificing on the high places. Jeroboam is thus not only a decentralizer, but a ‘degenerator’ of the “original” Solomonic cult as well, and thus, in a way, even more of a villain – the only thing worse than an idolater, sociologically speaking, would be an apostate. For the History writer the main sin of Israel was therefore – as might be expected – the same as Judah’s, only taken one fateful step further. Indeed, in the eyes of the History writer, the Judahites were collectively practically just as sinful as the Israelites, save for the only saving grace, namely the kings still holding fast to the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem. Therefore, when it comes to finding the oldest base text in 2 Kgs 17, “the sin of Jeroboam,” i.e., the Israelite decentralization of the Yahwistic cult, is the most logical (and likely the only) ideological clue the History writer has left us. The issue of centralization is the sine qua non of 1–2 Kings.

Concerning “the” sin of Jeroboam and its differing interpretations during the long and complex transmission history of Kings, one may take into account one more illustrative difference between the MT and the LXX. In 1 Kgs 11:43–12:3 these versions differ quite drastically: the LXX completely lacks verses 12:2 (or rather, has some of its content transposed to 11:43) and 3a. Consequently, the depiction of Jeroboam’s actions and reasoning changes: while in the MT he arrives in Israel after

145 Of course, in case the narrative goes back to any particular historical situation, which is quite dubious (already the naming scheme of the two kings, Jeroboam and Rehoboam, which are wordplays on the same theme of “people increasing,” reminds one of the mythical founders of Rome, Romulus and Remus), Israel and Jeroboam’s “regressive” reaction is, politically and otherwise, only to be expected: not often in history are such drastic religious reforms as those of Solomon met with cheering applause from the people, whose traditional ways of living are thus hampered. The apostasy of Jeroboam may thus best be seen not as a historical act, but rather as a mental image of the History writer, a “strawman” of sorts.

146 The argument of Berlejung, “Twisting Traditions,” 19 n.38, against Pakkala, that, “There would not be a contrast to the misdeeds of the South any more,” is not true, since the biggest Deuteronomic misdeed possible remains, i.e., the separation from Jerusalem. Similarly, Berlejung’s (19) objection that “…the building of high places seems to me quite meagre to be the ‘sin of Jeroboam’…” seems to speak more of the presumptions of the scholars than anything else: for us it is now “the sin(s)” of Jeroboam, but for the ancients this may not have been as much the case – in the eyes of the early Deuteronomists a simple decentralization from Jerusalem would have certainly been more than enough to deem the whole Northern Kingdom heretics.

147 Indeed, the main sin of Manasseh, if his reign was yet recounted in the original History writer’s document, may have originally been simply the reinstation of high places (2 Kgs 21:3) – thus his grave sin would simply mirror that of Jeroboam.
having heard about the upcoming crowning of Rehoboam (12:2) and because the Israelites explicitly send for him (3a), in the LXX Jeroboam simply leaves Egypt after having heard that Solomon has died (11:43). As noted by Richelle, there appears to be an ideological difference between the two: unlike in the LXX, where Jeroboam quite understandably returns to his homeland only after the person persecuting him has died, in the MT his actions are clearly malicious from the start – Jeroboam, and Israel as a whole (3a), is already up to no good. Both Jeroboam and the Northern Kingdom are thus in the MT shown to be erratic and untrustworthy from the very beginning, as if already preparing for the schism. This, once again, emphasizes the grave need for the use of textual evidence for literary and redaction criticism: without the LXX, we would have a very different idea of what would constitute the (more) original version of Jeroboam’s rise to power – a text that is often taken as coming from the “Deuteronomistic Historian.” It also shows that there was a clear scribal/editorial tendency for new interpretations of Jeroboam’s actions even at the very late stage of transmission, thus giving further indirect support for Pakkala’s thesis.

Martin Noth further saw 2 Kings 17 as a crucial “chapter of reflection” of the Historian, a series which, according to him, proved the unified nature of the original redaction. However, Noth’s own analysis of the chapter’s literary history, especially concerning verses 7–23, differs quite radically from the earlier analyses – and most of the analyses after him – since to him the earliest textual strands are not to be found in

148 It is also important to note that the LXX attests a Wiederaufnahme in 11:43: the two mentions of Solomon “sleeping with his fathers” frame the secondary addition of Jeroboam’s actions. As Richelle, “Relevance of the Septuagint,” 584–6, notes, the attestation of this editorial technique very likely shows the older form of the text.
149 Richelle, “Relevance of the Septuagint,” 584–6, who also importantly notes that 1 Kgs 12:2 in the MT is not in line with the understanding of 12:20 where the Israelites are said to not yet have been aware of Jeroboam’s return. This literary-critical remark only further strengthens the originality of the LXX.
150 The prophetic story in 1 Kgs 13 emphasizes this point even further: one cannot trust even those northerners who (claim to) have heard Yahweh’s speech, i.e., the prophets. Even the legitimate holy men of the north are malevolent liars!
151 See Würthwein, Erste Buch der Könige, 146–52. Another question completely, albeit just as much related to the matter at hand, is the lack of the MT’s Jeroboam narrative, 1 Kgs 14:1–20, in the LXX (and, vice versa, the lack of 12:24a–z in the MT). This whole sequence transforms the guilt of Jeroboam to simple idolatry, especially in verse 9. The post-exilic date of this textual unit is clearly proclaimed by verses 14–16. Whatever the prominence of the more “primitive” LXX 12:24a–z (which, once again, is introduced into the text through Wiederaufnahme), the MT plus 14:1–20 is (similarly?) undoubtedly late.
152 Noth, ÜSt., 4–6.
verses 21–23 (where the sin of Jeroboam is explicitly cited), but rather in 7–20.\textsuperscript{153} Nevertheless, taking into account this important role Noth gave to 2 Kgs 17, it is quite surprising to note that no substantial study – whether text or literary critical – has been conducted on the chapter before this.\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{153} See the table in 3.2.1. It is likely that Noth’s evaluation of these verses is faulty.

\textsuperscript{154} Verses 7–23 are usually considered “in chunks” in literary-redactional literature, namely, dividing them in a very general manner into different layers (such as 7–18/20, 7–12/13–18, 19–20, 21–23). This is, as will be argued, problematical since the chapter is likely an exceedingly complex creation by dozens of different editorial hands that did not respect such strict boundaries between textual units. Of course, such complexity does not fit the traditional redactional picture where the text is only assigned to a couple of main redactors. Indeed, one may wonder whether the inability of redactional scholars to find this complexity in 2 Kgs 17 is due to the strict restrictions they have thus far set for themselves and the material, i.e., only a couple of hands behind the text.
2. The textual history of verses 1–23 in light of documented evidence

2.1 The significance of verse 1 in the redactional history of 2 Kings 17

Even though the significance of Greek and Old Latin witnesses for the textual and redactional history of chapter 17 has recently been stressed by some scholars, verse 1 of the chapter has mostly been passed over in silence. On the part of the MT and the LXX this is understandable, as they give practically the same text. Questions do arise, however, with the Old Latin witness La\textsuperscript{115}. The manuscript has a considerably shorter text in verse 1, as it lacks the synchronism of Hoshea with Ahaz, the king of Judah (“in the 12\textsuperscript{th} year of Ahaz”). While this alone is a highly interesting textual trait, the text of La\textsuperscript{115} is even more peculiar here: the whole of chapter 16 is missing in La\textsuperscript{115} as well, verse 17:1b continuing straight from verse 15:38.\textsuperscript{155}

Is this large minus in the text to be ascribed to an accident in the transmission of the text? Or could this minus actually attest a text in a different redactional stage from all the other extant witnesses? Could the two peculiarities mentioned above be linked somehow?

2.1.1 Accidental omission of chapter 16 in the transmission process of La\textsuperscript{115}?

As most of the leaves of La\textsuperscript{115} have been lost,\textsuperscript{156} it is hard to say whether or not chapter 16 was originally part of it at all. While the text of La\textsuperscript{115} does have its peculiarities, it does not seem to preserve and present the chapters and narratives in an arbitrary order: where elsewhere extant, it arguably preserves the OG order of the text (and indeed the OG text).\textsuperscript{157} It is stressed by the editor of the manuscript that the minus most probably

\textsuperscript{155} The text found on the folio of La\textsuperscript{115} consists (in given order) of verses 15:32aβ–15:38, 17:1–6, 7*, 15–19, 9ba. The large minus of the whole chapter 16 is a textual trait that has not been stressed enough, if at all, in the research. As far as I am aware, this phenomenon has thus far only been noted by the editor of the manuscript, Bonifatius Fischer, and by Adrian Schenker and Matthieu Richelle; it was also briefly discussed by Wolfgang Schütte, “Israels Exil,” 379–80.

\textsuperscript{156} See Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 20-2, for the outline of the manuscript. Only 28 leaves of the original codex (~198–200 leaves) are extant.

\textsuperscript{157} See 1.2.2.2 and 3.1 for a more in-depth discussion of the textual order and characteristics of La\textsuperscript{115}.
does not originate with the scribe of La\textsuperscript{115}, but with the earlier stages of (Latin) copying\textsuperscript{158} since verses 15:38 and 17:1 are now found on the same side of a folio.

It is possible that at some point of the textual transmission of the text form of La\textsuperscript{115} (either in Latin or already in the Greek exemplar) chapter 16 did precede chapter 17, but was for some reason lost or displaced, either deliberately or, more probably, by accident. There are many different reasons why this could have happened: possibly chapter 16 alone was at some point written on a folio of its own, which was then for some reason lost and never recovered,\textsuperscript{159} or the copyist was not well (or at all) acquainted with the text of Kings, and did not notice one chapter changing place or even missing.\textsuperscript{160} Taking into account the relative theological unimportance of the books of Kings in the first centuries CE, it does not seem completely impossible that the copyists would not have even noticed such crude mistakes. In any case, it is now hard to say from the material evidence we possess whether or not the chapter was located in La\textsuperscript{115}, either before verse 15:32 or after chapter 17 – or whether it was even missing altogether.\textsuperscript{161} It is at least fairly improbable that the chapter would have preceded the text of 15:32 now found in La\textsuperscript{115}, as in 15:38 it is said that Ahaz succeeded his father Jotham on the throne of Judah. A more probable place for chapter 16 would be after chapter 17.

It is quite possible that the minus of La\textsuperscript{115} is simply an accidental omission, caused by some mistake in the earlier copying processes. However, it seems suspiciously convenient that a whole chapter alone (and possibly verse 17:1a with it) would have fit exactly one leaf,\textsuperscript{162} which was then omitted/displaced – especially

\textsuperscript{158} Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 36: “The following have nothing to do with the scribe of our MS, but rather with an earlier stage of the textual transmission: … the omission or transposition of 4 Rg 16 ….”

\textsuperscript{159} Using the Latin scribe of La\textsuperscript{115} as an example, the text of Rahlfs’ edition for chapter 16 consists of about 53.5 lines. This would mean roughly 26–27 lines of text per page. According to Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 26, the scribe of La\textsuperscript{115} wrote 27 lines per page in quire XXI (though the attested lines per page vary from 17.5 in 1 Samuel to 27 in 2 Kings). Thus, it would not be an impossible idea that the text of chapter 16 was at some point prior to La\textsuperscript{115} indeed written on a single leaf. Even if the 0.5–1 line of the now-missing verse 17:1a is added to this, the picture stays the same.

\textsuperscript{160} Since Ahaz, whose reign is reported in chapter 16, was in no way a prominent king of Judah, it is not impossible (albeit not very likely) that a copyist would not have even noticed his regnal narrative missing from the text.

\textsuperscript{161} Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 26–7.

\textsuperscript{162} Especially if the text was copied on a double leaf (either in Greek or Latin), the possibility of the displacement of the double leaf itself becomes more improbable, as it would have also changed the position of other textual units on the double leaf. It is more probable that a single leaf containing the text was somehow displaced from the codex.
when it is taken into account that La\textsuperscript{115} preserves the Old Greek text and order quite faithfully elsewhere in 1–2 Kings. Accidental omissions more often confuse a text, and it would be exceptional that an accidental omission cuts out a passage exactly where it begins and ends. Therefore, even though the text-critical evidence might indeed allow us to simply close the case as a mere mishap of copyists, the literary-critical possibilities can – and indeed have to – be taken into account as well. It thus has to be asked: could the transposition also be due to\textit{deliberate} change(s) in the text?

Here, it should be noted that the literary critical possibilities born from accidental omission should not and cannot be used, quite self-evidently, as evidence for a deliberate change in the text. In this case it would, however, be too uncertain to pass the phenomenon off as a simple accident in the transmission.

### 2.1.2 Textual history of verse 1

#### 2.1.2.1 Textual witnesses

The differing reading of La\textsuperscript{115} in the first verse of chapter 17 is a point of interest in several ways. First, it might contribute to the discussion of the chronology of Kings, and, second, the reading may help us with the problem of the missing chapter 16 in La\textsuperscript{115}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 15:38b, 17:1</th>
<th>LXX B 15:38b, 17:1</th>
<th>La\textsuperscript{115} 15:38b–17:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָעָם איש</td>
<td>καὶ ἐβασιλεύσεν Ἀχαζ ἡ αὐτοῦ ἀντ᾽ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>et regnavit achas filius eius pro eo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְשַׁעְיָהוּ</td>
<td>[chapter 16 follows]</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֵהָי מֵחָי</td>
<td>ἐν ὑπὲρ ἀναπνέσα Ἰσραηλ</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּל־הָוָה אָדָם</td>
<td>ἐν Σαμαρεὶ ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ ἔννα ἕτη</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁנָה יַעַרְשֶׁר</td>
<td></td>
<td>et osee filius dala [=hela] regnauit annis VIII\textsuperscript{I} in samarium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{ἐν } 1° \text{ pr και } 554 | \text{δωδεκάτω} \text{δεκατω } 44 \text{d} \text{d} 46 | \text{τεταρτω } 127 \text{a } 44 44 | 48 \text{a } 158 71 158 44 44 68 125 158 460 700; > 127f } 64 318 372 | \text{βασιλεῖ } A V C II 46 46 46 44 44 44 55 71 158 244 245 707' | \text{βασιλεως rel | νω} 68 | \text{Ηηα} 158* | \text{ἐν } 488 | \text{ἐννα ἕτη}} \text{tr 444}
\]

\[15:38\text{b} \text{And Ahaz, his son, reigned in his stead. …}
17:1 \text{And in the twelfth year of Ahaz, king of Judah, reigned Hoshea, son of Elah, in Samaria over Israel nine years.}
15:38\text{b} \text{And Ahaz, his son, reigned in his stead. …}
17:1 \text{And in the twelfth year of Ahaz, king of Judah, reigned Hoshea, son of Elah, in Samaria over Israel nine years.}
15:38\text{b} \text{And Ahaz, his son, reigned in his stead. …}
17:1 \text{And Hoshea, son of Dala (=Elah) reigned nine years in Samaria.}

\[163 \text{The dative τῷ βασιλεῖ for the Hebrew preposition } \text{against the genitive τοῦ βασιλέως, is in multiple manuscripts likely due to kaige revision; see Shenkel, Chronology, 53.} \]
The synchronism, “in the twelfth year of Ahaz, king of Judah,” is missing from the text of La\textsuperscript{115}.\textsuperscript{164} It is entirely possible, that the beginning of the verse (1a) was part of the text accidentally omitted from La\textsuperscript{115} (16:1–17:1a), as noted above. This would explain the lack of the synchronism in the text and the unusual word \textit{et} at the beginning of the regnal formula. Thus, if the synchronism (\textit{in anno duodecimo}) was accidentally lost, the slightly awkward construct \textit{regnauit osee filius dala annis VIII} left behind would have necessitated the addition of \textit{et} at the beginning, although the reversal of the word order, as now seen in the Latin, does not seem necessary.\textsuperscript{165}

There are, however, also possibilities to argue otherwise: namely, that the minus of the synchronism in La\textsuperscript{115}, or rather, the plus in the rest of the tradition, is a deliberate change brought into the text.

2.1.2.2 The problems of the chronology of 2 Kings 15–18 and the synchronism of 2 Kgs 15:30

The chronological problems of 1–2 Kings during the Omride dynasty are a well-known and especially massive problem. Not that surprisingly, similar chronological problems pile up at the time of the end of the Northern Kingdom as well.\textsuperscript{166} In the span of chapters 2 Kings 15–18, the MT gives multiple chronological notes that contradict each other:

1) in 15:30b Hoshea is said to have become king in the 20\textsuperscript{th} year of Jotham – even though Jotham is said to only have reigned 16 years in 15:33;\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{164} The usual notice of Hoshea reigning “over Israel” (עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל) is missing here as well.

\textsuperscript{165} A massive parablepsis from \textit{ἐν} \textit{étet/in anno} in 16:1 to 17:1 is practically impossible; see Vroom, “Cognitive Approach,” 279. In such a case one would also expect verse 17:1 to include the synchronism.

\textsuperscript{166} These problems in the MT are most often resolved by the supposition of certain overlapping (co-)regencies of a king and his son. For this sort of argumentation, see Thiele, \textit{Mysterious Numbers}. While such co-regencies are not impossible, theories of this kind should be kept away from text-critical work, as they have normally been formulated based on certain text forms (usually, if not always, the MT), and thus their conclusions cannot be applied to other text forms (circular argument). It is also highly probable, that most – if not all – of the textual “evidence” used to argue for such co-regencies is actually due to corruptions in the text. See similarly Piquer, “Hebrew Bible(s),” 697–703; and Tekoniemi, \textit{Omrin dynastian aika}, 66–8, 80–2, 98.

\textsuperscript{167} Many commentators have argued on various grounds that this synchronism is due to some sort of mistake in the copying process. Thus, for instance, Thenius, \textit{Könige}, 367. To the contrary, see Barnes, “Not a Gloss,” 294–6. Interestingly enough, in such a system the reign of Ahaz would be either unnecessary, or only a year long at best (Hoshea’s 2\textsuperscript{nd} year, since Hezekiah accedes to the throne already in Hoshea’s 3\textsuperscript{rd} year).
2) Jotham’s son Ahaz (17th of Pekah) is said to have reigned 16 years as well, but Ahaz’s son Hezekiah (3rd of Hoshea) begins his reign well before Ahaz’s 16 years have ended, even if 15:30 were deemed a gloss;

3) Hoshea is given a second synchronism in 17:1, the 12th of Ahaz, which contradicts the one in 15:33, and leaves 7 kingless years in Israel between him and Pekah, who dies in Ahaz’s 4th year.168

In the light of the text-critical material concerning the Omride dynasty and its chronology, these kinds of internal inconsistencies hint at revisional tendencies in the text.169 The fact that La115 actually lacks one of the problematic synchronisms in 17:1 creates some interesting possibilities.

The especially problematic synchronism of Hoshea in 15:30b is extremely important when the compositional rules of Kings are taken into account: when a king, with whom king(s) of the other kingdom have been synchronized, dies, the regnal narratives of the other kingdom are in turn given until a new king in the other kingdom emerges. Thus, in the light of the chronological data of 15:30b, the narrative of Hoshea’s reign (17:1b–41) would be expected to commence immediately after Jotham’s regnal narrative (15:32–15:38) – which it indeed does in the text of La115. Even though La115 has preserved in its text no synchronisms,170 from the lack of chapter 16 it is already clear that in its implied chronological scheme Hoshea indeed begins his reign during the reign of Jotham, not Ahaz – and as a result of this Ahaz must have begun his reign either after or simultaneously with Hoshea.

It is possible to argue, therefore, that La115 has here simply a harmonization of the text made exactly on the basis of the chronological logic given above, namely that chapter 17 was transposed before 16 in order to agree with the data of 15:30. It would be surprising, however, that the change was made according to such an “aberrant”

---

168 Another, albeit completely different, problem is the fact that the numbers given in 2 Kings 15–18 cannot be reconciled with the Assyrian data (a span of about 70 years), even with the most imaginative solutions.

169 See Shenkel, Chronology; and Tekoniemi, Omrin dynastian aika (in Finnish) for two full-scale studies focused solely on the problems of the Omride chronology. It is likely that the chronological problems in the MT are due to later revision. See further Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 6–9; Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 86–96; and Trebolle, “Textual Criticism,” 60–78.

170 The text of La115 begins at 15:32aβ, just after the synchronism in that verse. That there indeed was originally some synchronism here in La115 can be discerned from the syntax of the preserved text: [in anno ... phaceae] fili romoliae regis israel regnauit ionathan ....
synchronism: the contradicting synchronism of 15:30 is found in an unexpected location (at the ending formula of a king), and is problematic chronologically, unlike the more customary one in 17:1. It then becomes very interesting that the Antiochian text lacks the whole synchronism (“in the 20th year of Jotham”) in 15:30b. Many commentators have deemed this lack of a highly problematic synchronism in L as reflecting the most original text attainable. On one hand, it is possible that L omits here a synchronism it seemed impossible or otherwise unnecessary. This would however be somewhat unexpected for L, which seems to mainly strive for as “full” (and readable) a text as possible. On the other hand, the incongruity of the synchronism makes it a lectio difficilior: why would a later glossator add such clearly erroneous information to the text? This would not be the only time the MT adds such a “clearly erroneous” synchronism, however. In 2 Kgs 1:17 the MT gives its first synchronism for Joram, the king of Israel (“in the 2nd year of Joram son of Jehoshaphat”), which coincides with the OG synchronism of 1:18a (L), but is in a complete disagreement with the second synchronism given in 3:1 (“in the 18th year of Jehoshaphat”). The MT thus adds an OG synchronism in 1:17 only at a very late

171 Verse 15:30b is also omitted by one medieval Hebrew manuscript (Kennicott 115). According to Torijano, “Different Distribution,” 190, some Hebrew manuscripts also agree with the Lucianic synchronism in 2 Kings 8:17, reading “ten” instead of Masoretic “eight,” and in 25:8, reading “ninth” instead of “seventh.” This might confirm that the readings of L could go back to a Hebrew Vorlage, even if the value of some (if not most) of the coinciding readings noted by Torijano is debatable: for example, the many coinciding additions or omissions of the word “and” may have been added/omitted over time independently by the copyists of either tradition, and are likely coincidental. Agreements on the chronology in 2 Kgs 8:17 and 25:8 are, however, quite possibly true agreements between the witnesses. Nevertheless, the contradictory 15:30b could have been secondarily omitted by both traditions independently.

172 Thus Stade, Kings, 254 (“very late addition”); Benzinger, Könige, 169 (“eine (verdorbene) Glosse”); and even BHS (“frt dl”).

173 Montgomery, Kings, 452: “Lucian expunged the contradictory item, but that gives no basis for textual criticism”; similarly Barthélemy, CTAT, 405; and Rahlfs, Lukian, 278.

174 For this position, see Fernández, Septuagint in Context,” 230, where, according to him, one of the main features of the Lucianic recension as a whole is to give “a full text with no omissions.” See also Fernández, Scribes, 33–4. There are, however, indeed some doubts to be raised about the possible streamlining tendencies of the Antiochian text when it comes to chronological notices. It is possible that at some points L may have recensionally omitted “superfluous” synchronistic notices. In 2 Kgs 3:1, L gives no synchronism whatsoever. The synchronism might have been deliberately omitted, possibly because the synchronism was already given in verse 1:18a. However, it is also possible that verses 3:1–3 are due to kaige revision even in L. In one case the Antiochian text also seems to add some synchronic material, showing that the Lucianic revisers may have been interested in chronological matters: in 1 Kings 16:15, manuscripts 19´-93 give a unique synchronism “27th year of Asa,” which is probably a late harmonizing addition. Here the aim of the Lucianic redactor(s) may have indeed been to make the text “fuller” by harmonizing the text.
stage,\(^\text{175}\) not as an aberrant gloss, but clearly from another Hebrew source (a text resembling the OG Vorlage). The case of 15:30b could be the same.\(^\text{176}\)

A similar phenomenon can also be noted in 1 Kgs 16:6 where the whole Greek tradition gives a synchronism for Elah not found in the MT, and, subsequently, in 16:8 all non-Hexaplaric Greek manuscripts lack the Masoretic synchronism. The missing synchronism is caused by the abrupt interpolation of a prophetic narrative into verse 16:7, which is located outside any regnal frame.\(^\text{177}\) Thus in 16:8 the OG reading, and likely the earliest reading attainable, seems to be the one without any synchronism. Another case of a missing accession synchronism in the OG is found in the regnal formula of Zimri (1 Kgs 16:15).\(^\text{178}\) The OG originally had no synchronism here either.\(^\text{179}\) These examples already show that synchronisms (or at least some of them) were indeed added at a very late stage in the development of Kings.

Thus, when we find in 2 Kings 17:1 a missing synchronism in La\(^\text{115}\), it is reasonable to ask whether it preserves the oldest reading, as it is more probable for later editors to either add synchronisms where there were none or to change the seemingly erroneous synchronisms than to just simply delete the ones they saw inappropriate. The lack of the synchronism could also explain the apparent movability of the whole chapter: because this narrative was not yet definitely anchored with a synchronism to a certain point in the chronological framework of 2 Kings, it was possible for the narrative to change places with the other narratives even at a very late stage.\(^\text{180}\) Furthermore, one may here take into account the fact that La\(^\text{115}\) preserves

\(^{175}\) Shenkel, Chronology, 73–6. See, however, the cautions of Piquer, “Hebrew Bible(s),” 703, about using this as too straightforward evidence of diachronic evolution of the text.

\(^{176}\) In both cases the chronologically contradictory synchronism is found in or near the concluding formula of a king.

\(^{177}\) Similarly Stade, Kings, 144. In 1 Kgs 16:6 and 8, the MT has harmonized the text towards the more usual style by transposing the regnal year from the end of 16:6 to the beginning of verse 8 while also changing the synchronism from the 20th year of Asa to his 26th year. L further reads in 16:8, an apparently corrupted \(\varepsilon \nu \tau o \ \alpha s a \ \beta a \sigma i l e i \ \iota o \nu \alpha \) without any synchronism, which seems to be a late facilitation towards the MT (possibly partly Hexaplaric). The lack of the synchronism (compare with 2 Kgs 3:1 and 15:30b) is noteworthy.

\(^{178}\) Note also the similar word order between La\(^\text{115}\) 2 Kgs 17:1a (\(\epsilon t \ o s e i f i l i u s \ d a l a \ r e g n a u i t \ a n n i s \ \text{VIII in samaria}\)) and 1 Kgs 16:15a (\(\xi o i \ \Sigma a m b r i \ \epsilon b a s i l e i z e i e n \ \varepsilon p t a \ \eta \mu e r a s \ \varepsilon n \ \Theta e r e i o s\)).

\(^{179}\) There are actually four different (secondary) synchronisms given in different Greek traditions: the Hexaplaric “27th”, “22nd” of 19’-93, “31st” of 127, and “30th” of Josephus.

\(^{180}\) The most suspicious thing about the information given about Ahaz is that it is nearly identical with the information given on his father Jotham. In 2 Chronicles 27 there is also a curious difference to the text of Kings: Jotham’s age at accession and his regnal years are recounted twice in 27:1, 8 (lacking in the majority of LXX manuscripts). See Wifall, “Chronology,” 330.
(with 4QSam\(^3\)) the OG minus of 2 Sam 5:4–5 where David’s regnal information has been secondarily added.\(^{181}\)

One chronological caveat pertains even to the textual order of La\(^{115}\), however. Second Kings 16:5 (= Isa 7:1), where Ahaz is attacked by both Rezin, king of Aram, and Pekah, king of Israel, seems to contradict the implied chronology of La\(^{115}\) since if Hoshea was already reigning when Ahaz ascended the throne, Pekah, who was killed by Hoshea (15:30), could hardly have attacked Judah during Ahaz’s reign.\(^{182}\) Since chapter 16 is missing in La\(^{115}\), there is no way of knowing whether it contained this mention of Pekah. If the text of 16:5 was already found in the OG – as might be inferred from the fact that no Greek witness now lacks this mention of Pekah in 16:5 (which could of course simply be due to \textit{kaige}, but this cannot be verified) – one has to accept the conclusion that the order of La\(^{115}\) also bears some chronological problems very similar to those found in the other witnesses.\(^{183}\) Nevertheless, with the peculiar synchronism of 15:30, this verse also creates a similar problem in the MT since according to 15:30 Jotham outlives Pekah, making it impossible for Pekah to attack Ahaz, the son of Jotham. Thus, with any text we turn to, we encounter more or less unsurmountable chronological problems.\(^{184}\)

While there are therefore arguments made by analogy to other passages in Kings that the lack of the synchronism witnesses the most original state of the text, it is also possible to reverse the argument: the lack of the synchronism could also be a more or less accidental or even deliberate omission, which may have happened when the

\(^{181}\) See 1.2.2.2 for a discussion of this phenomenon.

\(^{182}\) This problem could be settled, however, by resorting to the often-used idea of co-regencies: maybe Jotham and his son Ahaz were reigning \textit{simultaneously}, due to which this – only apparent! – “problem” has creeped into the text. On the other hand, it could also be possible to argue that Hoshea and Ahaz simply began their reigns in the same year, Ahaz having begun his reign (maybe only weeks or months) before Hoshea and his conspiracy against Pekah. This way Pekah could have both attacked Ahaz and been killed by Hoshea (possibly during the military campaign in question). If, furthermore, the regnal years of the two kingdoms were reckoned by two slightly differing calendars, as is often argued, it could be possible to propose that the author of Kings used to recount first the regnal narratives of new kings of Israel before those of Judah for those rare years when the kings of both kingdoms died (the regnal narrative of Jehu is recounted before that of Ataliah, for instance). Needless to say, while plausible, such reconstructions are mainly just sad attempts to harmonize the inherently confusing data.

\(^{183}\) One could of course argue that the text of La\(^{115}\) would thus be partly the literary-critical \textit{lectio difficilior} – or that, at least, it cannot thus be a completely facilitating reading.

\(^{184}\) It would thus be intellectually dishonest to revert because of this – that even La\(^{115}\) is not a completely “innocent” witness – straight back to the MT, which has been demonstrated to in fact comprise the most problematic text here.
narrative was moved from its original place to another,\footnote{It is also possible, that La\textsuperscript{115} harmonizes the synchronism of 15:30b by transposing the whole chapter 16, though we have no textual material to evidence this. As also said, this would seem quite doubtful in the context of the general affiliation of La\textsuperscript{115} to the OG and its narrative sequence.} or that the “movability” of the narrative prompted a late transposition in the text.\footnote{Thus, it is possible to argue, that La\textsuperscript{115} is in fact the one moving the chapter. This may have been prompted by the synchronism of 15:30b. In this case, however, one could expect La\textsuperscript{115} to also include this synchronism in 17:1. When the uncertain history of verse 15:30b is taken into account, this theory does seem somewhat unlikely.} In order to find even somewhat conclusive evidence for the textual history, an appraisal of the different scenarios is needed.

### 2.1.2.3 Appraisal of the different scenarios of change

There are two possible scenarios for the textual history of the passage. The text of La\textsuperscript{115} was either 1) corrupted at some point of the transmission process, or 2) stood originally as it now stands, and this was likely the OG order as well. The scenario for corruption has already been evaluated, and its probability is quite high, though even this explanation raises some serious doubts.

In the case of the minus of the chronological note in La\textsuperscript{115} going back to the OG and its \textit{Vorlage}, it needs to be asked how the whole of the Greek tradition (that is, even \textit{L}) would have come to adopt the MT order of the chapters. As the passage lies in the \textit{kaige} section of Kings, and thus adaptation towards the MT is only to be expected in the majority text, this is no problem for the rest of the manuscripts. The biggest problem is the order of the Antiochian text, which also conforms to the MT. If the OG order of the chapters was originally different, why does the Antiochian text not exhibit this order?\footnote{It is noteworthy that \textit{L} also follows the order of the MT in the composition of chapter 17 itself, unlike La\textsuperscript{115}; see 3.1. Most probably these phenomena are linked.}

The Antiochian text contains both \textit{kaige} and especially Hexaplaric readings from time to time,\footnote{On the Hexaplaric readings of \textit{L} in 1–2 Kings, see Torijano, “How Much Hexaplaric Material,” 80–119.} notably in chapter 17 as well. The Lucianic reviser(s) would have thus been at least aware of the MT/\textit{kaige} order of the text. It is hard to say, however, whether the putative OG order of La\textsuperscript{115} would have been retained: on one hand the Antiochian text is generally very faithful to the OG order, but on the other hand the chronological notices the Lucianic reviser had in his exemplar (or the ones he did \textit{not}
have) would have probably also greatly dictated his actions.\textsuperscript{189} Thus the question boils down to the originality of the synchronism in 17:1a: if the Lucianic redactor(s) had this reading from the MT or added it to an originally empty accession formula, they would also have been forced to adopt the order of the chapters in the MT.\textsuperscript{190} Otherwise the narrative logic of Kings would be violated. If the minus of the conflicting synchronism of 15:30b in $L$ is regarded as a later omission by Lucianic redactor(s), this starts to seem somewhat probable: together with the adoption of the Masoretic chronology, $L$ goes even farther by omitting the contradictory synchronism in 15:30b.

In any case, there is some evidence that $L$ is at least ready to add some synchronic information/formulations where this would be expected. On the other hand, it should at least be acknowledged as an option that the exemplar of $L$ was already subjected to this kaige-type change of order. It may be concluded that the Lucianic reviser(s) could have well adopted the MT order of the text, especially if he wanted to create “as full a text as possible” here: by adding the synchronism of the MT/kaige to the bare verse 17:1a he was also forced to transpose the chapter after chapter 16 with the kaige text.

\textbf{2.1.2.4 Where was chapter 16 originally positioned in La\textsuperscript{115} and why?}

The most probable position of the missing chapter 16 in La\textsuperscript{115}, assuming that this chapter indeed was originally part of the text (and in its original position in its exemplar), was behind chapter 17, as it would be quite unusual for the son (Ahaz) to reign before his father (Jotham), as recounted in 15:38, \textit{et regnavit achas filius eius pro eo}, “and Ahaz, his son, reigned in his stead.” Why, then, would chapter 17 precede chapter 16 in La\textsuperscript{115} if not simply due to an accident? The reason may be partly chronological, as already discussed, but this line of argumentation is inconclusive. In cases like these, we need to find the \textit{literary} and \textit{contextual} differences between the

\textsuperscript{189} It is good to note that the Antiochian manuscript 127 is the only Greek manuscript to give a completely harmonized idiosyncratic chronology in Kings; see Shenkel, \textit{Chronology}, 29–30. While the Antiochian text, as a whole, otherwise clearly retains the OG text and chronology, 127 shows that the (Lucianic?) revisers behind 127’s text were to some extent aware of matters pertaining to the chronology of Kings.

\textsuperscript{190} It could also be argued that $L$ would have not been obliged to simply adopt an existing synchronism, but it could have just \textit{created} a new one, as can be seen in manuscript 127 as a whole and in 1 Kgs 16:15.
two traditions: (how) do the ideological, theological, etc. readings of the immediate context of the passage change with the inversion of the chapters?191

The fact that the regnal narrative of Hoshea and the narrative about the destruction of Samaria are related in La115 before Ahaz, one of the most wicked kings of Judah, might well have relevant literary-critical repercussions. In verse 16:3 it is said that Ahaz “walked in the path(s) of the kings of Israel,”192 which in the MT is easily understood as the kings before Hoshea. In La115 the situation is not so clear: it could be interpreted that Ahaz also walked in the same path as Hoshea, who ultimately led his kingdom to destruction.193 Was Ahaz thus as evil as Hoshea?194 Indeed, in the confusing remark of 17:2 about Hoshea doing evil “not as much as the kings of Israel before him”195 (vs. “did evil more than anyone before him” in the OG tradition) may be related to the order of the chapters in MT: the possible guilt of Ahaz also walking in the ways of the worst king of Israel would probably outshine even the deeds of Manasseh,196 on whose account Judah was ultimately exiled as well. If it is stressed that, on the contrary, Hoshea himself was not as evil as the kings before him, it is no problem for Manasseh to easily be worse than Ahaz, who was a contemporary of Hoshea.197 The lessening of the blame on Hoshea thus also works similarly for Ahaz.

191 See similarly Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 12–16.
192 This same expression is also given in 2 Kings 8:18 for Joram of Judah. These kings are also linked in the fact that they are the only kings of Judah whose mothers’ names are not mentioned. Fricke, Könige, 213, comments: “Woran bei diesem Vorwurf in einzelnen bei Ahas gedacht ist, vermögen wir nicht zu sagen.” However, Smelik, “The New Altar,” 277–8, argues that this notice refers to the altar building of Ahaz later on in the chapter, verses 10–18. In any case, he too concludes that this somewhat rare expression is not used here haphazardly. Smelik, “Representation of King Ahaz,” 263–78, also notes the interesting trait of the text of 2 Chronicles where Ahaz is actually made to be worse than Manasseh (whose blame is simultaneously lessened). Whether this interpretation is born from the Chronicler’s possibly differing source material or his tendencies is hard to say.
193 Ahaz also “makes his son walk through fire” as do the Israelites in 17:17. It is also interesting to note that, unlike with two other evil kings of Judah, Abiam and Joram, Yahweh’s forgiveness for the sake of David is not mentioned. The same is the case with Ahazyah.
194 Hobbs, 2 Kings, 228, on the basis of the MT, makes a similar remark: “By this comment Hoshea is also compared quite favorably with his southern contemporary Ahaz, who copied the actions of “all the kings of Israel.”
195 This reading has inspired considerable discussion, but there has been no definite answer to why Hoshea would be “not as evil as the kings of Israel before him.” See 2.2 for further discussion.
196 Thus, there is a risk of Ahaz being more than just a “prototype of Manasseh,” as he is called by Ben Zvi, “Account of the Reign of Manasseh,” passim.
197 Compare with Schenker, “Septuagint in text history,” 12, who compares the guilt and sins of Ahaz and Manasseh in the light of the Old Latin (Lucifer’s quotations): it seems like Ahaz and Manasseh are in the end almost as evil, with Manasseh only adding to his sins by placing an Ashera in the temple of Jerusalem. It has to be noted, however, that the methodology of Schenker here is, if not faulty, at least questionable: as Kauhanen, “Lucifer of Cagliari,” 422–8, points out (among other things), there is a very high chance of transcriptional error in Lucifer’s text. In cases like these, it is somewhat questionable to formulate such far-reaching literary-critical theories. The same could be said in the case
Ahaz walking in the paths of his contemporary Hoshea would not be as grave a sin in the MT as in La\textsuperscript{115}.

Schenker comes to similar conclusions. While he does not discuss the above-mentioned synchronism in verse 15:30b, he does emphasize the chronological peculiarities and difficulties of the MT. According to Schenker, the MT’s changes are due to ideological reasons: when the reign of Hoshea is counted from the 12\textsuperscript{th} year of Ahaz onwards, the destruction of Samaria only happens during the reign of the pious Hezekiah.\textsuperscript{198} This would explain why Israel was exiled but Judah spared, even though both kingdoms are judged just as harshly in 2 Kgs 17:13 and 19–20;\textsuperscript{199} while Israel continued on its godless path until the bitter end, the Yahwistic reformations of Hezekiah were already well underway.\textsuperscript{200} Even if Ahaz did sin like the kings of Israel, Hezekiah had already started atoning for his father’s sins, so there was yet no reason for Yahweh to exile both kingdoms.\textsuperscript{201} Such “theologization” of the chronology seems to be a recurrent feature of MT Kings overall.\textsuperscript{202} In the order of La\textsuperscript{115}, Hoshea’s reign would in any case end while Ahaz was still reigning, leaving open the major unanswered theological question: why was Judah spared? It would be hard to understand why La\textsuperscript{115} (~ OG) would later deliberately add such grave theological

---

\textsuperscript{198} Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 168–9. See also the Excursus and note 334 for a further argument for theologizing chronology in the MT.

\textsuperscript{199} Unlike in the MT, which has been corrupted in verse 17:20, the more original LXX has Judah forsaking Yahweh together with Israel instead of Yahweh forsaking them; see 2.6.11.

\textsuperscript{200} Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 170.

\textsuperscript{201} Thusly also noted by Sweeney, \textit{Kings}, 389: “The deliberate contrast between northern Israel destroyed by Assyria in 2 Kgs 17 for its apostasy against YHWH and southern Judah – or at least Jerusalem – spared in 2 Kgs 18-20 because King Hezekiah repented and turned to YHWH as required of northern Israel (2 Kgs 17:13) suggests that Hezekiah serves as a model for what northern Israel should have done in the eyes of the DtrH.” This chronological solution also works with the idea of Hoshea being “not as evil as/worse than the kings before him”: in the MT the guilt of Ahaz is twice reduced, while in the La\textsuperscript{115} tradition it is twice (once in 17:2 in L) increased (see 2.2 below).

\textsuperscript{202} As was first argued by Shenkel, \textit{Chronology}, 87–108, this would not be the first time the MT changes the chronology and the order of narratives for ideological reasons. The case of the chapter 2 Kings 2 being positioned outside any regnal frame in the MT is probably due to this kind of activity, as is the renaming of the kings in 2 Kings 3:6–27 (Jehoshaphat and Joram in the MT vs. Ahazyah and Joram in the Antiochian text). Similarly, the transposition of Elisha’s death narrative from 10:30+ (as found in La\textsuperscript{115}) to 13:14–21 may have been partly motivated by chronological matters too; see Tekoniemi, “Enhancing the Depiction.” Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 86–107, has proposed that the same sort of activity happened in the case of 1 Kings 20–21 as well. See also a brief positive appraisal of Schenker’s theory by Philippe Hugo, \textit{Deux Visages d’Elie}, 331–49. The chronology, which in the process becomes historically and logically incomprehensible, is “theologized” in a way which allows \textit{ideological/theological} problems in the text to be solved, even if at the expense of the overall logic of the text. Similar reasons may also be at play in the Solomon stories in 1 Kgs 2–12.
tensions to the text. The priority of La\textsuperscript{115} is therefore suggested by the fact that it contains an evident theological tension, which may have been smoothed over or removed in all other witnesses through the revision of the chronology. As will be seen, these are not the only instances of Judah’s more sinful behavior in the OG edition of the chapter.\textsuperscript{203}

That the transposition of chapter 16 was, at least at some point of the transmission, understood as a part of the (OG) edition reflected by La\textsuperscript{115} may also be hinted at by 17:18 where La\textsuperscript{115} as the lone witness speaks of “the rest of Israel” against the simple “Israel” of the other witnesses. It will be argued that this mention forms a secondary harmonizing allusion to verse 15:29, bringing the text of La\textsuperscript{115} into closer conformity with itself.\textsuperscript{204} The text of La\textsuperscript{115} may indeed have been aware of the lack of chapter 16 in its expected place.

\textbf{2.1.2.5 Conclusions}

The “unique” traits displayed by La\textsuperscript{115} in verse 1 are not as unique in their text-historical or chronological context as they could at first seem. It is indeed possible to argue that the lack of the synchronism in verse 1 in La\textsuperscript{115} and the probable transposition of chapter 16 behind chapter 17 could have already existed in its (Old Greek) exemplar. Ultimately, this form of text might well even bear witness to the oldest textual form partially attainable to us, as argued by Schenker. Although the chronologically problematic case of 2 Kgs 16:5, where Ahaz is attacked already by Pekah, the predecessor of Hoshea, could be used as a decisive argument for an accidental misplacement of the chapter in La\textsuperscript{115}, the fact that in the MT the same verse also seems to cause similar problems makes this conclusion more elusive.\textsuperscript{205} Nevertheless, there are good reasons to think that the OG edition, likely reflected by La\textsuperscript{115}, indeed evidences the oldest version of the text.

\textsuperscript{203} See 2.4, 2.5.3, and 3.1.3.

\textsuperscript{204} For the discussion, see 2.6.9.

\textsuperscript{205} We may thus need to conclude, as does McKenzie, “The Last Days,” 299, that “there is no clear solution for these chronological problems ....”
2.2 The mystery of verse 2: was Hoshea better or worse than the previous kings of Israel?206

The verse 2 Kings 17:2, with its Deuteronomistic judgment of Hoshea, practically universally agreed to come from the History writer, has long been a matter of debate because of its unexpectedly lenient judgment of Hoshea. Unlike what could be expected, according to the MT Hoshea “did evil in the eyes of Yahweh, only not as much as the kings of Israel who were before him.” Hoshea is thus apparently said to have been better than some, or even any of the other kings of Israel!207 There is nothing in the text that would evoke such a lenient indictment, however. As the last king of Israel, during whose reign the Northern Kingdom was destroyed and exiled, the complete opposite could be expected, i.e., Hoshea being judged even as the most evil king of Israel.

Some theories to account for this phenomenon have been proposed. The simplest solution is to propose that the turbulent political climate of Hoshea simply did not allow him to focus on the cultic misdeeds of Israel’s previous kings.208 This idea runs into problems, however, when it is noted that even Zecharyah, who only reigned for 6 months (and whose short reign most probably was even more turbulent than that of Hoshea), is said in 2 Kgs 15:9 to have sinned “like his fathers had done.” On the other hand, according to the rabbinic tradition, Hoshea let the northern Israelites freely take part in the cult at Jerusalem, which lessened his blame.209 This reasoning is not particularly convincing either, as there is nothing in the text to support this interpretation. It has also often been proposed that the History writer may have had in his possession some “now lost sources,” where Hoshea would somehow have been

---

206 A heavily shortened preliminary version of this chapter has been published as Tekoniemi, “Between Two Differing Editions,” 211–27.
207 The reading of the MT, while most naturally to be interpreted as meaning that Hoshea was the least evil king of Israel, is somewhat vague, since לְפָנָיו הָיוּ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּמַלְכֵי, “like the kings of Israel who were before him,” could also be understood as simply denoting some of the kings before him (for instance Shallum, Menahem, Pekahyah, and Pekah), although this is somewhat straining the interpretation.
208 Gray, Kings, 583 (“His comparative virtue according to Deuteronomic principles was a virtue of necessity”); Jones, Kings, 546. Some have also noted that Hoshea’s valiant resistance against Assyria could have earned him the honor of being hailed as the best king; see Snaith, Kings, 278; Fritz, 2 Könige, 95.
209 Cf. Ta’anit 30b–31a; Giṭṭin 88a; Baba Bathra 121b. This would be partly in line with 2 Chr 30:1–12 where Hezekiah sends letters to the northern Israelites inviting them to take part in his Passover. The results were not stellar, however, and nothing is said about the king of Israel letting his people go freely, but some Israelites indeed do, according to the Chronicler, take part in the festivities.
depicted as a valiant king, possibly for opposing the Assyrian oppression. However, nothing of these sources is known in the biblical text or otherwise (even the customary ending formula referring to the sources of the writer, “are these not written in the annals of the kings of Israel” is unusually not given for Hoshea). Moreover, as will be argued in the next section, such theories depending on an assumed but now lost historical (annalistic) source are unnecessary when considering the textual history of verses 3–6, very much heightening the probability that they should be considered unnecessary in this case as well.

On the other hand, and more convincingly, it has also been noted by the rabbinic literature that after Dan was lost to the Assyrians in 2 Kgs 15:29, there would indeed be a good reason to think why Hoshea could not have been as evil as his predecessors: with the conquest of Dan the blame for one of the golden calves of Jeroboam would also have been canceled. Hoshea would have only had the sole calf at Bethel under his rule from the beginning of his reign. Because the “sin of Jeroboam,” usually associated in the scholarship with the golden calves of 1 Kgs 12:28–30, is the biggest transgression Israel’s kings are blamed for, Hoshea could have then been at worst only half as bad as any of the kings before him!

However, most theories have not taken into account the text-critical evidence, which gives a completely different picture of Hoshea: L and the OL witnesses La, LaM and Sulpicius Severus all depict Hoshea as the most evil king of Israel. As the reading of L is backed up by the OL witnesses against the majority (kaige) text that conforms to the MT, it is probable that the reading is at least proto-Lucianic (and

---

210 See, e.g., Benzinger, Könige, 172; Richelle, “Who were the worst,” 4; Brueggemann, I & II Kings, 476. Even if this was the case, one may nevertheless wonder whether Hoshea would have been remembered in such a positive light since it is now known that he may have in fact been placed on the throne by Tiglath-Pileser III. If his rebellion against Pekah was indeed somehow known to have been supported by the Assyrians – which it likely would have been – this could even be used as an argument for the OG understanding of the verse (see below): Hoshea was known to be an evil king who would not shy away from working with even the evil Assyrians – his later (unsuccessful) rebellion against them would hardly have much increased his worth in the eyes of the History writer.

211 Of course, it is simply impossible to completely rule out the possibility of a source of any kind, used at any point of the textual history. However, it often seems that such proposed “sources” are simply used as a text- or redaction-critical deus ex machina, a convenient way to maintain the (MT) text as it is without any need of alteration (or even discussion thereof).

212 Van der Kooij, “Zur Exegese,” 110–12. Cf. Miqra’ot Gedolot 2 Kgs 17:2, where Rashi concludes that because there were no more calves to worship, Hoshea must have let the Israelites take part in the cult of Jerusalem.

213 Sulpicius, Chr I, 48:1: hic ultra omnes reges superiores impius.
therefore not a “perversion of Lucian”\textsuperscript{214}, and most probably OG.\textsuperscript{215} The OG Vorlage would have read יָשָׁר בֹּשִׁי יְהוָה מְכַל אָשֶׁר (יהוה) לפניי (Ahab).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17:2 MT</th>
<th>17:2 LXX B</th>
<th>17:2 L</th>
<th>17:2 OL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיַּעַשׂ לֵיהָ</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν</td>
<td>et fecit male</td>
<td>And he did evil in the eyes of Yahweh, only not as much as the kings of Israel who were before him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיַּעַשׂ לֵיהָ</td>
<td>ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κυρίου</td>
<td>in conspectu dmí</td>
<td>And he did evil before the Lord more than all who were before him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּשֶׁב</td>
<td>ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν</td>
<td>super omnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּשֶׁב</td>
<td>παρὰ πάντας</td>
<td>qui fuerunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּשֶׁב</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>ante eum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זָרָה</td>
<td>τοὺς γενομένους</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זָרָה</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How should this difference be assessed? According to Stade, the OG reading was later harmonized to the context: it would indeed be easier to see the last monarch of Israel as the most evil one, while his being “not as evil” is ideologically certainly the lectio difficilior.\textsuperscript{216} On the reverse, the fact that Hoshea appears to do nothing to earn himself his judgment may have prompted the MT, as Piquer notes, to change the judgment: it is curious that such a minor character could have been worse than either Jeroboam or especially the Omride kings, the absolute epitomes of evil in the books of Kings.\textsuperscript{217} Furthermore, the arguments given above for making sense of the reading of the MT could also be, at least to a certain extent, reversed: for instance, it would not seem impossible that a later (proto-Masoretic) reviser, like some of the rabbinic writers have indeed done, noticed the second calf missing at the time of Hoshea and deducted that as a result of this he indeed could not have been the worst king of Israel. Therefore, both sides of the argument fail to convince completely on their own, as they are

\textsuperscript{214} As noted by Montgomery, Kings, 464.

\textsuperscript{215} Thus also Richelle, “Quels furent,” 337, among others. It may be briefly noted here that in 1 Kgs 15:14 (יהוה) pr oút L\textsuperscript{19} 246 554), 23 (ἐπόνεσεν) pr εποιήσεν Μακα πονηρον καὶ 328 L 158 246 554), the picture of pious Asa, king of Judah, also similarly changes in L to a more sinful one. However, while the case of v. 14 seems indeed to be an intra-L phenomenon (though likely a simple intra-L\textsuperscript{19} corruption/harmonization versus verse 23), the case of v. 23 is a much trickier one since 127 gives the plus inside an asterisk (even though an obelos would be expected, this nevertheless appears to show that this reading likely came to L from some other source) and since MS 243 was also aware of this reading, commenting in its margin that the reading in question does not seem to originate from Hexapla or “ancient manuscripts,” where the reading is not found. The plus is either a paraphrastic (Lucianic) harmonization to 2 Chr 16:7–10, 12, where Asa indeed becomes evil in his old age, or possibly an intra-Greek corruption due to some sort of corruption/misunderstanding of the verb ἐπόνεσεν in v. 23, possibly a dittography of ΕΠΟΝΕΣΕ(N), which was then “corrected” by a subsequent scribe to ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕ (ΑΣΑ) ΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ, in line with the Chronicles’ parallel. This reading then found its way to L.

\textsuperscript{216} Stade, Kings, 260. Similarly also Šanda, Könige, 212.

\textsuperscript{217} Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 237.
reversible with respect to each other – there is thus a need for further, cumulative, evidence.\(^{218}\)

The solution may be found when the other similar judgment formulae are text-critically assessed.\(^{219}\) While most Israelite kings are simply condemned for “doing evil in the eyes of Yahweh” without any comparisons, the Omride kings Omri (1 Kgs 16:25), Ahab (16:30, 33), Ahaziah (22:54), and Joram (2 Kgs 3:2) are all said in the MT to have been either more (Omri, Ahab) or as evil (Ahaziah, Joram) as their predecessors. However, this picture changes after the textual evidence is taken into account: in 1 Kgs 22:54 Ahaziah is said in L (~ OG) not to have provoked Yahweh “like all his fathers had done” (אָבִיו אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה כְּכֹל) as in the MT, but in fact παρὰ πάντα τὰ γενόμενα ἐξηρόθεσθαι αὐτοῦ, “more than all who were before him.”\(^{220}\) The fact that in two different places there is a similar difference between the witnesses raises a question: is there some larger connection between these phenomena? Are the differences simply coincidental?

| Who was the worst king of Israel? |
|------------------|-------|
| OG               | MT    |

\(^{218}\) See similarly Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 14.

\(^{219}\) In this context the argument of Trebolle, Centena, 188–93, may also be noted. According to him, the phrase רַק כְּ אָבִיו (2 Kgs 3:2, 14:3, 17:2) comes into Kings in each case not from “DtrH,” but a later reductor (DtrN). Furthermore, he finds a chiastic structure in the larger OG form of 1–2 Kings: in Israel both the first and last king (Jeroboam and Hoshea), are deemed as the most evil ones, together with three central Omride kings (Omri, Ahab, Ahaziah). Somewhat similarly, David, Hezekiah, and Josiah (the first and last kings in the putative Josianic edition of Kings) also form a similar structure in reverse as the best kings of all time in Judah. However, as noted by Richelle, “Who were the worst,” 3–4, Trebolle’s argument seems quite unconvincing for a number of reasons. First, there is no guarantee that רַק כְּ אָבִיו is redactionally late (DtrN or otherwise) phraseology in any of the passages – indeed, 2 Kgs 3:2–3 is grammatically dependent on this structure, indicating that either the construct is original, or that the passage has been considerably altered, with no remains of the original text form (even the respective OG form in 1:18b reads πλὴν οὐχ ὡς, thus making this unlikely). Admittedly, however, the sentence רַק כְּ אָבִיו in 2 Kgs 14:3 does appear to be a later interpolation (gloss?), as it breaks the connection of 3a and 3b; similarly Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 370–1. Second, in the words of Richelle, “… while the idea of a concentric structure is ingenious, it is difficult to say if it is a rediscovery or a projection into the text, since there is no necessary link between such a feature and the deuteronomistic theology, which in no way implies that the first and the last kings are the worst.”

\(^{220}\) The rest of the LXX witnesses give the text as κατὰ πάντα τὰ γενόμενα ἐξηρόθεσθαι αὐτοῦ, “according to all that (τὰ) was before him.” It seems that this text has been only partially corrected towards the MT by the kaige reviser by simply changing the preposition παρὰ of L to κατὰ, but leaving the “all that were before him” intact (the difference between the neuter plural of kaige and masculine plural of the OG is significant in Greek only since both translate the Hebrew פָּנָיָה). Interestingly, the Hexaplaric witnesses have not been further harmonized towards the MT either. An accidental change κατὰ – παρὰ is possible, although not one of the likeliest of mistakes. The reading of L is also supported by La:\(^{44}\) Et servivit Baalim et adoravit illi superponens in malitia universis quae gesta erant ante eum. Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 100, also notes that in 2 Kgs 1:18d (not found in MT) L has a harsher condemnation of Ahaziah, as L adds “and Yahweh became angry (L +towards him) and towards the house of Ahab.” Furthermore, in 2 Kgs 1:6 there is another large plus in the OG, not found in the MT, which makes the fall of the Omride dynasty Ahaziah’s fault; see the discussion below.
The most important thing to note is that both kings, Ahazyah and Hoshea, rule Israel after Ahab. This is important, since Ahab is often thought to be the main antagonist and evildoer in the books of Kings, which is indeed the case on the basis of the MT’s text: no one else after him is said to have been worse (although Ahazyah is still said to have been as evil as him)²²¹ than their predecessors. In the OG this is of course not the case: even though Ahab is clearly the main villain of Kings, he is indeed not the worst of the bunch, but only gets third place – after two quite insignificant kings (Ahazyah only rules for 2 years and Hoshea for 9 years).²²²

This is, in fact, not the only case where the LXX gives a more ambivalent picture of Ahab,²²³ and because of this it has been proposed that the LXX has been subjected to a midrashic “whitewashing” revision concerning Ahab: a later reviser behind the Vorlage of OG wanted to improve the quite dark picture of Ahab given by the MT for “midrashic” purposes.²²⁴ While this theory is not impossible, it does not appear very likely: it is more conceivable for evil characters to become more evil in the transmission process than the opposite – especially when we are dealing with Ahab, the evildoer par excellence.²²⁵ In this case it seems that the picture of Ahab was indeed extensively blackwashed by MT by later changing the judgments of two quite

---

²²¹ It is noteworthy already in the MT that even the insignificant Ahazyah is as evil as his father.
²²² Therefore Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 237, notes: “... MT tried to smoothen incongruities in the narrative, as it would certainly seem odd that this late minor monarch whose reign fills barely a couple lines in the narrative of Kings could be more evil than Jeroboam, who split Israel, or than Omri and Ahab, targets of choice of biblical invective against the Northern Kingdom.”
²²³ See Hugo, Deux Visages, 278–99, 326–7; idem, “Case of 1 Kings 19,” 16: “[T]hroughout the entire Elijah cycle, the MT tends to smooth out the portrayal of the king and queen in order to highlight their apostasy.” Similarly also Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 86–107. The most notable cases where Ahab is portrayed in a more favorable or ambiguous light are 1 Kgs 18:45, 20[21]:43 (only in L), 21[20]:27 (Ahab “weeping” in LXX), 21[20]:16 (Ahab mourns the death of Naboth before taking possession of his vineyard; verse 16a in OG form creates a Wiederaufnahme with 27, encompassing the prophetical story of 16b–26).
²²⁵ This tendency of enhancing the depiction of certain characters also works in the opposite direction since characters such as David and Solomon have been made more virtuous during the transmission processes. Moreover, one of the main building blocks for the argument of “midrashic” revision in the LXX has often been that the revision indeed happened at the stage of translation or an even later Greek revision. This is, as already noted (1.2), highly unlikely. Similar “blackwashing” may also happen to Zedekiah in Jeremiah; see Stipp, Das masoretische, 157–9.
insignificant kings from being the most evil to either being as evil as Ahab (Ahazyah) or even to being the least evil of all the kings of Israel (Hoshea). The seemingly “harmonized” and more “unproblematic” reading of the OG should thus be seen as the more original judgment of Hoshea.

Richelle, arguing against Schenker and defending the originality of the MT, has recently also brought into the discussion the passages 2 Kgs 1:6+, where the OG has a remarkable plus emphasizing the evil conduct of Ahazyah, and 1 Kgs 21[20]:20–21, where a very similar judgment is given to Ahab. According to Richelle, these passages contradict each other since first the same blame is given to Ahab and then to his son Ahazyah. Furthermore, 1 Kgs 21[20]:25, where Ahab is said to have “sold himself like no other to do evil in the eyes of Yahweh,” is in literary tension with the OG readings of 1 Kgs 22:54 and 2 Kgs 17:2, indicating that the OG may be secondary in its readings.

Richelle’s argument is mostly methodological. Although the tension found in the OG is indeed a lectio difficilior, Richelle asks whether it is in this case actually a lectio impossibilis since it is indeed very unlikely “that a redactor would contradict himself in such an obvious way.” He further argues that even though Ahazyah thus becomes the worst king of Israel in the OG, Ahab nevertheless stays the “textbook ‘bad king’” in Kings (cf. 2 Kgs 21:3, where Manasseh “built an Ashera like Ahab did”), which is unexpected. Even though Richelle admits that the verses and/or OG pluses in question may – and most likely indeed do – originally come from different

226 Similarly Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 116–22.
227 Trebolle, Centena, 188–93.
228 The plus is attested by the manuscripts L CI 527 55 158 244 245 342 707 (not just by L, as Richelle maintains).
229 Richelle, “Who were the ‘worst’,” 1–6. His argument is more fleshed out in Richelle, “Quels furent,” 333–53. A comparison of the passages shows that they are indeed likely to be linked literally.
230 Richelle, “Who were the ‘worst’,” 2.
231 The LXX reading of 1 Kgs 21:25 (πλὴν ματαίως Ἀχααβ ὡς ἐπράθη ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιον κυρίου, “but wickedly Ahab, as he sold himself to do evil before the Lord”) may be somehow corrupt, since πλὴν ματαίως hardly translates MT הָיָה יְהִי and is grammatically problematic in both Greek and Hebrew. The LXX may be supposed to be a translation of some other fairly similar Hebrew Vorlage, such as הָיִינוּ (as in Ps 72:13), but this form would still make little sense. Interestingly, L reads מָתָאֵיָו (וַיְהִי יְהִי, “he was not like,” thus conforming to MT, probably secondarily (Hexaplaric influence?)). It seems unlikely that the majority reading would have been born from the L reading, even if there is a slight graphical similarity between the two. On the other hand, the unusual use of הָיִינוּ by the MT makes it somewhat suspicious as well; see note 235 below.
232 Richelle, “Who were the ‘worst’,” 2. However, Richelle does rightly acknowledge that “It would be more understandable from a copyist intervening on an occasional basis, who didn’t necessarily have in mind the logic of the whole book” to make such additions to the text as in OG 2 Kgs 1.6+.
(Hebrew) hands, he still seems to maintain that they should be seen as coming from the same editor (whom he calls “a (dtr) redactor”).233 This would of course make it very improbable that the contradicting readings of OG were original.234

However, there is no need, or even reason, to think that this is the case – in fact, the OG reading is more likely to be original exactly because its text is at times somewhat contradictory with itself, since the many revisers/scribes/scribe-revisers of the Hebrew Bible often left in and even added contradictory statements to the texts, as Richelle himself acknowledges – the text constitutes countless strata via Fortschreibung from just as countless revisers, who often were not too concerned about the possible grammatical and/or narratological problems they brought into the text (see, for instance, 2.3 dealing with verses 17:3–6). A good example of this is the praise given to Hezekiah in 2 Kgs 18:5 (“after him there was none like him among all the kings of Judah”), which is then in 23:25 contested by Josiah (“before him there was no king like him”). Indeed, 1 Kgs 21[20]:25–26 is clearly an interpretive latecomer, and cannot therefore be used to say much about the earliest textual layers of the book(s).235 The fact that the MT is here devoid of these contradictions – which clearly come from different editorial hands – makes one rather presume that its text has in fact been later harmonized, as argued by Schenker.236

Richelle’s second objection need not be as definitive as he argues either. While it is true that one could theoretically expect Ahazyah (or rather, Hoshea) to be the evil king to whom the most evil king of Judah, Manasseh, is later compared (to be precise, Manasseh is actually nowhere compared to Ahab as such, but only to Ahab’s action of “making an Ashera”)237 in the OG, it does not necessarily follow that this should be the case. As already mentioned, Ahab is quite clearly and expectedly the “main villain” of Kings in both editions (his reign spanning altogether more than six full chapters in 16:29–22:40), regardless of his status as the (not-so-)worst king of

233 Richelle, “Who were the worst,” 2.
234 Richelle, “Who were the worst,” 2–3.
235 The argument for the lateness is (at least) threefold: 1) verses 21[20]:25–26 break the narrative unity of 24 and 27; 2) the phrase אָּלָּלָּלָּוָּו, is used in an unusual way, different from the other instances in Kings (instead of forming a negation of the previous statement, as in Deut 17:16; 2 Kgs 3:2, 14:3, 17:2; 2 Chr 25:2, 27:2, the phrase here acts unusually as a confirmation of the preceding verses); 3) the phraseology used is either unusual or markedly late (http://www.bible.ub.uni-muenchen.de/). 236 Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 119–22.
237 This is, in fact, the only mention of an Ashera in the Northern Kingdom apart from 1 Kgs 14:15 (>LXX), 2 Kgs 13:6, 17:10, 16, and apparently 23:15. More often it is the Judahites who make or worship Ashera/Asherim in Kings.
Israel.\textsuperscript{238} The fact that he (together with his wife Jezebel) is the main antagonist of Elijah, the most revered prophet of all time, only further emphasizes this point. The arguments of Richelle for the primacy of the MT are therefore not very convincing.

Coming back to the mechanics of textual change in 17:2, it could even be argued that the lack of the customary Deuteronomistic denunciation of the Israelite kings, i.e. “walking in the sin(s) of Jeroboam,” in the case of Hoshea also prompted the change in the MT: since Hoshea is exceedingly unusually not condemned for this main sin of Israelite kings,\textsuperscript{239} he \textit{could} not have been worse than his predecessors, but seems to have been much better off than any of them. Indeed, in 2 Kgs 17:21–22, where a mention of Jeroboam’s sin can be found, it is not Hoshea, but generally “the sons of Israel,” who walk in the sin(s) of Jeroboam, leaving Hoshea in a way “blameless” in this respect.\textsuperscript{240} The OG reading could thus again be seen as the literary \textit{lectio difficilior}: even though Hoshea did not apparently even walk in the main sin(s) of the Israelite kings, he still somehow manages to be the worst of the bunch. On the basis of this logic MT would again have the facilitating reading.

Indeed, in chapter 17 it is not the kings of Israel who are blamed for the destruction, but the people, which is ideologically quite unusual in the books of Kings.\textsuperscript{241} It could even be argued that by trivializing the role of Hoshea as a sinner by calling him the “best” king of Israel, the MT edition now puts even more blame on the people of the Northern Kingdom. Even though the kingdom was in the hands of a good king, the sins of the people and the previous kings heavily outweighed Hoshea’s alleged good deeds – a situation later paralleled in Judah by Manasseh and Josiah (2

\textsuperscript{238} In a way this phenomenon could even be compared with modern films, where the “main villain” – or his sidekick – may or may not be the worst of the bunch. The “objective” evilness need not be the definitive qualification of the “main villain.” In the original Star Wars trilogy, for instance, the main villain of the movies is clearly Darth Vader, who is ultimately but a henchman of the truly most evil character, the galactic Emperor – who nevertheless gets much less screen time than his in the end not-so-evil assistant; see Tekoniemi, “Editorial In(ter)ventions,” 1–30, on the similar comparisons of the editorial techniques of film and the Hebrew Bible.

\textsuperscript{239} The only other Israelite kings not accused of Jeroboam’s sin are Elah (1 Kgs 16:8–14) and Shallum (2 Kgs 15:13–16), although Elah is accused of walking in his father’s (Baasha) sin, who in turn did walk in Jeroboam’s sin. Shallum reigns for only a very short time (one month), but the lack of this formula in his case is similarly baffling.

\textsuperscript{240} It is now impossible to say whether Hoshea was blamed for Jeroboam’s sin in the original text: the text of the chapter has clearly been revised by dozens of hands, and the possible original condemnation of Hoshea may have simply been either accidentally lost, purposely omitted, or even transformed (and transposed) into what we now have in verses 21–22 (of which verse 21 is, at least in its current form, demonstrably late, and thus hardly comes from the History writer; see 3.2.6 for the discussion).

\textsuperscript{241} Rösel, “Why 2 Kings 17,” 85–90.
Together with the possible tendency of the MT to avoid blaming the “fathers” of Israel (and Judah) for their sins in this chapter (cf. 2.4.3), this makes the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom solely responsible for its fall (which could even be seen as an anti-Samaritan modification).

**Conclusions.** The most original attainable form of the text of verse 2 is to be found in the OG, according to which Hoshea “did evil before the Lord more than all who were before him.” This was the original formula penned by the History writer. The text of the MT has gone through a theologically motivated revision. While only one exact motive for this change is hard to pinpoint, there are several reasons to think that proto-MT scribe(s), interested in a more or less thorough-going revision of 1–2 Kings, changed the depiction of Hoshea. The MT is interested in depicting Ahab, the main antagonist in Kings, as the worst king of Israel — unlike the OG, where Ahab is surpassed in wickedness by both his son Ahaziah and Hoshea. The fact that Hoshea is nowhere accused of the sin of Jeroboam in any of the present text forms — possibly because the second calf of Jeroboam in Dan (which is likely a late addition to the passage to begin with) was no longer in the possession of Israel (2 Kgs 15:29) — may have further motivated the proto-MT reviser to harmonize the text.

As will be seen in section 3.2, this textual difference may have an important role when deciding about further redactional matters in verses 7–23.

---

242 It is likely that verses 2 Kgs 23:25–27 are very late interpretive nomistic additions to the narrative; see for instance Würtzwein, *Bücher der Könige*, 454, 462. Supposing that the OG already had these verses, which is now impossible to ensure, as even L seems to be under the influence of kaige (27 καὶ γέ) in these verses, it is possible that the proto-MT reviser noticed this theological idea in Judah and decided to bring the parallel to the Northern Kingdom as well.
2.3 The textual history of the “historical” verses 3–6

In verses 3–6 the different textual witnesses have both large- and small-scale differences when compared with each other. It is important to note that the OG text form has not been preserved in these verses in any of the Greek manuscripts as such, but first has to be reconstructed via intra-Greek textual criticism. Only after this will a discussion be provided on the differences of the two editions, OG and MT. It will be shown that in these verses the MT has gone through a substantial revision not yet found in the OG version of the text. These conclusions will also have further repercussions on the historical study of the destruction of Samaria.

2.3.1 The history of scholarship and scholarship of history in verses 3–6

The text of verses 3–6 of chapter 17 poses multiple (narrato-)logical and above all historical questions. It has long been noted that there are grave tensions in the narrative logic of this passage. As the text now stands in the MT, there seem to be two different Assyrian attacks that are alluded to: the first in verse 3a, as a result of which Hoshea becomes Shalmaneser’s vassal (3b), and the second in verses 4b–6, in which Samaria is destroyed and its people are exiled. However, there is no other evidence (external or otherwise) for two Assyrian attacks on Samaria, making the witness of the text problematic. As the history of the time of Samaria’s fall is somewhat murky, and there is still no consensus on the identity of the Assyrian king who ultimately conquered Samaria (either Shalmaneser V or Sargon II), many scholars have taken the somewhat confusing narrative of the MT to depict the just as confusing historical

---

243 Historically this does not seem to be true, either, as according to Tiglath-Pileser III’s annals he himself, not Shalmaneser, installed Hoshea as the king of Israel; see Becking, Fall of Samaria, 19–20. It has been suggested by Winckler, Untersuchungen, 22–3, and later by Benzinger, Könige, 172–3, that the verb יָהֵיהַ in verse 3b should be read as יָהֵיהוּ, “and Hoshea was (already) servant,” which would take away some of the historical problems of the passage. However, as Stade, Kings, 329, already note, such a construction is ungrammatical, and, moreover, textually unattested.

244 Becking, Fall of Samaria, 50–1.

245 The biggest problem concerning the king is that both Shalmaneser and Sargon II claim in their annals to have conquered Samaria while 2 Kgs 17:3a only mentions Shalmaneser. Sargon II seems to be historically more accurate as the king who, at least mainly, sacked Samaria; see Tadmor, “Campaigns of Sargon II,” 33–9. Kittel, Könige, 273, thinking that the reference to the king of Assyria in verse 3 has to be to Tiglath-Pileser, has even proposed to omit the name of Shalmaneser as a gloss. There is no manuscript evidence for this, but as a solution this is quite a sensible one. However, as will be argued below, the naming of the king can also be explained as coming from a later redactor and not from the most original account.
situation quite well. Most importantly, the dating of Hoshea’s imprisonment recorded in 4b is even more problematic: if he was indeed captured before (4bβ), the historically equally problematic three-year-long siege of Samaria (5bβ), the kingdom would apparently have been without a king all this time. Knowing the turbulent history of Israel’s en- and dethronements, this seems quite unlikely. And indeed, the siege does end “in the ninth year of Hoshea” (6a), indicating that Hoshea was still understood to be reigning when the city was captured. This same understanding of the text is also shared by the parallel narrative in 18:9–11.

Because of these problems, since the work of Hugo Winckler, it has customarily been assumed that verses 17:3–6 consist of two differing accounts (roughly in verses 3–4 and 5–6) of the same historical event. This proposition would do away with most of the historiographical problems of the text. These two accounts are often seen to derive from two different ancient sources, respectively, the annals of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Of these accounts the second one (5–6) is recounted almost verbatim in a parallel passage in 2 Kgs 18:9–11, which, according to many scholars, confirms its Judean (annalistic) origins. Text-critical material has usually not been taken into account when analyzing this passage.

The idea of two different textual sources is a sensible proposal to ease the many literary-critical and historical problems of the text, as it makes the fewest hypothetical assumptions about the different historical events that may or may not have happened.

---

246 See Cogan & Tadmor, If Kings, 198–201; Tadmor, “Campaigns of Sargon II,” 37–9; Hobbs, 2 Kings, 225–6. For an appraisal of the different theories, see Galil, Chronology, 83–90.

247 Grabbe, “The Kingdom of Israel,” 64, notes on the historicity of this alleged siege on an archaeological basis: “According to 2 Kings 17.5-6, 23-24, the Assyrians besieged Samaria for three years ... From an archaeological point of view there are some problems with this scenario. There is no burn layer or other evidence of destruction for Samaria, raising questions about the 2 Kings 17.5-6 statement that Samaria was besieged three years.”

248 Similarly already Winckler, Untersuchungen, 20 and Burney, Kings, 328: “It is, however, highly improbable that Israel remained for three years without a king ...”

249 However, according to Cogan & Tadmor, If Kings, 195, the “ninth year” is an “artificial calculation of the chronographer like those in 18:1, 9.” Be this as it may, the synchronism still seems to come from the earliest layers of the text since verse 6a cannot work grammatically without it.

250 According to Winckler, Untersuchungen, 24, these accounts are found in 3a.4αβ (in the conflated form of L), 5–6 and 3b.4aa.4b. Winckler, of course, could not have yet been aware of the kaige revision, and therefore incorrectly took the conflated form of L in 4αβ as the original. Rougher divisions have been proposed, for instance, by Benzinger, Könige, 172; Jones, Kings, 542–3; Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 394–5 (“parallelberichte”); and many others.

251 See, for instance, Becking, Ondergang, 22–33; Benzinger, Könige, 173; Eissfeldt, “Könige,” 569; Gray, Kings, 580.

252 The form or position of this narrative, when compared to that of 17:4–5, is seen as original by Benzinger, Könige, 173; Eissfeldt, “Könige,” 569; Kittel, Könige, 273.
and prompted the textual state of the passage. A division of the text into two distinct parts (roughly in verses 3–4 and 5–6), coming from different writers, is indeed very likely, as will be seen below. Textual criticism may, however, have its benefits for the literary- and source-critical discussion of the passage. As has been noted by Trebolle, there are some hints in the Antiochian text, backed up by the Old Latin evidence, that the text of verses 3–6 is probably not a composite of two different annals, but, instead, is comprised of multiple successive revisions.

### 2.3.2 Text-critical notes on the passage

Below is a table of the most important textual witnesses to verses 3–6. The most striking textual differences between the MT and L/La have been bordered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 3</th>
<th>LXX B 3</th>
<th>L 3</th>
<th>La 115 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הַשְׁלַמְנֵאֶסֶר</td>
<td>ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἀνέβη</td>
<td>ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἀνέβη</td>
<td>athuc ascendit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיְהִי־לוֹ</td>
<td>Σαλμανασσαρ</td>
<td>Σαλμανασσαρ</td>
<td>salmanassar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֶבֶד</td>
<td>βασιλεύς ᾿Ασσυρίων, καὶ ἔγνετο αὐτῷ</td>
<td>βασιλεύς ᾿Ασσυρίων, καὶ ἔγνετο αὐτῷ</td>
<td>rex assyriorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מֶלֶךְ</td>
<td>Ωσὴ δοῦλος</td>
<td>Ωσὴ δοῦλος</td>
<td>et factus est ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שָׁלְמַנְאֶסֶר</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>καὶ ἐφερεν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>ose servus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>טּוּבָא</td>
<td>μαναχ</td>
<td>μαναχ</td>
<td>et adferebat ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְלֹא</td>
<td>מְלֹא</td>
<td>מְלֹא</td>
<td>munera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over him rose Shalmaneser, king of Assyria(ns), and Hoshea became to him a servant, and he brought him tribute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 4</th>
<th>LXX B 4</th>
<th>L 4</th>
<th>La 115 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיִּמְצָא</td>
<td>καὶ εὗρεν</td>
<td>καὶ εὗρεν</td>
<td>et invent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁוּר</td>
<td>βασιλεύς ᾿Ασσυρίων</td>
<td>βασιλεύς ᾿Ασσυρίων</td>
<td>rex assyriorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קֶשֶׁר</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ Ωσὴ ἐδίκαιον</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ Ωσὴ ἐδίκαιον</td>
<td>in osee insidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּהוֹשֵׁע</td>
<td>διῆτι ἀπέστειλεν</td>
<td>διῆτι ἀπέστειλεν</td>
<td>εὗ misit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַלְאָכִים</td>
<td>ἀγγέλους</td>
<td>ἀγγέλους</td>
<td>nuntios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶל סֹא</td>
<td>πρὸς Σηγωρ</td>
<td>πρὸς Σηγωρ</td>
<td>πρὸς Adramalech tōn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נוּדְלֵא</td>
<td>πρὸς Αδραμαλέχ τὸν</td>
<td>nontios</td>
<td>st adramalec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

253 Some scholars have tried to read the narrative as one coherent unit, containing only one originally continuous narrative. Oftentimes this forces them to make quite hypothetical reconstructions of the contemporary history, of which there is no evidence whatsoever. For such approaches, see Snith, *Kings*, 278–9; Hentschel, “Did Hoshea of Israel,” 355–65; and for a more nuanced reconstruction Na’amân, “Historical Background,” 206–25.
256 According to Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 36, 86, this should be corrected to “at/d hunc,” which is likely right. Taking this as a textual, rather than literary variant, one need not propose conjectural and quite improbable (literary-critical) solutions, such as subtly suggested by Torijano, “Text-Critical Edition,” 211.
257 Kaige (mis)reads as שֶׁקֶר; cf. 1 Sam 25:21; 2 Sam 18:13; 2 Kgs 9:12.
258 The conjunction *et* cannot easily be taken as a translation of διότι of the Greek witnesses, and would rather be expected to render καί. It is likely *et* here is simply due to some corruption, possibly from *ut*, for instance, which would nevertheless be quite an uncommon translation of διότι. This *et* also slightly changes the logic of the passage: the one sending messengers to Adrammelek would not be Hoshea, but the king of the Assyrians. This is hardly the original meaning of the text.
And the king of Assyria(ns) found in Hoshea a conspiracy (fault LXX), for he sent messengers to Sô, king of Egypt, and did not pay tribute to the king of Assyria(ns) ‘from year to year’ (‘in that year’ LXX).

And the king of Assyria(ns) besieged him and bound him in prison.

And rose the king of Assyria(ns) in all the land, and he rose in Samaria, and besieged it for three years.

---

259 See also the OL witness Sulpicius Severus (Chr 1.49.4): *sed cum occultis consiliis rebellionem pararet rege regnum Aethiopiam, qui tunc Aegyptum optimebat*...

260 This reading is also confirmed by two other Old Latin witnesses, La

261 This plus (“in Gilead”) is likely an early (secondary) variant, also attested by La in Galee and AN gen 569 (et paranem ei insidias).

262 Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 86, posits that *et inaniariam* fecit ei rexi assyriorum in chalee

However, this is not likely, since in the B-text such a mistake would not result in the text now found in La115. The word order of La115 is that of L, but as the second verb of L is ἠλθεν (~venit), not ἄνεβη (as retroverted by Fischer), the mistake is not possible in such a text either. La115 likely preserves the earliest text without the later notion.
As can be seen, La\textsuperscript{115} gives the briefest account of all, while L has the longest form of the text. The length of L is mostly due to its conflating different kinds of readings from both the OG and the \textit{kaige} text(s).\textsuperscript{264} In addition to the proto-Lucianic base layer, the L-text now also has many Hebraizing \textit{kaige} readings (‘ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐναντίῳ έκείνῳ, ὥσπερ ἤνεγκεν αὐτοῦ μανα = ποταμὸς Ταύρος’;\textsuperscript{265} καὶ ἐπολίρκησεν αὐτῶν = ποταμὸς Ζαγερ, ποταμὸς Ταύρος, καὶ Ὀρη Μήδων’.\textsuperscript{266}) together with one longer Lucianic

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
& OG & L & see regis \textit{kaige} text(s) \\
δεν & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
κατάξη & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
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καὶ & & & \\
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καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
καὶ & & & \\
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καὶ & & & \\
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καὶ & & & \\
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καiability of the destruction and exile of the Israelites. Possibly verse 23 was ab anno in annum [et non attulit ei munera in illum annum] et inuriand fecit ei. However, as Torijano, “Text-Critical Edition,” 205–7, shows, this is rather a Lucianic conflation, not yet found in the proto-Lucianic stratum likely reflected by La\textsuperscript{115}.

\textsuperscript{266} This phrase is also missing from the parallel account in 18:9, pointing to its later provenance. The reading is likely a later (proto-)MT, potentially anti-Samaritan, plus made in order to emphasize the totality of the destruction and exile of the Israelites. Possibly verse 23 was lost in the protolucianic stratum and its mention of “its land” has also affected this plus.

\textsuperscript{267} Ορη Μήδων seems to be a \textit{kaige} reading. The \textit{kaige} reviser transcribed the Hebrew וַיַּלְאָה erroneously as a place name (“Ore of Medians”), continuing the list given before it. See Tov, “Transliteration in the Greek Versions,” 82, for this mistaken “place-naming” tendency of \textit{kaige} especially in such list-like contexts. As Torijano, “Text-Critical Edition,” 210, notes, L and other traditions then diverged from this transliteration. It is likely that the translation/transcription of וַיַּלְאָה (6b) as Ορη Μήδων is due to \textit{kaige} influence in all witnesses except La\textsuperscript{115}, which rightly translates \textit{in civitatem mediorum}, “in the cities of the Medians”; see Tekoniemi, “Identifying \textit{kaige}.” Its transposition in La\textsuperscript{115}, however, is
recensional addition not found in any other witness (καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν αὐτῆς). However, it is also important to note that L has not been completely harmonized towards all the kaige readings found in B (ἐπέστρεψεν = וַיָּשֶׁב, μαναα = מִנְחָה; Σηγωρ/Σωβα; ἐπολιόρκησεν = πάλη). Whether or not these Hebraizing readings come from a Hexaplaric source or a kaige text proper (such as B), this passage is again a good example of the mixed textual character of L in 2 Kings.

It is important to note that the name of the Egyptian ruler of verse 4 differs widely between the witnesses. As would be expected, most Greek manuscripts give simply the MT name or a variation of it, Σωα/Σωβα, or a somehow corrupt form, Σηγωρ. However, the proto-Lucianic (= OG) text of L and the OL witnesses differ from the majority tradition, calling him, possibly even more strangely, “Adrammelek the Ethiopian, who dwelt in Egypt.” Such a reading hardly came to be because of an accident, and the OG clearly reflects an independent literary tradition from the MT. This difference between names is one of the main points to be discussed in the literary-critical assessment below.

As the text of La in verses 3–6 closely follows L, except for its recensional double readings, it is quite safe to assume that it contains here a text very close to the OG – the single closest manuscript to the OG, in fact. Torijano, editor of the Göttingen Septuagint edition of Kings, has provided the apparatus and a fine text-critical commentary on this passage, its most notable issues, and its probable OG text (which deviates only in small details from the text given by La). It is also important to note that the phrase “until this day” (ἕως τῆς ημέρας = זְמֵה יָמִינוֹ) at the end of verse 6 and later in 7b in both L and La creates a Wiederaufnahme, which encloses the material in 7*a.

somewhat problematic. Instead of giving this reading at the very end of the verse like every other witness, the mention is found as the first place of exile mentioned.

270 Similarly Trebolle, “La Caida,” 150 n. 23. See 2.4.3.1 for further discussion.

This phrase is used three times in the chapter in the MT and five times in L (twice in La\textsuperscript{115}, both times coinciding with L), marking shifts from one narrative unit to another. This appears to be its function here as well: the historical narrative of verses 3–6 ends and switches to the “homiletic” part of the chapter beginning with verse 7. Considering its structurally fitting position at the hinge-point of differing narrative units and the fact that this phrase is also found at the end of verse 17:23b, which in turn seems to form a \textit{Wiederaufnahme} with verse 6b, the originality of this phrase here seems most likely. The parallel passage 1 Chr 5:26 also has this phrase.

\textit{The most important textual variants} in the text of the OG related to the literary-critical assessment of the passage are the following:

First, the OG has in verse 4α the peculiar repetition of 3β, “and Hoshea was bearing tribute to the king of Assyrians (from year to year).” This runs contrary to the MT, which affirms that Hoshea “did not offer tribute to the king of Assyrians as year to year” (the ‘awkwardness’ of this expression is discussed in detail below). This OG repetition changes the narrative logic of the passage.

Second, the OG has at the beginning of verse 4α a peculiar repetition of 3β, “and the king of Assyrians did wrong/injury to Hoshea and put him in prison.”

Third, and possibly linked to the first variant, unlike in MT 4b, where Hoshea’s imprisonment is recorded twice (“and the king of Assyrians \textit{shut him up} and \textit{bound him} in prison”), the OG gives the peculiar reading “and the king of Assyrians \textit{did wrong/injury} to Hoshea and put him in prison.”
2.3.3 Literary-critical considerations: OG vs. MT

The three important textual differences posited above have further repercussions for both the historiographical and especially the text-historical study of the passage. As will be shown, the OG edition preserves the earliest attainable edition of the text, while the MT evidences the very latest, revised version of the passage. This means that the further (undocumented) redaction-/literary-critical work also has to be conducted, not on the basis of the MT text form, but on that of the OG. This is important because with the witness of the OG we are able to reconstruct one more otherwise unidentifiable textual layer in the transmission process of these verses.273

2.3.3.1 Who did Hoshea send messengers to: the mystery of Sô the Egyptian and Adrammelek the Ethiopian

Verse 17:4 has incited quite a considerable amount of discussion from the historical viewpoint, mainly because of the strange name of the Egyptian Pharaoh, “Sô, the king of Egypt,” to whom Hoshea sent messengers.274 Despite the several dynasties and Pharaohs reigning simultaneously during Israel’s last years,275 no Pharaoh easily recognized as “Sô” seems to have ruled during the time of Israel’s demise. Therefore Sô has been identified with numerous Pharaohs, such as Tefnakht, Osorkon IV, or Piye, and sometimes not even as a personal name, but as the name of a city, Sais – while some have proposed that the “name” is in fact an Egyptian job description for “commander” (ṯ3), or, more likely, “king” (nsw).276 No scholarly consensus has been formed on the identification of Sô.

The Greek witnesses have rarely been considered when assessing this problem, and mostly they have been brushed aside as either irrelevant or as early attempts to make sense of the (apparently already then unexplainable) name “Sô.”277 The OG

---

273 The section “Who did Hoshea send messengers to” has previously been published as part of an article; see Tekoniemi, “Between Two Differing Editions.”
274 The text of the MT (רַמֵּאָם מֶלֶךְ–סֹא) is clear and lucid, and most probably should not be emended in any way. Most of the emendations have indeed been born of the need to make the name “Sô” work in the historical context of the text, not because of problems of the text itself.
276 For an overall picture of the problems pertaining to “Sô,” see John Day, “Problem of ‘Sô, king of Egypt’,” 289–301.
277 See, for instance, Duane Christensen, “The Identity of King Sô,” 141 (“… the most significant of the earliest attempts to eliminate “King So” …”); Donald Redford, “A Note on II Kings 17.4,” 75 (“Lucian substituted”). Day, “The Problem of ‘Sô, king of Egypt’,” 298, also makes lengthy mention of the Lucianic reading, but discusses it no further. In any case, it is unlikely that any Greek reviser (not to mention the translator) would have had any interest in changing the name of the Egyptian ruler.
name Adrammelek is obviously neither an Ethiopian nor an Egyptian name, and on the basis of its distribution it seems rather like a “stock-name” that could be used for different purposes: in 2 Kgs 17:31 it reappears as the name of a foreign god and in 19:37 (= Isa 37:38) as the name of a son of Sennacherib – albeit there it could also be a genuine, corrupted historical name.\footnote{One has to wonder whether this recurrence of the name in 17:31 has something to do with the appearance or disappearance of Sô or Adrammelek in verse 17:4. Simo Parpola, “Murderer of Sennacherib,” 174, has convincingly argued that the wrongly spelled name Adrammelek of 2 Kgs 19:37 can indeed be found in the Assyrian sources as a son and murderer of Sennacherib in the form Arda-
\footnote{NIN.LIL, to be read in Neo-Assyrian times as Arda-Mullissi. According to Parpola, the form Adrammelek can be explained as a scribal error (from the form “Ardamelos,” for instance). While this is indeed likely, the reason for this “scribal mistake” may also be harmonization towards the two other mentions of the name “Adrammelek” before the one in 19:37. Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 235, hypothesizes that Hoshea may have been historically somehow linked to this murder and conspiracy, as shown by the OG, but that the mention of his involvement in the text has become distorted in the long history of the text. Perhaps the name was even understood at some point as a sort of “stock-name for a conspirator” because of its appearance in 19:37, and was taken over from there.}N.\footnote{See also Morkot, “The End,” 125–44. Na’a’man, “Historical Background,” 217–18, on the basis of the Assyrian iconographic evidence, indeed posits that the Egyptian king (who, according to him, also sent forces to aid Hoshea) must have been a Kushite.}NIN.LIL, to be read in Neo-Assyrian times as Arda-Mullissi. According to Parpola, the form Adrammelek can be explained as a scribal error (from the form “Ardamelos,” for instance). While this is indeed likely, the reason for this “scribal mistake” may also be harmonization towards the two other mentions of the name “Adrammelek” before the one in 19:37. Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 235, hypothesizes that Hoshea may have been historically somehow linked to this murder and conspiracy, as shown by the OG, but that the mention of his involvement in the text has become distorted in the long history of the text. Perhaps the name was even understood at some point as a sort of “stock-name for a conspirator” because of its appearance in 19:37, and was taken over from there.}NIN.LIL, to be read in Neo-Assyrian times as Arda-Mullissi. According to Parpola, the form Adrammelek can be explained as a scribal error (from the form “Ardamelos,” for instance). While this is indeed likely, the reason for this “scribal mistake” may also be harmonization towards the two other mentions of the name “Adrammelek” before the one in 19:37. Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 235, hypothesizes that Hoshea may have been historically somehow linked to this murder and conspiracy, as shown by the OG, but that the mention of his involvement in the text has become distorted in the long history of the text. Perhaps the name was even understood at some point as a sort of “stock-name for a conspirator” because of its appearance in 19:37, and was taken over from there.

\footnote{Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 235.} 278 There is thus no historically relevant information in the name here – quite the contrary, the name seems like a literary construct. There is, however, one interesting and historically quite legitimate remark in the OG text that is lacking from the MT: at the time of Hoshea’s reign both upper and even lower Egypt were, at least nominally, under the rule of the Ethiopian 25th dynasty.\footnote{Kitchen, \textit{Third Intermediate Period}, 362–8; Redford, \textit{Egypt, Canaan, and Israel}, 345–7. See also Morkot, “The End,” 125–44. Na’a’man, “Historical Background,” 217–18, on the basis of the Assyrian iconographic evidence, indeed posits that the Egyptian king (who, according to him, also sent forces to aid Hoshea) must have been a Kushite.} 279 How should one then assess these two completely differing names, “Sô” and “Adrammelek”?  

Because of these peculiar traits of the OG, Adrian Schenker argues that the MT tradition could, in fact, be reflecting a textual situation posterior to that of the OG.\footnote{Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 117–19.} First, Adrammelek’s “job description” is completely lacking in the OG and has to be deduced from the context: he could be anything from a mercenary to a king (which could, in a way, quite well reflect the confusing state of Egyptian politics of the time).

In the MT there is no room for any confusion. On the other hand, the name “Sô” appears to be a much more Egyptian name (possibly even a transcription of \textit{nsw}, “king,” or an abbreviation of [O]so[rkon]) than “Adrammelek.” It would be easy to see why a potentially confusing remark of an Ethiopian called Adrammelek who lives in Egypt would have later been changed into the much more understandable and possibly even Egyptian-sounding “Sô, [that is:] king of Egypt”: since the literary motif
of Israelites depending (futilely) on the help of Egypt and its king is somewhat common in the Hebrew Bible, and is found even in 2 Kgs 18:21, it would also make sense here that Hoshea asked for help from “the king of Egypt.”

Finally, the fact that the name “Adrammelek” confusingly appears in two completely different contexts elsewhere makes it likely that the MT has here smoothened a text that seems quite contradictory with itself: how could Hoshea send messengers to an Ethiopian in Egypt, who concurrently is a son of Sennacherib and, even more confusingly, is revered as a god by the later Mesopotamian settlers of the province of Samaria? It is thus quite easy to see why the text would have been changed to the MT version, while the opposite, a change from the lucid MT to the somewhat contradictory OG text, would be quite unexpected.

The MT therefore attests the very latest stage of the textual evolution in verse 4, while the OG has preserved an earlier edition. Any further literary (or historical) work thus has to be done on the basis of the OG version.

2.3.3.2 The changing narrative logic of the passage: OG vs. MT
As proposed by Trebolle, the repetition of 3bβ “and Hoshea bore tribute” in 4aβ (“and Hoshea was bearing tribute”) may be a case of Wiederaufnahme in the OG tradition, possibly framing a later interpolation in 4aa, mentioning the sending of Israelite messengers to Egypt. There are two distinct ways the editorial technique of Wiederaufnahme or resumptive repetition can be used: it can either be used as a framing device, added after or before the interpolated text (thus potentially the enframed 4aa), as proposed by Trebolle, or it can simply be used to begin an insertion by repeating a part of the preceding text, after which the addition (in this case 4aβ.b) is made. Both of these possibilities are viable here and will be assessed below. In any case, the narrative logic of the passage is somewhat hindered by this OG reading

281 Cf. 2 Kgs 18:21, 24; Hos 7:11, 12:2; Jer 37:7–8; Isa 30:2–5, 31:1–2; Ez 29:2–7.
282 See Matthieu Richelle, “Intentional Omissions,” 141–6, for a similar omission of contradicting information in 1 Kgs 14:26.
283 Trebolle, “La Caída,” 142. When retroverted into Hebrew, this repetition of the wording in 3b becomes apparent: אשור למלך מנחה משיב הוושע ויהי. According to Stade, Kings, 260, however, this doubling is just “expansions derived from v. 3.” Stade does not take into account the readings of La, which confirms the proto-Lucianic character of the reading here.
284 Trebolle, Jehú y Joás, 58: “El duplicado se remonta al original hebreo. Se verifica aquí una repetición de engarce (‘Wiederaufnahme’), que permite descubrir el carácter secundario del 4a.” This framing use is very recurrent in the Hebrew Bible, and likely to be found multiple times even in chapter 2 Kgs 17 in verses 7 (OG), 11.17, 34.40. This view of Trebolle’s is also echoed by Tekoniemi, “Between Two Differing Editions,” 221–3, although I have since changed my view on the matter in this thesis.
when compared to the smooth MT: even though in 4aα “the king of Assyrians found a conspiracy in Hoshea,” in 4aβ OG Hoshea still kept paying his tribute “year by year,” as if nothing had happened. One could even read this as a demonstration of Hoshea’s cunning: even though he sent messengers to Egypt, he did not stop with the tribute so that his conspiracy would not become known.

In the MT this repetition cannot be found, likely as a result of later harmonizing revision. The reason to doubt the originality of the MT is that, unlike the OG, the MT makes perfect sense in its context: Israel is attacked because Hoshea both conspires against Assyria (4aα) and, accordingly, ceases with his tribute (4aβ). Hoshea’s not paying tribute of course finally forces the Assyrian king to act. However, as Torijano notes, the wording of the MT is a little awkward here: the exact, punctual act of not paying tribute happens oddly “as year by year.”285 One would expect the MT to give a certain moment when Hoshea ceased with his tribute – as is done by the revised *kaige* B-text, reading “in that year.”286 The expression “as year by year” works well in the OG version, but not in the MT. This small discrepancy hints that the text before the expression בְשָׁנָה כְּשָׁנָה has indeed been altered somehow, without a change to the temporal construct itself. Furthermore, it needs to be noted that the construct עָלָה מִנְחָה, unlike בְשׁוּב מִנְחָה of 17:3 (and 4 OG), is in fact cultic, not political, terminology, used elsewhere in the meaning “to offer a burnt offering.”287 This again makes the text of the MT suspect.288 The later-added negation in the MT seems to be the reason for
the changes in the text and, subsequently, the late Lucianic composite, “and Hoshea was bearing tribute to the king of Assyrians year by year (OG), but in that year he did not pay tribute (kaige).”289

The slightly problematic repetition of v. 3bβ, “and Hoshea bore tribute,” in 4aβ in the OG version likely attests to a literary seam inside verse 4, which was later seen, as is often the case, as needing emending by the ancient scribes.290 It is easy to see why the MT would change the OG text, where Hoshea keeps paying tribute, to a more logical one where he stops the tribute – a literary lectio facilior – while the opposite, a deliberate change from the MT to the OG version, which only adds challenges to the interpretation of the verse, does not seem very plausible.291 Methodologically, it is often probable that a text attesting a technique resembling a Wiederaufnahme is older than the one where such repetition is not found.292

In the OG Hoshea thus keeps paying his tribute “year by year,” but the king of Assyria still attacks him, adding one further literary tension to the already problematic text of 17:3–6. In addition, it is also said by OG 4b that instead of “binding him up” (אָרְצָה), the Assyrian king “maltreated/injured him,” (L ὑβρίσε ἀυτὸν; La115 iniuriam fecit ei; La91-95 iniuriatus est eum). It is unclear what the Hebrew Vorlage (possibly נָשָׁם or צער) for this rare verb may have been as well as precisely what is meant in

290 It is common that such literary seams are – or later become – textually active after the addition/omission and especially transposition has been made to the text. See Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition.”
291 Stade, Kings, 260, argues that “S1 paraphrases the clause, adding expansions derived from v. 3 ....” However, Stade does not take into account the OL witnesses, the kaige text, or the above-mentioned literary considerations – it is very unlikely the text would have been expanded (and otherwise modified) as seen in L and the OL. It seems equally unlikely that the plus would have been born by some sort of accident or mishap. The difference here is between the MT and the original Old Greek (and its Vorlage). 292 See similarly Richelle, “Intentional Omissions,” 157: “… a Wiederaufnahme can disappear, and thus also the trace of the insertion of a passage. Maybe this could provide, in some cases at least, a criterion to detect an omission: the textual witness preserving the Wiederaufnahme has a good chance of reflecting an earlier stage of the text.” See also Trebolle, “Text-Critical Use,” 285–96.
293 The verb ὑβρίζειν is only used 4 times in the LXX: 2 Sam 19:44 (<טיר); Isa 13:3, 23:12 (<טיר>; Jer 31:29. Trebolle, “La Caida,” 145, finds צער (“to horrify”) the most probable option for the underlying Vorlage. However, I would consider ים (3x) another good candidate. The semantic range of this rare Hebrew verb (“to be little”) could work in the context as well: the king of Assyria “belittled Hoshea/made (likely in the hiph‘il or pi‘el stem) Hoshea small.” Attestations in other Semitic languages (“insult, maltreat”) could also support this idea; see Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targumim, 1294–5. These cognates could well suit צער as the OG Vorlage of ὑβρίζειν. Thus, in the MT this rare word (albeit in an otherwise unattested verbal form) may have been at some point assimilated phonologically to the following verb צקר, which produced a much more common verb by metathesis. It is also quite interesting that these consonants (צָרָה) can be found in the B-text in the variant name of the king of Egypt. Indeed, סיגור is elsewhere in the LXX always used as a transcription of the name סיגר, a direct cognate of צער. In any case, the double reading of the MT seems to be due to textual reasons, not literary.
Greek (“to treat spitefully, insult, maltreat, injure, mutilate”). If the verb is to be translated as “maltreat,” the sense of the passage becomes very interesting: the tribute-bearing Hoshea would himself actually become a victim of the king of Assyria’s whims. It would again be very improbable that the text had been changed to this form later rather than the opposite. However we may interpret the verb, the OG narrative is in any case interesting, as Hoshea somehow becomes humiliated before/during his imprisonment, as could also historically be expected to have happened.

2.3.3.3 The text-historical repercussions of the OG repetition in verses 3b and 4aβ
What does the repetition in the OG mean for the textual history of the passage? As mentioned, there are two distinct possibilities for how this repetitive resumption may have been used to add text to the present passage: either the text framed by the repetition (4aα) has been interpolated, or the text after the second repetition in 4aβ was added together with the repetition. In either case the reason for the addition seems clear: to further elaborate the reason for the fall of Samaria, which is otherwise left unelaborated except for the lengthy, but demonstrably late, homiletical portion (7–41) of the chapter.

The first solution is that of Trebolle’s: 4aα, recounting the sending of messengers to Egypt, was later interpolated to the text as a further notion of Hoshea’s guilt, since the narrative of verse 3 (together with 4aβ.4b) left Hoshea’s role in the destruction of Samaria vague. Without 4aα it is as if Hoshea himself does nothing to get his kingdom destroyed. It could then have seemed necessary for a later scribe to add a reason for Israel’s fall, that is, Hoshea’s conspiracy with Egypt. The futile dependence

---

294 See also Muraoka, *Lexicon*, 692: “2. to cause sbd loss of honour.” The Old Latin witnesses are just as ambiguous with their translations of this word.
295 Even if the OG reading is taken as a misreading of עַצְרֵהוּ, as Stade, *Kings*, 260, does, this sense of logic of the passage stays the same, albeit not as exacerbated. However, the reading ὑβρίζει works quite well in the suggested OG logic of the sentence, more so than the double reading of the MT.
296 Even more interestingly, if 4aα is deemed a later addition between 3b and 4aβ, the law-abiding and tribute-bearing Hoshea himself seems to do nothing to bring about his own and his kingdom’s doom. By narrative logic, this reading would be even more clearly a lectio difficilior. The unimaginable idea that the last king of Israel (who did even “more evil than anyone before him” in the OG of 17:2) would not be directly responsible for Israel’s destruction, or even that he was a victim himself, would have understandably easily prompted corrections to the text.
on Egypt is quite a recurrent narrative motif in the Hebrew Bible, and together with the secondary and “stock-name-like” Adrammelek it could be possible to argue that this conspiracy narrative of 4aα was, as a whole, a late scribal creation.298 Trebolle sees verses 3.4aβ.4b (Hoshea’s cessation of tribute) and 4aα.5–6 (conspiracy) as constituting two originally separate annalistic units.299 However, it is hard to see why 4aα.5–6 would form a literary unity coming from the annals: if that is the case, why is the text separated by the text of 4b, and, more importantly, why would the beginning part (4aα) have been added seemingly separately from verses 5–6 via a *Wiederaufnahme*?300 Trebolle’s theory can be nicely fit into the theory of two annalistic sources, but the separation of 4aα from its “main story” of 5–6 appears to run contrary to this theory.

This reconstruction is, furthermore, somewhat problematic from the viewpoint of the narrative logic of this putative original text: no apparent reason for Hoshea’s imprisonment would have originally been given. The king of Assyria, right after making Hoshea his tribute-bearing vassal (3), for no particular reason invades Israel (4aβ), or at least decides to imprison Hoshea. The *Gegenprobe* does result in a grammatically meaningful text, but the abrupt movement from Hoshea paying yearly tribute to him being immediately “restrained” by the Assyrian king in the narrative thus reconstructed does not seem original.301

The second option for a *Wiederaufnahme* is that the text of 4aβ.b, beginning with the repetition of the information of 3b יִרְאוּ הַשָּׁמַשׁ מְנַחַה לֵאמֶר אָשֻׁר ašur (reconstructed according to L) in 4aβ, has been added to the text after that of 3–4aα (where Hoshea is first made vassal and found conspiring against Assyria). This base text would work perfectly narratologically since 5a follows 4aα directly with the consequences: the king of Assyria rises against Samaria (5a) due to the misconduct of Hoshea (4aα). If

---

298 It is also good to note that the construct מצא + קֶשֶׁר is very rare, and is found elsewhere only in Jer 11:9 in a speech of Yahweh against the men of Judah.

299 Trebolle, “La Caida,” 146–7, 151. Trebolle seems to have viewed the negation of the MT and the Greek as original in both. While this is possible and makes the text logically more sound in both traditions, the negation in L is probably a *kaige* feature, as suggested by Torijano, “Text-Critical Edition,” 205–7.

300 The argument of Trebolle, “La Caida,” 147 n. 15, that the unity of 4aα.5–6 is confirmed by the impossible narrative unity of 4aβ–6 is not convincing in itself. While the unity of 4b–6 is indeed hard to believe, the unity between 3b and 4aβ.4b seems more probable a match than that of 4aβ–6 in any case.

301 The text would run: אַשּׁוּר ˂ מֶלֶ וַיַּעַצְרֵהוּ בְשָׁנָה כְּשָׁנָה מִנְחָה לוֹ וַיָּשֶׁב עֶבֶד הַוֹשֵׁעַ וַיְהִי לוֹ אַשּׁוּר ˂ מֶלֶ שַׁלְמַנְאֶסֶר עָלָה עָלָיו כֶּלֶא׃ בֵּית וַיַּאַסְרֵהוּ.
4aβb were indeed added later to the text, this would also well explain the historiographical problem of why Hoshea now appears to have been both captured already before the fall of Samaria but still reigns during its fall, and why there was apparently no king for three full years in Israel: the mention that creates all these problems was only later added to the text by a scribe, who was not very concerned about the possible historiographical or narratological problems that he would be incorporating into the text.302 This addition, of course, also brought other problems to the text, as the repetition of Hoshea’s tribute now disturbs the narrative flow of the verse – something that was later noted and resolved by the MT, as already argued.

The addition of 4aβb could have been made to recount the fate of Hoshea, for whom no customary death or ending notices are now otherwise given: he was, as recounted by the OG, “mistreated/injured” by the Assyrian king, and after this taken prisoner, and is understandably never heard from thereafter. The idea that Hoshea was, at some point, captured by the king of Assyria could well be historically relevant information as such, or it could simply be a later construct, possibly made to parallel the fate of Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, who was similarly taken as captive to Assyria (2 Kgs 25:7), together with his people “from its land” (25:21, = 17:23 verbatim). Furthermore, it is good to note that a “house of confinement” (כֶּלֶא בֵּית) is only mentioned elsewhere in 2 Kgs in the case of Jehoiakin (25:27), likewise the last Judahite ruler about whom anything is ever heard, making it likely that these stories are also somehow literarily linked.303 In any case, the mention of 17:4 hardly goes back to the History writer, or even less so to the annals of Israel/Judah. We have here therefore upon each other two successional redactional layers, rather than two strangely intertwined sources.304

---

302 This solution is in many ways similar to that of Trebolle, “La Caida,” 147, and, in fact, the main difference concerns the understanding of the mechanics of the Wiederaufnahme as beginning a secondary unit instead of framing it: like Trebolle argues, verses 4αα.5–6 should be seen as a unit, albeit for somewhat different reasons than what he lists.
303 The term כֶּלֶא בֵּית is overall quite rare in the Hebrew Bible, found altogether only in 1 Kgs 22:27; 2 Kgs 17:4, 25:27; 2 Chr 18:26; Isa 42:7, 22 (pl.); Jer 37:15, 18. However, since the ending of 2 Kgs is very late as well, it is not completely certain which story would have influenced the other in this case. In any case, a clear differentiation is made between the Israelite Hoshea (who may have been even “humiliated” by the Assyrians, as in the OG), who is never heard of again, and the Judahite Jehoiakim, who is freed and honored by the Babylonians.
304 Similarly Levin, “In Search,” 258: “The other version does not go back to a different source. It constitutes a later comment on what was transmitted in one single source.”
2.3.4 Beyond the documented evidence – the most ancient stratum in verses 3–6

The text-critical evidence gave us a good view of the latest history (MT vs. OG; the two textual layers of verse 4) of the passage in question. In this case it is also possible to posit some further questions to the text on a purely redaction-/literary-critical basis.

The *Wiederaufnahmen* in verses 3–6 do not, in fact, end with the one in 3b.4αβ in OG. As suggested by Talmon, verses 3a (וַיַּעַל מֶלֶךְ עָלָיו אַשּׁוּר) and 5a (וַיַּעֲלָה מֶלֶךְ עָלָיו אַשּׁוּר עָלָה) form a *Wiederaufnahme* themselves, enclosing the interpreting additions of the destruction of the Northern Kingdom.305 As the use of *Wiederaufnahme* in this chapter is quite frequent, this comes as no surprise.306 The History writer’s text would have thus run from verse 2 straight to verse 5, in a brief, annalistic, matter-of-fact style: no specific reasons for the destruction were originally given, as would be expected if the text indeed originated from the annals of either kingdom. The difference between the subject matter of verses 3–4, which are solely interested in Hoshea and his political games with no mention of Samaria/Israel, and 5–6 with Samaria and its conquest, where no specific mention of Hoshea apart from the synchronism of verse 6 is found, similarly indicates that they come from different hands. This repetitive resumption between 3a and 5a was originally composed to contain the inserted conspiracy narrative in verses 3–4αβ.

Again, the language use in verse 3 is somewhat unusual: the attack, or “rising upon” (עָלָה עָלָיו), of foreign enemies is customarily conducted against cities or lands in Kings (as in 17:5), and not kings as in 17:3a.307 The reversed word order of 3a (לְבָנָי נֶבֶל) is also surprising, since in classical Hebrew, a narrative continuing a *wayiqtol* form

305 Talmon, *Literary Studies*, 155–6: “… (v. 5) is a resumptive repetition of … (v. 3) which proves that the reference to Hoshea’s conspiracy with Egypt and his refusal to pay tribute and his ensuing arrest by the king of Assyria (v. 4) is a secondary insert into the originally shorter text.” Talmon comes to this conclusion on the basis of the MT, without any text-critical considerations. His theory about a greater *Wiederaufnahme* between 17:5 and 18:9, however, seems highly unlikely. Rehm, 2. *Könige*, 166–7, also acknowledges this *Wiederholung*, as he puts it. See also Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 116–17 and Levin, “In Search,” 258, 262–4.

306 Furthermore, this editorial technique is recurrent in 1–2 Kings overall; see Trebolle, “Textual Growth,” (forthcoming).

307 Cf. 1 Kgs 14:25, 15:17, 16:17, 21:1; 2 Kgs 6:24, 12:18, 19, 17:5, 18:9, 13, 25. The only exceptions are 1 Kgs 15:19, 20:22; 2 Kgs 23:29 (here the meaning of the preposition is of course debated heavily; see Hasegawa, “Josiah’s Death,” 532–3). It is possible that these cases are simply due to scribal mistakes (על instead of אל). In 2 Kings 16:15 the actual “rise” happens against Jerusalem, not Ahaz, who is “besieged” (like Hoshea in 17:4) instead of “risen upon.” When the parallel passage of 16:5 in Isa 7:1 (where the construct עָלָה עָלָיו can be found) is taken into account, it seems that in 16:5 there has occurred some sort of textual corruption; see Stade, *Kings*, 255. In 2 Kings 24:1, the “rise” of Nebuchadnezzar has no object (apart from לַאֲשִׂר לֶבֶן).
would be expected here instead of a *qatal* הָעַל.\(^{308}\) This seems to be a sign of late, Chronistic language use, since a verbatim identical construct, "עָלָה עָלָיו," at the beginning of a verse is elsewhere found only in 2 Chr 36:6 (the exile of Jehoiakim).\(^{309}\) Furthermore, the parallel narrative of 2 Kgs 18:9–11 only contains a text very close to that of 17:5–6 (and especially the form of La\(^{115}\)), which may indicate that the original text form had no mention of Hoshea, his tribute, and his rebellion.\(^{310}\)

All the confusing “historical” details found in this passage, such as the two Assyrian invasions, the name of the Assyrian king, Hoshea being a vassal of Assyria, the Egyptian conspiracy, and the imprisonment of Hoshea (which further leads to the seemingly kingless situation in Israel), can therefore be explained as later additions to the text, hence only secondarily generating these problems. There would be no need to see the text as giving a continuous account of the two different campaigns of Assyrian kings to Samaria, or that Israel would have been without a king for three years after Hoshea was captured – or that he was even captured at all prior to the fall of Samaria. At the same time, the problem of the Assyrian king being Shalmaneser (3a) instead of Sargon II, historically the more probable king to have conquered Samaria, is eliminated.\(^{311}\)

The text(s) of 3–4αα and 4αββ may or may not have been taken from different sources of their own, but it needs to be asked whether or not any of the information given even demands an actual annal as its source.\(^{312}\) Indeed, the subject matter would not be too hard for a late redactor to come up with: the historical fact that Hoshea was a tribute-bearing vassal of the “king of Assyria,” maybe even Shalmaneser himself, would have probably been well known or easily deducible even without an extant (annalistic) source stating so.\(^{313}\) As is put forward by Dubovský, it is likely that a later

\(^{308}\) See Hobbs, *2 Kings*, 225; and Trebolle, “La Caida,” 147 n. 16 (“3a tiene visos de ser redaccional”). According to Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 117, the phrase has signs of Late Biblical Hebrew.

\(^{309}\) Similarly Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 115.

\(^{310}\) It is not certain if the form of 2 Kgs 18:9–11 can be used as an argument in 17:3–6, however; see the Excursus for further analysis.

\(^{311}\) This late inserting does not, in itself, negate the possible historical value these remarks have. However, this information clearly did not originate from “the original author,” which subsequently makes the information highly suspect. Similarly Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 118: “Indeed, the only specific information given, the names of the Assyrian king Shalmaneser, and especially of So, king of Egypt, is highly suspect. This raises the possibility that vv. 3–4 were created to offer background information concerning the exile.”

\(^{312}\) For a similar view, see Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 118–19.

\(^{313}\) Levin, “In Search,” 258, comes to the conclusion that the text is a later, even *theologically* motivated construct: “The addition follows the theological doctrine of retribution. Someone’s fate had to be in
reviser simply used the invasion accounts of Jerusalem in chapters 24–25 as his model when expanding the similar passage in chapter 17.314

The case of Hoshea’s imprisonment – and his possible “maltreatment” by the Assyrian king as recounted by the OG – is somewhat more open to debate. Did this happen historically? Was this commonly known for a fact? We may never know, but the idea of imprisonment and humiliation of the losing king in times of war does not, in itself, seem too far-fetched or unlikely for a late redactor to come up with either, as already argued – especially since this later happens to quite a few Judean kings as well.315 The statement may have even been added in order to give Hoshea’s regnal narrative a “proper ending” since no customary ending to his regnal narrative is now found in the chapter. There may be some truth to the statement, but this is not necessary.316

The case of sending messengers to king Sô or Adrammelek the Ethiopian is an even clearer case, as both traditions have even later come up with a completely new name and/or historical context for the Egyptian ruler. As “Adrammelek” probably attests the older name in the story, and is already quite clearly a literary invention of some sort, it becomes ever more likely that the text is simply pure literary fantasy, created by combining elements found elsewhere in Kings.317 Indeed, the scheming of Hoshea (with Egypt, no less!) goes against the late (Chronistic) theological idea of Koalitionsverbot, the prohibition of alliances with foreign powers and anyone other than Yahweh,318 and acts as a further reason why Israel was destroyed. Hence the use of the information given in 17:3–6 for any historical reconstructions should be reassessed on the basis of the text- and literary-critical discussion provided here.319

line with someone’s behavior. Because Hoshea was punished by the Assyrian king, he must have sinned against the Assyrian king. The scribe suggested that Hoshea rebelled against Shalmaneser.”
315 This is also noted by Dubovský, “Suspicious Similarities,” 58: “The concentration of the arrest episodes in the last days of the northern and southern kingdoms creates another thematic link between the narratives of their falls.”
316 Similarly Pietsch, “Hoshea ben Elah,” 354: “The narrative does possess a general historical plausibility, but it does not allow a closer historical reconstruction of the course of events.”
317 Indeed, when one takes into account the biblical “rewritings” of Qumran – or even those of the Chronicler – such additions and changes as witnessed here would not be too hard to accept.
318 Levin, “In Search,” 259.
319 Similarly also Richelle, “Relevance of the Septuagint,” 587: “… historians must take into account the diverse textual forms in which these narratives were transmitted.”
2.3.5 Conclusions: the textual growth of 17:3–6

The text of verses 3–6 has grown extensively during its long redaction and copying process. As the text now stands, there are four different text-historical strata to be excavated in the text (the youngest MT revision, the oldest attainable text of the OG version, and the text of the History writer disentangled from a later expansion), some with the help of text-critical evidence:

Layers 1 and 2: The latest layer of redaction can be discerned when comparing the OG text to that of the MT in which the different narrative units in verse 4 are brought into conformity with one another. The original resumptive repetition "was bearing tribute to" of the OG was purposely changed to a negative statement ("he did not bear tribute") in the MT. This brought some small textual incongruities to the MT that are missing from the text of the OG, which attests the oldest text attainable.

Layer 3: Accordingly, when the older OG text is taken as the starting point for the literary analysis, a division of earlier verses 3–4aa from the later addition of 4aβ.b via Wiederaufnahme is made possible.

Layer 4: Verses 3–4aa were, furthermore, originally also additions via Wiederaufnahme between verses 2 and 5a. Therefore, the ancient source text, possibly from the royal annals, contained roughly the text of verses 5 (likely without the repetitive MT plus וַיַּעַל בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ) and 6aa (to which the History writer probably added 6aβ.b; see 3.2.1). The original text thus ran from verses 1–2 to 5–6, most probably in their putative OG form.

Textual layers of 2 Kgs 17:3–6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>עָלָיו וַיָּשֶׁ עֶבֶד הֹשֵׁעַ וַיְהִי לוֹ אַשּׁוּר</td>
<td>שַׁלְמַנְאֶסֶר מֶלֶק אֲשֶׁר קֶשֶׁר בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ אַשּׁוּר מִנְחָה עָלָה לוֹ בַּמַּלֲאֵכִים שָׁלַח אֲשֶׁר קֶשֶׁר בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ אַשּׁוּר מִנְחָה לְמֶלֶק אֲשֶׁר קֶשֶׁר בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ אַשּׁוּר מִנְחָה לְמֶלֶק אֲשֶׁר קֶשֶׁר בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ אַשּׁוּר מִנְחָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4aa</td>
<td>עָלָיו וַיָּשֶׁ עֶבֶד הֹשֵׁעַ</td>
<td>וַיַּעַל בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>שָׁעִיר בָּאָרָם</td>
<td>שָׁעִיר בָּאָרָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4bβ</td>
<td>לִבְגָּד אַשּׁוּר</td>
<td>לִבְגָּד אַשּׁוּר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>שָׁעִיר בָּאָרָם</td>
<td>שָׁעִיר בָּאָרָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>שָׁעִיר בָּאָרָם</td>
<td>שָׁעִיר בָּאָרָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>שָׁעִיר בָּאָרָם</td>
<td>שָׁעִיר בָּאָרָם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

320 Or, alternatively, “he did not offer (עלה) sacrifice (מִנְחָה).”
321 The oldest version (OG) of the text is encircled, while the Masoretic reworkings and additions are indicated by italics on their own rows.
322 Possibly to be read as רֹהוּ (ירשנ) (according to OG).
Translation in English

3 Over him rose Shalmaneser, king of Assur, and Hoshea became to him a slave, and he bore him tribute.

4α And the king of Assur found in Hoshea a conspiracy that he sent envoys to Adrammelek the Ethiopian, who lived in Egypt. (OG)
   = to Sô, king of Egypt (MT)

4b And Hoshea was bearing tribute to the king of Assur (OG)
   = And he did not make burnt offerings/bear tribute to the king of Assur (MT)
   as year by year.

4bβ And the king of Assur humiliated him/bound him up, and shut him in prison.

5 And the king of Assur rose in all the land, and he rose (MT)
   to Samaria, and he besieged it for three years.

6a In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assur conquered Samaria,

6b and he exiled Israel to Assyria, and settled them in Halah, and Habor, the river Gozan, and the cities of the Medes, until this day (OG).

In the end, the reason for the growth of the text in verses 3–6 was to give more reason(s) for the attack of the Assyrians and put more political blame on Hoshea. The reasoning of the additions is quite non-theological, which is somewhat surprising, albeit in line with the “democratization of sin” principle also found in the later parts of the chapter (verses 7–23). The relatively old age of these additions is confirmed by the textual evidence, since the text is attested by both main traditions. However, the quite young age of the final redaction of the passage – that of the MT – is also determined by the evidence presented here.

The assumption that the text is somehow a composite is almost universally accepted. However, the textual evidence allows us to see that the text is actually not composed of two annalistic narratives, but originally of only one (5–6) which was later at least twice expanded. The redactional – or rather, text- and literary-critical – solution provided here also makes the fewest unnecessary assumptions about both the hypothetical historical happenings and different hypothetical source materials of the original writer(s).

---

323 See 2.4 on this OG plus, which likely constituted part of the original composition.
324 Namely, the tendency to see not only the sins of the kings, but also the people of Israel as the reason for the destruction. It is not impossible that this too is an anti-Samaritan motif: not only the kings, but also the people in the north were (and thus still are) beyond saving.
Excursus: Textual history of 2 Kgs 18:9–12

The unusual doubling of the text of 3a.5–6 in 18:9–11 has long puzzled scholars: why exactly is the text also found inside the regnal narrative of Hezekiah and what does its considerably shorter form mean in terms of the textual history of 17:3–6? Is the doublet taken from an otherwise unknown (annalistic) source?325 Did the writer of this doublet use an originally shorter form of the narrative, only composed of 17:3a.5–6, as his base text?326 Or was the text in chapter 18 simply taken over from 17 by a later editor?327

Text shared by 2 Kgs 17:3–6 and 18:9–11328

As has been argued above, it is quite unlikely that the writer would have had a completely differing source in his possession, since the text is practically verbatim the same as found in chapter 17, aside from the clearly editorial chronological pluses. It thus seems the likeliest – and simplest – explanation is that the writer of 18:9–11(/12)329 simply took the text from 17:3–6 in some form or another.330 However, one question remains: was the Vorlage of 18:9–11 the text now found in the OG/MT?

325 Often known as “Annals of Judah,” as originally proposed by Winckler, Alttestamentliche, 16–25, and followed later by multiple scholars such as Gray, Kings, 580, and Jones, Kings, 563.

326 Thus Levin, “In Search of,” 262–4, although he maintains that there was still some sort of “original record” behind both passages.

327 As proposed by Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 393: “Diese Überlieferung wiederholt DtrN in 18,9–11 mit geringen Abweichungen.”

328 The shared text is marked with borders (verbatim) and underlining (same content).

329 It is hard to say whether 12 was written by the same scribe who added 9–11, although this does seem more likely than not. In any case, the ideology and phraseology in 12 is very late (“post-priestly Deuteronomism”) and quite unusual in Kings, as shown by Levin, “In Search of,” 253–5.

330 One cannot completely rule out the possibility either that this text was only added later to the LXX via kaige and was originally a proto-MT plus. This is now impossible to show, of course.
editions of 17:1–6 or one that still lacked the — clearly secondary — text of 3b–4? Was 3a, with its mention of Shalmaneser, thus part of this older text?

It is quite clear that verses 18:9–11/12 were later interpolated into their context since they sever the link between verses 7–8 (Hezekiah’s rebellion) and 13 (the Assyrian attack).331 Verse 12 also has some clearly late theological conceptions.332 Many scholars have thus rightly seen 9–12 as a late unity.333 These observations alone indicate that we are likely not dealing with any older materials like annals, coming from an “original source” of any kind, but a later rewriting of the same information found earlier in 17:3–6. This later dating also makes it more probable that the full text found now in 17:3–6 was also there before the time of the creator of 18:9–12.

Indeed, the only information missing (apart from the synchronism) from the second account is that relating to Hoshea, the king of Israel, which would be more or less unnecessary inside the regnal narrative of the Judean king Hezekiah. It is thus not too wild an assumption that a later rewriter would have simply left this information unmentioned, as he was in any case clearly interested only in Hezekiah here, and — for whatever reason — the exact synchronic dating of the fall of Israel and his reign.334

331 Levin, “In Search of,” 251–2. Also, as Levin notes, verse 8 already seems similarly late in the context.
332 The nomistic reasoning (not hearing Yahweh’s voice) goes against the main sin of the History writer, i.e., “the sin of Jeroboam.” “The voice of Yahweh” is also otherwise found in Kings only in 1 Kgs 21:36, a late prophetic story — and also forms part of the evidently late addition in Judg 6:7–10, missing from 4QJudg4. References to Moses are similarly rare in Kings (1 Kgs 2:3, 8:9, 53, 56; 2 Kgs 14:6, 18:4, 6, 12, 21:8; 23:25). There is also a peculiar and unnecessary repetition of אֲשָׁמְעוּ at both the beginning and the end of the verse, likely indicating literary activity of some kind.
333 For instance, Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 410. If the remark of Šanda, Könige, 244–5 (“Der Inhalt erinnert stark an 17,34–40 … Die ganze Versgruppe 9–12 ist also Arbeit eines späteren nachexilischen Rezensenten, der in Denkweise und Sprache mit dem Verfasser von 17,34–40 übereinstimmt.”), is right, 12 would be extremely late; for verses 34–40, see section 4.5 below.
334 It is hard to find a reason why the text is so interested in giving such exact numbers in 18:9–11 (unless they are indeed historically valid, which seems exceedingly unlikely). However, there just might be a theological reasoning behind these synchronisms. It is important to note that Ahaz is said to still have reigned during the first few years of the reign of Hezekiah (the 14th to 16th years of Ahaz correspond to the 1st to 3rd years of Hezekiah, according to the MT chronology). However, we may interpret this “co-reign,” one thing is certain: the Hezekian reforms could not have taken place during this time since Ahaz was hell-bent on “walking in the way of the kings of Israel” (2 Kgs 16:3). The reforms would have been possible only after his death, which synchronizes exactly with the 3rd or 4th year of Hezekiah — the year when the king of Assyria is said to have invaded the north. During the 3 years of the siege of Samaria, his reforms could then be interpreted as already having taken place. After this, according to 18:13, the attack of Sennacherib on Judah in the 14th year of Hezekiah’s reign would coincide with the 8th year after the conquest of Samaria, which means that the pious Hezekiah would thus have had 7 years (one full Sabbath year) of peace after the disastrous example of the Northern Kingdom and before his own rebellion. For a somewhat similar view on the theologization of the chronology in MT 1 Kgs 20–22, see Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 86–107. This might also affirm the idea that the putative chronological reworking in 2 Kings 15–18 was indeed due to interest in somehow (not) synchronizing Hezekiah with the destruction of Samaria (see 2.1 for further discussion).
Hoshea’s being a vassal of Assyria, conspiring with Egypt, and his ultimately being taken prisoner indeed have nothing to do with Hezekiah and his reign. This would also explain why the problematic mention of Shalmaneser is found in 18:9 – this mention was simply found in the Vorlage of 17:3, and thus understandably used in the later abbreviation of 18:9–11/12. The “original source document” hypothesis is an unnecessarily complicated solution (bringing into the picture historiographical problems and arguments) when compared to the quite easy textual explanation of a rewriting Fortschreibung (of which there are by now large amounts of evidence) of 17:3–6 in 18:9–11.

It is therefore methodologically not very tenable to argue for an unknown source document, when the source (that is, verses 17:3–6), by which the doublet can be completely satisfactorily explained, could well be right under our collective nose (Occam’s Razor). When one takes the evidence from Qumran – or even some reworked passages in Kings – into account, such rewriting of these verses as found in 18:9–11 becomes quite minor in comparison. The doubling of the passage could speak of a different source document, but it does not by any means need to – especially when it has been argued above that even in 17:3–6 no specific historiographical sources may have been used.
2.4 Verse 7 – at the hinge of textual units

Perhaps the biggest individual textual problems in the whole chapter are located in verse 7 or its immediate vicinity. Here we possess not only two, but three quite vastly different textual forms of – arguably – the same verse. While the MT/LXX and La\textsuperscript{115} give two almost totally different forms of the text, L gives an amalgam of these two, mostly coinciding and harmonized with the MT. The readings of La\textsuperscript{115} are especially noteworthy, as they are not only valuable and challenging text-critically, but even indicate that its text is here at a completely different redactional state when compared to all other witnesses. And indeed: after verse 7, La\textsuperscript{115} first lacks verse 8 and then reverses the order of verses 15–19 and 9–14. It will be argued that the textual state of La\textsuperscript{115} cannot be adequately explained as simply resulting from textual accident. In fact, not only does its text probably go back to the OG, but likely attests to the oldest attainable text of the verse.\textsuperscript{335}

2.4.1 Why does La\textsuperscript{115} differ so much from the other witnesses? Accidentally or deliberately?

Even though there have already been some attempts to tackle the textual and literary challenges of La\textsuperscript{115} in chapter 17, there has not been that much discussion about the possibility that the large differences in the text could be due to some accidental mistake in the copying process.\textsuperscript{336} While the literary critical arguments already posited by certain scholars for the originality of La\textsuperscript{115} have certainly been at least partly successful in showing the originality of some of its readings, the possibility that these readings have only secondarily come to resemble an “original” textual state should be discussed. Only after this can we posit literary-critical explanations for the differences between the text forms.

\textsuperscript{335} An earlier version of this chapter, originally given as a paper at SBL Annual meeting in San Antonio in 2016, is to be published as an article; see Tekoniemi, “On the Verge.” It may also be noted here that at the time I was still under the impression that 7*b in La\textsuperscript{115} was in fact modeled after verse 8 (or vice versa), and that verse 8 was therefore not completely missing from La\textsuperscript{115}. This view I have since changed, as may be seen in the argumentation below.

\textsuperscript{336} The originality of La\textsuperscript{115}’s text and layout in this verse has previously been quite convincingly asserted especially by Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23” and Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 147–9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>La\textsuperscript{115}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיֶּגֶל אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל אַשּׁוּרָה…</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγένετο ἄργη κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραήλ διότι ἡμαρτόν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγένετο ἀργή κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραήλ διότι ἡμαρτόν</td>
<td>et transmigravit rex assyriorum Israel assyrios… … usque in hunc diem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיְהִי כִּי־חָטְא וּבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל הֵיהם אל־יָהוָה</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγένετο ἀργή κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραήλ διότι ἡμαρτόν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγένετο ἀργή κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραήλ διότι ἡμαρτόν</td>
<td>7\textsuperscript{a}quia, propter omnes exacerbationes quibus exacerbauerunt dom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והלכו בְּחֻקּות הַגּוֹיִם הוֹרִישׁ אֲשֶׁר מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν τοῖς δικαιώμασι τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὧν ἐξῆρεν κύριος ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν υἱῶν Ισραήλ…</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν τοῖς δικαιώμασι τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὧν ἐξῆρεν κύριος ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν υἱῶν Ισραήλ…</td>
<td>7\textsuperscript{b}non custodierunt precepta dni di patrum suorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translations**\textsuperscript{337}

6b And he exiled Israel to Assyria…
6b And the king of Assyrians exiled Israel to Assyria(ns)… … until this day.
6b And the king of Assyrians exiled Israel to Assyrians… … until this day,

7 And happened, because the sons of Israel sinned against Yahweh, who had brought them up from the land of Egypt, from under the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and they feared other gods.
7 And the wrath of the Lord happened over Israel, because the sons of Israel sinned against the Lord their God, who had led them up from Egypt, from under the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, from the day he brought them up even until this day, and they feared other gods.

7\textsuperscript{a} for, because of all the provocations with which they provoked the Lord from the day he led their fathers from Egypt even until this day,
7\textsuperscript{b} they did not keep the commandments of the Lord, the god of their fathers.

\textsuperscript{337} The MT and LXX Rahlfs have been combined in the first column, as they give practically the same text.
8a And they walked in the customs of the nations whom Yahweh drove out before the sons of Israel...

The first thing that strikes the reader is the brevity of La115 when compared with the MT and especially L. The expression “and it happened” is missing, as is the long epithet of Yahweh, and the notion “and they feared other gods.” While it seems the most likely option that the phrase καὶ ἐγένετο was indeed already missing from the exemplar of La115, it has to be noted that the translator may have, at least at some points, left it untranslated.338 The idea of “because they sinned” is given in a completely differing wording: “because of all the provocations with which they provoked.” Intriguingly, La115 also adds two brief notices: “since the day he led out their fathers from Egypt,” with somewhat similar content as the epithet in the MT, and “and until this day.”

The birth of the text of La115 can be explained in multiple ways. The text may be simply a fabrication by a Latin copyist, caused partly or fully by corruption in the stage of textual transmission.339 Alternatively, La115 may attest here a Greek Vorlage. This Greek text is in turn either 1) the OG, or 2) a later fabrication by a copyist, as in the first option.340

It is possible that whole verse 7 was at some point dropped because of a homoioteleuton mistake from καί 1º to another at the beginning of verse 8, 9, or 15, depending on the underlying textual order of the exemplar. This could also explain why verse 8 is now lacking in La115: it was simply omitted by parablepsis along with verse 7. Later the apparent(?) lack of a linking verse or two between the units of 1–6 and 9(-14) or 15–19 could have prompted a copyist to add, more or less independently

338 The phrase καὶ ἐγένετο is translated as et factum est in 1 Sam 4:18, 9:26; 2 Sam 11:1, 14, 13:23, 17:27, 18:6, 8; 1 Kgs 12:24n, 13:20 bis, 23, 16:1; 2 Kgs 10:7, 9, 13:21, as et facta est in 1 Sam 4:17; 2 Sam 18:7, and omitted/left untranslated in 2 Sam 11:2 (et), 13:30 (et dum; om ἐγένετο 125), 36 (et ut; om V 246 92; > ἐγένετο 125); 1 Kgs 18:27 (om La115 Luc = OG?), 29 (et cum); 2 Kgs 10:25 (OG?). The practically synonymous καὶ ἐγενήθη is translated as et factum est in 1 Sam 1:20, 4:1, 5, 11:1, 11; 2 Sam 11:16; 1 Kgs 11:43, 16:11, 18, as et facta est in 1 Sam 14:14, as et factus est in 1 Sam 14:15 bis; 2 Kgs 17:3, and left untranslated in 1 Sam 14:19 (et dum). As can be seen, in some cases the minus in La115 could go back to an exemplar similar to manuscript 125, and at least in two cases the minus likely preserves the oldest extant text form.

339 It may be noted that La115 has no affiliation whatsoever with the text of Vulgate in verse 7.

340 It needs to be stressed that by no means are these differences in text attributable to the OG translator(s) of the book. As the translation technique in Kings is very literal, the translators would have kept the text as close to the original as possible. See Emanuel Tov, “Three Strange Books,” 372–4.
of other sources, some quite formulaic text between the units to create a smoother shift from one narrative unit to another. It is not impossible either that the exemplar was in poor shape physically and was lacking some words/phrases, but even then, the emergence of the present text form would be hard to explain.

This loss of a verse or two could also explain the transposing of the two later units (9–14 and 15–19), or perhaps the transposition itself was the cause for the loss of the verse(s). The actions could have taken place either in Greek or Latin transmission. In such a case, the difference would be due to both initial accidental omission and later deliberate insertions. However, the exact mechanics of these theorized changes are hard to trace back. There seems to be no definite reason for the transposition of verses 9–14 and 15–19 even if verse(s) 7(–8) were at some point omitted. Correspondingly, in the case of the transposition happening first, the modification of the hinge-verse 8 would be completely understandable, but why would verse 7 be changed this radically as well?

When the text of verse 7* of La115 is examined on its own, it quickly becomes clear that it mostly consists of formulaic “stock phrases.” It would not be impossible to imagine that a later redactor had simply added these to a partly or even completely missing verse(s) 7(–8) in an attempt to reconstruct them. Such phrases as “provocations, with which they provoked (Yahweh),”341 ”from the day they/their fathers were led from Egypt,”342 and “until this day”343 would be possible for even a late Greek or Latin copyist to find and utilize in the passage.344

However, the copyist appears to have had at least some vestiges of the passage left, as the subject matter of his additions is strikingly similar to that of MT/LXX/L. The idea that in the case of verse 7* the copyist would have worked completely ex nihilo does not seem preferable, as there would have been nothing in the text to hint to the copyist about the subject matter of verses 7–8: a causal construction, a mention about Israelites leaving Egypt/epithet of Yahweh, and a mention of (not) following (Yahweh’s) statutes. In the case of the causal construction, the copyist may have used the example of the parallel passage 2 Kings 18:12 in his reconstruction. However, one

341 For this phrase, see 1 Kgs 15:30, 21:22, and 2 Kgs 23:26.
342 See 1 Sam 8:8; 2 Sam 7:6; 1 Kgs 8:16; Jer 7:25; and especially 2 Kgs 21:15.
343 This phrase can be found in many places in the books of Kings alone, but most importantly three more times even in chapter 17, verses 23, 33/34, and 41.
344 In fact, Alfred Rahlfs, Lucians Rezension, 254, argues that the plus of L (“from the day he brought them up even until this day”) in verse 7 was due to Lucian’s addition from 1 Sam 8:6 or 2 Sam 7:6.
could expect more of the language of the parallel passage to have seeped in here, especially if verse 7* had been somehow damaged in its transmission and supplemented on the basis of 18:12. It is also hard to reconstruct how these hypothetical vestiges would have been born (by accidental mistakes?), as there are no major possibilities for haplography in the text. Therefore, a different Vorlage becomes a viable alternative solution to the problem.

Moreover, when the text of La115 is compared with the Antiochian text, it becomes evident that the text of La115 here must have at least some roots in an older Greek base text since the two phrases “from the day they (L)/their fathers (La115) were led (from Egypt)” and “and until this day” are both found at the end of the verse in the Antiochian text and the manuscripts 328 158 460. Therefore, the base text of La115 seems to have been proto-Lucianic (and thus probably going back to OG). La115 does not simply make its text up – at least not completely. A purely textual reason (unintentional textual corruption) for the differences is thus unlikely – the differences found in La115 are probably intentional in their character, as was also argued by previous scholars.

Last, it should also be noted that the retroversion of verse 7*a in La115 into Greek and further into Hebrew is, for the most part, possible because of the rather faithful translation techniques employed by the Latin and Old Greek translators – despite the somewhat pessimistic statements of Trebolle and Piquer. In Greek, the underlying

---

345 This is especially the case with the Greek text. However, possibly in the translation process of the OG, or even in its Hebrew Vorlage, one could argue that a homoioteleuton mistake happened between the words וַיְהִי and לַיהוָה, dropping the beginning of the verse. At the same time a similar mistake may have happened from one στις μετατητος to another, also dropping the latter part of the verse that was later supplemented. The text born in this way (אֲחֵרִים הִים) would have been nonsensical. At the later stage of Greek transmission, the verse would then have been brought back into conformity with the MT. This is possible, but very unlikely.


347 It is a possibility that the text was indeed translated from a proto-Lucianic text which somehow became corrupted and later intra-Latinistically supplemented. However, it is again hard to reconstruct the actual mechanisms behind such a corruption and even more so the posited original proto-Lucianic base text.

348 Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 242, asserts: “... here it is quite probable that the Latin materials are witnesses of The Old Greek, and ultimately of a differently-structured Hebrew reduction ....” The “Lagardean principle” (the text farthest from MT may be equated with the OG) works here for the further preferentiality of La115.

349 According to Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23.” 223 n. 15: “It is not possible to reconstruct the beginning of the protasis (v. 7) following LXX* and OL.” Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 241 n. 38: “... the Latin text may not be exempt of paraphrastic elements.” On the other hand, Adrian Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 147, even though not giving a reconstruction of his own, is much more hopeful: “Nichts nötigt zur Annahme, der lateinische Text könnte nicht auf einer hebräischen Textbasis beruhen. Alles lässt sich auf die entsprechenden hebräischen Wendungen zurükrufen.”
sentence would have read something very close to ὅτι (+ preposition, ἐπὶ?) πάντα τὰ παροργίσματα ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ παροργίσματα ἐν ἡμέρας ἧς ἦσαν ἀνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἔως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. This would, in turn, probably go back to the following Vorlage: יְהוָה אָפִּי מִמָּצִיֹּר אֲבֵיתָם אֲפַלָּו מֵאַשֶּׁר חָרָה מִשָּׁבְעָה אַשֶּׁר־חָרָה מֵחֲרוֹן יְהוָה אִשָּׁה. A causal construction in the manner of quia, propter ..., non custodierunt (“for [ , because of …] they did not guard”) is indeed rare in Hebrew, especially in such long sentences as this one. Nevertheless, the quite rare construction (“for because of …”) does seem to work in this way, albeit usually in considerably shorter sentences. An almost word-for-word parallel for a Hebrew causal construction where the verb comes only at the end of the sentence, can be found in 2 Kings 23:26.

2.4.2 Conclusions to text-critical remarks

The textual situation of verse 7 is quite complex. While the notable differences between La115 and the MT/LXX can certainly be theorized to have been somehow introduced in the copying process, there appears to be no single discernible mechanism behind how this accidental change would have taken place. Accidental change does not adequately explain the La115 verse 7* in relation to the MT/LXX. There are no possibilities for major (or even minor) haplography in the Greek or Latin stage, and a reconstruction of the putative process of such corruption (a physically rundown manuscript?) is problematic. Therefore, the supposition of an originally differing Greek base text (which, in turn, would practically be the OG or at least a proto-Lucianic text) for La115 becomes possible, and even preferable, since the translator would hardly have changed the text himself. Its text is not the product of a mere corruption and/or later correction. This is underlined by the observation that at least the latter part of the verse (“from the day he led their fathers from Egypt even until this day”) clearly has a proto-Lucianic basis, as the same text is found in L. That a retroversion of the whole verse from Latin to Greek and further to Hebrew is possible further corroborates this supposition. As unintentional reasons for the differences can

---

350 The word quia always translates the Greek ὅτι in La115, while propter probably translates some Greek preposition in its causal meaning. The Greek construction ἀνθ᾽ ἥν is twice translated with propter quod (1 Kgs 13:21, 16:2), and once by quia (2 Kgs 10:30).
351 See Ex 34:27, 2 Sam 13:32, 2 Kgs 24:20, Qoh 11:9, Jer 3:8 (here rather “that, because of …”), and 52:3 (= 2 Kgs 24:20) for the use of this construction in this sense.
352 2 Kings 23:26: (καὶ ἅμα τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ πάντω ἐλάχιστον ἐλαχίστω ἐλαχίστω ἐλαχίστω ἐλαχίστω ἐλαχίστω ἐλαχίστω ἐλαχίστω ἐλαχίστω ἐλαχίστω).
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be thus eliminated with relatively high probabilities, an intentional change is probable, and can only be understood in connection with literary-critical analysis of the verse.

2.4.3 Literary-critical assessment of verse 7(a)

There are three important literary variants in the verse that may help us find the answer to the question of the most original form as well as the textual history of the text.

First, there may well be a case of *Wiederaufnahme* in the OG tradition (\(\text{ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης} \ldots 7\text{b ἧς ἡμέρας ταύτης}\)), which is missing from the MT.

Second, the syntactically difficult and long-debated beginning construction of the MT’s verse 7 (‘\(\text{כִּי וַיְהִי}\)’) may have further literary-critical repercussions.

Third, the peculiar formula “and they feared other gods” of the MT and its absence in La\(^{115}\) may even lead us to reconsider some of the posited redactional models of the chapter.

By the analysis of these variants it will be shown that in this verse La\(^{115}\) may be the only witness to preserve the earliest attainable text, which in turn would have significant repercussions for the literary and redactional theories of the whole chapter.

2.4.3.1 Resumptive repetition of “until this day”

First, it is important to note that the phrase “until this day” in verses 6b\(\beta\) and 7b creates a *Wiederaufnahme* in both *L* and La\(^{115}\), which encloses the material of 7*\(\alpha\). This is most probably an OG feature, reflecting its Hebrew *Vorlage*, as it would be quite unlikely for a Greek or Latin copyist or translator to add material using this technique.\(^{353}\) Thus, if there was some sort of corruption in play in this verse, the later supplement of this text via *Wiederaufnahme* would most probably have been made already in Hebrew. This supposition is possible regardless of the origins of the text of La\(^{115}\): the OG, as shown by *L*, seems to have had the repetition of “until this day” here in either case.

In the MT both of these notices are missing. According to Richelle, whenever there is a notable transposition of a textual unit and a *Wiederaufnahme* to be found in some of the textual tradition(s), it is probable that the disappearing repetition is due to

---

\(^{353}\) If one wants to argue for this to have happened, it needs to be asked why the “vestiges” of verse 7*\(b\) in La\(^{115}\) are then left out of the *Wiederaufnahme*. Were there two different (Latin) hands at work here?
later revision.\textsuperscript{354} Here the lack of the two notices “until this day” relieves redundancy and makes the text run smoother. The lack of these transitional elements in the MT may thus indicate the lateness of its text, rather than the opposite.

Furthermore, the syntactically somewhat complex and even awkward nature of verse 7*a may also be mentioned as evidence towards a later addition via \textit{Wiederaufnahme}. The verse lengthens the sentence of 6b to consist of 6b–7*ab, which seems a very unlikely construction for an original writer. Also, when read without the text of 7*a, the text of 6b and 7*b runs smooth, both creating their own sentences in easily understandable Hebrew.\textsuperscript{355} The straightforward sentence of 7*b (“they did not guard the statutes of the Lord the God of their fathers”) can be read as implying causality after the exile of the Israelites – if one wants to see any causal relationship here. There is exactly no reason to see any such causal connection between verses 6 and 7*b, which are quite separate from each other in their content.\textsuperscript{356} The addition of verse 7*a explicates, or rather \textit{adds} the causal relationship, and creates a bridge between the two clauses of 6b and 7*b. If verse 7*a was indeed a later addition, this would explain the syntactical awkwardness and uncommonly long sentence in 6b–7*ab. These problems may also very well have prompted later revisers to change and smooth the text.

In the context of La\textsuperscript{115}’s differing edition, this case of \textit{Wiederaufnahme} emphasizes even more clearly how the text’s growth most probably originally happened by simple additions of different narrative units “one block at a time” to the text.\textsuperscript{357} Even if we were to take some of these blocks away, the text would not be

\textsuperscript{354} Richelle, “In Search of Intentional Omissions,” 15: “Maybe this could provide, in some cases at least, a criterion to detect an omission: the textual witness preserving the \textit{Wiederaufnahme} has a good chance of reflecting an earlier stage of the text.” See Trebolle, “Text-Critical Use,” 286–97, for a similar use and application of the methodology.

\textsuperscript{355} The text 6b and 7*b runs thusly: רָבָּא אַחֲרֵי מֵי חָכַּי לֵבָּה לָעְשׂה הָעָבָדָה תֵּן חֲבוֹר רַע וַחֲבֹר הָה: אֶל שְׁמֵיהּ אָאָבָה הָאָבָה. The causal connection of the sentences is missing in this reconstruction.

\textsuperscript{356} If one wants to posit the Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} to have had a causal conjunction \textit{כי} between verses 6b and 7*b, its lack could simply be due to the fact that the addition in verse 7*a was made from the preposition \textit{עַל} onwards (see the Hebrew reconstruction above), and the \textit{quia} now seen is the original one. As a second \textit{כי} here would be redundant, the reviser would probably have seen no problem completing his \textit{Wiederaufnahme} with the simple רָבָּא אַחֲרֵי מֵי חָכַּי לֵבָּה לָעְשׂה, without the second syntactically even more redundant and intrusive \textit{כי}.

\textsuperscript{357} This same phenomenon can also be witnessed in verse 17:4a where there seems to be a similar case of \textit{Wiederaufnahme} in the OG (\textit{L} and La\textsuperscript{115}) edition. The fact that the MT gives the latest streamlined stage of the text in verses 3–6 only adds to the suspicions about verse 7 as well. This way of literary growth by \textit{Wiederaufnahmen} is also evident in the latter parts of the chapter, in the MT as well; for this, see Mordechai Cogan, “Israel in Exile,” 40–2.
rendered incomprehensible – sometimes the exact opposite may even be the case. Only later, when these blocks are by harmonization brought into conformity with each other, would problems arise with this procedure. This relative independence of different narrative units will come into play with the next literary difference.

2.4.3.2 “And it happened, because …” – What exactly happened?
The problems of the MT’s beginning construction כִּי וַיְהִי have long been noted, and as it now stands it creates grammatical problems. Usually this expression has a temporal meaning (“and it happened, when”), but this temporal understanding can hardly be the meaning here. Instead, the construction may be understood as referring to the preceding clause, namely verse 6: “and this (i.e., the deportation of Israel) happened, because …” However, such retrospective use is abnormal in the Hebrew Bible. Just as unexpected would be using כִּי as an explicative “and it happened, that …,” as this use is nowhere else attested either. The verb וַיְהִי, which here begins a completely new sentence, is rather unnecessary and intruding here.

On the other hand, the perfectly fine and harmonizing reading of L (“And the wrath of the Lord happened over Israel, because …”) has often been argued to have been born out of the MT’s puzzling construction. It is good to note, nevertheless, that there is a thematic link between L and La, namely Yahweh being furious. There is also a remarkable similarity between the words ὀργή and exacerbaverunt (most

---

358 The phrase is elsewhere found in Gen 6:1, 26:8, 27:1, 43:20, 44:24; Ex 1:21, 13:15; Josh 17:13; Judg 1:28, 6:7, 16:16, 25; 2 Sam 6:13 (not found in LXX), 7:1, 19:26(25); and Job 1:5. In each case the meaning is either temporal or causal (“and it happened, when/because”). Only in Ex 1:20 (and possibly 13:15) is the retrospective causality even a remotely possible interpretation, and even in this case the most natural interpretation is indeed the beginning causal construction. In Ex 1:20, the LXX has a clear interpretative flavor; see Wevers, Exodus, 10.

359 See already Thenius, Könige, 384; and Benzinger, König, 174.

360 Bähr, Kings, 184, sees this as the preferable reading. The minority Greek reading of ὅτε, found in manuscripts O CII 121 α s 707 may be here noted as evidence for this interpretation, though in this case the reading is likely Hexaplaric. This is also the most common translation of כִּי וַיְהִי (5 cases out of 15, most notably also in 2 Sam 7:1, 19:25), so this may also simply be due to some inner-Greek harmonization.

361 The construction is read this way by Gray, Kings, 587 n. 1: “the subject of wayehî in MT is apparently the fact of the collapse of Israel stated in v. 6, but the verb demands a more direct subject”; Jones, Kings, 548; Fritz, Zweite Buch der Könige, 95; Hobbs, 2 Kings, 221, 231; and Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 441.

362 Richard Nelson, Double Redaction, 55: “wayhî kî as a retrospective causal clause … would be completely anomalous.” Also, Iain Provan, Hezekiah, 71: “No justification exists from the syntax for … a retrospective causal clause.”

363 The words of Montgomery, Kings, 478, may be the most well known: “S has found rhetorical difficulty, and expanded with ‘and the Lord’s anger was against Israel (because)’ – ‘superior,’ says Burney – but not original!” See also Stade, Kings, 262: “S with scribal expansion from v. 18” and Rahlfis, Lucians Rezension, 278 n. 10. None of them, however, take into account the reading of La.
probably from verb παροργίζειν). In this way, the plus of L may still preserve a vestige of the OG text. On the other hand, the idea of Yahweh’s wrath in L may simply have been taken from either verse 18 or 20, being thereby completely recensional. Nevertheless, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the plus of L indirectly reflects an earlier stratum of the text.

Another, and the most popular, interpretation for the verb וַיְהִי is to read it as a protasis to an apodosis in verse 18: “7 and it happened, [because …], 18 that Yahweh was/became angry.” This sort of understanding has its problems as well since such a 10-verse-long verbal construction would hardly be original either. Depending on this grammatical understanding, Provan, for instance, argues that the original sentence would have consisted of simply 7αβ and 18a, in between which was then added 10 verses of the sins of Israel.

This MT construct with its multiple possible interpretations could thus be seen as a lectio difficilior, which is eased by the other two versions in two different ways: the Antiochian text would have taken the road of adding a subject (“the wrath of Yahweh”) to the verb, while the Latin would have just omitted the puzzling verb altogether. Positing this 10-verse-long protasis seems to make sense of the larger syntax of MT verses 7–18.

Unlike in the MT/LXX, in La115 the main clause of verse 7*ab can be found in the preceding verse, as it does not have this puzzling verb. The text of 7* of La115 forms a direct grammatical continuum with the preceding clause (6b et conlocauit [rex assyriorum] israel assyrios … 7*aquia, propter omnes exacerbationes …, 7*b non custodierunt … “and the king of Assyrians relocated Israel to Assyria … for, because of all the provocations …, they did not guard …”). It is noteworthy that there is no

---

364 Thus, for example, Nelson, Double redaction, 55; Cogan & Tadmor, Kings, 204; Trebolle, “2 Kings 17.2-23,” 222; Becking, Ondergang, 169; Thenius, Könige, 384; Montgomery, Kings, 468; Bähr, Kings, 184–5; Provan, Hezekiah, 71.
365 Trebolle, “2 Kings 17.2-23,” 222: “Such long apodoses are usually due to insertion of interpolations that lengthen a sentence that was much shorter than the present text.” Norman Snaith, Kings, 280: “a very unlikely Hebrew construction”; Provan, Hezekiah, 71: “It is much more likely that the form of 2 Kings 17:7–18 is the result of insertion into an already existing sentence, than that an author would have composed it from the start in this way.” One could ask, however, why the subject of this construction could not be Yahweh already in verse 13 (“and it happened, [because …]”); Becking, Ondergang, 169, accordingly notes about this: “Zij [that is, de lange bijzin,” TT] wordt onderbroken door vers 13 en in 14 weer opgenomen.”
366 Provan, Hezekiah, 72. On the basis of MT/LXX this supposition is well founded, but it understandably runs into problems with the composition of La115. The MT’s problematic expression is indeed one of the most noteworthy phenomena when it comes to the purely literary/redactional analysis of verses 7–23; see 3.2.1 for further discussion.
need for such a large and overarching apodosis-structure in La\textsuperscript{115} vis-à-vis the MT: 7*a finds its natural apodosis in 7*b, and can be seen as syntactically independent from the other following narrative(s), only clarifying the reason for Israel’s exile in verse 6. Therefore, Trebolle’s idea that there is also a long protasis-apodosis structure in La\textsuperscript{115} does not seem probable.\textsuperscript{367}

This lack of such an apodosis, in fact, may be one of the most important indicators of La\textsuperscript{115}’s possibly older age: while the MT has a long and tedious, but nevertheless coherent, syntactical construction of 10 verses in 7–18, encompassing all the possible sins of Israel, La\textsuperscript{115} is not as concerned about the mutual coherence of its text blocks. The words of Schenker are apropos here:

“It is likely that a narrative form, careless about coherence beyond the boundaries of its own unit, is more original than another which cares about the logical coherence of a number of stories unified only by the same hero protagonist.”\textsuperscript{368}

Even though Schenker talks here about the coherence of narrative logic between different chapters containing Elijah stories, the general point remains the same. While verse 7* in La\textsuperscript{115} is not syntactically and/or explicitly connected to the long listing of Israel’s sins, the text of the MT may have been reformed in a way that allows the reading of verses 7–18 (which may furthermore be composed of two text blocks in 8/9–14 and 15–18) as one big unity.\textsuperscript{369} Especially if verse 7(*), partially enclosed by a \textit{Wiederaufnahme} in L/La\textsuperscript{115}, is to be seen as constituting an (additional) textual unit of its own, separate from the following narrative units, it is more likely that the text with more coherence between these different units has emerged later through revisional/redactional processes.\textsuperscript{370} Hence the remark of Provan is true in a way that the MT does indeed “interpolate” the narrative between verses 7\textalpha β and 18a – or rather

---

\textsuperscript{367} Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 222–5. Since La\textsuperscript{115} lacks the expression καὶ ἐγένετο, it cannot form a grammatical unity with 18a, for example.

\textsuperscript{368} Schenker, “What Do Scribes,” 284. However, as Van Keulen, \textit{Two Versions}, 20, notes, the argument of narrative logic alone is often reversible: the greater literary coherence may be seen as showing more original state of the text contra more illogical one, while the one with less coherence may be seen as simply literary \textit{lectio difficilior}. Thus, this argument alone is rarely enough when assuming literary changes. On the “reversible arguments,” see Schenker, “Man bittet um das Gegengargument!”

\textsuperscript{369} Rofé, “Midrashic Traits,” 83–4, proposes that something very similar happened in 4QSam\textsuperscript{4} with the transposition of 1 Sam 2:13(b)–14 between verses 16 and 17: “By putting the illegitimate action first, the late scribe has combined both actions into one major transgression.” The happening in 2 Kgs 17 might therefore not be the only case of such an action. On this particular case, see also Trebolle, “Textual Criticism and the Composition History,” 275–6.

\textsuperscript{370} Here too, it is good to see the parallel phenomenon in the preceding verses 2 Kings 17:3–4: while the OG version of the narrative seems quite uninterested of its greater narrative coherence, different hands giving almost contradictory information, the MT smooths the logic of the overall narrative of the passage.
creates a frame surrounding it. However, this construction is not part of the more original composition of the chapter, but evidences even later revision.

The opposite is of course also possible, namely that the textual coherence is here consciously decreased, but it is difficult to find a motive for this, especially since a harmonization and improved coherence is a much more common secondary development. This can be seen even better and becomes even clearer with the third literary difference between the versions, as the MT seems to make the textual blocks of the whole chapter even more unified.

### 2.4.3.3 “Fearing other gods”

It is also worth noting what else is not found in the text of La\textsuperscript{115}. The ending notice of MT 7b, אֲחֵרִים הִים אֶוּ וַיִּירְאוּ (“and they feared other gods”), is missing. It is also peculiarly placed in L, given only at the very end of the verse, after the OG notice “from the day he led them/their fathers from Egypt and until this day.” One could expect the sentence to be given before this notice, in its apparent context, as in MT/LXX. The mention does not appear to have been part of the proto-Lucianic stratum of the Antiochian text, but rather reflects later adaptation towards the MT\textsuperscript{372}

The phrase “to (not) fear other gods” appears in the Hebrew Bible only in 2 Kings 17:7, 35, 37, 38.\textsuperscript{373} This mention in MT verse 7 is thus actually tightly linked to the end of the chapter. The mention here seems to work as a sort of “key” to the chapter and its interpretation, as this is the first explicit sin mentioned: the destruction of Israel was first and foremost due to the Israelites’ sin of idolatry.\textsuperscript{374} In the same

---

\textsuperscript{371} The same phenomenon may be seen to happen with the all-encompassing “Wiederaufnahme” (“they walked in the statutes … that they had made”) of MT verses 8 and 19b as well; see 3.1.2.

\textsuperscript{372} It is sometimes the case that the comparison of L and La\textsuperscript{115} in the kaige section yields results of this kind, namely that a phrase or word that is lacking in La\textsuperscript{115} is also found in L in a slightly different spot from the rest of the tradition. See 2 Kgs 10:11, 25; 17:4 for similar phenomenon. Many Lucianic double readings work the same way as well of course, though often it is the OG reading that moves.

\textsuperscript{373} This idea is also found in Judges 6:10, though in a slightly different wording (“do not fear the god(s) of the Amorites”). It is important to note that this verse is part of the very late addition 6:7–10, which is also missing from the Qumran manuscript 4QJudg; see Ausloos, “Literary criticism and textual criticism.” The phrase is thus also elsewhere text-critically markable as forming part of a very late addition. Also, the idea of “fearing Yahweh” appears for the first time in chapter 17 in verse 17:25, after which it is recurrent until the end of the chapter. This contextually new use of ‘fear’ as a synonym for serving God(s) likely indicates a different redactional stratum from the text of verses 1–23, where it is not otherwise used.

\textsuperscript{374} Thus also Knoppers, “Cutheans or Children of Jacob?” 235: “The thrice-repeated admonition not to worship other deities (17:35, 37, 38) … is key to the author’s message …” and Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 396: “Eine erste DtrN-Schicht (V. 7–12*.18) stellt den Fremdgötterdienst … in den Vordergrund.” This is especially noticeable when the sentence is read as expolatory (“the sons of Israel
way, the epithet in MT verse 7 ("Yahweh, their god, who brought them out of the land of Egypt")\(^{375}\), is almost verbatim the same as is found in verse 36a ("Yahweh, who brought you out of the land of Egypt"). This ties the beginning of the "homily" part of the chapter to the end of it in the MT. \(^{376}\) In La\(^\text{115}\) the link is not nearly as refined and clear. Additionally, as noted by Rösel, the rare MT phrase "sons of Israel sinned against Yahweh" is only used here in Kings, which adds to the peculiarity of the MT’s language here.\(^{377}\)

When compared to the MT, the respective readings of La\(^\text{115}\) are much vaguer and more ambiguous: together with "not guarding the statutes of Yahweh" the exile is due to nonspecific "provocations," not specifically because of idolatry, "fearing other gods." This is especially the case if the mysterious כִּי וַיְהִי is read as constituting a protasis to verse 18: the sin of Israel is given in excruciating 10-verse-long detail. The OG mention of "from the day he led their fathers from Egypt" only adds to this generality of Israel’s sin, as it alludes to days even before the monarchies and the golden calves of Jeroboam.\(^{378}\) This may be seen to take away some of the northern Israelites’ blame, as the common ancestors of both Israel and Judah already provoked Yahweh – the specific sin(s) of Israel in this case did not begin only with the apostasy of Jeroboam.\(^{379}\) At the same time, an indirect reference to Judah as a sinner is made. In the MT this reading is impossible, as the mention of Egypt is in Yahweh’s formulaic epithet and the sinners ("sons of Israel")\(^{380}\) are clearly explicated.

\(^{375}\) The continuing phrase, “a from under the hand of (Pharaoh, king of Egypt)” is somewhat rare and is also here used in an unusual sense, as the usual oppressor of the phrase “from under the hand of” is not a person (as also in Exodus 18:10; and 2 Chron 21:10 [probably late invention of the Chronicler]), but a country (2 Kings 8:20, 22; 13:5; and 2 Chron 21:8, 10). There is also once again the possibility of a Wiederaufnahme here as well in the MT ("land of Egypt … king of Egypt"). It is noteworthy that the text encompassed by this repetition indeed has subject matter not found in La\(^\text{115}\).\(^{376}\) Viviano, “2 Kings 17,” 550, also finds a ring construction in verse 7 of the MT, emphasizing further its carefully structured unity.\(^{377}\) Rösel, “Why 2 Kings 17,” 88–9.

\(^{377}\) Schenker, “Cause de la Chute,” 156, 166–7; idem, Älteste Textgeschichte, 147.

\(^{378}\) It is not impossible either that the MT form is already aware of Jer 11:7–8 (> OG), which is phraseologically somewhat similar to the text of 7*a of La\(^\text{115}\). If a later reviser had made the connection between the two passages, La\(^\text{115}\)’s text would have created another problem since it implies that both kingdoms (or their fathers) broke the covenant, as in Jer 11:7–8, and should be now exiled. See Schenker, Das Neue am neuen Bund, 35–48, for a discussion of Jeremiah’s passage.

\(^{380}\) There has been discussion about the interpretation of the term “sons of Israel” found in this chapter in verses 17, 7–9, 22, and 24. Some scholars see this as a reference to just “Israelites” (Gray, Kings, 587–9), while others interpret the term to include both the people of Israel and Judah (Becking, Ondergang, 240). Brettler, “Ideology, History, and Theology,” 273, even sees this as referring to Judah alone. In La\(^\text{115}\) there is no ambiguity on the subject of the verse, as it carries over from verse 6 (Israel).
From an ideological perspective then, it would seem quite unlikely for the text to have evolved from the clear cut condemnation of (the sons of) Israel in the MT to the more lenient and vague interpretation of Israel’s sin in La\textsuperscript{115}, in which Judah can also be seen to take part.\textsuperscript{381} It is also more conceivable that a more general statement would be made more specific than the opposite. Here we have a literary difference that seems to hint at the greater antiquity of La\textsuperscript{115}’s reading in this verse. The notice about fearing other gods seems to be a very late addition to verse 7.\textsuperscript{382}

Furthermore, many scholars have also noted a neatly constructed allusion to the Decalogue (Deut. 5:6–7) in the MT: even though Yahweh, who brought them from Egypt (5:6/17:7a), commands Israel not to have other gods (5:7), in 2 Kings 17:7b they “fear” them nonetheless – even though it is indeed Yahweh whom they should be “fearing” (cf. Deut 5:29, 6:2).\textsuperscript{383} These neatly formed allusions to breaking the commandments of the Decalogue and Deuteronomy are, once again, practically missing from La\textsuperscript{115}.

2.4.3.4 Literary-critical conclusions
In conclusion, in verse 7, the MT gives a later text than is to be found in La\textsuperscript{115}. This can be shown by considering the three literary variants among the texts. First, the fact that the OG tradition has a \textit{Wiederaufnahme} while the MT does not seems to imply the older age of the OG. Second, the MT appears more concerned about including all the possible explicated sins of the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom inside one big syntactical unit while La\textsuperscript{115} has Israel’s (and thus also Judah’s) \textit{ancestors} already commit quite vague “provocations” against Yahweh. Third, the fact that the MT has a formulaic sentence found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible only at the very end of

---

\textsuperscript{381} This is also the opinion of Schenker, “Cause de la Chute,” 167. It is indeed possible that this (implied) inclusion of Judah with the sinners was actually the original intention of the redactions of the chapter and that this was only later changed to the condemnation of solely Israelites. There may be some hints in this direction; see, for example, Provan, \textit{Hezekiah}, 70–3.

\textsuperscript{382} Eynikel, \textit{Reform}, 94, comes to the same conclusion from purely redaction-critical viewpoints: “…part of a very late post-dtr addition.” Similarly Petry, \textit{Entgrenzung YHWHS}, 52.

\textsuperscript{383} Fricke, \textit{Zweite Buch von den Königen}, 227; Hobbs, \textit{Kings}, 231; Becking, \textit{Ondergang}, 182; Rehm, \textit{Zweite Buch der Könige}, 169. It may be noted that prior to this, in Deuteronomy 4, the Israelites are called “sons of Israel.”
chapter 17 (“fear (not) other gods”) points to a unifying tendency in the MT between the different narrative units or blocks of the chapter.

Thus, the somewhat crude state of verse 7 in La$^{115}$ when compared with the MT can be explained in two ways: either it preserves an older text form predating an extensive revision, or it has been revised itself, possibly because of corruption in the earlier transmission process. On the basis of both textual and literary-critical arguments, it is more likely that this crude state of La$^{115}$, and ultimately the OG, should indeed be seen as the more original edition of the verse.

2.4.4 Possible redactional ramifications of the textual evaluation

Practically all contemporary redactional theories take the MT form of verse 7 as reflecting the original form of the passage, and as a result of this the verse is mostly seen to form a more or less organic unity with the verses after it. However, this hinge-verse, together with its surroundings, has clearly been revised over and over in the course of time. As has been argued, the text-critical material allows us to see that the MT might actually witness the latest stage of this revisional history. If this is indeed the case, this would have drastic repercussions not only on the redaction-critical work of this chapter and Kings as a whole, but on the whole method of redactional analysis – scholars may have been using the latest textual edition when trying to distinguish the earliest textual strands and layers!

As verse 7 lies at the hinge-point of different literary units, the textual problems of such a verse come as no surprise. The importance of the verse in the overall composition of this chapter is noteworthy: this is the verse that starts the exceedingly long string of “homiletic” additions to the preceding “historical” narrative. Thus, it is only to be expected that this important verse would have been subjected to successive revisions/redactions, spawning new textual traditions. The vastly differing textual traditions only highlight this notion, and also give us documented evidence of this supposition. However, what the textual and literary-critical approach also highlights is the possible age of these redactional changes: if the modifications happened, for example, during the centuries between the translation of the Septuagint and the final formation of the MT, the latest redaction that took place in the proto-MT transmission is indeed post-exilic – (Late) Hellenistic – to say the least.

384 See the table in 3.2.1.
The two completely different MT and OG editions of the verse indicate that the most original text of chapter 17 may have ended with the notion of “until this day” in verse 6.\footnote{This is also the opinion of Trebolle, “2 Kings 17.2-23,” 223. The fact that this notion also ends the textual blocks of verses 24–33 and 34–41 (ending thus still the whole chapter with this phrase!) only adds to this conclusion.} Interestingly, like many of the added materials in the chapter, 7*a was probably also originally added via the technique of \textit{Wiederaufnahme} between 6b and 7*b. At a quite late date, the text underwent a redaction in the proto-MT transmission. This conclusion is substantiated by the fact that the phrase “fear (not) other gods,” which is missing in La\footnote{Thus Eynikel, \textit{Reform}, 94; Kartveit, “The Date,” 44; Burney, \textit{Kings}, 333; Stade, “Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö. 15-21,” 167–9; Gray, \textit{Kings}, 597; Nelson, \textit{Double Redaction}, 64; Würthwein, \textit{Bücher der Könige}, 398, 401; Campbell & O’Brien, \textit{Unfolding}, 446. However, on the opposing opinion, see Thenius, \textit{Könige}, 379 (“7–23 und 33–41 vom verarbeiter”); Cogan & Tadmor, \textit{II Kings}, 213–14; McKenzie, \textit{Chronicler’s Use}, 195–6. The reason to believe this to be a late addition comes from its attitude towards the foreign immigrants: as opposed to the preceding narrative (verses 25–33), where the foreign immigrants are told to have “feared Yahweh” along with their own gods, verses 34–40 tell us that “they did not fear Yahweh.” This seems to form a late clarification to the preceding narrative. Also, some of the linguistic traits of this passage come clearly from Late Biblical Hebrew; see 4.1.}, is characteristic of the later part of the chapter (17:34b–40). This section is often considered a very late addition (or at least later than 7–23),\footnote{Thus Eynikel, \textit{Reform}, 94; Kartveit, “The Date,” 44; Burney, \textit{Kings}, 333; Stade, “Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö. 15-21,” 167–9; Gray, \textit{Kings}, 597; Nelson, \textit{Double Redaction}, 64; Würthwein, \textit{Bücher der Könige}, 398, 401; Campbell & O’Brien, \textit{Unfolding}, 446. However, on the opposing opinion, see Thenius, \textit{Könige}, 379 (“7–23 und 33–41 vom verarbeiter”); Cogan & Tadmor, \textit{II Kings}, 213–14; McKenzie, \textit{Chronicler’s Use}, 195–6. The reason to believe this to be a late addition comes from its attitude towards the foreign immigrants: as opposed to the preceding narrative (verses 25–33), where the foreign immigrants are told to have “feared Yahweh” along with their own gods, verses 34–40 tell us that “they did not fear Yahweh.” This seems to form a late clarification to the preceding narrative. Also, some of the linguistic traits of this passage come clearly from Late Biblical Hebrew; see 4.1.} which may indicate that the ultimate revision of the verse 7 in the MT happened either with or after the addition of these verses. It may even be that this revision of verse 7 was made the very last, after the other changes, in connection with the final redaction process of 17:34b–40/41.

Kartveit, with many others, proposes that the unit 17:35–40 is to be read as a repetition of 7–23.\footnote{Kartveit, “The Date,” 41.} While this is true for the most part, the text-critical evidence indicates that the direction may have in some cases been the \textit{opposite} as well: some passages in verses 7–23 may have been redacted even later on the basis of 24–41 in order to make the overall narrative more uniform as a whole. Knoppers sees the exceptional use of the verb “to fear” in this chapter in the MT exactly as a “sign of unity in the chapter as a whole.”\footnote{Knoppers, “Cutheans or Children of Jacob?” 235.} When such unifying traits as found in verse 7 of the MT are found in such extensively redacted chapters as this one, this “unity” seems however more suspicious than original.

Quite often the redaction history of 2 Kings 17 – and Kings in general – is seen as a somewhat straightforward process: different narrative units have simply been added after (or inside) one another in the manner of \textit{Fortschreibung}, and this may or
may not prompt textual adjusting at the hinge-points of the narratives. It is not that often suggested that the phrases and ideas of the new narratives could have also prompted adjusting in the text of the older narratives as well. Of course, this sort of textual zigzagging would be both vulnerable to circular reasoning and hard to prove with only undocumented, purely literary- or redaction-critical, methods. It is highly likely, however, that at least occasionally this was exactly the way the ancient texts evolved – as is the case with modern texts, as well.

However, when the documented textual evidence is taken into account, the possible history of the (mostly very late) redaction can in some cases be inferred. This also seems to be the case with 17:7.
2.5 Textual Criticism of the hinge-verses 8–9

The textual state and history of verses 8–9 has its challenges already in the MT, which has multiple grammatical and lexical problems in these verses. Some textual witnesses lack the text of 8b either in part or in whole, and the beginning verb of 9a forms one of the most debated *cruces* in the interpretation of the chapter. It is no wonder then that we also find differences here in La115 when compared to all other witnesses – most importantly verse 8 appears to be completely missing from it. Verse 9a, which has some key differences when compared with the other witnesses, is also transposed after verse 19 in it. This is also where its preserved text ends. In this chapter it will be shown that the text of La115 forms in many ways a viable alternative to the MT/LXX text form, thus possibly evidencing the OG, especially due to its ideologically more ambivalent characteristics and also its depiction of Judah as a sinner too.

2.5.1 Text of verse 8 in MT/LXX

Before delving into the challenges of the Old Latin, verse 8 of the MT/LXX has its own text-critical problems already in itself, as the grammatically challenging mention of “the kings of Israel” in 8b is missing in a large part of the Greek manuscript tradition, and even one medieval Hebrew manuscript (K 70). The Syrohexapla gives the text under an obelos. Even the Peshitta lacks the text of 8b, but has a detached gloss-like mention “they (were) their kings” (ܢܐܢܐܘܢ) after 9a, apparently referring to the preceding “sons of Israel.” On grounds of textual evidence this phrase, and the whole of 8b, is under strong suspicion.389

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 17:8</th>
<th>LXX B 17:8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הַגּוֹיִם בְּחֻקּוֹת וַיֵּלְכוּ יְהוָה הוֹרִישׁ אֶת תָּם אֶת סֹגֵלָה</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν τοῖς δικαίωμασιν τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὃν ἔξηρεν Κύριος ἐκ προσώπου υἱῶν Ισραηλ, καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς Ισραηλ, ὥσοι ἔποσχαν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיְהוָה וַיִּשָּׂרוּ אֶת בֵּית יָהוָה</td>
<td>ἐθνῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And they went in the statutes of peoples, whom Yahweh had driven out from before the sons of Israel, and the kings of Israel, which they made.

The lack of καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς Ισραηλ, “the kings of Israel,” may be due to a simple homoioteleuton mistake from one “Israel” to another (either in Greek and Hebrew), or, conversely, the phrase could be an addition via *Wiederaufnahme* between these

---

389 Therefore Eynikel, *Reform*, 91, is simply wrong in stating that “there is no text critical reason” for omitting this mention, as is cautiously advised even by BHS (“dl?”).
two words, as argued by Trebolle.\textsuperscript{390} The whole 8b, \( \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל, which they made,} \) is highly problematic syntactically since it does not seem to be connected to either the preceding or the following sentence. This, in any case, points to its late origin as an explicating and harmonizing gloss.\textsuperscript{391} Context-wise the sinning of the Israelite kings would be quite understandable, but the additional nature of this mention becomes even clearer when it is noted that in chapter 17 the main sinner is now the people, not their king(s).\textsuperscript{392} However, the Greek evidence for the minus, even though somewhat widespread, can be most easily explained by (quite early and at least partly independent) intra-Greek corruption. In this case, the witnesses have likely simply (accidentally) omitted the phrase more or less independently of one another.\textsuperscript{393}

Several scholars have proposed that the whole verse 8b (“and the kings of Israel, which they made”) should be seen as a late addition or gloss to the MT text.\textsuperscript{394} There are indeed good reasons for this assumption. As mentioned, the Peshitta lacks the whole phrase, and, curiously enough, the same happens in the Samaritan Chronicle (\textit{Sepher ha-Yamim}).\textsuperscript{395} Other possibilities have also been suggested.\textsuperscript{396}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{390} Among others, Barthélemy, \textit{CTAT}, 409, argues for a homoioteleuton mistake; Trebolle, \textit{“2 Kings 17,7–23,”} 219.

\textsuperscript{391} Similarly Montgomery, \textit{Kings}, 468 (“… ungrammatical Hebrew … the passage is secondary”); Burney, \textit{Kings}, 332 (“Senseless”); Hobbs, \textit{Kings}, 231 (“syntactically very clumsy”). The \( \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל,} \) clearly has as its object \( \text{קֹּות,} \) not “the kings of Israel,” as seen in the parallel verse 19b. The idea that the peoples would have been exiled from before “the sons of Israel \textit{and the kings of Israel}” is in turn nonsensical, as this could not have been the case, as the “sons of Israel” most certainly did not have kings at the time. “The kings of Israel” as a complement of \( \text{קֹּות} \) (“in the statutes of the peoples … and kings of Israel, which they made”) is the most probable interpretation, but it is, as mentioned, grammatically very awkward. Despite these problems, some scholars have still tried to defend the syntax of this phrase; see, for instance, Hobbs, \textit{Kings}, 232 (“The very difficulty of the sentence would argue against its omission”); Long, \textit{2 Kings}, 182 (“[t]he last phrase is … elliptical … the MT is perfectly clear as it stands.”). These attempts have not been particularly convincing.

\textsuperscript{392} See Rösel, \textit{“Why 2 Kings 17,”} 85–90, for a discussion of this surprising ideological feature.

\textsuperscript{393} Especially problematic would be his idea that the Greek text had been corrected \textit{twice} towards the Hebrew in a \textit{kaige}-like manner (first from the OG version preserved by La\textsuperscript{115} [see below] to that of the shorter form, and after this to the longer form). While the idea of “double-\textit{kaige} in itself – \textit{kaige}-like corrections being done in two (or more) stages – is not at all impossible (rather, this has indeed happened to a certain degree; see Aejmelaeus, \textit{“Textual History,”} 172–8), this seems quite unlikely here since the Greek manuscript evidence can hardly be used to reliably back up this theory. It is also hard to see how the Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} would have originally had such a complex form, \( \text{יְהוָ֔ה,} \) \( \text{הֹורִישׁ,} \) \( \text{אֲשֶׁר,} \) \( \text{אֲשֶׁר,} \) \( \text{יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל,} \) \( \text{בְּנֵי,} \) \( \text{מִפְּנֵי,} \) \( \text{עָשׂוּ אֲשֶׁר,} \) \( \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל,} \) \( \text{בְּנֵי,} \) \( \text{מִפְּנֵי,} \) where \( \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל,} \) does not refer to anything before it – the referent is hardly \( \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל,} \) and \( \text{קֹּות} \) is too far away to be referred to, unless the relative sentence in between the two \( \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל,} \) \( \text{בְּנֵי,} \) \( \text{מִפְּנֵי,} \) \( \text{עָשׂוּ אֲשֶׁר,} \) words is considered as an even later addition (via \textit{Wiederaufnahme}?).

\textsuperscript{394} Brettler, \textit{“Text in a Tel,”} 127; Gray, \textit{Kings}, 587–8; Stade, \textit{“Anmerkungen zu 2. Kö 15-21,”} 165.

\textsuperscript{395} See 1.2.2.3 for a brief discussion of \textit{Sepher ha-Yamim}. It is possible that this minus of a (proto-)Masoretic plus is a true case of differing Hebrew \textit{Vorlagen}.

\textsuperscript{396} For instance Stade, \textit{Kings}, 262, on the basis of the text-critical evidence, proposes more simply that possibly only the last two words, \( \text{עָשׂוּ אֲשֶׁר,} \) crept into the text of 9a. Possibly this addition would have been due to harmonization towards verse 19b. There is nevertheless no further text-critical evidence for this theory.
\end{footnotesize}
It is noteworthy that $L$ also seems to be under the influence of $kaige$ here, as shown by the translation equivalent $\pi\rho\sigma\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$ since the OG equivalent of $\pi\rho\sigma\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$ was probably $\pi\rho\sigma\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$. The further change of $L$-700 328 (488) 460 of $\delta\sigma\omega\iota\iota\iota$ ($\delta\sigma\alpha$ = $\tau\iota\iota\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\iota\omega\mu\omega\iota\iota\iota$), on the other hand, is a Lucianic stylistic improvement, possibly made independently in 247 (488).

The text-critical evidence, as well as the syntactical considerations, point to a late addition of verse 8b after 8a in the MT edition of the text. The Greek evidence for the minus of 8b seems secondary, however.

### 2.5.2 Verse 7* and the mysterious lack of verse 8 in La115

The lack of verse 8 in La115 is crucial for the discussion of the composition of the whole chapter 17, as instead of having this verse, La115 transposes 9–14 and 15–19. Verses 7–8 are, of course, at the very hinge of this change of order.

Continuing from verse 7*a of the previous section (2.4), the case of 7*b is not much easier: La115 again gives a totally different text when compared to MT/LXX. This time even $L$ concurs with the majority text. The theories concerning the possible accidental omission of this verse have already been covered in the discussion of the minus of 7*a in La115 (2.4.1). To summarize, the most plausible theory would be a homoioteleuton between two verse-beginning “and”-words ($\kappa\alpha\iota\iota\iota$). After this a Greek or Latin copyist may have felt that some text was missing and decided to add some on his own. However, as the text of La115 seems to be syntactically connected to the already analyzed preceding text of 7*a ($7^a$quia ... $7^b$non custodierunt precepta ...), which, as has been argued, most probably is not a simple product of accidental change (but rather the most original extant text form), the text now following it too is most probably original in the context of La115’s edition. Nevertheless, Fischer subtly implies that this minus may be due to a parablepsis to $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\nu$ at the end of verse 14. The lack of verses 9–14 would be simply due to haplography. Possibly right after this

---

397 This is quite easily seen already from the attestations of $\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\iota\omega\mu\omega\iota\iota\iota$: none in 1 Kings, but seven in 2 Kings. Thysl already Trebolle, “Histoire du Texte,” 336 and more recently Kauhanen, “Lucifer of Cagliari,” 162, who further confirms this feature with the help of the text of Lucifer. The OG equivalent of $\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\iota\omega\mu\omega\iota\iota\iota$, on the other hand, seems to have been $\tau\iota\iota\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\iota\omega\mu\omega\iota\iota\iota$.

398 Contra Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,7–23,” 219, according to whom $\delta\sigma\alpha$ should be seen as the OG. Either way, this is ultimately a purely intra-Greek question since the Hebrew $\tau\iota\iota\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\iota\omega\mu\omega\iota\iota\iota$ in the Vorlage can be understood here to refer to either.

399 Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 87: “$\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\nu$: these words occur in another context at the end of v 14.” Verse 14 also ends in $\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ in manuscripts 247 L-700 328 121 488 158 460, which may also have prompted a haplography.
mistake the copyist realized his blunder and simply added the text of verses 9–14 after verses 15–19, thus creating the order now found in La\textsuperscript{115}. While not impossible, the size of this suggested haplography is substantially large: a homoioteleuton mistake covering 5 or more verses is extremely rare, even from the viewpoint of cognitive science.\textsuperscript{400}

The other possibility would be, as in the case of verse 7 above, that the text was physically somehow corrupted and had to be emended for this reason. It is remotely possible that the copyist had before him a fragmentary text similar to the following: 7… ἑτέρους καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν κύριος ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν θεοῦ πατέρων αὐτῶν. This he would have reconstructed as “οὐκ ἔφυλαξ ἐντολάς κυρίоς ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν θεοῦ πατέρων αὐτῶν.” However, this option is again highly unlikely. Since accidents as the reason for the differing text of La\textsuperscript{115} do not seem convincing, the most probable option, then, is that the translator of La\textsuperscript{115} had a different Greek base text (going back to a different Hebrew Vorlage) before him here as well.

La\textsuperscript{115} reads in verse 7*b non custodierunt precepta dmi di patrum suorum, “… they did not guard the commandments of the Lord, the god of their fathers.” Of this, only the words custodierunt and precepta need further consideration, as otherwise the text is easy to render into Greek.

The word pr(a)ectum is used three times in La\textsuperscript{115}: twice it translates ἐντολή,\textsuperscript{401} and once praeceptum appears to translate λόγος from the L-text, given as a variant to the majority text.\textsuperscript{402} The verb praecipio is usually used as a translation of ἐντέλλω.\textsuperscript{403} Therefore it is quite safe to conclude that we could also expect La\textsuperscript{115} to have had ἑντολάς in its Vorlage here.\textsuperscript{404}

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{400} For the cognitive approach, see Vroom, “Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors,” 279: “... haplography should only be considered a viable text-critical explanation for small variants; it should not be used to account for large differences among a text’s witnesses.” Fischer’s theory would in any case suppose La\textsuperscript{115} to have had a differing text/Vorlage in verse 7*ab that ended with the words patrum suorum/τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{401} In 1 Kgs 13:21; 2 Kgs 17:16.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{402} In 2 Sam 11:17 (in the kaige section) where L gives the variant κατὰ τὸν λόγον instead of ἐκ τῶν δοῦλων (rel). This (probably OG) plus, which is not found in the MT, seems to accentuate the sin of David (killing Uriah the Hittite), as Uriah is said to have died “as was the command/word of David.” In this case, La\textsuperscript{115} may have understood λόγον as “order, commandment,” which in the context is very plausible.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{403} In 2 Sam 4:12, 5:25, 11:19, 13:28, 29, 17:14, 18:5; 1 Kgs 13:21, 17:15. Only in 2 Sam 17:23, where all the Greek witnesses read ἐνετείλατο, does La\textsuperscript{115} have disposuit (likely from διατίθημι).}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{404} The evidence is too scanty to make any definite claims, as La\textsuperscript{115} may also have rendered some other Greek words with praeceptum in the sections now not preserved to us.}
\end{footnotesize}
The word *custodierunt* poses some problems as well, as this word is used nowhere else in the extant parts of La. However, the verb La translates here is probably *φυλάσσω*, as the construction *φυλάσσειν τὴν ἐντολήν/πρόσταγμα/δικαίωμα/κρίμα* is used frequently in Kings, this is quite a safe assumption. Thus, the Greek exemplar of verse 7*b* would have run οὐκ ἐφύλαξαν τὰς ἐντολὰς (τοῦ) κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν.

Apart from the word ἐντολή, which most of the time translates the Hebrew word אֶת־שָׁמַר, this Greek sentence is easily further translatable into Hebrew: לא שמרו את מצות אלהיו. This is, in fact, almost verbatim the text of 19a: את שמרו אבותם אלהיו יהוה. It could be argued, therefore, that the text of La here was simply taken over from verse 19, either accidentally or, if this was indeed the case, more probably deliberately. While this is indeed a valid possibility, the literary-critical arguments to be posited below (3.1.4) would not seem to support this theory, but rather speak for the probability of a different Vorlage.

### 2.5.3 Verse 9 – The textual variants

#### 2.5.3.1 The beginning of verse 9 and the crux of the Hebrew hapax

Verse 9 is, apart from the peculiar Old Latin, quite uneventful in terms of textual evidence. There is, however, one major textual problem, namely the beginning Hebrew verb והחפוא, which is a *hapax legomenon* and thus has provoked considerable discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 17:9</th>
<th>LXX B 17:9</th>
<th>L 17:9</th>
<th>La 115 17:9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיְחַפְּאוּ בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל דְּבָרִים</td>
<td>καὶ δοὺς ἡμιψεόντοι</td>
<td>καὶ ἡμιψεόντοι</td>
<td>et revelaverunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְּבָרִים</td>
<td>οἱ ὄλοι Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>οἱ ὄλοι Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>filis Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֹא־כֵ֔ן אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>λόγους</td>
<td>λόγους</td>
<td>quae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﬠַל־יְهوָה</td>
<td>ἀδίκους</td>
<td>ἀδίκους</td>
<td>non ita oportebat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיִּבְנוּ בָּמוֹת</td>
<td>κατὰ Κυρίον</td>
<td>κατὰ Κυρίον</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָהֶם</td>
<td>θεοὺ ἀυτῶν</td>
<td>θεοὺ ἀυτῶν</td>
<td>deos suos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀμφιέσαντο</td>
<td>μητρίας</td>
<td>μητρίας</td>
<td>et aedificaverunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ λόγους</td>
<td>ἀδίκους</td>
<td>ἀδίκους</td>
<td>sibi excelsa…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

405 Elsewhere in La φυλάσσω is rendered with *dum obsidet* in 2 Sam 11:16; 1 Kgs 13:21 *non servasti*; 2 Kgs 6:9 *observane*; 2 Kgs 6:10 *observavit*; 2 Kgs 10:31 *observavit*; 2 Kgs 17:19 *observavit*. The translation custodio is also often used by another OL witness, Lucifer of Cagliari.


408 It is hard to say why L changes the text here to read “unjust things” (due to Lucianic recension?), unless it is somehow connected to the (secondary) reading assigned to Symmachos in Syrohexapla (σ᾿ quae non recta).
The verb יָכִלוּ (‘they sinned’) is an ancient crux interpretum.409 Because of its problems, multiple emendations have been proposed (for example the verb roots סֵד or סֵס) and cannot be completely ruled out, although no single emendation seems to have yet gained widespread support.410 An Akkadian origin (hapû/hepû, “to break/invalidate, crush”) for the verb has often been proposed.411 Taking the Akkadian verb as the etymological basis of the Hebrew word, Ronnie Goldstein further argues that also the continuing phrase עַל־יְהוָה א־כֵן אֲשֶׁר דְּבָרִים should be understood in the light of the Akkadian idiom dibbu ša lā kinnu (“disloyal talk”).412 While not impossible, the easier and more probable option, however, is that this peculiar expression simply shows late Aramaic influences (instead of being an exceedingly early Neo-Assyrian loan).413 Such Aramaic influence is recurrent, especially in the latter part of the chapter.

409 The commentators are usually only able to translate this verb based on its context; see, for instance, Cogan & Tadmor, Kings, 205 (“ascribe”); Fritz, 2 Könige, 95 (“angehängt”). This of course means that were the context to (even slightly) change, so also would the interpretation.

410 Klostermann, Könige, 453, emends to יָכִלוּ, “and they healed,” according to Jer 6:14, but this is exceedingly unlikely. A simple (but similarly unlikely) corruption of one letter from יָכִלוּ, “and they sinned,” to יָכִלוּ, is possible, and would in turn make the text of 9a shortly intelligible, especially because the verb יָכִלוּ is nowhere else used with the preposition על as the marker of the object (cf. חֲטָא + על in Ex 29:36; Lev 4:14, 5:5; Num 6:11; Neh 13:26). This emendation would also create a redundant, and therefore literary-critically interesting, repetition with verse 7a, which also recounts the sons of Israel “sinning against Yahweh.”

411 The idea is not particularly new; see already Stade, Kings, 262, and Gray, Kings, 588. For the Akkadian verb, see CAD H, 170–4.

412 Goldstein, “A Suggestion,” 394–9. While highly intriguing, Goldstein’s theory necessitates making some textual conjectures which do not appear plausible. Furthermore, such Akkadian parallels would necessitate the literary-critical conclusion that 9a would come already from Neo-Assyrian times, which does not seem creditable.

413 Montgomery, Kings, 478, asserts that צִוָּרָה is used like Aram ตร, Actualizar. This is also observed by Goldstein, “A Suggestion,” 397: “the particle צִוָּרָה in this phrase does not function in the same way as it does in classical Hebrew, corresponding more closely to the Aramaic  אומר and Akkadian ṣa.”
The verb וַיְחַפְּאוּ has often been understood as denoting actions done “in secret.” The problems of this hapax legomenon can be seen already in the apparently misguided LXX translation ἠμφιέσαντο, “they clothed themselves,” which may translate a different Hebrew verb altogether (חפה). This translation is probably an educated guess made by the translator due to an unintelligible Vorlage and therefore does not go back to a different Hebrew original.

When we come to the readings of some of the versions, however, a different picture emerges. Both Targum Jonathan and the Peshitta read “they uttered words that were not right,” possibly as translations of אמר. This reading has usually been deemed secondary with only quite brief remarks. However, this reading may also find some support from the Old Latin witnesses. LaM reads et composuerunt filii Israel verba non recta adversum Dominum Deum suum, “the sons of Israel composed/made up/placed words that were not right against the Lord their God.”

More interestingly, however, La115 has the complete opposite of the MT’s often assumed meaning of “doing in secret”: et revelaverunt filis israel quae non ita oportebat at deos suos, “and they revealed (to) the sons of Israel those [parts?] which were not at all appropriate to/concerning their gods.” It is probable that this reading goes back to a different exemplar than the majority text’s ἀμφιέννυμι, although it is still possible that the translator incorrectly read this as a non-existent Greek verb ἀντιἐννυμί, “to un-clothe,” and aptly interpreted it as revelare. This idea of differing Vorlagen is also partly backed up by the traditions of the Targums and the Peshitta: in

---

414 Thus already Syrohexapla (α´ texerunt), Vulgate (opperuerunt). This translation is followed by Sweeney, Kings, 386; Hobbs, 2 Kings, 221, 223. Snait, Kings, 280, however, aptly notes: “The translation did secretly cannot be right since there was nothing at all secret about what they did.”

415 Burney, Kings, 332, sees this as the preferable reading, albeit only “if the text is genuine,” whatever this may mean. Similarly Thenius, Könige, 385.

416 Similarly Snait, Kings, 280. See Aeimelaeus, “Levels of Interpretation,” 17–18, for the phenomenon of guessing as the last “emergency solution” in the translation process.

417 For instance, Goldstein, “A Suggestion,” 395, discards this reading because it lacks “any etymological basis” with the verb שָׁתַ’. Apparently, Goldstein does not take into account the possibility that the reading may attest to a different Vorlage from that of the MT.

418 Taking into account the vast semantic range of compono, its Greek equivalent could have been almost anything that denotes “uniting” or “putting together,” and is thus very hard – if not impossible – to reconstruct. Arguably this makes ἀμφιέννυμι a valid option as well.

419 It is unlikely that manuscript 328, which lacks καὶ ἠμφιάσαντο and has dative υἱοίς Ισραηλ, has preserved indirect evidence of a dative case similar to La115 here. More probably 328 tries to independently harmonize 8b and 9a.

420 This rare verb is elsewhere used only in Job 40:10 (ἡμφιέσα). Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 148, proposes a base text of ἁν-ἀποκαλύπτο (from the Hebrew יִגְלוּ). I am indebted to Tuukka Kauhanen for this ingenious proposition. However, an error between ΗΜΦΙΕΣΩΝΤΟ ~ ΗΝΤΙΕΣΩΝΤΟ, while possible, does not seem very likely to me.
all three traditions we have semantics of speaking or bringing forth instead of presumably hiding or covering something up. The evidence is not particularly strong, however.

Nevertheless, the La\textsuperscript{115} plural reading “to their gods,” \textit{deos suos}, against the singular “the Lord, their god,” \textit{κυρίου θεοῦ αὐτῶν}, is harder to posit as simply originating from a mistake and, as argued by Trebolle, may be a theologically more unorthodox, and thus original, variant. Indeed, having Yahweh as the sole god of the Israelites in the MT/LXX is theologically more appropriate than their having multiple gods, as in a pantheon.\textsuperscript{422} A somewhat similar theological correction can also be found in 2 Kgs 18:34, where the multiple “gods of Samaria,” found in \textit{L} and \textit{LaM}, have probably been omitted from the MT.\textsuperscript{423} The above-mentioned theological inconvenience somewhat heightens the probabilities of La\textsuperscript{115}’s preserving the most original text in the verse overall.

However, in La\textsuperscript{115} there is the possibility of an accidental change of \textit{filii israel} (nominative) to \textit{filis israel} (dative), as now found in its text.\textsuperscript{424} If this was indeed what happened, La\textsuperscript{115} would not be that different a witness after all, as the “sons of Israel” would here be the subject as in every other witness. The text would thus be logical and unproblematic, though the sentence “the sons of Israel revealed inappropriate things to/concerning their gods …” would still evoke questions since no receiver of such revelation can be found in the text. It may be that this revelation was further explicated in the later text of La\textsuperscript{115}, which is now lost to us, or, as is more probable, that the \textit{Vorlage} of \textit{revelaverunt} was actually just another, albeit misguided, guess for the meaning of the unintelligible Hebrew/Greek verb.

Because of this text-critical problem, an analysis of the contextual repercussions of both readings (dative \textit{filis} vs. nominative \textit{filii}) will be given below.

\textsuperscript{422} Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 217. Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 148, further notes that the Hebrew prepositional phrase \textit{לָהֶם}, “to them(selves),” in the \textit{Vorlage} of La\textsuperscript{115} could be understood to refer to these other gods mentioned before them. The (Old) Greek translator would not have understood this, however, since La\textsuperscript{115} now also translates \textit{sibi}, corresponding to \textit{ἑαυτοῖς} in all the Greek witnesses.

\textsuperscript{423} See Pakkala, \textit{God’s Word Omitted}, 241–3 and Trebolle, \textit{Centena}, 196–8. Even more interestingly, as Trebolle points out, it seems that the whole verse 18:34 is probably a later insertion into the original text, to which this even later correction via omission was made. This is evidence for the notion that not even later insertions were always theologically completely orthodox in their views – at least in the eyes of even later correctors. A very similar case is likely at play also in 2 Kgs 17:17; see 2.6.8.

\textsuperscript{424} Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 87, notes: “\textit{filis = filis}: possibly an error for \textit{filii},” making this an adaptation of case suffix from the beginning of the word “Israel” (\textit{fil[is] israel}). This change could only have happened in Latin.
2.5.3.2 The subject of verse 9a in La\textsuperscript{115}: two narrative logical options

2.5.3.2.1 Option 1 (dative): Judah as the subject of verse 9 of La\textsuperscript{115}?

While the beginning of verse 9 is lexically difficult in the MT, the challenges of a problematic subject are this time present in La\textsuperscript{115}. If its text is indeed to be read with a dative, as now found in the edition, we have to ask: Who is the one revealing inappropriate things to the Israelites?

Taking the text of La\textsuperscript{115} as it now stands, Trebolle argues that “the subject of the clause must be ‘the pagan nations.’”\footnote{Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2–23,” 217.} This is a possible interpretation, and narratively much easier reading than seeing Judah as the subject, but the text preceding verse 9 in La\textsuperscript{115} is not that of verse 8, where the nations are indeed mentioned, but that of verse 19, where only Israel and Judah are mentioned. Therefore “the pagan nations” are actually last mentioned four verses back in verse 15. Therefore, the conclusion of Trebolle seems unlikely. On the other hand, Schenker notes the interesting implications the dative reading *filis* has: the only possible subject for the verb “they revealed” is Judah from the preceding verse 19.\footnote{Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 147–8.} However, Schenker does not explicate the further drastic change this reading brings to the passage – namely that the subject of the next three verses (presumably 10–12 as in other witnesses)\footnote{Of course, when positing this, we have to make a leap of faith by supposing that the text of La\textsuperscript{115} was indeed followed by these verses mostly in the form of the MT/LXX. As argued before, this seems like a well enough supported hypothesis, as in verses 15–19 the differences are mostly on the level of single words. Also, the fact that the second verb of verse 9 (“they built to themselves”) gives a simple third person plural points in this direction. Making this supposition is the only way forward in the literary critical argumentation when it comes to La\textsuperscript{115}.} thus must also bely seen as Judah, and, in fact, only as Judah, since Israel is not mentioned in them.

This also changes the mutual dynamics of the two textual units of La\textsuperscript{115}: while the unit 7*ab.15–18 deals with the condemnation of Israel, the second one in verses 19.9a(-12\textsuperscript{2}) would deal with an equal, though a bit shorter, condemnation of Judah. After this, both are addressed in verses 13–14 and seemingly in verse 20 as well (“all the seed of Israel”). While in the MT/LXX the mention of Judah seems a mere afterthought and a gloss in verses 13 and 18–19, La\textsuperscript{115} takes its references to Judah as a sinner much more seriously, as is the case already in verse 7*a: also here in 9a its text can be interpreted so that it was in fact the Judahites who misled “the sons of [71x45]110
Israel” (potentially even all twelve tribes instead of just the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom) from following Yahweh.

2.5.3.2.2 Option 2 (nominative): Judah not as the subject in verse 9?
Alternatively, if we accept the idea that filis Israel might have been born out of a scribal mistake from the original nominative plural form filii Israel, we are left with the same question as before: Who in this case would then be the “sons of Israel”? Should this be seen as a differentiating term from “Judah”? While this is a completely valid option, the semantic field of the term makes it, once again, possible to interpret the term in two other ways: either as only Judahites or as including both Israelites and Judahites. The ambiguity of La115 is again present here.

The most intuitive interpretation on the basis of the MT is, and has clearly been, to read the “sons of Israel” as denoting only the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom, as the term is used in this sense in verse 7 as well. However, in La115, verse 9a is the first one to use this term and therefore there is no such possibility for continuing interpretation from earlier verse(s). The meaning of the term in the context of La115 thus has to be inferred solely from its unique context, without any preconceptions from the MT/LXX. Two possibilities seem the most likely: that is, either the term denotes only the northern Israel or both Israel and Judah.428

Indeed, the fact that the subject could quite plausibly be understood as including both Israel and Judah already makes this reading ideologically harder than the one in the MT: the possible inclusivity of Judah in the condemnation of verses 9–12 is already something that could be seen as improper by a later (proto-)MT reviser (compare with the earlier situation with verse 7*a),429 even if this was not the intention of the original text. The broader sense of La115 also works well in its context: as will be argued, the second text block 19.9(–14.20) of La115 also has Judah and not just Israel in its focus.430 Reading “the sons of Israel” as including inhabitants of both kingdoms would thus work very well in the context of La115’s textual order.

428 Seeing Judah alone as the “sons of Israel” here does not seem recommendable, even if theoretically possible. See 3.1.3 on the terms “Israel,” “Judah,” and “sons of Israel” and their use in the chapter.
429 Even though theoretically similar inclusivity could also be seen in MT verse 9, the phenomenon is not as clear there as in La115. MT verse 7 gives quite an unambiguous interpretation for verse 9’s “sons of Israel,” even if verse 8 does use the term in a broader sense.
430 See 3.1.4.
2.5.3.2.3 Synthesis: Judah as the (implied) subject of 9a and its ideological repercussions

Judah as the more or less explicit subject of verse 9 (regardless of what its verb revelaverunt may be translating) is surprising, and brings with it some ideological differences when compared to the MT/LXX. The most apparent one is brought up by Schenker: when the “sons of Israel” are read with the dative case, the Judahites seem to be the teachers of the Israelites on matters “not right concerning/to their gods.”

This is quite a grave accusation: the idolatry of Israel became what it was partly because of Judah. This is surprising, as the exact opposite is usually argued: Ahaz of Judah is rather said to have “walked in the customs of the kings of Israel.” Even right before verse 9 of La, in 19b it is indeed Judah that walks “in the acts” of the whole Israel, according to what they made.”

This glaring discrepancy is thus also an argument for the accidental appearance of the dative: one could expect it to appear only by mistake. On the other hand, the idea of Judah teaching the Israelites actually works somewhat well within the context of the chapter, as some of Israel’s listed sins (especially the ones in verses 9–12) are in fact sins only Judah has been or will be accused of in Kings.

According to Schenker this teaching by Judahites would have happened to the new Mesopotamian inhabitants of the land after the fall of Samaria. However, there is one problem with this interpretation: in the rest of the chapter the people living in the Northern Kingdom’s area are only called “the peoples.” The problem of the identity of “the sons of Israel” is thus again present: are the newcomers also to be considered as “sons of Israel”? The other possibility would be that Judah began its “teaching” already at the time of the separation of the kingdoms, or even before this, as may be hinted at by 1 Kgs 14:23. When the text of 7*ab is taken into account,
the latter seems contextually more preferable: already the fathers of both Israel and Judah did not keep the statutes, and therefore Judah could have been telling untruths about Yahweh for quite a while. When the ambiguous semantics of “the sons of Israel” are taken into account, this idea creates even more ideological tension in La\textsuperscript{115}. Judah may not have told untruths only to the people of the Northern Kingdom (whether Israelites or the later newcomers), but to all twelve tribes.

In any case, the direction of change from the MT to La\textsuperscript{115} does not appear to be ideologically preferable – if anything, the opposite is more likely. As Judah is, after all, the rightful Davidic kingdom from which Israel unlawfully separated, it would certainly be unexpected for a late MT redactor to make Judah more sinful in a way such as seen in La\textsuperscript{115}.\textsuperscript{436} Also, as we are dealing with the fall of Samaria, a late reviser may also have seen it more fitting to change the text of verses 9–12 to concern only Israel. He did not want to, or even could not, fade Judah completely out of the picture, as can be seen in the MT, but he greatly lessened the involvement of Judah in the sinful conduct.\textsuperscript{437}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{436} See also Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 149 and section 1.3 above. Furthermore, if the reading of La\textsuperscript{115} that concerns “their gods” instead of “Yahweh, their God” is taken into account, the sin of Judah would be even harsher: not only did they tell other Israelites about inappropriate things concerning Yahweh, but quite a few other gods as well.
\textsuperscript{437} This way we could also posit another reason for the change of the text of MT’s verse 9. If the verb \textit{חפא} indeed does mean “to cover up, to do in secret,” it may have been the intention of a reviser to change the meaning of the sentence to an opposite of the original, making the statement ideologically more suitable. The transposition of the units and the fact that verse 9 is at the exact hinge-point of this action may have had something to do with the elusive wording of the MT – it would certainly not seem too far-fetched that a possible transposition on such a scale would even have prompted textual corruption at the very hinge of this action. I have argued this earlier in Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 13: “Such substantial transpositions have often resulted in the editing of both the text around the transposed material and inside the material itself ... especially the hinge-points of the original text and the relocated text are often textually active.”
\end{footnotesize}
2.6 Textual criticism of verses 10–23

2.6.1 Verse 10

There are no striking differences between the versions. Verses 9b–14 and 20–23 are not preserved in La.\(^{15}\) L explicates the subject (οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ), but this addition is due to the explicating tendency of the Lucianic revision, and is therefore not in need of deeper inquiry.\(^{438}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐστήλωσαν ἑαυτοῖς (L + οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ) στήλας καὶ ἄλσος ἐπὶ παντὶ βουνῷ υψηλῷ καὶ ὑποκάτω παντὸς ξύλου ἄλσώδους</td>
<td>L + οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ L-700 460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And (+ the sons of Israel L) built them(selves) stelae and asherim on every high hill and under every lush tree.

2.6.2 Verse 11

The only notable difference between the texts concerns the Septuagint rendering of רָעִים דְּבָרִים, “bad things,” as κοινωνοὺς (“companions”), and the equally enigmatic LXX plus καὶ ἐχάραξαν, “and they engraved/vexed.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐθυμίασαν καὶ ἐχάραξαν τοῦ παροργίσαι τὸν κύριον</td>
<td>MT: And they burned incense there in all the high places, like the peoples, whom Yahweh had exiled from before them. And they made bad things in order to provoke Yahweh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

438 See Brock, Recensions, 252, on this well known Lucianic tendency.

439 The imperfect ἐθυμίασαν of L is likely OG here, the majority aorist reading coming from kaige; see Voitila, “Use of Tenses,” 230, for the originality of the imperfect against the aorist. Aorists of θυμίαω are otherwise only found in 2 Kgs 16:13 (ἀνήνεγκεν L-700), 23:8 (ἐθυμίασαν L 460 554).

440 According to Bodine, Greek Text of Judges, 48, the equivalent וָאֶשֶרִים = ἀποκικίτη is a sign of kaige revision in Judges. In Samuel–Kings, however, this feature cannot be completely ascertained, as וָאֶשֶרִים in the meaning of “to (go into) exile” can only be found in kaige sections; cf. 2 Sam 15:19 (μετοίκισεν), 2 Kgs 15:29 (ἀπώκισεν), 16:9 (ἀπώκισεν), 17:6, 23, 26, 27, 28 (ἀπώκισαν) ἀπήγαγον V CII d\(^{370}\) s\(^{48}\)mg 488 71 342 554 707, 33 (ἀπώκισαν), 18:11, 24:15 (ἀπώκισαν) μετοίκισαν L 460, 25:11 (μετήρεν) μετοίκισαν L 460, 21 (ἀπωκικίσθη). While curious, these cases do not yet allow us to posit וָאֶשֶרִים = ἀποκικίτη as a kaige reading in Samuel–Kings, as ἀποκικίτη remains the most common translation, and the differing readings in L may be simply due to Lucianic lexical preference.
The peculiar LXX readings are probably due to textual mishaps: the OG translator probably read הָרְעָם as דברי, thus translating κοινωνοὺς (“companions”), while ἔχαραξαν, the only instance of χαράσσω in the Septuagint, possibly translates some form of the verb כעס. Such a reading may have risen from some graphical corruption of רעים. It is also possible that the translator/Vorlage erroneously read רַעְש as a hiph’ıl form of רע, “to do evil.” LaM maligna verba, “wicked words,” translates interestingly a Greek text that has been corrected towards the MT. There is no need to emend MT in any way.

2.6.3 Verse 12
The texts agree almost completely. The majority of LXX manuscripts have at the end a plus “to the Lord.” There is also a possibility that L has been influenced by kaige in its readings εἰδολον and λατρεύω.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיַּֽﬠַבְדּוּ הַגִּלֻּלִ֑ים</td>
<td>καὶ ελάτρευσαν τοῖς εἰδώλοις,</td>
<td>καὶ ελάτρευσαν τοῖς εἰδώλοις,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וּאֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אָמַר</td>
<td>οἱ εἶπεν Κύριος αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>οἱ εἶπεν κύριος αὐτοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַזֶּ֔ה׃</td>
<td>οὐ ποιήσετε τὸ βῆμα τοῦτο</td>
<td>οὐ ποιήσετε τὸ βῆμα τοῦτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶת־הַדָּבָר</td>
<td>Κυρίῳ</td>
<td>Κυρίῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תַﬠֲשׂוּ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And they served idols, about whom Yahweh had told them: “do not this thing (+to the Lord LXX).”

There are two possibilities for explaining the LXX plus τῷ κυρίῳ, “to the Lord”: 1) MT is original, the plus of LXX being probably due to harmonization towards the formulation of Deut 12:4, 31 (either in Greek or already in the Vorlage); 2) The plus of LXX is original (לַיהוָה) and the minus of L is due to Hebraizing correction (Hexaplaric?). The word לַיהוָה could have dropped from the MT because of a homoioteleuton due to graphical similarity (יהוה…יהוה), but this is a rather weak explanation.

441 Therefore, the view of Becking, Ondergang, 172, that this is an “interpreting translation” is probably not true. The translator would not have had need for such a faulty interpretation – especially if this reading was apparently accepted by the kaige reviser. Neither κοινωνοὺς nor חָבְר cannot be found elsewhere in Samuel–Kings.

442 Thenius, Könige, 385, interprets this as a parallel translation of the verb form ויכעיסו (“erbittern”). Because of the unusual lexical use, this should indeed probably be seen as a “true” double reading/translation (as in a later new translation that found its way into the textual tradition very early). It is not impossible either that κοινωνοὺς is due to a misreading of רעים as רעים, “friends.”

443 It is possible LaM knew the reading of Aquila here: ο´ και εποιησαν ρηματα κακα. Syrohexapla (α´ verba mala) considers Symmachus to also have been aware of the text of the MT. The Greek base text of LaM seems to have been here neither the majority text nor the Lucianic one, showing well its eclectic character.

444 Cf. Deut 12:4 MT: הֵיכֶם ˄ אֱלַיהוָה כֵּן א־תַﬠֲשׂוּן ˄; LXX: οὐ ποιήσετε οὕτως κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν.
explanation. Stade considers the LXX plus a gloss, and this is indeed the most probable option. The more implicit reference to Deuteronomy is a lectio difficilior.

Concerning the possible influence of kaige in L, there is a faint possibility that εἴδωλον as an equivalent of לִים, found in every Greek witness, is in fact revisional. Its translation as εἴδωλον is found three times in 2 Kings, while in 1 Kings לִים is once rendered with βδέλυγμα. Furthermore, the OG translation equivalent γίγνεται = εἴδωλον seems to stop simultaneously with the beginning of the kaige section, as noted by Kauhanen, which may also be taken as indirect evidence for the possible supplanting kaige equivalent of לִים = εἴδωλον. There is thus a recognizable “kaige-pattern,” albeit the evidence is quite scant. Nevertheless, a cautious suggestion is here made that L may show further influence from kaige here.

The second kaige reading may be hinted at by the double reading ἐλάτρευσαν καὶ ἔδούλευσαν of manuscripts 247 121 488. While this may be simply due to later Hebraizing, likely Hexaplaric, correction (the verb δουλεύω being closer to the semantics of the Hebrew \( \text{שֶׁבֶר} \)), \( \text{λατρεύω} \) as a translation of \( \text{שבֶר} \) can interestingly be found only in the kaige sections of Samuel-Kings. In 2 Kgs 17:16 and 21:21 there is also variation in the manuscript evidence, possibly suggesting revisions to the text. Furthermore, the semantic difference in translation is considerable, as \( \text{λατρεύω} \) is used only as a translation of serving gods in these cases, while δουλεύω is used in both kaige and non-kaige sections for serving people and gods alike. This semantic difference is attested already in the classical Greek usage. Using δουλεύω for serving gods is, however, attested many times in the kaige sections, as well.

---

445 Stade, Kings, 263.
446 As partly shown by Sepher ha-Yamim, which changes the deuteronomic reference completely; see 1.2.2.3.
447 Cf. 1 Kgs 15:12 (ἐπιτηδεύματα; translator misread עללים), 21:26 (βδέλυγμάτων); 2 Kgs 21:11, 21, 23:24. The equivalent βδέλυγμα is used by the OG translator for other cultic “abominations” as well (עלים, עלים); see Kauhanen, “Lucifer of Cagliari,” 164–5.
449 Cf. McLay, “Kaige and Septuagint Research,” 133 (#61), who lists this as one of the better-known kaige features.
450 Cf. 2 Sam 15:8; 2 Kgs 17:16, 33, 35, 21:21 (twice). This runs contrary to the attestation in Joshua, where λατρεύω is the OG rendering; see Greenspoon, Textual Studies, 312.
451 In 17:16, La as the sole witness reads servierunt. Even though there are no other attestations of possible translations of λατρεύω in La extant, servio was, on the basis of other equivalent data, probably translated from δουλεύω; cf. 1 Sam 4:9 bis, 11:1; 2 Sam 11:1; 1 Kgs 12:4, 7, 24p. In 21:21, L twice gives άδουλευσεν against ελάτρευσεν, possibly retaining the original translation.
452 LSJ (via perseus.tufts.edu), λατρεύω: “A.3. serve the gods with prayers and sacrifices”; δουλεύω, on the other hand, has no such connotations.
Therefore, if this phenomenon is indeed due to the doings of a *kaige* reviser, the revision would not have been conducted completely uniformly – as is often the case.

The evidence is not conclusive, as the translator may have simply used different translations here and there, and, more notably, this would run completely contrary to the observations of Bodine in Judges, where the noted equivalents are already differentiated by the OG translator, not the *kaige* reviser.454 However, what Bodine’s find does nevertheless indicate is the fact that a difference between the two was indeed seen and made, at least in the context of Judges. In any case, it would be quite peculiar if we had an OG variant here that only started to pop up in the *kaige* sections of Samuel–Kings. It is therefore suggested that λατρεύω as a translation of ἐρωτάσσεσθαι is indeed a true revisional, theologically more expressive, *kaige* feature in 2 Kgs.

### 2.6.4 Verse 13

There are two notable differences between the texts of the LXX and MT in this verse: unlike in the MT, where Yahweh’s commandments and statutes are to be kept “like ( …. ) the whole Torah,” in the LXX, the Torah forms only one part of the list “and (καὶ = ἦπερ) the whole law (Torah).” The receiver of the sending of the Torah is also different in the two traditions (“you” in MT, “them” in LXX).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>LXX L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְִהוָוִיָּﬠַדְתּ</td>
<td>καὶ διεμαρτύρατο Κύριος</td>
<td>καὶ διεμαρτύρατο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָֽרָﬠִים</td>
<td>τῷ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ Ἰουδα</td>
<td>τῷ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ Ἰουδα ο κύριος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּל־נְבִיאוֹ</td>
<td>ἐν χειρὶ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ,</td>
<td>ἐν χειρὶ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָלְחֵה</td>
<td>παντὸς ὁμός,</td>
<td>παντὸς ὁμός,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אל־נְבִיאוֹ</td>
<td>λέγων Αποστράφητε</td>
<td>λέγων Αποστράφητε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְּרֵכְס</td>
<td>απὸ τῶν ὄνομα ὑμῶν τῶν πονηρῶν</td>
<td>απὸ τῶν ὄνομα ὑμῶν τῶν πονηρῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁרמֹּרֻ</td>
<td>καὶ φυλάξατε</td>
<td>καὶ φυλάξατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַמִּיח</td>
<td>τὰς ἑντολὰς μου</td>
<td>τὰς ἑντολὰς μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָדְו</td>
<td>καὶ τὰ δικαίωματά μου</td>
<td>καὶ τὰ δικαίωματά μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּל־נְבִיאוֹ</td>
<td>καὶ πάντα τὸν νόμον,</td>
<td>καὶ πάντα τὸν νόμον μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַוְרֶאֶר</td>
<td>ἐν ἑνετελάμγην</td>
<td>ἐν ἑνετελάμγην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עַטְאָזֶר</td>
<td>τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν,</td>
<td>τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

454 Bodine, *Greek Text of Judges*, 28: “In the OG of Judges, the pattern seems to be that δουλεύω is used when the object is human and λατρεύω when it is divine.”

456 While the two ἐν pluses of the majority could be seen as *kaige*-like additions, the sole datives of *λυσ* are likely due to Lucianic stylizing, similar to the transposition of ὁ κύριος to the end of the phrase.

457 This plus is probably just stylistical harmonization (already in the OG Vorlage?) to the preceding sentence, “turn from the bad ἔργα (ἐργαὶ κακὸν) of yours.” Interestingly enough the same plus is also present in the Ethiopian version, which may hint this is a proto-Lucianic secondary reading. The phrase ἐν ὑμῶν (object) in the sense of guarding the statutes is somewhat common in the Hebrew Bible, but usually gets ἔργα as a complement; cf. Gen 18:19; Judg 2:22; 2 Sam 22:22; 1 Kgs 2:4, 8:25; 2 Chr 6:16; Psa 17:21, 36:34,39:2; Pr 2:8, 8:32; Job 23:11.

458 The plus μου is likely due to Lucianic harmonization.
MT: And Yahweh warned Israel and Judah in the hand of all his prophets, all seers, saying: "Turn from your bad ways and keep my commandments, my statutes, like all the Torah, which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you in the hand of my servants, the prophets."

LXX: And the Lord testified against Israel and Judah in the hand (s) of all his prophets, all seers, saying: "Turn from your bad ways and keep (+ my ways, and) my commandments, and my statutes, and all (+ my L) law, which I commanded your fathers, which I sent to them in the hand of my servants, the prophets."

Usually the Torah, which is only rarely mentioned in Kings (likely telling of the lateness of these mentions), is indeed listed only as part of the listing of given commands, as here.\(^459\) The MT seems to slightly emphasize the prestige of the Torah in comparison with other commandments, as they too are to be kept like the Torah, the principal law (similar to 1 Kgs 2:3). The slight “degradation” of the Torah in the LXX is likely more original.\(^460\)

There is also a curious difference between the MT and the LXX concerning the object of Yahweh’s commands: in the MT Yahweh sent his commandments “to you,” while in the LXX they were sent “to them” (= your fathers). The difference is small, and could well be due to harmonization to the context,\(^461\) or a simple copying mistake in either tradition (клима – אליהם). However, it is noteworthy that this change is in line with the differences seen in verse 7 (and possibly verse 9), where in La\(^115\) (~ OG) the fathers (of both Israel and Judah) were already the ones sinning.\(^462\) Here the same idea

\(^{455}\) The double reading αὐτοῖς + πρὸς ὑμᾶς 376 121 488 (=MT) is Hexaplaric, similar to the double reading given by 247 121 488 in the preceding verse.

\(^{459}\) See 1 Kgs 2:3 (LXX/καίγε τὰ γεγραμμένα seems to have read הכתובים instead of MT כַּכָּתוּב); 2 Kgs 17:34, 37. The Torah is otherwise mentioned only in 2 Kgs 10:31, 14:6, 21:8, 23:25, and as “the book of the Torah” (הַתוֹרָה) in 22:8, 11, 23:24. In 2 Kgs 21:8, however, OG has ἔντολη (ἐντολή), while νόμος (νόμος) is found only in L and Lucifer; according to Kauhanen, *Lucifer of Cagliari*, 225: “The change from “commandment” to “law” in accordance with the MT … is probably Hexaplaric ….” Overall, the mentions are likely very late “Mosaicizing” additions, and, as mentioned, at times even text-critically suspect; see Trebolle, “Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles,” 484–92. La\(^115\) alone also seems to give the Torah in a similar list-like environment in verse 15 (lex et mandata) as well.

\(^{460}\) Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 65, notes: “However, in all the various combinations of legal terms … torah is never so demoted as to be listed in parallel with those other expressions. Only in 2 Kings 17:34,37, and Josh. 22:5, is torah brought down to the level of lesser concepts like commandments, judgments, and statutes.”

\(^{461}\) Either LXX has harmonized both mentions to refer to the fathers, or MT has harmonized the suffixes to the 2.masc.pl.

\(^{462}\) Klostermann, *Könige*, 454, also sees the reading of LXX as the preferable variant. Even though the difference is only a matter of one or two letters, it has been shown that a larger redaction layer, such as the one in MT Jeremiah, similarly includes many changes of minuscule scale.
in the MT is avoided by a different suffix: even though the law was already commanded (צִוִּיתִי) to the fathers, the subsequent “sending” (תִּישָׁלַח) of the law happened to “you,” i.e., seemingly the current people of Israel and Judah, who are sinning at the very moment. The ideological content is thus ever so slightly changed: the problem in the MT concerns the disregard of later prophetical authority, while in the LXX the first Israelite generations already failed to heed the very commandments of Yahweh, and this disregard continues to this day.⁴⁶³

2.6.5 Verse 14
There are two noteworthy text-critical features in this verse: first, in the MT the sins of the Israelites are as grave (כְּ) as the fathers’, while in the LXX the sin exceeds (ὑπὲρ) that of the fathers’. Second, the large omission of 14b–15a by homoioteleuton (14b אֲבֹותָם אֲבֹותָם 15a אֲבֹותָם) in the majority Greek tradition leaves out the second part of the verse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B [+ O]</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וְלֹֽשָׁמֵ֑עוּ אֶת־ﬠָרְפָּם וַיַּקְשׁוּ כְּעֹרֶף לֹא אֲבֹותָ֔ם אֲבֹותָ֔ם אֲבֹותָ֔ם</td>
<td>καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν καὶ ἐσκλήρυναν τὸν νῶτον τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν</td>
<td>καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν καὶ ἐσκλήρυναν τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τὸν νῶτον τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν, οἱ οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MT: But they did not listen, and hardened their neck like the neck of their fathers, who did not believe in Yahweh, their God. LXX: But they did not listen, and hardened their neck over the neck of their fathers [who did not believe in Yahweh, their God. O L-] ⁴⁶⁴

Similar to verse 13, the change between MT כְּעֹרֶף and OG מְעַרְעֶף could be seen as simply accidental, but it is noteworthy that the exact same idea of sinning more than the fathers is also expressed by Jer 7:26⁴⁶⁴ and 17:23(LXX),⁴⁶⁵ which are textually so similar to this verse that there probably exists a literary dependency between them, lending support to the form of the LXX.⁴⁶⁶ As the recipient of this condemnation here is apparently Israel and Judah from the preceding verse, the LXX’s reading again raises similar questions as verses 7*a and 13 do: if Judah here also “hardens its neck over that of their fathers,” should not they too be exiled with the Israelites? The sin of

---

⁴⁶³ Nevertheless, it seems likely that verse 13b is a later addition to 13a; see 3.2.4.
⁴⁶⁴ The MT לֹא אֲבֹותָ֔ם אֲבֹותָ֔ם actually has two different sentences, while the LXX καὶ ἐσκλήρυναν τὸν νῶτον τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν has only one, as in 2 Kgs 17:14.
⁴⁶⁵ MT מְעַרְעֶף; LXX καὶ ἐσκλήρυναν τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν (= Jer 7:26).
⁴⁶⁶ Similarly Benzinger, Könige, 174: “Besser als Hebr. erscheint die Lesart der LXX …”
Judah and Israel thus becomes more lenient in the MT in comparison with the LXX, likely secondarily.

In 14b, where the majority of Greek witnesses have lost the text via homoioteleuton,\(^467\) the Lucianic and Hexaplaric witnesses are identical, heavily indicating that this is indeed a Hexaplaric addition in \(L\).\(^468\)

### 2.6.6 Verse 15

#### 2.6.6.1 Assessment of the witnesses

The beginning of the verse is lacking in most of the Greek manuscript tradition. This is likely due to a somewhat lengthy homoioteleuton mistake, starting from 14b \(אֲבֹותָּם\) to 15a \(אֲבֹותָּם\). However, quite perplexingly, \(L, O,\) and \(L_{115}\) give three differing translations of this omitted portion. How should these readings be accounted for, and what is the relationship of these three witnesses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B + [Aquila]</th>
<th>(L)</th>
<th>(L_{115})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִּמְאַ֣מוּ וּאֶת־חֻקָּ֗יו</td>
<td>[καὶ ἀπερρίφαν]</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπώσαντο</td>
<td>et dereliquerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ</td>
<td>καὶ τὴν διακοιμάτα</td>
<td>δὲ διέδει</td>
<td>λέγει εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּרַא</td>
<td>δὲ διαμαρτύρατο</td>
<td>δὲ διαμαρτύρατο</td>
<td>quae disposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>patrie eorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תָּבֹא</td>
<td>יִד</td>
<td>יד</td>
<td>et testimonia eius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָבֹאֵית</td>
<td>בָּם</td>
<td>בָּם</td>
<td>quib testificatus est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מֵאָבֹוּ</td>
<td>אַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>אַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>in eis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּלְכוּ</td>
<td>יִם</td>
<td>ים</td>
<td>et ambulaverunt post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַהֶבֶל</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>uana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֶּהְבָּלֵו</td>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td>et euamuerunt(^471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>et post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַגּוֹיִם</td>
<td>יִד</td>
<td>יד</td>
<td>gètes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּרִיתוֹ</td>
<td>הֵﬠִ</td>
<td>הֵﬠִ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תָּבֹא</td>
<td>יִד</td>
<td>יד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּלְכוּ</td>
<td>יִם</td>
<td>ים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַהֶבֶל</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֶּהְבָּלֵו</td>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַגּוֹיִם</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>הֵﬠִ</td>
<td>הֵﬠִ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּרִיתוֹ</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶת</td>
<td>בָּ֑ם</td>
<td>בָּ֑ם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲבֹותָ֔ם</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td>אֵאֲבֹסַּו</td>
<td>אֵאֲבֹסַּו</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּלְכוּ</td>
<td>יִם</td>
<td>ים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַהֶבֶל</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֶּהְבָּלֵו</td>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַגּוֹיִם</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>הֵﬠִ</td>
<td>הֵﬠִ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּרִיתוֹ</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶת</td>
<td>בָּ֑ם</td>
<td>בָּ֑ם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲבֹותָ֔ם</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td>אֵאֲבֹסַּו</td>
<td>אֵאֲבֹסַּו</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּלְכוּ</td>
<td>יִם</td>
<td>ים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַהֶבֶל</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֶּהְבָּלֵו</td>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td>וְאַחֲרֵי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַגּוֹיִם</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>הֵﬠִ</td>
<td>הֵﬠִ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּרִיתוֹ</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td>אֲשֶׁר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶת</td>
<td>בָּ֑ם</td>
<td>בָּ֑ם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲבֹותָ֔ם</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td>וְאֵת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְוֹתָ֔יו</td>
<td>אֵאֲבֹסַּו</td>
<td>אֵאֲבֹסַּו</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{467}\) While it is possible that a very early intra-Greek homoioteleuton mistake \(αὐτῶν\) took place in verse 14, it is more likely that the mistake already happened in the Hebrew; see the analysis of verse 15 below.

\(^{468}\) Thus also Šanda, \(Könige, 221\): “… in A L wieder nachträglich eingefügt.” Although there are not many different ways to translate “who did not believe in the Lord their God” in Greek, and nothing in the text speaks strictly for a Hexaplaric origin, the similarity is so striking that this agreement is easiest to see as Hexaplaric; similarly Torijano, “How Much Hexaplaric,” 74, although he rightly ponders the question of where this plus indeed does come from.

\(^{469}\) Elsewhere in Samuel–Kings \(κόπτω\) is used only in the meaning “to hit; to mourn,” unlike here (“making a covenant”); cf. 1 Sam 25:1, 28:3; 2 Sam 1:12, 3:31, 5:20, 24, 11:26; 1 Kgs 5:20 bis, 25, 11:15, 12:24m, 13:30, 31; 2 Kgs 19:23. Therefore this is another good mark of Hexaplaric material.

\(^{470}\) This plus \(τῶν ἱδιῶν\) is only found in \(L\)\(^{93}\)–\(^{700}\) \(460\), which would seem to indicate a Lucianic plus. This is also argued by Schenker, \(Une Bible, 159\), who considers this a harmonization towards the more usual formulation. This is likely the case, and \(L\) here probably harmonizes towards Deut 6:14, which may originally have worked as the inspiration for 2 Kgs 17:15 as well.

\(^{471}\) The reading of \(L\)\(^3\) is again not of much help here: \(Et abierunt post vanam et supervacuum, et facti sunt vani et supervacui\). \(L\)\(^3\) only adds \(et supervacua\) (“useless, redundant”) and \(et supervacui\), respectively. These additions may be simply interpretational, or, more probably, new translations added as double
Before delving deeper into the relationship between the three extant witnesses in 15a, two possible *kaige* influences in *L* need to be assessed. First, ἀπώσαντο as an equivalent of ἃνεγνωμένος, “to reject,” may be a *kaige* feature. The usual translation of ἃνεγνωμένος in Samuel-Kings is ἐξουδένεω, which, however, changes to ἀποθέω in 2 Kings, appearing three times.⁴⁷２ As Muraoka notes, this may be simply a translational or stylistic variant, “but their clear-cut distribution is remarkable,” the feature likely coming from a Hebraizing reviser.⁴⁷³ *Laⁱ¹⁵* does not help us onwards, as we cannot ascertain its base text here.⁴⁷⁴ If this reading in *L* is indeed taken as a real *kaige* reading, and not coming from Theodotion or Symmachus, for instance, this would have very interesting text-historical repercussions. Second, as already mentioned, ὑπολειπόμεθα as a translation of ἁπατᾷ seems to be a *kaige* feature as well.⁴⁷⁵

---

readings to the text. Using *supervacuo* as a translation of μάταιος is attested three times even in *Laⁱ¹⁵* (1 Kgs 16:2, 13, 26). In any case, there is not much weight to be given to these readings.

⁴⁷² In 1 Sam 8:7, 10:19 (*sprevistis Laⁱ¹⁵*), 15:23, 26, 16:1, 7. As a plus vis-à-vis MT in 1 Sam 15:9 (ἐξουδενομένον ἐξουδέθηκεν), 2 Sam 6:16 (ἐξουδενομένος, < ἀπερριψομένος, < ἢπετέος); ἀποθέο is found here and in 2 Kgs 17:20, 23:27. According to Reider & Turner, *Index to Aquila*, 30, the equivalent ἀποθέοτητα = ὁ ἀπερριψαν is once attributed to Aquila and Symmachus.

⁴⁷³ Muraoka, “Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings,” 41, 44. Muraoka notes that ἀποθέω is the most common translation of ἃνεγνωμένος in the LXX overall.

⁴⁷⁴ Only in 1 Kgs 12:8 is *derelinquor* used elsewhere (ἐκοπατηθέων). No passages with ἀποθέω are extant.

⁴⁷⁵ In 2 Sam 17:12, Laⁱ¹⁵ also reads *reliquemus* for ὑπολειπόμενος. The Greek base of Laⁱ¹⁵ thus may well have been different from *O L*.

⁴⁷⁶ See 2.5.1.
The text of La\textsuperscript{115} has some interesting lexical traits as well, as it reads \textit{legē eius et mandata} \textsuperscript{476} eius, “his law and his commands,” against \textit{διαθήκην αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ δικαίωματά}, “his covenant and his statutes.” As Schenker points out, at least \textit{lex} (“law”) may not translate \textit{διαθήκη} (רִבְיוֹן), but rather \textit{νόμος} (תּוֹרָה).\textsuperscript{477} Indeed, \textit{lex} is an unusual translation of \textit{διαθήκη}, which is normally translated with \textit{testamentum} in La\textsuperscript{115}.\textsuperscript{478} The use of different words may be due to natural fluctuation of the translational variants, although both the usually literal translation technique and the semantic range of these two being quite different indeed points to a differing Greek base text. The exact phrase \textit{disposo testamentum} is also used in 2 Sam 10:19,\textsuperscript{479} showing that this phrase was indeed known and used by the Latin translator, and would therefore be expected here as well, had the exemplar been similar to L.

However, רִבְיוֹן as the object of הָכַם would be very unusual, and cannot be found elsewhere. This problem culminates with \textit{disposuit}: is this a translation of \textit{דַּיְאֵתָּה} (*רִבְיוֹן)? In nine cases out of ten this is the case,\textsuperscript{480} but in 2 Sam 17:23 La\textsuperscript{115} seems to have used \textit{disposo} as a rendering of \textit{ἐντέλλω}, “to command,” which is the most common rendering of רָכֲב in the LXX.\textsuperscript{481} Therefore there is a slight chance that the \textit{Vorlage} behind the Greek exemplar of La\textsuperscript{115} had not רָכֲב, but a much more common רֵא as the complement of הָכַם.\textsuperscript{482} However, positing that \textit{disposuit} indeed ultimately translates רָכֲב here, Schenker considers \textit{lex} (*תּוֹרָה) a \textit{lectio difficilior}, and therefore more original,\textsuperscript{483} but this reasoning is too simplistic from the methodological perspective – and possibly not even necessary since La\textsuperscript{115} here might be ultimately translating a Greek text that had the Hebrew verb רָכֲב as its \textit{Vorlage}.

\textsuperscript{476} About \textit{mandata} not much can be said, as it only appears here in all of La\textsuperscript{115}’s text. It is not impossible, though, that here it translates the \textit{kaige} reading δικαίωμα, or the OG πρόσταγμα, but neither of these possibilities can be confirmed.

\textsuperscript{477} Schenker, \textit{Une Bible}, 160. In Samuel–Kings, רָכֲב is always translated as νόμος; cf. 2 Sam 7:19; 1 Kgs 2:3; 2 Kgs 10:31, 14:6, 17:13, 34, 37, 22:8, 11, 23:24, 25. For 2 Kgs 21:8, see note 459 above.

\textsuperscript{478} The Greek word διαθήκη is translated in La\textsuperscript{115} by \textit{testamentum} four times; cf. 1 Sam 11:1, 2; 2 Sam 5:3, 10:19 (with L, against the majority text and MT). One would thus expect it to be given here as well. The word \textit{lex}, however, cannot be found elsewhere in the text of La\textsuperscript{115}. Interestingly, in 2 Kgs 10:31, where other witnesses read רָכֲב/ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου, La\textsuperscript{115} alone gives in uiam domini, “in the way of the Lord.” The difference is in two letters only (ΕΝΝΟΜΩ ~ ΕΝΟΔΩ), so this may simply be due to textual corruption. Either way, this “attestation” does not help us any further.

\textsuperscript{479} La\textsuperscript{115} agrees with L in an OG reading in 2 Sam 10:19: ηὐτομόλησαν διέθεντο διαθήκην Bmg L.


\textsuperscript{481} The usual rendering of εντέλλω in La\textsuperscript{115} is \textit{praecipio}; cf. 2 Sam 4:12, *25 (pre|...), 11:19, 13:28, 29, 17:14, 18:5; 1 Kgs 13:21. Only in the case of 2 Kgs 17:15 is the translation different.

\textsuperscript{482} Elsewhere in Num 19:2, 31:21; Deut 33:4; Josh 1:7 (> LXX), 22:5; 2 Kgs 14:6, 17:34, 21:8 (> OG); 1 Chr 16:40; 2 Chr 25:4, 33:8; Ps 78:5; Neh 8:1, 14, 9:14; Mal 3:24.

\textsuperscript{483} Schenker, \textit{Une Bible}, 160.
The relation of L and Aquila’s text (O) in this verse is a tricky one, and depends to a certain degree on the conclusions made about verse 14 and the possibility of a homoioteleuton in the Greek text. As Torijano notes, L could simply smooth out the grammar and uncommon lexical variants of the Hexaplaric text. Torijano concludes that the L text indeed has some Hebraizing flavor, but that “its source was not the Hexaplaric recension as it has reached us.” Arguably, however, the only “Hexaplaric” feature of L is indeed the fact that it too gives any text here. By this logic La115, which appears to further differ from both O and L, could also be somehow Hexaplaric here. Could the text not have just been added by some other Hebraizing revision (for instance Theodotion) since there seems to be some kaige flavor to its lexical variants? Or could this not even be a remnant of OG or a text form close to it? These matters will be analyzed in 2.6.6.3 below.

2.6.6.2 Is there a literary link between verse 7*b and the hinge-point of verses 14–15?

Trebolle marks a further curious – according to him also literary-critically relevant – phenomenon in verse 15: here the vast majority of Greek manuscripts have a plus οὐκ ἐφύλαξαν (“they did not guard/preserve”) against the MT. Only manuscripts B L 460 and La115 do not have this plus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15abα MT</th>
<th>15abα LXX B</th>
<th>15abα L</th>
<th>15abα La115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀπερρίφαν τοὺς ακριβασμοὺς αυτῶν καὶ τὴν διαθήκην αὐτῶν ἐκοψαν τοῦ πατρασιν auton O 121 488] καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτῶν, ὑπὸ διεμαρτύρατο αὐτῶις, οἴκ ἔφυλαξαν καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ματαίων καὶ ἔματαιώθησαν...</td>
<td>15 καὶ απωσαντο τὴν διαθήκην αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα ἐδιέτει τοῦ πατρασιν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτῶις δια διεμαρτύρατο αὐτῶις, &gt; καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ματαίων καὶ ἔματαιώθησαν...</td>
<td>15 et dereliquerunt legē eius et mandata eius quae disposit patreb eorum et testimonia eius quib testificatus est in eis &gt; et ambulaverunt post uana et euanauerunt...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Trebolle, this occurrence of οὐκ ἐφύλαξαν in the middle of the verse marks a literary seam between verses 14 and 15 and shows a vestige of the earlier OG order (= La115) and text in the verse and its original context. The plus would then

484 Torijano, “How Much Hexaplaric,” 74. It is nevertheless hard to say what Torijano means by “the Antiochian text seems to be more Hexaplaric-like than the Hexaplaric text itself.”
486 Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 220.
confirm the authenticity of La\textsuperscript{115}’s similar reading in 7*b (non custodierunt) and that the text of 7*ab indeed originally directly preceded the text of verse 15, as now happens in La\textsuperscript{115}.\textsuperscript{488} As “their fathers” and the “testimonies” are also addressed both here and in 7*b, Trebolle argues that the Greek majority text must have been at least in some contact with a Greek text form similar to 7*b of La\textsuperscript{115}.\textsuperscript{489}

There are some difficulties with this idea, however. The plus is also wanting in L, and a simple accidental omission of the words is not very likely. This alone is naturally no argument for the greater originality of the minus – the minus could be due to the possible Hebraizing, even Hexaplaric, nature of L in 15a. However, L is, with La\textsuperscript{115} and some Hexaplaric manuscripts, the only witness to also give the beginning part of verse 15. Furthermore, since all the manuscripts (except for B) that lack 15αε also have the plus οὐκ ἔφυλαξαν, these phenomena are probably linked.\textsuperscript{490} As the MT has preserved the text of 15α as a whole, but not the Greek plus οὐκ ἔφυλαξαν (* לא נשמרו), this starts to seem like a solely intra-Greek addition.\textsuperscript{491}

And indeed, when the corrupted Greek majority text is examined more closely, it can be seen that the text of the LXX in verses 14–15 is in fact grammatically (and otherwise) hard to understand without the plus οὐκ ἔφυλαξαν: “And they did not listen, and hardened their necks over the necks of their fathers, and his testimonies that he testified to them [+ they did not guard]. And they walked after vanities ….” It is clear that the text needed some emending after the haplography had happened, and as φυλάσσω (v. 13) is, apart from ἀκούω, the latest verb used in connection with (not) taking heed of Yahweh’s commandments, it would be no wonder that exactly this verb would have been added here at some point.\textsuperscript{492} The phenomenon is thus due to free copying.

Furthermore, it is also probable that the word preceptum (v. 7*b, La\textsuperscript{115}) was not used to translate μαρτύριον, as Trebolle suggests,\textsuperscript{493} but ἐντολή. The customary Latin translation of μαρτύριον and its cognates is testimonium, though the attestations in

\textsuperscript{488} Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2–23,” 219–22.
\textsuperscript{489} Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2–23,” 220–1.
\textsuperscript{490} The manuscripts O 127 328 121 488 158, which give the full text (15α) in some form and also attest the plus “οὐκ ἔφυλαξαν,” can be adequately explained by the influence of the majority text’s reading on these manuscripts.
\textsuperscript{491} Manuscript 127 accordingly gives this plus inside an obelos.
\textsuperscript{492} The same line of argument is presented by Stade, Kings, 264 and Becking, Ondergang, 173.
\textsuperscript{493} Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2–23,” 220: “The verb is part of the same sentence, καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια ... οὐκ ἔφυλαξαν / non custodierunt praecepta.”
La\textsuperscript{115} are again too rare to base any definite claims on.\textsuperscript{494} This lexical difference makes the proposed link between verses 7*b and 15a even less apparent.

While it is indeed possible that parts of the readings of verse 7*b of La\textsuperscript{115} (= OG) have now, for whatever reason, been buried in the middle of verse 15, this seems somewhat unlikely. Therefore, the attestation of οὐκ ἔφυλαξαν in the Greek witnesses is not a case of a literary-critically important “element that encloses the second block of the text” as Trebolle puts it, but due to secondary intra-Greek development.\textsuperscript{495}

\textbf{2.6.6.3 The minus of 15a in LXX – relationships of the three LXX text forms}

One of the biggest challenges concerning the textual development of verse 15a of the LXX is the fact that not even the \textit{kaige} revision has supplemented the missing text. If the text was missing already in the OG, and the homoioteleuton did not happen in Greek, one would expect the text to have then been added already by \textit{kaige}, and not only at a very late stage by Aquila, as now is the case.\textsuperscript{496} This problem becomes even more challenging when the likely \textit{kaige} features of \textit{L} in this verse (ὑπωθέω, δικαίωμα) are taken into account: Is \textit{L} here the only witness preserving the \textit{kaige} text? Did the homoioteleuton happen in Greek (14b αὐτῶν 2°…αὐτῶν 15a) after all? If it indeed did, how should the full text of La\textsuperscript{115} be accounted for? In any case it is quite clear that 15a must have originally been part of the OG \textit{Vorlage} since the omission leaves the text grammatically awkward and forces most manuscripts to add an additional verbal construct οὐκ ἔφυλαξαν to the sentence as argued above.

There are three possible ways to deal with the relationship of the three Greek witnesses:

1) \textit{L} \textsuperscript{La\textsubscript{115}} = OG;
2) \textit{B} = OG, in which case \textit{L} \textsuperscript{La\textsubscript{115}} = \textit{kaige}/Hexaplaric; or
3) \textit{La\textsubscript{115}} = OG, in which case \textit{L} = ~ OG/\textit{kaige}/Hexaplaric.

\textsuperscript{494} See 1 Sam 9:24 (\textit{testimonium}); and \textit{testimonia}, \textit{testificatus est} (ἀδειμαρτύρατο) in this verse.
\textsuperscript{495} Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 221. This is a good example for showing that what has previously been called “text-critical” method should, already from a work-efficiency viewpoint, be considered before the larger literary-critical argumentation is commenced.
\textsuperscript{496} It is often noted by scholars that the haplography is due to a homoioteleuton between two occurrences of אֲבֹותָם in verses 14 and 15; see Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 221 and Rahlfs, \textit{Lukians Rezension}, 245. However, such a mistake can happen naturally only in Hebrew, which would imply that the homoioteleuton must have happened already at the transmission stage of the \textit{Vorlage} of the OG (which is, however, not seemingly indicated by Trebolle). The plus of \textit{L} \textsuperscript{La\textsubscript{115}} would thus in any case be harmonization towards the MT.
In the first two cases, La\textsuperscript{115} would most probably be a proto-Lucianic or, especially in the second option, possibly even a truly Lucianic recensional witness. The main question pertains to the stage at which the omission happened – in Greek or already in Hebrew?

In the first option, the readings ἀπώσαντο and δικαιώματά in L in 15\textalpha are not kaige readings, in which case the text of L could be seen as approximately OG with La\textsuperscript{115}. The omission may have happened through a homoioteleuton in Greek. The proto-Lucianic manuscript tradition could well have survived this seemingly very early mistake.

A problem with this alternative arises, however, with the fact that otherwise only the Hexaplaric manuscripts have supplemented this text, and even they from Aquila. Why did kaige – or, apparently, any other Hebraizing revision – not already add this text? Was the text missing from the (proto-)MT Vorlage of kaige as well?\textsuperscript{497} If this was indeed the case, the minus could also be due to kaige, which secondarily omitted the OG portion of the text not found in its Hebrew Vorlage.\textsuperscript{498}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{diagram.png}
\caption{Diagram illustrating the text transmission and possible sources.}
\end{figure}

In the second option, proposing the majority text and its minus as OG, L could be seen as a revision of a Hexaplaric text or reflecting some other unpreserved Hebraizing revision. The text was dropped via homoioteleuton already in the Hebrew Vorlage of the OG. In this case the few other witnesses, including La\textsuperscript{115}, would be giving a later Hebraizing text. The text of L, with its probable kaige influences, could come from

\textsuperscript{497} A somewhat similar case is 1 Kgs 22:47–50 (completely a kaige text; OG, likely represented by L, lacks verses 41–51), which is missing from the majority text but supplemented to A from Aquila. Why were these verses apparently not yet added by kaige? These cases are also similar in that both have a considerable transposition of material; see Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 6–9. Was this text missing from the Vorlage of kaige? Could this also be the case here?\textsuperscript{498} In such a case, L would have gotten its text – or at least some parts of it – from a Hebraizing revision such as Theodotion or Symmachus whose texts are no longer preserved. La\textsuperscript{115} might then follow this (proto-)Lucianic trait. However, although kaige is known to omit text, such long minuses are quite rare, albeit not unheard of.
either kaige or “Lucianized” Aquila, although if the text was from kaige proper, one would once again also expect to see the text in the B-text. Therefore, it would be more natural to see L as giving a Hexaplaric text, which was changed quite extensively by the Lucianic revisers.

In any case, the problem of non-existent kaige texts is again present: why was the B-text not supplemented? Did the reviser make the same, quite unlikely, mistake as the putative Vorlage of the OG? Or was the text for some reason not found in the (proto-)MT either? It is not completely impossible either that there was a further Greek homoioteleuton shortly after kaige that dropped the text again, but none of these scenarios seem very probable. Furthermore, taking into account that La¹¹⁵ has very little Lucianic (and no Hexaplaric) material in its text of Kings, it is very questionable, although not totally impossible,⁴⁹⁹ that it would give such a long Lucianic plus that was, no less, originally taken over from the Hexapla.

Moreover, if L were to be taken to represent (alone) a kaige text, this would make the textual history of the passage quite complex: La¹¹⁵ possibly as the sole witness to a proto-Lucianic text (OG?), L as later Hebraizing revision, and a Hexaplaric text as the latest addition. Also, at a very early point the text would have been dropped from the majority text’s line, as otherwise the lack of the passage and its supplementation in A with Aquila’s text would make little sense.

There is yet a third option. It should be noted that in La¹¹⁵ the text of verses 14b–15aa could not have dropped in the same way it may have in other witnesses,⁵⁰⁰ as the text of verse 15 is given already after verse 7ªb, not 14. The same homoioteleuton mistakes

---

⁴⁹⁹ Moreover, the true recensional Lucianic influences in La¹¹⁵ are otherwise on the scale of several words at best, not full verses. For a discussion of this very sporadic stratum of secondary (proto-)Lucianic readings, see 1.2.2.2.

⁵⁰⁰ The order of the text in La¹¹⁵ is 17:1–6.7ªab.15–19.9ª[–14ª.20ª.21–23ª].
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are still possible, as 7*b ends in the words patrum suorum/πατέρων αὐτῶν/*אבותם, but they would have taken off only the text of 15aa, not 14b. Such an omission is only possible in MT/LXX. Presuming that verses 15–19 were indeed at some point moved after 9–14 in MT/LXX, the actual act of transposition to the new position could also well have prompted, already in Hebrew, an accidental omission of verses 14b–15a, which lay at the exact hinge-point of this putative change.

The change of order in Greek would probably have been carried out at the stage of the kaige revision. The omission of 14b–15a could have already been in the Hebrew Vorlage of kaige, or the kaige reviser may have mistakenly omitted the text by parablepsis. The omission may also have happened by some mishap in the process of transposition. The text of L could then be either kaige, otherwise Hebraizing, or Hexaplaric, though the latter does seem more likely when the case of verse 14b is taken into account. Of course, if the text of L is ruled as (at least partly) kaige, this could run somewhat contrary to this theory: the omission, in Greek, would have needed to have happened relatively early in the manuscript tradition after the work of kaige. It is also possible that L, as is often the case, in fact preserves to a certain degree the OG text, albeit in a slightly corrupted form (mixed text type of L). Indeed, the Hebraizing change of order would have probably been made independently by the Lucianic reviser in any case.

In any case, this theory could, at least to some extent, explain the lack of text in the Greek majority manuscript tradition: the omission may have happened, probably accidentally, at the kaige stage, or rather, at the stage of the Hebraizing change of order of the narrative blocks. If the order of the narratives of La115 is seen as OG, this would support the option at hand: because the kaige reviser had to adapt the text order to that of the MT, it would not be impossible that in the process some of the text at the very seam of this transposing action dropped off.
Conclusions: In the case of the Greek verse 15 it seems that there are only problematic options when it comes to reconstructing the textual history of the passage – very likely we are missing some essential part(s) of the textual evolution of the Greek text (and possibly even of the MT). As such, all three cases have their pros and cons, although option 2 with its complexity may be ruled out as the most improbable.

Since the text of L here may well be – as is quite often the case (see for this especially 2.6.10) – a composite of different text historical layers, option 3 appears in many ways preferable. L could thus simply preserve in 15a a slightly Hebraized (Symmachus/Theodotion) OG text in a secondary location. This synthesis would solve some key problems, and allow some leeway for different text-transmissional possibilities, even if still suggesting quite a complicated textual history – though the history of this passage seems to have been very complicated in any case.

2.6.7 Verse 16

There are two noteworthy phenomena in this verse. First, La 115 transierunt may not translate ἐγκατέλιπον, but some other Greek verb. Second, La 115 agrees with the Greek majority reading by reading Asherim in the plural against the singular of MT/L.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>La 115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיַּﬠַזְב֗וּ אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹת יְהוָהֵ֔ם</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησαν ἐαυτοῖς</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγκατέλιπον</td>
<td>et transierunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יַשׂוּם מַסֵּכָה</td>
<td>χώνευμα</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησαν</td>
<td>omnes503 praeceptum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דָּוָאָלָיָהּ</td>
<td>δύο βαμάλεις,</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησαν</td>
<td>dimi dei sui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָשְׁתָם</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησαν</td>
<td>et fecerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְשָׁרִים</td>
<td>ἐξαρτύνονται</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησαν</td>
<td>lucos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִזְיוֹת</td>
<td>καὶ προσεκύνησαν</td>
<td>καὶ προσεκύνησαν</td>
<td>et adorauerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּלִיוֹת בְּלִיוֹת</td>
<td>πάση τῇ δυνάμει</td>
<td>πάση τῇ στρατιᾷ502</td>
<td>toto exercitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כַּשְׁרַשְׁר</td>
<td>τοῦ κύριοῦ</td>
<td>τοῦ κύριοῦ</td>
<td>caeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּל־לָהֶם</td>
<td>καὶ ἐδάφευσαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐδάφευσαν</td>
<td>et servierunt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

501 The plural seems like a Lucianic harmonization of the number of objects, the two calves. The respective plural reading of La 115 may be (proto-)Lucianic, but, more probably, La 115 harmonizes the number independently. 502 L, with La 115 and a plethora of Greek manuscripts, preserves the OG reading here. The Kaige revision changed the translation of πάση from OG στρατιά to δύναμις. This change can be evidenced multiple times in the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr), the prime example of a kaige type text; see Tov, Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 132–3, 149, 154, 157. 503 La 115 is here somehow corrupt, as omnes (pl.) and praeceptum (sg.) are grammatically incompatible – the plural is to be emended as omne, as suggested by Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 87, and followed by Schenker, Une Bible, 161–2. This plus is probably due to a copying mistake in Greek (ΤΑΣ ~ ΠΑΣ).
And they forsook the commandments of Yahweh, their God, and made themselves a molten image, two calves. And they made Asherah, groves, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served Baal.

The verb *transseo* “to go over/across, transgress” is usually used in La to translate διαβαίνω or δι-/παρέρχομαι,504 while ἐνκαταλείπω, “to leave behind, abandon” is once rendered by *derelinguo*, and the shorter καταλείπω once by *relinquo* and once by *remitto*.505 It is possible that the Latin translator has translated ἐνκαταλείπω somewhat freely here, since even *transeo* transmits clearly enough the basic meaning of the text: the Israelites did not obey the commandments of Yahweh. On the other hand, it can also be argued that the phrase of La was not translated from the majority text’s ἐνκαταλείπω, but from παραβαίνω/παρέρχομαι.506 If this difference went back to Hebrew, as may well have been the case, the *Vorlage* was probably not ברם, but רכש.507 The difference is not great, and could even be argued to be due to a copying mistake in Hebrew, but the meaning indeed becomes ideologically slightly different: instead of completely “abandoning” the statutes, the Israelites simply “transgressed them.” As a condemnation this could be seen as more lenient than that of the MT. It is also noteworthy that the LXX lacks the MT plus כל (“all the statutes”), which Montgomery sees as similarly “softening the indictment” of Israel.508 However, as noted in the case of verse 7*, such a more lenient condemnation of Israel could conversely very well be the more original statement. The plus of כל in the MT also seems like a small independent scribal addition.509 The Septuagint majority text is therefore to be preferred here.

---

504 Cf. 1 Sam 2:5 (παρήκαν), 9:27 (διελθέτω), 14:23 (διήλθην); 2 Sam 10:17 (διέβη), 17:16 (καὶ γε διαβαίνων σπέας); 22 (transiens transit), 21 (διάβητα), 22 (transiebant + pertransi = διαβαίνει + διαβαίνει), 24 (διέβην); 1 Kgs 18:29 (παρῆλθεν); 2 Kgs 6:9 (παρελθεῖν διέβη). See also 2 Sam 17:20 (pertransierunt = παρῆλθαν).

505 Cf. 2 Sam 5:21 (remiserunt); 1 Kgs 12:8 (derelinquit).

506 Similarly Schenker, *Une Bible*, 160. Overall, διαβαίνω and δι-/παρέρχομαι are the two most common Greek equivalents of verbal רכש in the LXX.

507 Schenker, *Une Bible*, 160.


509 Similarly Stade, *Kings*, 264: “> S, and this omission is right.” Such additions of כל are recurrent in the scribal transmission. It is possible that a similar independent addition of omnes in La has happened in the Latin/Greek transmission process, since such a small-scale Hebraizing correction towards the MT would otherwise be very perplexing to be found here in La. More likely this is just a copying error however; see note 503 above.
On the changing number of the Asherim (plural in LXX/La\textsuperscript{115}, singular in MT/L\textsuperscript{510}), Schenker argues that the singular reading adds to the sin of Israel more than the plural: while the making of cult objects (Asherim) is bad, it is even worse to have Israelites make “(an) Ashera,” a goddess in her own right, similar to Baal at the end of the verse.\textsuperscript{511} At the same time the singular also makes the apposition of the deities Ashera and Baal clearer in the passage.\textsuperscript{512} It has been further marked by Hugo that this change from plural אֲשֵׁרִים to singular אֲשֵׁירָה in the MT is not a completely unique occurrence but may indeed be a broader revisional characteristic of the MT.\textsuperscript{513} Redaction-critically speaking, however, it is more likely for the singular to be original since in the later stages of the nomistic editing the plural understanding of Ashera as a simple cultic object (the same also happens with “Baalim”) becomes more prevalent.\textsuperscript{514} The Greek plural could here even be a slight translational change.

### 2.6.8 Verse 17

In this verse La\textsuperscript{115} differs quite notably from the majority text.\textsuperscript{515} Curiously, L again agrees partly with La\textsuperscript{115}’s readings, hinting at the proto-Lucianic origins of the text of La\textsuperscript{115}. Most notably, they both add to the list of Israel’s sins “and they made ephod and teraphim,” to which La\textsuperscript{115} likely erroneously further adds “and took auspices” (et augurabantur) in place of “and they sold themselves.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>La\textsuperscript{115}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיַּﬠֲבִירוּ</td>
<td>καὶ διῆγαν</td>
<td>καὶ διήγαγον</td>
<td>et perducebant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶת־בְּנֵיהֶם</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτῶν</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτῶν</td>
<td>filios suos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֶת־בְּנוֹתֵיהֶם</td>
<td>καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας</td>
<td>καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας</td>
<td>et filias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּאֵ֔שׁ</td>
<td>αὐτῶν ἐν πυρὶ,</td>
<td>αὐτῶν ἐν πυρὶ</td>
<td>suas in igni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיְנַחֵ֑שׁו</td>
<td>καὶ συνενεύοντο</td>
<td>καὶ συνενεύοντο</td>
<td>et divinabant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καִὶ</td>
<td>μαντεῖαι</td>
<td>μαντεῖαι</td>
<td>divinationes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיִּקְסְמ</td>
<td>καὶ συνενεύοντο</td>
<td>καὶ συνενεύοντο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיִּקְסָמ</td>
<td>καִὶ</td>
<td>καִיני</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{510} It is interesting to note that L is here the only Greek witness to give the singular. Is this a true Hebraizing/Hexaplaric reading (possibly from α´ και ἐποιησαν ἀλσος) or simply some sort of Lucianic change (possibly harmonization towards the singular in verse 10)?

\textsuperscript{511} Schenker, Une Bible, 161.

\textsuperscript{512} Schenker, Une Bible, 161.

\textsuperscript{513} Hugo, Deux Visages, 270–6. Similarly Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 31–33. The difference MT sg. vs. LXX pl. can be found in four passages: 1 Kgs 18:19 (but see 18:22, where only L gives a plural form against the sg. Of the LXX, and which is not found in the MT); 2 Kgs 13:6 (the singular is likely harmonization towards 1 Kgs 16:33; L preserves the original plural), 18:4, 21:3. In 23:4 (ἅλση) ἅλση 247 313 799 107 488; τη ἁσερωθ L 460 = Asera Luc), 6 (ἅλσος) + τη(ς) σαρπη Λ 158 460), L has a curious Hebraizing/transcribed form of the Hebrew plural (understood by L as a singular), differing from the rest of the traditions, which Kauhanen, Lucifer of Cagliari, 294, deems Lucianic.

\textsuperscript{514} See Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings,” 145–6, 150. As this mention is also an allusion to the sins of Manasseh (2 Kgs 21:3) and Ahab (1 Kgs 16:33), the singular is more likely to be the original.

\textsuperscript{515} This section has previously been published in a shortened form as part of an article; see Tekoniemi, “Between Two Differing Editions.”
It is quite clear that the plus of $L$ and La$^{115}$ is not a result of some textual mishap, at least a typographical one. We are most probably dealing with a literary variant between the MT and the OG.$^{520}$ When noted by commentators, the most common explanation for this plus is that this mention was a gloss-like addition made in the LXX, either at the level of OG or some later copying stage.$^{521}$ The addition would have been made for the purpose of adding even more sins to the already lengthy listing
in verses 7–17. The addition would have not been made haphazardly since both the *ephod* and *teraphim* are indeed at times used in divinatory practices. The plus thus continues the list of illicit divinatory cult practices quite organically.

However, some scholars have also seen this plus as part of the original text. As Schenker notes, it is actually not that clear whether “making *ephod* and *teraphim*” is actually a *sin* in itself: at least *ephod* was quite clearly considered part of the legitimate cult and it is nowhere denounced as such. The *teraphim*, on the other hand, are more often seen as a form of idolatry. Therefore, on one hand it would be quite understandable to have the sinful Israelites also “make *teraphim*,” as they clearly at least at some point came to be seen as idolatrous devices. On the other hand, making an *ephod* does not seem like a good sin (or sin at all) to add to the list. Conversely, why would *teraphim* have been taken out of the text if they worked so well in the context? Were they indeed simply added in the OG or its Hebrew *Vorlage* as a gloss of sorts, possibly to increase the sinfulness of the Israelites?

---

522 It could even be that this addition was made as a partial harmonization to the phrase found in 2 Kgs 21:6 (καὶ οἰωνίζετο καὶ ἐποίησεν θελητὴν), but in that case the editor would have made an extremely bad job of his “harmonization” attempt – and, moreover, towards a *kaige* text, since L preserves the OG reading (καὶ οἰωνίζετο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐγγαστριμύθους) in this verse; see Kauhanen, *Lucifer of Cagliari*, 218–19.

523 Ephod is used for “asking Yahweh” in 1 Sam 23:9–12 (LXX lacks verse 12), 30:7–8, and is in Exodus often mentioned in connection with the breast-plate where Urim and Thummim were positioned (Ex 25:7, 28:4, 15, 28 (> LXX), 29:5, 35:9, 27, 39:8, 21). Teraphim are used for divination in Ezek 21:21; and possibly Zech 10:2. Teraphim are also mentioned together with ephod in Judg 17:5, 18:14, 17, 18, 20; Hos 3:4 (different in LXX).


525 Schenker, *Une Bible*, 162–3: “On aurait donc deux fois, en 2 Rois 17,17 et 2 Rois 23,4, éliminé la mention de l'ephod d'un contexte païen créé par la décadence religieuse du roi Manassé” (163). Schenker’s argument seems to be more about the text of Lucifer of Cagliari in 2 Kgs 23:4 than it is about 17:17, and his argumentation does not really carry over from 23:4 to 17:17, as the contexts of these passages are so different (destruction of Samaria – reform of Josiah). That *ephod* was possibly omitted from the text in 23:4 does not in any way mean that it would be omitted here as well, especially when the “religious decadence” of Manasseh, to which Schenker seems to give the blame in 17:17 as well, could not even have affected the Israelites yet. See also Kauhanen, *Lucifer of Cagliari*, 293, who contends that the addition of *ephod* in 2 Kgs 23:4 may simply be due to Lucifer’s own modification of the text.

526 There are nevertheless some texts that criticize *ephod* in the Hebrew Bible. In Judg. 8:27, Gideon makes an *ephod* in Ophrah, “and all Israel played the harlot with it there, so that it became a snare to Gideon and his household.” Another story where *ephod* is criticized is the satirical story about Micah and his own temple(!) in Judg 17–18. However, the biggest problem with an *ephod* in these stories seems not to be its inherent unholiness (on the contrary, the *ephod* appears as quite holy in both stories), but the fact that the wrong person has made an *ephod*, and even more so, *in the wrong place* (the Danites even take Micah’s *ephod* with them to Dan). In this way the case of 2 Kgs 17:17 may be in a way parallel to the idea expressed in these stories as well: the wrong people have made an *ephod* in the wrong place (in the north).

527 See 1 Sam 15:23; 2 Kgs 23:24; Zeph 10:2.
The key to the problem may indeed lie in the *ephod*. While still somewhat enigmatic, it is quite clear that this usually quite lavishly adorned vestment was worn by priests, and therefore it was indeed part of the legitimate Yahwistic cult. Most importantly, even though an *ephod* of some kind (אֵפוֹד בָּד, “linen ephod”) is also said to have been worn by young Samuel and David,\(^{528}\) it appears that *ephod* was understood especially to have been a garment of the high priest.\(^{529}\) This understanding of the word would in turn create an implicational ideological tension in the OG text: was there an *ephod* of a Yahwistic high priest in Israel/Samaria?\(^{530}\) This, in turn, would imply that there was also a legitimate sanctuary of Yahweh in Samaria. This was something the later revisers, especially during the Second Temple period, would have seen as highly inappropriate.\(^{531}\) The mention of an *ephod* in the context of Samaria would be omitted,\(^{532}\) even if it meant simultaneously taking out the mention of the sinful *teraphim*. The MT, accompanied by the *kaige* text, has thus here omitted part of the more original text (*ורתפים אפד ויעשׂו*).

One has to note, however, that the OG plus does seem literary-critically somewhat intrusive in the context, suddenly mentioning two mantic *instruments* between the different mantic practices.\(^{533}\) As will be argued later (3.2), this plus was likely added with the many other purely material conceptions of other, idolatrous gods and/or their service (e.g., the לִיםʗ of verse 12).

\(^{528}\) In 1 Sam 2:18; 2 Sam 6:14.

\(^{529}\) This was the understanding of the rabbinic writers as well; see Grintz, “Ephod,” 804–6; Meyers, “Ephod,” 550.

\(^{530}\) In fact, both Judg 8:27 (Ophrah) and 17–18 (Dan) also have the “wrong *ephod*” in the area of the later Northern Kingdom. These may well be the same sorts of allusions to an illegitimate high priesthood in the Northern Kingdom/Samaria as here in 2 Kgs 17:17. Of course, in 1 Kgs 12:31/13:33 we are told that Jeroboam institutes an illegitimate *priesthood* on the northern high places – it would only make sense that this action included the appointment of a *high priest*, as well.


\(^{532}\) In verse 17:29 the text has been further edited according to similar “anti-Samaritan” principles. This implicit notion of a Yahwistic high priesthood in Samaria can hardly be directly taken as telling of a historical situation. However, a later omission of such a remark would seem much more suspicious, and possibly even more telling of a historically extremely likely Yahwistic sanctuary in Samaria. As noted by Pakkala, *God’s Word Omitted*, 213–22, 231–7, 243–5 and Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte*, 34–51, 149–66, 177–8, the Masoretic edition of Samuel–Kings is especially interested in omitting improper references to the illegitimate temple(s) of Yahweh, and even Baal, in Israel and Judah. It would thus be expected that these Masoretic revisers were just as sensitive to possible illegitimate priestly garments in the Northern Kingdom.

\(^{533}\) Thus, the already quoted remarks of Cogan & Tadmor, 2 *Kings*, 205–6 and Stade, *Kings*, 264, are not completely off the mark – the textual history of the passage simply happens to be slightly more complex than first meets the eye.
2.6.9 Verse 18

La has two notable differences from other witnesses in this verse. While the MT/LXX read as the object of Yahweh’s “great” wrath simply “Israel,” La has no mention of the greatness of his wrath, but instead has a peculiar plus “the rest of Israel.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>La</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| נָּאַם יְהוָה֙ יְהוָ֔ה יָ֔שֶׁר־נַ֥ע בָּ֖רֶץ וַיִּתְאַנֵּֽף | καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος σφόδρα ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ | et iratus est in indignatione dm
| וַיִּסִּרֵם פָּנָיו מֵﬠַל נִשְׁאַ֔ר לֹא יְהוּדָ֔ה שֵׁבֶ֖ט רק לְבַדּוֹ׃ | καὶ ἀπέστησεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐχ ὑπελείφθη | ut 534 transerret eos a faciem tua [corr. sua] non remansit
| מְאֹד יְהוָ֔ה וַיִּתְאַנַּף בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל | καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος σφόδρα ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ | in reliquis Israel
| מְאֹד יְהוָ֔ה וַיִּתְאַנַּף בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל | καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος σφόδρα ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ | καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος σφόδρα ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ
| מְאֹד יְהוָ֔ה וַיִּתְאַנַּף בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל | καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος σφόδρα ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ | καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος σφόδρα ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ
| מְאֹד יְהוָ֔ה וַיִּתְאַנַּף בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל | καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος σφόδρα ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ | καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος σφόδρα ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ

An accidental mistake does not seem like a likely explanation for the peculiar Latin reading. In La, relicus is used to translate many different words, and the Greek σφόδρα is usually translated as valde. In the LXX, the phrase יִשְׂרָאֵלשְׁאֵרִית, “the rest of Israel,” is translated as κατάλοιπον τοῦ Ισραήλ, and this was likely the base text of La as well. The reading of La hardly emerged from any kind of scribal mistake in either the Latin or Greek stage of transmission. Schenker argues that the phrase constitutes another literary variant against the MT/LXX, and was therefore probably already to be found in the Hebrew, reading יִשְׂרָאֵלשְׁאֵרִית. If this is indeed the case, it is exceedingly hard to say why Israel is now, all of a sudden, called “the rest of Israel.” There does not seem to be any exact need or reason

534 Et would be expected here as a literal equivalent. Unless ut is simply due to some graphical mistake, it seems that the translator used some interpretive freedom in this verse, as also seen in the unusual rendering of ἔθυμοθῆ as iratus est in indignatione.
535 Nisi here likely translates two words, πλὴν and μονωτάτη.
536 Cf. λοίπος (1 Kgs 11:41, 16:5, 14, 27, 28d; in 1 Kgs 16:20 and 2 Kgs 15:36 as caetera); κατάλειμμα (2 Kgs 10:11); κατάλειμμα (1 Sam 2:11; 2 Sam 13:30); ύπόλειμμα (relicum 1 Sam 9:24); ύπολείπω (1 Sam 11:1; 2 Sam 17:12).
537 Valde in 1 Sam 3:21, 4:10, 14:31, 2 Sam 11:2, 13:15, 21, 36; also magna in 1 Sam 11:6; and vehementer in 1 Sam 14:20.
538 Cf. Isa 46:3; Jer 6:9, 31:7, 38:7; Ezek 9:8, 11:13; Mic 2:12; Zeph 3:13; 1 Chr 12:39 (דָּרָשָׁי, ó καταλοίποι); 2 Chr 34:9 (παντὸς καταλοίπου ἐν Ἰσραήλ). Also as a plus in LXX in Mic 3:1, 9.
539 On the basis of the majority text, the expected Latin text would read along the lines of et iratus est (in indignatione) dominus valde in Israel. The current text would retrovert to a Greek Vorlage of ἔθυμοθῆ (ἀνηρ) κύριος ἐν τοῖς καταλοίποις Ισραήλ (τοῦ ὑποσήςσαι or καὶ ἀπέστησαν) αὐτούς ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ.
540 Schenker, Une Bible, 164; full retroversion mine.
for this specification. It needs to be admitted, however, that as this is the first time in La\textsuperscript{115}'s “homiletic” portion of the chapter (verse 7 onward) where the explicit subject (Israel) is mentioned at all, it is hard to say how we would even expect Israel to be mentioned. In any case, the text is surprising.

How or why did this reading come to be? Is the change simply made to underline the totality of the exile of the Israelites, possibly independently by La\textsuperscript{115}?\textsuperscript{541} As one of his suggestions, Schenker suggests that “the rest of Israel” might here actually refer to Judah, which is mentioned at the end of the verse: only Judah alone was left.\textsuperscript{542} However, while Judah is indeed the only remnant of “the sons of Israel” after the exile of the Northern Kingdom, the Schenker’s idea is not preferable. Here the remnant is already exiled (\textit{ut transferret eos}), and only after this deportation are we told that indeed only Judah remained.

The more probable option is that the writer took the mention about Israel’s earlier partial exile to Assyria by Tiglath-Pileser III in 2 Kgs 15:29 seriously enough to refer to it here as well.\textsuperscript{543} In this deportation a large portion of Israel was already exiled to Assyria.\textsuperscript{544} This option in fact becomes somewhat more likely when we note one of the other peculiarities of La\textsuperscript{115}'s text, namely the lack of chapter 16 between 15 and 17. Therefore the mention of 15:29 is much closer to 17:18 of La\textsuperscript{115} than it is in the MT/LXX, making the connection between the two deportations much easier to see.\textsuperscript{545} Hoshea, the king of Israel in chapter 17, is also introduced for first time immediately after this in verse 15:30.

\textsuperscript{541} Small explicating additions to subjects are very common in La\textsuperscript{115}, but this case does not fit the usual pattern.
\textsuperscript{542} Schenker, \textit{Älteste Textgeschichte}, 147: “Juda ist somit der Rest Israels.” Schenker has written, to my knowledge, on this issue on 3 different occasions, and in each of them he has given slightly differing suggestions/arguments concerning the possible solution.
\textsuperscript{543} This is in fact what Schenker, “Chute,” 164, suggests. This suggestion is not mentioned in the revised version of the article in \textit{Une Bible}.
\textsuperscript{544} Second Kings 15:29: “In the days of King Pekah of Israel, King Tiglath-pileser of Assyria came and captured Ijon, Abel-beth-maacah, Janoah, Kedesh, Hazor, Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali; and he carried the people captive to Assyria” (NRSV). However, most scholars agree that the words “Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali” are later additions to the list; see Cogan & Tadmor, \textit{2 Kings}, 174; Stade, \textit{Kings}, 254. That this deportation indeed historically happened is confirmed by the annals of Tiglath-Pileser III; see Becking, \textit{Fall of Samaria}, 2–18.
\textsuperscript{545} It must be noted, however, that the leaves on which verse 15:29 was written are no longer extant in La\textsuperscript{115} either. Therefore, we cannot be completely sure whether this verse even existed in its edition. As the text of the verse does not seem to have any grave text-critical or other problems, it is however somewhat safe to suppose that indeed it too originally stood in the text of La\textsuperscript{115}. Redaction critically too, this verse likely consists of very early, even annalistic, material, as also argued by Würthwein, \textit{Bücher der Könige}, 383 (“vordeuteronomistisch”).
Whether or not this reading here should be, even in this case, deemed original is hard to answer. If the lack of chapter 16 in La\textsuperscript{115} is simply accidental, this might even be a later harmonizing gloss or a small revision made to La\textsuperscript{115} or its exemplar to bring the text into more coherence with itself. However, conversely, if chapter 16 was later moved between 15 and 17 in the MT/LXX, it would not be surprising if the mention of “the rest of Israel” in this new edition was seen to be just as baffling as it is to us now and was therefore changed into the more understandable “Yahweh became very angry towards Israel.” The argument of Schenker that in this context the reading “rest of Israel” is a \textit{lectio difficilior} is thus partly true, but not yet convincing enough in itself.\textsuperscript{546} In fact, this argument of Schenker may even be partly invalid, as it does not adequately take into account the fact that we are dealing with a completely different \textit{edition} of the text. Hypothetically, if we were to have multiple witnesses of La\textsuperscript{115}’s edition (with its transpositions and all), but some of them had the text here now seen in or resembling the MT/LXX (“Yahweh became very angry towards Israel”), we might even be tempted to consider the reading of the MT/LXX as the \textit{lectio difficilior}, and thus more original, exactly because it would not bring the two narratives (2 Kgs 15:29 and 17:18) into more coherence with each other. Therefore, even if the order and text of La\textsuperscript{115} were to be deemed overall original in chapters 16–17, the reading of MT/LXX here could in fact be argued to give the literary \textit{lectio difficilior}. This is thus a good example of a case where the narrative logic alone cannot be used as an argument in either direction.\textsuperscript{547}

All in all, if the explanation above is accepted, we may conclude that the reading of La\textsuperscript{115} works well in the context of its edition of the text, and may be a hint showing that La\textsuperscript{115} and/or its exemplar was indeed aware of the ordering of its chapters (15.17.16), but, because or in spite of this, the relative age of the reading cannot be completely determined.

\textbf{2.6.10 Verse 19}

The “triple reading” of \textit{L} (καί γε καὶ Ιουδας καὶ αὐτός) at the beginning of the verse again raises questions about the textual affiliations of \textit{L}. There is also a curious plus

\textsuperscript{546} Schenker, \textit{Une Bible}, 164: “VL semble présenter un texte plus difficile et par conséquent plus original.”

\textsuperscript{547} See the further discussion on the (questionable) value of narrative logic in the text- and literary-critical argumentation in Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 14–16.
of "all (Israel)" shared by L and La. The reading actibus of La also has its challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>La</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ γε Ιουδας</td>
<td>καὶ γα Ιουδας και αυτος</td>
<td>καὶ γε καί Ιουδας και αυτος</td>
<td>et iudas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υιων</td>
<td>σοι Ερωτας</td>
<td>σοι εφυλαξε</td>
<td>non observavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και επορευθησαν</td>
<td>και Επορευθηθη</td>
<td>και επορευθη</td>
<td>justificacionesn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επορευθησαν</td>
<td>επορευθησαν</td>
<td>επορευθη</td>
<td>dmi dt sui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MT/LXX: And Judah (+ too L) did not guard the commandments of Yahweh, their God, and they went in the statutes of (all L) Israel, which they did.*

La**: And Judah did not observe the statutes of the Lord, their God, and they went in the deeds of all Israel according to what they did.

The "triple reading" (και γε | και Ιουδας | και αυτος) of L attests to three different strata of the text, again underlining the composite nature of L. The και γε is practically certainly attributable to kaige revision, while και Ιουδας attests to the reading also found in La (et iudas), and likely the OG. The third reading, και αυτος, "it too," referring to Judah from the preceding verse, should probably be understood as a Lucianic stylistic variation, possibly prompted by the double reading, to be read along the lines of "and when it comes to Judah (και γε και Ιουδας), it too (και αυτος) did not guard the commandments." The addition of the kaige revision seems to have prompted the text of L. This comes as no surprise, as once again the likely kaige feature δικαιωμα is found in L in this verse.

---

548 The plus των υιων in CI 244 is probably due to a later explication of the subject.
549 In La δικαιοσυνη and its cognates are outside of chapter 17 always translated with iustus, etc. Cf. δικαιοσυνη = iustus in 1 Sam 2:2, 9, 10c; 2 Sam 4:11; 2 Kgs 10:9. See also 1 Sam 2:10b (δικαιοσυνηθη = iustitiae), 2:13 (δικαιοσυνη = iustificationem), 3:13 (δικαιοσυνη = iustitiis). In 2 Sam 5:8 La gives alone reading iustam. Therefore the Vorlage most probably read here δικαιωματα, unless the translator was ready to use different terms interchangeably. Also Lucifer uses justificativo as the usual equivalent for δικαιωμα; see Kauhanen, "Lucifer of Cagliari," 16. This was therefore probably not translated from εντολας, found in all the Greek witnesses. The Vorlage of δικαιωματα was in turn probably δικαιωματα.
550 Similarly McLean, Greek Kaige Version, 533. It must be noted, however, that in Latin there is no such particle as ге, and therefore it cannot be translated as such. La's et iudas could thus theoretically even be a translation of και γε Ιουδας.
551 However, Klostermann, Könige, 454, sees this last Lucianic reading here as the original, going back to Hebrew עשהrete. This would be a slight lectio difficilior, as it would give the subject in less explicated form. It is also a tendency of La to make the subjects more explicit, which could well make this theory possible; see Tekoniemi, "Is there a (proto-)Lucianic stratum." Stade, Kings, 264, opposes this idea. In any case, the addition of the kaige revision seems to have, once again, prompted the text of L.
552 See 2.5.1 for the analysis of this feature.
The case of *actibus* in La115 is problematic. The Greek witnesses read the *kaige δικαιώματα* here, but this does not help us any further, since this is only the second time La115 uses *actus* in its text, and *actibus* (“act, performance”) is an unexpected equivalent for any law-technical term. No translations of πρόσταγμα, the OG equivalent of בקעה, have been preserved in La115 either. More natural would be to see this as a translation of ἔργον, for instance (possibly from the Hebrew מַעֲשֵׂה). However, because of the expressed problems, this question has to be left open. The rest of La115’s text can easily be retroverted, however.

The plus “in the statutes/deeds of all Israel” in L/La115 appears quite irrelevant when looked at from a purely text-critical perspective, and could be discarded as a (proto-)Lucianic secondary addition, not worthy of much discussion. However, in the literary context of La115 the plus becomes actually quite interesting: in verse 18a there was only a “remnant of Israel” to be exiled in La115, and now “all of Israel” is addressed in both La115 and L. Is there a link between the two? And, methodologically speaking, would seeing a link between these phenomena be reading too much into a minuscule piece of evidence?

555 As Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 148, notes: “Die Wörtlichkeit der lateinischen Übertragung im Ganzen erhebt es zur Gewissheit, dass hier ebenso wie sonst eine griechische und dahinter eine hebräische Vorlage impliziert ist. Aber diese ist bei der Seltenheit einiger Wörter und Wendungen weniger leicht zu restituieren.”

556 In Greek the verse may have read καὶ Ιουδα οὐκ ἐφύλαξεν τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις παντὸς Ισραηλ κατὰ ὅσα ἐποίησαν, which goes back to the Hebrew עשה כאשר ישראל וכל [משה] יוהי משם שאר שמשו יודה במשה.

557 Indeed, Stade, Kings, 264, notes rightly: “Sciraph expansion.”

558 This would be a case in which quite small details in the text are used to create a greater, even overarching, theory of textual development. This method has been criticized by Talshir, “Review of Van Keulen,” 2, who uses Schenker as an example of one of the proponents of such methodology: “As for Schenker, he places a great weight on details, ingeniously manipulating every difference to support the priority of the LXX. His explanations, however, do not in my view emerge from the text but are rather imposed on the text.” The critique of Talshir is somewhat harsh, but not completely unjustified.
“all Israel” – or the ways of all the twelve tribes. In this case, indirect evidence of the reading of verse 18 of La115 may also have been preserved here in the Lucianic text.559

2.6.11 Verse 20
The most notable text-critical issue in verse 20 is the LXX plus καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος, “and the Lord became angry.” This quite clearly OG plus is shared by practically every Greek witness, though the Lucianic manuscripts also attest to a change of word order here. The subject of the “rejecting” also differs: in the LXX, the Judahites mentioned in the previous verse are seemingly the ones to reject Yahweh (ἀπώσαντο τὸν κύριον), while in the MT Yahweh (יְהוָה וַיִּמְאַס) rejects “all the seed of Israel.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Majority text</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיִּמְאַס יְהוָה בְּכָל־זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>καὶ ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ διαρπαζόντων αὐτούς ἐξ αὐτῶν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ διαρπαζόντων αὐτούς ἐξ αὐτῶν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν纽带</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και εθυμωθη κυριος</td>
<td>και ἐθυμώθη κύριος καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ πάντων τῶν διαρπαζόντων αὐτούς, ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἰσραηλ.</td>
<td>και ἐθυμώθη κύριος καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ πάντων τῶν διαρπαζόντων αὐτούς, ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἰσραηλ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς</td>
<td>και ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ διαρπαζόντων αὐτούς, ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἰσραηλ.</td>
<td>και ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ διαρπαζόντων αὐτούς, ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἰσραηλ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και ἐθυμωθη κυριος και εσαλευσεν και εδωκεν</td>
<td>και ἐθυμώθη κύριος καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ διαρπαζόντων αὐτούς, ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἰσραηλ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

559 Ultimately this plus could also be used as (very) indirect evidence of the originality of La115’s textual layout in the proto-Lucianic phase of L’s text. However, making such grand claims on the basis of one word does not seem recommendable.

560 The text of A B (“they rejected the Lord in all seed of Israel”) is hard to make sense of, likely showing (late) Hebraizing influence on both. The Syrohexapla also has the first clause (καὶ ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ διαρπαζόντων αὐτούς) under an obelos instead of the LXX plus καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος, which is probably a mistake.

561 The Greek text may be slightly corrupt; see Trebolle, The Jewish Bible, 382: “In 2 Kgs 17:20… the MT has «and he afflicted them» (waye’annem) whereas the Greek text καὶ ἐσάλευσεν αὐτούς assumes the Hebrew to read wayent’em, «and he moved them»; one of these readings is the result of metathesis…”

562 Although the Hebrew manuscript K130 has the same addition of a subject here, this plus is likely an independent (Lucianic) explication, as is the case with the later L plus πάντων τῶν.
Both the Greek majority text (OG) and MT readings work well both syntactically and contextually. The text of L has often been deemed late here, and quite rightly so. L not only changes the word order, but also the actual wording of the rejection: “and they rejected the Lord from themselves, all the seed of Israel.” As the “seed of Israel,” originally the object of the next sentence, has been interpreted here as the subject, L needs to further add ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς to the sentence “and the Lord became angry over them.”

However, it is important to note that the textual order of L now agrees with that of the MT and the clearly Hebraized manuscripts A B, against the rest of the manuscript tradition which has a different order. This quite clearly speaks for the influence of the Hebraized reading on L. Otherwise, it would be hard to see why L would make such a change to the text since the style of the passage is hardly any better (if not worse), though it may not be a coincidence that this phenomenon appears, once again, at the hinge-point of different text blocks of La.

On the other hand, it has been proposed that, in fact, the MT has lost the LXX plus because of a homoioteleuton mistake (יְהוָה … יְהוָה). Thenius also suggests that after this haplography had happened, the resulting grammatically incorrect verbal form (εἰμι, as still evidenced by καὶ ἀπεώσαντο of B) was subsequently revised from the OG plural to singular in the MT. This could also explain why even the otherwise kaige-influenced majority text gives the OG plus καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος but the text of A B does not: the homoioteleuton would have happened only after the kaige revision. The Hebraized text form of A B would then be due to an even later kaige-like Hebraization (possibly on basis of Hexaplaric material). Trebolle notes further that the OG plus is, as will be seen below (3.1.4.1), also literary-critically crucial, which gives it more credibility as an original reading. These arguments will be analyzed elsewhere, but both textual and literary arguments seem to point to the

---

563 See Stade, Kings, 264; Hobbs, Kings, 223. As is their custom, most commentators have not taken the readings of the LXX into account here, however.
564 According to Stade, Kings, 264, however, the LXX (or rather, B) has misunderstood the syntax of מָשָׁא + objectival ב, which could also have made the addition of the plus of L necessary. This is somewhat unlikely, however, as the translator would then not have understood the singular and changed it to plural. Stade’s explanation does not take into account the plus καὶ ἐθυμώθη κύριος of the majority tradition either. Was this simply taken over from verse 18 for no apparent reason?
565 Thenius, "2 Kings 17,2–23,” 222; Thenius, Könige, 387.
566 Thenius, Könige, 387. Indeed, as noted above for the reading of A B, such a text makes hardly any sense with the plural verb.
567 See in more depth about such “kaige in two phases” or “super-kaige” in 1.2.2.1.
conclusion that the plus of the OG is indeed part of the most original Hebrew text of the verse.

It may also be argued that the reading of the LXX is now also ideologically the lectio difficilior: as the subject of the plural has to be Judah from the preceding verse 19, Judah already abandons Yahweh here at the time of Israel’s demise, i.e., during the rule of Hezekiah, which would be in blatant contradiction with the information given in 18:3–7. As the ones sinning in verses 18b–19 are indeed Judahites, the reading of LXX 20a thus makes sense in the context. With the MT’s singular this reading is not possible, and the mention of Judah in verse 19 appears to be a simple side note: Judah is indeed sinning and “walking in the ways of Israel,” but they are yet to abandon Yahweh. The reading of the MT also makes the interpretation of the term “all the seed of Israel” more ambiguous, since it is not clear whether this includes Judah or not. Because of this theological peculiarity, the difference is likely not simply accidental. This same ideological problem would also have been present in La, where verse 20 is supposed to have followed verses 13–14, which similarly condemn Judah together with Israel.

2.6.12 Verse 21
The main difference between the witnesses in verse 21 is the subject of 21aa: Is the one rending Israel away Yahweh (MT) or Israel itself (L)? On the other hand, the majority Greek text attests no verb whatsoever. It is extremely important to assess this problem, as it has repercussions for the literary and redactional analysis of the verse as well: while the phrase and the idea that “Yahweh tore Israel away” can also be found elsewhere in the books of Samuel-Kings, the phrase “Israel tore itself/became torn away” is nowhere else attested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קִרְבַּיּוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>ἐπάνωθεν ὑπὲρ Δαυὶδ</td>
<td>ἐπάνωθεν ὑπὲρ Δαυὶδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְשֻׁל בְּכָל־חָךְ</td>
<td>ἔπάνωθεν ὑπὲρ Δαυὶδ</td>
<td>ἐπάνωθεν ὑπὲρ Δαυὶδ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

569 Compare with the case of verse 1 where the same theological reasoning concerning the chronological matters could be in play.
570 See 3.1.3.
571 The L reading here is probably the OG variant, as ἐπάνωθεν (הָעַל) has been argued to be a kaige feature; see McClay, “Kaige and Septuagint Research,” 131 (#4). In 1–2 Kings, the attestation is quite clear: only ἀπὸ in the non-kaige section (1 Kgs 9:7, 13:4, 34, 20:41) except for 1 Kgs 7:9, 16 (הָעַל) and 7:13, 48, 8:7 (הָעַל), where the translator apparently understood these Hebrew words as architectural terms worthy of ἐπάνωθεν, while the translation ἀπὸ ὑπὲρ for ἀπὸ can be found only in the kaige sections (1 Kgs 1:53, 2:4; 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 13, 14, 10:31, 17:23, 25:5, 21, 28); in 1 Kgs 14:15 the Hexaplaric text reads ἀπὸ ὑπὸ.
The problematic sentence of the MT, ἀπωθέω, has already provoked quite an extensive discussion and two main streams of translation: some see the subject as Yahweh, carrying over from the previous verse, while others argue that the subject of the verb ἀπωθέω can only be Israel. Both views have their problems, as in the former option one could expect the preposition ἐπάνωθεν to be given before the supposed object ἀπωθέω, although this is not completely necessary. The lack of this preposition makes ἀπωθέω indeed the most natural candidate for the subject of the sentence. There is no apparent reason why this preposition would have accidentally dropped off in the copying process. In the second option, if Israel is indeed to be read as the subject, we would have to suppose that the qal form ἀπωσάτω could also be read as intransitive instead of the normal transitive meaning – or that the original form of this verb was somehow corrupted. Such a use is not attested anywhere else.

The major difficulty of the LXX is even more problematic, as it lacks the verb altogether, and has been proposed to have been born out of a textual corruption at the

---

572 Instead of translating a Hebrew Vorlage (ץ[ע]ר[ש]לָה), this is likely a Lucianic explicating addition.
573 It is hard to say if the difference between ἔξωθεν instead of ἀπωθέω (L) here is attributable to καίγε or Lucianic revision. The words ἐπάνωθεν and ἔξωθεν appear only in the καίγε sections, and in each case L has ἀπωθέω as a variant. See also the discussion of ἀπωθέω in 2.6.6.1, where it was found that ἀπωθέω as an equivalent of ἐξαπλάθω may be a καίγε feature. If L is indeed in the right in giving ἀπωθέω as the OG variant of ἐπάνωθεν, this could be further proof that the καίγε reviser changed these equivalents (see similarly the case of εἴσοδος in verse 12). It is also noteworthy that L does not give the other two καίγε readings (ἐπάνωθεν, ἔξωθεν) in this verse either.
574 Thus Aurelius, Zukunft, 75–6; Hentschel, 2 Könige, 81; Keil, Kings, 418; Montgomery, Kings, 470; Gray, Kings, 592. The argument of Hobbs, 2 Kings, 223 (“G3 and others avoid making God the subject of this action, but such a motivation is no reason to emend the text”), however, is unconvincing, since elsewhere the LXX has no problem with this kind of statement.
575 Bähr, Kings, 186; Benzinger, Könige, 174; Thenius, Könige, 387; Fritz, 2 Könige, 96; Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 393; Sweeney, Kings, 387; Stade, Kings, 264–5, also leans towards this possibility.
stage of its Hebrew *Vorlage* (קרע כר ע). While this seems more or less certain, it is hard to assess the more correct translation πλὴν ὅτι ἐρράγη of *L* – is this due to Hebraizing influences in *L*, or is this the OG text? If *L* contains the OG, the majority reading would have to be considered a later Hebraization towards an otherwise unknown, possibly corrupted Hebrew text. This way the corrupted translation ὅτι πλὴν could also have later spread to *L*, creating a double reading πλὴν | ὅτι ἐρράγη here. There are no problems in regarding ρήγνυμι as an OG equivalent of קרע.

Further proof of the OG may be given by the pre-Lucianic church father Cyprian, who curiously agrees with *L* in giving the same verbal form: 21 *quia dissipatus est Israel a domo David et constituerunt sibi regem Hieroboam filium Nebat,* “because Israel dispersed from the house of David and constituted itself Hieroboam, son of Nebat, as king” (Cyprian, ep 69). It is somewhat challenging to assess the value of this reading since not much is known about the origins of Cyprian’s biblical text. Kauhanen comes to no overarching conclusions about the agreements between *L* and Cyprian, although he does consider them to be mostly proto-Lucianic. Indeed, as part of the same quotation, Cyprian gives the OG text of verse 20 without the Lucianic changes (“et indignatus est, inquit, Dominus in omni semine Israel et dedit eos in direptionem donec abiceret eos a facie sua), thus confirming the value of his text at least here. The verbal form shared by *L* and Cyprian is therefore likely at least proto-Lucianic, and most probably OG.

---

576 Benzinger, *Könige*, 174. On the opposite side, Klostermann, *Könige*, 454, considers the reading of the MT to have been eased from the nonsensical version of the LXX. This does not seem likely, however.

577 Thusly Benzinger, *Könige*, 174 and Stade, *Kings*, 265. This goes against the argumentation of Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 223 n. 14, who considers the construction יִרְעָה יְהוָה רֹנְשָׁה to have been an original part of the (added) text. According to him, the presence of the word יְהוָה shows that verse 21 begins its own new textual unit, as יְהוָה is, according to him, a “particle that is used frequently in the addition of deuteronomistic glosses.” We are thus again partly at a crossroads between textual and literary-critical argumentation – which one should take priority? The textually secondary origin of the particle יְהוָה could well be argued here, but on the other hand Trebolle’s idea of יְהוָה as yet another literary-critical marker for the secondary nature of verse 21 in its current location should also be taken into account. If verse 21 is seen as part of the oldest text (History writer) in the chapter, there would naturally be no need for the particle – but if the particle happened to be original in the text (and denoting the beginning of a later addition to the text), that would make verse 21 seem like not that good a candidate for the oldest text in the chapter (which it indeed is not; see 3.2.6)! However, as יְהוָה is usually used as a contradicting conjunction after a positive statement in Kings (except for the very late verse 1 Kgs 21:25, for which see notes 231 and 235), one would then expect verse 21 to somehow contradict the earlier text, which it however does not. This could speak against Trebolle’s theory.

578 See especially 1 Kgs 13:3, 5, where the niphal יִרְעָה is translated as ἐρράγη. In Samuel–Kings ρήγνυμι is elsewhere used to translate עָרָה in (kaige sections) 1 Kgs 1:40 (יהושע ו), 2 Kgs 25:4; and עָרָה in 1 Kgs 11:31, 13:3, 5 (non-kaige section). The verb ρήγνυμι is once more found in 12:24ο.

Even if the verb form in L were deemed late, some other witnesses, such as Targum Jonathan,\textsuperscript{580} the Peshitta (אֲשֶׁר כִּי מַכָּה בָּהּ), and even the Vulgate,\textsuperscript{581} support the interpretation of L as well, namely that the subject is indeed Israel instead of Yahweh and that the verb is to be read as an intransitive qal, or, alternatively, their original Hebrew Vorlage read the niph'al perfect נקרע (or possibly even the impf. יקרע). The niph'al form, then, could be read in either middle or passive voice: Israel either “rent itself” or “became rent”\textsuperscript{582} from Judah. In the latter option the implied subject could still be Yahweh. Indeed, in the light of the even massive textual changes already seen in the chapter, it would not seem too radical a supposition for one letter (either י or ר) to have dropped out from the text, either accidentally or deliberately.

The fact that the MT has here an allusion to 1 Kgs 11 has occasionally been used as an argument for the MT’s originality.\textsuperscript{583} However, one may question this on the basis that this could in fact be seen as a literary-critically easier reading (harmonization): unlike the uncommon (if not unique) idea of the people “being torn” or even themselves tearing away from another kingdom, the house of David no less,\textsuperscript{584} the more usual understanding of the MT can also be found elsewhere in the books of Samuel-Kings. A later copyist could have well harmonized the phrase to conform to the more usual expression. The argument is thus reversible.

This case of the changing subject is not simply a matter of a theoretical trifle since the ideology of 21a changes quite remarkably with the interpretation of the subject. This fact also makes it more probable that we may be dealing with a deliberate change in the text. If it was indeed Yahweh who tore Israel off from David’s house here, there would be nothing unexpected in the contents of this mention, as this was indeed what happened: because of Solomon’s sins the separation of the kingdoms and crowning of Jeroboam was completely justified. What is unexpected, however, is that this is used as a reason for Israel’s exile: Why would Yahweh now punish Israel for something he himself made happen?\textsuperscript{585} The reading of the LXX would make more

\textsuperscript{580} Reading אֲשֶׁר כִּי מַכָּה בָּהּ יַעֲרֵ֥אָלָה דְּבֵית עַל יִשְרָאֵ֖ל בֵּית אִתפְלִינָֽו (or possibly even the impf. יַכִּרֵֽע), “because the house of Israel became divided (ethp. pl.) from the house of David.”

\textsuperscript{581} Reading ex eo iam tempore quo scissus est Israhel a domo David.

\textsuperscript{582} Gesenius, Lexicon, 745.

\textsuperscript{583} For instance, see Gray, Kings, 592.

\textsuperscript{584} The people tearing themselves away would also be in line with the apparent overall tendency of chapter 17 to blame the people instead of their kings; see Rösel, “Why 2 Kings 17,” 85–90.

\textsuperscript{585} Even if read as a protasis to the apodosis “and [because/after this] they made Jeroboam son of Nebat king,” the actual accusation (Jeroboam’s “great sin”) comes only at the second part of the verse. Making
sense, namely that it was the rebellious Israel who tore itself from Judah and legitimate Davidic rule. Separating from the legitimate rulership of Rehoboam could very well be taken as a proper sin, especially in the times of the Samaritan schism.586 This view would actually be closer to that of the Chronicler, not the Deuteronomists in Kings.587 This difference between the witnesses goes back to the difference between the two editions of chapter 17, and thus the (incredibly hard) critical decision has to be made jointly with the other main differences (cumulative argument).

2.6.13 Verse 22
The only notable text-critical phenomenon in this verse concerns the fluctuation between the plural or singular sin(s) of Jeroboam. Are the Israelites accused of “the” sin of Jeroboam, or his multiple sins? Curiously, the MT has first a plural חַטֹּאות, but then refers to these sins with the singular מִמֶּנָּה, “from it.”588 L (both plurals) and the LXX (both singulars) give very clear texts instead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיֵּלְכוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִיַּרָבְﬠָ בְּכָל וַיָּרָבְﬠָ בְּכָל־חַטֹּאות מִמֶּנָּה</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἐν πάσῃ ἁμαρτίᾳ Ἰεροβαάμ ἤς ἐποίησεν οὐκ ἀπέστησαν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἐν πάσαις ἁμαρτίαις Ἰεροβαάμ ῦιοῦ Ναβατ ἢς ἐποίησεν οὐκ ἀπέστησαν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִמֶּנָּה</td>
<td></td>
<td>αἷς ἐποίησεν: οὐκ ἀπέστησαν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה רִמְּנָבָ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִמֶּנָּה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the sons of Israel went in all the sins (MT/L)/sin (LXX) of Jeroboam (+ son of Nebat L), which he made; they did not turn from it (MT/LXX)/them (L).

While the LXX exclusively gives Jeroboam’s sin(s) in the plural in 1 Kings, the MT uses the singular in two cases.590 In 2 Kings, most of the remarks of Jeroboam’s sins

---

586 Taking into account the other anti-Samaritan readings in the MT version in this chapter, this could well be the reason behind the change.

587 Similarly also Noth, ÜSt., 85: “Der Gedanke, daß das πρῶτον ψεῦδος des Staates Israel die Trennung von der davidischen Dynastie gewesen sei, findet sich sonst bei Dtr nicht.” Steck, Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick, 66, takes the same position. In 2 Chr 13:4–7 the rebellion of Jeroboam seems to have been something illegitimate, and the Chronicler indeed mentions the prophecy of Ahijah only very briefly and in passing in 2 Chr 10:15.

588 Becking, Ondergang, 174, seems to consider this a valid grammatical combination, albeit a very rare one.

589 This seems like a Lucianic explication. Curiously, the medieval Hebrew manuscript K 150 also gives this plus, though likely independently.

are in the plural in both the LXX and the MT, and on the basis of this plural would also be the expected form here. As the second clause’s מִמֶּנָּה here is in contradiction with חַטֹּאות, the plural of the MT could simply be due to a late (possibly accidental) addition of a waw to the singular form חטאת. Indeed, even multiple medieval MT manuscripts give the singular חטאת, thus showing considerable variation even inside the Masoretic tradition. Unless the base text of L already had this grammatical incongruence, there would seem to have been no apparent reason for L to change both of these to plurals. Even though the forms—or either one of them—may have already been plurals in its (OG) base text, the Greek readings are easiest to explain as having arisen from the conflicting MT form: if L’s base text were one close to the MT, the latter plural ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν could well be due to Lucianic grammatical harmonization. The B-text could correspondingly be explained as a harmonization as well.

2.6.14 Verse 23

There are no noteworthy text-critical variants in the verse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דע את־ישראל</td>
<td>ἡδοὺ μετέτητεσθεν</td>
<td>ἡδοὺ μετέτητεσθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קְרִיָּהּ תּוֹנָיָּם</td>
<td>κύριος τὸν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>κύριος τὸν Ἰσραήλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מֵעַזְבַנְתָּם</td>
<td>ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵשְׁרָה</td>
<td>καθὸς ἐλάλησεν κύριος</td>
<td>καθὼς ἐλάλησεν κύριος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בַּדְּרֵךְ בְּעָבָדָיו</td>
<td>ἐν χείρι πάντων τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>ἐν χείρι πάντων τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּיַד נַבִּיאֵים</td>
<td>τῶν προφητῶν</td>
<td>τῶν προφητῶν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיֶּגֶר</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπωκρίσθη Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπωκρίσθη Ἰσραήλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַעְקַרְנָה</td>
<td>ἐπάνωθεν τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>ἐπάνωθεν τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַעְלֵה</td>
<td>εἰς Ασσυρίον</td>
<td>εἰς Ασσυρίον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַעְקַרְנָה</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπῳκίσθη Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπῳκίσθη Ἰσραήλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>ἐν χείρι πάντων τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>ἐπάνωθεν τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπ vrou</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπ vrou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>αὐτῷ</td>
<td>αὐτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>ἐπάνωθεν</td>
<td>ἐπάνωθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>ἐπανωθεν</td>
<td>ἐπανωθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>επανω</td>
<td>επανω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>ἐπανωθεν</td>
<td>ἐπανωθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>απο</td>
<td>απο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁנֶּדֱעֶד</td>
<td>L-700 460</td>
<td>L-700 460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

591 2 Kgs: OG 1:18c pl. (MT), MT 3:3 pl. (sg. pl. V L-700 64′ 460), 10:31 pl. (pl.), 13:2 pl. (pl.), 6 pl. (pl.), 11 pl. (sg. A B 247 CI a 121 / 64′ 488 55 71 158 244 342 372 pl. rel.), 14:24 pl. (pl.), 15:9 pl. (pl.), 18 pl. (pl.), 24 pl. (pl.), 28 pl. (pl.). In many cases, however, the main reason to take the MT reading as plural is the vocalization since the singular and plural are often written consonantly similar to each other.

592 See, for instance, Cogan & Tadmor, II Kings, 204 and Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 393.

593 Kennicott, Vetus Testamentum, 670, lists altogether 22 manuscripts in favor of the singular.

594 Gray, Kings, 592, and Snait, Kings, 282, read both as plurals.

595 However, from the literary-critical viewpoint, the singular seems like the likeliest option for the most original understanding of Jeroboam’s sinning: instead of multiple sins, the “sin” he was originally accused of consisted plainly of his cardinal sin in 1 Kgs 12:28–31. See Pakkala, “Jeroboam Without Bulls,” 501 n. 2: “The plural is more often used than the singular, but it is not always clear which one is meant: In I Reg 13.2; II Reg 3.3; 13.2.6.11; 17.22 the plural is used but a suffix refers to the sin(s) in the singular … This may suggest that the singular is original but was later changed. It would be logical that Jeroboam’s sin was originally a single issue, but when later editors attributed more sins to him, the plural began to be used.”

596 See the analysis of ἀπὸ (OG)/ἐπάνωθεν (kaige) in verse 17:21 above (2.6.12).
Until when Yahweh removed Israel from before his face, according to what the Lord said in the hand of all his servants, the prophets. And Israel was exiled from its land into Assyria until this day.
3. Literary and redactional analysis of verses 7–23

3.1 The OG edition: La\textsuperscript{115} as the sole witness of OG?

After the analysis of the textual sources the assessment of the purely literary and redactional aspects of the text(s) may be conducted. One of the main questions to be investigated in this section is whether the text order of La\textsuperscript{115} has resulted from a simple accidental change or whether it originally reflects a Greek base text (~ OG) which would have in turn gone back to a more or less meaningful Hebrew composition. It will be shown that in many ways the differing narrative formulations of La\textsuperscript{115} from the MT/LXX text form indeed seem deliberately crafted and have hardly arisen due to simple scribal mistakes. This textual form of La\textsuperscript{115} was likely the now otherwise unattested OG, which, therefore, has to be taken seriously into account when analyzing the undocumented evolution of the chapter. Another question pertaining to this OG form is then its literary character: How is the literary form of the OG constructed, and what are its ramifications for the literary-critical study of 2 Kings 17 – and also its MT text form?

3.1.1 Was the transposition of verses 9-14 and 15-19 simply accidental?

While individual accidental changes in verses 7*ab and/or 8 of La\textsuperscript{115} may not be too likely, there is also a possibility that the text after them was accidentally misplaced in some stage of the copying tradition. It would not be at all impossible that verses 9–14 and 15–19 were, for instance, at some point written in two columns, and either one or both of them torn off and subsequently displaced because of this. Even though this would have happened suspiciously neatly – at least one of these columns happened to contain exactly the text of verses 15–19 – this does not seem too far-fetched an idea. However, judging from the “displaced” verses 15–19, the text block preceding it (whether or not this contained exactly verses 9–14) would also have been just as neatly cut off.

It could, albeit more improbably, also be that these verses, or 15–19 at least, took one side of a folio each. After this folio containing the text was torn off, it was placed back in the codex wrong side up, giving rise to the “transposition.” Considering that chapter 16 is also missing from between 15:38 and 17:1, and that the narrative about Elisha’s death in verses 13:14–21 is also found in La\textsuperscript{115} after verse 10:30, there
may have been an even larger upheaval at some point of the codex-form transmission tradition of La\textsuperscript{115}, in either Greek or Latin. However, the fact that this putative upheaval nowhere clearly hindered the syntactical or even narratological structures of the text – arguably, it may have even improved them at some points – makes it exceedingly unlikely for these changes to have been simply accidental.\textsuperscript{597}

The biggest and most prominent reason to doubt the originality of the transposition found in La\textsuperscript{115} is of course the text of \textit{L}, which shares its order with all the other textual witnesses. However, \textit{L} is, as has been previously shown, under the clear influence of \textit{kaige} (not to mention Hexaplaric) revision at least in verses 4–19. This familiarity with the \textit{kaige} text – and thus also its order – could be the reason why even \textit{L} concurs with the majority text’s order.\textsuperscript{598}

3.1.2 The role of hinge-verses 7*\textit{b}/8 and 19 in the literary frame of the chapter in MT/LXX and La\textsuperscript{115}

The neat division of the transposed text in La\textsuperscript{115} is not the only reason to doubt that the change of order in La\textsuperscript{115} happened simply accidentally. The (retroverted) phrase אבהם אלהי יהוה מצות את שמרו לא in verse 7*\textit{b} also has quite a clear counterpart in 19a, יהוה לא שמר את מצותיהם יהודים. Interestingly enough, these phrases now enclose the first “displaced” narrative unit (15–18) of La\textsuperscript{115}.\textsuperscript{599}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Verse 8 MT & Verse 7*\textit{b} Vorlage La\textsuperscript{115} \\
יהוה אלהי יבגוי
בחקוות
ומלכו ישראלי
והורים ישראלי
תשוב
ואם נשמה \hline
Verse 19 MT/LXX & Verse 19 Vorlage La\textsuperscript{115} \\
נֵּכַּה יִשְׂרָאֵל
וַיֵּלְכוּ
אֲשֶׁר
יִשְׂרָאֵל
בְּחֻקּוֹת
וַיֵּלְכוּ
ﬠָשִּׂוּ
אֲשֶׁר
יהודָה
שָׁמַר
לֹא
יהוה
אֱיִשְׂרָאֵל
בְּחֻקּוֹת
וַיֵּלְכוּ
ﬠָשִּׂוּ
אֲשֶׁר
יהודה
שָׁמַר
לֹא
יהוה
(לֹא)
אֱיִשְׂרָאֵל
כְּכַשְׁר
שמֶשׁ

\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{597} For the Elisha narrative, see Richelle, Testament d’Elisée, 11–87, according to whom the text of La\textsuperscript{115} has, in fact, the best narratological structure; similarly also Tekoniemi, “Enhancing the Depiction.” Similarly, the narrative logic of La\textsuperscript{115} seems to be better in 2 Kgs 17 in verses 9–20 in some ways, as well. However, it is not impossible that chapter 16 was indeed accidentally misplaced; see 2.1.1 above for discussion.

\textsuperscript{598} Another question completely is the way through which \textit{L} got its \textit{kaige} readings. Did they come through Hexaplaric or some other Hebraizing influence (Symmachus, Theodotion)? Were the Lucianic revisers aware of \textit{kaige} manuscripts proper (such as B)? Or were these \textit{kaige} tendencies already extant in the Greek base text of the Lucianic revisers?

\textsuperscript{599} Trebolle, “2 Kings 17.2-23,” 221, notes only the similar verb φυλάσσω as an “enclosing element” (which it however likely is not, see 2.6.6.2), but not the other characteristics.
After the text of 7*b, 15–19a, the second narrative unit of verses 9–14 starts in La with verse 19b (*[הָעָשָׂ] as is found in MT verse 8). It is noteworthy that even the Peshitta, which usually gives a faithful translation of the MT, has at the end of 19 a notable plus (“what was evil before the Lord and angered him all days”), found in no other witnesses. This further strongly suggests that the end of verse 19 was indeed regarded as an important textual hinge-point, even at a very late stage. It is unlikely, although not impossible, that La would have created this redaction-like doublet as a result of an accident, even suspiciously placing it at a textually attested hinge-point of the text.

In the same vein, it is also noteworthy that MT has a somewhat similar construction, with its verses 8 and 19b, encompassing the whole of 9–19a (**). These similarities between verses 8 and 19b in the MT/LXX have been noted by relatively few scholars. The two mentions differ in the “origin” of the wrong statutes (”peoples” in verse 8, “Israel” in 19b). The phrase וַיִּלְכוּ בְּחַקּות occurs only twice elsewhere in Kings in the MT, and merely once in the LXX. This rare use is a good sign of the close (and possibly even somehow interdependent) relation between verses 8 and 19. The fact that in both traditions we have these textual and

---

600 The plus of the Peshitta has been noticed by Piquer, “The What Text to Edit,” 240 n. 37: “The Syriac text has a plus at the end of the verse, which reads ... (“and they walked in the custom of Israel, who did what was evil before the Lord and angered him all days”). This “Deuteronomistic” plus may have simply been taken from verse 17 (reading ...), as Stade, Kings, 264, suggests, but, as Piquer notes, “its mere presence is quite telling, as it gives testimony of a persisting notion of a redaction break point ... where OL also attests one.”

601 The texts of the verses are of course not completely symmetrical, as verse 8 has a plus concerning the “peoples.” It is also noteworthy that verse 22 also has a very similar structure ("...יָרָבְעָם חַטֹּאות.").

602 Long, 2 Kings, 181 and Keil, Kings, 451 (“parallel passage 19b”), note the similarities, but discuss them no further. Trebolle, “2 Kings 17:2-23,” 219, however, remarks on the text of the MT/LXX: “In any case vv. 8 and 19 have a duplicate that encloses vv. 9-19a.” Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 127, n. 109, notes the similarities, and also proposes a Wiederaufnahme between verses 19b and 22, but not 8 and 19b. Thenius, Könige, 387: “wahrscheinlich wie V. 8”(?);

603 Cf. 1 Kgs 3:3, and the extremely late, (proto-)Masoretic, 6:12, a verse which is completely lacking in the more original LXX, showing a slight predilection of the MT towards this phrase against the LXX. The comment of Becking, “From Exodus to Exile,” 220, that “the combination כָּל הָעָשָׂ אֲשֶׁר הָעָשָׂ ... only occurs in the Old Testament in 2 Kgs 17, 8 and 19” is however not true: the phrase can also be found in Lev 18:3, 4, 20:23, 26:3; Ezek 5:6, 7, 11:20, 18:9, 17, 20:13, 16, 19, 21, 33:15; Jer 44:10MT (here the OG Vorlage did not have כַּלא אוּרְשָׁלַיִם, which is interesting in the context of the textual problems of 2 Kgs 17:7 where La of course lacks this verb as well). In any case, based on the attestations the language use appears quite late, and possibly even proto-Masoretic.
literary clues about the beginning of a new narrative unit(s) in the vicinity of verse 8 may also provide further evidence for the originally somehow separate character of the preceding verse 7 from the following text, as has been argued earlier.

The biggest difference between the two versions is the length of the passage enclosed by verses 8 and 19: four verses in La115 and ten in the MT/LXX. This longer unity of the MT/LXX appears to work in the same way as the long protasis-apodosis structure formed by verses 7a and 18a. If creating greater unity between the verses and narratives was indeed a goal of the putative reviser of the MT in verse 7, it could be argued that this sort of “apparent Wiederaufnahme” would serve his intentions quite well here too.

However, as seen in the table above, the actual textual material used in the process of this framing differs: in La115 the enclosing formulation is that of 19a (כוּר יָהוּ עָשֶׂר אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יֵּּלְכוּ), while the MT/LXX uses 19b (עָשׂוּ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל קְוִּי נִכְלָא אֲשֶׁר יֵּּלְכוּ). This distinction could prove meaningful since, if the order of the text was changed by the MT from that of La115, the use of similar text as in 19b for verse 8 would be understandable: as the text of 19b is found just before verse 9 in La115, the text of 19b could have easily been transposed with the block of 9–14 as well (and partly modified in the process too). In La115 there is no similar mechanism to be observed: the formulation of 19a would have been taken over to verse 7*b seemingly arbitrarily. In fact, if the transposer behind the order of La115 indeed had wanted to create such a resumption between its verses 7*b and 19, he could have just left the text of verse 8 standing more or less as it was in the MT/LXX, as then the “pseudo-Wiederaufnahme” would have perfectly covered the whole text of 8*, 15–19. Now the inclusion stops already in 19a, leaving 19b out.

3.1.3 The subject(s) of verses 8–23 in MT/LXX and La115 – who is doing what?

The issue of the subjects in verses 7–23 has lately been raised by several scholars. In the MT the terms “Israel,” “Judah,” “sons of Israel,” and “all the seed of Israel”

---

604 See, for example, Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 442–3 (“Judah has been latent in this text from its beginning with v. 7”); Provan, Hezekiah, 70 (“17:20 refers to the exile of ‘all the seed of Israel’, implying all twelve tribes, and vv. 7-19 prepare the ground for this by cataloguing the sins of both Israel and Judah (v. 13, 18–19)...”); Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 119–21; Becking, Ondergang, 181, 240–1 (both Israel and Judah throughout).
appear somewhat problematically in the text. As such, the terms “Israel” and “Judah” are self-explanatory. However, of the latter two, the meaning of the term “all the seed of Israel” (יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל־זֶרַע) has been hotly debated: elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible this term typically includes both Israel and Judah, a meaning which has been seen as problematic here by some scholars. Especially surprising is the sudden appearance of “Judah” in verse 13 in the middle of a long condemnation of Israel. Because of its intrusive nature, many scholars have deemed this mention of Judah a gloss or a later addition, often together with the other two verses 18b–19a mentioning Judah. There is, however, no text-critical evidence for this supposition – rather, it is very likely that verse 13 is already itself a very late interpolation to the chapter, and that this late character of its text is probably the best solution for its many “unexpected” qualities, such as the mention of Judah (see 3.2.4).

The subjects of verses 7–23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>MT/LXX</th>
<th>La115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>sons of Israel</td>
<td>7*ab: 3rd person pl. (= Israel in v. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3rd person pl. (= sons of Israel)</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>sons of Israel</td>
<td>3rd person pl.: sons of Israel or Judah609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>3rd person pl. (= sons of Israel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yahweh; obj: Israel and Judah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3rd person pl. (= Israel and Judah?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>3rd person pl. (= Israel and Judah?)</td>
<td>3rd person pl. (= Israel in v. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>Yahweh; obj: Israel</td>
<td>Yahweh; obj: the rest610 of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b–19</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>Judah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MT: Yahweh; obj: all the seed of Israel</td>
<td>LXX: two subjects, 1)Judah 2)Yahweh; obj: all the seed of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>1)Yahweh or Israel 2)Israel</td>
<td>LXX: 1)Yahweh or Israel 2)Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>sons of Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a</td>
<td>Yahweh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No unified scholarly view on what these terms or concepts refer to in chapter 17 has developed. For instance, Brettler proposes, largely on the basis of the differing use of the term(s) “Israelites,” that the text of verses 7–22 has been composed from four

---

605 La115 also has the additional term “the rest of Israel” in verse 18, found nowhere else.
606 Not all agree, however: Werlitz, Könige, 275, sees the term “Israel” in the chapter as including both Israel and Judah. This interpretation does not seem very likely, however.
607 See McKenzie, Chronicler’s Use, 195 (“may refer to both”); Provan, Hezekiah, 70 “all twelve tribes”; Becking, Ondergang, 216. For opposing opinions, see Montgomery, 470: “This can hardly include Judah”; Cogan & Tadmor, 2 Kings, 207. The phrase is found elsewhere only in 1 Chr 16:13; Neh 9:2; Ps 22:24; Jer 31:36, 37; Isa 45:25, where the term usually seems to include either both or all the twelve tribes.
608 Montgomery, Kings, 469; O’Brien, Deuteronomistic History, 210; and Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 392, seem to consider this as an addition. However, some scholars, such as Eynikel, Reform, 92, consider this mention not that intrusive.
609 See on the assessment of the subject of verse 9 of La115 in 2.5.3.2.
610 The plus “rest” is likely a secondary reading in La115; see 2.6.9.
different sources. The term בֵּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל, “sons of Israel,” seems to indeed be, as already noted in the case of La115’s verse 9a, somewhat ambivalent semantically: in MT verse 7 it likely denotes “Israelites,” as in the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom. However, the second attestation inside a subordinate clause in verse 8 already raises questions: who are these sons of Israel “before whom Yahweh exiled the peoples,” a phrase which alludes to the exodus population, the fathers of Israel and Judah? Elsewhere in Kings this phrase appears to include both Israelites and Judahites (or all twelve tribes), as is most often done by the term “sons of Israel,” and this is probably the case here as well. Immediately after this “the sons of Israel” are addressed in verse 9, again seemingly including only the people of the Northern Kingdom. Overall, the MT uses the term “sons of Israel” more than does the LXX edition of Kings, although the difference is hardly significant. This fluctuation in meaning is not yet in itself very disconcerting, although it does make the reader wonder why the writer(s) could not have used clearer terms in verses 7, 8, and 9.

The case of verse 13 and its reference to Judah (“And Yahweh testified to Israel and to Judah … But they did not listen …”) is, however, much more confusing. The possibility of this mention of Judah being a gloss is completely plausible. As there is, however, no textual evidence for this, and since the text is grammatically completely valid, we may, or even have to, handle this mention of Judah as part of the text for as long as possible. This is the case especially when comparing two (or more) differing editions of the texts with each other. As the following verses 14–17 only use third person plurals without explicating the subject, we have to ask: Is Judah

611 Brettler, “Text in a Tel.” 119. These four sources would be found in vv. 7–12 (“sons”), 13–18a (“Israel”), 20 (“all the seed of Israel”), and 21–22 (“Israel”). Brettler does not seem to take into account, however, that the term “sons of Israel” is also used in verse 22.
612 See Brettler, “Text in a Tel.” 121, who mentions the three main uses of the term in Kings: 1) The Northern Kingdom, 2) the Judeans after the exile of the north, and 3) both the Northern and the Southern Kingdoms. As can be seen in note 614 below, the last one is the most recurrent in Kings.
613 In most cases this formulaic phrase is given in a Judahite context; cf. 1 Kgs 14:24 (Rehoboam), 21:26 (Ahab); 2 Kgs 16:3 (Ahab), 21:2 (Manasseh).
614 The term is used in an inclusive sense 11 times (in 1 Kgs 6:1, 13, 8:9, 63, 9:21, 11:2, 14:24, 21:26; 2 Kgs 16:3, 21:2, 9). The term seems to be used in the meaning “Northern Kingdom” 7 times (in 1 Kgs 12:24 (=12:24z OG), 18:20, 19:10, 20:15, 27, 29; 2 Kgs 13:5). The term denotes exclusively “Judah” only once in 2 Kgs 18:4.
615 The mention of the “sons” is missing in the LXX in 1 Kgs 6:13 (the whole verse being a later MT addition), 18:20 (πάντα Ἰσραήλ), 20:15 (πάν υἱὸν δυνάμεως), 29 (Ἰσραήλ); 2 Kgs 13:5 (L: Ἰσραήλ).
616 Thus also Becking, “From Exodus to Exile,” 221.
also to be read as a subject of the sins listed in these verses?\textsuperscript{617} Grammatically, this seems to be the correct (and only) understanding, but contextually this would be quite unexpected, as the passage would first and foremost be expected to consist of the condemnation of Israel.

There is also an interesting disparity in the use of the term “sons of Israel” between La\textsuperscript{115} and the MT/LXX. While the rest of the traditions give “sons of Israel” as the subject of verses 7 and 8, La\textsuperscript{115} does not have this term in its 7*ab. In fact, the only time we encounter this term in chapter 17 of La\textsuperscript{115} is in verse 9, which is given only after verses 15–19. While in the MT it is now hard to say who the actual subjects of verses 15–17 are (both Israel and Judah?), in La\textsuperscript{115} there is only one possibility: after mentioning “Israel” in verse 6, its text gives only third person plurals, and thus “Israel” is also the only possible subject in verses 15–18. The unit of 15–18 is also otherwise quite clearly meant, at least in its current form in every witness, to condemn specifically Israel: this can be seen in verse 16a, where we now find “and they made to themselves an idol, two calves,” a sin of which only the Northern Kingdom is ever accused.\textsuperscript{618} “Israel” (or, as in La\textsuperscript{115}, “the rest of Israel”) is then explicated as the object of Yahweh’s wrath in verse 18. Therefore, the use of the term “sons of Israel” actually seems to be characteristic of verse 9 and of MT/LXX verses 7–8. Elsewhere in the chapter, this term is found only twice more in verses 22 and 24, both apparently in the meaning “Israelites of the Northern Kingdom.” Even if this use of the term does, to a certain extent, bring more lexical unity to the chapter, it is nevertheless hard to say whether this more frequent use of the term is due to some interest on the part of a putative MT reviser.

Coming back to the question of the confusion of the subjects, La\textsuperscript{115} may give, in terms of narrative logic, a more logical text: only after the sins of Israel have been recounted in verses 15–18a, is “Judah” as a subject also brought into the picture in verses 18b–19. Only after this are “the sons of Israel” mentioned in verse 9, possibly as a differentiating (and/or all-encompassing) term from “Judah.” With La\textsuperscript{115}’s order

\textsuperscript{617} This is indeed what Becking, \textit{Ondergang}, 181, 240, proposes. Similarly also Viviano, “2 Kings 17,” 551: “Following v 13 as it now stands, the ‘they’ of v 14 can only refer to both Israel and Judah.” However, after this Viviano for some reason only refers to Israel as the subject of verses 15–18. See also Dietrich, \textit{Prophetie}, 43 and Sweeney, \textit{Kings}, 395: “Verses 13-17 emphasize YHWH’s witness against Israel and Judah ….”

\textsuperscript{618} Sweeney, \textit{Kings}, 395: “The reference to molten calves in v. 16 harks back to Jeroboam’s golden calves ….” Literary-critically, however, this mention of calves is clearly a gloss; see 3.2.4.
of the text, the mention of Judah in verse 13 would not be as surprising as it now is in the MT either: as Judah has been established as a sinner already in verse 19a (“And Judah, too, did not keep the statutes …”), it is only logical that Judah would be condemned/warned together with Israel in verse 13 after this.

This apparent logicality can be explained in two antipodean ways of textual development: either 1) La\textsuperscript{115} (or rather, its exemplar/Vorlage) has smoothed the text or 2) La\textsuperscript{115} gives the original, more logical order of the narrative units. From the narrative logical point of view, it is indeed preferable that the original meaning of the unit in question (verses 7–18) would have been to condemn Israel alone, and not to “anachronistically” foretell the destruction of Judah as well – as is now nevertheless done by both editions. Moreover, such narratological smoothing does not seem very likely, at least as the sole reason for such changes: in this case, La\textsuperscript{115} would have changed the readings of one verse (7) practically completely and omitted another (8), and after this transposed the two textual units just to get the subjects of the passages right. Such drastic editing seems superfluous. On the other hand, it is similarly possible that the more confused text has actually been born out of the more lucid one: the person transposing the units may not have been overly concerned about the subtle subject-altering consequences of his actions – indeed, the problems of the “confusing subject” only arise after the text is read carefully enough to see the quite small incongruities in it. The intuitive reading of the chapter, namely seeing only Israel as the subject of the sins in MT verses 8–18a, has been so apparent that most scholars have not mentioned these slight incongruities at all either.\textsuperscript{619} If the involvement of Judah in the sins of verses 14–17 was indeed an intended effect, one could expect this to also have been somehow otherwise emphasized in the text, but this is not the case. On the contrary, the sinfulness of Judah appears in the MT edition much more reduced than in La\textsuperscript{115}.

Of course, as I have argued elsewhere with Mäkipelto and Tucker, the narrative logic alone can hardly be used as the main argument for or against a text-critical case since such arguments are inherently reversible, as is also seen in this case.\textsuperscript{620} The end result of this perusal of the subjects thus brings no definite light to the question of the

\textsuperscript{619} This is also partly noted by Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 121–2: “Commentators have generally assumed that the children of Israel in 2 Kgs 17:7 refers to the north. This is suggested by context, and by the mention of Israel in vv. 13–18, which clearly refer to the northerners … However, given the composite nature of this chapter, this argument is of no value.”

\textsuperscript{620} See Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 14–16.
relationship of the two textual forms. However, the fact that La$^{115}$ may well have a text with a narratologically more fluid text form is important, as it gives further reason to think that its differences vis-à-vis the MT/LXX are hardly simply accidental, but go back to deliberate and meaningful changes on the part of one or the other.

3.1.4 Comparing the two “text blocks” of La$^{115}$
According to Trebolle, the two text blocks identified in La$^{115}$ form “two parallel literary units.”$^{621}$ However, in his article, Trebolle does not, apart from a few structural markers, discuss this parallelism much further. How exactly can this parallelism be seen in the text blocks? Trebolle mainly discusses some textual characteristics that seem to coincide at the seams of the text blocks, but if the two blocks are indeed “parallels,” there should be more similarities between the texts.

Interestingly enough, on the basis of the MT, Hoffman notes that the repetitions of the same ideas and motifs form two distinct “sections of side arguments” in verses 7–14 and 15–20 – sections that agree closely with La$^{115}$’s textual units.$^{622}$ As will be seen, the putative text block 19, 9–14, 20 is in many ways similarly constructed when compared with the composition of the preceding one in 7*b, 15–18.

One should, nevertheless, once again keep in mind that the evidence we possess is not complete: only the text of verses 17:1–6, 7*, 15–19, and 9a, in the given order, is extant in La$^{115}$. After this the only possibility is to work on the basis of the MT and the LXX. Therefore, we have to make the supposition that after 9a the text went on as now seen in other witnesses, namely having first verses 9–14 and after this probably 20–23 – or at least mostly so. Even though not ideal evidence-wise, this is the only way to make any further claims about the text and its editorial and redactional history.$^{623}$

---

$^{621}$ Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 222–3. According to him, these units are to be divided into 7*, 15–19 and 7*, 8–14.20. In Trebolle’s theory, verse 7* forms a protasis to both units, but, as argued above (2.4.3), this division of the verses does not seem likely.

$^{622}$ Hoffmann, Reform und Reformen, 129: “Wiederholungen und Variationen eines Motives finden sich also nicht nur im Verhältnis der beiden Hauptargumentationsgänge 7-20.21-23, sondern auch im Verhältnis der Teilargumentationsgänge 7-14.15-20. Solche Motivvariationen sind charakteristisch für dieses Kapitel wie für den Stil der dtr Kultgeschichtsschreibung überhaupt.” Hoffmann (ibid., 130–1) also notes that in verses 9–12, 16–17, and 21–22 three “cult catalogues” are listed, again peculiarly to be found inside the three different blocks delimited by La$^{115}$. See also Hobbs, 2 Kings, 227: “specific catalogue of misdeeds (vv 9b–12, 15–18).”

$^{623}$ When compared to many literary-critical theories, where even the textual evidence of the LXX is brushed aside with minimal comments, I would argue that this use of La$^{115}$ together with the MT/LXX is, while not optimal, still at least methodologically much more justified than, say, working solely on
3.1.4.1 Structural parallels: the seams of different text blocks

As already argued, it is of utmost importance to the analysis of La to note the similarities between verses 7*b and 19, as the text of 15–18 is framed by the repetition of the phrase “they did not guard the statutes of Yahweh their God.” However, the function of this sentence seems to be the same in both verses as well, namely, to begin a new textual block after a preceding one. The replicated phrase forms a sort of reprise to verse 7*b that begins a new, additional portion of the text.

Verse 7*b reconstructed Vorlage of La

Verse 19a reconstructed Vorlage of La

After these introductory verses, listings of sins follow. The second text block should thus be seen to begin not with verse 9, but already with verse 19a. The somewhat disconnected 18b, which also deals with Judah, should probably be seen as the conclusion to the first block.

Trebolle further argues that, in verses 15 and 20, the verb מוס , “to reject,” forms a similar frame around the first text block of verses 15–19. However, this “framing” only happens in the ordering of the MT/LXX, but not in La, where only verses 7*ab, 20aβ–23 would be left outside the framing. Therefore it does not seem very probable that this lone verb was used as a redactional marker or a “framing device” similar to some other materials in the text. What this reiteration of מוס does show, however, is that both text blocks use very similar phraseology at many points,
especially in their seam-verses (at the beginning of the first block and the end of the second).

Even more unlikely is the idea of Trebolle that the LXX plus οὐκ ἐφύλαξαν (*לא שמרו) in the middle of verse 15 reveals a redactional hinge-point, similar to the above-mentioned phrases in 7*b and 19a.630 There is, however, a gradual process to be noted in the stages of “abandoning” Yahweh in both the LXX and La115: first, in verse 15 only his statutes are abandoned by Israel, while finally in verse 20 Yahweh himself is abandoned (the MT form of verse 20 being secondary), seemingly by both Israel and Judah.631 This gradation was probably an original characteristic of the OG edition and the whole chapter, regardless of the original order of the text blocks.

On the other hand, verse 20 appears to form an ending to the second text block similar to that of the first one. As has been argued earlier, the MT has most probably lost the plus in the verse found in LXX (καὶ ἐθυμώθη Κύριος *יהוה ויתאנף) via homoioteleuton.632 As the reading is integral for understanding the history of the text and its composition, the plus should be seen as an original part of the text.

The phrase וַיִּתְאַנַּף יְהוָה ... בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, “Yahweh became angry … towards Israel,” found in verse 18a forms part of the ending formula of the first text block, together with the mention פָּנָיו לְמֵעַ וַיְסִרֵם, “he removed them from before his face.”633 It is then no wonder that we also find these same phrases and ideas in verse 20, at the end of the second block, although in a slightly altered wording, וַיִּתְאַנַּף יְהוָה בְּכָל־זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל … עַד אֲשֶׁר הִשְּלִיכָם מִפָּנָיו, “Yahweh became angry towards the whole seed of Israel … until he sent them from before his face.”634 The framing of the two text blocks is therefore very

---

630 See 2.6.6.2 for the discussion of this phenomenon.
631 The idea of Becking, “From Exodus to Exile,” 220, that “the two clauses in 2 Kgs 17,7–20 presume each other and should best be regarded as stemming from the same hand” is not that persuasive. Neither of the mentions is, at least explicitly, aware of the other, although the second mention in verse 20 could be argued to form the culmination of the actions of the first one in verse 15 – and it may, once again, be no coincidence that the two mentions are situated in the two different blocks identified by La115.
632 See 2.6.11 for the discussion.
633 Thus Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2-23,” 222–3, who goes as far as to suggest the Hebrew form of a common ending formula for both text blocks: יררונו הוה אלד אֵשֶׁת הָאָרֶץ אַלָּא יֹשֵׁב (יהוה אַלָּא יֹשֵׁב עד פָּנָיו) (223). This probably goes too far, as there is no need for both text blocks to have had completely identical beginnings/endings. If the text blocks originate from different scribes and from differing contexts, as is likely the case, it would indeed be no wonder that the forms and phrases differ from each other somewhat.
634 The case of verse 20 is complicated somewhat by the fact that an even more natural phraseological counterpart for 18a פָּנָיו מֵעַ וַיְסִרֵם could be found in verse 23α (לא יישמר עלי כְּאֶרֶץ יְהוָה אַלָּא נָשָׁה) instead of 20b? The verb and preposition construction used differ between 18a and 20b, which somewhat hinders seeing them as parallels. However, as already mentioned, complete and strict parallelism should not be expected,
similar, as both begin and end with practically the same formulations. This indicates that the units 7*b, 15–18 and 19, 9–14, 20 indeed parallel each other in their basic framework, and shows that the textual order is somehow deliberate, not due to any textual mishap in the transmission process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First text block (7*b; 18a)</th>
<th>Second text block (19a; 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning formula</strong></td>
<td>עֲשֹׂוּ לְבִלְתִּי ָכָהֶם מִפָּנָֽיו עֲשֹׂוּ לְבִלְתִּי ָכָהֶם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending formulae</strong></td>
<td>ידּוֹרֵם מֶעֲלָה יִחְדֶּשׁ אֲשֶׁר הָעָרָבָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.4.2 Parallels in the contents of the text blocks

The formulaic and structural parallels are not the only ones between the text blocks. The style of the chapter is quite repetitive throughout, and many of the phrases, ideas, and words are found in both text blocks:

**Similarities between the contents of the text blocks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text block 1 (7*b, 15–18)</th>
<th>Text block 2 (19, 9–14, 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7*b: beginning formula</td>
<td>19: beginning formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: Statutes and Torah</td>
<td>13: Statutes and Torah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“their fathers”</td>
<td>14: “their fathers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְָשֹׂ הַזֶּה אֶת־הַדָּבָר תַעֲשֹׂו אִ עְטוֹרִי</td>
<td>13: דְָשֹׂ הַזֶּה אֶת־הַדָּבָר תַעֲשֹׂו אִ עְטוֹרִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nations</td>
<td>11: nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Do not like these”</td>
<td>12: “Do not do this thing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: Asherim</td>
<td>10: Asherim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golden calves, host of heaven, Baal</td>
<td>12: לִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: “to do evil in order to enrage Yahweh”</td>
<td>11: “to do evil in order to enrage Yahweh”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“making” of ephod and teraphim (OG plus)</td>
<td>11: “making” of “bad things”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: ending formulae</td>
<td>20: ending formulae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, there are multiple lexical and phraseological parallels between these text blocks. The phrase “serving the לִיםʗִלּ” of verse 12 likely has its counterpart in the calves, the Asherim, the host of heaven, and Baal in verse 16. Similarly, the order of Yahweh to “do not this thing” in verse 12b (הַזֶּה אֶת־הַדָּבָר תַעֲשֹׂו אִ עְטוֹרִי) quite clearly reflects 15bβ, “Yahweh ordered them to not do like these” (לָבַלְתֵּה וְשָׁוֵא כָּהֶם). The idea of “making” (עשה) something is also recurrent between these verses in different traditions: in verse 11 “bad things” are made,\(^{635}\) which may correspond to the actual

---

\(^{635}\) In the LXX the Israelites also made “companions,” which is nevertheless probably due to textual corruption; see 2.6.2.
physical objects mentioned in OG verse 17 where the Israelites make “ephod and teraphim.” Verse 11b further echoes verse 17 in the concurrent phrase “to do evil in order to enrage him/Yahweh.” Furthermore, the negatively listed transgressions of subsequent verses 7b and 15aa of La115 (יְהַלַּכְתָּם אֶת מִצְוָתָם savings, לֶא שִׁמְרוּ אֶת מִצְוֹתָם 7b הָֽעָרַהֲנֵיהֶם אֵשׁ זְרֵעַ אֲבֹתֵם) are used in almost the same order in verse 13 in a prophetic exhortation thus emerges as a reiteration and reinterpretation of the first one.

Although the two listings are very similar, they also seem to exhibit differing lexical and even “ideological” traits. This indicates further that, if the block structure of La115 are original in the chapter, the narratives hardly originated from the same hand. In verse 16 the Israelites “make” (יוֹצִּלוּ) an Ashera (plural in OG), while in verse 10 they “set them up” (נִבְנֵוּ). The verb in the concluding formula differs between 18a “he rent them” (שִׁימָ֑לֵם) and 20 “he sent them away” (וַיְשִׁלִּיכּוּ). In La115 the already mentioned appearance of “sons of Israel” (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) in the text only in verse 9 also differentiates the two blocks. These differences in wording are, however, of somewhat dubious value alone, and can only be used as part of a cumulative argument.

More substantial and important than the slight lexical disparities are the differences in the ideology promulgated by the text blocks. The most apparent difference is, of course, the appearance of Judah as an explicit sinner in verses 19, 13a, and 20 (“all the seed of Israel”) – and possibly implicitly in the problematic term “sons of Israel” in verse 9 (see 2.5.3.2). The appearance of Judah in verses 18b–20 had already been taken in the earliest research as a sign of later (or, in the context of verses 7–23, often even the latest) redaction to the text, and therefore this may even be the most notable characteristic of the second text block. It is thus no surprise that verses 9b–10, which clearly allude to the sins of Judah (= 1 Kgs 14:23), are found in connection with Judah in the second block. Furthermore, as verse 13 is also inside the second text block, the usual way of seeing the mention of Judah in that verse as a gloss is no longer necessary: Judah in the second text block is explicitly just as guilty as Israel (or, as Schenker maintains, even more sinful), and therefore there is nothing unexpected in its appearance in verse 13. All the mentions of Judah apart from 18b, explicit or implicit, are thus to be found only inside the second text block in La115.
Furthermore, in verse 15 there are said to be nations “around” Israel, while in verse 11 (and 8 of MT) the nations have already been rooted out. Thus the ideology of complete conquest can be found in the second text block, but not in the first one.

3.1.4.3 Was the second text block originally an “independent unit”?
Piquer surmises that the text blocks identified with the help of La may not have originally simply been added successively one after the other, but that they comprised two independent units (editions “A” and “A”) that were added to the text at some point, either one after the other or even at the same time. However, it is hard to see how the clear parallelism of the units (on both structural and contextual grounds) came to be if they were completely independent of each other. Similarly, it would be hard to see how the first block, dealing solely with the Northern Kingdom, could have been missing from the putative earlier versions of La’s edition – the text history of the chapter would make little sense if the condemnation of Judah were originally given right after verse 6 or 7(*), especially since verse 21a must have originally been dependent on verse 18b of the first block, and not verse 20 of the second one. It seems unlikely that, as Piquer argues, there existed a text form (in his words “edition A”) where after the exile of the Northern Kingdom (6b) the focus would have immediately been directed to Judah and its misdeeds without any explication of Israel’s sins before it. As the theory that there is to be found a similar protasis to both units in verse 7* has earlier been found unsatisfactory as well, this theory is made even more problematic since there are probably no shared syntactical structures between the two textual blocks either.

While the second block does have a different ideological focus, it is still easy to see how it would have originated on the basis of the first unit. The second text block is thus indeed “independent” in the way that it can clearly be differentiated from the

---

636 Trebolle, “2 Kings 17.2-23,” 223: “The second unit, vv. 7*8-14 + 20-21 is characterized by the reference to ‘the nations that were around them’ … whereas the first, vv. 7*15-19, refers to ‘the nations whom the Lord drove out before the people of Israel.’” (Trebolle lists the text blocks in the wrong order, but the argument remains the same nevertheless.)

637 Piquer, “What Text to Edit,” 239–40. Compare this with the idea of Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 121, that parts of verses 7–23 originally constituted an independent sermon against Judah, which was later added to chapter 17: “I would suggest that 2 Kgs 17:7–12 are a misplaced fragment of a speech which justified the exile of Judah. The lack of such a speech in 2 Kings 25, where it would have been expected, has been noted. Such a speech probably did exist, and has been misplaced to 2 Kings 17.”

638 See 3.2.6 below for discussion.

639 See section 2.4 for the discussion of this theory. In this sense they are indeed very much “independent” of each other.
first one through both its structure and contents, but it is most probably text-historically secondary to the first one.

### 3.1.4.4 The parallel narrative structure in the context of LXX Kings

If there is indeed such a parallel narrative structure to be found in chapter 17, as posited above, are there any parallels to this phenomenon elsewhere in 1–2 Kings? Could it be that the creation of “text blocks” was a well-known scribal technique in antiquity? Tov indeed notes that “the technique of juxtaposing two versions of the same story was used from ancient times onwards in the composition of Hebrew Scripture.”

This occurrence in La is thus not completely out of place.

In LXX 1 Kings there indeed seem to be multiple similar narrative parallels. First of all, the story of Jeroboam’s rise to power is also told twice in the OG, but only once in the MT (1 Kgs 11:43–12:24). The second Jeroboam narrative of OG (12:24a–z) is also framed by the same opening and closing phrases as the first one – or vice versa. The same phenomenon may also be partly observable in the structure of the so-called “Miscellanies I and II” of LXX 1 Kgs 2:35a–o and 2:46a–l, as both of them begin with very similar accounts of Solomon’s wisdom. In 2 Kgs 10:36+ the OG (represented by L and LaM) also includes a short regnal narrative of Ahaziah of Judah in which Jehu’s rebellion is briefly recounted as well. The case of the MT Goliath story in 1 Sam 17–18 might be mentioned as a somewhat similar, albeit not completely parallel, phenomenon.

This technique of juxtaposing two parallel narratives is not, in fact, completely unique in the text of La either: in 2 Kgs 10:25–28 La also has a curious “double

---

640 Tov, “LXX and the Deuteronomists,” 158. Tov, “Three Strange Books,” 374, also considers the “duplication” of the Jehoshaphat narrative of 16:28a–h (OG) in 22:41–51 (kaige) a similar phenomenon, but this is not the case.

641 Verse 11:43 (καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Σαλωμῶν μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ...) shares the information with 12:24a (καὶ ὁ βασιλέας Σαλωμῶν κοιμάται μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ...). Verse 12:24 (τάδε λέγει κύριος οὐκ ἀναβήσετε ...) then repeats almost verbatim parts of 12:24y–z (καὶ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λόγου κυρίου καὶ κατέπαυσαν τοῦ πορευθῆναι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου) then repeats almost verbatim parts of 12:24y-z (καὶ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λόγου κυρίου καὶ κατέπαυσαν τοῦ πορευθῆναι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου).

642 Both verse 2:35a (καὶ ἔδωκεν κύριος φρόνησιν τῷ Σαλωμῶν καὶ σοφίαν πολλῇ σφόδρᾳ καὶ πλάτος καρδίας ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τῆς θαλάσσης) and 2:46a (καὶ ἦν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμῶν φρόνιμος σφόδρα καὶ σοφὸς καὶ Ιουδα καὶ Ισραηλ πολλοὶ σφόδρα ἡ ἡ ἄμμος ἡ ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης) begin their respective units with praise of Solomon’s wisdom using very similar wording.

643 However, in this case (or, at least, in the latest form of the MT – possibly the original parallel tradition was indeed given in a similar fashion in the OG edition of 1–2 Kings) the stories have been intertwined, and not simply given as two parallel narratives. This is also quite similar to how the so-called Jahvist and Elohist accounts work in Genesis.
narrative” (“VL\(^1\)” and “VL\(^2\),” as they are called by Trebolle)\(^{644}\) of sorts, telling about Jehu’s killing of the servants of Baal.\(^{645}\) In the MT and *kaige* text there are not many traces of two parallel narratives having existed, unlike in *La\(^{115}\)* and to a certain extent *L*.\(^{646}\) In *La\(^{115}\)* the additional parallel narrative “VL\(^1\)” seems to have been added to the text in a manner similar to the second text block of chapter 17,\(^{647}\) though in this case the two narratives VL\(^1\) and VL\(^2\) are even more clearly parallel. It seems that *La\(^{115}\)* preserves the original OG form (and likely the most original text altogether) in both chapter 10 and 17.

It should be further noted that in the text of 1–2 Kings most – if not all – of these parallel structures cannot be found in the MT. There are of course two possibilities for why this is: either the Vorlage of the LXX added these to the text, or the MT, for one reason or another, took them out or merged them into the other narratives. It is in either case important to note that this doubling tendency is something that appears to differentiate the two editions by and large, for whatever text-historical reason.

### 3.1.5 The “third text block”: verses 21–23 in the context of *La\(^{115}\)*

The originality of verses 21–23 in the context of 2 Kings 17 has long been a matter of literary- and redaction-critical debate.\(^{648}\) However one may see the origin of these verses, there is among scholars almost universal agreement that the verses begin their own literary, and possibly even redactional, unity. The signs for this independence are quite clear: the grammatically awkward beginning (יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי־קָרַע) of verse 21 remains as baffling as ever and seems to have no connection to the preceding verse 20.\(^{649}\) Also, the sudden change in the subject matter (the unlawful kingship and the sin of Jeroboam instead of the sins of the Israelites) when compared to earlier verses suggests that the verses originate from a different hand than the earlier narrative(s).\(^{650}\)

---


\(^{645}\) *La\(^{115}\)* first (VL\(^1\)) tells about the slaughter with singular verbal forms, as if Jehu himself was the one carrying out all the actions, while in the second narrative (VL\(^2\)) the verbs are in the plural, indicating that the ones performing the slaughter are his soldiers. See Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte*, 149–54 and Schütte, “2 Kön 10,23–28,” for an analysis of this parallel structure.

\(^{646}\) The peculiar amalgamation of text forms of *L* in 10:25–28 seems to prove the originality of the double narrative of *La\(^{115}\)* in a very similar way as happens in 17:7\(^{a}\).


\(^{648}\) A detailed analysis of these verses and the earlier scholarly discussion will be provided below in 3.2.

\(^{649}\) Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 56.

At this point the most important question is: to which verse were verses 21–23 originally attached? Two main proposals have been made. Many scholars have, rightly in my opinion, suggested that seeing verse 21 as (more) originally attached to verse 18 is the most probable solution. It has often been noted in the classical redaction-critical scholarship that verses 19–20, dealing with Judah both explicitly and implicitly, are intrusive and possibly later additions between verses 18 and 21. When these are taken out of the text, verses 18 and 21 flow quite smoothly. Interestingly enough, this mystery of verses 19–20 can also be similarly solved in the context of La115: even if not originally connected to each other in the manner now seen in the MT, verses 19 and 20 indeed belong to the same textual unity, which intrude between verses 18 and 21 – this intrusive unity in question just happens to be the second text block of verses 19.9–14.20 instead of 19–20 as in the MT/LXX. By postulating a later addition of this second text block, verses 18 and 21 could indeed be reconnected with each other.

There does not seem to be any difference when it comes to the function of verses 21–23 in either position, since both after verses 18 and 20 – or even verse 6 or 7*b – they function to explicate further the reason for Israel’s – and only Israel’s – exile. In any case, it is again quite remarkable that the order of La115, even if taken as a late and purely accidental construct, nevertheless agrees with some of the previously posited (and in this case, the most plausible and well supported) redactional theories, as well. In fact, since verse 20 would still precede 21 in La115, almost any broader literary-critical model already posited for the MT verses 18–21 (and, as will be seen, practically the whole chapter) could, to a certain degree, be adapted to its text as well.

Furthermore, if verses 21–22 (or parts of them) indeed more originally stood directly after 18 (before the addition of the second text block 19.9–14.20), this could

---

651 See, for instance, Provan, Hezekiah, 71; Rehm, Könige, 166; Kittel, Könige, 274.
652 For instance, Cogan & Tadmor, 2 Kings, 207; Gray, Kings, 591. Depending on whether 18b is deemed a gloss, the original unity would thus run either 18a.21 or 18b.21 onwards.
653 Alternatively, it has been suggested that verses 21–22 constitute part of the oldest material in the chapter and are now simply displaced from behind verse 6; see for instance Würtzhein, Bücher der Könige, 395. The now problematic לֹא in MT verse 7 could have thus originally been connected to the clause-beginning כִּי of 21, which seems to now lack its own לֹא – or any other protasis for that matter – as argued by Šanda, 2. Könige, 224. This theory would, however, require that the MT form of verse 7 is original, which may not be the case, as has previously been argued (2.4). Therefore, seeing this redaction-critical idea as a counterargument to the theory of La115’s primacy in verse 7 is possible, but not commendable: as the different opinions on the origins of verses 21–22 differ so greatly, and no clear consensus on their provenance has been formed, the argument would not have, methodologically speaking, very much weight over the text-critical one (rather, it would border on a circular argument).
help us explain some of the curious characteristics of verse 19 as well: the clause "וַיֵּלְכוּ עָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל קּוֹת בְּח", “they walked in the statutes of Israel, which they made,” of 19b could simply be seen as reflecting part of the material that previously stood after verse 18, namely 22a: "עָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר יָרָבְעָם טֹּאות כָּל־חַ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵי וַיֵּלְכוּ", “and the sons of Israel walked in all the sin(s) of Jeroboam, which he made.” The phrase would have been slightly altered (“statutes” of Israel instead of “sins” of Jeroboam) to the new context as a beginning clause, to function as a resumptive repetition of sorts. This theory could be further supported by the fact that in verse 9 of La115 we now also find the first mention of the somewhat problematic “sons of Israel,” who are similarly addressed in verse 22a. As verses 19 and 9 follow each other in La115, this possible phraseological connection between verse 22 and the beginning of the second text block becomes even stronger.

3.1.6 Conclusion: La115 as the sole witness of OG edition in verses 7–23
The main question of the preceding study was this: Can the text order of La115 be deemed not to result from a simple accidental change but rather to evidence a Greek textual form (~ OG), which would in turn go back to a meaningful Hebrew composition? On the basis of both structural and contextual arguments it has been argued that most likely this was indeed the case – or that, at least, since the order of La115 has so many peculiar features pointing to deliberate arranging, it was hardly born simply by accident.

The text form originally reflected by La115 seems to have been composed of two more or less independent text blocks (7*b, 15–18 and 19, 9–14, 20), both framed by similar beginning and ending formulae (verses 7*b/18 and 19/20, respectively). The contents of these blocks parallel each other to a certain degree, but they are also ideologically opposed: while the first one has its listings of sins directed solely against Israel (and thus older), the second block also brings Judah to the fore as a sinner.

Whether or not this OG text order is the most original, i.e., older than the MT version, is still an open question, and is likely to be unanswerable on textual arguments.

654 Or “deed(s)” if the reading *actibus* of La115 indeed goes back to a different Vorlage; see 2.6.10.
655 Supposing that the order of La115 was original, the use of this term in verse 9 would then have also spread to MT verses 7–8 after its transposition was made. In verse 20, the phrase קֵצָה יָשֶׂם is also found, possibly in turn reflecting 23aa.
alone (reversible argument). While the text of La115 seems to be narratologically more coherent, this more logical nature could be argued to be due to either the earlier or later character of its text. It is possible that the purely literary- and redaction-critical arguments, which will be evaluated next on the basis of the MT, will shed light on this problem, since it is unlikely that the text blocks now evidenced by La115 were originally created as units, but have rather evolved through multiple revisional stages, of which the “unification” of the blocks may be only one of the latest – if not the latest.

If indeed going back to a Hebrew Vorlage, the study of the present textual order of La115 already has quite far-reaching repercussions for its literary history: at least the first text block – or parts of its contents – must have preceded the second block, which was composed after the model of the first one. As will be argued below, verses 21–22 also preceded the second text block, and verse 22, which may already come from the History writer, possibly preceded even the first text block. It is similarly likely that, as previously argued, 7*a is literarily independent of 7*b (or any other passage), and was interpolated at a later date – or, if the transposition of La115 preserved the latest stage of the textual evolution, as a part of this transposing action.
3.2 The MT edition: in search of the History writer

After analyzing the literary form of the OG edition, it is time to take a look at the form of the MT. In this section the text of the MT, with certain text-critical modifications suggested above (sections 2.4–2.6), will be literary-critically analyzed especially in order to find the very first layer (History writer) upon which the later revisers made their additions (and at times, omissions). The text of verses 7–23, which has created such heated debate in the scholarship, is most probably a result of a very complex web of additions by multiple hands. It is therefore exceedingly hard to separate these different strands of traditions, especially since the original input of the History writer appears to be minimal in these verses – if present at all. The reader should bear in mind that, because of the already-mentioned limitations of redaction-/literary-critical method (see the Introduction as well as 3.2.7–3.3 below), the results of the literary-critical analysis below are best understood as “explorations” in the jungle that is the textual history of 2 Kings 17:7–23. While some groundwork and foundations can fairly certainly be established, many findings remain much more speculative.

3.2.1 Broader literary limitations in the MT edition of verses 6b–23

As has been argued, the annalistic material (1, 5–6αα, mostly in the OG form) and the History writer’s additions to this base text (2–3, 4α* in their OG form), which constitute the oldest text of the chapter, ends with verse 6, probably according to the OG text and its plus “until this day” at the very end of the verse. Likewise, 6αα (annals) likely differs from the History writer’s 6αβ (וַיֶּגֶל אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל אַשּׁוּרָה, ) as the earlier object of conquest, “Samaria” of verses 5–6αα, changes to a broader term “Israel,” denoting the whole Northern Kingdom, a term which is retained for the rest of the chapter.

After this, the scholarly opinions on the literary and redactional state of the chapter start to differ greatly, as may be seen in the table below:

---

656 See 2.3 for the analysis of the material in verses 3–6.
657 This use of “Samaria” as the object continues in verse 24, which could show an original link between these two passages; see Levin, “Der Untergang des Königtums von Israel,” 180, who posits that the annalistic material encompasses verses 1.3a.5*–6.24αα.α, verse 4(b*) thus being late as well. As has been seen, there are indeed many grave text-critical problems in verse 4, which would further corroborate Levin’s hypothesis (and as he himself asserts in Levin, “In Search,” 257).
658 For a somewhat similar table, divided between pre-exilic, exilic, and post-exilic materials, see Trebolle, “2 Kings 17.2-23.” 224–5. It has to be noted that, simply for the sake of presentation, the column “even later additions” combines under only one column a single “textual layer,” even though the reconstructions are actually in many cases much more nuanced with multiple later layers.
Essentially, the vast majority of scholars agree that there is a literary break of some kind between verses 7–18 and 21–23. According to most scholars, a later hand interpolated 19–20 between 18 and 21. This is a clear and well-argued position, and, as already seen even in the analysis of La115’s text form, such a literary break between verses 18 and 19 is also corroborated even by the textual evidence from the OG edition. This tripartite understanding will, for the most part, also be taken here as a working hypothesis. However, as seen in the table above, it is still debated whether 7–

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Most original unity</th>
<th>Secondary additions</th>
<th>Even later additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klostermann (1887)</td>
<td>18b, 21–23</td>
<td>7–18a</td>
<td>19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzinger (1899)</td>
<td>21–23</td>
<td>7–18</td>
<td>19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittel (1900)</td>
<td>18, 21–23</td>
<td>7–17, 19–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burney (1903)</td>
<td>7–18, 21–23</td>
<td>19–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stade (1904)</td>
<td>21aba, 22–23</td>
<td>7–14, 15bβ–18</td>
<td>15aba, 19–20, 21bβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śanda (1912)</td>
<td>7aα, 21–23</td>
<td>7aα2–18</td>
<td>19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noth (1943)</td>
<td>7–20</td>
<td>21–23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery (1951)</td>
<td>21–23</td>
<td>7–18</td>
<td>19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jepsen (1953)</td>
<td>21, 23b</td>
<td>7–20, 22, 23α</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vaux (1958)</td>
<td>7a, 21–23</td>
<td>7b–18</td>
<td>19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (1964)</td>
<td>18, 21–23</td>
<td>7–17, 19–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debus (1967)</td>
<td>21–23</td>
<td>7–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietrich (1972)</td>
<td>7–11, 20</td>
<td>12–19</td>
<td>21–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson (1981)</td>
<td>7–20, 23b</td>
<td>21–23a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becking (1985)</td>
<td>21aba, 22–23</td>
<td>7–20</td>
<td>21bβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provan (1988)</td>
<td>7αα, 18a, 21–23</td>
<td>7αβ–17, 18b–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eynikel (1996)</td>
<td>7a, 9, 11a, 16αβ, 21–23</td>
<td>8, 10, 12–16αα2, 18, 20</td>
<td>11b, 17, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius (2003)</td>
<td>21–23</td>
<td>7a, 8–11, 18</td>
<td>7b, 12–17, 19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer (2005)</td>
<td>21–23</td>
<td>7–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakkala (2012)</td>
<td>7a, 21</td>
<td>7b–11, 13–15αββ, 12, 15αa, 16</td>
<td>16b–18, 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

659 Small glosses (like that of שִׁבְיַד in 16) have not been included in the table. Klostermann, König, 453–4; Benzinger, König, 174; Kittel, König, 274; Burney, Kings, 330–1; Stade, Kings, 48; Śanda, König, 220–4; Noth, ÜSt., 85; Montgomery, Kings, 470; Jepsen, Quellen, app. 1; De Vaux, 1–2 Rois, 199; Gray, Kings, 591–2; Debus, Sünde Jeroboams, 99; Dietrich, Prophetic, 45–6; Nelson, Double Redaction, 63; Rehm, 2 König, 166–71; Würthwein, Bücher der König, 395–7; Becking, Ondergang, 179–200; Cogan & Tadmor, 2 Kings, 207; Provan, Hezekiah, 71–2; McKenzie, Trouble with Kings, 141–2; Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 131–2; Eynikel, Reform, 91–2; Fritz, König, 95–6; Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 442–3; Kratz, Composition of the Narrative Books, 168–9; Aurelius, Zukunft, 84–5, 89; Römer, So-Called Deuteronomistic History, 121; Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings,” 143–5.
18 or 21–23 includes the more original text (or rather, some parts of the oldest text) – and whether either of these units already belongs to the History writer.

Since it is very unlikely that the History writer would not have commented at all on the fall of the Northern Kingdom himself, the starting point of constructing a redactional model of the chapter would be to first separate these most original parts upon which later redactors and revisers piled their additions and glosses. In order to do this, it is important to first consider the most elementary literary limitations of the text: Which textual units can or cannot, from the get-go, be considered viable as the original layer, and on what basis? Or are there reasons to conclude that there is in fact no such material to be found after verse 6?

There are indeed some larger literary critical caveats that first need to be heeded before starting the analysis of verses 7–23, namely:

1) the possible (editorial) framing devices in 6b/23b and/or 18a/23a;
2) the grammatical frame created in the MT by 7α.18a, and the narrative interrupting 13a inside this frame;
3) the grammatical problems of 21a, especially if this verse is to be connected directly to 6b; and
4) the challenge of OG verse 2 to the larger redactional overview of chapter 17.

The foremost challenge to the view that verses 7–23 might contain any ancient materials is verse 6aβ (with the OG plus והזו היום עד, which seems, from a structural point of view, to form a Wiederaufnahme with 23b:

\[
\text{Such a use of an ancient editorial technique would indicate that most, if not all, of the materials found inside this resumptive repetition (verses 7–23a) are later additions to the text.}^{661}
\]

Therefore the History writer’s layer in the chapter would be extremely small: only in verses 1–6 could there be found any traces of the oldest text of the author, with everything else – that is, more than 35 verses – coming from later hands.

---

660 Of course, as already noted, it would seem similarly unlikely that the History writer should not give the usual condemnation formula concerning the “sin of Jeroboam” to Hoshea, the last king of Israel – but seemingly this is exactly what is done (see 2.2). This fact only underlines the challenges of reconstructing the very oldest textual layer in verses 7–23, and that our redaction-critical expectations are not always met by the textual evidence.

661 Thus also Aurelius, Zukunft, 77–8. Long, 2 Kings, 182–3, while also positing a Wiederaufnahme here, does not see it as the marker of a late addition, but as a “stylistic” device.
The text of verse 23b is almost verbatim that of 6aβ, except for the additional מֵעַל אַדְמָתוֹ of 23b, which has, especially in connection with 2 Kgs 25:21, a slightly theologizing flavor: the use of אַדְמָתוֹ quite clearly alludes to the idea of the promised land and to the myth of empty land after the deportation. This indicates that, at least, the formulation of 23b is later than that of 6aβ. However, in order for this repetition to constitute an editorial Wiederaufnahme, it needs to be ascertained that the thematic and ideological contents of the framed text, which will be analyzed below, can also be deemed to reflect late ideas.

The passage framed by verses 6 and 23 adds the reason(s) for the fall of Israel narrated in verses 3–5. As verses 7–23 evidently do not form a literary unit as a whole, we have to look for the original added unity. It is usually proposed that this unity most probably started with MT verse 7a. As has been argued earlier (2.4), however, already here, at the very beginning of the literary-critical work of the chapter, the text-critical material may hinder the conventional redactional picture since the text form of La115 (= OG) may well have the oldest text extant in verse 7, which greatly differs from the MT form.

Nevertheless, if one decides to take the text and edition of the MT as it stands as the basis of one’s literary analysis, the protasis construct כִּי וַיְהִי (“and happened, because …”) can only have its apodosis in verse 18a, יהוה וַיִּתְאַנַּף (“… that Yahweh became angry towards Israel”) – or, alternatively, 13a (“that Yahweh warned Israel and Judah …”), which interrupts the flow of the narrative and is therefore a very late interpolation to the context (cf. below). This is the only unproblematic syntactical understanding of the construction כִּי וַיְהִי of the MT, and any other translations of the construction are likely faulty. Already the way one translates the construction,

662 The idea of a promised land is found elsewhere in Kings only in 1 Kgs 8:34, 40, 9:7, 14:15 (> LXX); 2 Kgs 21:8. See especially 2 Kgs 25:21 where the exile of Judah is recounted with the exact same formula (אַדְמָתוֹ מֵעַל יְהוּדָה וַיִּגֶל). The quite rare phrase גהל+אדמות is elsewhere used in Jer 52:27 and Amos 7:11.
663 Similarly Becking, Ondergang, 169 (“…onderbroken door vers 13 …”) and Ehrlich, Randglossen, 313 (“Das Ganze von hier an bis V. 12 bildet den Vordersatz zu V. 13.”). Verses 20b and 23a, which have practically the same text, have not been proposed as the apodosis in the research, although they too are grammatically completely viable options.
664 See 2.4.3.2. For example, Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings,” 143, translates “this happened, because …” which makes it possible for him to connect 7aa directly to 21a as the oldest text, with nothing else in between. Similarly De Vaux, Livres des Rois2, 199. However, such a Hebrew text with two conjunctions, reading יִהְיֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל יָרָבְעָם־קָרַע וַיַּמְלִיכוּ בֵּית אֱלֻיֶ֑והַה בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל נַחֲלָ֣ת־יִשְׂרָאֵ֤ל נַחֲלָת־יָרָבְעָם־קָרַע֙ to connect 7aa to 21a is not very likely and does not make much sense. In order to make such translations, one would need to emend the beginning as ויהי ככ or the like – although such a construction seems quite awkward, and ויהי ככ is very rare (Gen 1:7, 9, 11, 15, 24, 30; Judg 6:38; 2 Kgs 15:12; Amos 5:14).
therefore, has repercussions for the redactional analysis of the passage. This, of course, constrains the literary and redactional analysis of the chapter further since if verse 7a is taken as the beginning of the oldest text of the chapter after 1–6, this necessitates seeing its apodosis 18a as coming from the same literary stratum (this does not apply to the converse, however). 665

As an alternative to such an understanding of 7a, Šanda suggests that only the first verb of the verse, וַיְהִי of 7aα, should be seen as original, with the now otherwise enigmatic syntactical structure כִּי מָשָּׂא, “because it/he tore,” of verse 21a serving as its original continuation (instead of כִּי־חָטְאוּ of 7a). 666 This resulting כִּי וַיְהִי construction would thus be grammatically less problematic, having its apodosis in the כִּי־מָשָּׂא of 21b (“And it happened, 21abecause/when he tore Israel from the house of David. 21bthat they made Jeroboam king …”). 667 This makes it possible for Šanda to consider everything in 7b–20 as later additions. However, this solution is also problematic from the grammatical point of view since the subject of 21a כִּי מָשָּׂא, “(he) tore,” if read as transitive qal, would be the king of Assyria directly after verse 6, which is obviously impossible. However, as argued by many, the qal form כִּי מָשָּׂא of MT should be understood as either reflexive (“Israel tore itself”) or, more likely, the verb form was changed in the (proto-)MT stage from the more original niph’al form ענקר, as attested by the OG, to the MT qal כִּי מָשָּׂא. 668 Such a solution would alleviate the problems of Šanda’s theory.

Verse 18a (or, as some contend, verse 20) thus works as the punishment clause for the sins listed from verse 7 onwards and as a suitable conclusion even to the original denunciation of Israel and its sins in the chapter. One would not expect any more sins to be mentioned after the exile of the Israelites in 18a. However, such a reconstruction would leave the mention of Jeroboam’s sin in verses 21–22 out of both the original text of verses 1–6 and even the putative original layer in 7–17 where no

665 Provan, Hezekiah, 71–2, sees only this unity of 7a.18a as the most original text in verses 7–20, with everything between as later addition(s).
666 Šanda, 2. Könige, 224.
667 In such a case one could even argue that the two כִּי conjunctions in 7a and 21a now form a Wiederaufnahme-like repetition, between which the later interpolations were then made.
668 For the text-critical discussion, see 2.6.12. In his “Reconstructed Hezekian History,” Thomas, Hezekiah and the Compositional History, 435, has verse 21 follow 6 directly while still maintaining that the subject should be seen as Yahweh, apparently implicitly. This is of course not possible. However, it is possible that the original niph’al form was harmonized to a qal form because of the late additions of verses 7–18, or even 19–20, before it, so that the subject of 18/20 (Yahweh) would only later also become the subject of 21a.
mention of Jeroboam can be found. Some scholars have found this problematic since this would mean that the sin of Jeroboam, the universally thought staple mark of the History writer, would not have been mentioned at all in the original edition of chapter 17 but only by some later redactor. 669 This seems unlikely. On the other hand, if the History writer’s text is supposed to have ended already with verse 6, no sin would have been recounted in such a text for either the people of Israel or its king, Hoshea. The only apparent reason for the destruction would be the political miscalculation of Hoshea found in verse 4a – which is also a late addition. 670 It is thus hard to argue that no explicit (theological) reason at all would have originally been given for the fall of Israel in chapter 17. 671

Furthermore, linked to this problem, the textual challenge of verse 17:2 – whether Hoshea was a relatively good (MT) or the worst (OG) king of Israel – should also be noted since it might have redactional significance for verses 7–23. 672 According to the MT, Hoshea, who “did what was wrong in the eyes of Yahweh, though not like the kings of Israel before him” does nothing particularly wrong – apparently he did not even walk in the sin of Jeroboam. This is of course baffling, as in this case there would be even less reason for the exile in verses 1–6. If we were to understand, for instance, that Hoshea being the not-worst king means that the worship of the calves in Bethel and/or Dan had already ceased, 673 the condemnation of the MT must be late since the calves were hardly yet present in the History writer’s text. 674 Hoshea being “not like the kings of Israel before him” would then have to mean something else, and there is at least a possibility that his not being as evil had something to do with his not following the sin of Jeroboam since almost all the other kings of Israel are said to have

670 For all of 3–4 as a likely (mixture of) later addition(s), see 2.3.
671 It is also possible – albeit extremely unlikely – that the explicit reasoning was originally given elsewhere, for example in 1 Kgs 14:15–16 or 2 Kgs 18:12, and therefore there was no need to do it again in 2 Kgs 17. Indeed, O’Brien, Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis, 209, argues that 1 Kgs 14:16 was part of the DtrH scheme, while also claiming that 2 Kgs 17:22–23a should similarly be seen as DtrH material. On the other hand, Nelson, Double Redaction, 61–3, seems rather to opt for the originality of 2 Kgs 18:12. Both passages are, however, quite suspect of being late: 1 Kgs 14:16 is missing from the LXX, and 2 Kgs 18:12 is similarly phraseologically very exceptional – the idea of “hearing the word of Yahweh” is only once found elsewhere, in 1 Kgs 20:16, a late prophetic story; see also Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 380, 447, who argue for the lateness of both passages.
672 See 2.2 for the text- and literary-critical assessment of the verse.
673 As was the understanding of the rabbinic writers, and as argued by Van der Kooij, “Zur Exegese,” 111–12.
674 The calves in 1 Kgs 12:28–30 are probably a late invention. See 1.3.
done so. In the OG text there would of course be much more reason for the exile, since Hoshea “did more evil than anyone before him,” apparently surpassing even Ahab, the epitome of evil. Such a reading would at least imply that the sin of Jeroboam was continued by him, although it is hard to say if such an implicit remark alone would have sufficed for the History writer. In any case, the OG text form would make more sense in a redactional model where only parts of verses 1–6 were posited to attest to the most original text.

As a second option, it has been proposed that the original unity should be found in verses 6, 21–23, between which verses 7–20 were added in various stages. The aforementioned problems of the subject of the construction stay the same, but, as has been argued, they are text-critically emendable. There is thus no grave need to suggest that some material has been lost before 21, for instance.

The unity of verses 6, 21–23 would easily solve the problem of Jeroboam’s sin not yet being mentioned in relation to the fall of the Northern Kingdom in verses 1–6. There are two main large-scale literary-critical problems with this solution, however: the first being the already mentioned possible *Wiederaufnahme* in 6b and 23b; the second would be another rather suspicious repetition found between 18a and 23a:

18a פָּנָיו מֵﬠַל וַיְסִרֵם יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמְאֹד יְהוָה וְיִתְאַנַּף

23a פָּנָיו מֵﬠַל יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־הֵסִיר עַד

The phrases are similar enough to warrant a literary connection of some sort. The complexity of the situation is further increased by the fact that 20b (ודּ אוהֳוֹתָם) is also very similar to these phrases, and especially 23a – Brettler even comes to the conclusion that there is a resumptive repetition not between 18a and 23a, but between 20b and 23a. Of course, in the OG edition these repetitions seem to mark literary hinge-points and form no such substantial challenges as they do in the MT.

---

675 Levin, “Frömmigkeit,” 156, indeed assumes that Hoshea desisted from Jeroboam’s sin: “Der letzte König Hoschea schließlich unterläßt die Sünde Jerobeams ganz.” Similarly Wiseman, *Kings*, 265: “He seems not to have inaugurated or continued the anti-Yahwistic practices for which Israel itself is condemned” and Pietsch, “Hoshea ben Elah,” 341.

676 Thus, for instance, Römer, *The So-called Deuteronomistic History*, 121; Thomas, *Hezekiah and the Compositional History*, 435.

677 As cautiously suggested by Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 56: “However, it is just possible that the beginning of the phrase was lost through the editorial process.”

678 Brettler, “Text in a Tel,” 119–20. This would of course make the unit 21–22 even later than verses 19–20, which are usually seen as the latest additional unit in 7–23. Rehm, 2. Könige, 166, on the other hand, considers verses 18b–22 to constitute a “Zwischenabschnitt.”
As will be seen, there are indeed some ideological peculiarities in verses 21–22 that indicate that at least some parts of verse 21 – if not the verse as a whole – are probably later additions to it. Nelson goes as far as to suggest that 21–22 are “an even later addition by someone who missed any mention of Jeroboam, dependent upon both the historian and the second editor in language.”\textsuperscript{679} It is not necessary to make such drastic statements, however: some parts of 21–23, and especially verse 22, may be still taken as already belonging to the History writer, as will be argued below. However, everything else, that is 7–20, likely does not originate from the earliest text form, but constitute a complex web of subsequent additions and interpretations by numerous different editorial hands. It is thus best to consider these repetitions as emerging from editorial meddling, but not as involving the technique of \textit{Wiederaufnahme}. With these preconditions in mind one may start the assessment of the “first homiletical passage” of 7–23.

\textbf{3.2.2 How unified is the “unit” of verses 7–18?}

It has been concluded above that at least verses 7a(MT), 18a; 19–20; and 21–23(a) should be seen as coming from at least two different hands, 19–20 being an interpolation between the two other units, of which 21–23 (or at least 22–23a) has good likelihood of even coming from the History writer himself. What about the in-between material in 7–17? Even though some, most notably Noth, have seen the passage in question as coming from only one author,\textsuperscript{680} the number of repetitions, glosses, contradictions, and even differing ideologies – as already briefly noted in the analysis of La\textsuperscript{115}’s text blocks – makes it likely that the materials in between have been composed by several hands.

There are repetitions of certain elements, such as Yahweh exiling the peoples from before the Israelites (8, 11), the Israelites erecting Asherim (10)/making Ashera (16), and doing evil and inciting the wrath of Yahweh (11, 17). In verses 8 and 11 we learn the peoples have been exiled by Yahweh from before the Israelites, but in 15 they are said to be still “around them.” Furthermore, verses 7–12 (and 16aβ–17a) have their focus on the cultic crimes and the veneration of other gods, while verses 13–16aα.


\textsuperscript{680} Noth, \textit{ÜSt.}, 85–6, according to whom this author was the Historian. Similarly, e.g., O’Brien, \textit{Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis}, 210: “From a literary critical point of view 2 Kgs 17:7-18a, apart from a later insertion in v 12, exhibits a high degree of uniformity” and Šanda, \textit{Könige}, 223: “Der Abschnitt 7–18 ist einheitlich.”
have their focus solely on the many ordinances Yahweh had given to the Israelites (and their fathers), which they had not followed. 681 There are thus multiple phraseological and thematic reasons to presume multiple editors at work.

Several scholars have seen these characteristics as reason for a redactional break into two distinct units in verses 7–12 and 13–17.682 The earlier subject of verses 7–12, i.e., “Israel,”683 prematurely changes in verse 13 to “Yahweh,” whose speech is now addressed not only to Israel, but also to Judah. Thus the interrupting verse 13 is in this model seen as beginning a second unit, spanning all the way to verse 17 or 18. The mention of Judah also means that, grammatically, the plural subjects of verses 14–17 are to be understood as both Israel and Judah (the objects of the denunciation of Yahweh), which could hardly have been the meaning of the original text of the History writer.684 Also, the ideological significance and role of prophets as the preachers of Yahweh’s statutes and commands in verse 13 differs from the more customary idea in the books of Kings of a prophet as a miracle worker or simply as a messenger of Yahweh’s word.685 It is highly likely that verses 13 and 14 following it form a later explicating interpolation to the text (in the case where the MT is taken as the more original edition of the chapter, that is).

Other unities can also be proposed on the basis of the underlying ideological tendencies of redactors. Not finding the differentiation between 7–12 and 13–18 satisfactory, Eynikel proposes that, since the History writer was evidently interested in the high places and the “sin of Jeroboam,” verses 7a, 9, 11a, 16aβ, 21–23 could

---

681 See 3.1.4 for the suspiciously even distribution of many of these repetitions and differences between the two textual units of the OG (9–14, 15–18). A somewhat similar division, although not as marked as in the OG (which has clear literary divisions between the two), is thus also to be found in the MT. The fact that both traditions display similar tendencies points very strongly to the conclusion that there are indeed at least two distinct literary layers in verses 7–17.

682 Thus, for instance, Fritz, König, 95, 98–9; Spieckermann, Juda unter Assur, 222; Würtlwein, Bücher der Könige, 392, 395–7 (two DtrN units 7–12.18 and 13–17.20). Some see the break to lie between 11 and 12 (or 13) instead; see Dietrich, Prophetic, 44–6; Aurelius, Zukunft, 82, 87 (8-11.18, 13-17.19-20, verse 12 being an even later interpolation between 11 and 13).

683 The terms “Israel” and “sons of Israel” are interpreted in this section as denoting the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom only. This is the most uncomplicated understanding of the terms, even though, as argued earlier, some objections to this view can be raised; see 3.1.3 for the discussion of the terms.

684 For further analysis of this phenomenon, see 3.2.4.

685 Rösel, “Why 2 Kings 17,” 88: “This understanding is typical of Jeremiah and Ezekiel and is alien to the Deuteronomist, especially to the Deuteronomists in Kings, who describe the prophets as intervening in Israel’s history according to a schema of prophecy and fulfillment”; similarly Würtlwein, Bücher der Könige, 397. According to Gray, Kings, 588–9: “The inclusion of Judah in the doom of Israel here and at v. 19 indicates a post-exilic date, as does also the reference to the ignoring of the prophets’ call to turn from their evil ways.”
have formed the original textual unity, with everything else having been added later in two main stages. However, the main problem with this particular reconstruction is that the resulting text is not grammatically, or even logically, sound: the difficult protasis of 7a does not have an apodosis, since 18a is deemed to be later by Eynikel.

Nevertheless, the idea of a text unit in verses 7–11 revolving around the illegitimate and uncentralized (possibly still Yahwistic) cult on the high places is plausible. Indeed, as Eynikel reconstructs, there are signs that suggest that verses 9b and 11a originally followed each other without verse 10 in between (see below). Therefore, a modified working hypothesis of 7aa, 9ba, 11aab, 18(a), 22–23a on the basis of Eynikel’s model could be proposed as having the oldest text in verses 7–23, and as the best base text to mostly suit the style and needs of the History writer. Verses 7aa and 18a would form the grammatical “frame” inside which 9ba, 11aab recounted the grave provocation of making high places. After this the sin of Jeroboam (22) is recounted for the whole of Israel one last time before their exile (23a). However, certain phraseological phenomena in verses 9 and 11 may point to the later provenance of even these verses. In the end, it will be argued, we are left with only 22–23a as the likeliest option for the most original text layer in verses 7–23.

3.2.3 Analysis of verses 7–12
The text-critical findings already suggested that 7b and the phrase “they feared other gods” (אֲחֵרִים אלהים they feared other gods) may be a late, possibly even as late as proto-MT, addition to the text which found its way even into the L tradition via kaige. The phrase is highly suspicious even without text-critical evaluations since יִרְאוּ אֲחֵרִים האֱלֹהִים can be found in the whole Hebrew Bible otherwise only in 2 Kgs 17:35, 37, 38, which are

---

686 Eynikel, Reform, 91. Eynikel asserts that the calves were also important to the Historian, thus taking 16aβ (رسمו למסכה) as original material, but this is not likely; see 3.2.4.
687 Eynikel, Reform, 91. Such a resulting syntactical structure with two כי clauses in 7a and 21a would also be very peculiar, not to mention that the second כי clause of 21a would also be quite nonsensical after 16aβ (how does making a molten image relate to Yahweh tearing Israel from the house of Judah?), even if the verb of 21a is read as reflexive or niph’al נקרע. Eynikel’s reconstruction therefore does not pass the Gegenprobe.
688 In a way this hypothesis can be seen as updating the base text proposed by Eynikel.
689 In fact, if one reads 7aa without the verb וַיְהִי, one could even posit a grammatically sound redactional model 7aa, 9b, 11aa(b), 22–23a (or an even more stripped one of 7aa, 22–23a!), thus without the apodosis of 18a, as the original text of the first homiletical passage. The text-critical evidence (La15, which does not have this verb; see 2.4.3.2) could support this claim to a limited extent. In this model one would also need to delete the unnecessary and redundant יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵי of 22 as a gloss that was made necessary after the addition of 21aa+β (the subject of which is Jeroboam).
690 See 2.4.3.3.
evidently very late. As this is the first explicit sin mentioned, this phrase could have been added here to emphasize that the main sin of the northerners was (and still is in verses 29–33) first and foremost idolatry – i.e., transgressing the first commandment. Kartveit notes that this use in the latter part of the chapter may have simply been picked up from the earlier verse 7 – but the reverse is just as possible, and in this case more likely.

Verse 8, which is now completely lacking from the OG edition reflected by La, is similarly redactionally quite questionable, as its text clearly echoes Lev 20:23a and has phraseology rarely used in Kings. Textual attestation also indicates that the grammatically very difficult 8b (עָשׂוּ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמַלְכֵי) is an even later (proto-Masoretic?) gloss-like addition to the verse. As the meaning of the term “the sons of Israel” – which is suspiciously and unnecessarily mentioned in three subsequent verses – also changes between verse 7 (Northern Kingdom) and 8 (all Israelites), then in 9 back to the understanding of 7, verse 8a appears like a later interpolation between the two.

Furthermore, the similarities of verse 8 with the “sin of Rehoboam” are to be noted: the clause יִשְׂרָאֵלהַגּ בְּנֵי מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה הוֹרִישׁ אֲשֶׁר וֹי ("the peoples whom Yahweh drove from before the sons of Israel") is verbatim the same as found in 1 Kgs 14:24. This allusion to the sins of Judah is no coincidence when it is noted that verses 9–10 also

---

691 Similarly Aurelius, Zukunft, 81. See 2.4.3.3 and 4.5.2 for the discussion of this phrase in both redactional and text-critical terms. Nelson, Double Redaction, 53–4, 57, notes that 7b and 13–14 show similarities with the language use of Judges 2:1–5 and 6:7–10, which he deems secondary additions to Judges.

692 Kartveit, “Date of II Reg 17,24-41,” 41. If 7b is nevertheless taken as original, the sentence could also work very well in direct connection with 9b ("they feared other gods and built them high places..."); were the verses 8–9a deemed secondary to them (which they quite likely are), this would effectively render the text of 9b idolatrous – and thus non-DtrH – as well.

693 Leviticus 20:23a reads מִפְּנֵיכֶם מְשַׁלֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי הַגּוֹי קֹת ("do not walk in the statutes of the peoples"). The action of the sons of Israel, namely “walking in the statutes of the peoples, whom Yahweh exiled before the sons of Israel,” is the exact violation of Lev 18:3, 20:23 ("do not walk in the statutes of the peoples").

694 See 2.5.1–2. Especially interesting is the lack of this phrase in the Samaritan Sepher ha-Yamim. If this minus was indeed already due to its Vorlage, and not the Samaritan editors, this would be evidence for exceedingly late (proto-)Masoretic editing.

695 See 3.1.3 for further discussion of the subjects of verses 7–23.

696 The same clause can be also found verbatim in 2 Kgs 16:3 (Ahaz) and 21:2 (= 2 Chr 33:2, Manasseh).
allude to the aforementioned sin (1 Kgs 14:23–24). As seen in the table below, it is clear that these passages are literally linked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Kings 14:22–24</th>
<th>2 Kings 17:8–10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיְבָנֵּ֙ים֙ בִּהְרֵ֔י עָרָ֔יִם אֲשֶׁ֖ר יָבֹֽאָֽם</td>
<td>וְתַחַת הָ֔הֶם יָבֹֽאָֽם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיְבָֽאוּ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַיְבָֽאָֽם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּםֹת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַצֵּבוֹת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarity between the phrase אֲשֶׁר בִּהְרֵי עָרָיִם in 1 Kgs 14:23a and 2 Kgs 17:9b seems to have prompted a later reviser to add the other cultic misdeeds of 1 Kgs 14:23 (מִבְצָר) into 2 Kgs 17:10 as well. This later addition is indicated by the fact that verse 10 now severs the connection between the high places of 9b(a) (וַיְבָֽאוּ לֵֽאמָּתָ֖יִם) and the sacrificing on them in 11aa (וַיִּבְּנְוָֽהֶֽם). Indeed, the addition of the harmonizing verse 10 would have forced the reviser or a later glossator to add the explicating verse 9b after אֲשֶׁר בִּהְרֵי עָרָ֖יִם in 11aa since אֲשֶׁר is in the present text actually refers to the hills and the lush trees of verse 10b, not to the high places in the cities of the Israelites (9b). It is not impossible that this addition of verse 10 happened together with 8a as a harmonization towards the sin of Judah, the “customs of the peoples” (1 Kgs 14:22–23), made according to the “inverted quotation” or the principle of the so-called Zeidel’s Law.

697 Indeed, Brettler, “Ideology, History, and Theology,” 273, notes that these verses are a quotation from 1 Kgs 14:22–23, and made according to the “inverted quotation” or the principle of the so-called Zeidel’s Law.

698 The MT plus דְּבָרִים, “they too,” seems to be a late MT addition, as it is missing from LXX (καὶ ὡς ἐκ τῆς ᾿Αρσαήνος) and marked with an asterisk in Syrohexapla, the reading coming to some Greek manuscripts from Aquila and/or Symmachus. The plus may even be classified as an “anti-Israelite/Samaritan” MT addition: the custom of building high places came, according to this plus, originally from Israel (as their building is recounted verbatim in 1 Kgs 14:22–23 in 2 Kgs 17:9–11), as the Judahites “too” started building them! The addition could, alternatively, be due to the now unclear text of MT 14:22b, where it is not completely certain, who the subject of אֲשֶׁר בִּהְרֵי עָרָ֖יִם is (either the fathers or the Judahites). Therefore a late copyist may have wanted to clear the confusion by adding that “they too,” probably referring to Judah, did evil things, like their fathers. This potential gloss, of course, ultimately only further adds to the ambiguity of the passage.

699 Similarly Eynikel, Reform, 96, who concludes that the phrases come from the same hand. It is good to note that the explication אֲשֶׁר בִּהְרֵי עָרָ֖יִם is, “from watchtowers to fortified towns,” also acts similarly. It is possible this was glossed to the text with verse 10 as further denoting the broadness and extent of building high places – there was absolutely no place without sin in the north.

700 However, in 2 Kgs 16:4 Ahaz is said to have sacrificed both on the high places and on the hills and under all lush trees, making it not impossible that verses 9–11 would indeed come from the same hand. The idea of sacrificing on any of these places is thus not impossible, although 16:4 itself may well be simply dependent on 17:9–11. Nevertheless, the form of 16:4 is remarkably that of Deut 12:2 verbatim and likely an allusion to it, unlike 2 Kgs 17:10 (וַיִּבְּנְוָֽהֶֽם אֲשֶׁר בִּהְרֵֽי עָרָ֖יִם), which makes this a somewhat more complicated idea.
14:23bα) denoting the high places (9a) and the matsebot and asherim (10a) in the resulting text.\textsuperscript{701}

The evaluation of the relative age of 9a, on the other hand, is difficult for multiple reasons, as has been noted above (2.5.3). First, the first word of the verse, וַיְחַפְּאוּ, is a \textit{hapax} whose meaning is highly disputed. Second, the odd phrase of 9a, “and they (either “the sons of Israel”\textsuperscript{702} or “the kings of Israel” of the previous verse) did in secret\textsuperscript{703} things that are ‘not right’ against/concerning Yahweh,” is found nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible and is quite vague and ambiguous. The fact that this very awkward Hebrew sentence conforms to Aramaic language use only makes it more suspect of being very late (possibly from the stages evidenced by verses 24–41).\textsuperscript{704} If “doing in secret” or the like is indeed the right translation of נאכז, it could allude to some idolatrous deeds, as in Deut 13:6 and 27:15 idolatry is also performed “in secret” (בַּסֵּתֶר). Nevertheless, at least the “sin of Jeroboam” was quite clearly done in the open, as almost every king of Israel is accused of it.\textsuperscript{705} The unnecessary explication of the subject “sons of Israel” in 9a is again surprising here since the subject should carry over from verse 7. This may suggest that the text of 9a was added behind 8b and its ungrammatical gloss containing “the kings of Israel,” after which the new explication of the subject became necessary.

As the text now stands it is somewhat difficult to say whether the sacrificing at the high places in verses 9b and 11a should be seen as a Yahwistic (potentially from the History writer) or an idolatrous practice (later revisers).\textsuperscript{706} If either 7b (“they feared

\textsuperscript{701} Verses 8 and 10 are also attributed to the same redactor by Eynikel, \textit{Reform}, 91.
\textsuperscript{702} If the subject is indeed “the sons of Israel” of 9a, this mention of the subject is quite unnecessary. However, this superfluous repetition of the same subject as in 7a (which carries over to here) should probably not be seen as too literary-critically disconcerting; as the strange “kings of Israel” (which is probably some sort of gloss) at the end of 8b could be understood as also changing the subject of verse 9a, the successive explicative addition of “sons of Israel” would then be completely understandable. On the other hand, if the gloss “kings of Israel” came later than the “sons of Israel,” this would change the situation: the repetition of the subject would indeed be unnecessary and possibly hint at a late provenance of either verse 9a or 7a, where the “sons of Israel” are also mentioned. On the basis of the MT’s text “the kings of Israel” could be either earlier or later, more probably earlier; however, on the basis of the text-critical assessment and La\textsuperscript{115} lacking verse 8. The situation becomes even more complicated, as “the kings of Israel” indeed come to the text later than the “sons of Israel,” who themselves also seem like latecomers to the text!
\textsuperscript{703} The most often used translation “to do in secret” is pretty much nonsensical, as commented by Snaith, \textit{Kings}, 280.
\textsuperscript{704} See Goldstein, “A Suggestion,” 397; Montgomery, \textit{Kings}, 478.
\textsuperscript{705} In 2 Kgs 17:22 the people of Israel are also said to have walked in the sin(s) of Jeroboam, apparently quite publicly.
\textsuperscript{706} Provan, \textit{Hezekiah}, 82, sees them as idolatrous.
other gods”) or 11b (“they did evil things in order to provoke Yahweh”) comes from the same author, the cult is clearly idolatrous. The wording of the original unity 9b, 11aα could be interpreted either way since the verb קטר (in hiph. and pi.) is used for both Yahwistic and non-Yahwistic sacrifices, although one would also expect the verb זבח, “to sacrifice,” here, the common pairing of קטר when it comes to sacrificing on the high places in Kings. Indeed, according to Nelson, this sole use of קטר indicates later language use. “Building” (בנה) or “making” (עשׂה) high places is not very common a sin either, in Kings or otherwise. As the mention of 9b should in our working hypothesis be seen as a recapitulation by the History writer of the first mention of the sin of Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 12:31, it is quite remarkable that the verb used for building the high places (בנה) differs slightly, together with the object (house(s) on/of high places vs. high places). It is thus best concluded that these three discrepancies speak of the work of two different hands. Verses 9b, 11a are unlikely to originate from the same author who wrote 1 Kgs 12:31.

The many idolatrous practices in verses 7–11 indicate that these high places were understood – at least by the later redactors – as non-Yahwistic. Apart from 1 Kgs 12–13, mentions of (houses/priests of) high places in the Northern Kingdom are scarce and appear almost solely in late contexts. It is clear that the later redactors of Kings were also interested in high places and were ready to add them to the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The (houses/priests of) high places in Israel</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 12:31 יבית במות</td>
<td>Yahwistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:32 חניך במות</td>
<td>Yahwistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:2 נקנח במות</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

707 Similarly Weinfeld, Deuteronomy, 326. Eynikel, Reform, 221, sees the verb as “RI” where the subject is the stereotypical king or the people of Israel.

708 Nelson, Double Redaction, 57–8, asserts on this lack of the second verb: “For the historian, the verb seems to have had its more narrow meaning of burning incense or causing smoke to rise; therefore, when he is making a negative judgment about sacrifices at the high places, he always uses the verbs קטר and זבח together ... For the exilic editor, however, the word seems to have had the broader connotation of sacrifice in general, for he always uses this verb alone in his negative judgments.” Indeed, the attestations of קטר as the sole verb of sacrifice seem generally late in Kings; cf. 1 Kgs 9:25, 12:33, 13:1, 2; 2 Kgs 16:13, 15 (however, both have עלה as their object here), 18:4, 22:17, 23:5 bis, 23:8. In the Priestly texts in the Pentateuch (for instance Lev 9:13), the semantic field of קטר has also become broader, replacing זבח, as happens here.


710 Thus also Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings,” 142–3. Pakkala (155–6) also notes that, in the very latest transmissional stages, the high places even lose their meaning as a place of sacrifice and become understood as simple cultic objects that should be destroyed with other idolatrous objects (as seems to happen in 2 Kgs 23:19–20). The mention of high places in 2 Kgs 17:9 as an actual location is therefore at least earlier than this very late conception.
A further problem is the syncretistic 11aβ with its יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־הָגְלָה "like the peoples whom Yahweh exiled from before them," a rewording of 8a. As the combination גל + גל of 11b occurs elsewhere only in 2 Kgs 17:26 and 33, this pairing may be a sign of late language, although this use in these two verses more probably derives from the earlier verse 11. In 11b the “bad things” (רָעִים דְּבָרִים) also point to idolatrous behavior, as they probably should be seen as an allusion to Deut 13:12, which deals with the punishment for idolatry, “the bad thing” (רָעָן). Because of the redundant repetition of Yahweh exiling the peoples from before the Israelites in 8a and 11b, either of them – more likely 8a – may be a later reformulation of the other.

Verse 12, sometimes thought to come from the same hand as verses 9 and 11, could be another indication that the cult at the high places described in 9–11 is criticized for being syncretistic and idolatrous. However, verse 12 with its לִים 글 is mentioned as one of the sins of Manasseh in 2 Kgs 21:11 and especially of his son Amon (21:21). The verb אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשׂוּ of 12b forms an allusion to Deut 12:4 (א־תַעֲשִׂיתוּן כֵּן לַיהוָה הֵיכֶם א), evoked by verses 8 and 10–11 before it, which also allude to Deut 12:2. The word itself is probably of late origin, as it suggests that the other “gods” were nothing but simply material idols (or rather, even “dung”) with no divine power whatsoever; see Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1-2 Kings,” 155–6. The word is found in abundance only in Ezekiel, and even there appears to have been occasionally added only later to the MT edition (the mentions in Ezek 6:5, 30:13, 33:25, 36:18 are lacking in the LXX); elsewhere only in Lev 26:30; Deut 29:16; 1 Kgs 15:12, 21:26; 2 Kgs 21:11, 21, 23:24; Jer 50:2.

Serving the לִים 글 is mentioned as one of the sins of Manasseh in 2 Kgs 21:11 and especially of his son Amon (21:21). Goldstein, “A Suggestion,” 403–4, also notes the close resemblance of 2 Kgs 17:8–11 and Deut 12:2–4. The phrase רַעֲנָן כָּל־עֵץ וְתַ֖חַת גְּבֹהָ֔ה כָּל־גִּבְעָ֣ה (10b), found verbatim only in 1 Kgs 14:23 and Jer 2:20, reflects Deut 12:2 (רַעֲנָן כָּל־עֵץ וְתַ֖חַת עַל־הַגְּבָע֔וֹת), quoted verbatim by 2 Kgs 16:4. Deut 12:2 also speaks of the peoples whom the Israelites will dispossess (אֹתָם יֹרְשִׁים אַתֶּ֛ם אֲשֶׁר הַגּוֹיִם), similar to 2 Kgs
with Yahweh as its object clearly denotes idolatry, after which “idols” as an explication of “bad things” works well. Verse 12 is thus a later addition that emphasizes the purely material and thus powerless aspect of idols, similar to the calves of 16αβ. The gods of other peoples, like the calves, are nothing more than material idols, without any divine power vested in them, similarly to Deutero-Isaiah where this aspect becomes prominent and shows the generally late date of these concerns.

Furthermore, Dietrich sees verse 11b as a sort of “summary” statement to 7–11a. It is not impossible that 11b, or at least its לְהַכְעִיס אֶת־יְהוָה, was even the ending and climax of the original condemnation of Israel in these verses, which was then followed by the original punishment formula in 18a. Indeed, this would explain the second, tautologous statement at the end of verse 17 (לְהַכְעִיסוֹ יְהוָה בְּעֵינֵי הָרַע לַעֲשׂוֹת), which quite clearly functions as a framing resumptive repetition for a second layer of additions (parts of verses 12–17) to the more original unity that ended in verse 11b. If this was the case, the verb כעס of this resumptive repetition would indicate that the unit thus created was later than the History writer’s text as well since it is used solely of idolatrous deeds in Kings.

As a preliminary conclusion concerning verses 7–12 of the MT it is proposed that the most original textual unity in these verses can be found in 7αα, 9βα, 11aαβ (without

17:8. It is good to note that Deut 12:2–4 itself comes from the later stages (“DtrB”) of the formation of chapter 12; see Veijola, Deuteronomium, 262, 274–6.

716 In both Deuteronomy and elsewhere in Kings this is the understanding of the verb; cf. Deut 4:25, 9:18, 31:29, 32:16, 19, 21 bis; 1 Kgs 14:9, 15, 15:30 bis, 16:13, 26, 33, 21:22, 22:54; 2 Kgs 21:6, 15, 22:17, 23:26. Similarly Judg 2:12. Only in 1 Kgs 16:2, 7 do these verses speak only of Jeroboam’s sin, being clearly secondary, and in 2 Kgs 23:19, which is somewhat unclear (albeit in any case very late).

717 Dietrich, Prophétie, 44, furthermore sees verse 12a as a “Wiederholung von V. 7b,” but this is not necessary.

718 This is indeed what Aurelius, Zukunft, 82.

719 Dietrich, Prophétie, 44, according to whom: “Nichts spricht dagegen, daß dieser Gedankengang von dem Verfasser des dtr Geschichtswerkes, von DtrG, stammt.” On the other hand, Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1-2 Kings,” 144, sees 11b as a late gloss, although he does not discuss the passage further. There is nothing in the passage that would outright deem it a gloss, but it is also somewhat unlikely that it would come from “DtrG,” as Dietrich maintains, since it speaks of the Israelites “provoking Yahweh,” an idolatrous statement.

720 Thus Aurelius, Zukunft, 82.

721 Dietrich, Prophétie, 44–5, connects 11b rather to the second punishment formula in 20b, but this seems very unlikely.

722 This is indeed what Aurelius, Zukunft, 82, also proposes: “Die einfachste und vorerst zu prüfende Erklärung des doppelten Vorkommens ist, der Abschnitt ν 13-17 später hinzugefügt und durch die Wiederaufnahme von ν 11b am Ende von ν 17 in den Kontext eingebunden worden ist.” If this verb is indeed used in such a narrative framing fashion, it is interesting to note that the verb כעס is also found in the OG version (La119) of verse 7, thus similarly also framing the beginning of the homiletical portion 7–23.
While it is not completely impossible that this unit of text was penned already by the History writer, this seems quite unlikely. The verses come from a later (exilic to post-exilic?) reviser, who already saw the cult of the Northern Kingdom as idolatrous and not Yahwistic. After this the text grew at least in two different stages, by 8a, 10, 11α (possibly by one hand), and even later (possibly in multiple different stages) by 7b, 8b, 9a, and 12. The original textual unit in 7–18 would have thus been again quite short.

The textual growth of verses 7–12

7a ויהי יהודה בנרesthesia ליהוה אלהינו משעה אחר מأمن מגעיו ממהן דו פרעה מדברים מקדמם

7b נוeline חתון ענשו אחרกระי יהוה מפני בני יונתן

7c זקולмиртверд ירוש

8a ויהי בנרesthesia אדם רבים אלענינו משעה פעמים רבות

8b זקולмиртверд ירוש

9a ויהי יהודה בפלデート

9bזקולוירחד ירוש

10 ויהי יהודה בפלデート

11a זקולוירחד ירוש

11b זקולוירחד ירוש

12 זקולוירחד ירוש

3.2.4 Analysis of verses 13–18

It was already noted above that verses 13–14, which interrupt the narrative flow begun with 7α and bring Judah and Yahweh prematurely to the fore, come from a later hand than that of 7–11 or 15–17, which seem to deal solely with Israel and its sins. The combination עוד ויהוה as subject, as used in 13a (and 15a), is very rare in the Hebrew Bible, and is used mostly in late contexts – it is specifically significant to note that the combination is used by the Masoretic idiolect of Jeremiah, but is missing from the older Septuagint edition. This indicates that עוד ויהוה as a subject is indeed a very late (certainly post-exilic) phrase. Similarly, the phrase ישבר המרכז קרעים can be

723 The last part of the text, המרכז קרעים שלמה כפרעם, “from watchtower to fortified city,” seems like a gloss. The same construct is only found in 2 Kgs 18:8, in a context of warfare, in which the construct works well. However, in 17:9, where the context is about cultic deeds, the phrase’s militaristic flavor is somewhat out of context. It is likely that the phrase was added to 17:9 from 18:8. This way verse 9b also parallels the text of 10b, where a further remark is made about the location of the idolatrous worship (“on every high hill and under every lush tree”).

724 The combination is found elsewhere in Ex 19:23; Jer 11:8, 42:19 (both missing from the LXX edition, thus being very late additions to the MT edition); Ps 49:7; Neh 9:29, 30; Mal 2:14. Furthermore, the mention of עのでしょう in MT 1 Kgs 2:3 is not found in LXX manuscripts B M α 723 b f64’381 55 71 158 245 318 460 707 either, even though the text is in a kaige section, indicating a very late addition (probably Hexaplaric in the rest of the manuscripts); see Trebolle & Torijano, “From the Greek Recensions to the Hebrew Editions,” 271. Mentions of עדות are thus shown to be text-critically suspicious sometimes even in Kings.
found verbatim in Ezek 33:11. The prophetic ideology of 13 also differs significantly from the usual prophetic depictions of Kings, as mentioned above (3.2.2). Therefore, the whole of verse 13 is quite clearly an addition to the context, as the rest of the verse cannot work without its beginning clause יְהוָה וַיָּעַד. There are also some indications that the highly repetitive 13b may stem from an even later explicative hand.725

Verse 14, which is dependent on 13, then fulfills the charges of Yahweh: like their fathers, the Israelites (and Judahites) did not heed the warnings of the prophets.726 The language of verse 14 is unique in Kings: only here do the people “harden their necks” (עורפם את קשה)727 and “(do not) believe (hiph.) in Yahweh” (ביהוה אמן).728 According to Levin, the practically monotheistic and highly abstract theological idea of “(not) believing in Yahweh” is indeed a very late (Hellenistic) one in the whole Hebrew Bible – and especially so in Kings, where “not believing” in Yahweh or any other god is otherwise never an issue.729 To the earlier writers of Kings such a modern, almost atheistic, concept would have been nearly incomprehensible. The late characteristics of 13 thus continue in 14.

Much of the nomistic language of verse 15a is shared by the already analyzed verse 13. The likely late use of the verb רדש with Yahweh as the subject is again notable (תולהתיו אניד והיעדו). The question arises whether the similar use of this phrase in verse 13 comes from the same hand or not. The sentence אשה גהתו והיעדו והתיו, “and the testimonies which he testified to them,” is not integral to the sense of the verse 15, and indeed only comes as an afterthought to the first sentence of 15a, “and they rejected

725 Verse 13b (הכתיו אניד והיעדו) repeats the preceding sentence (תולהתיו אניד והיעדו), but instead of having the “fathers” as the object, the statutes are sent to “you,” i.e. the present generations. After this, 13b repeats that the preaching came “in the hand of the prophets,” as in 13a. It is probable that this high degree of redundancy of 13b stems not from the original writer of verse 13a, but is due to later insertions(s), possibly to underline that the subject of 14א תולהתיו והיעדו is not the fathers, but the present generations, or to make it explicit that the preaching of the prophets not only happened in the times of the fathers, but continued even until the destruction of Samaria. It would not seem impossible either that the text between the two mentions “in the hand of (his [servants]) prophets” was originally added via Wiederaufnahme.

726 Verse 14א תולהתיו והיעדו, could also serve as a continuation of verse 12 since there is also a quotation of Yahweh’s speech in 12b. This would necessitate seeing verse 13 alone as a late addition between 12 and 14, which is unlikely, albeit not impossible.

727 Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible in Deut 10:16, 31:27; 2 Chr 30:8, 36:13; Neh 9:16, 17, 29; Ps 29:1; Jer 7:26, 17:23, 19:15.

728 Elsewhere only in Ex 14:31; Deut 1:23, 9:23 (negative statement with “they did not listen”); 2 Chr 20:20. The phrase is found with the verb in the singular in Gen 15:6; and in Ps 78:22 and Jonah 3:5 with אלוהים as the object. See also Smend, Mitte des Alten Testaments, 118–123.

729 Levin, “Glauben im Alten Testament,” 26–7, who rightly tracks the use of this phrase to the Hellenistic period. The almost monotheistic tenet of this phrase is indeed notable. The phrase is so peculiar that it may be an even later addition to 14.
his statutes and his covenant which he made with their fathers” (קָּיוֹן אֶת־חַבְּרוֹת אֶת־אָבַיִם), which has seemingly already ended its listing with אֶת־הָעִבְדֵּהוֹת אֶת־אֲבוֹתָם. It may be that the phrase was added here either by the author of verse 13 or a later reviser who wanted to harmonize the two verses.730

Similarly, the mention וַיַּעֲבְדוּ הַהֶבֶל אַחֲרֵי וַיִּלָּכְבוּ “they went after the vanity” in 15b is problematic. As it stands, it interrupts the connection between the beginning וַיַּעֲבְדוּ הַהֶבֶל (“they went after”) and the latter part of the sentence, “the peoples who were around them.”732 It is thus likely that וַיִּלָּכְבוּ is a gloss, taken from Jer 2:5 where this phrase is found verbatim.733 The fact that this mention is also of dubious origin in Jer 2:5, breaking the poetic structure, only underlines its probably secondary nature in 2 Kgs 17:15 as well. The singular form of the rare word הַהֶבֶל (“vanity”) is also slightly unusual734 and possibly should be understood as a reference to the singular הַגּוֹיִם of 16, one of the latest additions in the passage. Similarly to the הָעִבְדֵּהוֹת of verse 12, the reference to the foreign gods as only “vanities” comes from the same very late editorial stage where the other divinities apart from Yahweh were thought of as nothing more than simply material images, or even nonexistent “vanities” – in contrast to the idea of 16b, on one hand, where Ashera, the host of heaven, and Baal are apparently still implied to be actual gods, and 14b, on the other, where even Yahweh’s existence is a matter of “believing.”735 These differences in the theological understandings of verses 12/15, 16, and 14 indicate different editors at work.

---

730 The later may become the likelier option if the witness of Sepher ha-Yamim is taken into account and deemed probative. This phrase is completely missing in it; see 1.2.2.3.
731 The LXX reading is in the plural, but this is probably due to secondary harmonization.
732 A similar reconstruction is made by Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings,” 142 and Römer, “Current Discussion,” 60. Especially problematic is the waw before the second בִּלְתָיָה. According to Kittel, Könige, 275, this could however be simply due to dittography from the earlier plural verb. On the other hand, one could also argue that the four vowels אַחֲרֵי מַסֵּכָה אֲשֶׁר הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר סְבִיבֹתָם are a later addition to the verse since it is grammatically quite straining after וַיֶּהְבָּלוּ and partly echoes 12b. It also brings to the text the new idea of the peoples still living around the Israelites (unlike in 8 and 11 where they have already been exiled by Yahweh).
733 Thus also Auld, Life in Kings, 159; Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 392; and Stade, Kings, 264. On the other hand, Klostermann, Könige, 454, only deletes the verb וַיִּלָּכְבוּ as an intrusion from Jeremiah. The gloss would have been added to the text in a Wiederaufnahme-like fashion, between two mentions of בִּלְתָיָה. See, however, Fischer, Jeremia 1–25, 157, and McKane, Jeremiah I–XXV, 31, for the opposite opinion: according to them, וַיִּלָּכְבוּ is problematic as the conclusion of Jer 2:5 since it breaks the poetic structure of the verse and is likely quoted straight from 2 Kgs 17:15. Overall, 2 Kgs 17 uses quite heavily Jeremiac language; see, for instance, Fischer, Prophet wie Mose, 180–7.
734 The word הַהֶבֶל is found elsewhere in 1–2 Kgs only in 1 Kgs 16:13, 26 (both in plural).
The nations being still *around* the Israelites in 15b differs from the idea of the completely wiped out nations in verses 8 and 11, which indicates that these phrases, if not verses, come from at least two different hands. The sins began already with the fathers (as apparently in 8a), and together with 15a בּוּרָה (בּוּרָה אֲשֶׁר נָפְלָה בְּאֶרֶץ–אֱוָאֵם), this idea of the surrounding nations could be seen as another case of inclusive language in which Judah (or its fathers) could also be seen to take part – indeed, there is nothing in the nomistic phraseology of verse 15 that would solely condemn Israel, but, rather, both Israel and Judah. On such a basis, 15, which explicitly denounces Judah, could even be seen as coming from the same late hand as 13–14.

The beginning of verse 16, והֵיהֶם אִיֵּהוָה תּוֹכָל–מִצְוֹת אֶוָוַּעַזְבוּ , “and they abandoned (all) the commandments of Yahweh their God,” practically repeats the information of 15a (or vice versa), only with another word denoting the statutes of Yahweh. The mention of “Yahweh their God” in 16a אֲשֶׁר נָפְלָה בְּאֶרֶץ–אֱוָאֵם is unnecessary as well, since Yahweh has already been mentioned in the previous verse (compare with the similarly unnecessary “sons of Israel” in 9a). This slight repetition may indicate that 15a and 16a do not stem from the same hand. Verse 16 has the Israelites again building “an Ashera” (sg.), which indicates that verses 10 (pl. “asherim”) and 16 also come from two different hands.

---

736 Trebolle, “2 Kings 17,2–23,” 223. In Judges 2 this is a well-known difference between the different Deuteronomistic textual blocks that constitute the chapter; see Soggin, Judges, 41–4 and Smend, *Mitte des Alten Testaments*, 133–7.

737 See 2.4.3.2 and 3.1.3 on “the fathers” and their role in the inclusivity of both Israel and Judah in the chapter.

738 Verse 15 alludes furthermore to Deut 6:14 (סְבִיבוֹתֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר הָעַמִּים מֵאָחֵרִים וַּתֵּלֶ לְאַחֲרֵי תֵלֶכְמָה הָאָתָם), as the language is also otherwise very similar (notably, L even brings the text slightly closer to Deuteronomy).

739 This is, with MT 1 Kgs 18:18, the only occasion of the combination עִזְבָּה + מִצְוֹת in Samuel–Kings (elsewhere in 2 Chr 7:19; Ezra 9:10) – however, in the OG the one abandoned in 18:18 is Yahweh himself, not his commandments, which is likely the original, “un-nomistic,” understanding. Interestingly, 18b בְּעָלִים אֶוָוַּעַזְבוּ, is also somewhat similar to 2 Kgs 17:15b. O’Brien, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 210, argues that the use of the verb עִזְבָּה is, as would be expected from the attestations, a sign of later redactions. Indeed, 16 certainly does not originate from the History writer.

740 The mention of Ashera is quoted here directly from the sin of Manasseh (21:3, which in turn alludes to 1 Kgs 16:33) together with the sin of bowing down to the host of heaven, and should therefore not be omitted as a gloss together with the עֲגָלִים, as argued by Stade, “Miscellen,” 166. One could of course argue that the mention of Ashera is simply a later harmonization towards the wording of the sin of Manasseh, but there is no exact need for this supposition. This mention is likely older than the one in verse 10, where the “Asherim” have already become simple cult objects instead of a goddess in her own right; see 2.6.7 for further discussion.
The mention of 16αβ, “they made themselves a molten image, two calves” (וַיַּעֲשׂוּ עֲגָלִ֑ים שְׁנֵים מַסֵּכָה לָהֶם), likely influenced by Ex 32:8 (וַיַּעֲשׂוּ עֲגֶל מַסֵּכָה לָהֶם), now has its interest again solely on the Northern Kingdom and the sin of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 12:28–29), similarly to verses 7–11/12. However, there is a grammatical problem with the combination of the singular מַסֵּכָה and the dual עֲגָלִים שְׁנֵים. The dual עֲגָלִים שְׁנֵים is universally seen as a late explicating gloss to מַסֵּכָה and should indeed be taken as such.  

On the other hand the origin of the whole sentence, framed by two וַיַּעֲשׂוּ verbs, may be held suspect: the addition of מַסֵּכָה, remarkably similarly to Hosea 13:2 (וַיַּעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם מַסֵּכָה), underlines again the purely material aspect of the idolatrous gods, which has been shown to come from the latest editorial stages of Deuteronomy and Kings. It would thus belong to the same layer of very late additions as verse 12 and 15βα (and 21ββ, see below).

While verses 7–11 are very strongly reminiscent of Judah’s/Rehoboam’s sin (1 Kgs 14:22–24), verses 16–17 with their cultic misdeeds are highly similar to the sins of Manasseh (2 Kgs 21:3–6), again to the point of verbatim similarity. The sins depicted in verse 17 (making children walk through fire and divining) are elsewhere in Kings only found in connection with the kings and people of Judah: Ahaz (2 Kgs 16:3), Manasseh (21:6), and Josiah (23:10). As with the previous verses, it is likely

---

741 See, for instance, Benzinger, Könige, 174 and Klostermann, Könige, 454. Cogan & Tadmor, 2 Kings, 205, similarly note that this may be a gloss, “but it is most appropriate nevertheless,” which of course makes it even more suspicious. A scribal mistake from מַסֵּכָה does not seem very probable, nor does a later deliberate change from plural to singular. Montgomery, Kings, 469, argues that the singular is a collective, but this is not very likely either. The opposite – namely that מַסֵּכָה is the later addition – is also remotely possible. Since מַסֵּכָה is otherwise found only in 1 Kgs 14:9 (> LXX), this word may have originally been a marginal note – the “two calves” would have, in fact, been the “molten image” made by Jeroboam. The singular used is indeed interesting: what exactly was this “molten image,” which was made not by Jeroboam, but as is seen from the plural of the verb, by the Israelites? The most infamous single “molten image” would of course be the golden calf in Exodus 32. This interpretation would, interestingly, once again accuse both Israel and Judah of the same sin committed already by their fathers. The subject of verse 16 could then also include the Judahites, as Judah is also mentioned in verse 13; see similarly Pakkala, “Jeroboam Without Bulls,” 513–14. The understanding of the verse may thus change quite remarkably with the decision on the glossed word(s).

742 Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings,” 145: “In addition to the general shift from the location of the cult to its content, there are short additions to the older additions of the classical phase that shift the attention to the material aspect of the other gods ... The reference to vain gods may imply incipient monotheistic conceptions.”

743 Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings,” 144–6, accordingly ascribes these glosses to the same very late glossator. This is corroborated by the fact that 2 Kgs 17:16 is the only place aside from 1 Kgs 14:9 (> LXX!), also a very late passage, where the word מַסֵּכָה is used in Kings.

744 Unlike most of the verses analyzed above, verse 17 does not seem overly composite – rather, it is likely some text (L. La115 “and they made ephod and teraphim” = OG) has been omitted from it. This OG plus should probably be seen as coming from the redactor(s) interested in the materialistic idolatrous representations and also responsible for 12, 15b, 16b, 21bβ.
that these sins were added here to create a connection between the sins of the Israelites with those of Manasseh, possibly so that his sins would thus seem to in fact originate from the north – similarly to how Ahaz is said to have “walked in the ways of Israel” (16:3). The ending formula of the verse, לְהַכְעִיסוֹ יְהוָה בְּעֵינֵי הָרַע, which forms a Wiederaufnahme with 11b, is found in 21:6 (= 2 Chr 33:6), 16 as well.

The curious hithp. form of מַכְר appears late from a redactional viewpoint, as in Kings it is otherwise only found in 1 Kgs 21:20, 25, in literary-critically clearly late condemnations of Ahab. In 2 Kgs 21:3 Manasseh is also compared to Ahab, but with different wording, of which this passage is clearly a reformulation. It is thus quite clear that the reviser who added verses 16b–17 wanted to conflate the sins of Ahab and Manasseh, the two worst kings of all time, with Israel here. Since 16(b)–17 deal with cultic sins, they are best seen as originally forming a secondary continuation of the similarly cultic-minded 9–11. The thematically quite different verses 12–15, which are especially characterized by their nomistic language use, were, on the basis of the MT’s editorial text order, later interpolated between these two units (7–11 and 16–17) in various stages.

Verse 18a (ףוייתא ייוה ומייסר מעל פני) finally closes the long syntactical structure of the MT begun in 7a (וַיְהִי כִּי), indicating that these verses should be ascribed to the same hand (or, alternatively, 7a as later, since verse 18 works perfectly well without 7a, but 7a not without 18a). Some scholars have tried to ascribe Yahweh’s denunciation (אנף hithp.) of Israel to certain redactors, either early (DtrH) or late (DtrN). A nomistic background seems in this case the more probable option, but since the verb אנף is so rare in the books of Kings, this alone cannot be taken as a

---

745 One may take into account, however, that “burning sons and daughters in fire,” along with some other phrases, seems to have been well-known stock language in any case since this phrase is also found in Jer 7:31, which is likely part of an early enough addition to be found in both the MT and LXX, as shown by the Qumran manuscript 4QJer; see Ulrich, “Deuteronomistically Inspired,” 494–506.

746 Šanda, Könige, 222. The hithp. form is attested elsewhere only in Deut 28:68. However, there the use of the verb form is law technical and in the context of the actual legal action of selling oneself into slavery.

747 Similarly Brettler, “Ideology, History, and Theology,” 275–6: “… 2 Kings xvii 17 wytmkrw ḥswt ḥb ḫn ḫhy lbh ḥmkr ḥsw may be seen as a conflation of the Ahab formula ḥmkr lcswt ḥrc bcyny yhwh 1 Kings xxi 20, 25) and the Manasseh formula ḥrbh lcswt ḥb ḫn ḫhy lbh ḥmkr yhwh lcswt ḥb ḫn yhwh lcswt ḥmkr (2 Kings xxi 6).”

748 The verb אָנֵף can be found twice elsewhere in 1 Kgs 8:46 and 11:9; elsewhere in hithp. in Deut 1:37, 4:21, 9:8, 20; gal in Ezra 9:14; Ps 2:12, 60:3, 79:5, 85:6; Isa 12:1. According to Würthwein, Erste Buch der Könige, 95–100, 131, 1 Kgs 11:9 comes from DtrH, while 8:46 comes from a later redactor. To the contrary, Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 367, see both as late. Similarly Dietrich, Prophetie, 68–9. The (rare) attestation of the verb indeed raises doubts concerning its attribution.

749 Dietrich, Prophetie, 44-5 and Jones, 2 Kings, 551, deem 18a specifically “DtrN.”
definitive argument for the provenance of this verse. Similarly, Yahweh as the subject of הiph’il + נעל פניע has been argued to be a late phrase as well since it only appears elsewhere in 2 Kgs 23:27, 24:3, and Jer 32:31. The language use of verse 18 therefore appears late and could undermine the attempts to ascribe the verse – or even anything between 7a–18a – to the History writer. In any case, and as concluded above, 18a appears literally somehow linked with 23aa (שׁי אֲשֶׁר לְהוֹדַע אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה עַד פָּנָיו מֵעַל פָּנָיו). Many redaction-critical models, despite the differing datings, have indeed noted the similarity of these two passages, and often see them as originating from the same hand. However, exactly their remarkable similarity rather indicates two hands at work – it is unlikely that the same writer would have written practically the same phrase twice in such close proximity. The occurrence is hardly a Wiederaufnahme in the strict, technical sense, but a second hand has simply used the phraseology of the earlier text when reworking the narrative. The textual unit ending in verse 18 thus ends in the same phrase as did the more original ending of the chapter, 23aa.

Verse 18b, “only the tribe of Judah remained, alone” (אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁאַר רַק שֵׁבֶט יְהוּדָה לְבַדּוֹ), dealing explicitly with Judah instead of Israel, bears a striking resemblance to 1 Kgs 12:20 (לְבַדּוֹ בֶּט־יְהוּדָה שֵׁזוּלָתִי בֵּית־דָּוִד אַחֲרֵי הָיָה א),753 which deals with Jeroboam and Israel separating from the house of David – the exact action that is recounted only a few verses later in 2 Kgs 17:21. This makes it likely that verses 18b and 21 were originally similarly linked with each other, even though they are now separated by the interpolated verses 19–20. Whether or not 18b is later than 18a is hard to say, mainly because of its probable close connection to 21a: if 18b is taken as an addition, the provenance of 21a becomes even more doubtful than it already is. It seems easiest to take 18b as the original conclusion to verse 18.

Conclusions: Verses 13–17 are some of the most worked-over verses in 2 Kgs 17, and in 1–2 Kings as a whole, in many ways comparable to 2 Kings 23. Verses 16–17, without the glosses of 16αβ, were added via Wiederaufnahme of 11b in 17b. After this,
as the latest large addition to the passage, verses 13–14, and likely parts of 15, were inserted. After this many smaller glosses and additions were made.

The textual growth of verses 13–18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Textual Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13    | שָׁלַה הַנְּבִיאִים וְגוֹזֹּה שָׁלַה הַנְּבִיאִים: יָֽﬠַד לֵאמֹ֗ר חֻקּוֹתַ֔י מִצְוֹתַי שְּׁמַרְוּ הָֽרָﬠִים שֻׁבוּ אֶת־אֲבֹתֵיכֶ֑ם צִוִּיתִי אֲשֶׁר כְּכָל־הַתּוֹרָ֔ה שָֽׁלַ הַנְּבִיאִים:וַאֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱבָ֔דַי בְּיָד אֲלֵיכֶ֔ם חְתִּי שָׁמֵ֑עוּ לֹא אֲבֹתָ֔ם כְּעֹרֶף אֶת־ﬠָרְפָּם וַיַּקְשׁוּ הֵיהֶם: יְהוָה בֹּתָ֔ם אֶת־אֲב כָּרַת אֲשֶׁר וְאֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ אֶת־חֻקָּ֗יו ויִּמְאֲסוּ אֲﬠֵדְוָ֔יו וְאֵת בָּ֑ם הֵﬠִידשֶׁר אַחֲרֵי וַיֵּלְכוּ וַאַחֲרֵי וַיֶּהְבָּ֔לוּ הַהבֶל כָּהֶם׃ וֹתﬠֲשׂ לְבִלְתִּי אֹתָ֔ם יְהוָה צִווָּה אֲשֶׁר סְבִיבֹתָם אֲשֶׁר הַגּוֹיִם אֶת־כָּלוֵי עָזְבַוּ הֵיהֶם יְהוָה מִצְוֹת מַסֵּכָה לָהֶם וַיַּﬠֲשִׂי סְנֵﬠֲגָלִ֑ים י יאָבְדֵהַלֵ֔וֹת לְכָל־צְבָא וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ אֲשֵׁירָ֗ה וַיִּהְכִּיתִוּ קְסָמִים וַיִּקְסְמוּ בָּאֵ֔שׁ בָּאֵ֔שׁ נְבִיאַיִת אָמַרְוָ֔ה שֶׁר אַחֲרֵי וַיֵּלְכוּ וַאַחֲרֵי וַיֶּהְבָּ֔לוּ הַהבֶל כָּהֶם׃ יְהוָה בְּﬠֵינֵי פָּנָ֑יו מֵﬠַל וַיְסִרֵם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל מְאֹד יְהוָה וַיִּתְאַנַּף לְבַדּוֹ׃ יְהוּדָה שֵׁבֶט רַק נִשְׁאַ֔ר לֹא הָרַע לַﬠֲשׂוֹת וַיִּתְמַכְּר֗וּ לְהַכְﬠִיסוֹ׃ יְהוָה בְּﬠֵינֵי פָּנָ֑יו מֵﬠַל וַיְסִרֵם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל מְאֹד יְהוָה וַיִּתְאַנַּף לְבַדּוֹ׃ יְהוּדָה שֵׁבֶט רַק נִשְׁאַ֔ר לֹא הָרַע לַﬠֲשׂוֹת וַיִּתְמַכְּר֗וּ לְהַכְﬠִיסוֹ׃ יְהוָה בְּﬠֵינֵי פָּנָ֑יו מֵﬠַל וַיְסִרֵם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל מְאֹד יְהוָה וַיִּתְאַנַּף לְבַדּוֹ׃ יְהוּדָה שֵׁבֶט רַק Н

3.2.5 Analysis of verses 19–20 – a late interpolation

Verses 19–20, ascribed to the latest hand in 7–23 since the early commentators,\(^\text{756}\) are indeed suspicious in their MT context in multiple ways. First, the focus of the allegations changes to Judah in 19, which is rather unexpected in a chapter dealing with the destruction of Israel. Second, the verse-beginning וְגוֹם is a well-known indication of later additions.\(^\text{757}\) Third, the verses break the connection between 18b and 21, which were likely originally united – indeed, verses 19–20 form a gloss-like addition, made to interpret further the mention of “only Judah remaining” in 18b.\(^\text{758}\) The object of the condemnation stays consistent between verses 18 and 21 (Gegenprobe), and, unlike in verses 19 (“Judah”) and 20 (“the whole seed of Israel”), in 18a and 21 only Israel is at the focus of the action, as would be expected. Fourth, both verses have apparently been composed of elements taken from elsewhere in the

\(^{755}\) The original text probably had here וֹתﬠֲשׂ אָפָדֵה וַיִּתְמַכְּרַו לְהַכְﬠִיסוֹ, omitted from the proto-MT edition, but retained by OG; see 2.6.8.

\(^{756}\) The view of Stade, “Miscellen,” 166–7, has become the standard, and is followed by most scholars.

\(^{757}\) Add waw (וְגוֹם) after the versions. The MT only reads וְגוֹם, but the waw may have dropped because of a copying mistake after לְבַדּוֹ.

\(^{758}\) Thus also Debus, Sünde Jerobeams, 99.
chapter. Fifth, the pan-Israelite ideology of “all the seed of Israel” in 20, seemingly encompassing the inhabitants of both the Northern and Southern Kingdoms, is late in Kings, the text having possibly been influenced by Jer 31:37b.

The unity of verses 19 and 20 has also occasionally been contested. While the lateness of 19 is mostly accepted, opinions differ on 20 since it is not directly dependent on 19, syntactically or otherwise. However, verse 20 would be just as problematic after 18b as it is after 19: in any case, the view is “all the seed of Israel” seems to contain both kingdoms. Even though these verses are separated from each other in the OG edition for good reason, it is best to ascribe these verses to the same hand if working on the basis of the MT text.

3.2.6 Analysis of verses 21–23 – a coherent unit from the History writer?

Earlier scholarship has often taken verses 21–23 as a coherent unit of its own. However, there are certain complexities to this view, especially concerning verse 21. The exceedingly unclear beginning of this verse already evokes some questions regarding the literary unity of the section, especially when there are also text-critical considerations to be taken into account. The beginning כִּי is most probably to be read as causal “for/because,” and not as temporal “when.” It is practically certain that verse 21 was originally attached to some previous verse other than 20, after which it now obviously does not work. As argued above, this verse must have been 18b.

However one decides to solve the problems of the conjunction כִּי at the beginning, the second challenge of the verb form קָרַע (see 2.6.12) remains and needs to be resolved simultaneously: if one does not want to take the verb as a reflexive, with Israel as its subject (as attested by the versions), its subject has to be Yahweh, and so

---

759 Verse 19 is a direct violation of 13a מִצְוֹת מִצְוָי מִשָּׂרֵה יְהוָה עָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר יָרָבְעָם בְּכָל־חַטֹּאות... to 20 (or vice versa), apparently after gloss 8b with its gloss מִשָּׂרֵה ... מִיָּדָה מִיָּדָה מִרְבַּעְתָּה... In verse 20, the MT has probably lost some of its text (Yehovahעָשָׂה עָשָׂה עָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר יָרָבְעָם בְּכָל־חַטֹּאות... via homoioteleuton, but this text is retained in the LXX, and taken from 18a; the LXX has the verb מִשָּׂרֵה in the plural, as in 15; and finally 20b מִפָּנָיו הִשְּלִיכָם אֲשֶׁר עַד is a direct violation of 13a מִצְוֹת מִצְוָי מִשָּׂרֵה יְהוָה עָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר יָרָבְעָם בְּכָל־חַטֹּאות... and possibly acts as a Wiederaufnahme of 18a מִפָּנָיו הִשְּלִיכָם עַד). 760 MT verse 20 resembles MT Jer 31:37b מִיָּדָה מִיָּדָה מִרְבַּעְתָּה even more than does the OG. The phrase “to be given in the hand of plunderers” בְּיַד־שֹׁסִים וַיִּתְּנֵם is found elsewhere only in Judg 2:14 (verbatim), where Israel and Juda h are of course still part of the same Israelite community as well.

761 See O’Brien, Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis, 161. These verses are indeed separated in La115 (= OG).

762 It at least cannot be read as both, i.e. “for when,” as is done by Provan, Hezekiah, 72.
21a must have originally followed a text mentioning him. The only grammatically valid possibilities for this are verses 18a and 20, of which 18a would be more likely since 19–20 with their focus on Judah and repetitive nature are certainly secondary to 18a. It is very unexpected, however, that Yahweh’s decision to separate Israel from Judah is given here as a reason for Israel’s exile: why would Yahweh now punish Israel for something he himself made happen (1 Kgs 11:29–39)? As an explicit sin this would be unique in Kings.

However, taking the verb קרע as a reflexive or, rather, as originally having read a niph’al form (קרע), the text begun even only with 7אא (וימ), as proposed by Šanda, would make perfect sense: “And it happened, 21a because (or: when) Israel tore itself (קרע) from the house of David ….” One could even see 21a as a direct continuation of 6b: “6b and he settled them … in the cities of the Medes. 21a Because/when Israel tore itself from the house of David …” The niph’al form could easily have been changed later, even accidentally, to a qal קרע at some point by the proto-Masoretic editor, since the preceding verses 19–20 now speak of Yahweh’s actions too.

When this reflexive reading is accepted as the more original, one could even argue that there would be no need to see verse 21a as expressing later ideological

---

763 Šanda, Zweite Könige, 224, retains the qal form and posits that the original text had יהוה את יושב. However, it is hard to see why יהוה would have dropped from the text.

764 No verse in 7–17, for instance 7א, can have preceded 21 in the present MT edition because of the already mentioned syntactical unity of 7א and 18א. However, Campbell, Of Prophets and Kings, 161–7, argues for the original (pre-dtr) unity of 6, 20–21, and 23b, verses 7–19 being later additions. This would indeed solve many of the problems of verse 21a, and would allow us to take the “sin of Jeroboam” as the reason for the exile. However, this reconstruction is unlikely for a number of reasons: the language use of 20 is very unusual in Kings, coming from later redactions; the כִּי of 21a is much more likely to be meant as causal – a temporal understanding is still quite a strain; verse 21b is a late gloss, and therefore verse 22 is needed as a continuation of 21; verse 21b reflects ideology that comes from later redactors; the text in 20–21, 23b has the impression of being a later addition via Wiederaufnahme of 6b in 23b.

765 Even if read as a protasis to the apodosis “and [because/after this] they made Jeroboam son of Nebat king,” the actual accusation (Jeroboam’s “great sin,” which is in fact an even later gloss; see below) comes only in the second part of the verse. Making Jeroboam king is no sin either, but the will of Yahweh. Thus also Van Den Born, Königen, 188 and Rösel, “Why 2 Kings 17,” 89: “Verse 21 states that the Israelites made Jeroboam king. After the preparatory sentence that Israel ‘tore away from the house of David,’ this must be understood as designating a sin by the people of Israel.”

766 Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 393, apparently reads not קרע, but instead the reflexive קרע, “Als Israel sich losgerissen hatte,” directly after verse 6. The emendation does not seem very likely.

767 Šanda, Könige, 224.

768 Taking into account that there would have been 10 verses added before 21a according to the classical redactional reconstructions, such a small scale correction of one nun (which moreover is even text-critically noticeable!) at some point of the transmission does not seem too radical a move – indeed, much more substantial changes have evidently happened in verses 1–7, for instance.
tendencies because the clause could simply function as a (possibly temporal) explanation for the action of the Israelites crowning Jeroboam. Nevertheless, even Israel tearing itself (and this being a sin) is ideologically somewhat unexpected (see 2.6.12), especially if taken as coming from the History writer. In any case, then, verse 21a (with or without כִּי) seems like a late explication of 22, creating with 18b an understandable unity ("none was left except the tribe of Judah, for Israel tore itself from the house of David") and at the same time a harmonization towards 1 Kgs 12:20.

At first glance, the material in 21b could be suitable for the interests of the History writer, as it mentions the “great sin” of Jeroboam and how he made Israel sin. However, the way this customary information is given is unusual. First, in 21ba, the verb נדחק (hiph. “banish, thrust out, lead astray, seduce”) is used only here in all of the books of Kings, which in itself is not too disconcerting – the author may have just preferred a different verb here. However, the sin of Jeroboam here is “seducing Israel from behind Yahweh” (יְהוָה מֵאַחֲרֵי), a phrase which in Kings implies idolatry, not simply the change of the cult venue. This ideological feature would be the most

---

769 As does, for instance, Brettler, “Ideology, History, and Theology,” 279: “This short source provides an unusual reason for the north’s exile: they deserve their fate for breaking away from the Davidic monarchy. According to this view, non-Davidic kingship is illegitimate from its inception; this is in striking opposition to the prophecy of Ahijah (1 Kings xi 29-39), which offers divine legitimation to the northern kingship.”

770 Both Becking, Ondergang, 191, and Dietrich, Prophetic, 85–6, argue the same on a phraseological basis: according to them וַיַּדִּיחוּ and the hiph.consperf.3.pl.m. of נָעַשׂ come from a later redactor, as they can only be found in other late contexts.

771 The quite rare term נדחק is otherwise only used in 1 Kgs 12:19 (= 2 Chr 10:19), 20, 13:2, 14:8 (> LXX), thus making the connection between the two verses only stronger. Elsewhere only in 1 Sam 20:16; 2 Sam 3:1, 6; 1 Chr 17:24, 21:7; Ps 122:5; Isa 7:2, 3, 22:22; Jer 21:12; Zech 12:7, 8, 10, 12, 13:1. This may be another indication of late language use in 21 (Davidic kingship).

772 The use of this verb seems very similar to that of 2 Chr 21:11 where Manasseh is said to have “led Judah astray” (הֶיֶם רָעָם). The verb is used in Deut 4:9, 13:5, 11, 14, 30:17 in connection with idolatry and forsaking Yahweh, making it thus an unlikely candidate for the History writer’s language.

773 Even though the italicized part is intriguingly missing from two medieval Hebrew manuscripts (Kemnict 154 253), it is hard to draw any text-critical conclusions as no other textual witnesses, such as the LXX (or any of the Greek manuscripts), lack the mention.

774 This whole phrase seems to refer back to Deut 13:11, where we find נָעַשׂ נֵבֶל אַחֲרֵי, and 13:13 נַעֲשׂ נֵבֶל אַחֲרֵי, both passages dealing with idolatry. Cf. Deut 7:4 and 1 Kgs 9:6, 11:2, 10. See also 1 Kgs 11:4, where Solomon’s foreign wives “turned his heart to behind other gods” (אָבִיו כְּדָוִד יְהוָה אַחֲרֵי מִלֵּא וְ), and 11:6, where Solomon does not “follow fully behind Yahweh as his father David had done” (אָבִיו מִלֵּא וְ). This can only refer to idolatry. On the other hand, in the covenant of Josiah in 2 Kgs 23:3, the people are to “walk after Yahweh,” which most probably denotes strict monotheism; in the likely gloss in 2 Kgs 17:15 the exact opposite happens (הַהֶבֶל אַחֲרֵי). The phrase seems to be late in origin. Becking, “Josianic View,” 287–8, argues that, as this verb is also used metaphorically in connection with adultery, the verb here is meant to be read as depicting Israel’s adulterous behavior towards Jerusalem. In Josh 22:10–34, the phrase is indeed used for denoting the sin of decentralization, though not from Jerusalem, but from the Tabernacle. However, this story quite
notable reason to doubt the roots of this passage: as has been noted, it is very probable that the History writer still saw Jeroboam’s cult as Yahwistic and not yet as idolatrous like the later redactors. He simply changed the Yahwistic cult venue of Jerusalem, but did not yet seduce Israel “from behind Yahweh.”

Coming to 21bβ, the use of the verb וְהֶחֱטֵיאָם is similarly unusual, as חטא usually gets no suffixes, and nowhere else in its hiph’il form in the Hebrew Bible. The usual formula of Jeroboam’s sin also always gives the verb חטא with the object שְׂרָאֵלאֶת־יִ. The “great sin” (גְדוֹלָה חֲטָאָה) of Jeroboam is nowhere else called such, and this term can be found elsewhere only in Exodus’s calf episode (Ex 32:21, 30, 32) and once in Genesis 20:9 – all of these quite late passages. Most importantly, the sentence begins with a we-qatal construction הרָאָתָה as tempus historicum, even though a more customary narrative-continuing wa-yiqtol form (ויחטאם) would be expected. This sudden Aramaizing change in the verbal form, especially when taken together with the other uncommon stylistic features, is a telling sign of a very late addition (possibly coming from the writers of 24–41). Thus 21bβ can be confirmed as a gloss-like addition.

The addition may have been an attempt to harmonize this passage telling of Jeroboam’s sin with both Exodus’s and Jeroboam’s calf episodes (similarly to 16aβ), and especially the normal formulaic practice of recounting Jeroboam’s having made Israel sin (אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל הֶחֱטִיא אֲשֶׁר). As the chapter did not yet have the common formula of Jeroboam’s “making Israel sin,” a later reviser saw a need to harmonize the passage with the rest of the passages in Kings. This may have happened together clearly comes from an ideological context different from dtr, as noted by Nelson, Joshua, 248: “The ideological background of the plot is the conviction that no more than one altar can be a place of lawful sacrifice. While this was an axiom of both deuteronomistic and priestly theology, here the single central altar is delineated in a typically priestly mode.”

775 A suffix added to other forms of the verb can occasionally be found in Gen 31:39 (pi.), Lev 9:15 (pi.), Num 19:19 (pi.), Ps 51:7 (pi.), Prov 8:38 (qal), and Ezek 33:12 (qal).

776 Becking, Ondergang, 199–200, considers this phrase a “toevoeging van een latere redactor.” He also proposes that the quite clear addition “two calves” in verse 16 was made by this same reviser (227–8). Of course, the phrase could have also been taken over to Exodus from here. One could also expect some preposition to be given with גְדוֹלָה חֲטָאָה, possibly ב. 777 Becking, Ondergang, 192, argues that this verb “ends the narrative” of the section. However, it is much more likely that this is simply a sign of later, Aramaizing, language use – like that of the later part (24–41) of the chapter; cf. Levin, “Empty Land in Kings,” 68: “... the perf.cop. as tempus historicum is an evident disturbance of the syntax, which, as so frequently, indicates a late interpolation.” Similarly Vanoni, Literarkritik, 119, notes that this verbal form “unterbricht die we=yiqtol-Reiche 21b-22a.”

778 Stade, Kings, 265, accordingly takes the passage as an addition. See also the argumentation of Dietrich, Prophetie, 93–5, who ascribes this sentence to his “DtrP.”

779 The reviser may have even simply taken the verb form חֲטָאָה usually found in the formula, and put a וָאָ before it (and a mem after it), as if it was a consecutive form. This may imply that the reviser
with some of the other glosses and additions underlining the material aspect of the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (12, 15bα, 16aβ). The whole of verse 21, therefore, appears to be composed of late elements and was likely originally added in response to 18b.

On the other hand, verse 22 appears to be a good candidate for the History writer’s text, as it has the formulaic qualities of the usual condemnation of Israelite kings “walking in (all) the sin(s) of Jeroboam (which he made).” However, the verse deals with the people of Israel instead of its king, which is quite unusual, but in the closing chapter of the Northern Kingdom this might be accepted as a stylistic variant to the normal practice, since Jeroboam is indeed said to have “made Israel sin” as well.

This same ideology of the people sinning is expressed by 2 Kgs 13:6, where Israel “did not turn from the sins of the house of Jeroboam,” and possibly even in Judah in the MT edition of 1 Kgs 11:33. As verse 13:6 is clearly part of an interpolation, this similarity in ideology could somewhat undermine the redactional character of 17:22 as well. Some do indeed see 22 simply as a later explication of verse 21 (but, as we have seen, this verse is a result of multiple late additions, as well). This could

---

780 The last words of the formula of 17:22, עָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר, are somewhat unusual, and can only be found in two other formulae in 1 Kgs 16:19 (Zimri); and in Judah in 1 Kgs 15:3 (Abijam). Usually Jeroboam is not said to have “made” sins, but to have “made Israel sin.” Similarly, having Israel walk in “all the sins” of Jeroboam seems late since Jeroboam had originally committed only one grave sin of decentralization – but this exaggeration (the addition of כָּל and the waw in חַטֹּאות) may easily have been brought to the text later.

781 Contra Rösel, “Why 2 Kings 17,” 89, who contends that this “democratization of sin” is a late phenomenon. Similarly O’Brien, Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis, 209 and Knoppers, Two Nations, 64. On a larger scale, as seen in this chapter, this is certainly true, but this “democratization” cannot be taken everywhere as an absolute rule. The customary notice on Jeroboam’s sin consists of both the mention of the king following it and Jeroboam making the people go after it (1 Kgs 15:30, 34, 16:2, 7, 19, 26, 21:22, 22:53; 2 Kgs 3:3, 10:29, 31, 13:2, 6, 11, 14:24, 15:9, 18, 24, 28), and therefore there is nothing completely new or distressing in hearing now at the end that the people did indeed walk after the sin of Jeroboam as they were said to have done.

782 Curiously, in 1 Kgs 11:33 in the MT the verbs are in the plural (which is completely nonsensical in the context), while the OG gives the more original singulars – the ending תָּמַי תָּמַי clearly proves this, as noted by Stade, Kings, 126. The verse has also gone through further “nomistic” revision in the MT, as it adds תָּמַי תָּמַי (≅ OG). The “democratizing” ideology is thus also found elsewhere in the MT; see also Appendix B.

783 Verses 13:5–6 clearly sever verses 3/4 and 7 from each other. Now one needs to read the subject of verse 7 as Yahweh (from verse 5), which is very awkward. The original subject of verse 7 must have been the “king of Aram” of verse 3 or 4. Würtz, “Bücher der Könige,” 360, 362, sees 13:6 as an especially late addition. See also Stade, Kings, 243.

784 See O’Brien, Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis, 208–9; Pakkala, “Deuteronomy and 1-2 Kings,” 144.
be indicated by the unnecessary explication of the subject, “sons of Israel,” which also differs slightly from the “Israel” of the preceding – and following – verse. On the other hand, this explication of the subject may be a later plus, made necessary at some point in the transmission because of the ever-changing context of the verse (for instance, if verses 18 and 22 were ever in more direct contact, as may well be the case, this plus would be only natural). Either way, 21a (with reflexive נקרע, נקרע or rather, simply verse 22 alone, would make the most unproblematic History writer’s text in 21–22, and likely in all of 7–22 – but only if one is ready to overlook the aforementioned peculiarities.

The prophetical note of 23αβ, “as (the Lord) spoke in the hands of all his servants, the prophets” (ָּנָּבִּיאִים כָּל־עֲבָדָיו בְּיַד דִּבֶּר כַּאֲשֶׁר), which is found practically verbatim in 2 Kgs 24:2 (ָּנָּבִּים עֲבָדָיו בְּיַד דִּבֶּר אֲשֶׁר) concerning Jehoiakim, is late in Kings with its unconventional interpretation of prophets as harbingers of destruction. The mention may have been added with or after the prophetic interpolation of verse 13, as its fulfillment notice.

785 However, the recurrence of “the sons of Israel” could be a sign of the literary unity of 7a and 22.
786 Reading thus: אֲשֶׁר יָרָבְעָם כָּל־חַטֹּאות בְּ יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵי ויֵלְכוּ | וַיַּמְּדוּ דָּוִד בֵּית מֵעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל קָרַע | נִכִּי מִמֶּנָּה: א־סָרוּ ^עָשָׂה.
787 The contents of 23αβ are under suspicion on several fronts. First, its form is almost verbatim that of the ending of 13 (עֲהַנְּבִיאִים בְּיַד בָדַי). Second, its prophetic ideology differs from that of 13, and its contents have hence often been thought to come from a very late reviser; see Hentschel, 2 Könige, 81 (“DtrP”); Jones, 2 Kings, 543; and Dietrich, Prophetie, 41, according to whom the notion is later than the one in 13 (coming from “DtrP”), since their ideology differs slightly (in verse 23αβ the prophets are thought of as foreseeing the inevitable destruction, while in verse 13 they are simple preachers of God’s law and statutes, through which salvation is still possible). Verse 23αβ acts now as a fulfillment of 13, as argued by Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 443. In 1–2 Kings this late idea of prophets foreseeing the destruction of an entire kingdom (Judah) starts to recur only after this (in 2 Kgs 21:10–15, 22:16–20, 23:26, 24:2–4, 24:13b). Third, the idea that the Northern Kingdom would have been forewarned of its impending doom is both ideologically and even text-critically problematic. The only occasions, other than verse 13, where such a warning is mentioned or alluded to in 1–2 Kings are dubious. In 2 Kgs 13:23 it is said that “the Lord did not yet rend Israel away,” which can hardly be taken as a warning (and seems like a gloss) – the fact that the location of this verse is somewhat volatile, as shown by L (13:23 is found in 13:7+ in L), raises further questions about the verse and its contents. In 2 Kgs 14:27, it is said that “the Lord had not yet said that he would blot the name of Israel away.” This can hardly be taken as a proper forewarning either (quite the contrary), and, furthermore, there are even some text-critical challenges with this verse. In the MT “name” is blotted out, while in the LXX the object is “seed” (σπέρμα – only L-700 460 give the Hebraizing ὄνομα) – a mistake (σπέρμα ~ ὄνομα) does not seem likely, contra Stade, Kings, 250. Last, but certainly not least, the only actual case of prophecy against the kingdom of Israel in 1 Kgs 14:15–16 by Ahijah is completely lacking in the OG. The OG narrative 12:24a-z does not have this prophecy either. Therefore, in the LXX edition the sentence of 17:23αβ is more connected to other biblical books (such as Jeremiah, Micah, or Amos) that predict destruction of the Northern Kingdom than to anything in 1–2 Kings, which further indicates the lateness of the text. Becking, “Josianic View,” 290, notes: “This expression might have been taken over from Amos 3,7.” The addition seems more at home in the overall Kings composition of the MT than that of the LXX.
The status of verse 23b, which recounts the information from 6b in a *Wiederaufnahme*-like way, is heavily debated due to its repetitive nature, as has been previously noted. In the research, the whole of verse 23 has often been seen as part of the oldest layer of the chapter. However, some scholars have recently proposed that 23b should be connected to the next textual unit beginning in 24, rather than to the preceding 7–23a. Indeed, seeing 23b as the beginning of a new homiletical section, 24–41, instead of the ending of the one in 7–23a, seems the least problematic way of interpreting this resumptive repetition, for it is harder to posit an all-encompassing *Wiederaufnahme* in 6b–23b than one beginning a new unit 23b–41. While verse 23 could be dispensed with, as 23aα simply repeats the text of 18b/20b and 23b simply resumes 6b, verse 22 confronts us with a redactional problem: the sin of Jeroboam would not be expected to be just a later addition and framed apparently not only by one but two potential *Wiederaufnahmen*, but rather an original part of the judgment of the northern monarchy. However, if 21–23 were deemed late, as is done by some scholars, why would the denunciation of Jeroboam’s sin also be missing after verse 2 and the customary Deuteronomistic condemnation of Hoshea (“He did evil in the eyes of Yahweh . . .”), the exact place where such material would usually be expected to be found in the chapter? Such reconstructions do not seem likely.

In the MT this problem is, as argued in section 2.2, partially eliminated by the fact that Hoshea is apparently said to have been a *better* king than “the kings of Israel before him.” As the sin of Jeroboam is missing in connection with him, it could even

789 Thus Cogan & Tadmor, *2 Kings*, 207; and Würtwein, *Bücher der Könige*, 393. See, however, the criticism of Aurelius, *Zukunft*, 78, against this idea: “Daß v 23b ein Zusatz zu v 21-23a sei, ist keine gute Erklärung der Wiederaufnahme von v 6, denn warum sollte jemand einen solchen Zusatz machen? Näher liegt der Schluß, daß v 23b geschrieben worden ist, um einen größeren Zusatz in den Kontext einzubinden, nämlich den ganzen Epilog v 21-23.”
791 For reference see the Omride kings Omri (1 Kgs 16:25-26), Ahab (16:30–33), Ahazyah (22:52–54), and Joram (2 Kgs 3:2–3), who, like Hoshea, are also compared to their predecessors. With them the doing of evil, the comparison, and the sin of Jeroboam are always given in direct connection with each other. The customary condemnation for Jeroboam’s sin is also missing altogether from the Israelite kings Elah (1 Kgs 16:8) and Shallum (2 Kgs 15:13). While Shallum reigned for such a short period of time (one month) that he may have been interpreted to have not even been able to follow in the sin of Jeroboam, the lack of the mention in the case of Elah is a mystery, as he reigned two years, certainly a time sufficient to walk in Jeroboam’s sin, as even Zechariah (2 Kgs 15:9), who reigned for six months, is said to have done so. Whatever Jeroboam’s sin may have been, Hoshea with his nine years would definitely have had time to indulge in it. It is therefore unlikely that the length of reign has any significance when it comes to the condemnation of Hoshea.
be argued that Hoshea indeed did not continue the sin of Jeroboam – certainly reason enough for him not to be as evil as even most (if not all) kings of Israel. If this was indeed the case, it would be no surprise that the mention of Jeroboam’s sin is only to be found in a redactionally later portion of the text and with the uncustomary “sons of Israel” walking in the sin, and not the king(s).\textsuperscript{792} These two notices may, after all, be logically incompatible with each other: if, against all odds, Hoshea ended the sin of Jeroboam, the people would not have been able to follow it, as in 21–23a, “until Yahweh cast them from before his face.” Of course, if Hoshea was such an exceptional king, one could certainly expect the author to have then explicated reasons for this in a more pronounced way. The OG understanding (Hoshea as the worst king of Israel) could thus be seen as the logically preferable option as well. Therefore, taking into account all the variables in the chapter, it is exceedingly hard to come to a definite conclusion on the relationship of verse 2 and its two textually opposite textual versions on one hand and the “oldest textual unit” of 21–23 on the other.

\textit{Conclusion:} The clearly incoherent unit 21–23 does not originate from one single hand. The grammatically problematic verse 21 is largely (if not completely) late, with the ideologically unusual 21a (to be read according to the LXX), which must have originally been attached to 18b; 21b\textsuperscript{β} exhibits clear signs of being a gloss written in Late Biblical Hebrew; 23a\textsuperscript{β} is a lately added fulfillment of the prophetic denouncements of verse 13; and 23b forms a \textit{Wiederaufnahme} (used in a fashion similar to the \textit{Wiederaufnahme} in verse 4b) to 6b that was used for adding the story of 24ff. to (at that time the end of) the chapter. Of 21–23, verses 22–23a have the smallest number of unexpected traits and are the best option for the History writer’s text in these verses, albeit admittedly not completely unproblematically.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Textual history of verses 21–23} & \\
\hline
21 & יִכְּי־ןַקְרַע

וִיהֵי בֵּית חֶם יָרָבָּא וְאֵת־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶֽׁר־כָּלָֽה

וַיַּמְלִיכוּ דָוִ֖ד בֵּית מֵﬠַ֑ל יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל יהוָ֖ה מֵאַחֲרֵי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל יָרָבְﬠָם וַיַּדַּח גְדוֹלָה׃

חֲטָאָה וְהֶחֱטֵיאָם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל בְּנֵ֣י ויֵּלְכוּ לֹא־סָרו־חַטֹּאכָל אֲשֶׁר יָרָבְﬠָם מִמֶּנָּה׃ת וּפָנָ֔יו מֵﬠַ֖ל אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל יהוָ֑ה אֲשֶׁר־הֵסִירﬠַד הַנְּבִיאִ֖ים כָּל־ﬠֲבָדָיו בְּיַד דִּבֶּ֑ר כַּאֲשֶׁ֣ר הַזֶּה הַיּוֹם עַד אַשּׁוּרָה אַדְמָתוֹ מֵﬠַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּגֶל׃

22 & יִכְּי־ןַקְרַע

עַד אֲשֶׁר־קֶל הָלָֽהּ בֵּית יְהוָ֖ה אֲשֶׁר־הֵסִירﬠַד הַנְּבִיאִ֖ים כָּל־ﬠֲבָדָיו בְּיַד דִּבֶּ֑ר כַּאֲשֶׁ֣ר הַזֶּה הַיּוֹם עַד אַשּׁוּרָה אַדְמָתוֹ מֵﬠַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּגֶל׃

23 & יִכְּי־ןַקְרַע

נָפָשׁ דֶּרֶךְ בֵּית יְהוָ֖ה אֲשֶׁר־הֵסִירﬠַד הַנְּבִיאִ֖ים כָּל־ﬠֲבָדָיו בְּיַד דִּבֶּ֑ר כַּאֲשֶׁ֣ר הַזֶּה הַיּוֹם עַד אַשּׁוּרָה אַדְמָתוֹ מֵﬠַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּגֶל׃

\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{792} The “sons” of Israel could of course be argued to also include the kings, but this interpretation is strained.

\textsuperscript{793} The verb is to be understood with “Israel” as its subject, and is to be read in the niph’al form according to the Versions.
3.2.7 The full redactional picture of the MT edition verses 6–23

The literary analysis of verses 7–23 above has shown that the section does not form a literary unity. In fact, it is exceedingly important to note that even the units often posited in the scholarship – such as 7–12, 7–18, 13–17, or even 21–23 – are hardly internally coherent. There are many secondary glosses and additions of varying sizes, from multiple hands. This makes their literary and redactional assessment exceedingly difficult and uncertain. It is thus no wonder that scholars have at times even come to completely contradictory conclusions on the relative age of these passages. Indeed, even the reconstruction provided here is only an exceedingly rough approximation to the textual history of these verses, especially when it comes to assigning multiple verses to one hand – it is very much a possibility that, in fact, no two verses in 7–23 come from the same writer/reviser. Therefore, the wise words of Ville Mäkipelto should be here heeded:

“Since the editorial processes in documented evidence are so complex, we may assume that the earlier editorial processes were as well. Therefore, it seems that the texts should not be divided into different layers too rigorously. It is often enough to describe the most likely outlines of the editorial history, keeping in mind that these reconstructions are based on lower probabilities than those based on documented evidence.”

It has been concluded that the suggested working hypothesis of 7αα, 9bα, 11aαb, 18α, 22–23α as the most original text in verses 7–23 could indeed somewhat adequately answer the questions pertaining to the redactional outline of the chapter: such a text would have had its focus on the high places, (and) the sin of Jeroboam – i.e., the decentralization of the cult. However, as has been argued, this solution is not without its problems either: all these verses, save perhaps for 22–23α, reflect some ideological or lexical tendencies which may not be readily accepted as coming from the History writer since even the making of the high places in 9bα, 11αα is recounted in language quite different from 1 Kgs 12:31. Of course, the somewhat uncommon language use could possibly be attributed, at least to a certain extent (especially in

---

795 If aiming for the absolute minimum, one could possibly take out 11b as yet another later component, but in such a case one would need to explain how the *Wiederaufnahme* 11b/17b came to be.
verse 22), to the equally uncommon content of the chapter, namely the final destruction and exile of the Northern Kingdom.

The working hypothesis should thus be modified in one respect, namely by taking only 22–23a (the mention of Jeroboam’s sin and the exile of Israel) as the original layer, and seeing 7αa, 9βa, 11αb, 18 as forming the earliest additional layer to this short and simple text form. After this earliest addition, which had already brought Judah into the picture in 18b, albeit only as an “afterthought,” the cultic sins of Manasseh (16a–17) were added to the text after 11b via Wiederaufnahme, possibly together with 11αβ and 21αβ, which further explicate the historical background of the fall of Israel and reinforce the idolatrous nature of the sinning.

The third layer of additions, consisting of 8a.10, which brought the sins of Judah/Rehoboam from 1 Kgs 14:22–23 to the chapter, may have happened with the second one. It is not impossible that these “Judaizing” additions (16a–17, 8a, 10) were made at the same point, since both share the general object of introducing the sins of Judah to Israel as well (or thus imply that Israel was in fact the one introducing these sins to Judah). In any case, these two “Judaizing” harmonizations are distinct. At this point the text would have run through 7a, 8a, 9–11, 16a, 17–18, 21αβ, 22–23a, and formed one long list of different cultic sins, which were attributed solely to Israel. To 8a was at some late point glossed 8b, after which the awkward addition of 9a was made.

The fourth reviser then added a full and explicit denunciation of Judah by adding 13a, 14a, 15αβ (without הַהבֶל וַיֶּהְבָּלוּ וְאַחֲרֵי, 19–20 and possibly 23αβ, after which the chapter no longer dealt with only Israel, but Judah as well – i.e., “the whole seed of Israel” (20). Judah now effectively became a full partner in crime in verses 13–14 (explicitly), 15–17 (by grammatical implication), and 19–20 (explicitly), and because of the allusions to the sin of Rehoboam in 8–11, implicitly in the whole chapter. Even later these verses were further supplemented with small glosses and harmonizations. One of these later hands probably brought to the fore the purely materialistic aspect of other gods/idolatry in 12, 15b (דָּבָר הַבֶל וַיֶּהְבָּלוּ וְאַחֲרֵי), 16b(α), 17a+, 21β. One of the latest,

796 At this point the addition of the now superfluous subject יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵי to 22a may also have been done. As the conclusion can hardly be completely definite, three other highly plausible theories of the most original textual layer in 7–23 are those of Šanda (7αa,21–23), Stade (21αa,22–23), and Provan (7αa,18a,21–23), albeit all with certain necessary modifications, as argued above. In many ways these reconstructions could be seen as alternative literary-critical results, since they are all plausible, hard to refute, and work on slightly different presuppositions, even if their base tenets are roughly the same.
if not *the* latest (proto-MT?), additions was 7b, which was taken from the end part of the whole chapter (verses 35, 37–38).
The literary layers of MT 2 Kgs 17:6b-23

The bordered text is to be read according to the OG.

The OG plus * should be taken as the original ending of verse 6 (see 2.4.3.1).

The beginning of the verse is to be read according to the more original LXX.

The verb is to be understood with “Israel” as its subject, and possibly to be read in the niph'ål form according to the versions.
In the ninth year of Hoshea king of Assur conquered Samaria, and he exiled Israel to Assur and settled them in Halah and in Habor, the river Gozan, and cities of the Medes until this day.

And it happened, because the sons of Israel sinned against Yahweh their God, [who brought them up from the land of Egypt, from under the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt,]

and they feared other gods,

and they walked in the customs of the peoples, whom Yahweh had driven out from before the sons of Israel,

[and the kings of Israel, which they made]

and the sons of Israel 'did in secret' things that are not right against Yahweh their God,

and built themselves high places in all of their cities, [from watchtowers to fortified towns,]

and they erected themselves standing stones and Asherim on all high hills and under every lush tree,

and sacrificed there

on all high places like the peoples whom Yahweh had exiled from before them,

and did evil things in order to provoke Yahweh,

and they served the Gilulim, about which Yahweh had said to them "do not do this thing."

And Yahweh warned Israel and Judah by the hand of all his prophets, [all the seers,] saying: “turn from your evil ways, and observe my commandments, my customs, and all my Torah, that I have commanded to your fathers,

and which I sent to you, by the hand of my servants, the prophets,

but they did not hear, and hardened their necks more than their fathers, who did not believe in Yahweh, their God,

and they rejected his customs and his covenant, which he made with their fathers,

[and his testimonies which Yahweh had testified to them,]

and they walked after

[vanities and became vain, and after]

the peoples who were around them, about whom Yahweh had commanded them to not do like they did.

But they forsook [all] the commandments of Yahweh, their God,

and made themselves molten image, [two calves,]

and they made Ashera, and they bowed down to all the host of heaven and served Baal

and they made their sons and their daughters walk through fire, and divined by divinations and sought omens,

and made ephod and teraphim,

and they sold themselves to do evil in the eyes of Yahweh in order to provoke him,

so that Yahweh was very angry with Israel, and he removed them from before his face. None was left but only the tribe of Judah alone.

And Judah, too, did not observe the commandments of Yahweh, their God, and they walked in the customs of all Israel, which they made.

And they rejected Yahweh and Yahweh was angry with all the seed of Israel, and he humbled them and gave them to hand of plunderers, until he sent them from before his face.

For Israel rent itself from the house of David, and they made Jeroboam, son of Nebat, king; but Jeroboam seduced Israel from behind Yahweh,

[and he had made them sin a great sin.]

And the sons of Israel walked in [all] the sin[s] of Jeroboam – they did not turn away from it until Yahweh removed Israel from before his face.

[as was told by the hand of all his servants, the prophets];

(ISrael was exiled from its land to Assur, until this day.)

The italicized parts are to be read according to OG; [bracketed] readings denote glosses.
3.3 Synthesis: comparing the OG and MT editions of verses 7–23

Now that both the OG (= La\textsuperscript{115}) and MT editions have been submitted to a textual analysis, and, furthermore, a literary analysis of both editions has been given, a synthesis of their results may be made.

The main result of the combined textual and literary assessment of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin materials shows that there are two largely different editions of 2 Kings 17 preserved to us. It has been argued that the textual order of La\textsuperscript{115} witnesses the otherwise lost OG version of the chapter, which goes back to a Hebrew Vorlage different from MT. This raises the question: which one of these compositional layouts is the older one, OG or MT? In which one has the transposition taken place? Can a relative chronology of these editions even be determined?

The first thing to note concerning the two layouts is that certain broader literary-critical phenomena are \textit{shared} by both editions:

1) verse 7(*ab) begins a new redactional unit after 6b, and there are grave (text-critical and/or syntactical) challenges both within and in the near vicinity of this verse;
2) verse 7(*b) also seems to be somehow related to verse 18(a) in both editions (via grammar in the MT, and by giving the beginning and ending formulae of the first text block of the OG);
3) both editions coincide in utilizing framing devices in their verses 7*b (OG)/8 (MT) and 19;
4) verse 15 marks the beginning of the listing of Israel’s sins in the OG, while in the MT 15 resumes the listing after the disruptive prophetic note of 13–14, after which the sinners of verses 15–18 are syntactically to be read as both Israel and Judah;
5) there is a redactional break after 18b, and verses 19 and 20 belong to a somehow different unit from 18 (and 21); and
6) verses 21–23 form a third “unit,” somehow different from verses 7–20.

At the same time, one may also take note of the most substantial \textit{differences} between the two editions:

1) the use of framing devices in 7*b (OG)/8 (MT, missing from OG) and 19 (19a and 19b, respectively) differs, together with the text thus enclosed;
2) in the OG verses 13–14 are not (as) disruptive, since they were probably situated inside the second text block, which would have dealt with Judah as much as with Israel;

3) unlike in the OG, in the MT such a clear textual division between the sins of Israel and the shared sins of both kingdoms is not found, aside from the enigmatic verses 19–20; and

4) practically all(!) Greek witnesses preserve the ending formula of the second OG text block in verse 20, while in the MT this phrase has dropped out due to a homoioteleuton mistake (together with a likely deliberate change of the subject).

While it is possible that these phenomena are completely incidental, this is not very probable. Because of the similarities, it is more likely that there is a genealogical relationship between the two editions – one has been constructed on the basis of the other.

In the literary-critical assessment of both the OG and MT it became clear that, in any case, the text must have grown considerably during its transmission process – if original, the text blocks of the OG, for instance, could not have originally been in the form they are now. This could be seen as an argument against their originality: the somewhat clear parallelism between the two could have only risen out of the full, repetitive, and mixed text of the MT. This is in no way a conclusive argument, however, since the two blocks seem to differ in their overall object of reprehension – only Israel in the first one, but both Judah and Israel in the second one. In fact, the parallelism may have reversibly grown from this differentiation: when a sin was added to one of the blocks, it was more likely to have been adopted in some form also into the other one. Further scholarly analysis of this parallel structure is therefore needed.

It is quite remarkable that when the literary-critical results of the MT text are applied to the transposed OG text, there appear surprisingly few problems, since the main redactional break-points are, curiously enough, shared by both editions. Many of the smaller glosses in particular could have originally been made to either edition, and only the arguments specific to a certain edition – such as textual growth via Wiederaufnahme in verses 11 and 17 in the MT vis-à-vis the two text blocks in the OG – understandably remain more or less irreconcilable. The narratological
disruptions created by verses 13–14 in the MT, however, may be the most important argument for the secondary nature of the MT. If the transposition happened in the proto-MT transmission phase, it would make sense that a slight inconsistency (in this case the grammatical subject of verses 15–18 becoming both Israel and Judah) in the narrative was introduced into the text. This argument could be reversed, so that the OG wanted to harmonize this inconsistency by transposition, but the grave measures taken (a large transposition of 9–14 with 15–18, omission of verse 8, and complete rephrasing of verse 7) seem very over-scaled if only targeted at accommodating this discrepancy. Moreover, together with the missing OG ending formula in MT verse 20, the loss of this potentially ideologically problematic structural marker in the MT could speak for its later editing vis-à-vis the OG.

However, purely redaction-critically speaking, if verse 15 originates from the same hand/layer as 13–14, the OG order would probably be due to later editing — but it is all but certain that 15 is such a late verse, at least as a whole. This is indeed one of the methodological problems encountered when working with multiple editions of a text: while in the layout of the MT a verse may appear as late, in the other editions this may not be the case at all. Applying the literary-critical conclusions of one edition to another without taking into account the special features of the other will inevitably result in a circular argument. We therefore have to admit that some of our literary-critical tools may no longer be well enough suited when working with multiple editions, especially when there are vast transpositions differentiating these editions — what seems like a Wiederaufnahme in one edition may appear as something completely different in another. If, theoretically speaking, neither edition can be deemed clearly later than the other (as is in many ways the case in 1 Kings, and especially its differing Jeroboam stories), we are at a loss. Since the whole of 7–20 comes from nomistically minded hands, a clear-cut differentiation between different verses is extremely challenging, even if working only with the text of the MT (as shown by the history of scholarship on these verses).

In many ways one could thus argue for the older age of the OG edition. It has become clear that the single most important case is that of verse 7, where it can be

---

802 Of course, the one thing inferable is the lateness of such textual units. For instance, Josh 8:30–35 can seemingly be found in three different positions in the witnesses, and this movability likely tells of its later provenance; see Mäkipelto, Tekoniemi & Tucker, “Large-Scale Transposition,” 3–5.
quite strongly argued that La\textsuperscript{115} preserves the oldest version of this hinge-verse. Further analysis of this verse would be in order since verse 7 is likely the key to many of the questions concerning the textual transmissions of the chapter. For instance, verse 7\textsuperscript{b} would work grammatically with 21a regardless of the understanding of the problematic MT verb קָרַע, and could potentially even form a text coming from the History writer: 7\textsuperscript{b}“They did not guard the commandments of the Lord, the God of their fathers, 21afor/when he rent Israel/Israel rent itself from the house of David, they made Jeroboam, son of Nebat, king.” Indeed, the correct interpretation of MT 7a וַיְהִי כִּי – which probably should be read as the protasis to the apodosis in 18a – has been a consistent issue in the scholarship, and it would not be completely unheard of that such a challenge was in fact a result of late textual alteration. Furthermore, if the OG form of verse 2 (i.e., Hoshea being the most evil king of Israel against the least evil king of the MT) is indeed to be seen as the original judgment of Hoshea as the worst king of Israel, there would potentially be no problems in seeing nothing in 7–20, or even 7–23, as originating from the History writer – something that would on the contrary seem very strange in the MT text form. The case of verse 2 and its possible redactional implications is an issue that is yet to be taken into account in the scholarship (see 3.2.6 for discussion).

Therefore, in many ways it may be argued that the narrative of the OG is in fact more coherent, at the same time being also ideologically/theologically more problematic. While the first argument can be reversed (argument for harmonization), the second proves much more difficult to reverse and seems to hint at a more original narrative. Further research on these issues would in any case be in order.

Thus, while I do not consider the case of the relative age of the two editions of verses 7–23 completely solved by the arguments posited in this chapter or thesis, it seems, at the very least, clear to me that there indeed existed two differing but genetically linked editions of chapter 17, those of the MT and of the OG, circulating at some point(s) of time. In most individual text-critical cases, moreover, the OG text has preserved the oldest version of the text, which lends further credibility to the idea that the overall layout of this edition might well also be the older one.
4. The textual history of verses 24–41

The number of (substantial) text-critical problems diminishes in the second half of the chapter. Nevertheless, there is one somewhat large plus shared by all of the LXX tradition (17:32+), which has mostly been neglected or overlooked in research – notwithstanding its likely originality and therefore notable literary-critical importance. The kaige (or Hexaplaric) revision has clearly influenced even the Lucianic text in these verses, even more so than seems to have happened in the first half of the chapter. Some, if not most, of the original readings of the OG may now have thus been lost.

Unlike the exceedingly confusing redactional situation of verses 7–23, the main literary layers of the latter half of the chapter are relatively commonly agreed upon. The often-cited solution of Stade has usually been taken as the starting point of the reconstructions: the oldest text would have consisted of verses 24–28.41, with two later additions, first in 29–34a and then in 34b–40.803 Stade’s proposition has stood the test of time quite well and is also taken here as the working hypothesis. While generally applicable, this basic outline is nevertheless in need of some adjustments – especially when it comes to the aforementioned OG plus between verses 31 and 32 and the textual history of the latest additional “unit” 34b–40.

4.1 The distinction between two halves in 7–23 and 24–41

The two units, 7–23(a) and (23b–)24–41, are often seen as two distinct units, coming mostly from two or more different hands. The latter half of the chapter reflects ideological tenets that differ greatly from – and at times even contradict – those expressed by the earlier verses.804 First of all, the focus of the narrative changes from the Israelites to the new foreign inhabitants, peoples who would have hardly been of interest to the writer of 7–23, who is still focused on solely the sins of the Northern Kingdom itself. That these new inhabitants then paradoxically “fear Yahweh” at the same time with their own native gods goes similarly against the fervent monolatrous

803 Stade, “Miscellen 2 Kō 15–21,” 167–9. Stade’s solution is accepted by Benzinger, Könige, 175; DeVaux, 1–2 Rois, 202; Gray, Kings, 579; and Šanda, 2. Könige, 224–33, to name a few. These divisions into three units are agreed on by most scholars even if they differ on the relative dating of these units.

804 As aptly summarized by Campbell and O’Brien, Unfolding, 444: “Certain aspects are surprising. First, the dualistic solution adopted would have been unacceptable to a dtr theologian. In vv. 24-33, it is treated as acceptable; it solves the lion problem. Second, the failure to centralize, implicit in worship at the high places, is not condemned in vv. 24-33, in contrast to vv. 7-23. In the circumstances it would have been absurd; but the dtr theologians never extended such leniency to Jeroboam and the north. Third, dtr influence is felt; dtr language is mimicked without being replicated–is aped but is absent.”
Yahwism of 7–23 (and especially MT verse 7a). The actions of the peoples in 24–33 are also not explicitly condemned, unlike in the first half of the chapter, even when it is told that the new peoples set up high places and their priests (29, 32). The unit of 34–40 is, furthermore, explicitly targeted against all Israelites, not just the northerners.805

Not only do these two sections differ greatly from each other ideologically, but, possibly even more importantly, also by their language use. Kartveit has recently noted that the latter half of the chapter has (even more so than verses 9 and 21) clear signs of Aramaic-influenced Late Biblical Hebrew: the usual finite verbal forms of classical Hebrew, which have been used mainly in the first half of the chapter, are increasingly replaced by participle constructions.806 It is thus very clear in the scholarship that there is a substantial break – both in literary and likely also temporary sense – between units 7–23(a), where no such participle constructions are found, and (23b–)24–41, where they are abundant (18 in total).807

In fact, since the language use here differs so greatly from pretty much anything else in Kings, it is extremely unlikely these verses go back to any “classical” redaction proposed in Kings, which uses classical Hebrew. Most of 24–41 is thus very late and post-exilic, to say the least.808 The only question concerns verse 24 (and possibly some parts of 25–28 with it), which is unaffected by this late language use, and has sometimes even been posited to contain early materials from the History writer, and ultimately even the royal annals or other early sources.809

805 This situation is arguably comparable with verses 13 and 18–20, though in the case of 34–40 the situation is much clearer; see 4.5.2 below.
806 Kartveit, “The Date of II Reg 17,24–41,” 34–7. The same is also noted by Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 444 and already by Šanda, 2. Könige, 232, in verses 32–34. The different uses are those of wayehi qotel in 25, 28, 29, 32 bis, 41; hayah qotel in 33 bis, 41; hinem qotel/hem qotelim in 26, 29, 31, 34, 40, 41; and enam qotelim in 26, 34 bis. The only verses unaffected by this characteristic are thus verses 24 and 34b–39. It is then interesting to note that even though the unit of 34b–39 is usually taken as the latest textual unit of the chapter, it has “earlier” verb forms in it. This could slightly support the theory of Cogan & Tadmor, 2 Kings, 213–14, that these verses originally continued the story from verse 23 onwards; however, the other problems of the theory still remain, making it unlikely, as will be argued below.
807 Interestingly in the OG edition of verse 4 there is an additional participle construction (καὶ ἦν Ὡσῆς φέρων δῶρα τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀσσυρίων = אשור למלך מנחה משיב Hoshe) not found in the MT. This may be used as an additional argument for the overall lateness of 4b.
808 Similarly Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 398–9 (“nachexilisch”).
809 Thus for instance Jones, Kings, 552 and Levin, “In Search,” 263–4. Many scholars, such as Hentschel, 2 Könige, 82–3, and Noth, ÜSt, 78, propose that some other verses (such as 25–28 or 29–31) should also be taken as coming from these early layers. However, this becomes unlikely because of the late ideology and language use of these passages. Nevertheless, some parts of 25–28 could be argued to come from the same early layer as 24, as is done below.
4.2 Textual history of verses 24–28

In these verses the assessment of textual witnesses reveals only minor differences between the main traditions. The literary critical analysis shows that there may have originally been a somewhat more condensed kernel of the lion story, written in Classical Hebrew style. This basic narrative may have been later expanded by a scribe using Late Biblical Hebrew syntax.

4.2.1 Appraisal of the main witnesses

Since there are practically no substantial textual differences to be found between the main witnesses MT and LXX in these verses, it is here possible to continue straight to the literary analysis after only a brief textual survey of mostly intra-Greek variants.

The text of the MT should be emended concerning only two minor variants in verses 25 (שָׁם should be omitted) and 27 (הִגָּלִיתֶם should be vocalized as *הִגָּלִיתִים).

It may be noted that, unlike in verses 1–23, the textual character of L becomes more Hebraizing (mostly Hexaplaric) in the second half of the chapter. Besides the recensional Lucianic readings, L often gives a text closer to the MT than any of the other witnesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 24</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יבֹאָל מַלְאָךְ אָשֶׁר מְכָבָּלָה מֶשֶׁכָּה</td>
<td>καὶ ἤγαγεν βασιλέα Ασσυρίων ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος τὸν ἐκ Χουνθα ἀπὸ Αια καὶ ἀπὸ Λυμα γὰρ Σεπφαρουαιν καὶ κατοικίσθησαν ἐν πόλειν Σαμαρίας ἀντὶ τῶν ἱλὸν Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἐκληρονόμησαν τὴν Σαμαρίαν καὶ κατοικήσαν ἐν ταῖς πόλεις αὐτῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִשָּׁב בִּרְכֵיָה יִשָּׁחְתָּ בְּתֵימָה</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς καθέδρας αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$L$ is closer to MT משָׁרִי with its sg. κατοίκισαν against κατοικίσθησαν, and this may be recensional. The majority text is likely here the OG (*משָׁרִי) and in accordance with 23, where the Israelites are similarly objects of a passive verb (ἀπωκίσθη Ἰσραηλ). It is exceedingly hard to argue for the primacy of either number, since both could be seen as harmonizations to the context. $L$-700 also change the last sentence slightly to read καὶ ἐκληρονόμησαν τὴν Σαμαρίαν καὶ τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς καὶ κατοίκησαν ἐν αὐτὰς, which is due to Lucianic recensional action (logically slightly better/smooth text).
And it happened at the beginning of them having settled (+ there MT), (that) they did not fear Yahweh. And Yahweh sent amongst them lions, and they were killing amongst them.

The majority reading καθέδρας is OG, as this is the customary translation of מושׁב in Samuel-Kings. L, likely recensionally, changes the word order and the beginning of the verse, together with a conflation of OG and Hexaplaric text forms (μετά το κατοικισθῆναι τα ἐθνά ταῦτα ἐκεῖ ἐν ἀρχῇ). While it could be possible to posit a (somewhat awkward) Hebrew Vorlage behind L (יוֹלְדוֹת נוֹבִים נָהֲלָה שָׁם בְּתוֹלְדוֹת), these changes are more probably due to Lucianic stylizing. However, the iterative impf. ἀποκτέννοντες of L at the end of the verse, which is also further away from the MT, may well represent the OG here against ἀποκτέννοντες of the majority text.

The plus of ἐκεῖ in L (= MT שָׁם), which is otherwise only found in the Hexaplaric manuscripts A 247 121 488 (⊗ σ’ ε’ in Syrohexapla), is missing from the kaige text, also indicating its probable lateness in the MT. The plus of שָׁם should thus be deemed a secondary explication.

The verb ἀντικαθίζω of the majority text is otherwise unattested in the whole LXX, unlike the κατῴκωσας of L, which conforms to the use in the context (cf. verses 6, 23, 24). Nothing suggests that the majority reading would be a kaige-type reading – rather, its slightly interpretational use suggests an OG origin, L being a Lucianic harmonization, likely made together with the slight lexicographical change of κρίμα to νόμον (L-700 460).

---

810 Cf. 1 Sam 20:18, 25; 1 Kgs 10:5, 19; 2 Kgs 16:18, 19:27.
811 See Voitila, “Use of Tenses,” 220 and Wirth, Septuaginta, 151–7. This could nevertheless also be harmonization with the following verse (θανάτοντες).
The singular readings πορευθῆτω and κατοικείτω of L are likely due to (Lucianic) harmonization of the narratological disruptiveness of the two plurals πορευέσθωσαν καὶ κατοικείτωσαν (MT), On the other hand, the majority text’s plural φωτιοῦσαν against the MT singular φωτίζω is a harmonization towards this plural use.812

The use of φωτίζω as an equivalent of ἡρίειν is a kaige feature, and again notably followed by L (although the sg. of L is here recensional as well).813

The minus of the bracketed text (ἐκεῖ έλαομένει) in the majority text of the LXX has sometimes been argued to exhibit the most original text.814 However, as Stade later maintains, this is not likely: the verb ἀπάγετε (the majority reading ἀπαρετε is due to graphical confusion) has no object, and this minus leaves the text badly damaged without an object for the verb.815 More probably a homoioteleuton mistake in Hebrew (שׁמיָהוֹ…דמָּשָו) or an early homoiarchton in Greek (ἐκεί…ἐκείθεν) has taken the text away. Indeed, the (proto-)L text likely retains this OG text, reading ἐκεί ἐνα τῶν ἱερέων ἄνθρωπον ἡμᾶς ἐκείθεν ἔτεκεν ἐκ Σαμαρίας, ἐκ Σαμαρίας being a later Lucianic explication of ἐκείθεν.816 The OG nature of L may be corroborated by the fact that L also reads 1st person sg. ἀπάγκοσα, according to the more original Hebrew sg. (*הָאָרֶץ).
against the Masoretic plural vocalization (הִגְלִיתֶם), which is followed by Symmachus and Theodotion.817

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 28</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יַנְבֵּאת הָאָדָם הַמַּהֲמִים אֶת עֲנָיו</td>
<td>καὶ ἤγαγον ἐνα τῶν ἱερέων ὅν ἀπόκισαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שָׁמַרְתִּי בַעֲדֵי לָךְ</td>
<td>ἀπὸ Σαμαρείας καὶ ἑκάστουν ἐν Βαιθηλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִתְוַדֵּהוּ האָמִים</td>
<td>καὶ ἦν φωτίζων αὐτοὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רָעִי מָצִיתוֹ</td>
<td>πῶς φοβηθῶσιν τὸν κύριον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[γαγον] ἤγαγον 247 CII 121 s 245-707 | ἀπόκισαν 247 121 488; ἤγαγον A; ἤγαγον V CII d 245 s 707 | ἐκάθισεν 19-93-700 44 68-120 | φωτίζων A B V CII d 245 | 342 554 707 | ἡγαγεν 247 121 s 488; ἡγαγον A; απηγαγεν V CII d 370 s 64-488 71 244245 | ἐκαθισαν 19-93-700 44 68-120 | φωτίζων A B V CII d 245 | 342 554 707 | pr ἐκ τοῦ L-700 460; + ἐκ τοῦ rel | αὐτοὺς + ἐκ τοῦ 381 71 244 342 | αὐτοὶς L-700 460 |

And one of the priests, whom they had exiled from Samaria, went and settled in Bethel. And he/the priest818 was teaching them how they would fear Yahweh.

### 4.2.2 Literary critical assessment of the lion narrative

Verses 24–28 concern themselves solely with the “lion narrative” and the return of an exiled Samarian priest to Bethel (interestingly without any apparent polemics against the cult of the newcomers), after which the peoples mentioned in 24 are said to have made their own gods in 29–31. The LBH periphrastic participle use starts already in these verses. It is nevertheless highly probable that even this quite uniform unit does not come from only one hand either, but has been emended with several small glosses.

Verse 24 has sometimes been attributed to the History writer or even pre-Deuteronomistic sources, sometimes together with the whole lion narrative of 25–28.819 However, as noted, the lion narrative likely comes from late writers together with the rest of the chapter. As Campbell and O’Brien note, the story reminds one more of the prophetic stories where different animals (lions in 1 Kgs 13, bears in 2 Kgs 2) are sent as a form of divine retribution.820 Some phraseological remarks also make verse 24 – or parts of it – problematic. First, the text mentions the “cities of

---

817 Similarly Burney, Kings, 336; Hobbs, 2 Kings, 224; Kittel, Könige, 276; Klostermann, König, 455; and Montgomery, Kings, 479.
818 The majority text’s plus ὁ ἱερεὺς, whether given before (L) or after φωτίζων, is likely OG (albeit a secondary explication), and has been omitted by kaige/Hexaplaric text.
819 Verse 24 alone is attributed to (pre-)dtr writer(s) by, for instance, Talmon, Literary Studies, 142–4; Jones, Kings, 552; and Barrick, “meaning.” 635 (“It is tempting to see 17:24 as a continuation of 17:6”).
820 Some phraseological remarks also make verse 24 – or parts of it – problematic. First, the text mentions the “cities of
Samaria,” שׁומְרוֹן, probably as a designation of the newly formed Assyrian province.\(^{821}\) This phrase is very rare, and appears elsewhere in Kings only in other late contexts.\(^{822}\) Second, the term “sons of Israel” as a designation of northern Israelites hardly comes from the History writer.\(^{823}\) However, since 24 is somewhat repetitive with multiple mentions of Samaria being reinhabited, this problem could be alleviated by positing 24אβγ, יִשְׂרָאֵל שֹׁמְרוֹן תַּחַת, and likely also 24אב, יִשְׂרָאֵל שֹׁמְרוֹן חָמַת בֵּית לְוֹנָה, as coming from later hand(s).\(^{824}\)

However, the very list of place names in the verse also seems like a later construct. Kartveit argues that, as the list has Syrian cities like Hamath and Arpad in it, it is not probable that the list goes back to any historical situation since the exiles from Syrian cities could have simply fled back to their homes from Samaria at the first possible moment.\(^{825}\) Furthermore, apart from Babylon and Kutha, the names in the list are greatly reminiscent of the lists found in 2 Kgs 18:34 (the more original OG lacks Hena and Avva here, as does the parallel passage Isa 36:19), 19:13 and Isa 37:13, which casts doubt on the origins of the place names – the list is likely a composite.\(^{826}\) Because of these considerations, it is thus best to see verse 24 also as part of the later strata of the text, and as the original beginning of the lion narrative in 25–28.\(^{827}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Hamath</td>
<td>Hamath</td>
<td>Hamath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutha</td>
<td>Arpad</td>
<td>Arpad</td>
<td>Arpad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avva</td>
<td>Sepharvaim</td>
<td>Sepharvaim</td>
<td>Sepharvaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamath</td>
<td>Hena (&lt;&gt;OG, Isa 36)</td>
<td>Hena</td>
<td>Hena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepharvaim</td>
<td>Ivvah (&lt;&gt;OG, Isa 36)</td>
<td>Ivvah</td>
<td>Ivvah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{821}\) Thus Rehm, 2 Könige, 171; and Levin, “In Search,” 264.

\(^{822}\) In 1 Kgs 13:32 (but simply Ἡμιαπειq in all LXX witnesses!); 2 Kgs 17:26, 23:19.

\(^{823}\) Šanda, 2. Könige, 229, however notes that the “sons of Israel” is earlier than the “Samaritans” in verse 29. This is indeed the case, although the case of 29 is much more complex than this since the MT reflects the very latest text form in 29, and thus cannot be used to say anything about the matter at hand; see 4.3.2 below.

\(^{824}\) Thus Levin, “In Search,” 264.

\(^{825}\) Kartveit, “The Date of II Reg 17,24–41,” 37–41. Kartveit also notes that, interestingly, the list is also very unlike that of Ezra 4:9–10 where only Mesopotamian place names as the newcomers’ original cities are found. This would be more likely, since the Assyrian custom was often, albeit not always, to exile peoples from one end of the empire to another; see Oded, Mass Deportations, 27: “The Assyrian kings vaunted their ability to move people over great distances, from one end of the known world to the other ... There are indeed many examples of population being transported over enormous distances from east to west and vice versa ....”

\(^{826}\) Kartveit, “The Date of II Reg 17,24–41,” 40–1, even argues that this list was added here in anticipation of 2 Kgs 18:34 where multiple “gods of Samaria” are mentioned.

\(^{827}\) Similarly also Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 445: “Some annalistic material has been claimed here; it may well have formed part of the raw material, but it has been thoroughly blended into the final product (e.g., v. 24 supplies the subject for v. 25).”
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It is very probable that this story about the exiled priest in verses 24–28 is part of the oldest additions in 24–41 since verses 29–33.41 – and especially 29–31 – would be rendered meaningless without it. Why else would verses 32–33, 41 be so adamant about the foreign peoples “fearing Yahweh” – a theologically quite problematic idea – if no specific reason for such fearing was given beforehand as is done in verses 24–28? It is easier to see 29–33(, 41) as later interpretation(s) of verses 24–28 than the other way around, especially since there are no interpretational or explicitly polemical elements in the lion story itself.

Another important reason to see 24–28 as the most original text in the latter half of the chapter is verse 41, which mentions הָאֵלֶּה הַגּוֹיִם, “these peoples,” as fearing Yahweh. This mention would work well as a concluding remark to 28b, “and he was teaching them how to fear Yahweh,” or possibly to 32. In any case, this phrase in 41a is now somehow severed from its more original context by the later additions in 34b–40 which attack the Israelites, “the sons of Jacob,” with whom Yahweh had made a covenant and not the “peoples” mentioned in 24–32. While positing 41 as originally following 32/33/34a is also possible, seeing 41 as originally connected to the unit 24–28 could also make it easier to see why the phrase “they feared Yahweh” is so often repeated in verses 32–34: these repetitions were used as literary tools to add new text between verses 28 and 41. Indeed, verses 32, the LXX plus 32+, and 33 all begin with this statement, and were likely added to the text in a similar way (see 4.3.2).

Furthermore, it is possible to surmise that the lion story was originally somewhat shorter than the one now found in the text, and that the sentences with the LBH verbal forms uniformly attest additions to this earlier core narrative. None of the LBH

---

828 However, other possibilities have also been posited: for instance, Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 398–9, sees 24, 29–34a, 41 as the oldest text; somewhat similarly also Noth, ÜSt, 78 (24.29–31). However, in Würthwein’s reconstruction the text of verses 32–34a, 41 would be highly repetitive, and does not seem like an original composition.
829 Kittel, Könige, 278.
830 Similarly Stade, “Anmerkungen,” 168–9 and Šanda, 2. Könige, 229. Alternatively, Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 445, propose that 41 is an even “later addition, reaffirming the position of v. 33 over against the exclusivity of vv. 34-40.” This is also proposed by Frevel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 24. The addition would have thus brought to the text an additional inconsistency, as is so often the case.
831 Brongers, II Koningen, 168, sees 41 as a continuation of 33: “Vs. 41 ten slotte, dat op vs. 33 schijnt terug te grijpen ....”
832 Thus contra Kartveit, “Date of II Reg 17,24–41,” 36: “The instances are found in vv. 25,26,28f,31–34.40f., which makes it difficult to isolate a particular strand or layer in the text, and also to explain them as additions ....”
clauses bring any new and/or relevant information to the story, but are in some cases even intrusive.

First, 25bβ (וַיְהִי הַרְגִים) and 26baα (וַיִּהְיוּ) simply note that the new peoples were being killed by the lions sent by Yahweh, which is quite self-evident even by implication from the lions being “sent amongst them.” This alone would be enough to warrant an action from the Assyrian king, the sole person in charge of killing lions in the kingdom.833

Second, the whole of 26baβ (וַיִּהְיוּ) which suspiciously begins with וְהִנָּם, is completely redundant, only repeating information given already in the previous verse, and seems to have been added via resumptive repetition of “they do not know the law of the god of the land.” Similarly, 28b (וַיְהִי אֶת־יְהוָה יִירְאוּ) is not necessary to the story either since it is clear from 28a (וַיְהִי אֶת־בֵּית־אֵל) that the exiled priest would subsequently teach the peoples to “fear Yahweh” as has been related in 27b.

Third, the short and unnecessary mention (they shall) go (pl.) and live (pl.) there,” in 27aβ has similarly often been deemed a later gloss-like addition as well, as its plurals (whether they are to be read as indicative or jussive) are in glaring contradiction with the rest of the story, where only one priest leaves for Bethel.834

In such a compact form (23b, 24a, 25aα, 26aαβ, 27aαβ, 28a) the kernel narrative could potentially be seen as an early (even pre-exilic) polemic against Bethel, whose “priesthood” (originally only one puny exiled priest!) was arbitrarily imported by no other than the Assyrian king only at a late date.835 It is indeed likely that the earliest layers in verses 29–34a further added to this criticism of Bethel by alluding to the sin of Jeroboam, ironically explicating that this “neo-Yahwistic” cult in Bethel was in fact a direct descendant of the idolatrous cult of the Northern Kingdom, and thus no

---

833 On this Assyrian custom, see Strawn, What Is Stronger, 166–7.
834 Similarly Fritz, 2 Könige, 100; Würtwein, Bücher der Könige, 397; and even BHS (“vel dl”). This may be an addition via resumptive repetition of שָׁם. In any case the repetition of שָׁם is equally unnecessary and disruptive. The gloss may have been inspired by the MT plural understanding of the consonants הָגְלָיתם (see 4.2.1 above).
835 Quite similarly Robinson, 2 Kings, 161: “This account ... is propaganda.” If we are to believe Pakkala, “Jeroboam’s sin,” 90, this could well be the case: “the main criticism of the history writer in 1Kgs 12:25-31 was actually directed at the Yahwistic cult of Bethel, which competed with Jerusalem as a cult center.” While this outlined old kernel of the story may have existed at some point as an independent unit, it is not certain whether this short form was already at some point part of the composition of Kings.
better. In the context of chapter 17 the compact story could indeed be quite an early addition. In its current form, however, it is undoubtedly late (Persian period or later).

Conclusions. The narrative in verses 24–28 derives from at least two hands. The original, somewhat shorter version, found in verses 23b, 24a, 25abo, 26abo, 27aob, 28a, is still written in Classical Hebrew style. To this a later hand added multiple rather redundant phrases and sentences, which are mostly easily identified by their use of Late Biblical Hebrew (Aramaic influenced) syntax.

The textual layers of 2 Kgs 17:23b–28.41

The bordered readings are to be read according to LXX.

This causal use of כַּאֲשֶׁר "(because, since)" is otherwise unattested in Kings (possibly also in 2 Kgs 8:19, which seems like a later "Davidistic" addition between 8:18, 20), and may thus be a sign of later language use. Usually כַּאֲשֶׁר is used in comparisons ("as, like"): 1 Kgs 1:30, 37, 2:24, 31, 38, 3:6, 14, 5:5, 12, 8:20, 25, 53, 57, 9:2, 4, 5, 11:38 bis, 12:12, 14:10, 15, 20:34, 21:11; 2 Kgs 2:19, 5:26 ("when"), 7:7, 10, 17, 8:18, 10:15, 15:9, 17:23, 41, 21:3, 13, 20, 23:27, 24:23. Also used twice as temporal ("when") in 2 Kgs 5:26, 14:5.
4.3 The textual history of verses 29–32: the relationship of 17:29 and the LXX plus 17:32+

Verses 29–33 are, apart from 29 and the OG plus in 32+, relatively uninteresting from the text-critical viewpoint. Literary-critically, however, the OG plus of 32+ is extremely valuable since it helps us reconstruct at least one more textual layer otherwise unattainable by showing that the MT now evidences the latest textual form of verses 29 and 32.

4.3.1 Analysis of smaller-scale differences between the witnesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 17:29</th>
<th>LXX B 17:29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἦσαν θεοὶ τῶν ἔθνων</td>
<td>καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες Βαβυλῶνος ἐποίησαν τὴν Ἐβλαζεράκη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οἱ Ανὴρες Θαρθακ ἐποίησαν τὴν Θεωραθακ</td>
<td>καὶ οἱ άνδρες Χουδ ἐποίησαν τὴν Ἐργέλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οἱ Ανὴρες Τοῦρος ἐποίησαν τὴν Ἀτκανα αὐτῶν</td>
<td>καὶ οἱ Ανὴρες Θεῖοι ἐποίησαν τὴν Σεφφαρουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οἱ Ευαῖοι ἐποίησαν τὴν Εὐαῖον</td>
<td>No significant variants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LXX plus ἐν αὐταῖς at the end of the verse should probably be seen as a vestige of a version of the text similar to 17:32+, where the singular ἐν αὐτῇ (*νη) is found. This is hardly a differing translation of the Hebrew פָּרֶשׁ, since the OG translator of 1 Kgs always uses the set equivalent έκεῖ for פָּרֶשׁ.\(^{839}\)

MT 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B(^{840})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οἱ άνδρες Βαβυλῶνος ἐποίησαν τὴν Ἐβλαζεράκη</td>
<td>καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες Θαρθακ ἐποίησαν τὴν Θεωραθακ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὴν Ἐβλαζεράκην, ὡς κατέκαιον τοὺς ἔθνους αὐτῶν ἐν πυρὶ</td>
<td>καὶ τὴν Σεφφαρουν, ὡς κατεκαίων τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν ἐν πυρὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ Αδραμελέω καὶ Ανημελέχ</td>
<td>καὶ ἄνθρωποι Θαρθακ καὶ τὴν Θαρθακ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant variants.

And the men of Babylon made Sukkot-Benot, and the men of Kutha made Nergal, and the men of Hamath made Asima’ (MT)/Asimath (LXX).

MT 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οἱ Ευαῖοι ἐποίησαν τὴν Εὐαῖον</td>
<td>καὶ οἱ Ευαῖοι ἐποίησαν τὴν Εὐαῖον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὴν Σεφφαρουν, ὡς κατεκαίων τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν ἐν πυρὶ</td>
<td>καὶ τὴν Σεφφαρουν, ὡς κατεκαίων τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν ἐν πυρὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ Αδραμελέω καὶ Ανημελέχ</td>
<td>τῷ Αδραμελέω καὶ Ανημελέχ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{839}\) Cf. 1 Kgs 1:14, 34, 23, 34, 36, 5:23, 6:19, 7:7[7:44], 8[845], 8:9, 16, 21 bis, 29, 47, 64, 9:3 bis, 11:16, 36, 13:17, 14:21, 17:4, 9, 10, 19, 18:40, 19:3, 9 bis, 20:18) and έκῆξαν for פָּרֶשׁ (1 Kgs 1:45, 2:36, 9:28, 12:25, 17:13, 19:19). When left untranslated, in most cases the Vorlage likely lacked the word altogether (in 1 Kgs 2:3, 5[5:1], 8:8, 10:20, 18:10, where no OG translation is found).

\(^{840}\) There are dozens of different spellings given for the god-names in these verses, but since they are in no way crucial for the assessment, they will be skipped here.
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And the Avvites made Nibḥaz (MT)/Eblazer (LXX) and Tartaq, and the Sepharvaites burnt their sons in fire to Adrammelek and Anammelek, the god(s) of Sepharvaim.

The B-text in this verse is quite corrupt. L stylizes the verse so that each nation makes only one god here and accordingly omits the OG mention of Eblazer (*עבלזר; only the Hexaplaric manuscripts correct the name according to the MT). Instead of the plural θεοίς, L also reads θεῷ, which interestingly agrees with the MT Ketiv sg. יִּהְיוּ and accordingly lacks the mention of Anamelek. This could either be due to a homoioteleuton (Adrammelek...Anemelk), as is likely the case in manuscript 68, an otherwise unattested Hexaplaric correction, or the already-mentioned idea of L that each nation made only one god.

In the case of οἱ Σεπφαρουαιν of manuscripts L-700 a 64’ 55 318 372 460, the OG translator apparently made a mistake and understood וְהַסְפַרְוִים as another god name, as the majority text has an accusative article τὴν instead of a nominative οἱ. L noticed this mistake and smoothed the text. The correction could also be understood as a Hebraizing correction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 32</th>
<th>LXX B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐστοιζην ἀνθρώπουν καὶ καθήκουσαν τὰ βεβαιώματα αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς οίκοις τῶν ψηλῶν ἐποίησαν ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ, ἵνα δοκησέναι τῇ πόλει ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ἦσαν φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον.</td>
<td>ἐστόιζην ἀνθρώπουν καὶ καθήκουσαν τὰ βεβαιώματα αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς οίκοις τῶν ψηλῶν ἐποίησαν ἐν ᾿Αμαλίᾳ, καὶ ἦσαν φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32+And they were fearing Yahweh, and they made themselves from their midst priests of high places. And they were making [sacrifices] for themselves in the house(s) of high places.

The OG seems to have lacked the Masoretic plus מיקוטאים,” “from themselves.” L alone supplies ἀπὸ μέρους accordingly, apparently from a Hexaplaric source, as is hinted by

---

841 Interestingly enough, according to Kennicott, altogether 72 Masoretic manuscripts give the plural יִהְיוּ.

842 The plus ἦνικα in the majority text (κατέκαιον L-700 460) pr καὶ 328; pr γνίκα rel) was likely made because of this mistake as well. The plus is suspicious, however, since γνίκα can only be found in the Καιγέ sections of Samuel-Kings (2 Sam 12:21[ὡς Λ], 13:36[ἐν τῷ Λ]. 16:16[ὁρε Λ], 17:27[ὁρε ἀρχ.], 20:13[ὁρε ἀρχ.]; 2 Kgs 4:18[ὁμ Λ]), but here does not seem to refer to anything in the MT; McLay, “Καιγέ and Septuagint Research,” 134 (#75), lists this as a possible Καιγέ feature.
the Syrohexapla. While a homoioteleuton mistake is remotely possible (א´ σ´ τ´ ε´ et fecerunt sibi ex parte sua sacerdotes excelsorum), the plus is more likely a later (proto-)Masoretic harmonization towards the wording of 1 Kgs 12:31/13:33, where מִקְצוֹת is also found.

4.3.2 The duplication of verse 29 in 32+ in OG

The few commentators who have noted the duplication of the subject matter of verse 29 in LXX 32+ have mostly discarded it simply as an errant re-articulation or dislocated double translation of the preceding verse 29. However, there are multiple text- and even literary-critical aspects in these verses that should be taken into account before coming to the conclusion that there is no valid information on the practices of the new/old inhabitants to be found in the plus.

First of all, the study of verse 29 already yields some interesting text-critical results. There are two noteworthy phenomena in this verse.

First, instead of the singular רֵאֵי בֵית of the MT, L reads “houses” in plural (οἶκοις), which is likely OG. Reversibly, one could see this as a Lucianic harmonization of the use between verses 29, 32+, and 32b, in which L has only plural forms of οἶκος. However, this is not likely since such a “harmonization” would change two singular forms towards the one plural form found only in the OG plus 32+.

Second, in verse 29, the Peshitta, the Syriac version translated from a text closely resembling (proto-)MT, has certain readings that disagree with the MT to a surprising degree. The Peshitta agrees with L on the plurality of the high-place houses (א´ σ´ τ´ ε´ et fecerunt sibi ex parte sua sacerdotes excelsorum).

843 Stade, Kings, 267, gives the most extensive discussion of the passage: “Before v. 32 S inserts a verse formed by a combination of v. 32a+29b ... But there is no connection between 32a and 29b: v. 32a explains the worship of JHVH on the part of the Samaritans; v. 29b relates their adoration of heathen gods. This alone proves v. 29b to be an interpolation in our passage. After it had crept in, v. 32a was repeated after it.” On the other hand, Burney, Kings, 337, notes very briefly that “This reading bears the stamp of superiority, MT, probably representing the restoration of an imperfect text upon the lines of I. 12. 31”; to which Montgomery, Kings, 479, quite aptly remarks: “... it is difficult to see why Burn. regards it as superior ...”; similarly Hobbs, 2 Kings, 224. On the other hand, Coggins, “Samaritan Origins,” 40 and Schenker, “Man bittet um das Gegenargument,” 57, take the plus as original. Thus also Tov, “Septuagint and the Deuteronomists,” 410. On a side note, the explanation of Sweeney, Kings, 388, is completely misguided: “The expanded LXX reading draws upon language from 29 to interpret the Hebrew term, miqṣôtām, ‘from their ends,’ i.e., ‘from throughout themselves.’ The Greek text presupposes that the term is interpreted as a form of the verb root qoṣ, ‘to be loathsome, disgusting’.”

844 See Stade, Kings, 266.

846 The text of the Peshitta reads: א´ σ´ τ´ ε´ et fecerunt sibi ex parte sua sacerdotes excelsorum.
and, more importantly, it also agrees with the alleged “errant doublet” of LXX 32+ in its reading “which they made in Samaria” against the highly debated MT hapax “Samari(t)ans.” What makes this agreement especially curious is the fact that the Peshitta does not have the lengthy LXX plus 32+ in its text. Therefore, the Peshitta most probably read בשמרון already in its Hebrew Vorlage.

The plus 17:32+, which greatly resembles 29, is remarkably found in all Greek witnesses, and can easily be retroverted into Hebrew. This OG plus seems thus to have been added already in Hebrew via Wiederaufnahme of ויהיו יראים את יהוה, and they were fearing Yahweh – a repetition of material which may have then resulted in the text dropping out of the MT due to a homoioteleuton mistake.

MT 17:29

LXX B 17:32+

847 It is important to note that in 1 Kgs 13:31 (§ÙÁ) and 2 Kgs 17:32 (§ØûãýÁ) the Peshitta has the houses in singular (both without variants), and therefore seems to have been aware of the differentiation, and able to translate both forms.

848 According to Dyk & Van Keulen, Language System, 233: “In 2 Kings 17:29 çØûãýÁ corresponds to שֹּׁמְרֹנִים.” This is indeed the correspondence, but the reading of the Peshitta was hardly translated from a Vorlage similar to the MT. However, Dyk & Van Keulen, Language System, 485, note that: “Where the Syriac text deviates from the Masoretic text but exclusively agrees with the Greek of the Antiochene text, revision may be considered. Influences from the Antiochene text on the Peshitta indicate revision, since the original Syriac translation is earlier than the formation of the Antiochene text.” Dyk and Van Keulen name “2 Kgs 17:29” as an example of such a passage, but do not discuss this any further. In this case, of course, the agreement is between the whole of the LXX tradition and the Peshitta, not just L, and as the reading is found in a curious plus of the LXX (which is lacking in the Peshitta), it seems more likely that the agreement is indeed a true one, rather than some kind of harmonization of the proto-MT Vorlage and the LXX made by a Peshitta translator or reviser.

850 The retroversion is that of Tov & Polak, “Tov-Polak Parallel-Aligned Greek-Hebrew Old Testament.”

851 It is not completely certain that the Greek βδελύγμα was here translated from אֵלֶּה אֶלֶּה. Another possibilities could be שקצים, תועבות, or even אלהים, since the OG translator (or his Vorlage) sometimes independently interprets אלהים as βδελύγμα when in connection with the idolatrous nations.
And each nation were making its god, and they settled [them] in the house of the high places, which the Samari(t)ans had made, each nation in their cities which they settling there...

And they were fearing the Lord, and settled their abominations in the houses of high places, which they had made in Samaria, each nation in a city in which they settled in it, and they were fearing the Lord...

The plus recounts verse 29, but in a substantially different wording:

First, the plus explicates the object, “abominations” (τὰ βδελύγματα), of the “setting up,” which is now curiously missing from MT 29, which says that the peoples “were making gods” (יָרִאֵתָם נַעֲשֶׂה גּוֹי) instead.

Second, the MT clause “שָׁם יֹשְׁבִים הֵם אֲשֶׁר בְּעָרֵיהֶם , “in their cities, which they were settling there,” is recounted as ἐν πόλει ἐν ἡ κατῴκουν ἐν ἀυτῇ, “in a city in which they settled in it.”

Third, the “Samari(t)ans” (הַשֹּׁמְרֹנִים) of the MT are nowhere to be found in the OG text, which says that it was in fact the peoples who built the houses of high places “in Samaria” (*בֵּית שְׁמֵרְון).

The retroverted text of the LXX plus is stylistically much better (albeit still Late Biblical) Hebrew: the addition of an object is an improvement on the objectless verb מַהֵנוּ, and the distributive repetition גּוֹי גּוֹי customarily works in the Hebrew Bible with a singular complement (*בעיר OG), rather than plural (MT בְּעָרֵיהֶם).

Accordingly, in the MT the sudden change of the singular suffix in 29a (יָרִאֵתָם) to a plural one in 29b (יָרִאֵתָם) when referring to the nations is also notable – unless the latter plural suffix is not supposed to refer back to the nations but to the Samari(t)ans, which would make the text even more awkward than it already is. Furthermore, Schenker notes that the grammatically difficult MT version is also logically somewhat contradictory, which further speaks for its somehow secondary nature: even though the gods of the nations are set in the singular “house of high places,” the nations also set them in their numerous “cities” (בֵּית שָׁם).

854 The plus cannot take the object from the remark of 29a, “every nation were making its god (יָרִאֵתָם).” However, this is not done by the MT in 29 either, since יָרִאֵתָם has no explicit object.
855 The cursory statement of Burney, Kings, 337, that “This reading bears the stamp of superiority …” is thus indeed valid.
856 Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 42, notes accordingly: “Freilich ist die Formulierung von V. 29 im MT syntaktisch schwer zu interpretieren und daher nicht ganz eindeutig.”
857 See Schenker, Septante, 117: “Jusqu’au V. 31 inclusivement, il n’avait donc jamais été question du lieu où ces divinités étaient placées, sauf au V. 29b et c, et en cet endroit, il en est question deux fois! Car les peuples érigent les effigies de leurs divinités simultanément en deux endroits! Selon V. 29b, ils...
aforementioned problems, and is thus hardly a simple “combination of v. 29<sup>b+32</sup>” as posited by Stade.<sup>858</sup>

Verse 29 is even more curious since it is the only one that mentions “Samari(t)ans” (נִשְׁמָרֹנִים) in the whole Hebrew Bible. The plus of the LXX, on the other hand, only speaks of the commonly known city of Samaria. Effectively, in the LXX plus the ones making high-place houses (against the singular of MT) “in Samaria” are the city’s new foreign inhabitants, not the peculiar נישמרונים of the MT. This sudden appearance of “Samaritans” (οἱ Σαμαρῖται) in verse 29 has caused long-lasting debate since it is not clear who is actually meant by the term. Are these people indeed to be understood as the sectarian Samaritans of the last centuries BCE, as interpreted by Josephus and the (kaige?) translation of the LXX?<sup>859</sup> Does the term rather denote the people of the new Assyrian province, “Samarians,” or were these “Samarians” simply the former and now exiled inhabitants of the monarchy of northern Israel?<sup>860</sup> Of these options it seems most unlikely that the Samari(t)ans here should be understood as the former, exiled inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom, since they could be easily referred to as “(the sons of) Israel” as before in verses 7–24, for example. The designation “Samari(t)ans” is thus used to refer to a different group of people(s).

The answer to this question of the identity of these enigmatic “Samari(t)ans” is likely to be found in the abovementioned text-critical differences between the witnesses. It is clear that the rare singular of the MT, “the house of the high places,” is due to later textual development.<sup>861</sup> It has been demonstrated by Schenker that this reading is not simply due to an erroneous copying mistake, but a deliberate ideological correction made to the text of the MT not only in verses 17:29, 32, but in 1 Kgs 12:31 (pl. in LXX) as well: the reference to an unnamed singular house of high places in the
north, built by Jeroboam and now by the “Samari(t)ans,” is probably to be read as a polemic against the sectarian Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim. In MT 2 Kgs 17:29 it is then clear that the idolatrous use of Jeroboam’s “house of high places” of 1 Kgs 12:31(MT) continues or even escalates, even if the inhabitants change. However, the provenance of these “Samaritans” may be understood here (be they descendants of the northern monarchy or the newcomers, “Kuthim,” as referred to by the rabbinic sources), their temple is now even more sacrilegious, and has remained so “until this day” (as recounted in verses 34 and 41).

It is thus hardly a coincidence that these two textual changes are found in 17:29 right next to each other, and that both are absent from the older LXX plus of 17:32+ and even Peshitta 17:29, which only refers to the new inhabitants, as would be expected here. In the process of this ideological correction, as is often the case, this revision also introduced into the text logical and grammatical difficulties. The reason why the LXX now has both of these textual forms (29 and 32+) would be later Hebraizing influence (kaiige/Hexaplaric) on its text.

The version of MT verse 29 is thus due to a very late (Maccabean period or even later) anti-Samaritan revision, which strove to explicitly equate the sin of Jeroboam with that of the contemporary Samaritans, the שומרים – which, of course, effectively goes against the self-identification of the Samaritans themselves. This dating to the Maccabean period can be made relatively precisely since, according to Purvis, “the cumulative evidence now available concerning the Samaritan Pentateuch indicates that it underwent a sectarian redaction in the late Hasmonean period, roughly contemporaneous with the destruction of the Samaritan temple under John Hyrcanus.”

---

862 Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte, 34–45; idem, Septante, 103–6. Even if left unnamed, the “house of the high places, which the Samaritans made” would surely have been understood as a derogatory reference to the Samaritan temple by the Judeans during and after the schism. See similarly Werlitz, Könige, 280: “Die in VV. 24–41 überliefernde, wahrscheinlich späte Darstellung über die ethnischen und religiösen Verhältnisse im Gebiet des ehemaligen Nordreichs Israels kann als Gründungsurkunde der Samaritaner aus der Sicht der Judäer angesehen werden.” See also 1.3. A very similar polemical charge against the Shechemite cult can be seen in the OG (Vorlage) of Joshua 24:1–25, where the place name of the MT, “Shechem,” has been changed to the theologically more appropriate “Shiloh”; see Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 70–5.

863 See e.g. Masseket Kutim.

864 There is of course nothing in the text itself that would betray the text of 29 as kaiige beyond any doubt, however.

865 See Purvis, “Samaritan Problem,” 328–9: “The Samaritans thus view themselves as the surviving remnant of the Israelites of Shechem who remained loyal to the worship of the Hebrew God and avoided both the heresy of the Judeans and the paganism of the followers of the kings of northern Israel.” This same ideology is also reflected in the Samaritan Chronicle/Sepher ha-Yamim (see 1.2.2.3).
(128 BCE) and the subsequent destruction of Shechem (ca. 107 BCE).\textsuperscript{866} If this was indeed the case in Samaria, it would make sense to conclude that a parallel action was very likely taking place in Maccabean/proto-MT scribal circles as well. These redactions would have acted as “countermoves” to each other, as both communities saw themselves as the true Israelites. In this vein, the lack of 17:32+ in the MT could in fact even be seen as a deliberate omission on the part of the MT, since the plus is both redundant and, more importantly, ideologically opposed to the later interpretational (proto-)Masoretic reworking of verse 29.

The idea of 32+ that the new inhabitants made houses of high places “in Samaria” (ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ) is well connected to the subject matter of 32b, even more so than are verses 29–31: not only did the newcomers of verses 24–28 re-activate the cult places and false priesthood like Jeroboam did, but they also made themselves the same “houses of high places,” and put there their “abominations” – just like Jeroboam had done in 1 Kgs 12:28–31. Indeed, what the exiled priest of Bethel from the earlier narrative of 24–28 is effectively said to have done in verses 32+, 32 is reconstituting (or letting the people reconstitute) the previous northern idolatrous cult anew (only this time in Bethel). In this context the LXX plus 32+ would thus work perfectly well as a later addition and harmonization towards 1 Kgs 12:28–31.\textsuperscript{867} This “neo-Yahwistic” Bethelite cult of 24–28 then spread to the city of Samaria, showing that even in LXX 32+ the text should likely be understood (though much more implicitly) as telling of the genesis of the proto-Samaritan cult.\textsuperscript{868}

The text of 29 has one more ideological factor that is missing from the version of 32+, namely the almost absurd idea (for the earlier Deuteronomists) of making\textsuperscript{869} gods (הָיוּ אֱגוֹיָהּ). Such an idea is rare in the Hebrew Bible, and otherwise

\textsuperscript{866} Purvis, “Samaritan Problem,” 333. Mäkipelto, “How Scribes Rewrote,” (forthcoming), further convincingly argues that the manuscript 4Q379, which recalls the curse of the builder of Jericho (found in Josh 6:26/1 Kgs 16:34), may have originally been a pro-Samaritan/anti-Hasmonean document, directed against John Hyrcanus and his sons. There is therefore at least some textual evidence for these parallel polemical tendencies.

\textsuperscript{867} Contra Stade, Kings, 267, according to whom the plus does not work in the context and thus “there is no connection between 32a and 29b.” Stade, however, does not take into account the textual differences of the LXX plus vis-à-vis MT 29.

\textsuperscript{868} The contrary, that the LXX has here somehow (accidentally?) smoothed the text, does not seem preferable because of the great ideological differences between the two witnesses – the problems of verse 29 pertain to its syntax, not to שֹׁמְרֹנִ.\textsuperscript{866}

\textsuperscript{869} The verb עשׂה must be understood here, as customarily, “making,” with לאָ as its direct object, thus differing from the peculiar use of the verb in 32b, where it rather denotes “worshipping” (יִּהְיוּ לָהֶם).
non-existent in LXX Kings.\textsuperscript{870} Curiously, however, the MT also has in 1 Kgs 14:9 – a verse which is completely missing from the OG – this very same idea, “you have made yourself other gods” (והם אחרים ואמר ותעשה). It is possible that this ideological trait is indeed characteristic to the (proto-)Masoretic edition of Kings.

The last question to be posed pertains to the actual literary/redactional origin of verses 29–32 and the LXX plus 32+. There are two distinct options:

1) The plus was added between 29–31 and 32 as an explicatory summary of 29–31, for some reason in practically the original wording of verse 29.\textsuperscript{871} This addition may have already been made to the common text behind the LXX and MT (from which the text was later mistakenly dropped), or, more unlikely, only to the Vorlage of the LXX. It is not completely impossible in this option that the plus was even added somehow accidentally.

2) Verses 29–31 were, on the contrary, later expansions and adaptations made between the lion narrative of 24–28 and its original continuation in 32+–32, 32+ having been added to the text via \textit{Wiederaufnahme}.

It is quite clear that the listing of peoples in verses 30–31 has simply been taken over from the earlier verse 24, to which names of both real (Nergal, Ashima) and likely imaginary (Nibhaz, Tartak, Sukkot-Benoth, Adrammelek/Anammelek)\textsuperscript{872} god names have been added. As long as the text of 24 was already in place, these verses could thus have been easily composed either before or after the addition of 32+. Indeed, verses 29–31 now break the connection between 28 and 32 – i.e., the Bethelite priest’s teaching the peoples to “fear Yahweh” (ותואם מורה ויהיו אתים ירואו יוהו), and their actually doing so (ויהיו ירואו) – by prematurely mentioning that the peoples also made their own gods and set them up in houses of high places. The LXX plus 32+, against the form of 29, does this to a lesser degree since 32+ first recounts

\textsuperscript{870} Otherwise in Ex 20:23, 32:1, 23, 31 (יזák רוחך); Judg 18:24; Jer 2:28; Amos 5:26. Cf. also making of חכמה in Ex 34:17, Lev 19:4. Jer 16:20 directly prohibits this “making of other gods.”

\textsuperscript{871} This phenomenon would be somewhat similar to verse 33, which in turn appears to summarize verses 29–32 (see below).

\textsuperscript{872} While many attempts at finding the identification of these gods have been made, none of them seem completely satisfactory since no extra-biblical attestations of them have been found. Adrammelek, as has previously been argued (2.3.3.1) is a stock-name of sorts. Anammelek could arguably be some sort of Canaanized mixture of Anu, the Mesopotamian god of Heaven, and רֵחַ, “king” – unless the name has simply been born by some mistake from Adrammelek. Sukkoth-Benoth has been argued to refer to the Mesopotamian goddess Banitu, but the prefixed “Sukkoth-” remains an enigma. Nibhaz and Tartak are as mysterious as the place name Avva itself – nothing about them is known; see \textit{Dictionary of Deities and Demons}, 10, 34–5, 623, 821–2, 836–7.
that the peoples “feared Yahweh,” and – ironically enough – only after this did they begin “setting up” their abominations in the houses of high places. Verse 29 pertains only to the idolatrous practices of the new inhabitants. Text-historically it would be quite easy to see how the sequence 24–28, 32+, 32 was, exactly because of the mention of “abominations” in 32+, later expanded with 29–31, which deals only with these abominations. The parallel verses 29 and 32+ would, in such a case, frame the added material, as is still the case in the LXX. Later, in the (proto-)Masoretic phase, verse 29 was reworked, and, possibly at the same time, the second mention of 32+ was omitted as redundant, or simply by mistake.873

Conclusions: The MT edition of verse 29, now also reflected by all of the LXX (probably due to kaige revision), is due to a later anti-Samaritan reworking of a text originally resembling the LXX plus in 17:32+. The text has been reworked to put the blame of the house(s) of the high place(s) on the sectarian Samaritans, not simply on the “inhabitants of (the city of) Samaria”. The “making of gods” by different peoples in verses 29–31, which breaks the narrative unity of 28, 32(+), and the “fearing Yahweh” according to Jeroboam’s cult, hardly belong to the same textual layer. The analysis of the LXX plus therefore helps the scholar both by identifying the youngest textual version (MT) and by hinting at undocumented growth of the text by verses 29–31.

873 See Trebolle, “Text-Critical Use,” 288–96, for examples of such omissions of redundant but original expressions in both the LXX and MT traditions.
4.4 Verse 33 – a gloss-like summary verse with multiple grammatical problems

Verse 33 begins with an inverted repetition (יְרֵאִים הָיוּ אֶת־יְהוָה) of the earlier mention of “they feared Yahweh” of 32 (אֶת־יְהוָה יְרֵאִים וַיִּהְיוּ), which together with the uncommon word-order indicates its likely later provenance.874 Nothing new is added to the earlier discussion of 28–32 by verse 33 either, and the verse seems rather to serve as a brief summary, even gloss-like, statement of the earlier verses: the new inhabitants feared Yahweh (28, 32), but also served their own gods (29–31).

Furthermore, 33bβ is suspect of being of even later origin because of its apparently intruding sentence מִאֹתָם אֲשֶׁר־הִגְלוּ הַגּוֹיִם כְּמִשְׁפַּט. “according to the custom of the peoples, which/whom876 they exiled them from there.” Since the context already speaks of the newcomers, and not the Israelites, there is no need to explicate that the peoples served their gods “according to the law of the peoples.” The text of 33bβ is also grammatically problematic, since it seems to have no sensible subject, especially if the verb הִגְלוּ is read as a hiph’il (instead of hoph’al *וּהָגְל) as its Masoretic vocalization now stands. It is thus not clear who the subject (or even the object) of the plural הִגְלוּ is: are these the gods of the peoples or the peoples themselves? In either case the meaning of the sentence is unclear: “the (gods of) peoples exiled them(selves) from there.”877 The word מִשָּׁם, “thence,” does not refer to anything sensible in the near

---

874 According to the so-called “Zeidel’s Law,” inverted quotations are often to be seen as later constructs; see Beentjes, “Inverted Quotations.” 506–23.
875 The inverted word-order should likely be interpreted thusly.
876 It is not impossible to understand מִשָּׁם here as causal “because/since” either, but in such a case the sense of the text still eludes the reader since in the context the sentence can only refer to the peoples, not the Israelites.
877 Even reading the verb as a singular (as is done by Greek manuscripts B 247 L CI 121 f 488 71 158 244 460 554, probably secondarily), with Yahweh as the one exiling the peoples from their homes, is hardly very meaningful. Indeed, the Greek translator (either OG or, more likely, kaige) does not seem to have completely understood the passage either (ἡθέν ἀπόκισεν αὕτοὺς ἐκεῖθεν, “whence he exiled them from there”). Another possibility is to disregard the Masoretic vocalization and read the verb as a passive hoph’al (טָהֲרָה) “they were exiled” instead of a causative hiph’il. However, in this case the object מִשָּׁם becomes unnecessary and intrusive; cf. also Gray, Kings, 595, who proposes that instead of reading the verb as passive, the hiph’il plural is here to be read as indefinite (= passive). This goes against the (classical) Hebrew grammar, however, and is not recommendable. The hoph’al form of the stem העל is
context either. Ideologically 33a is in fact very close to the LXX plus 32+ and verse 41a, where the Israelites both fear Yahweh and set up “abominations.” All three also appear at hinge-points of differing narratives, possibly denoting scribal/editorial actions.

It is therefore likely that 33bβ, if not the whole verse, is a gloss, and in any case an “explicating” addition to the text. This highly repetitive verse briefly summarizes the contents of 24–32, and possibly acts as a “hinge-verse” between the two narrative units in 29–32, 34a and 34b–40.879

very rare in the Hebrew Bible, and appears in late usage, otherwise attested only in Est 2:6; 1 Chr 9:1; Jer 13:19 bis, 40:1, 7.
878 Some scholars take מִשָּׁם as referring back to the preceding הַגּוֹיִם, translating along the lines of “the peoples from among whom they had been deported”; see Gray, I & II Kings, 595. Similarly also Slotki, Kings, 269 and Robinson, 2 Kings, 160. This interpretation is somewhat forced, however. In such a case one could expect מִמָּם or the like instead. The only way to alleviate these problems would be to read verse 33 directly after 28, but such a solution does not seem particularly recommendable in the literary-critical context.
879 This use as a “hinge-verse” is corroborated by the fact that the Peshitta, as in verse 17:17, again has in 33–34a certain deviations from the MT, highlighting that there likely was felt certain tensions between these units – or at least that the verse had some grave problems as it stands. After the first part of the text, ܐܢܓܘܝܡ̃ ܒܠܡ̃ ܢܘ̃ ܒܠܡ̃ ܨܠܐ, “The Lord they were fearing and their gods they were worshipping, according to the custom of the peoples,” the Peshitta continues with ܠܡ̃ ܫܠܡ̃ ܒܠܡ̃ ܐܢܡ̃ ܒܠܡ̃, “and they exiled the sons of Israel from their land.” Stade, Kings, 267, maintains that the Syriac translator “entirely misunderstands” the text, which seems quite unlikely (if anything this deviance would be due to free translation). Even if this was the case, one has to ask whether such a misunderstanding of the indeed quite difficult text stems from the larger literary problems often noted by the scholarship. For a more in-depth analysis of the verses, see Dyk & Van Keulen, Language System, 460–4.
4.5 Verses 34–41 – the last uniform addition to 2 Kings 17?

Verses 34b–41, which at many points evidence very late language use, have been added via Wiederaufnahme of 34a in verse 40a. The enclosed text forms an all-encompassing reprimand of all Israelites instead of just the peoples now living in the areas of the former Northern Kingdom. However, not even this very latest addition to the chapter appears uniform, but has been written by at least two distinct hands.

4.5.1 Brief appraisal of the main witnesses

The textual differences between the witnesses are again minimal in verses 34–41, and have no real bearing to the literary analysis. As before, L shows signs of Hexaplaric influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT 34</th>
<th>LXX Rahlfs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דר והיה ה“Oh, until this day they have done according to their former customs; they do not fear Yahweh, and are not doing according to the statutes, customs, Torah, and commandments, which Yahweh commanded to the sons of Jacob, whose name he changed to Israel.”</td>
<td>אֵין הַזֶּה הַיּוֹם עַד הֵם הָאָרָא שִׁפְתוֹת אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂים לֵאמֹר בֵּן יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׂמוֹ שַם אֲשֶׁר יָאֹב שָׁם אֲשֶׁר יַﬠֲקֹב אֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוָה יְרֵאִים אֵיתָם כְּחֻקֹּתָם עֹשִׂים וְאֵיתָם וְכַתּוֹרָה וּכְמִשְׁפָּטָם יְהוָה צִוָּה אֲשֶׁר וְכַמִּצְוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל׃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until this day they have done according to their custom; they fear, and they are doing according to their statutes, judgments, as well as the law and commandment, which the Lord commanded to the sons of Jacob, whom he gave the name Israel.</td>
<td>Until this day they have done according to their custom; they fear, and they are doing according to their statutes, judgments, as well as the law and commandment, which the Lord commanded to the sons of Jacob, whom he gave the name Israel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority Greek text reads simply as if כמשׁפטם (as in 17:40), instead of כַּמִּשְׁפָּטִים. This reading is also attested by three medieval Hebrew manuscripts (K 93, 96, 403), preserving the more original textual form. However, for some reason the majority text of the LXX lacks the twice repeated negations (אֵינָם) in this verse, thus completely reversing the meaning of the MT: the peoples in fact do according to the commandments of Yahweh! While this is quite clearly the ideological lectio difficilior (albeit this reversal works with the idea that “the sons of Jacob” are indeed the ones acting here instead of the peoples), in this case this is likely due to some mistake on part of the (Hebrew?) copyists. The Antiochian tradition as the sole witness has again gone through Hebraizing corrections: L secondarily supplies כַּמִּשְׁפָּטִים וּכְמִצְוָה (to απαρχῆς).
And Yahweh made with them a covenant, and commanded them, saying: “Do not fear other gods, and do not worship them, and do not serve them, and do not sacrifice to them.”

The L reading θύσετε (< θύω) here is likely the OG, as θυσιάζω as a translation of זבח has been found to be a kaige feature. See also the next verse, where B and L agree on the reading θύσετε, while the majority of witnesses give the kaige reading θυσιάσετε, as here.

“But instead Yahweh—who brought you from the land of Egypt, with great strength and outstretched arm—him you shall fear and him worship and to him sacrifice.”

And the covenant, which I (MT)/he (LXX) made with you do not forget, and do not fear other gods.”

---


881 L adds θεῷ ὑμῶν, “your God,” likely as a harmonization towards 39 (τὸν κύριον θεὸν ὑμῶν).
All LXX manuscripts give in this verse a 3rd person sg. διέθετο against MT κράτη, probably due to harmonization, since the 1st person sg. makes no sense in the immediate context. Also, the literary-critical repercussions of the MT form speak for its originality here. Nevertheless, since the reading is in the kaige section, one has to ask: did the proto-Masoretic Vorlage of the kaige already have the harmonization, or was this verbal form simply not caught by the reviser?

MT 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX Rahlfs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִפְרֹתְךָ יְהוָה לְאָבֹתֵיהֶם</td>
<td>ἀλλ' ἢ τῶν κύριων δεῖν ψυχὰς φοβηθῆσθε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξελθῃ ὑμᾶς ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἑχθρῶν ὑμῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“But instead Yahweh, your God, you shall fear and he shall deliver you from the hand (>OG) of all your enemies.”

MT 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX Rahlfs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δὲ σὺν ἀκούσωσιν ἐπὶ τῷ κρίματι αὐτῶν δὲ αὐτοὶ ποιοῦσιν</td>
<td>καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ποιοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ κρίματι αὐτῶν δὲ αὐτοὶ ποιοῦσιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But they did not listen, but instead they did according to their former custom. But you shall not listen to their custom, which they do.

The majority Greek text gives a very different text from MT (= L) at the beginning of the verse, as if translating יִפְרֹתְךָ יְהוָה לְאָבֹתֵיהֶם instead of MT יִפְרֹתְךָ יְהוָה לְאָבֹתֵיהֶם. Since the Greek majority text is incomprehensible (how could the Israelites not heed the statute and still do it at the same time?), it is most probably somehow corrupt. Whether this mistake was found already in the Vorlage of OG or only in kaige, the L reading is again that of the MT here, probably because of Hexaplaric influence.

MT 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX Rahlfs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἠδοὺς τὰ δίδακτα ψυχὰς φοβηθῆσον τῶν κύριων, καὶ τοὺς γλυπτοὺς αὐτῶν ἔδωκεν</td>
<td>καὶ ήθουν τὰ δίδακτα ψυχὰς φοβηθῆσον τῶν κύριων, καὶ τοὺς γλυπτοὺς αὐτῶν ἔδωκεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ γε αἱ υἱοὶ καὶ αἱ υἱῶται τῶν ἑχθρῶν καθὰ ἐποίησαν</td>
<td>οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν ποιοῦσιν ἐς τῆς ημέρας ταύτης</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And these peoples were fearing Yahweh, and their images they were serving; also, their sons and the sons of their sons, like their fathers did, they (>OG) did, until this day.

---

882 Similarly Frevel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 25. On the other hand, Gray, Kings, 597, prefers the reading of the LXX; similarly Montgomery, Kings, 480: “preferable; but the writer may have fallen artlessly into the divine first person.” See also Stade, Kings, 268, and Hobbs, 2 Kings, 224. The reading of the Vulgate, marked as 3rd sg. in BHS, is in fact not stable either and fluctuates between the majority reading percussi (= MT) and the minority reading percussit (= LXX).

883 L corresponds to the MT ב in giving χειρός (similarly Vulgate and Peshitta). This may be a Hexaplaric plus.

884 L has a plus (οὐτοὶ) here, correcting once more towards the MT, similarly to uioi 1°] + αὐτοὶ L 460. In the Syrohexapla the plus οὐτοὶ is given under an asterisk, pointing to its Hexaplaric origin.
4.5.2 Literary-critical assessment

It has been clear in the scholarship for over a century that verses 34b–40 were added to the already existing text of 24–34a(, 41) via Wiederaufnahme, comprising thus the very latest larger addition to the chapter.885

This theory is corroborated by the ideology of verses 34b–40, which differs greatly from the rest of the chapter. Even though it is twice asserted in the preceding verses 32 and 33 that the newcomers “fear Yahweh,” it is nevertheless said in 34b that this was in fact not the case. The polemic of unit 34b–40 seems to be directed against a completely different group from before as well: instead of the newcomers of 24–34a.41, these verses are clearly aimed (in somewhat awkward Hebrew) against the Israelites, “the sons of Jacob.”887

In fact, נֶעַרְשְׁנוּ כְּמִשְׁפָּטִים עָשִׂים הַזֶּה הַיּוֹם עַד 40 עָשִׂים הָֽרִאשׁוֹן אִם־כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם כִּי שָׁמֵעוּ׃וּלֹא

In 34b, with whom Yahweh had made a covenant (35, 38), is a somewhat rare designation of all twelve tribes of the Israelites, including both the Israelites and Judahites elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.888 It is worth noting that the יִשְׂרָאֵל is elsewhere only found in Gen 34:14, 25, 27, 35:5, 22, 26, 46:26, 49:2; 1 Kgs 18:31 (> OG!); 1 Chr 16:13; Ps 77:16, 105:6, Mal 3:6. However, the references of Genesis are to the actual sons of Jacob, while the other instances include both the northern and southern Israelites. In 1 Chr 16:13, the יִשְׂרָאֵל, a term also connected to all Israelites (compare with 2 Kgs 17:20). Similarly Barrick, “On the Meaning,” 631. Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 444–5, note that this language use here seems more “priestly” than Deuteronomistic, and is therefore “unlikely to warrant dtr attribution.” Cogan & Tadmor, 2 Kings, 213, also notice that the use of the verb שָׂים in the meaning “to change,” as here, is only found otherwise in Neh 9:7. The construction שָׂים + שֵׁם is otherwise found only in Judg 8:31 and Dan 7:1. The language use is thus in many ways late (possibly Late Biblical Hebrew).

885 Thus, for instance, Benzinger, Könige, 175; Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 401; Friedman, Exile and Biblical Narrative, 24–5; Gray, Kings, 655–6.
886 Probably to be corrected as הָֽרִאשׁוֹן כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם as in verse 40; see Ehrlich, Randglossen, 314–15.
887 McKenzie, Chronicler’s Use, 195-6, goes as far as stating: “The change from the discussion about the foreigners who were settled in Israel in vv 24–33 to the reference to the exiled Israelites in vv 34b–40 is so abrupt and obvious that one wonders whether a transitional verse may have fallen out from between vv 34a and 34b.” There is nevertheless no need for such a supposition, unless the awkward and gloss-like 33ב is seen as such a transitional element, which it could indeed well be.
888 Similarly, for instance, Sweeney, Kings, 392. Alternatively, Frevel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 25, makes a suggestion that these “sons of Jacob” would be the leftovers of the former Israelites who were not exiled. The designation נֶעַרְשְׁנוּ כְּמִשְׁפָּטִים is elsewhere only found in Gen 34:14, 25, 27, 35:5, 22, 26, 46:26, 49:2; 1 Kgs 18:31 (> OG!); 1 Chr 16:13; Ps 77:16, 105:6, Mal 3:6. However, the references of Genesis are to the actual sons of Jacob, while the other instances include both the northern and southern Israelites. In 1 Chr 16:13, the נֶעַרְשְׁנוּ כְּמִשְׁפָּטִים are even compared to דְּבָעָה שָׂם שֵׁם, a term also connected to all Israelites (compare with 2 Kgs 17:20). Similarly Barrick, “On the Meaning,” 631. Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 444–5, note that this language use here seems more “priestly” than Deuteronomistic, and is therefore “unlikely to warrant dtr attribution.” Cogan & Tadmor, 2 Kings, 213, also notice that the use of the verb שָׂים in the meaning “to change,” as here, is only found otherwise in Neh 9:7. The construction שָׂים + שֵׁם is otherwise found only in Judg 8:31 and Dan 7:1. The language use is thus in many ways late (possibly Late Biblical Hebrew).
889 De Vries, 1 Kings, 225, regards the OG as the original in 1 Kgs 18:31: “MT ‘sons of Jacob’ may be a late ideological alteration.” Indeed, there is some fluctuation even in the Medieval Hebrew manuscripts between the readings “Jacob” and “Israel” (לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁלב | לֵוָאשׁל ב | לֵוָאשׁל ב | לֵוָאשׁל ב | לֵוָאשׁל ב | לֵוָאשׁל ב | לֵוָאשׁל ב | לֵוָאשׁל ב | לֵוָaphrag
similar to the problematic verses 13 and 19, where Judah is also brought into the text as a sinner, and especially to 20, where the phrase “all the seed of Israel” similarly includes all twelve tribes. This is corroborated by the idea of a “covenant” between Yahweh and the Israelites, mentioned in verses 35 and 38, which could only have been made with the whole of Israel.890

The overtly “nomistic” phraseology and “covenant-theology”891 of this unit is also evidently very late, as the Torah is already referred to as a written document here (37).892 The phrase “to fear Yahweh” is also used in a slightly different meaning from verses 24–34a, 41, where the phrase refers to cultic crimes rather than not being loyal to Yahweh and his more abstract ordinances.893

Some scholars have proposed that the unit of 34b–40 is a very late post-exilic (Persian period?) and “anti-Samaritan” polemic against the northern inhabitants who claimed to be legitimate Israelites as well.894 However, since the “sons of Jacob”

---

890 Similarly Knoppers, “Cutheans or Children of Jacob,” 233; “… the writer views the residents of the former northern kingdom ethnically as Israelites”; and Frel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 37–8, who further notes the similarities between verse 38 and Deut 4:23 where the verb נָשָׁבָה is also used.

891 The idea of a covenant made at Sinai-/Horeb between Yahweh and the Israelites is quite rare in Kings, and likely did not form part of its oldest layers. The word ברית is only found in a similar meaning of the earlier theological covenant in 1 Kgs 8:23; 11:11, 19:10, 14; 2 Kgs 13:23; 17:15; otherwise in the ark of covenant” in 1 Kgs 3:15, 6:19; 8:1, 6, 21; as a political covenant in 1 Kgs 5:12, 15:19, 20:34; the covenant of Jehojada in 2 Kgs 11:4, 17; and the (book of) covenant of Josiah in 2 Kgs 23:2, 3, 21. Indeed, even the text-critical evidence shows that some references to the earlier theological covenant have been added only at a very late (proto-)Masoretic stage: in 1 Kgs 11:11, 19:10 the OG version lacks the word altogether (in 19:14 L lacks the word, and the B-text transposes it after ωἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ), likely telling of a later καιγε-like addition, and the mention of 2 Kgs 13:23 is found in L already in 13:7, showing that the (already phraseologically very suspicious) verse is, due to its movability, a very late addition. For the analysis of 17:15, see 2.6.6.

892 In 17:37, the Torah, among other statutes of Yahweh, is referred to as כָּתַב אֲשֶׁר. Similarly, in Kings it is only in 1 Kgs 2:3 (בְּתוֹרַת כַּכָּתוּב). Frel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 27–8, also notes that Yahweh as the subject of “writing” the Torah is very unusual, since normally this honor is given to Moses. Yahweh is given as the subject otherwise only in Ex 24:12, 31:18, 32:16, 34:1, 28; Deut 4:13, 5:22, 9:10, 10:2, 4.

893 Aster, “‘They feared God’,” 138; “In vv. 28–33, and 41, yr’’ Yhwh refers to cultic worship, while in vv. 34–40 it refers to loyalty and obedience to Yhwh.”

894 Thus already Burney, Kings, 333; Frel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 48, speaks of “nachpriesterschriftlichen Spuren” in the text. Cogan, “Israel in Exile,” 41–4; and Cogan & Tadmor, 2 Kings, 213–14, oppose this idea by proposing that this unit should be seen as a continuation of verse 23, referring to Israel in exile and coming from the time of Josiah, but their arguments fail to convince. According to them, “… idolatry among the residents of Samaria is never an issue in the literature of the Persian period.” Even if this was the case, the unit of 34b–40 (or rather, its original unity 34b–35, 38, 40) is mainly concerned with the Israelites’ failure to follow Yahweh’s covenant, not their idolatry. Cogan also does not take into account that the Wiederaufnahme in 34a and 40 is a sign of a later addition, or even more so the fact that the “sons of Jacob” of 34b are hardly the same people as “(the sons of) Israel” of verses 7–23.
should most likely be read as including both Israelites and Judahites, this unit seems rather to work as another all-encompassing reprimand of all Israelites – unless the mention of “the sons of Jacob” is deemed a later gloss, as is done by Stade. 895 Nothing in the text itself speaks for this option, however.

However, even this late unit does not appear literarily uniform. The phrase אֲחֵרִים “do not fear other gods,” appears superfluously often in verses 35–39, probably indicating multiple hands at work. 896 Interestingly enough, the subjects of verses 35–39 also evidence some irregularities. Verse 35 introduces a direct quotation, spoken by Yahweh, in which he prohibits idolatry: “You shall not fear other gods, nor bow down to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them.” The text then continues with further prohibitions, but the subject of the speech quite clearly changes: Yahweh becomes the object of the speech in verses 36–37 (“36but Yahweh, who brought you up from the land of Egypt …, him you shall fear”). However, in verse 38, a 1st person singular כָּרַתִּי reappears, apparently continuing the speech of Yahweh. 897 In verse 39, Yahweh again becomes the object of the exhortations (“39but Yahweh your God you shall fear”).

Because of this Numeruswechsel, it seems probable that verses 35 and 38 originally followed one another, forming quite a lucid and meaningful reminder of Yahweh’s covenant with (all) Israelites: “35 And Yahweh made a covenant with them and commanded them, saying: ‘You shall not fear other gods, nor bow down to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them; 38 and the covenant, which I made with you, you shall not forget, and you shall not fear other gods.’” 898 Verse 40, which is now similarly disjointed from the actual speech of Yahweh in 35.38 by verse 39, finally remarks that the Israelites “did not listen” (וַיְצַוֵּם בְּרִית אִתָּם יְהוָה וַיִּכְרֹּת תִּזְבְּח֖וּ אֶלָ֑הֶם וְתַעַבְד֔וּם אֶלֶ֖ם אֲחֵרִ֑ים הִ֣ים אֱתִירְאוּ֥ אֶלֶךָ֑ לֵאמֹ֔ר וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲו֣וּ אֶלֶ֖ם אֲשֶׁר־כָּרַ֥תִּי והַבְּרִ֛יתם לָהֶֽם אֲחֵרִֽי הִ֥ים אֱתִירְא֖וּ."

895 Stade, Kings, 49. It is very probable that at least the awkward, and possibly even ungrammatical, יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁמוֹ אֵשֶׁר־שָּם is indeed a later gloss, as doubled ראשֶׁ-clauses are quite rare in Hebrew; see similarly Stade, Kings, 268. Nevertheless, the same cannot be as readily be said about the first ראשֶׁ-clause, which is grammatically correct and perfectly understandable.
896 Some scholars have seen this repetition as simply stylistic or “rhetorical”; see Long, Kings, 187; Knoppers, “Cutheans or Children of Jacob,” 235–7; Viviano, “Rhetorical and Form-Critical Analysis,” 555.
897 The LXX reads this verb uniformly as 3rd person sg. See, however, the text-critical appraisal above.
898 In Hebrew: קָרַתִּי אֲשֶׁר־כָּרַ֥תִּי והַבְּרִ֛יתם לָהֶֽם אֲחֵרִֽי הִ֥ים אֱתִירְא֖וּ.
commands in verses 36–37 and 39. Verse 36 is, furthermore, the only instance in Kings where the verb “to prostrate” (חוה) is used in relation to Yahweh – this usage appears Chronistic.

Verses 36–37 and 39 would in this reconstruction then form two similarly constructed pesher-like explications and exegetical interpretations of verses 35 and 38, respectively. Both explications begin with a similar אִם־אֶת־יְהוָה + כִּי־תִירָאוּ construction. The first exegetical remark in verse 37α (וְאֶת־הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים קִּים וְאֶת־הַחִלָּה לָכֶם), which essentially just repeats the list of 34bβ (כָּתַבְתָּם כְּחַיִּים מִצְרַיִם מֵאֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר לֶבַעְבַּעְבַּעְבַּעְבַּעְבַּע), also ends with a resumptive repetition of the matter at hand, “do not fear other gods,” after which the speech of Yahweh continues in 38.

Frevel also notes that the use of vocabulary also differs slightly between the different text blocks: the singular statute (מִשְׁפָּטִים) of Yahweh in the enclosing verses 34b, 40 becomes a more customary plural in 37 (הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים), and the masculine קֹּתָם of 34b becomes feminine קֹּתָם in 37. These verses thus likely come from different hands.

Conclusions. The original text of the addition thus read 34b–35, 38(a), 40, to which verses 36–37, (38b–)39 were added. Some scholars also take verse 41 as part of the unit of 34b–40, or as an even later explicatory ending to the chapter. However, as already argued, this does not seem likely because of the designation הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה “these peoples”: this would make no sense as a later addition after verses 34b–40, where the “sons of Jacob” are mentioned, and who could hardly be simply referred to as “these peoples.” It is much more probable that 41 originally followed verse 28, or, alternatively, 32/33, as has been argued above.

---

900 Thus Auld, Life in Kings, 135, who notes that the Chronicler uses this phrase in 1 Chr 16:29, 29:20; 2 Chr 7:3, 20:18, 29:28, 29, 30.
901 Frevel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 25, comes to a similar conclusion, although his detailed literary- and redaction-critical hypothesis with three distinct textual layers is much more intricate.
902 Verse 36 has an epithet of Yahweh נְטוּיָה וּבִזְרוֹעַ גָּדוֹל בְּכֹחַ מִצְרַיִם מֵאֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר and an object marker אֹתוֹ separating these two, however. It is not impossible that this epithet is an even later gloss since the object marker is somewhat awkward and intrusive, and is made necessary only because of the lengthy epithet.
904 Frevel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 23–31, goes even further and ascribes the additions to three different hands instead of only two: the base text of 34(without 34bβ), 35.37(without *
905 Campbell & O’Brien, Unfolding, 445. Frevel, “Vom Schreiben Gottes,” 24, also notes that there may be a Wiederaufnahme of בִּזְרוֹעַ בְּכֹחַ מִצְרַיִם in 40 and 41, thus marking most of verse 41 as a later addition.
4.6 The full redactional picture of verses 24–41

This investigation corroborates Stade’s general division of the second half of the chapter into three different hands or main units (24–28, 41; 29–34a; 34b–40). The picture is, however, somewhat more intricate than this since these three units have—like verses 7–23—clearly evolved in multiple stages through their history. Unlike in verses 7–23, however, the picture is quite simple, the texts having mostly been added in larger chunks. Nevertheless, it seems that there were not just three, but at least six or seven\(^{906}\) hands at work in verses 24–41, most (or all) later than those found in 7–23.

The first layer of text consisted of the lion episode in 24–28 and the ending remark of 41αbb. Even though the narrative itself is not explicitly polemical towards the northern cult, there is no particular need to see it as “pre-dtr” or early in any way: since the preceding verses 7–23, which were likely for the most part already extant when any of the additions in 24–41 were made, have made the character of the northern Israel’s cult exceedingly clear, the sarcastic remark of an exiled Samaritan priest teaching the newcomers “how to fear Yahweh” is easily contextualized.\(^{907}\) It is quite clear that “fearing Yahweh” in the manner of the earlier inhabitants of Israel and Samaria is no proper worship of Yahweh. The lion narrative can be divided into two layers, as well, with the basic core of 23b–24a, 25ab, 26abx, 27aα, 28a having later been expanded by an explicating glossator.

A second hand then explicated these implicit tenets of the earlier lion narrative and with verse 32 brought to the text the explicit sin of Jeroboam as an allusion to 1 Kgs 13:33 (where, hardly incidentally, the other lengthy lion narrative in Kings can also be found). This addition happened via Wiederaufnahme to the phrase “they were

---

\(^{906}\) There is evidently a seventh deliberate layer as well, i.e., the slight Masoretic revision in verse 29.

\(^{907}\) Long, 2 Kings, 187, notes on this phenomenon: “There may even be some irony in the writer's suggestion that a priest of Yahweh was sent from exile to teach the non-Israelite Samarians how to revere Yahweh at Bethel (v. 28). Of all places in the DtrH’s geography of sacred grounds, this cultic center was antipodal to Jerusalem ....” See also Barrick, “On the Meaning,” 625: “… the actions of the newcomers create exactly the same situation as that represented by 1 Kgs 12:31 + 32b whereby Jeroboam makes 'a bamoth-house' in Bethel and creates nonlevitical bamoth-priests, whom he stations there to officiate in the worship of Yahweh. This congruence is surely not serendipitous ....” Sweeney, Kings, 396: “Ironically, the appointment of priests from the foreign population resembles Jeroboam's appointment of non-Levitical priests from Israel (1 Kgs 12:31).” See also somewhat similarly Würthwein, Bücher der Könige, 401, who attributes these verses to the very last layer of the chapter: “Dieser Midrasch klingt sarkastisch in seiner Ätiologie des samaritanisches Kultes: Er wird von ethnisch Fremden praktiziert, die von einem Priester des verabscheuten Heiligtums von Bet-El unterwiesen worden waren.”
fearing Yahweh” in 41a. The Samarian priest’s reinstated cult of Bethel was indeed that of Jeroboam.

The third hand added 32+, a plus now only preserved in the LXX, as a further harmonization towards 1 Kgs 12:31 and the episode of Jeroboam’s calf. The new inhabitants also made themselves (houses of) high places, as Jeroboam had done, and revered their idols there. The addition happened via the exact same Wiederaufnahme as in the second layer. The MT has lost this text due to a copying mistake or a deliberate omission (seemingly at a very late proto-MT stage).

The fourth hand then further expanded the addition made by the third hand (32+) in verses 29–31, working on the basis of the place-name list of 24. This “anti-Samari(tan)” hand may have also added 33(with or without 33bβ)–34a (and possibly 41aβ) as a summary statement of the preceding verses: the newcomers “feared Yahweh” (according to the cult of Jeroboam), served their own gods, and do according to their previous custom(s). The focus of the additions has thus far been only on the newcomers.

The fifth hand, probably working in the Persian period, may have already been interested in the Samaritan sect itself – or, if the “sons of Jacob” is to be read as consisting of all Israelites, also in the Judahites. The northerners in verses 34b–35, 38, 40 are no longer the exiled Assyrians, but the Israelites with whom Yahweh made his covenant. The addition happened again via Wiederaufnahme, between verses 34a and 40.

Finally, the sixth hand added two exegetical interpretations in verses 36–37, 39, again only focusing on the “sons of Jacob” (the Samaritan sect?). At this stage the Torah had seemingly already become a written, canonical document. The gloss of 41bα probably stems from this or the fifth hand.
The bordered readings are to be read according to OG.
Translation

And the king of Assyria brought from Babylon, Kutha, Avva, Hamath, and Sepharvaim and settled in the cities of Samaria instead of the sons of Israel.

And they possessed Samaria [and settled in its cities].

And it happened at the beginning of them having settled there, (that) they did not fear Yahweh. And Yahweh sent amongst them lions, and they were killing amongst them.

And they said to the king of Assyria, saying: “The peoples whom you exiled and settled in the cities of Samaria do not know the custom of the god of the land, and he has sent among them lions.

And behold: they are killing them, as they are not knowing the custom of god of the land.”

And the king of Assyria commanded saying: “Bring there one of the priests whom I exiled from there;

(and) they shall go and settle there, and he will teach them the custom of the god of the land.

And one of the priests, whom they had exiled from Samaria, went and settled in Bethel.

And he was teaching them how they would fear Yahweh.

And each nation were making its gods and settled their abominations in the houses of high places, which they made in Samaria; each nation in a city in which they settled in it.

And each nation were making its gods, and they put (them) in the house of the high places, which the Samari(t)ans had made; the many peoples in their cities which they settled there.

And the men of Babylon made Sukkot-Benot, and the men of Kutha made Nergal, and the men of Hamath made Asima’.

And the Avvites made Nibḥaz (MT)/Eblazer (LXX) and Tartaq. And the Sepharvaites burnt their sons in fire to Adrammelek and Anammelek, the god(s) of Sepharvaim.

And they were fearing the Lord and settled their abominations in the houses of high places, which they made in Samaria; each nation in a city in which they settled in it.

And they were fearing the Lord, and they made themselves priests of high places. And they were making (sacrifices) for themselves in the houses of high places.

(On one hand) Yahweh they were fearing, and (on the other) their gods they were serving, according to the custom of the peoples, which/whom they exiled them from there.

Until this day they have done according to their former customs; they do not fear Yahweh, and are not doing according to the statutes, customs, Torah, and commandments, which Yahweh commanded to the sons of Jacob[, whose name he changed to Israel].

And Yahweh made with them a covenant, and commanded them, saying: “Do not fear other gods, and do not worship them, and do not serve them, and do not sacrifice to them.”

But instead Yahweh [– who brought you from the land of Egypt, with great strength and outstretched arm – him] you shall fear and him worship and to him sacrifice.”

“And the statutes and the customs and the commandments, which he wrote to you, you shall guard to do all days. And do not fear other gods.”

“The covenant, which I made with you do not forget, and do not fear other gods.”

But instead Yahweh, your God, you shall fear and he shall deliver you from the hand of all your enemies.”

But they did not listen, but instead they did according to their former custom.

And these peoples were fearing Yahweh and their images they were serving:
also their sons and the sons of their sons, as their fathers did,
they did

until this day.
5. Conclusions: the textual history of 2 Kgs 17

5.1 Text-historical conclusions
This study has aspired to show that, first and foremost, the often-overlooked differing textual traditions of 2 Kings 17 – most importantly the Septuagint and its Old Latin translation – are of indispensable value when assessing the chapter, not only for text-historical but also for historiographical reasons. There were at least two differing editions (Old Greek and Masoretic Text) of the chapter circulating at the time of the Hebraizing kaige revisers, probably at the turn of the era. These editions varied vastly: in some verses and details the information is very different or even contradictory in the OG vis-à-vis the MT, and, furthermore, the textual order of some of the verses differed to a great extent. While this makes the search for the History writer’s original text and any historical study of Kings much harder than previously thought, the study of the differing textual traditions also becomes increasingly crucial.

It is evident that 2 Kings 17 was heavily edited from the very first verse onwards, apparently until a very late date – the latest proto-Masoretic changes to the chapter were likely made in the (Late) Hellenistic period. Already in the case of the chronologically important verse 1, it can be argued that the OG version (preserved only in Old Latin) was shorter, lacking the highly problematic synchronism now found in the MT/LXX. At the same time, it is possible that the whole chapter 17 was originally situated before chapter 16, the Latin being the only witness to preserve the original order. Similarly, verse 2 of the OG edition, preserved by the OL witnesses and L, evidences the oldest version of Hoshea’s Deuteronomistic denouncement, according to which he was the worst king of Israel – contradicting the statement of the MT that he was, in fact, the least evil king of Israel. This alone is important for the historiographical research, since this surprising theological denouncement, often taken to come from the very first textual layer of the History writer, has sometimes been taken as an indication that, to earn such a surprisingly lenient reproach, Hoshea – who was originally instated by the Assyrians himself – must have somehow opposed the Assyrians and their efforts to exert power in the area. After the assessment of the textual evidence, however, such a presumption becomes unnecessary.

Even more important for the study of Biblical history is the textual witness of the OG in verses 3–6, which have often been taken as depicting historical reality, at
least to some extent – but only in their MT form. Critical assessment of the two editions shows that a reviser in the proto-MT transmission greatly modified a more original version of the text preserved in the OG. Especially in verse 4 the reviser modified the text in order to make its text more logical and coherent in the larger context of 2 Kings. The original name of the ruler of Egypt, “Adrammelek the Ethiopian” of the OG, was changed to the now enigmatic (proto-)MT “Sô, king of Egypt.” In fact, the OG text form explicitly indicates that the writer of the verse was originally aware of the Ethiopian 25th dynasty ruling Egypt at the time. However, the further literary-critical analysis of this passage clearly shows that none of the text in 3–4 comes from the History writer himself, and is therefore likely to be a later historicizing interpretation, perhaps a historical fantasy – or, at the very least, late additions to the text via the editorial technique of Wiederaufnahme. Therefore, together with the OG form of verses 1–2, verses 5–6, taken from the annals of Israel/Judah, form the most probable layer coming from the History writer.

The case of verse 7 and its textual problems are likely the most illuminating, and at the same time most challenging, for the text-historical methodology. This verse in La115 (which is the only witness going back to the OG) differs almost completely from all other witnesses (all Greek manuscripts having been harmonized towards the MT via kaige revision). In its cruder ideological and compositional state, the text of La115 in verse 7* seems like the most original continuation to verse 6(b), apparently originally added to the text via Wiederaufnahme as a separate unit. The MT appears as contextually more harmonized, as in it verses 7a and 18a form a long syntactical unity. The outcome of this text-critical assessment – namely the OG having the older text – has the potential to be a game-changer for the redaction history of the whole chapter. If MT verse 7(a), which is often taken as belonging to the oldest stratum of the text and thus as the starting point of the literary analysis, is, in fact, one of the latest additions to the passage, over a century of literary-critical scholarship of verses 7–23 has to be rethought to at least some extent.

The OG edition, only preserved in La115 (albeit even there only in part), originally lacked verse 8 and had a transposition of verses 9–14 behind 15–19. These two text blocks form parallel units, both in their contents and in utilizing similar beginning and ending formulae. They are therefore very unlikely to have originated from pure textual mistake(s). This situation of two widely differing editions, which in
many ways parallels the complex textual circumstances of 1 Kings 2–14, makes the future literary- and redaction-critical analysis of the chapter, if not the whole book, much more complex. Nevertheless, this documented evidence of large-scale shifts in textual order corroborates the common scholarly assumption that verses 7–20 are in general later additions to the text – after all, a text or textual unit whose position is more susceptible to change is often more likely to be somehow secondary to one that remains more intact.

The text of the MT is also secondary elsewhere in many instances when compared to the OG. One of the tendencies of the (proto-)MT revision in the chapter clearly stems from anti-Samaritan or anti-Northern Kingdom sentiments. This is most remarkable in the latter half of the chapter when comparing MT verse 29 and the OG plus 32+. The OG plus shows that originally the sole Hebrew Bible mention of “the Samaritans” in verse 29 is a late, (proto-)MT change made to the text, which originally only mentioned the city of Samaria, where the new inhabitants built their own high places. The MT now ascribes these idolatrous high places only to the “Samaritans,” which is due to the anti-Samaritan tendencies of the Maccabean era Judahite revisers. Chapter 17 was a natural place to make such a remark. It is important to note that this is not the only occurrence of such anti-Samaritanism in the MT edition of Kings, or even the chapter itself. Indeed, the transposition of verses 8–14/15–18, together with the differences attested in verse 7, could well have been made in this (proto-)MT revision in order to emphasize the sinfulness of the northerners and, at the same time, to downplay the sins of Judahites in the same context. Similarly, in verse 17 the OG mention of an ephod (a vestment of Yahwistic high priests) has been omitted from the MT in order to delete the implication of a (legitimate) northern sanctuary.

However, a meticulous purely literary-critical analysis can also change the way we look at some verses. Even though customarily thought to come from the History writer, verse 21 has multiple grammatical and ideological characteristics that indicate that it is more likely to have been composed only in some later “nomistic” phase. Even verse 22, which appears as the best candidate for the History writer’s text in 7–23, may come from later writers because of its idea that the sin of Jeroboam was first of all collective and due to the people following it, and not due to the kings enforcing it as is the customary understanding in Kings. The amount of the original History writer’s text (only in verses 1–2, 5–6, 22–23α) in the chapter is therefore very scant,
the rest coming from multiple editorial hands. The latter half of the chapter (24–41) comes, as noted already in the early scholarship, from the very latest editors working on the chapter.

Despite the many complications (see further 5.2 below), the broader redaction-critical developments in the evolution of the text can nevertheless be described. Atop the original History writer’s text, concerned with the sin of Jeroboam and Hoshea, was added in the first phases more explicit cultic crimes Israel was thought to be guilty of (first 7α, 9β, 11αβ, 18; after this the sins of Judah were also increasingly brought into the picture with 8α, 10, 16α–17). Already at this point idolatry – not cultic decentralization – had become the main problem for the writers/editors. One may use the term “nomistic” from this point on to describe the main tendency of the revisions. There are at least two distinguishable phases in this idolatrous understanding, however, since originally the other gods were still thought of as actual gods, powerful in at least some sense (as still seems to be the case in verses 16–17). Only in the second phase do they become more and more powerless, being at the very end nothing but idols, material objects with no might whatsoever (such as the derogative לִים in verse 12, or “vanity,” הַהֶבֶל, as in verse 15). At the same time the many abstract nomistic terms (“commandments,” “statutes,” “judgments,” “law,” etc.) become increasingly more prominent. This is especially notable in the latter half of the chapter, and in verses 34–40, which constitute the very latest larger addition(s) to the chapter.

5.2 Methodological conclusions: The repercussions for literary and redaction critical methodology

This study has confirmed the supposition that text-critical means are necessary for the literary-critical study of Kings. Without a careful and unprejudiced analysis of the documented evidence, one could never even have suspected that, for instance, in verse 4 the original Egyptian ruler mentioned was not “Sô,” but a mysterious Ethiopian called Adrammelek, or that in verse 20 it was in fact all the Israelites (both Israel and Judah) who did the rejecting of Yahweh already at this point in time. These cases are only the tip of the text-critical iceberg as well. Text-critical evidence not only contributes to the study of 2 Kings 17, but has the potential to turn the scholarly situation on its head, very much analogically to what has happened with the book of Jeremiah after the Septuagint edition was shown to preserve a generally older version of the book.
This possibility has crucial methodological repercussions. Because of the numerous problems and the almost overwhelming complexity of the situation already in the MT edition of 17:7–23, one has to admit the shortcomings of the literary-critical method, especially when there is no textual evidence to back up its conclusions. As has been argued earlier, the work has in any case seen radical changes even at a relatively late stage (evidenced either by the OG or MT edition of the chapter) that resulted at times in an almost complete reworking of certain verses and phrases (verses 2, 4, and 7–9 in particular). There is even text-critical evidence of forthright deliberate omissions in 2 Kgs 17, not to mention extensive rewriting. This notice makes many previous literary-critical models of Fortschreibung (which, from the get-go, usually suppose that the text has only grown during the transmission, without any notable rewritings or omissions, even by accident) uncertain and liable to errors.

In a case like 2 Kings 17, and even only its verses 7–23, which have clearly been reworked for a long while and by numerous hands, one should therefore probably be content with giving only the most basic main lines of undocumented textual evolution and to acknowledge that redaction-critical reconstructions are abstractions of a more complicated reality. This includes noting the clearest glosses (such as 16αβ, 21bβ), remarking cases of possible/likely editorial techniques (the Wiederaufnahme of 6b in 23b, and possibly 11b in 17b in the MT edition; the “framing” of the two similarly composed narrative blocks in the OG edition), finding grammatically and/or literarily disruptive passages (13–14 in the MT edition), and recovering the original intertextual links that were later severed by additions (such as the connection of 9βα with 11αα, or 18b with 21a, as attested by both editions). Going any deeper than this is sure to cause massive divergence in opinions, as can be seen in the table in 3.2.1.910

Stipp, “Semi-Empirical Example,” 317, aptly summarizes this point concerning Jeremiah: “The Sondergut [of MT, TT] challenges overly optimistic attitudes as to the power of our tools for uncovering the history of biblical books. If we did not have an alternative text type permitting us to reconstruct the common ancestor, we would be utterly incapable of doing so ... the mass of the Sondergut would be impossible to uncover, and we would never have guessed that the entire book had been rearranged ... We simply have to admit that our texts may come down from histories beyond the reach of scholarship.” Similarly Pakkala, “Can we reconstruct,” 5–6: “Sometimes, later editors rewrote parts of the older text or simply omitted embarrassing or theologically offensive details. It would be impossible to reconstruct what was left out unless the older text was accidentally preserved ....”

A “divergence in opinions,” however massive, is of course not inherently problematic as such. Rather, the deeper one delves into the redactional swamp, the smaller the probabilities that the final reconstruction correctly represents the true history of the text – and, reversibly, the greater the chance that something has happened to the text(s) that we are now unaware of and thus unable to reconstruct.
A precise layering of these redactional/revisional strands and layers to only a few definite hands is almost certainly an impossible feat to accomplish as well. Because most of the language used in the chapter is, in the end, so generally “(Deutero-)nomistic,” we probably have no real means to accurately differentiate between (all) the revisers, as has often been done in traditional redaction criticism.\textsuperscript{911} In fact, since the very starting point, i.e., the original text, ideology, and even the very writing context of the History writer seems hard for the contemporary scholarship to pinpoint even approximately (see 1.3 for the example of the “sin of Jeroboam”), the scholars at times will inevitably even have completely differing starting points for their analyses. Nevertheless, one may certainly find certain similar strands of interpretation, such as the merely materialistic understanding of other “gods” as only completely non-divine and powerless “idols” in 12, 15b (יְהָבוּ), 16b(α), 17a+(OG), 21bβ, which are at the same time unlikely to come from the earliest layer(s) of the work, but also unlikely to have all been originally made by one and the same reviser. Rather, they come from a more general (late post-exilic Persian and even Hellenistic) timeframe when the understanding of divine matters had already evolved close to the practically monotheistic understanding of early Judaism. Therefore, the relative dating of these verses/glosses is also extremely hard. The best we can do is to compare them to the earlier (nomistic) texts, where the other gods are still quite real. Similarly, MT verses 8a and 10 are likely harmonizations towards 1 Kgs 14:23–24, but, as evidenced by La\textsuperscript{115}, their assignment to the same hand is all but certain.

In a way, even the conventional diachronic presentation of the textual evolution in table form, as given above, is hardly adequate and satisfactory when dealing with such complex text(s). In relatively more straightforward cases like verses 3–6, or 24–41 (where the textual evidence is almost completely uniform!), this simpler model can still be used. Finding alternatives for the conventional method of presentation could prove a useful venture in future studies. In our vastly more “chaotic” (in a mathematical sense) post-Qumran age, I would believe a more apt model for redaction criticism – or at least one worth testing – in the future could be that of Complex

\textsuperscript{911} Similarly Mäkipelto, Uncovering, 294, in the context of Joshua 24: “… nomistic editing should not be connected with only one distinct redaction (such as DtrN), but should rather be seen as a recurring editorial motive ….” This point can also be partly corroborated by text-critical evidence; see Appendix B for such “nomistic” editing at the stage of proto-MT transmission.
Adaptive Systems (CAS). In a CAS model the at times even immense textual plurality of the witnesses creates, instead of a simple rigid table, a web of possibilities (often very much equal in their probabilities), in which even the smallest textual or ideological differences may completely change the redactional situation.

A good example of this from the dissertation at hand would be the case of verse 2, which – as has been argued – likely plays an important role when deciding the redactional fate of verse 22, as well. Indeed, this difference between the MT and the OG with its two possible outcomes already creates multiple redaction-critically potential options to the interpretation of verse 22 – the analysis of which further creates multiple (practically equal) possibilities for the analysis of the other verses of the chapter, for instance verse 21. Indeed, 21a is another good example of the complexity one encounters when the textual material is taken seriously in the redactional work since this verse can in its two different versions (OG and MT) be grammatically and literary-critically connected completely viably to at least four different verses (6b, 7a[α], 7*b, 18b). The network of possible (though of course not always equally probable) redactional layouts quickly becomes, even with only these three above-mentioned verses, almost overwhelmingly vast. This is one promising prospect to be left for future research.

Even “overwhelming complexity” is not to say that nothing can be done however: this is certainly not the case. Even if the scope of the literary and redactional studies most probably needs to be narrowed some, it is still very much a possible and fruitful venture to look for and find the most likely textual unities/discontinuities and redactional hinge-points in the text. A good example is the case of verses 9–11, where verse 10 has been interpolated between 9 and 11. Similarly, verse 21 – as has already been posited by most scholars for well over a century – was originally not connected to verse 20, but to 18.

Although the results of even these proposals remain abstractions, as they are not based on text-critical materials, conclusions such as these can be relatively reliably made. Indeed, as was emphasized already in the Introduction of this thesis, literary-critical methodology and decisions are essential for text-critical work as well. One cannot work without the other – at times redactional arguments are practically

\[912\] See Mäkipelto, “Textual Transmission” (forthcoming), for a pioneering study on the use of this model in the study of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible.
indispensable for the “text-critical” argumentation. It is therefore vital that both are taken seriously, in their own right.


## Appendices

### A. The text of La\textsuperscript{115} in 2 Kgs 17: English translation and Greek retroversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek retroversion</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>et osee filius dala (=hela) regnuit annis VIII in samariam</td>
<td>καὶ ἔβαστευσεν Ὀσής υἱὸς Ηλα ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>et fecit</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρόν ἐνώπιον κυρίου παρὰ πάντας τοὺς γενομένους ἐμπροσθέν αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>athuc ascendit</td>
<td>ἐπʼ αὐτὸν ἀνέβη Σαλμανασσαρ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων καὶ ἔγενετο αὐτῷ Ὀσῆς δοῦλος καὶ ἔφερεν αὐτὸν δώρα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>et invenit rex assyriorum in osee insidiad et misit nuntios ad adjamalac ethiopem habitatem in aegypto et offerebat osee munera regi assyriorum ab anno in annum et inuriam fecit et rex assyriorum in chālee et tradidit eum in carcerem</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν ἐκείνες φυλακῆς ἐν Χαλεή καὶ ἐδόθη τὸν Ὀσῆς ὑπὸ τῆς Μαρτυρίας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>et rex assyrion ascendit in samariam et obedit eam trienio</td>
<td>καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ἀνέβη εἰς Σαμαρείαν καὶ περιεκάθισεν αὐτὴν τρία ημέρας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>in nono autem anno ose</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ἐννόῳ ἔτει τοῦ Ὀσῆς ἐπίστησαν τὴν Σαμαρείαν καὶ ἐπιβάλλαν τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους καὶ ἔστρεφον ἐν αὐτῷ τοὺς δοῦλους τὸν Ἡλα καὶ κατέκυσεν αὐτὸς ἐν πόλει Μαδὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν Ἀβύρω, ἐς τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>quia prophet omnes exacerbationes quibus excerberuerunt dom ex qua die eduxit patres eorum ex aegypto et usque in hunc diem non custodierunt precepta diui patrum suorum</td>
<td>ἔμπροσθεν τοὺς παρεργοῦσαν καὶ παρώργισαν τὸν κύριον αὐτὸ ὡς ἡμέρας ἀνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς Αἰγύπτον καὶ ἔστρεψεν τὴν ἡμέρας τοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>et dereliquerunt legem eius et mandata eius quae dispositum patrib eorum et testimonia eius quib vis</td>
<td>καὶ ἔποσαντο τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ προστάγματα τοῖς πατέροισιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτοῦ δότα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>et transierunt omnes praecep</td>
<td>et fecer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>et perduebant filios suos et filias suas in igni et divinabant diiu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>et iratus</td>
<td>est in indignatione dm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>et iudas non obser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>et revelaverunt filios</td>
<td>Israel quae non</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rest of the text has not been preserved.
B. A short list of (proto-)-Masoretic revisional characteristics in 1–2 Kings

As in Jeremiah, where Hermann-Josef Stipp has done impressive work on the Masoretic idiolect or Sondergut not yet added to the earlier Septuagint edition, something similar will be attempted here on the somewhat more modest scale of Kings. The aim here is especially to collect some theological/ideological traits/readings that can be argued to constitute more or less consistent additions to the Masoretic edition, and that are missing from the (in these cases more original) Septuagint edition. One may credit Adrian Schenker for doing something very similar in his book Älteste Textgeschichte.

The list provided below is by no means exhaustive (it is, in fact, anything but), since, to my knowledge, such a study has not yet been conducted on a systematical scale. The cases found below are simply a chance collection of (proto-)MT additions that seem to form a somewhat loosely connected Sondergut of their own. As with the Jeremiah Sondergut, the revisions in the MT are widespread and at times even large, but remain mostly quite insignificant and, most of all, would be difficult or even impossible to detect without any textual evidence.

Nomistic concepts
Sporadic additions of nomistic phraseology
In addition to the large nomistically minded interpolation in MT 1 Kgs 6:11–13, the LXX lacks some law technical terminology:

- בְּקַחַר in 1 Kgs 2:3, מָשַׁמֵּשׁ in 1 Kgs 11:34, 14:8, 18:18; מָשַׁמֵּשׁ in 1 Kgs 8:58, 11:33; and מָשַׁמֵּשׁ in 1 Kgs 11:33, 34.

Change from Moses to Yahweh as the origin of the statutes
In 1 Kgs 9:6 MT reads מִינֵיכֶם נָתַתִּי אֲשֶׁר against the LXX ἃ ἔδωκεν ἰωσήφ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν. It seems likely that the MT has harmonized this in order to emphasize the actions of Yahweh contra Moses.

Idolaters do not swear by Yahweh, but by their own gods
In both 1 Kgs 19:2 (Jezebel) and 20[21]:10 (Ben-Hadad) the same oath formula is given as referring to plural gods in MT (יוֹסִיפוּן וְכֹה הִם וְאֱכֹה יַעֲשׂוּן) instead of singular God, i.e. Yahweh, of the LXX (τάδε ποιήσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείη). This is likely due to proto-MT theological correction: idolaters should not be swearing by Yahweh.

---

913 Stipp, Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut. Of course, the Septuagint edition is not without its own Sondergut, either, but this layer is quite measy when compared to the Masoretic editing.
914 MT also similarly adds “congregation” (יוֹסִיפוּן) in 1 Kgs 8:5. In the whole passage 1 Kgs 8:1–11 MT clearly evidences a later, vastly expanded version.
915 The whole MT plus 1 Kgs 14:1–20 is suspect, as it is attested only by Hexaplaric witnesses. The passage is clearly late in its origin, with many (post-)deuteronomistic/nomistic ideas.
916 The Ethiopic has a conflation: “which I gave to Moses.” Stade, Kings, 110, sees this as “scribal expansion,” but since the meaning of the phrase completely changes, this explanation is not adequate.
Theological covenant
The idea of a covenant made at Sinai-/Horeb between Yahweh and the Israelites is quite rare in Kings, and therefore likely did not form part of its oldest layers. The word בְּרִית is only found in the meaning of the earlier theological covenant in 1 Kgs 8:23, 11:11, 19:10, 14; 2 Kgs 13:23, 17:15. Otherwise the word is found in “the ark of the covenant” in 1 Kgs 3:15, 6:19, 8:1, 6 (>LXX), 21,918 as a political covenant in 1 Kgs 5:12, 15:19, 20:34; as the covenant of Jehojada in 2 Kgs 11:4, 17; and as the (book of) covenant of Josiah in 2 Kgs 23:2, 3, 21.

Some references to the earlier theological covenant have been added only at the (proto-)Masoretic stage: in 1 Kgs 11:11, 19:10 the OG version definitely lacks the word altogether (in the parallel verse 19:14 L lacks the word, and the B-text transposes it after oi vioi Ἡσρηματ, likely telling of a later kaige-like addition), and the mention of 2 Kgs 13:23 is found in L (= OG) already in 13:7, showing that this (already phraseologically very suspicious) verse is, due to its apparent movability, in any case a very late addition (albeit not strictly Masoretic). For the analysis of 17:15, where in La115 the “covenant” changes to “law” (i.e., Torah), see 2.6.6 above.

Solomon “following other gods”
In 1 Kgs 11:5 (> OG) the MT has been expanded with the contextual harmonizing mention of Solomon “walking after” other gods, i.e., idolatry.919

Additions of “place” (מָקוֹם)
In the Elisha cycle the MT twice adds a mention of “place” in 2 Kgs 5:11920 and 6:2, possibly denoting a somehow theological concept in both passages.

“Democratization” of sin
In 1 Kgs 11:33 the MT has changed the verbal forms from the OG singulars (κατέλιπέν, ἐποίησεν) to plurals (עֲזָבוּנִי, וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ) in order to emphasize the sinning of the people (of “all the tribes of Israel” from 32, יִשְׂרָאֵל שִׁבְטֵי כֹּל) against that of Solomon.921 The interest of the MT towards this verse can further be seen from its additions of nomistic terms in 33–34 (see above).

Similarly, in 1 Kgs 14:22, whereas the OG reads καὶ ἐποίησεν Ῥοβοαμ τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιον κυρίου, “Rehoboam did evil in the eyes of the Lord,” the MT replaces “Rehoboam” with “Judah” (Ἡρῴαμ Ῥουβαμ τὸν πονηρὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου), and, accordingly, changes the following singular verb (παρεζήλωσεν) to the plural (παρεζήλωσαν).922 The OG understanding is also supported by the parallel passage 2 Chr 12:14.

---

918 The LXX has a secondary plus of πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης in 1 Kgs 8:9.
919 This addition is somewhat surprising since it actually makes Solomon’s sin somewhat harsher – indeed, the OG edition seems to be less denouncing of Solomon in 11:1–3, which may go back to a revision on the part of the OG Vorlage. Either way, verse 5 is likely an addition vis-à-vis OG.
920 Found secondarily in Greek MSS A B 247 CI a119 f 64’ 488 55 158 244 318 342 372 554.
921 This may be seen as part of the independent pro-Solomonic tendency of the MT as well.
922 On the complex case of 14:22–24, see further Stade, Kings, 138. Contra Van Keulen, Two Versions, 298: “… vv. 22b–23 in the LXX seem to qualify Rehoboam’s ancestors David and Solomon as evildoers. … It is difficult to believe that the LXX means to accuse these kings of having committed the sins described in vv. 22b–23.” Indeed, this would have been the exact reason for the MT to change the text, namely a pro-David/Solomon amendment.
Names

The “name” (שם) of Yahweh
The theologically significant idea of the power of Yahweh’s name is reflected in the large Deuteronomistic MT addition via Wiederaufnahme in 1 Kgs 8:41–42.923

In 1 Kgs 18:32, L−19’ 328 Lucifer (* Syh) attest a minus of ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, which is likely OG and the oldest text attainable.924

If Lucifer furthermore witnesses the oldest text in his minus of the whole verse 2 Kgs 21:4,925 this case may also be added to the list.

The name of Israel
In 2 Kgs 14:27 it is stated that “the Lord had not yet said that he would blot the name of Israel away.” In the MT the more abstract “name” is blotted out, while in the LXX the object is “seed” (σπέρμα – only L-700 460 give the Hebraizing ὄνομα, likely from a Hexaplaric source).926 The totality of the action is enhanced in the MT (not even a memory in the form of a name would be left of Israel), which may also be labeled as an anti-Samaritan change (see below).

The “name of Solomon”
In 1 Kgs 5:11 MT/LXX 4:31, the MT adds לְהָיְהוֹיָבָצ בְכָל־הַגּוֹיִם וַיְהִי־שְׁמוֹ, a sentence entirely lacking from the LXX. The plus emphasizes the greatness of (the name of) Solomon.927

Names of mothers
Both the names of the mothers of Jeroboam (11:26) and Rehoboam (14:31) are missing from the LXX; at least in the latter case the shorter reading is the more ancient one.

Also, in some Greek manuscripts in 2 Kgs 22:14 Huldah the prophetess is not the “wife” of Shallum, but his “mother.”928

Larger-scale revisions

The Elisha narrative: Elisha’s depiction enhanced
The MT has likely been revised in 8–11 cases (in 2:14, 3:14, 4:4, 41, 5:18, 8:11, 13:14–21, 21; likely also in 2:23, 4:7, 8:10). All these changes point in the same direction,
i.e., the MT giving a more favorable depiction of Elisha and his deeds. See Tekoniemi, “Enhancing the Depiction” (Paper given at the SBL Annual Meeting in 2018; revised paper forthcoming in Biblische Notizen 2/2020), for analyses of these cases.

Anti-Samaritan tendencies in MT
In 1 Kgs 14:23, the MT plus יַגִּם־הֵם, “they too,” seems to be a late MT addition, as it is missing from the LXX (καὶ ὠκοδόμησαν ἑαυτοῖς ὑψηλά = *במות לֹא-בָּם וְיבנו) and marked with an asterisk in the Syrohexapla, the reading coming to some Greek manuscripts from Aquila and/or Symmachus. The plus may even be classified as an “anti-Israelite/Samaritan” MT addition: the custom of building high places came, according to this small plus, originally from Israel (as their building in 1 Kgs 14:22–23 is recounted verbatim in 2 Kgs 17:9–11), as the Judahites “too” started building them!

The MT edition of 2 Kgs 17:29 (see section 4.3) is likely due to a later anti-Samaritan reworking of a text originally resembling the LXX plus in 17:32+. The text has been reworked to put the blame of the house(s) of the high place(s) on the (sectarian) “Samaritans” in all their cities, not simply to the “inhabitants of (the city of) Samaria.”

See also the headings “The name of Israel” and “Democratization of sin” above.

“House(s) of high places”
See section 1.3.

Temples or high places destroyed in Jerusalem?
In MT 23:8 Josiah is said to have destroyed, apparently in Jerusalem, “high places of the gates,” אֶת־בָּמוֹת בָּאָצֶרֶת הַשְּׁעָרִים. In Greek, however, a “house of gates,” τὸν οἶκον τῶν πυλῶν,929 is destroyed. A similar difference can be found a few verses later in 23:13, where instead of “high places” before Jerusalem a “house” (τὸν οἶκον) is destroyed in the LXX. Since practically the same difference is found twice in such close proximity, it is not likely that these readings go back to simple copying mistakes.930 Rather, it seems that the proto-MT edition has deliberately suppressed the idea that there were other temples in/near Jerusalem – built by Solomon, no less.931

In this context, one may also take into account the large minus of a mention of a temple of Baal in Jerusalem in 23:11 in the MT and the kaige text. The plus is retained by L 328 460 and Lucifer: “in the house of [Beth-]On that the kings of Israel had built, a high place for Baal and all the host of heaven” (ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ᾽Ων ὄν ὠκοδόμησαν βασιλέως Ἰσραήλ ὑψηλῶν τῷ Βαάλ καὶ πάση τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ).932 The proto-Masoretic editing seems so prevalent and, more importantly, uniformly pointing in the same direction in these verses (8–13) that it is hard to see how the edition of the LXX could be secondary.933 These cases also strengthen the argument presented above for

929 L reads, curiously, τὸν οἶκον τῶν ὑψηλῶν, “the house of high places.” This may be the OG wording since the majority Greek text is somewhat awkward.
930 Contra Kauhanen, Lucifer, 296.
931 Similarly Schenker, “Man bittet um Gegenargument,” 60–1.
932 On this case, see Kauhanen, Lucifer, 301–3 and Pakkala, God’s Word Omitted, 243–5.
933 This is attempted by Eynikel, “Reform of King Josiah,” 408–15, but his arguments are not very persuasive.
the cases 1 Kgs 12:31; 2 Kgs 17:29, 31. This shows that the MT edition of Kings is clearly interested in the correct use of the terms “temple” and “high place(s).”
C. An update to McLay’s list of known kaige equivalents

In addition to the 96 kaige equivalents listed and discussed by McLay and Greenspoon, at least 16 further characteristics with multiple occurrences have since been discovered in the study of Samuel-Kings. Some of the listed equivalents have also been discussed in this thesis. Below is a list of these additional equivalents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaige characteristic</th>
<th>Discovered/confirmed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97 ננח (niph.) = παρακαλέω</td>
<td>Aejmelaeus 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 נהלך imperative = δεῦρο/δεῦτε</td>
<td>Avalos 1989, Tekoniemi 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 נל =$εδόκολον</td>
<td>Kauhanen 2017; cf. 2.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 נלך = προσόχθισμα</td>
<td>Kauhanen 2017; cf. 2.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 נלך = θελητής</td>
<td>Klein 1967, Muraoka 1983, Kauhanen 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 נלך = ἀποκεθάω</td>
<td>Muraoka 1983; cf. 2.6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 נלך = θόρα</td>
<td>Muraoka 1983, Tekoniemi 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 נלך = ἀτμαξηθαυ/αισχύνεσθαι</td>
<td>Muraoka 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 נלך = ἀπεξηέκε</td>
<td>Piquer &amp; Torijano 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 נלך = πολυτρόκαω</td>
<td>Torijano 2012; cf. 2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 נלך = οὐχ οὗτος</td>
<td>Trebolle 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 נלך = δι άλλ. ή</td>
<td>Trebolle 1984, Kauhanen 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 נלך = δικαίωμα</td>
<td>Trebolle 1995, Kauhanen 2017; cf. 2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 נלך = δόνειμα (cf. McLay #12 and #30)</td>
<td>Trebolle 1984, Tov 1990, Kauhanen 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 נלך = μανά</td>
<td>Trebolle 1984, Torijano 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 נלך = λατρεύω (when serving gods)</td>
<td>Cf. 2.6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

934 See McLay, “Kaige and Septuagint Research,” 131–4. The list was originally compiled by Greenspoon, Textual Studies.

Abbreviations

BHS Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia

L The Antiochean text

La\textsuperscript{11} Palimpsestus Vindobonensis (Old Latin manuscript)

La\textsuperscript{M} Marginal readings in Old Latin manuscripts La\textsuperscript{91–95}

LXX Septuagint

MT Masoretic Text

OG Old Greek

OL Old Latin

The abbreviations of scientific journals/series in the bibliography below are given according to The SBL Handbook of Style (2nd edition).
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