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A NOTE OF APPRECIATION

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies is pleased to acknowledge its debt to Professor Eugene Ulrich, Editor of Bulletins 13 through 18 from 1980 to 1985. Professor Ulrich's service to the organization has been continuous and varied. Before his tenure as Editor he served for three years as Treasurer and then for one year as Associate Editor. When his pressing academic commitments forced him to relinquish the editorship he was willing to serve again as Associate Editor—the position he now holds.

To all of these duties, Professor Ulrich brought unusual vigor and exceptional skill. The six issues he produced showed progressive levels of sophistication both in their form and content. The form of the recent issues can hardly be distinguished from that of typeset materials; the range and scope of the contributions and the contributors to the Bulletin in recent years has confirmed it as a truly international organ of scholarly communication thanks, in large measure, to Professor Ulrich's efforts.

The IOSCS was privileged to have the services of Professor Ulrich for these many years and wishes to extend to him hereby its esteem, appreciation and gratitude for his hundreds of hours of labor and care.

On behalf of the IOSCS
Melvin K. H. Peters
MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING
23 November 1985 -- Anaheim Hilton

Programme

1:00 - 5:00 p.m. Albert Pietersma presiding

Benjamin G. Wright, University of Pennsylvania
"The Influence of the Greek Pentateuch on the Greek of Ben Sira"

Melvin K.H. Peters, Duke University
"Unique Passages in the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch: Inner Corruptions or Textual Traditions?"

D. Brent Sandy, Grace College
"Alexandrian Scholarship and the Septuagint"

Bernard Taylor, Hebrew Union College
"An Analysis of Manuscripts boc2e2 in 1 Reigns: A New Methodology"

Richard Nysse, Lutheran Northwestern Theological Seminary
"Lucianic and Theodotionic Agreements in Samuel"

Peter Cowe, Columbia University
"Variations in the Vorlage and Translation Technique between Two Strata of Armenian Chronicles"

Claude Cox, Brandon University
"Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Bible"

Business Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the President, Professor Albert Pietersma, at 5:00 p.m.

1. The minutes of the 1984 meeting in Chicago were read and approved.

2. Business arising from the minutes
   a. Proceedings of the 5th Congress of IOSCS (Salamanca) have appeared in print (ed. N. Fernández Marcos).
   b. For the 6th Congress (Jerusalem) there will be no overlap with the International Meeting of SBL.

3. President's Report.
   a. The 6th Congress of the IOSCS will be held in conjunction with the 12th congress of the IOSOT, Jerusalem, Aug. 21-22, 1986. The programme, which features two symposia, is in its final stages.
   b. Forum in textual criticism will be held at the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, Tuesday, Nov. 26, 2:00 - 6:00 p.m.
   c. The IOSCS will not meet with SBL in 1986.
   d. The IOSCS mailing list has been given to the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center, Claremont, so that IOSCS members can receive materials of interest.
   e. The Executive Committee recommends the following:
      1) That membership subscription fee be increased to $5.00. (Carried).
      2) That M. K. H. Peters be appointed Editor of the Bulletin and E. Ulrich become Associate Editor. (Carried).
   f. The President moved a vote of thanks to Prof. Ulrich for his splendid work as Editor.

   Balance on hand as of June 30, 1985 was $699.57.

5. Editor's Report (Ulrich).
   Bulletin 18 is about to appear.

6. SCS Editor's Report (Cox).
   Two manuscripts have been published this year: J. R. Miles, Retroversion and Text Criticism: The Predictability of Syntax in an Ancient Translation from Greek to Ethiopic; L. J. McGregor, The Greek Text of Ezekiel. R. A. Kraft and E. Tov, Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies vol. 1 is in press.

7. Professor E. Tov moved a vote of thanks to the President.
   There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A. Pietersma
IOSCIS TREASURER'S REPORT
July 1, 1985 - June 30, 1986

Initial Balance
(6/28/85) .................................................... $ 699.57

Payments
Received ................................................... +1,204.67

7/01/85 496.81 3/31/86 (int.) 19.08
7/15/85 9.00 4/01/86 224.00
9/30/85 (int.) 14.92 5/29/86 155.00
10/21/85 8.50 6/30/86 (int.) 13.05
11/25/85 246.00
12/31/85 (int.) 17.31

Expenses................................................... -1,027.86

$876.38

7/15/85 (mailing expenses) 19.11
4/22/86 (printer) 695.00
(mailing expenses) 313.75

Balance as of 6/30/86 ................................................... $ 876.38

Walter R. Bodine
IOSCS Treasurer
Dallas Theological Seminary

Auditors: Robert Chisholm and Robin Cover
Dallas Theological Seminary

NEWS AND NOTES

Changes in the Bulletin
With this issue, a new subscription price and a new Editor for the Bulletin are in place. Persons who have paid for several years in advance at the old rate are not required to pay the difference. The Editor invites contributions and notes to the Bulletin.

A Note on the Text of Rahlfs 928
Among papyri preserving portions of the Septuagint, P. Antinoopolis 8/210 = Rahlfs 928 must surely be one of the most intriguing, for it offers a glimpse of a text of the Proverbs which seems not to have survived in any other Greek witness. "Glimpse" is a term used advisedly, for the papyrus is unfortunately in a very poor state of repair. Nevertheless, it is perhaps by reason of its attestation of a unique text as much as its state of preservation that first C. H. Roberts and then G. Zuntz found such difficulty in reconstructing the text. Yet one important ally in the task of reconstruction has not been fully exploited, namely the Coptic version of Proverbs in Sahidic. This version is known in several slightly differing dialectal forms, which seem to reflect the existence of an earlier Sahidic form itself presupposing an early and distinctive text of the Septuagint Proverbs. It turns out that this original Coptic and 928 are very closely related textually and in other respects (pace Roberts).

The situation found in the Proverbs in not dissimilar from that met and brilliantly analysed by Rahlfs for the Psalter. There Rahlfs, chiefly by recourse to the Sahidic version, identified his so-called "oberigypitsch" text-type, and substantial portions of this text-type have been subsequently recovered in the form of Bodmer 24, which supplements the materials available to Rahlfs. Especially interesting for the study of 928 is the fact that Rahlfs has occasionally preferred the readings of the "oii" text in his edition of the Psalter (e.g. at Ps. 17:44), suggesting that some distinctive readings of that text-type belong, in his view, to OG. It remains to be demonstrated that 928-Sa for Proverbs represents a similar text-type to Bodmer 24-Sa for Psalms. Should this prove to be the case, the Sa of Proverbs would clearly assume a particular significance for any
edition of that book, and the possibility might arise that Sa alone preserved a (more) original LXX against all else. This compares interestingly with the text of LXX Job as edited by Ziegler.

Our own work involves both reconstruction of 928, including the identification of some newly-discovered and some old but previously unidentified fragments, as well as a study of the text-type, especially as it relates to Sa and the possibility of its representation of the "oi" text-type of Proverbs. Especially interesting in this regard is the occasional but seemingly not accidental agreement between Co, 928 and Syh, as well as the apparent attestation by 928 of the Theodotionic additions to Proverbs and other distinctively Hexaplaric phenomena. Not unimportant preliminary tasks to the edition of the LXX Proverbs are thus in hand.

The preceding note was solicited from R. G. Jenkins. Those with interests in his work may contact him at 49 Empress Rd, Surrey Hills 3127, Victoria, Australia.

Maredsous Colloquium on the Bible and the Computer

The computer processing of biblical texts developed about twenty years ago among a few Centres which acted as path-finders, and with the publications of the "Computer Bible" by J. Baird (Wooster, USA), the work of G. Weil (Nancy, France) and A. Q. Morton (Edinburgh, U.K.). Since then, a large number of centres have emerged and we have become conscious of the need for better communication between scholars, for an exchange of methods and results, and for better information for the benefit of those who are interested in the "Bible and Computer" field.

This is the prime goal of the "Computer Assisted Research Group" which works on an annual basis within the "Society of Biblical Literature Meeting" in the United States. This was also the aim of the "Association Internationale Bible et Informatique" when it decided to organize, in co-operation with the "Faculté de Théologie de l'Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve," a Colloquium on the theme "Bible and Computer: The Text," on the campus of the University, on September 2-4, 1985. This initiative proved a real success since more than 100 persons from various horizons and countries attended.
RECORD OF WORK
PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS


Gooding, David W. The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism. Papers of a Joint Venture. [See under Barthelemy.]


Knibb, Michael A. Edition of the Ethiopic Text of Ezekiel. [In progress.]


Passoni Dell'Acqua, Anna. "La terminologia dei reati nei prossimi periodi dei Tolemei e nella versione dei LXX." Proceedings, XVIIIth International Congress of Papyrology. [in press].


1 KINGS 8: A SAMPLE STUDY INTO THE TEXTS OF KINGS USED BY THE CHRONICLER AND TRANSLATED BY THE OLD GREEK

Steven L. McKenzie
Rhodes College

The importance of the Samuel fragments from Qumran for our understanding of the development of the text of the Hebrew Bible and the relationship of the witnesses to its text can hardly be exaggerated. The agreement in readings in those fragments with other witnesses such as the LXX, Chronicles, and Josephus has illustrated the variety of early textual families and has confirmed the value of these witnesses for attempts to restore the original readings (Albright, 1955; Cross, 1964, 1974; Ulrich). These witnesses have indicated the haplographic nature and generally inferior quality of the MT in Samuel. The 4QSam a fragments also led to the discovery that the text of Samuel used by the Chronicler was of a different type from that of the MT. Hence, the significance of the fragments goes beyond the bounds of "lower criticism" in affording us a more precise understanding of the Chronicler's editorial techniques.

While the evidence of the "Dead Sea Scrolls" has led to new treatments of the textual history and witnesses in many books (Ulrich, pp. 33-36), the books of Kings have generally been neglected in this respect. This neglect has been due to the overshadowing of the Kings material by the startling revelations of the fragments for Samuel. Since the Qumran material for Kings is minimal, some scholars have assumed that the witnesses to the text of Kings belong to the same textual families as they do in Samuel. Thus, since the Chronicler used a text of Samuel of a different type from the MT, it is assumed that the
Chronicler’s text of Kings was also of a different type from the MT (Lemke, 1965: 362-363; De Vries, lxix).

Another aspect of this neglect is related to the frequently wide variations between the MT and the LXX in Kings. In the γγ section (1 Kgs 2:12-21:43), isolated by Thackeray, the LXX attests several lengthy plus (2:35a-o; 2:46a-1; 12:24a-x) and a very different order vis-à-vis the MT, particularly in chapters 4-7, besides a plethora of briefer variants. Some have attempted to explain these differences, especially the variant order and the “miscellanies,” as tendentious changes by translators (Wevers; Gooding, 1965a, 1965b, 1965c, 1967a, 1967b). However, the agreement of 4QSam readings with the LXX against the MT would indicate that the Greek readings in Kings should be taken more seriously as representing a variant text type, particularly in the γγ section of Reigns where the Old Greek is extant.6 In short, the treatment of the textual witnesses in Kings in this century has a dash of irony. The lack of careful scrutiny of the textual witnesses to Kings has led, on the one hand, to an uncritical acceptance for Kings of the situation with regard to the Chronicler’s Vorlage of Samuel. On the other hand, some have apparently dismissed the evidence from Samuel for the LXX as an independent witness to a distinct text type as not applicable in Kings. My purpose here is to exhibit evidence that challenges both of these positions.

1 Kgs 8 is ideal as the focus for this investigation into the affiliation of the witnesses to the text of Kings because it is an extended narrative, for most of which the OG and parallels in Chronicles are extant.7 These three major witnesses are abbreviated as follows: MT of Kings = K, MT of Chronicles = C, Old Greek of Kings = OG. I shall deal with specific readings in this passage under three categories of relationships between these three witnesses: (1) OG = C ≠ K, (2) K = C ≠ OG, and (3) K ≠ C ≠ OG.

I. OG = C ≠ K

Readings in which the OG and C agree against K are few in a passage the length of 1 Kgs 8. These readings can be organized into the five categories discussed below. The references are to the verse(s) in 1 Kgs 8 and the parallel in 1 Chronicles.

A. Expansion or corruption in K

1. 8:33//6:24
   K: wsbw 'lyk
   C: wsbw
   OG: ρωσμά μάντειον = wsbw

2. 8:46//6:36
   K: 'I 'rš h'w'yb
   C: 'I 'rš
   OG: εἰς γῆν = 'I 'rš

The words 'lyk and h'w'yb appear to be expansions in K.

B. OG Vorlage is uncertain

1. 8:32,34,43,45//6:23,25,33,35
   K: hsmym
   C: mn hsmym
   OG: ek tou ouroou

In each of these verses, the OG stands in apparent agreement with C in reading the preposition. However, it is possible that the translator supplied the preposition and that his Vorlage contained the same reading as K. Even if the OG Vorlage did have mn in these cases, it would not be a strong argument for the affiliation of the Hebrew texts of Kings underlying the OG and C. It is easy to see how the preposition could have entered independently into each text, supplying a felt need for it in a text like that of K.
The Greek particle *hoti* is used more commonly for *ky*, but it can be used to translate ‘sr.

C. Difference of singular vs. plural

1. 8:15/6:4
   
   K: wbydw
   
   C: wbydyw
   
   OG: καὶ εν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ = wbydyw

2. 8:42/6:32
   
   K: wb' whtpllw
   
   C: wb'w whtpllw
   
   OG: καὶ ήγουσιν καὶ προσευξονται = wb'w whtpllw

3. 8:44/6:34
   
   K: 'I 'ybw
   
   C: 'I 'ybyw
   
   OG: επὶ τοὺς εἴχοντες αὐτοῦ = 'I 'ybyw

In each of these cases the original reading is uncertain, and it is easy to see how secondary readings could occur independently in the witnesses. They are, after all, matters of the omission or addition of a *waw* or *yod* next to another *waw* or *yod*.

D. Different order

1. 8:29/6:20
   
   K: lylh wywm
   
   C: ywmwylyh
   
   OG: ημερας καὶ νυκτος = ywm(m) wylyh

2. 8:39/6:30
   
   K: ky 'th yd't ibdk
   
   C: ky 'th ibdk yd't
   
   OG: οτι συ μουσατος οἶδας = ky 'th ibdk yd't

In both of these passages the original order is uncertain. It is possible that K is secondary and that C and the OG merely agree in the primitive reading.

E. Independent expansion likely

1. 8:26/6:17
   
   K: w'th lhy 'y'sr'l
   
   C: w'th yhwh lhy 'y'sr'l
   
   OG: καὶ υἱὸς κυρίου θεος Ισραήλ = w'th yhwh 'lhy 'y'sr'l

2. 8:27/6:18
   
   K: ky h'nmn ysb lhym 'l b'ns
   
   C: ky h'nmn ysb 'lhym 't h'dm 'l b'ns
   
   OG: οτι ει αληθεω κατοικησει ο θεος μετα ανθρωπων επι της γῆς

3. 8:63/7:5
   
   K: wyzbh slmh
   
   C: wysbh hmlk slmh
   
   OG: καὶ εὐσεβε ο βασιλευς σαλωμον = wyzbh hmlk slmh
In the examples from 8:26/6:17 and 8:63/7:5, the OG and C clearly agree in expansion. However, the expansions in these two cases are so common and so minor that they could have arisen independently in the witnesses. In 2 Chr 7:5, Paralipomena lacks "the king," indicating that the original reading in Chronicles did not include the expansion. In the case of 8:27/116:18, the OG and C seem to attest the same plus, although it is not certain that μετὰ αὐτῶν actually translates 't ἥ'δην. If these two witnesses do have the same reading it could be explained as independent expansion. Alternatively, the minus in K may be due to intentional omission motivated by a pious reluctance to have God dwelling with men. In any event, this single passage does not provide a strong argument for the affiliation of the OG and C in our sample text, especially in light of the evidence which follows.

The variants just treated in five categories represent all of the agreements of the OG and C against K in 1 Kgs 8 and its Chronicles parallel. The paucity of such agreements and the insignificance of those which do occur are striking. There is no decisive evidence in any of the readings examined for the affiliation of the OG and C against K. In no case did the OG and C agree in a clearly secondary reading that could not have arisen independently in each. This is not the result one expects to find in a narrative of this length if, as in the case of Samuel, the Chronicler’s text of Kings were more closely aligned with the OG that with the MT.

II. K = C ≠ OG

The agreements of K and C against the OG in 1 Kgs 8 are far more numerous than those cases in the category just treated. Unlike the previous category, the list of agreements of K and C against the OG in 1 Kgs 8 is too long to be given in its entirety. A partial list of the most obvious examples of agreement between the received texts in minor expansion follows.

A. Minor expansion

1. 8:6/5:7
   K, C: wyb(y)'w ḥkhnym 't ῥw'n bryt yhwh 'l mqwmw
   OG: kai εὐφυρεροῦσιν οἱ σελείς τῆς κῆπου τούτου
   εἰς τὸν τόπον αυτῆς = wyb'w ḥkhnym 't ῥw'n 'l mqwmw
   The words bryt yhwh represent an expansion.

2. 8:8/5:9
   K, C: wyhy(w) sm 'd ḥyw[y]m hzh
   This line is lacking in the OG. It appears to be a gloss or an expansion in the Hebrew witnesses.

3. 8:14/6:3
   K, C: wybrk 't ᾧ'y'sr'il
   OG: καὶ εὐλογησεν ο ραβιλες παντα Ἰσραηλ =
   wybrk hmilk 't ᾧ 'qhl y'sr'il
   The hmilk reflected in the OG is an expansion as is the qhl found in the received texts.

4. 8:17/6:7
   K, C: wyhy 'm lbb dw(y)d 'by
   OG: καὶ ἐγέρσατο ἐπὶ τῆς καρδιᾶς τοῦ παιδος
   μου = wyhy 'l lbb 'by
   The MT witnesses contain an expansion in the name "David."

5. 8:19/6:9
   K, C: rq 'th l' tbnh hbyt
   OG: σὺ οὐκ οἴκεσθε στὸν οίκον =
   'th l' tbnh hbyt
   The particle rq appears to be an expansion.
6. 8:20//6:10

K, C: k'sr dbr yhwh

OG: καθες ελαλησεν = k'sr dbr

The divine name in the Hebrew witnesses is an expansion.

7. 8:26//6:17

K: y'mn n' dbryk 'sr dbrl 'bd k dwd 'by

C: y'mn dbrk 'sr dbrl 'bd k dwd

OG: πιστῶσιν δὴ τὸ πρῶτον σου τῷ δανιὲ τῷ πατρὸ μου = y'mn n' dbrk Idwd 'by

The original reading was probably y'mn dbrk ld wd 'by. All three witnesses contain expansive elements. However, the MT witnesses agree in the expansion 'sr dbrt.

8. 8:28//6:19

K, C: wpnyt 'l tplt 'bdk w'l thtw yhwh 'lhy Ism' 'l hnh w'l htlh

OG: καὶ επιρέψει ἐπὶ τὴν δεσπόην μου κυριε
ο θεὸς Ἰσραήλ ἀκοουει τῆς τερψεως=
wpnyt 'al thny yhwh 'lhy y'sr'l Ism' hrmh

Several differences are evident in this verse between the OG on the one hand and the Hebrew witnesses on the other. However, the expressions 'l tplt 'bdk and w'l htlh in K and C appear to be expansions as the result of the frequent use of htlh in this context.

9. 8:37//6:28

K, C: 'r'b ky yhyh b'rš

OG: λίμος εοὐ γεννησεν = 'r'b ky yhyh

10. 8:38//6:29

K, C: (w)ltk 'm'k y'sr'l

This line is not reflected in the OG and seems to be an expansion.

11. 8:40//6:31

K, C: 'l pny h'dmh

OG: επι τὴν γῆν = 'l h'dmh

The word pny is an expansion.

12. 8:41//6:32

K, C: 'sr l' m'mk y'sr'l

OG: οὗ οὐκ εστὶν απὸ λαοῦ σου = 'sr l' m'mk

The name "Israel" in K and C is an expansion.

13. 8:43//6:33

K(M), C(M): lm'n yd'wn k1 'my h'rš 't smk

OG: οπως γνωσίν πάντες οἱ λαοὶ τὸ ονόμα σου = lm'n yd'wn k1 'myym 't smk

The word h'rš in the Hebrew witnesses is an expansion.

14. 8:49//6:39

K, C: 't tplt w't thtw m'syt m'sptm
This line is lacking in the OG. It appears expansionistic and has probably entered the text as the result of similar expressions in the context.

These examples illustrate the consistent agreement of the Hebrew witnesses against the OG in secondary readings. This evidence suggests two conclusions. First, it indicates the affiliation of K and C as over against the OG. This would mean that the alignment of the textual witnesses by families within Kings is different from their alignment in Samuel. Secondly, it indicates that the OG is a valuable witness to the text of Kings. To be sure, there are examples of secondary readings in the OG in 1 Kgs 8. We have already seen that the OG attests an expansion in 8:14. Other examples of secondary OG readings are given below.

B. Secondary OG Readings

1. 8:15//6:4
   K, C: brwk yhwh 'lhy y'sr'l
   OG: εὐλογήσεως κυρίου ο θεός ἱεραὶ σημερον =
       brwk yhwh 'lhy y'sr'l hywm

   The hywm reflected in the OG reading is an expansion.

2. 8:21//6:11
   K, C: bryt yhwh 'sr krt 'm btyaw
   OG: διαθήκη κυρίου ἡ διεθέτο κυρίος μετὰ τῶν
       πατέρων ημῶν = bryt yhwh 'sr krt yhwh 'm btyaw

   The second occurrence of the divine name in the text reflected by the OG
   is an expansion.

3. 8:24//6:15
   K, C: dbrt lw wtdbr bpyk
   OG: ελαλήσαι εν το στοματί σου = dbrt bpyk

The OG has lost the translation of this phrase by haplography occasioned by the recurrence originally of the word ελαλήσαι.

4. 8:27//6:18
   K, C: 'p ky hbyt hzh 'sr bnyty
   OG: πᾶν καὶ εἰκὸς εὐτυχὸς ο ὄρεισματι σου = 'p ky hbyt hzh 'sr bnyty lsmk

   "To your name" reflected in the OG is an expansion.

5. 8:29//6:21
   K, C: 'I hmqwm hzh
   OG: εἰς το τοπὸ τουτον ημέρας καὶ νυκτος =
       'I hmqwm hzh ywm wylth

   The expression "day and night" in the OG is an expansion. It has been
   brought on by the occurrence of the same expression earlier in the verse. The
   comparison of the witnesses in 1 Kgs 8 where there are parallels in Chronicles
   produces fewer secondary readings on the part of the OG than those shared by
   K and C. In general, the OG appears to represent a better text of 1 Kgs 8 than
   does the MT.

C. Other Agreements

There are other agreements of the Hebrew witnesses against the OG in 1 Kgs 8 that are more than minor expansions. These readings confirm the two conclusions suggested above. In 8:1-5//5:2-6 the received texts agree in a number of expansions against the OG.

1. 8:1-5//5:2-6
   a. 8:1//5:2
The references to the heads of the tribes and the leaders of the fathers' houses shared by K, C and 4QKgsa is expansionistic. The OG readings appear to be original, although the kl it reflects may be an expansion.

b. 8:2-3a/5:3-4a

K: wyqhlw'l hmlk slmh kl 'ys y'sr'l
byrḥ h'tnym bhg hw' ḫḥds ḥsb'y'
(3) wyb'w kl qyny y'sr'l

C: wyqhlw 'l hmlk kl 'ys y'sr'l bhg hw'
ḥḥds ḥsb'y (4) wyb'w kl qyny y'sr'l

4QKgsa: [wyqhlw 'l hmlk (slmh) kwl 'ys y'sr'l byrḥ h'tnymi bhg hw' ḫḥds ḥsb'y wyb'w kwl qyny y'sr'l]

OG: ev ṭm t'q'lyw = byrḥ h'tnym

The OG reading is again primitive. C has lost byrḥ h'tnym by haplography (homoiarchton with bhg). The additional information in which the Hebrew witnesses essentially agree is the result of expansion.

c. 8:4//5:5

K: wy'lw 'tm hkhnym whlwym
C: h'lw 'tm hkhnym hlwym

4QKgsa: [wy'lw 'tm hkhnym whlwym]

The OG lacks this line entirely, and it again appears to be an expansion in which the Hebrew witnesses essentially agree.

d. 8:5//5:6

K: whmlk slmh
C: whmlk slmh

4QKgsa: whmlk slmh

OG: καὶ οἱ πασι Ισραηλευς = whmlk

Solomon's name is an expansion shared by K, C, and 4QKgsa.

e. 8:5//5:6

K: wkl 'dt y'sr'l hnwa'dym 'lyw
C: wkl 'dt y'sr'l hwda'dym 'lyw

OG: καὶ πασ Ισραηλ = wkl y'sr'l

'dt and hw'dym 'lyw are again expansions attested by the received texts but not by the OG. 4QKgsa is not extant at this point.

The language and content of these expansions or glosses are striking. The expansions all share a concern for cultic matters. This might lead one to suspect that these are the Chronicler's additions that have been secondarily added to K. However, the language of the expansions is not characteristic of Chronicles, nor for that matter, of the Deuteronomistic History. Rather, it is Priestly language. The words na'si', mateh, and 'edah are found in these pluses and are all P words. Moreover, the pluses are also attested in several cases in 4QKgsa. These verses therefore, apparently attest revision by a Priestly
The occurrence of the expansions in 4QKgs but not in the OG indicates that the revisions were incorporated within a single text type which the received texts of Kings and Chronicles as well as 4QKgs reflect. Minor differences in K and C in these verses indicate that their similarity is not the result of secondary borrowing from one received text to the other.

2. 1 Kgs 8:12-13 (MT): ‘z ‘mr slmh yhwh ‘mr lskw b’rpl (13)

   bnh bnry byt zbl lk mkwn lsbtk ‘wlmym

2 Chr 6:1-2 (MT): ‘z ‘mr slmh yhwh ‘mr lskw b’rpl (2)

   w’ny bnry byt lk wmkwn lsbtk ‘wlmym

1 Kgs 8:53a (OG): tote ekalhisen solarwv uper tou oikou

   ws sunetlesen tou oikodomyias autou

   npiou enypurisein ev o玭c1wv kuriou eivei

   tou katoikeiv en yvorgou oikodomyasou

   oikou mou oikou ekpereia seantw tou

   katoikeiv epí kaiosileiose

On the basis of the OG, Gray (pp. 195-196) has attempted to restore the poetic fragment here as follows:

   yhwh ha-semes hekin (or hophia) ba-samayim

   wayyo’mer lskon ba’arapel

   bano baniti beyt zebul leka

   makon lesibeka ‘olamil

While his reconstruction may not be correct in every detail, Gray is certainly justified in seeing the OG as reflecting a better text of the poem than is preserved in the Hebrew witnesses. The original placement of the poem is uncertain. However, the fact that the K and C essentially agree in a corrupt reading is significant. Just as significant is the fact that they do not agree exactly. Where K has bnh bnry C has ‘ny bnry. This indicates that these two witnesses agree not because of secondary appropriation of one to the other but because they reflect the same textual family.

3. 8:37//6:28

   K: sdpwn yrqwn ‘rbh hasyl

   C: sdpwn wyrqwn ‘rbh whysyl

   OG: empuramos proouches eurwvth = sdpwn ‘rbh

   yrqwn

The Hebrew witnesses detail four kinds of disaster while the OG mentions only three. There is no reason to suspect haplography in the OG text, and the Hebrew witnesses apparently attest conflation in the additional term ‘hasyl.

III. K ≠ C ≠ OG

In each of the three previous passages the OG attests the best text and the Hebrew witnesses agree in a secondary reading. One final example where the witnesses vary widely again illustrates the superiority of the OG text and the affiliation of the MT witnesses. This final example comes from the last two verses of 1 Kgs 8. The narrative in 2 Chr 7:4-10 is not as closely parallel to 1 Kgs 8:62-66 as it has been for 1 Kgs 8:1-50a. This is due principally to the Chronicler’s editorial reworking of the material. The evidence of 8:65-66/7:8-10 is important, nonetheless, because the nature of the text underlying the Chronicler’s interpretive revisions is obvious.

1 Kgs 8:65-66 (MT):

   wy’s slmh b’t hhw’ t hhg wkl y’sr’l ‘mw qhl gdwl mlbw’ hmt ‘d nhl

   mrym lnpy yhwh ‘lhyw sb’t yymw wb’t yymw ‘rb’h ‘sr ywm (66) bywm

   hmywy sb’t h’m wybykw t’ hmlk wyikw l’lhyw ‘smhym wtbyb l’kl

   htwbh ‘sr’ ‘sh yhwh l’dwd ‘bdw wly’sr’l ‘mw

2 Chr 7:8-10 (MT):

   wy’s slmh b’t hhw’ t hhg wkl y’sr’l ‘mw qhl gdwl mlbw’ hmt ‘d nhl

   mrym lnpy yhwh ‘lhyw sb’t yymw wb’t yymw ‘rb’h ‘sr ywm (66) bywm

   hmywy sb’t h’m wybykw t’ hmlk wyikw l’lhyw ‘smhym wtbyb l’kl

   htwbh ‘sr’ ‘sh yhwh l’dwd ‘bdw wly’sr’l ‘mw
wy’s shnh ‘t hhg b’t hhy’ sb’t ynym wkł y’srs’l ‘mw qhl gdwl m’d mlbw’ hmt ‘d nhł msrym (9) wy’s sw bywm hsmyny ‘sr’ ky hakt hmezbl ‘sw sb’t ynym whgh sb’t ynym (10) wbywm ‘srym whsh lḥds hsb’y sỉ ‘t h’m l’hlyhm ‘smhym w’twby lb ‘l htwby ‘sr ‘sh yhw ldwyd wslmh wly’srs’l ‘mw

1 Kgs 8:65-66 (OG):

kai epoīnēs σαλωμον την εορτὴν εν τῇ ημέρᾳ εκείνη καὶ πας Ἰσραήλ μετ’ αὐτοῦ εκκλησία μεγάλη ἀπὸ τῆς εἰσόδου Ἡμῶν εὐς ποταμοῦ Ἀγίου ενώπιον κυρίου θεοῦ ημῶν εν τῷ ὁμών ως καθομῆσαι εἰς τὴν ημέραν τῆς καθήμενον ενώπιον κυρίου θεοῦ ημῶν επτα ημερῶν (66) καὶ εν τῇ ημέρᾳ τῇ γυμνή, εξαπεστείλει τοὺς λαοὺς καὶ εὐλογήσεις αὐτούς καὶ ἀπηλθὲν εκατός εἰς τὰς σημείας αὐτοῦ χαίροντες καὶ αγαθὴ η ἱεραῖα ἐπὶ τοὺς αγαθοὺς οἱ εποίησαν κυρίος τῷ Δαυὶδ δοῦλῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραήλ λαῷ αὐτοῦ.

wy’s slmh ‘t hhg bywm hhw’ wkł y’srs’l ‘mw qhl gdwl mbw’ hmt ‘d nhł msrym lpny yhw ‘lhwyw bbyt ‘sr bnh ‘klhm wstym w’smhymp lpny yhw ‘lhwyw sb’t ynym (66) wbywm hsmyny slh ‘t h’m wybrknw wylk ‘ys l’hlyw ‘smhym w’twby lb ‘l htwby ‘sr ‘sh yhw ldwyd ‘bdw wly’srs’l ‘mw

The most primitive reading here is that of the OG. The text type represented by K and used by the Chronicler has suffered haplography in 8:65/7:8. The phrase, “before Yahweh our God in the Temple which he built eating, drinking, and rejoicing,” is reflected in the OG but is lacking in the Hebrew witnesses. The loss of this material was triggered by homoeoteleuton in the repetition of lpny yhwwh ‘lhwyw. The ending of 8:65 in K is also corrupt. sb’t ynym occurs twice by ditography. The ditography brought about a marginal gloss, ‘rb’h ‘sr ywm, which has found its way into the text. 2 Chr 7:9 represents a further attempt by the Chronicler to clarify the reading of his Kings Vorlage. Finding a reference to two seven day periods in his text of Kings, the Chronicler distinguishes between the seven day altar dedication and the seven day cultic festival. This is particularly significant for our study, because it means that the interpretation found here in Chronicles can only be explained as based on a text of the same family as K.

Conclusions

What is of primary importance in this study is not the quantity of agreements between the Hebrew witnesses but their quality. The MT texts of 1 Kgs 8 and its parallels in Chronicles consistently agree in what the OG indicates are secondary readings. In contrast, the OG and C show no significant agreement against K. This fact suggests the affiliation of the MT witnesses. The same relationships between these witnesses hold true in other parts of 1 Kings where the OG is extant and there are parallels in Chronicles (McKenzie, 1985: excursus). The close similarity of the MT witnesses in contrast to the OG in 1 Kings cannot be explained as the result of secondary adjustment of one received text to the other for a least three reasons. First, there was no evidence in Samuel for this type of systematic revision of the MT of Samuel to the MT of Chronicles or vice-versa. Secondly, the agreement of 4QKgsa with secondary readings shared by K and C in 8:1-5 indicates that all three witnesses stand within a single textual tradition. Thirdly, minor differences between K and C in various passages that we have examined rule out secondary adjustment. This means that the situation for the Chronicler’s text of Kings is different than it is for his text of Samuel. His text of Samuel was not proto-Masoretic (or more accurately proto-Rabbinic); his text of Kings was proto-Rabbinic. Either the Chronicler changed from Samuel to Kings in the type of text he employed or, more likely, the type of text adopted by the Rabbis as the received text changed from Samuel to Kings. If the Chronicler’s text of Kings was indeed proto-Rabbinic, it has important implications for the understanding of the Chronicler’s use of his source in the Deuteronomic History. While the Chronicler’s deviations from his Samuel source, particularly in minor matters, may often be ascribed to a different text of Samuel from the MT, one must take more seriously the possibility that where the Chronicler deviates from his Kings source he is introducing his own Tendenz.
A second conclusion from the evidence of 1 Kgs 8 relates to the value of the OG as a textual witness. The nature of the LXX readings in 1 Kgs 8 argues for taking it seriously as an independent witness in the yy section of Kings where the OG is extant. This conclusion is particularly significant for the questions surrounding the OG's variant order in 1 Kgs 5-7 and the so-called "miscellanies" in various spots in the OG section of Reigns. Certainly more work is needed in evaluating these major OG variants and attempting to explain their origin. The results of our study on 1 Kgs 8 tend to corroborate Trebolle's arguments for the originality of the OG order and miscellanies (1980: especially 274-324) against Gooding's efforts to dismiss them as the work of pedantic interpreters. Clearly, Gooding's very negative position on the value of the LXX as a witness to the text of 1 Kings can no longer be maintained. The OG is not just an important independent witness to a variant text type, but the evidence indicates that it should probably be regarded, generally speaking, as the best text of 1 Kings extant.

Notes

1 This is a revision of a paper read at the 1984 SBL convention in Chicago. I am grateful to the Faculty Development Committee of Rhodes College for awarding me a grant for the summer of 1985 which enabled me to revise that presentation and to continue my research on the text of Kings.

2 See Lemke (1963, 1965) who developed the seminal ideas of Albright and Cross along these lines.

3 Trebolle (1980, 1984) also provides detailed illustrations of how the methodologies of "higher" and "lower" criticism may be used together in the analysis of a passage within Kings itself. On the importance of the Qumran discoveries in contributing to his analysis see 1980:371.

4 Exceptions to this statement are the works of Shenkel and Trebolle.

5 The texts from caves 5 and 6 are extremely fragmentary. They have been published by Baillet and Milik. None of the identified fragments from these caves contain readings from 1 Kings 8. The cave 4 fragments are unpublished. Prof. F. M. Cross has graciously allowed me access to his readings of them. They are also very few and fragmentary. Two 4QKgsa fragments are from 1Kgs 8.
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