

Text History as a Research Tool on Literary Development in the Books of
Kings: The Case of 1 Kgs 19 MT and LXX

Philippe Hugo, University of Fribourg/Switzerland

The context of my paper is the question of relationships between text criticism and redaction criticism: how can text history contribute to a better knowledge of the literary development in the books of Kings? The discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls profoundly renewed the knowledge of the most ancient transmission of the biblical text and, in particular, of the place that the Septuagint (LXX) occupies in it. Some fragments such as 4QSam^a or 4QJer^b confirm that the LXX is not the simple product of an approximation or the fantasy of translators, but is probably founded on a Hebrew text that differs from the Masoretic Text (MT).¹ If this report must not be generalized to become a methodological *a priori*, some recent research on many biblical books (Exodus, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Ezra-Nehemiah, Daniel) came to the conclusion that the Hebrew source of the LXX must represent a different literary form than that of the MT, and is sometimes older than it.² In the first century B.C., the Hebrew Bible was attested to by a multiplicity of textual forms to which the fragments of Qumran bore witness. This multiplicity appears to be the result of the entangling of the textual and literary history of the Hebrew Bible.³ In other words, the period of the most ancient transmission of the text was again marked by some activities of literary creation. It becomes difficult to make an airtight distinction between the period of the production of the text and the period of its transmission.⁴ Thus, the two disciplines (text criticism and redaction criticism) find themselves modified. On the one hand, text criticism is given a new task: more than purifying the text of its errors of transmission, it must identify (in the textual witnesses at its disposal) the eventual distinct literary forms and place them in the course of the history of the text.⁵ On the other hand, redaction criticism must reevaluate its results in light of the textual witnesses (in particular the LXX) that attest to possible literary forms more ancient than the MT. It is to this debate that I intend to contribute, as an historian of the text, by the analysis of 1 Kings 19.

¹ Cf. J. Trebolle-Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible. An Introduction to the History of the Bible* (Leiden, Grand Rapids MI: Brill, Eerdmans, 1998), 284-290.

² See the state of research in P. Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 R 18-19* (OBO 217; Fribourg, Göttingen: Academic Press, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 74-82.

³ D. Barthélemy, "L'enchevêtrement entre l'histoire textuelle et l'histoire littéraire entre la Septante et le Texte Massorétique," in *Découvrir la Bible* (LD Hors Série; Paris: Cerf, 2000), 161-183.

⁴ Some authors think that these two periods should no longer be distinguished, but that they represent a unique process of development of the text, for example: H.J. Stipp, "Textkritik – Literarkritik – Textentwicklung. Überlegungen zur exegetischen Aspektsystematik," *ETL* 66 (1990): 143-159; E. Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids MI, Leiden: Eerdmans, Brill, 1999), 99-120.

⁵ Cf. A. Schenker, P. Hugo, "Histoire du texte et critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament dans la recherche récente," in *L'enfance de la Bible hébraïque* (ed. A. Schenker, P. Hugo; Le monde de la Bible 54; Genève: Labor et Fides, 2005), 11-33, especially. 29-31.

1. METHODOLOGICAL PRELIMINARIES

When one carefully reads the MT parallel to the LXX in the books of Kings (as I will do for 1 Kings 19), one finds a multitude of small differences. This observation poses a series of questions to the research on text history to which several recent studies have attempted to bring some elements of response.⁶ The first question concerns the nature of the differences: are they strictly textual, that is to say due to corruptions in the manuscript transmission or due to harmonizations, assimilations, or explanations, or should one consider them to be literary, such as the witness of voluntary and thoughtful intentions in order to modify the narrative and theological sense of an account?⁷ Once the corruptions are identified and explained, one can confirm the literary nature of the other differences. It is thus suitable to wonder who produced them: do they find their origin in the translation techniques, in the ideological interpretation of the translators (Wevers⁸) or even the midrashic methods employed by the later Greek editors (Gooding,⁹ van Keulen¹⁰)? Are they rather witness to two different Hebraic forms? If one admits that the LXX generally represents Hebrew *Vorlage* distinct from the MT, how must be judged the relationship between these two Hebrew texts? Three models are possible: first, the two literary forms attest to two parallel currents developed from a common source (Stipp,¹¹ Böseneker¹²); second, the Hebrew source of the LXX is product of literary activity of the midrashic type (Talshir¹³); third, the predecessor of the MT (the proto-MT) is the result of a work of a literary edition which (for narrative, theological, and ideological motives) modified the most ancient form attested to by the *Vorlage* of the LXX (Trebolle Barrera,¹⁴ Schenker,¹⁵ Hugo).

Each variant, each passage and each biblical book needs to be submitted to these questions. In fact, the most ancient transmission of the biblical text was never totally homogeneous and all the mentioned phenomena are attested to in turn. However, the analysis of large narrative

⁶ See the state of research in Hugo, *Élie*, 85-113.

⁷ See the criteria of distinctions between textual and literary differences in A. Schenker, "Der Ursprung des massoretischen Textes im Licht der literarischen Varianten im Bibeltex," to appear in *Textus* (2007).

⁸ J.W. Wevers, "Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuaginta Text of 1 Kings ii 12-xxi 43," *OTS* 8 (1950): 300-322; *idem*, Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Books of the Kingdoms (3 K. 22 :1-4 K. 25 :30)," *CBQ* 14 (1952): 40-56.

⁹ D.W. Gooding, "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969): 1-29; *idem*, "Text-sequence and Translation-revision in 3 Reg. IX 10-X 33," *VT* 19 (1969): 448-463; *idem*, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reg. 2* (MSSOTS 4; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

¹⁰ P.S.F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Salomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11* (VTSup 104; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

¹¹ H.J. Stipp, *Elischa – Propheten – Gottesmänner. Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Elischazyklus und verwandter Texte, rekonstruiert auf der Basis von Text- und Literarkritik zu 1 Kön 20.22 und 2 Kön 2-7* (ATAT 24; St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1987).

¹² J. Böseneker, *Text und Redaktion. Untersuchungen zum hebräischen und griechischen Text von 1 Könige 1-11* (Ph.D. diss.: Rostock, 2000).

¹³ Z. Talshir, *The Alternative Story. 3 Kingdoms 12:24 A-Z* (JBS 6; Jerusalem: Simor, 1993); *idem*, "Literary Design – A Criterion for Originality? A Case Study: 3 Kgdms 12:24a-z; 1 K 11-14," in *La double transmission du texte biblique. Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (ed. Y. Goldman, C. Uehlinger; OBO 179; Fribourg, Göttingen: Editions Universitaires, Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 2000), 41-57.

¹⁴ J. Trebolla-Barrera, *Salomón y Jeroboán. Historia de la recensión de 1 Reyes 2-12;14* (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis, Dissertationes 3; Salamanca-Jerusalem, 1980); *idem*, *Jehú y Joás. Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11* (Institución San Jerónimo 17; Valencia, 1984); *idem*, *Centena in Libros Samuelis et Regum. Variantes textuales y composición literaria en los Libros de Samuel y Reyes* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 47; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989).

¹⁵ A. Schenker, *Septante et Texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1Rois 2-14* (CahRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000); *idem*, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (OBO 199; Fribourg, Göttingen: Academic Press, Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 2004).

units (passages, chapters, or a whole of chapters) permits one progressively to extract the general tendency of the evolution of a text.

My study on 1 Kings 17-18¹⁶ led me to confirm the hypothesis which was already formulated by Julio Treballe-Barrera and Adrian Schenker concerning the antiquity of the Hebrew source of the LXX and of the secondary or editorial character of the proto-MT.¹⁷ Generally the MT and the LXX attest to two distinct literary forms of the history of the prophet Elijah, two faces of Elijah (*Les deux visages d'Élie*). Except for some rare exceptions, the MT bears witness to a coherent revision project, that can be summarized in three principal features. First, the prophetic theology is modified by the accentuation of the supremacy of the action of God over that of the prophet, the obedience of the prophet to the divine word and its fidelity to the Torah. Second, the portrait of King Ahab is also modified in order to point out his guiltiness. Finally, the idolatry of the royal house is rendered more concrete and overwhelming. The detailed examination of the chapter 19 aims to pursue this inquiry and to test these conclusions.

2. ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT

The questions posed in the preceding paragraph will guide my analysis of the differences between the MT and the LXX¹⁸ in 1 Kings 19. I will therefore begin by identifying the phenomena that are clearly of textual nature – the corruptions (2.1), the explanations (2.2), the harmonizations (2.3) – in order progressively (2.4) to move on to the literary interventions in which one discern a narrative (2.5) and theoretical (2.6) intention. With this approach, one must not forget that the text must be read as a unit and that, if it is suitable to distinguish the differences and to classify them according to their nature, one must not proceed with an atomistic reading of the text. The text is a sense unit that has undergone a textual and literary evolution in its most ancient transmission.

2.1 TEXTUAL CORRUPTIONS

Textual corruptions are the first category of differences. To this group probably belongs the most important difference of the chapter (materially speaking), in verse 2. The LXX causes Jezebel to say εἰ σὺ εἶ Ἠλίου καὶ ἐγὼ Ἐζάβελ, “if you are Elijah, myself, (I am) Jezebel.” This “plus” is attested to by the whole of the Greek translation as well as by the *Vetus Latina* (VL): *Et dixit : Si tu es Helias, et ego sum Iezabel, Et dixit : Haec faciant mihi Dii...*¹⁹ Numerous authors since Thenius (1849) estimate that this phrase translated from a Hebrew text is probably the most ancient form: אַם אַתָּה אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה וְאֲנִי אִיזָבֵל.²⁰ In fact, the addition of

¹⁶ As well as affiliated texts : 1 R 19 (partially), 1 R 20,1-34, 1 R 21, 2 R 4,18-37.

¹⁷ See my synthesis Hugo, *Élie*, 321-330.

¹⁸ It is generally the *Codex Vaticanus* (B) that represents the Old Greek in this section of Reigns. I will therefore cite this text in the present article with the exception that I will point out later. For the history of the text of the Old Greek in the books of Reigns, see P. Hugo, “Le Grec ancien des Livres des Règnes. Une histoire et un bilan de la recherche,” in *Sôfer Mahîr. Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (ed. Y.A.P. Goldman, A. van der Kooij, R.D. Weis; VTSup 110; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2006), 113-141.

¹⁹ VL 91-95: A. Moreno Hernández (ed.), *Las Glosas marginales de Vetus Latina en las Biblias Vulgatas españolas. 1-2 Reyes* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 49; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1992), 115.

²⁰ O. Thenius, *Die Bücher der Könige* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 9; Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1849), 227; A. Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige* (Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments A. III; Nördlingen: Beckschen Buchhandlung, 1887), 370; C.F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), 229; J. Gray, *I & II Kings. A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press LTD, 1977³), 406-407; S.J. DeVries, *I Kings* (WBC 12/1; Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1985), 233.

that type of formula without a parallel in the Old Testament is not really plausible; thus, its difficulty speaks in favor of its originality²¹. The question is therefore to know how this clause disappeared in the MT.²² Otto Eissfeldt gave the most convincing explanation.²³ Based on the VL, he shows that the Old Greek certainly read a Hebrew text in which the statement of Jezebel contained two elements, each one introduced by לֵאמֹר, translated by *et dixit*. The VL (as it also happens sometimes in Reigns²⁴) represents here the most ancient form of the LXX which disappeared from the Greek witnesses. The Hebrew *Vorlage* would therefore contain a text as: לֵאמֹר אִם אֵתָה אֵלֶיהוּ וְאֵנִי אֵיזְבֵּל לֵאמֹר כֹּה יֵעֲשׂוּן אֱלֹהִים... The scribe's error consists of passing from the first לֵאמֹר to the second, leaving out the part of the intermediate phrase. Therefore, the omission of Jezebel's violent interrogation is due to a *homoioteleuton*, the passage from the same to the same. This is at least a provisional conclusion (cf. below 2.5).

One encounters a second possible corruption in verse 11. During the passage of the wind before Elijah, the *Codex Vaticanus* (B) does not deny the presence of the Lord in the wind, but says: καὶ πνεῦμα μέγα κραταῖον διαλύον ὄρη καὶ συντριβὸν πέτρας ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐν τῷ πνεύματι κύριου, "and a great wind broke the mountains and crushed the rock in front of the Lord, in the Lord's wind." All the other witnesses from the Greek translation, except for the citations from the text by Origen,²⁵ read in the negation here οὐκ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι κύριος, "but the Lord (was not) in the wind." The syntax leads me to think that this is not an error internal to the Greek, but rather the omission of the negation in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. In fact, besides the absence of the negation, B contains a genitive κύριου. One understands it very well if the translator had read a text such as: וּמִשְׁבֵּר סְלַעִים לְפָנַי יְהוָה: בְּרוּחַ יְהוָה. A corruption internal to the Greek would not have necessarily reconciled the syntax. I think therefore that the error is already found in the Hebrew source of the Old Greek. Since it is probably a corruption, it remains difficult to know exactly how this negation was left out, but in light of the fact that there are so many negations in this passage it makes the phenomenon of the omission of this negation plausible.

2.2 NAMING OF THE CHARACTERS

A second type of difference of a textual nature (that is to say attributable to a scribe) is the more or less spontaneous or deliberate explanations, which tend to clarify the account by specifying or naming characters, the subject or object of the verbs. It is a common phenomenon in the LXX, maybe even attributable to the translator. For example in verses 3,

²¹ In fact, I think that the lack of parallel is an argument for the authenticity of the formula. It is hard to see it as secondary in the Hebrew and even harder to see it as having this formula as well in the Greek: *pace* G. Hentschel, *Die Elijaerzählungen. Zum Verhältnis von historischem Geschehen und geschichtlicher Erfahrung* (ETS 33; Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1977), 66; B. Lehnart, *Prophet und Könige im Nordreich Israel. Studien zur sogenannten vorklassischen Prophetie im Nordreich Israel anhand der Samuel-, Elija- und Elischa-Überlieferungen* (VTSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 242.

²² Cf. B. Stade, F. Schwally, *The Books of Kings. Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text* (SBOT 9; Leipzig: Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1904), 156; J.A. Montgomery, H.S. Gehman, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Book of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951), 316-317.

²³ O. Eissfeldt, "Bist Du Elia, so bin Ich Isebel" (1.Kön 19,2)," in *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS Baumgartner* (VT Supl 16; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 65-70; *idem*, "Nachträge zu 'Adrammelek und Damarus' und zu 'Bist Du Elia, so bin Ich Isebel' (1.Kön 19,2)," *BiOr* 26 (19 69): 182-184.

²⁴ For this phenomenon of the VL as the only witness of the Old Greek, see my synthesis in Hugo, *Élie*, 48-52. We can mention for example the important studies of J. Treballe-Barrera, "From the *Old Latin*, through the *Old Greek* to the *Old Hebrew* (2 Kings 10:23-25)," *Textus* 11 (1984): 17-36; *idem*, "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Books of Kings (1Ki. 18:27 and 2 Ki. 20:11)," *Textus* 13 (1986): 85-94.

²⁵ Cf. A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1965²), 95.

6, 10, and 14, the LXX makes the subject of the verb explicit by naming Elijah, Ἠλίου,²⁶ just as Elisha is named in verse 20. In verse 1, the Greek specifies Jezebel as the wife of Ahab, γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ. One encounters the same phenomenon when dealing with personal pronouns, for example in verse 9 (MT), וַיִּצְמַח לֵי, and in verse 10 LXX, καὶ ζητούσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν.

Apart from these insignificant phenomena, the MT of this chapter attests to some “plusses” that seem to be explanations as well. These additions (if they are indeed additions) are not as spontaneous and fall under the head of certain types of narrative harmonizations. In verse 2, the MT specifies that Jezebel sent a messenger, מַלְאָךְ, to Elijah. The verb שָׁלַח in this context does not need an object complement, and the LXX represents a completely adequate formulation.²⁷ It seems more likely that the complement has been added in the MT instead of suppressed in the LXX.

In verse 5, MT attests once again to the same term, which is absent in the LXX: וַהֲנִיחַ זֶה מַלְאָךְ נֹגַע בּוֹ, and ἰδοὺ τις ἤψατο αὐτοῦ, “an angel / someone touched him.” One sees this term again in verse 7, attested to in Greek by ὁ ἄγγελος. It is very likely that the MT harmonized these two verses by introducing the subject which was already explicit in verse 5.²⁸ The two passages (v. 2 and v. 5-7) and their mention of מַלְאָךְ could be voluntarily tied in the MT: to the messenger of death sent by Jezebel, God responds with a messenger of life, an angel who comes to feed and comfort Elijah.

In verse 20, one perceives what is probably the same type of expansion in the “plus” of the MT to Elisha’s response: : וְשָׁקַח-נָא לְאָבִי וּלְאִמִּי, “Let me kiss my father and my mother please.” It is even more likely that this is coming from an addition rather than from suppression.²⁹

Finally, I would like to highlight a final case that could be classified in this category of spontaneous explanations, even if it is not talking about a person here. In verse 21, the MT contains a “plus” once again in a phrase in which the order is also different from the LXX. The Hebrew presents the sacrifice of Elisha in this way: וַיִּזְבַּח וּבִכְלֵי הַבָּקָר בְּשֵׁלֶם הַבָּשָׂר, “and he sacrificed it (the pair of oxen), and with the coupling of the oxen he cooked them the meat, and he gave to the people.” The LXX, in a different order contains the same logic: καὶ ἔθυσεν καὶ ἤψησεν αὐτὰ ἐν τοῖς σκεύεσι τῶν βοῶν καὶ ἔδωκεν τῷ λαῶ, “and he sacrificed and he cooked it (the yoke of oxen) with the coupling of the oxen and gave to the people.” Everything leads us to think that הַבָּשָׂר is a note to explain the masculine plural suffix of the verb בָּשַׁל.³⁰

If we establish that the LXX has the tendency to specify the name of the subjects, these few examples show us above all that, on a level that we must still qualify as textual, the MT introduced explanatory notes in order to aid comprehension.

2.3 DEVELOPMENT OF THE FORMULAE INDICATING GOD

The following phenomenon is on a fine line between the spontaneous gloss of a textual nature and the theological intervention of an editor. One observes two occurrences where the MT attests to formulas in reference to God, which are more developed. In verse 8 first of all, the

²⁶ In v. 19 the name of Elijah (MT) does not appear in the LXX. I wonder if the sequence of the phrase וַיִּעֲבֹר אֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל and the graphic proximity of the two last words might have led to the omission of the proper name.

²⁷ Cf. Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 156, followed by Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 316.

²⁸ Cf. B.P. Robinson, “Elijah at Horeb, 1 Kings 19:1-18: A Coherent Narrative?” *RB* 98 (1991): 513-536, esp. 514.

²⁹ Cf. Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 158.

³⁰ Cf. Thenius, *Könige*, 232-233; Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 158; Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 318 ; Gray, *Kings*, 407; DeVries, *1 Kings*, 238.

MT names the destination of Elijah's journey **הַר הַאֱלֹהִים חֲרֵב**, “the mountain of God, Horeb.” The absence of the mention of God in the LXX should be noted, for in Ex 3:1, where one finds the exact same expression, this mention is also absent from the Greek. Montgomery estimates that the mention of God was suppressed by the LXX in the two passages, for only Zion is the mountain of the Lord.³¹ But this argument can be countered with the fact that the context of the only three other occurrences of the expression **הַר הַאֱלֹהִים** lead one to attribute them to Horeb, Ex 18:5; 24:13; 4:27. Even though one cannot conclude the question in a definitive manner, it seems to me more reasonable to think that the MT harmonized these designations by adding **הַאֱלֹהִים** to it.³²

If my conclusion is accurate, it leads us to question once again certain conclusions of the redaction criticism, according to which an ancient compositional layer only contained the expression “the mountain of God” in Ex. 3:1 and 1 Kings 19:8, as in other cited passages. The name of Horeb would have been introduced in a later redaction.³³ The absence of **הַאֱלֹהִים** in the Hebrew source of the LXX leads me to conclude the opposite. Relying only on the subject of the redactional character of the designation of Sinai as Horeb, the textual witness cannot say anything further.

The second case concerns the name “YHWH Lord of hosts,” **לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת**, translated in verses 10 and 14 by **τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι** in B.³⁴ One finds, in the whole of Samuel and Kings, only one other time that this expression **יהוה אלהי צבאות** is used (in 2 Samuel 5:10) and the LXX does not even have an equivalent for **אלהים**. In contrast, the expression **יהוה צבאות** appears thirteen times³⁵ in the same literary body and it is translated in a very diverse manner.³⁶ The fact is that the Hebrew source of the LXX contains an equivalent to **אלהים** twice, which is not verified in the MT: 1 Sam 1:3, **θεός** and 1:11, **ελωα**, the transliteration proves that the word was in the *Vorlage* of the Greek.³⁷ It does not seem possible to me to draw a conclusion from the tendency to complete the divine name in one or the other textual form. The fact is that the most complete form (i.e. the form with **אלהים**) is most likely secondary.

2.4 NARRATIVE AND RHETORICAL HARMONIZATIONS

The fourth type of difference between the MT and the LXX is at the frontier between the textual and the literary. It concerns some cases in which the narrative strategy or the rhetorical structure of the account is modified or harmonized without so much as really transforming its meaning. The tie between these questions raised by redaction criticism is even more apparent. Two cases from chapter 19 are classified in this section.

The first case concerns the repetition of the formulation in verses 4 and 5, **תחת רתם אחד**, “under a broom tree.” The two formulations already pose a small question in Hebrew since

³¹ Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 318.

³² Cf. Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 157.

³³ See W. Thiel, “Deuteronomistische Redaktionsarbeit in den Elia-Erzählungen,” in *Congress Volume : Leuven 1989* (ed. J.A. EMERTON; VTSup 43; Leiden-New York: Brill, 1991), 148-171, esp. 165-166; S. Otto, *Jehu, Elia und Elisa. Die Erzählung von der Jehu-Revolution und die Komposition der Elia-Elisa-Erzählungen* (BWANT 152; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 157.

³⁴ The Antiochian witnesses, except 82 (o), have **τῷ κυρίῳ ἑὼ παντοκράτορι** in verse 14; **ἑὼ** was probably introduced by the harmonization in the MT.

³⁵ 1 Sam 1:3,11; 4:4; 15:2; 17:45; 2 Sam 6:2,18; 7:8,26,27; 1 R 18:5; 2 R 3:14; et 2 R 19:31 where **צבאות** appears in the *Qere*.

³⁶ On the questions raised by the diversity of the translation from **צבאות** and the problem of the *kaige* recension, see Z. Talshir, “The Representation of the Divine Epithet **צבאות** in the Septuagint and the Accepted Division of the Books of Kingdoms,” *JQR* 78 (1987): 57-75.

³⁷ In one case, the expression is not attested to at all by the Old Greek 1 Sam 4:4.

verse 4 gives in the *Ketiv* the feminine תַּחַת , corrected by the *Qere* to masculine as seen in verse 5. The two other occurrences of the substantive תַּחַת , (which designate a bushy tree, probably the broom tree) are also in the masculine (Ps 120:4 translated by ἔρημικός and Job 30:4 rendered by ἄλιμον). The LXX does not have the same formulation in the two verses, but ὑποκάτω ῥαθμέν, “underneath of a *rathmen*” in verse 4 and ἐκεῖ ὑπὸ φυτόν, “there under a tree” in verse 5. The expression of verse 4 is certainly a transliteration. The Greek tradition testifies to this transliterated word in diverse manners, but it is always acting on the same phenomenon: ραθμειν in *L*, ραμαθ in *A*, *sub virgultis raphem* in *VL*.³⁸ In this sense, Rahlfs interprets the Greek and corrects it to show the transliteration better: ὑπὸ ραθμ ἔν.

How should the repetition in the MT and the difference in the LXX be interpreted? According to Stade and Šanda,³⁹ the repetition is the product of the introduction of a marginal note to the wrong place (v. 5), which was aiming to correct verse 4 due to a fault of gender. The LXX of verse 5 is itself a posterior note introduced by assimilation to the MT. Burney pursues the same hypothesis by considering that the LXX verifies the original form of verse 5 that only contains ἐκεῖ, וַשָּׁ : “he laid down and slept there.”⁴⁰ As for the rest, the LXX also annotated its text source.

Trebolle-Barrera makes an argument of a literary nature.⁴¹ He says that verse 5a (MT) is secondary and the repetition of $\text{וַשָּׁתָּה וַתֵּשֶׁב תַּחַת הַתְּרֵם}$ is explained by the editor’s desire to add the idea of lying down and sleeping, which notes a narrative evolution in relation to verse 4, “he went and sat under a broom tree.” It is therefore purely a narrative or rhetorical contrivance that the editor introduces here. Curiously, starting from the textual difference of the MT and the LXX, Trebolle comes to an explanation that ignores the Greek witness, and considers it, without explanation, as “less good” than that of the MT.

I would propose a solution midway between textual and literary explanation. One must start from the disagreement of the expression in verses 4 and 5 in the LXX. It is not impossible to interpret verse 5 in Greek as an explanation or a reliable translation of what was transliterated in verse 4. The repetition of the term would have given the translator the possibility of shedding light on the comprehension. As תַּחַת is rendered by different terms, φυτόν is a possible translation of this. However, the faithfulness of the translation in Reigns leads one to think instead that, if the translator had found an equivalent to תַּחַת , he would have also used it in verse 5. Eventually he would have added an explanation to the transliteration, but logically it would have found a place in the first occurrence of the word and not in verse 5. It therefore seems more likely to me that in verse 5 the LXX attests to a different text than the MT. What could be the Hebrew substratum of φυτόν? This word translated סִבְךָ, “undergrowth, shrub” (Gen 22:13), מַטֵּעַ, “a plant, which is planted” (Ez 31:4; 34:29) and נֶצֶר, “branch” (Deut 11:7). As φυτόν renders many rare words, it can translate another synonym here. For example, the famous הַתְּרֵם of the burning bush (Ex 3:2 three times; 3:3; 3:4; Deut 33:16), but this one is systematically translated by βάλτος. The word תְּרֵם is the most plausible. One encounters it in the sense of the “shrub” in Gen 2:5 (χλωρός) and 21:15 (ἐλάτη), Job 30:4.7 (ἄλιμος, -). Two arguments make me inclined to hypothesize that the

³⁸ Moreno Hernández, *Las Glosas marginales*, 115. Just like the *VL*, some Greek witnesses specify the text by making the transliteration be preceded by ἀρκευθον which forms a repetition: 247 (x) et 554 (z); the Antiochian 127 (c₂) adds the same word under the line. These corrections follow Aquila.

³⁹ Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 158; A. Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige* (EHAT 9.1; Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1911) 446; followed by Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 317.

⁴⁰ Burney, *Kings*, 230, followed by Gray, *Kings*, 406, and E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der König. 1. Kön. 17- 2. Kön. 25* (ATD 11,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1985), 224, as well as BHS.

⁴¹ J. Trebolle-Barrera, *Centena in Libros Samuelis et Regum. Variantes textuales y composición literaria en los Libros de Samuel y Reyes* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 47; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989), 142-143.

LXX read $\eta\psi$ here. First of all, the syntactical context is close to that of Gen 21:15 with the idea of being beneath ($\eta\tau\alpha$) the shrub. Secondly, Job 30:4 puts the shrubs and the broom trees in exactly the same parallel phrase: $\eta\kappa\tau\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\iota\ \mu\lambda\iota\chi\ \epsilon\lambda\iota\psi\eta\ \omega\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \eta\tau\alpha\mu\iota\ \lambda\ \chi\alpha\mu\mu$, “they gathered salt herbs under the bushes, and the root of the broom tree was their food,” which are translated into Greek by the same word $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$. One can therefore suppose that $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\ \phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ translates a text like, $\psi\ \eta\tau\alpha\tau\ \eta\psi\ (\text{אחד})$.

In text criticism, two identical forms have more of a chance of being secondary and harmonized, whereas two different forms are probably originals. I think that we are dealing with a similar case in this passage, the ancient form being attested to by the Hebrew source of the LXX. The MT manifests well a narrative and rhetorical evolution, as Treballe shows: Elijah walks then sits under a broom tree (v. 4a); he complains to the Lord and expresses his hopelessness (v. 4b), then he sleeps under the same broom tree (v. 5a). I think that the MT specified the $\eta\psi$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}$) contained in the *Vorlage* of the Greek by replacing the possible $\eta\psi$ (or one of its synonyms) by the $\eta\tau\alpha$ of verse 4 in order to clarify that he is talking about the same place. If the sense of the account is not modified by it, it is clarified and harmonized. We are at the limit of the literary intervention in the textual transmission.

A second case of the same type is found in the sequence of verses 5-8. I have already talked elsewhere about this question that I am taking up again while adding some elements to it.⁴² In the cycle of Elijah, one finds what I call an “order/execution” construction. I have shown that generally the MT is more faithful in literally aligning the executions with the orders given by Elijah or by God. Now precisely in the present case, it is the LXX that is apparently more faithful to this construction, since in the command of the angel (or of $\tau\iota\varsigma$) in verse 5, “rise and eat,” the Greek makes the execution correspond to verse 6 “he rose (absent in the MT), and ate and drank,” $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\epsilon\nu$. The order is then repeated in verse 6 before finally being literally accomplished and in the same terms as in the LXX and the MT in verse 8, “he rose, he ate and drank,” $\omega\iota\kappa\mu\ \omega\iota\alpha\kappa\lambda\ \omega\iota\sigma\tau\eta$. If we can not exclude the possibility of a harmonization in the LXX which would complete this construction, I do not think that we can exclude the inverse argument which is founded on the narrative logic either. In fact, in the MT the narrative structure is progressive, while in the LXX it is simply repetitive (two identical orders have as a consequence two identical actions). In the MT, at the angel’s first order, Elijah does not completely obey since he does not rise but rather eats, drinks, and lies down again. It is only at the angel’s second command that Elijah rises, eats and drinks in order to then leave “in the strength of this food.” This narrative finesse is not accidental. If the MT is habitually more faithful to the order/execution construction, this infringement of the stylistic rule respects the meaning: the MT precisely shows that Elijah does not completely obey until the second injunction of the angel; there is a change in his behavior. This phenomenon seems to me probably to be secondary, a type of rhetorical intervention at the border of the literary intervention.

Treballe-Barrera⁴³ introduces another element in the discussion that I did not discuss in my book. He notes that certain Antiochian witnesses, 82 (o), 127 (c₂) 93 (e₂), are shorter between verse 6 and 8 than the other Greek witnesses and also that of the MT. In fact, after the first execution of the order in verse 6, “he rose and ate and drank,” the account immediately follows in verse 8, which continues “and he walked in the strength of the food.” The short form skips the fact that Elijah lies down again, in this manner until after the second intervention of the angel and the second execution. Treballe rightly shows that two conclusions are possible to explain this “minus.” It can first of all come from an internal

⁴² Hugo, *Élie*, 314-315.

⁴³ Treballe-Barrera, *Centena*, 143-144.

textual accident in the Greek by *homoioteleuton*: the scribe would have passed from the first phrase καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔπιεν in verse 6 to that of verse 8 which would have led to the omission of the central part. This is the reasoning I consider to be the most likely.⁴⁴ But he notes shortly after that it is not impossible to interpret this passage as an addition, marked by the literary phenomenon of *Wiederaufnahme*; an editor repeating a phrase in order to introduce a new idea. In this case, these witnesses would attest to a literary Hebrew form that is older and the MT would have developed the narration in order to introduce the idea of progression in Elijah's reaction and in order to identify the person in verse 5 LXX, τῆς, an angel of YHWH, a phenomenon which I talk about earlier.

To sum it all up, whether one adopts Treballe's explanation – which I think is very unlikely – or that which is more simple (the one that I proposed) the MT is the product of a rhetorical type of literary development which refines the narration, without radically changing the reading of it.

2.5 EXPLICIT MODIFICATIONS OF THE NARRATIVE LOGIC OF THE ACCOUNT

More so than the differences that I just analyzed, this fifth category of variants is of the clearly literary type. The differences (which sometimes remain relatively small materially speaking) have some narrative and/or ideological consequences of such an importance that it is not possible for them to be accidental. I will classify here three cases from chapter 19.

The first difference classified in this section concerns the reaction of Elijah (v. 3) to Jezebel's threat (v. 2). According to the MT, “he saw, rose and fled for his soul” (in order to save his life), וַיֵּרָא וַיִּקַּם וַיִּלֶךְ אֶל-נַפְשׁוֹ. The LXX, the Vulgate, some Hebrew manuscripts,⁴⁵ as well as Flavius Josephus⁴⁶ attest the same consonantal text but the first verb is vocalized נִרְיָא, “he feared,” καὶ ἐφοβήθη Ἡλίου. This form is understood very well in the narrative logic, it goes together even better than the MT. It is natural for Elijah to fear Jezebel's violent threat and it is natural for this fear to cause him to flee. Now, this is precisely the problem that raises this issue. In the wake of authors who correct the MT,⁴⁷ Carmel McCarthy⁴⁸ and Dominique Barthélemy⁴⁹ have rightly shown that the vocalization in “to see” is a secondary euphemism, a *tiqqûn soferim* (correction of the scribes): it does not adequately describe the prophet of the Lord as terrified when faced with the threat of an idolatrous queen. It authenticates the prophetic action faced with the royal apostasy. If this modification changes the portrait of Elijah, it has consequences on the representation of Jezebel herself: is the queen a threat to the prophet? The MT seems to want to minimize this danger, or at least its repercussions on Elijah.

⁴⁴ This phenomenon only concerns a part of the witnesses and not the whole Antiochian group, which gives it less likelihood of representing the ancient text. Moreover, the critical edition of Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz does not hold this reading as the original form of the Antiochian text: N. Fernández Marcos, J.R. Busto Saiz (eds.), *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega. II 1-2 Reyes* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 53; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1992).

⁴⁵ Cf. D. Barthélemy, *Criticism textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, vol. 1 *Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg, Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires, Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1982), 371.

⁴⁶ *Ant.* 8.348 (Thackeray, LCL): φοβηθεὶς δ' ὁ Ἡλίας.

⁴⁷ Principally Thenius, *Könige*, 227; Klostermann, *Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, 37; I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige erklärt* (KHC 9; Freiburg i. Br.: J.C.B. Mohr, 1899), 111, and Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 442; others choose the same reading without giving any justification: R. Kittel R., *Die Bücher der Könige* (HAT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1900), 150; Burney, *Kings*, 229; Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 317; Gray, *Kings*, 406; DeVries, *1 Kings*, 233.

⁴⁸ C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO 36; Fribourg, Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires, Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1981) 234.

⁴⁹ Barthélemy, *Criticism textuelle*, 371.

The question raised by this literary intervention invites us to reconsider the differences from verses 2-3. Indeed, the attenuation of the threat that Jezebel represents casts a new light on the “plus” of the LXX in the queen’s intervention in the beginning of the verse: εἰ σὺ εἶ Ἡλειού καὶ ἐγὼ Ἰεζάβελ. I showed earlier (point 2.1.) that the disappearance of this phrase could be due to a textual accident. Now, if one correlates the two differences, we notice a deep coherence. The “plus” attested by the LXX is a threat that lends Jezebel the pretension of being the equal of, or even more powerful than, Elijah. This phrase clarifies the relationship of the frontal force between the two characters described by the whole of the account. Jezebel, the idolatrous queen of foreign origin, exterminates the prophets of YHWH (1 Kings 18:4,13) and feeds the prophets of Baal and Asherah at her table (1 Kings 18:19). Elijah, the last survivor of the prophets of YHWH (1 Kings 19:10,14), has himself put to death all the prophets of Baal (1 Kings 18:40). In this context, Elijah and Jezebel are the last survivors of their respective clans, the prophet of YHWH and the protector of the prophets of Baal are put in a face-to-face situation. In this way, as far as the LXX is concerned, the conflict is between the two protagonists rather than between Ahab and Elijah. From the MT side, it is otherwise. In these two verses alone, the confrontation is less head-on: there is not a reply to the direct challenge and the terror is smoothed out. One must recognize therefore that, if the absence of this phrase is due to an accidental error, the chance omission does many things. In fact, I have often raised the issue in my study *Les deux visages d’Élie*, that the MT has the tendency to point out King Ahab’s guilt, even if it means smoothing out the picture of Jezebel (1 Kings 18:4,19; 21[20], 27).⁵⁰ The theme of the accumulation of Ahab’s guilt is already raised by redaction criticism.⁵¹

In conclusion, the literary intervention in verse 3 MT, (when put in the context of the corrections of chapter 18 concerning Ahab) is so coherent with the absence of Elijah’s reprimand of Jezebel in verse 2 MT, that we are right to wonder if this disappearance is not voluntary after all. Without denying the possibility of a textual corruption, I therefore formulate the hypothesis of the suppression of this phrase by the editor of the proto-MT as springing from narrative and ideological motives.

This case takes on an important methodological value for me. The nature of the witnesses at our disposal obliges us to consider a strictly textual cause as a primary hypothesis in the variances between the MT and the LXX. Yet, the placement in relation to the differences as well as the reading compared to the forms of the text as sense units, can lead us to revise this judgment and to envisage a type of literary evolution, as could be the case here.

A second passage seems to me to attest to a literary difference, even if the evaluation of this case requires caution. Verse 11, where God orders Elijah to leave the cave, is sprinkled with many differences from which the beginning synopsis of the verse will permit a view of the whole.

TM	LXX
וַיֹּאמֶר צַא וְעַמְדָּתָּ בְּהָרָ לְפָנַי יְהוָה	καὶ εἶπεν ἐξελεύσῃ αὐριον καὶ στήσῃ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἰδοῦ

⁵⁰ Hugo, *Élie*, 277-280 and 297-299 for the guiltiness of King Ahab; 338.343-344.346-349 for Jezebel’s role in the account of the vineyard of Naboth, in particular in the Antiochian text (L).

⁵¹ This guiltiness comes within the context of the discredit of the northern kings to the profit of those from Judah: cf. J.E. Breneman, “Debating Ahab: Characterization in Biblical Theology,” in *Reading the Hebrew Bible for a New Millennium. Form, Concept, and Theological Perspective*, vol. 1 (ed. W. Kim, D. Ellens *et alii*; Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 89-107, esp. 103-105 and 105-106; S.L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings. The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden: Brill, 1991) 99, 133 and 149-150 (which situates the Deuteronomistic redaction just before the Exile, to the time of Josiah from which he would have made the propaganda); Otto, *Jehu, Elia und Elisa*, 129.

וַיֵּן הַיְהוָה עִבֵּר

παρελεύσεται κύριος

And he said: “leave and stand on the mountain in front of YHWH.”
And behold YHWH passes by...

And he said: “you will leave tomorrow and you will stand before the Lord on the mountain. Behold the Lord will pass by.”

The most obvious difference is the Greek adverb αὔριον, “tomorrow,” attested by the whole of the Greek tradition, the VL⁵² and by Josephus.⁵³ This adverb (which is translated מחר, in Hebrew) is logically accompanied in the LXX by two future tense verbs: ἐξελεύσῃ and στήσῃ. According to the LXX, the order clearly means the next day. In the MT, the formulation is that of an immediate command, imperative and accomplished consecutive. Next, the structure of the phrase is different, while בַּהֲרֵךְ precedes “before the Lord” and that ἐν τῷ ὄρει is found after this same expression. Then, וַיֵּן, normally translated as καὶ ἰδοὺ (cf. v. 5, 9, 13), is rendered as ἰδοὺ only, probably וַיֵּן.⁵⁴ Finally, the participle of the MT עִבֵּר is rendered as a future construction παρελεύσεται⁵⁵ probably ordered by the adverb αὔριον. In the two forms, it is difficult to determine where the direct discourse stops. I wonder if וַיֵּן does not already introduce the description of the event itself: “and behold, the Lord is passing by.”⁵⁶ On the contrary, in the LXX the future leads us rather to integrate this phrase into the Lord’s speech.

In reality (setting apart the structure of the phrase) the whole of the differences could depend on the only presence of the adverb מחר in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. This would have led the translator to understand the verbs in this phrase as being in the future tense, which is grammatically possible. According to the possible Hebrew source of the Greek, God announces his passing as occurring on the next day, while in the MT the command of the Lord and that which one may call the theophany happens in a unit of time. How can we explain this difference?

If one cannot exclude the accidental omission of the adverb in the source of the MT, it cannot be explained at all. DeVries⁵⁷ suggests a corruption of בַּהֲרֵךְ into מחר. But, if a confusion between ה and ח is possible, that between כ and מ is even more difficult to sustain paleographically. A corruption like this seems unlikely to me, even more so since the Greek

⁵² *Exiens crastina die* in VL 91-95 ; *Exiens crastina die* by Pseudo-Ambrose; *Exiens cras* by Irenaeus. Cf. Moreno Hernández, *Las Glosas marginales*, 115, and P. Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae, seu vetus italica, et caeterae quaecunque in codicibus mss. & antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt*, vol. 1 (Reims, 1743; reprint Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), 585.

⁵³ *Ant.* 8.351 (Thackeray, LCL) : πάλιν δὲ ἀκούσας προελθεῖν εἰς τὸ ὑπαιθρον τῇ ἐπιούσῃ γινώσασθαι γὰρ οὕτως τί δεῖ ποιεῖν προῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ σπηλαίου μεθ’ ἡμέραν...

⁵⁴ The meaning of the two expressions is not totally equivalent: W. Richter, *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik. B. Die Beschreibungsebenen. III. Der Satz (Satztheorie)* (ATSAT 13; St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1980), 203-204.

⁵⁵ The VL cited by Irenaeus equally upholds the future tense: *ecce Dominus transiet*, cf. Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae*, 585.

⁵⁶ Cf. Burney, *Kings*, 231; it is in this way that the RSV, Osty, BJ understand. In the contrary sense, many authors estimate that the whole of verses v. 11b-12 are in direct discourse and must be understood as an announcement by the Lord. V. 13 would then describe the realization of the command from Elijah and the theophany itself. Cf. Robinson, “Elijah at Horeb,” 521; T. Seidl, “Mose und Elia am Gottesberg. Überlieferungen zu Krise und Konversion der Propheten,” *BZ* 37 (1993): 1-25, spéc. 14-16; S. Timm, *Die Dynastie Omri* (FRLANT 124; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1982), 106-107. Timm upholds that the final redaction of the MT seeks to hide the fact that Elijah would have been witness to the theophany. According to him, the references to the future by the LXX also permit us to avoid the description of the theophany.

⁵⁷ DeVries, *1 Kings*, 233.

contains ἐν τῷ ὄρει (בהר)⁵⁸ and since the placement of the word ἄρσιον (מחר) does not correspond to that of “mountain” in the MT or in the LXX.

Otto Thenius⁵⁹ argues that the LXX contains something of the ancient form, but that the original text was more clearly oriented towards the future. In fact, according to Thenius the preposition עבר יהוה, “YHWH will pass by,” was followed by the reality of the announcement of the Lord: ויהי ממחרת והנה יהוה עבר, “and it happened, the next morning, that YHWH was passing by.” The same formulation would have therefore provoked the omission of the phrase by *homoioteleuton*. This conjecture does not hold in any ancient textual witness and therefore remains very hypothetical. Besides, it does not explain the entire textual situation because it does not furnish a single explanation as to the disappearance of מחר in the beginning of the verse. For Thenius, the reason for this hypothesis resides in the parallel with Ex 34:2: “be ready for tomorrow morning (ל בקר, εἰς τὸ πρωῶν) you will come up in the morning (ועלית בבקר, καὶ ἀναβήσῃ –) on Mount Sinai and you will stand before me there, on the top of the mountain.” For him, the relationship between the two passages is original and not secondary.

It is the relationship to the same passage from Ex 34:2 that leads Montgomery to make the opposite suggestion and to think that ἄρσιον, מחר would have been introduced here by assimilation.⁶⁰ But against this hypothesis one should point out the fact that ἄρσιον is never chosen for ל בקר⁶¹ but מחר or מחרת, it is therefore unlikely that it is any different here. In fact, if there is a secondary assimilation, one expects rather the editor (context permitting) to choose common vocabulary between the two passages that he is seeking to bring together. I do not believe that the simple approximation of meaning allows us to suppose assimilation. Besides, the narrative logic is different between the two passages. In Ex 34, if the encounter is set for the next morning (v. 2), it is because Moses has work to do until then; he has to make two stone tables (v. 1). In 1 Kings 19, nothing keeps the meeting from taking place immediately. If it remains possible, the assimilation to Ex 34:2 does not seem to be a convincing explanation to me.

Certainly, the relationship between the events of Moses at Sinai/Horeb and the account of Elijah at Horeb is clear as most authors have shown.⁶² However it seems to me that another relationship between the two accounts is possible. In the two stories, there is the question of “forty days and forty nights.” Ex 24:18 and 34:28, make mention of the time that Moses spent on the mountain (Deut 9:9; 9:11; 9:18; 10:10). In 1 Kings 19:8, the forty days and forty nights mark the period during which Elijah draws near to Horeb, the “mountain of God” (MT). On the fortieth day when Elijah had arrived at Horeb, the Lord speaks to the prophet (v. 9). The relationship between Moses and Elijah is evident here since the expression only appears in relation to these two people,⁶³ setting aside the duration of the rain during the Flood in Gen 7:4, 12. In this context, the temporary mention of the LXX, ἄρσιον, מחר, “tomorrow” defers the theophany and the return to the forty-first day! Verse 11 therefore disagrees with verse 8 and with the reference to Moses. It seems to me that the intertextual influence (Ex/Kings)

⁵⁸ DeVries thinks that this expression was added in the Greek in an explicative gloss. Corruption on the one hand, explanation on the other hand, the solution is contradictory.

⁵⁹ Thenius, *Könige*, 229.

⁶⁰ Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 317. He is acting from a note Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 157, et Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 447.

⁶¹ The expression is translated by εἰς τὸ πρωῶν: Ex 34:25; Deut 16:4; Jr 21:12; Am 4:4; 5:8; So 3:3 etc.

⁶² Cf. Seidl, “Mose und Elija,” 2-4 (with bibliography). Seidl estimates that the two texts (Ex 33:18-23 and 1 Kings 19) are not tied by their literary genesis, but by a similar narrative program. They belong to the same tradition (see p. 19-21).

⁶³ This leads some authors to consider the expression as an addition in Kings aiming at reinforcing the Mosaic tradition, cf. Lehnart, *Prophet und Könige*, 246.

could have led the editor of the proto-MT to suppress this delay by making the theophany directly follow the command of God, so that all would take place on the fortieth day. If the possibility of the voluntary suppression of this mention in the MT – and therefore the antiquity of the form attested to by the LXX – keeps a part of the hypothesis, it seems to me that it is more likely than the assimilation proposed by Montgomery.

One must also wonder if the temporary mention modifies the narrative logic of the account itself. This passage contains two principal difficulties, noted by all of the commentators. On the one hand, the repetition of the dialogue between God and Elijah in verses 9b-10 and 13b-14 appears as a double reading. On the other hand, the commandment to leave in order to assist the Lord's passage (v.11a) doesn't totally fit with its realization that only occurs after the theophany (v.13). This gave way to diverse redactional theories considering some verses as secondary, or on the contrary, supporting the original literary unity.⁶⁴ Does the delay that exists in the LXX change the perception of these problems? In fact, the events brought back in a unit of time in the MT take place in two days in the LXX, which suppresses the perception of a double reading in the repetition. The first encounter between the Lord and Elijah (v. 9b-11) concludes with a command for the next day (v.11a), which can be paraphrased as: "I will come tomorrow and I will tell you." The pace of the narrative is slowed down: God does not immediately respond to the prophet's complaint, the prophet must wait, and he must prepare himself. Instead, the next day the second encounter begins with the theophany and finishes with a new dialogue. The Lord appears but in a paradoxical manner and does not respond to the expectation of Elijah, who was tormented by anxiety over death, the war and the massacres (v. 14). This leads to the second dialogue that is not the double to the first, but the repetition of the prophet's unresolved complaint. God will respond to it in verses 15-18.

If we extend the scope of our inquiry, we perceive that the presence of this temporal indication alters the account even before verses 9b-14. In fact, the preceding verses (v. 4-8) take on another narrative function, and especially verse 8 which contains the mention of the forty days and forty nights. In the LXX, the forty days and forty nights show the strength of the power of the food which was received from the angel's hand (v.7-8); they are not connected to the theophany. In the MT, the absence of the delay makes the forty days and forty nights the immediate preparation for the theophany. This symbolic preparation leads to the encounter with the Lord without further delay, as in Deut 9:11: "at the end of the forty days and the forty nights the Lord gave me the two stone tables of stone, the tables of the covenant." The importance of the relationship with the figure of Moses is once again emphasized.

Faced with this narrative logic, two types of reasoning are possible. First of all, the temporal mark ἀϋκισον, מַחַר, should to be secondary: the editor would have felt the narrative tensions between verses 9-11 and 13-14 and would have tried to lessen them by adding a temporal discrepancy between the two dialogues. But one can also make the opposite argument: it was important for the editor of the proto-MT that the theophany should be prepared by an initiatory itinerary of forty days and forty nights which afterwards leads to the encounter with the Lord without further delay. The theophany should share the theological and symbolical value of the forty days and forty nights in Exodus and Deuteronomy.

The group of difficulties that often raises the different conception of time in the MT and the LXX (whether for the immediate context or intertextual relationships) shows that one is faced with a problem of a literary nature. It is the meaning of the account that is transformed.

⁶⁴ See the state of the research in Seidl, "Mose und Elija," 13-14, he himself holds to the addition of 13b-14; M. Beck, *Elia und die Monolatrie. Ein Beitrag zur religionsgeschichtlichen Rückfrage nach dem vorschriptprophetischen Jahwe-Glauben* (BZAW 281; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1999) 128-129, holds the unity of the account; Lehnart, *Prophet und Könige*, 247, opts for the addition of 9b-11a.

At this moment, it seems premature to me to definitively break off the question of the chronology between the literary forms, but I am inclined to think that the MT testifies to a secondary form. I believe that the theological or ideological motives were more constraining for the editors of the biblical text than the harmonizations of a purely narrative nature.

The third case to classify in this section of narrative interventions concerns the tiny difference from verse 18. The Lord gives Elijah a group of commands aimed at the period that will follow the ministry of Elijah (v. 15-18). The last (v. 18) concerns salvation for those who will remain faithful to YHWH and who will not have succumbed to idolatry. The MT formulates this verse under the form of a Lord's promise in the first person: וְהִשְׁאֲרֵתִי בְיִשְׂרָאֵל, "I will leave in Israel," while the formula in the LXX is an order in the second person, καὶ καταλείψεις,⁶⁵ "you will leave," which translate the Hebrew וְהִשְׁאֲרֵתִי.

Stade and Schwally think that the first person was written defectively, which would have led the translator to understand it as a second person.⁶⁶ But the difference in first and second person does not have anything to do with plene or defective writing here. It would be better to think therefore that the *yod* might have fallen out by accident,⁶⁷ even though this remains unconfirmed. Kittel and Noth in the BH⁶⁸ estimate, on the contrary, that the second person is closest to the original.

In my opinion, the MT is the result of a correction of a literary nature. On the one hand, the formulation in the second person (as a command of God) corresponds completely to the context: Elijah must consecrate Hazael and anoint Elisha (v. 15-16), and following the description of the vengeance that will come (v. 17), God demands that Elijah (who has already wiped out the prophets of Baal, 18:40) spare the Lord's faithful ones. But on the other hand, this formulation is in disagreement with verse 17, which announces the divine vengeance through Elijah's successors. Therefore I think that the editor of the proto-MT corrected it and introduced the first person form: it is the Lord himself, in the future, who will leave a remnant.

In this sense, there is a decisive argument that seems to me to be in favor of the antiquity of the LXX and of the secondary character of the MT. My study of 1 Kings 17-18 showed that one of the specific literary traits of the revision of the MT is the tendency to emphasize the primacy of the divine action over the action and the initiative of the prophet.⁶⁹ I believe that this is an explicit case of this type of correction: it is not Elijah who must establish and preserve a faithful remnant, but the Lord himself. If this editorial intervention is of a narrative nature, it uncovers in reality a theological motivation, for it concerns the image of God that is pictured by the account.

2.6 INTERVENTIONS OF A THEOLOGICAL TYPE

The final type of difference concerns the literary interventions of an explicitly theological nature. The first case is found again in verse 2, in the oath pronounced by Jezebel. In the MT, she says: כִּהְיֵעֲשׂוּן אֱלֹהִים וּכְהַ יוֹסֶפוּן, "may the gods do this and may they add this..." while, according to the LXX, the formulation does not engage the gods but God: τάδε ποιήσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείη, "may God do this to me and may he add this."

⁶⁵ Note that the Antiochian text (*L*) has a form which is harmonized to the MT : καταλείψω; the mss 82 (o) has καταλείψει.

⁶⁶ Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 158: to strengthen their hypothesis, they mention 1 Kings 12:7 where the *Ketiv* gives וַיִּדְבֹּר corrected by the *Qere* וַיִּדְבֹּר. But our case has nothing to do with such a defective writing.

⁶⁷ In this sense Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 452.

⁶⁸ *Biblia Hebraica* (ed. R. Kittel; Stuttgart: Priv. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1937).

Followed by Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 318.

⁶⁹ Cf. Hugo, *Élie*, 324-326.

Other than the presence of $\mu\omicron\iota$, ל , probably original, it is the singular that draws attention. This formulation affirms that Jezebel swears by the unique and only God. The theological correction seems to me easy to understand and evident: it is not fitting for Jezebel, the idolatrous queen, to swear by the God of Israel. The MT wants to protect the image of God and to underline the idolatry of the queen by making her swear by the Baals.⁷⁰ The inverse change (from plural to singular) is much more difficult to understand. In addition, the same phenomenon repeats itself in 1 Kings 20[21]:10 in the mouth of Ben-Hadad: $\text{כְּהֵי עֲשׂוֹן לִי}$ $\text{אֱלֹהִים וְכֹה יוֹסֵפוּ}$,⁷¹ $\text{τάδε ποιήσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείη εἰ ἐκποιήσει}$. The tendency towards the correction is coherent: Jezebel and Ben-Hadad are idolaters and swear by their gods.

This theological correction harmoniously completes the portrait of Jezebel just as it appears in this rejoinder (cf. above). If the MT is applied to avoid the formulations that would show the threatening and frightening power of Jezebel, it endeavors to manifest that while serving the Baals and in swearing by them, Jezebel has no relation at all to the God of Israel.⁷²

The second case of theological divergence is found in Elijah's two parallel complaints (in verse 10 and 14) where the prophet designates the apostasy of the Israelites as the source of his hopelessness. In the MT, Elijah complains: $\text{כִּי־עָזְבוּ בְרִיתְךָ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$, "because the sons of Israel have abandoned your covenant." But according to the LXX, it is God they have abandoned: $\text{ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπόν σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ}$, "for they have abandoned you..."⁷³ I have already dealt with this question by tackling the similar case in 1 Kings 18:18.⁷⁴ In fact, in this verse, the formulation is practically identical. Elijah accuses Ahab and his house of having abandoned $\text{אֶת־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה}$, "the commandments of YHWH," in the MT, but $\text{τὸν κύριον θεὸν ὑμῶν}$, "the Lord your God," according to the LXX.

In these three passages, the MT is clearly the witness of a theological correction,⁷⁵ which Dominique Barthélemy calls of the "Deuteronomistic" type.⁷⁶ This is an important note in order to qualify the theological background of the editors of the proto-MT. At the time of the most ancient transmission (between the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C.) the editors corrected the biblical text, led by a concern analogous to that of the Deuteronomistic editors.⁷⁷

⁷⁰ Cf. Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 156. On the contrary see, Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 317.

⁷¹ Note the presence of ל also in the MT.

⁷² This agrees with the results of my study on 1 Kings 17-18. See Hugo, *Élie*, 326-326.

⁷³ We must note that in v. 14, B attests to a partially recensed form, harmonized to the MT with a double reading: $\text{ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπόν σε οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν διαθήκην σου}$. In this case, *L* conserves the ancient form without double reading (see Barthélemy, *Criticism textuelle*, 370). The VL attests to the same text as *L*: *quia dereliquerunt te filii Israel*, cf. Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae*, 586.

⁷⁴ Hugo, *Élie*, 268-270.

⁷⁵ See also Stade, Schwally, *Kings*, 157; Montgomery, Gehman, *Kings*, 317; Thiel, "Deuteronomistische Redaktionsarbeit," 166.

⁷⁶ Barthélemy, *Criticism textuelle*, 370: "On admet plus volontiers aujourd'hui que des réviseurs deutéronomistes sont intervenus jusqu'en des époques assez tardives. *Mieux vaut donc envisager que la tradition prémassorétique et celle de la Vorlage du *G [= Old Greek] ont continué à être l'objet de telles révisions – qu'il faut bien qualifier de "littéraires" – après qu'elles aient déjà divergé*" (he highlights).

⁷⁷ Cf. Hugo, *Élie*, 327. Emanuel Tov, in his paper "The LXX and the Deuteronomists" (IOSCS Congress, Ljubljana, July 2007), showed that the LXX is often preserved from certain interventions attributed to Deuteronomistic redactors. He remains very wise in his conclusion: "The overall conclusion is that one needs to be very careful in assuming two different entities in the Dtr layers on the basis of the LXX evidence." (Handout, p. 6). The discussion is open.

CONCLUSION

The goal of studying the textual differences between the MT and the LXX in 1 Kings 19 was to retrace the most ancient history of the text: to determine the ancient form and to identify the reasons that motivated the change. The results of the analysis seem to confirm the hypothesis of the antiquity of the LXX and of the editorial character of the MT in the cycle of Elijah. Already on the textual level, if the LXX has the tendency to complete the subjects of the verbs, it seems that the MT gives witness to the naming of characters (v. 5, 20, 21), to developments of the formulas designating God (v. 8, 10, 14), and to the narrative harmonizations (v. 5). But it is on the literary level that its secondary nature appears most distinctly. Verses 2-3 are the most reworked in the chapter. If the “plus” attested to by the LXX could have been omitted by accident, it appears that the sense of each one of the forms is very coherent. As to the LXX, Jezebel threatens Elijah as her *alter ego* and swears by God to kill him. That provokes Elijah’s terror. In the MT, Jezebel is less threatening and aggressive, but her apostasy is emphasized, since her oath calls on the gods, on the Baals. These differences are not accidental but come perfectly within the tendency that the MT. Throughout the entire Elijah cycle, MT tends to smooth out the portrait of the king and queen in order to highlight their apostasy. In verse 18, the MT is also secondary: as in 1 Kings 17-18, the editor seeks to emphasize the supremacy of God’s action over that of the prophet. Finally, even if the textual evolution of verse 11 appeals to prudence of judgment, it is likely that the MT sought to make the theophany arrive unexpectedly on the fortieth day of Elijah’s journey towards Horeb, just like Moses in Exodus and in Deuteronomy. In order to do this, the editor suppressed the delay for the following day, which is attested by the LXX. In sum, if the literary differences have a bearing on the narrative logic, it is theological reasons that guided the editor of the proto-MT: the prophetic theology, the characterization of idolatry, and the divine sovereignty.

Based on these results we prove that 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 (for example v. 4 and 8), 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 (v. 10 and 14). Then, on the level of the comparison of literary forms, text history is methodologically close to redaction criticism. The two methods aim to identify a redaction – text history will speak of the edition – while seeking to understand the theological or ideological reasons that led it to modify its source text. However, a major difference exists here between the two approaches. Text history compares existing literary forms, attested to by the manuscript tradition. The analysis is based on the objectivity of the textual evidence that it seeks to explain. The literary phenomena that it describes take place between the second half of the 3rd century and the 1st century B.C., that is to say between the translation of the books of Kings into Greek and the fixation of the proto-MT. In short, the contribution of textual criticism to the study of the literary history of Kings leads to a better knowledge of the theological characteristics of the final literary form of the Hebrew Bible probably attested to by the MT, if my demonstration is correct.