

Studia Biblica Slovaca

Ročník 12

2020

Číslo 1

Offprint



Studia Biblica Slovaca je recenzovaný vedecký časopis zameraný na skúmanie Svätého písma Starého a Nového zákona predovšetkým zo stránky filologickej, historickej, exegetickej a teologickej.

Ročník XII (2020), číslo 1

Vydáva Rímskokatolícka cyrilometodská bohoslovecká fakulta Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave, Kapitulská 26, 814 58 Bratislava 1, IČO 0039786510.

Redakčná rada/Editorial board:

Georg BRAULIK, OSB (Wien, AT)	Libor MAREK (Detroit, US)
Jaroslav BROŽ (Praha, CZ)	Helena PANCZOVÁ (Bratislava, SK)
Jeremy CORLEY (Dublin, IE)	Petr POKORNÝ (Praha, CZ, † 2020)
Peter DUBOVSKÝ, SJ (Roma, IT)	Jaroslav RINDOŠ, SJ (Bratislava, SK)
Pavol FARKAŠ (Nitra, SK)	Milan SOVA (Bratislava, SK)
Juraj FENÍK (Košice, SK)	Fides Iveta STRENKOVÁ, CJ (Prešov, SK)
Massimo GRILLI (Roma, IT)	Jozef TIŇO (Bratislava, SK)
Leslie HOPPE, OFM (Chicago, US)	Emanuel TOV (Jerusalem, IL)
Peter JUHÁS (Münster, DE)	František TRSTENSKÝ (Spišské Podhradie, SK)
Branislav KLUSKA (Ružomberok, SK)	Miroslav VARŠO (Košice, SK)
Róbert LAPKO (Košice, SK)	Ian YOUNG (Sydney, AU)

Šéfredaktor: Blažej ŠTRBA (Badín, SK)
Zástupca šéfredaktora: Jozef JANČOVIČ (Bratislava, SK)
Redaktor pre recenzie: Július PAVELČÍK (České Budějovice, CZ)
Výkonná redaktorka: Martina KORYTIAKOVÁ (Roma, IT)

Za recenzovanie všetkých článkov zodpovedá redakčná rada.

Obálka: Karol Hájiček

Na príprave publikácie sa podieľali: Veronika Černušková, Pavel Dudzik, Lionel Goh, OFM a Zuzana Očkajáková.

Príspevky v slovenčine, češtine a angličtine (od zahraničných autorov) alebo knihy na recenziu prosíme poslať na adresu redakcie: *Studia Biblica Slovaca*, Banská 28, 976 32 Badín (Slovakia), redakcia@biblica.sk.

Príspevky sa požadujú v elektronickej podobe, podľa možnosti v textovom editore Microsoft Word. Preferované fonty písma pre hebrejštinu a gréčtinu sú SBL Hebrew and SBL Greek. Príspevok typu štúdia, poznámka alebo reflexia musí byť doplnený abstraktom a jeho anglickou verzou, anglickým názvom príspevku, max. piatimi kľúčovými slovami v slovenčine/češtine a angličtine, zoznamom bibliografie a kontaktom na autora príspevku. Nevyžiadané rukopisy sa nevracajú. Redakcia si vyhradzuje právo upraviť titulok a vykonať potrebnú jazykovú a štylistickú úpravu prijatých príspevkov. Spresňujúce podmienky pre prispievateľov sú dostupné na www.biblica.sk.

Časopis je registrovaný a abstrahovaný v ATLA Religion Database, EBSCO, *New Testament Abstracts* ISSN 0028-6877 a *Old Testament Abstracts* ISSN 0364-8591.

S povolením Arcibiskupského úradu v Bratislave zo dňa 3. júna 2014
Prot. N. 2229/2014

Studia Biblica Slovaca
Printed in Slovakia, 6/2020
Vychádza dvakrát do roka.
Cena: 6 €

ISSN 1338-0141
e-ISSN 2644-4879
EV 3744/09

Some Major Israelite Figures in the Former Prophets in the Tradition of the Septuagint

Emanuel Tov

This study examines the representation in the Septuagint of a few major Israelite figures featuring in the Former Prophets. The Septuagint is a translation, but the translators of the various books could have presented these figures differently from the MT; for example, the Greek translations could have preserved vestiges of ancient traditions that differ from those of the MT. We know that in the MT the figures of David and Solomon as found in Chronicles differ from those in Samuel and Kings. We also know that Josephus, Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and several Qumran writings present a different picture from that in the MT and, by the same token, the LXX could also reflect different Hebrew or Greek traditions.

It should be remembered that the LXX canon is composed of translations of different types and therefore biblical figures are presented in different ways. Thus, the Greek Joshua reflects only a few variant traditions about Joshua, while the Greek book of 1 Kgs reflects many variant traditions about David and Solomon. Again, the LXX of Chronicles reflects very few diverse traditions. Each translated book stands by itself.

The Greek form of 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms in the LXX) presents a rather unique situation. I would say that this is the exception rather than the rule. Thus, in an earlier study¹ I found that the picture of Moses in the LXX did not differ much from that in the MT. Philo, Ezekiel the Tragedian, and Josephus had much to say about Moses, but their Greek source, the LXX, had little interest in exegetical traditions regarding Moses. The results of that investigation thus were rather negative and this, in by itself, is a remarkable phenomenon. The Greek books of the Torah reflect unmistakable contextual, theological, and legal exegesis, but

¹ Tov, *Moses in the Septuagint*.

the person of Moses was not the focus of their interest². This is the case also with the other biblical figures as far as I have been able to see. However, in this paper, I deal with the exceptions.

The first sign of the lack of exegetical traditions in the LXX is found in a research tool that should be one's first step in locating theology, namely the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*³. This handbook is very excessive in its description of the theological background of Septuagintal and New Testament words that are not necessarily theological. At the same time, *TDNT* does not refer to the persons or names mentioned in the LXX, such as Moses⁴, Abraham, Joseph, Aaron, Israel, and Jerusalem. Some of the major figures relevant to the period of the Former Prophets are mentioned in *TDNT*, but their coverage does not include the period of the Hebrew Bible or the LXX⁵.

In what follows, I present evidence that I have been able to find of differences between the MT and the LXX relating to major figures in the Former Prophets. The greatest amount found pertains to 3 Kgdms. The discussion is necessarily fragmentary and haphazard. I cannot give a complete picture of Joshua or Solomon in the LXX, because such a picture would not be realistic as most of its details agree with the MT. Usually the LXX takes the description from its Hebrew source. My discussion is limited to the few instances in which the LXX differs from the MT, as they may point to a special reality. This type of analysis is often fragmentary.

1 Joshua

The figure of Joshua in the MT and the LXX is the same person even though their names differ and they have a different character after the appearance of Christianity. The Greek translation was probably produced in the second century BCE, when there was no Christian flavor to the equivalent יהושע – Ἰησοῦς. That equivalent undoubtedly did not reflect יהושע but the shortened יהוֹשֻׁעַ.

² DOGNIEZ, *La figure de Moïse*, 62, reached a similar conclusion.

³ KITTEL – FRIEDRICH (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.

⁴ JEREMIAS, *Μωυσῆς*.

⁵ David is not covered but “son of David” is in LOHSE, *υἱὸς Δαυίδ*; Solomon in LOHSE, *Σολομών*; Joshua in FOESTER, *Ἰησοῦς*; Elisha in JEREMIAS, *Ἠλ(ε)ίας*.

such as found in the late books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah⁶. Indeed the same person was named both יהושע בן־יהוֹצָדָק הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל (Hag 1:1) and יְשׁוּעַ בֶּן־יֹצָדָק (Ezra 3:2). In Christianity, the Old Testament figure Joshua – Ἰησοῦς is often equated with Jesus Christ.

a) Common to the traditions about Ἰησοῦς in the LXX is the wish to present Joshua as a person who is more important than Moses and as a law-abiding person. Such tendencies can be learned only from differences between the LXX and the other sources.

i. According to the tractate Abot 1:1, “Moshe received the Torah from Sinai and he handed it over to Joshua, and Joshua handed it over to the elders and the elders to the Prophets”. This tradition reflects Joshua’s elevated status in both the MT and the LXX. Already in Exod 24, Joshua is close to Moses, more so in the LXX than in the MT⁷.

Exod 24:13

MT	ויקם משה ויהושע משרתו ויעל משה אל־הר האלהים = SP
NRSV	So Moses set out with his assistant Joshua, and Moses <i>went up</i> into the mountain of God
LXX	καὶ ἀναστὰς Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ παρεστηκῶς ⁸ αὐτῷ ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ θεοῦ.
NETS	And Moyses rose up and Iesous who assisted him, and <i>they went up</i> into the mountain of God.

Exod 24:13 attests to the various differences between the traditions in which Moses went up to the mountain, either alone or together with others⁹. The MT is contextually difficult since Moses and Joshua started out the journey together and only Moses arrived at the destination. The LXX solved the issue by changing the verb from the singular to the plural (while at the same time omitting the name “Moses”). The Greek version thus elevates Joshua’s position by making him also ascend the mountain of God¹⁰.

⁶ E.g., Ezra 2:2, 6; 1 Chr 24:11. The presentation of the shortened forms is also visible in the presentation of the theophoric names in 1QIsa^a. See KUTSCHER, *Isaiah Scroll*, 4.

⁷ See TOV, Textual Problems.

⁸ The equivalent of משרת, παρεστηκῶς, is rare (Num 11:28; Deut 21:5; 2 Sam 13:17).

⁹ Other traditions are found in Exod 19, 32, and 34. See TOV, Textual Problems.

¹⁰ Most striking is the juxtaposition of the similar vv. 12.13, in which v. 13 was changed and v. 12 was not (¹²The Lord said to Moses, “Come up to me on the mountain, and

ii. The Greek version of Josh 24:5 omits the mention of *Moses* in a central verse describing the history of the Israelites, and thus elevates Joshua to the higher position.

Josh 24:5-6

MT ⁵ וְאַתָּן לְעֵשָׂו אֶת־הַר שֵׁעִיר לְרִשְׁתּוֹ אוֹתוֹ וַיַּעֲקֹב וּבְנָיו יָרְדוּ מִצְרָיִם: ⁶ וְאַחַר הוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם: ⁶ וְאַחֲרַי אֶבְרַחְשִׁים יַם־סוּף וַיִּרְדְּפוּ מִצְרָיִם אַחֲרַי אֶבְרַחְשִׁים בְּרֶכֶב וּבַפָּרָשִׁים יַם־סוּף

NRSV I gave Esau the hill country of Seir to possess, but Jacob and his children went down to Egypt. ⁵ Then I sent Moses and Aaron, and I plagued Egypt with what I did in its midst; and afterwards I brought you out. ⁶ When I brought your ancestors out of Egypt, you came to the sea; and the Egyptians pursued your ancestors with chariots and horsemen to the Red Sea.

The LXX omits the half-verse mentioning Moses and Aaron, while also representing other details differently:

LXX καὶ ἔδωκα τῷ Ησαυ τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σηιρ κληρονομησαὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ Ἰακωβ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ κατέβησαν εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἐγένοντο ἐκεῖ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολὺ καὶ κραταιόν. ⁵ καὶ ἐκάκωσαν αὐτούς οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, καὶ ἐπάταξεν κύριος τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐν οἷς ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξήγαγεν ὑμᾶς ⁶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ εἰσῆλθατε εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν ἐρυθράν. καὶ κατεδίωξαν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὀπίσω τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν ἐν ἄρμασιν καὶ ἐν ἵπποις εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν ἐρυθράν,

NETS And I gave to Esau Mount Seir for him to inherit. And Iakob and his sons went down into Egypt and became there a great and populous and mighty nation, ⁵ and the Egyptians afflicted them. And the Lord smote Egypt with things he did to them, and afterwards he brought you out ⁶ of Egypt. And you came into the Red Sea, and the Egyptians pursued after your fathers with chariots and with horses into the Red Sea.

wait there ...” ¹³ So Moses set out with his assistant Joshua, and Moses went up...). A consistent change of the context would have led to the addition of the figure of Joshua also in v. 12.

This verse, according to which Moses did not lead the Israelites out of Egypt, is similar to another, a plus to the LXX of Josh 24:31a, in which Joshua is said to have led the Israelites out of Egypt. In other words, according to the LXX of this book, Joshua and not Moses played a central role in that event. This unique tradition is in competition with the main biblical tradition that Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt. As Joshua was already mentioned in the Torah, he would have been old enough to accomplish this task.

Josh 24:31a

LXX ἐκεῖ ἔθηκαν μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ μνήμα, εἰς ὃ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ, τὰς μαχαίρας τὰς πετρίνας, ἐν αἷς περιέτεμεν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Γαλγαλοῖς, ὅτε ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καθὰ συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς κύριος ...

NETS There they put with him, into the tomb in which they buried him, the flint knives with which he circumcised the sons of Israel in Galgala, *when he led them out of Egypt*, as the Lord instructed them ...

Reconstruction: ... בהוציאו אותם ממצרים ...

This plus refers to the story of the circumcision at Gilgal, and states that Joshua led the Israelites out of Egypt and to that location. It is in agreement with the tradition of 24:5, but I think that this tradition needs to be taken *cum grano salis*¹¹. It seems to me that a textual mishap took place in transferring the information to this position from 5:2-5, where the phrase “to leave Egypt” is mentioned five times in connection with the tradition about the circumcision at Gibeath-haaraloth. While in ch. 5 the Israelites leave Egypt, here the word refers to Joshua leading the people out of Egypt.

b) In two places, Joshua’s actions are reinterpreted as those of God; in ch. 4 regarding the erecting of the stones in the Jordan, and in ch. 9 regarding the ruse of the Gibeonites. Joshua is as important as Moses.

Josh 4:8

MT וַיַּעֲשׂוּ-כֵן בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה

NRSV The Israelites did as *Joshua* commanded.

¹¹ Differently in ROFÉ, Joshua, 23, 24: “This verse is most likely original.”; “Apparently, verse 31a was excised from MT.”; RÖSEL, Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches, 205.

- LXX καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ, καθότι ἐνετείλατο κύριος
τῷ Ἰησοῖ,
NETS And the sons of Israel did so, as the *Lord* commanded Iesous.

Josh 9:3

- MT יִשְׁבִי גִבְעוֹן שָׁמְעוּ אֶת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לִירִיחוֹ וְלָעַי
NRSV But when the inhabitants of Gibeon heard what *Joshua* had done to Jericho and to Ai.
LXX Καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Γαβαων ἤκουσαν πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν κύριος τῇ Ἰεριχω καὶ τῇ Γαι.
NETS And the inhabitants of Gabaon heard all that the *Lord* did to Jericho and to Gai.

There is no clear contradiction between these different accounts since Joshua fulfilled the command of God, but the implication of the texts is different. In the MT of 4:8 and 9:3, Joshua gave the command, while in the LXX God was active behind the scene in 4:8, and Joshua took his place in 9:3. It is hard to know whether this is the translator's interpretation or whether this idea was already found in his *Vorlage*.

The phenomenon itself is known from various places in the Old Testament and the classical sources, and was named “double causality” by Isac L. Seeligmann in a now-classical study¹². Often the initial stories about heroes in the historical books tell of their brave activities, while the historiographer summarizes the situation by saying that it was God who brought about the victory without referring to the human agent¹³. Likewise, in the MT of 1 Sam 19:5, Jonathan says to Saul about David's killing of Goliath: “He took his life in his hands and killed the Philistine, and *the Lord* wrought a great victory for all Israel.” In the same verse, the human bravery is mentioned next to the divine intervention. However, the Peshitta, for reasons of its own, felt the need to emphasize the human factor by referring to David's actions in a small plus: “...wrought a great victory for all Israel through his (i.e., David's) hands”¹⁴.

¹² SEELIGMANN, *Menschliches Heldentum*.

¹³ See SEELIGMANN, *Menschliches Heldentum*, 151-152.

¹⁴ וַיַּעַבְדוּ אֱלֹהֵי דָוִד לְעֵלְיָאֵל. וְזֶה הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה לְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּבָרָם, “...wrought a great victory for all Israel through his (i.e., David's) hands”.

c) The LXX presents Joshua as a more law-abiding person than he is in the MT. LXX-Joshua contains several nomistic changes (changes in accord with the Torah), but it is hard to know whether they were inserted by the translator or his *Vorlage*.

According to Num 10:8-9, only priests could sound the trumpets when Israel would go to war. However, the same Joshua, who was told to follow the laws of the Torah day and night (Josh 1:8), also gave orders in the MT that nonpriests should be involved in sounding the trumpet during the encircling of Jericho (6:9.13). Remarkably, these texts were changed in the LXX on three occasions:

Josh 6:9b

MT	וְהַמְאִיִּם הָלְכוּ אַחֲרֵי הָאָרוֹן הַלְלוּ וְתִקְוּ בְּשׁוֹפְרוֹת
NJPS	... and the rear guard marched behind the ark, with the horns sounding all the time.
LXX	καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ οὐραγοῦντες ὀπίσω τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου πορευόμενοι καὶ σαλπίζοντες.
NETS	... and the priests who bring up the rear, behind the ark of the covenant of the Lord, as they walk and trumpet.

Josh 6:13

MT	וְהַמְאִיִּם הָלְכוּ אַחֲרֵי אָרוֹן יְהוָה הוֹלִיִּךְ [הַלְלוּ] וְתִקְוּ בְּשׁוֹפְרוֹת
NJPS	and the rear guard marched behind the Ark of the Lord, with the horns sounding all the time.
LXX	καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς ὄχλος ὀπισθε τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου· καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐσάλπισαν ταῖς σάλπιγξι
NETS	and the rest of the crowd behind the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and the priests sounded with the trumpets.

Josh 6:20

MT	וַיִּרְעוּ הָעָם וַיִּתְקְעוּ בְּשׁוֹפְרוֹת
NJPS	So the people shouted when the horns were sounded.
LXX	καὶ ἐσάλπισαν ταῖς σάλπιγξιν οἱ ἱερεῖς
NETS	And the priests sounded with the trumpets.

The last verse, Josh 6:20, is far from clear in the LXX, but it is evident that the priests have been added to the base text¹⁵. In the MT, the priests sound the trumpets in v. 9a, but not in vv. 9b.13.20, while they do so in the LXX (and in the Targum in vv. 9b.13). Furthermore, in v. 8, the horns have been transformed into sacred horns, so that only priests can sound them:

Josh 6:8

MT	וְשַׁבְעָה הַכֹּהֲנִים נֹשְׂאִים שִׁבְעָה שׁוֹפְרוֹת הַיּוֹבְלִים
NJPS	... the seven priests carrying seven rams' horns
LXX	καὶ ἑπτὰ ἱερεῖς ἔχοντες ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγας ἱεράς
NETS	... and seven priests holding seven <i>sacred</i> trumpets

In the LXX, the “trumpets made of rams’ horns” have been transformed into “sacred trumpets.” If there was a Hebrew source, it would have been שופרות הקודש (for MT שופרות היובלים), which is unattested in Hebrew Scripture. The textual relation between the LXX and the MT is unclear since the LXX also leaves out several elements in this passage, possibly because they were considered “verbose” (vv. 6:3b.4.6b.9a).

In a detailed analysis, Leah Mazor ascribes these nomistic changes to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, basing herself on internal analysis and on the external parallel of the Targum and Josephus¹⁶. However, Josephus may depend on the LXX. On the other hand, the nomistic changes, also partially reflected in the Targum, may reflect a theological midrash-like tradition of the LXX, similar to other instances in Josh¹⁷. I find it difficult to reach a decision¹⁸.

The traditions on Joshua developed in several directions, *inter alia* in extensive pluses in the LXX at the end of ch. 24, in 4QJosh^a, and in additional sources¹⁹.

¹⁵ The rear guard is rendered with different terms in vv. 9.13. *σὺραγέω* does not occur elsewhere in the LXX, while *σὺραγία* occurs in Deut 25:18 and Josh 10:19 in connection with the verb זנב.

¹⁶ MAZOR, Jericho Conquest.

¹⁷ See TOV, Midrash-Type Exegesis.

¹⁸ However, nomistic tendencies are found in all witnesses, also in MT. See, e.g., MT Josh 1:7 compared with the LXX. It seems to me that MT expanded an earlier short text, as in the LXX, stressing the importance of the Torah. On the other hand, according to VAN DER MEER, *Formation*, 210-222, the Greek translator abbreviated his parent text.

¹⁹ See my studies TOV, Literary Development; TOV, The Growth of the Book of Joshua; TOV, The Rewritten Book of Joshua.

2 Hannah

The ancient versions differ often in the Former Prophets, but only some differences pertain to the depiction of the personality of a figure in these books. Hannah is such a person who is depicted in a different way in the MT than in the LXX and 4QSam^a. Hannah is a central person in the first chapters of Samuel and she also has a close connection with the temple and its cult. However, in the LXX and the Qumran scroll, her task is more prominent than in the MT, and there is a strong suspicion that her task in the cult has been curtailed in the MT because it would have been inappropriate for a woman to fulfill such tasks.

a) On two occasions the MT removed Hannah's standing before the Lord in a cultic context in 1 Sam 1–2, while other noncultic references were left unchanged (1:12.15):

1 Sam 1:9

MT ותקם חנה אחרי אכלה בשלה ואחרי שתה (= T V)

NRSV After they had eaten and drunk at Shiloh, Hannah rose

LXX + και κατέστη ἐνώπιον κυρίου + (=S)

= + ותתיצב לפני יהוה + = and she stood before the Lord (cf. 1:26; 3:10; 10:23)

1 Sam 1:14

MT+ הסירי את יינד מעליך

NRSV Put away your wine

LXX + και πορεύου ἐκ προσώπου κυρίου +

= + וצאי מלפני יהוה + and go out from the presence of the Lord (cf. Gen 41:46)

b) 1 Sam 1:25

MT+ וישחטו את הפר ויביאו את הנער אל עלי

NRSV and they slaughtered the bull and brought the boy to Eli

LXX και ἔσφαξεν τὸν μόσχον και προσήγαγεν Αννα ἢ μῆτηρ τοῦ παιδαρίου πρὸς Ηλι

= וישחט את הפר ותבא חנה אם הנער אל עלי

NETS and he slaughtered the bull calf. And Hannah, the mother of the child, *brought it* to Eli

According to the MT, unnamed persons brought the boy to Eli while, according to the LXX, Hannah performed this task in a cultic context. The connection in the MT is problematic, since v. 26, referring to Hannah's conversation with Eli, is not connected to the previous verse, while LXX presents a smooth connection. It is not impossible that the original wording was changed in the MT in order to avoid mentioning another action of Hannah.

c) 1 Sam 1:28

LXX	4QSam ^a	MT (= T)
>	וּתְעֹבַבְהוּ שֵׁם וְתִשְׁתַּחֲוֶי לַיהוָה ²⁰	וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶי שֵׁם לַיהוָה

MT and he bowed low there before the Lord / 4QSam^a [and she left] him [there] and she bowed [before the Lord].

1 Sam 2:11a

LXX	4QSam ^a	MT+
וּתְעֹבְבֵהוּ שֵׁם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וּתְלַךְ ²¹ הַרְמַתָּה	> ?	וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶלְקָנָה הַרְמַתָּה עַל בֵּיתוֹ

MT+ And Elkanah went home to Ramah / 4QSam^a > ?/ LXX and she left him there before the Lord and she went to Ramah.

The main actions described in 1:28 and 2:11, leaving Samuel at the temple and the bowing before the Lord, are ascribed to different persons in the various textual traditions or are not mentioned at all (the bowing before the Lord is lacking in the LXX). According to 4QSam^a, Hannah prostrates herself before the Lord in the verse preceding the Song of Hannah, and at that point she leaves Samuel at the temple (1:28). On the other hand, according to the LXX, Hannah leaves Samuel at the temple *after* her song (2:11). LXX and 4QSam^a present an internally consistent and probably original version. In 1:28, the MT reflects a revision that shifts the action to Elkanah, though not formally identified in the text, a role that was originally ascribed to Hannah (LXX and 4QSam^a)²².

²⁰ An alternative reconstruction would be וְתִנְחַבְהוּ, based on the reconstruction of LXX 2:11 by WELLHAUSEN, *Samuelis*, 42.

²¹ Καὶ κατέλιπον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀρμαθαιμ. For the two verbs, we follow (against Rahlfs) the text of manuscript B, disregarding the main evidence of the Greek tradition, which has plural forms κατέλ(ε)ιπον, ἀπῆλθον. See my study TOV, Hannah, 435.

²² For a full analysis, see TOV, Hannah.

d) 1 Sam 2:20

MT אשר שאל ליהוה (תחת השאלה) (= T)
 (in place of the loan) he(?) made to the Lord

4QSam^a השאל[ה] לי הוה [(DJD: ת] (השאלת)
 = NJPS (in place of the loan) *she* made to the Lord

LXX (ἀντι τοῦ χρέους) οὗ ἔχρησας τῷ κυρίῳ (= S V)

The reconstructed reading of 4QSam^a conforms to the earlier story: it is Hannah who promised Samuel to God in the very same words (1:27-28). While the MT is unclear, it seems that the figure of Hannah has been replaced with Elkanah as elsewhere in the context. LXX S V adapted the verb to the context (“you lent to the Lord”).

e) 1 Sam 1:23

MT אך יקם יהוה את דברו (= T V)
 May the Lord fulfill *His word*.

4QSam^a [אך יקם יהו]ה היוצא מפִּיךְ
 = NJPS [May the Lo]rd [fulfill] *that which comes out of your mouth*

= LXX ἀλλὰ στήσαι κύριος τὸ ἐξελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου

While the MT refers to the word of the Lord, 4QSam^a LXX refer to Hannah’s vow. The MT phrase occurs often elsewhere (e.g., Deut 27:26; 1 Kgs 2:4), while the alternative phrase occurs in Num 30:3 in a context of vows: **ל** יהוה יעשה **ל** יחל דברו ככל היוצא מפִּיךְ, “he must not break his *word*, but must carry out all that has crossed his lips (literally: came out of his mouth)”. Probably the reading of 4QSam^a LXX was corrected by MT T V. The mentioning of the “word” of God reflects more reverence towards God than the vow of a mere mortal, Hannah. This understanding ties in with the mentioned changes.

In short, in the LXX and the Qumran scroll, Hannah’s task is more prominent than in the MT, and there is a strong suspicion that her task in the cult has been downplayed in the MT because it would have been inappropriate for a woman to perform such tasks.

3 David

One of the stories about David in the MT depicts him in a theological framework that fits the theosophical framework of the MT, but the story is not

included in the LXX. In 1 Sam 16–18, containing mainly the story of David and Goliath, two different literary strata are contained in LXX and the MT reflecting distinct tendencies and theologies.

The story of David and Goliath in the LXX is significantly shorter than that in the MT, including the omission of long sections, the largest of which is 17:12-31. While some scholars claim that the translator omitted these sections with the intention of smoothing over problems in the Hebrew text, most are of the opinion that he found before him a short version of the story representing a literary edition different from the MT (see below)²³.

Since there is no external evidence (such as ancient Hebrew texts) to support the assumed existence of a short Hebrew text, the nature of the LXX can be explained solely on the basis of an analysis of its translation character. According to Tov²⁴, this translation unit reflects a literal translation method and therefore one cannot attribute to the translator the intention of abridging his source to such a great extent, as was claimed by Pisano²⁵.

According to Barthélemy, Gooding, and Rofé, this short Hebrew text, translated faithfully by the LXX, was created at an earlier stage as an abridgement of a longer Hebrew text resembling the MT. On the other hand, according to Tov and Lust, the LXX reflects a short version of the story of the encounter between David and Goliath²⁶. This short version, found both in the LXX and the MT and called here ed. I, is more natural than the MT since it does not contain the double accounts of the latter version, ed. II. Ed. II (the additional verses in the MT) has been added to the story of ed. I. Both versions of the story of David and Goliath contain several parallel (double) elements that are not linked by what we would name cross-references²⁷.

The two layers reflect different theological tendencies. While in the encounter between David and Goliath in 1 Samuel 16–18, David is a well-known person in the LXX (= ed. I), the MT conveys the idea that God can bring victory to his people (ed. II, lacking in the LXX) even through unimportant figures

²³ See TOV, *Composition*.

²⁴ TOV, *Composition*.

²⁵ PISANO, *Samuel*, 78-86.

²⁶ For details, see TOV, *Composition*.

²⁷ David is introduced twice to Saul (16:17-23; 17:55-58), he is twice appointed as an officer in Saul's army (18:5.13), and on two occasions Saul offers the hand of one of his daughters to David in marriage (Merab, 18:17-19; Michal, 18:20-27). The two versions are not completely parallel, for ed. I is fuller than ed. II.

(17:12-31 MT). Likewise, that edition also stressed that David did not need a sword in order to defeat the Philistine (17:50 MT). See 1 Sam 17:50: “So David prevailed over the Philistine with a sling and a stone, striking down the Philistine and killing him; there was no sword in David’s hand.” These words and several of the surrounding verses in the MT are not found in the LXX. It seems that this theological message has been added in the text edition of the MT, and this is one of its major objectives.

4 Solomon

The book that contains the largest amount of exegesis of a biblical figure in the LXX as a whole, not only in the Former Prophets, is 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs in the MT). This book (Kgdms $\gamma\gamma$ = 1 Kgs 2:11–21:15 [?]) poses a greater challenge for the researcher than the other three books of the Greek Kingdoms (1–2, 4 Kgdms). Scholars assume that Kgdms $\beta\gamma$ and $\delta\delta$ reflect an early revision, *kaige*-Theodotion. The many problems discussed over the past half-century relating to the *kaige*-Theodotion revision in 2 and 4 Kgdms and the evaluation of the Hebrew text of 1–2 Sam in the wake of the Qumran discoveries are very complex. However, they are less complicated than the evaluation of the Greek text of 1 Kgs. From the many studies published in the last decennia, it follows that there is no consensus concerning the evaluation of that version.

The discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek texts resulted from changes made in either the MT or LXX and therefore they cannot be described in neutral terms. The 2005 monograph by Percy S. F. van Keulen described the features of 3 Kgdms as follows:

The student of 3 Regum is not only struck by the high rate but also by the diversity of differences vis-à-vis 1 Kings that are contained in the book. Pluses and minuses are frequent, as well as word differences. Some of the pluses in 3 Regum consist of duplicate renderings of passages appearing elsewhere in the translation. ... Another peculiar deviation from the MT, typical of the second half of 3 Regum, pertains to the chronological data for kings following Solomon.²⁸

²⁸ VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 1.

In evaluating the extensive differences between the two versions, scholars have determined that the LXX reflects either a Hebrew text like the MT²⁹ or forms a faithful translation of a Hebrew book very different from 1 Kgs. In the latter case, we are confronted with two different compositions rather than texts differing at the scribal level. I believe that the latter option is correct.

Some of the tendencies of the Greek version of 3 Kgdms, already recognized by Thackeray³⁰, were described well by Gooding and van Keulen. Gooding presents a simplified analysis by describing the first ten chapters as being rewritten around Solomon's wisdom, including the whitewashing of his sins, chs. 11–14 as presenting a more favorable account of Jeroboam, and chs. 16–22 as whitewashing Ahab³¹. For Gooding, 3 Kgdms takes the form of a Greek commentary of 1 Kgs³². Likewise, for van Keulen, one of the main features of the first part of this rewritten composition is the presentation of a more favorable picture of Solomon³³ and a rearrangement of the sequence of events (named “pedantic timetabling” by Gooding³⁴).

The researcher of 1 Kgs immediately realizes that this translation differs from the MT and the other ancient versions. Leaving aside for a moment the question of the *incipit* of the third book of the Greek Kingdoms, we note that in the middle of ch. 2, the LXX has two long additions, named Summaries 1 and 2 (or Miscellanies 1 and 2). After v. 35, the LXX has fourteen additional verses, traditionally denoted 35_{a-o}, and after v. 46 there are eleven additional verses, denoted 46_{a-1}. These summaries were analyzed long ago.

There is sufficient support for the assumption that the Greek translation of 1 Kgs was based on a Hebrew source³⁵ anterior or subsequent to the MT. Since the tendencies of the Greek 3 Kgdms are easily recognized, and since no overall

²⁹ In this case, the major differences between the Hebrew and Greek were created either by a Greek reviser (see below) or by a free translator. The latter option was embraced by WEVERS, *Exegetical Principles*. Wevers identified various tendencies in relatively small details in the LXX, but he did not suggest often that a different Hebrew text lay at the base of the LXX. Nor did he realize that the LXX reflects a completely different composition.

³⁰ THACKERAY, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 18. See also THACKERAY, *The Greek Translators*; THACKERAY, *A Grammar*, 9-10.

³¹ GOODING, *Text and Midrash*.

³² GOODING, *Text and Midrash*, 28.

³³ VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 300.

³⁴ GOODING, *Pedantic Timetabling*.

³⁵ See my analysis in TOV, *Three Strange Books*.

reverse theory has been suggested for corresponding tendencies in the MT³⁶, I accept Talshir's view³⁷ that the *Vorlage* of 3 Kgdms reworked a text resembling the MT. Polak expressed a similar view³⁸. Ultimately, this view is close to Gooding's theory of midrash exegesis, except that he believes that the rewriting activity was carried out by a Greek reviser and not in the Hebrew text used by the translator.

On the basis of the assumption that 3 Kgdms is based on a Hebrew source, we now focus on its nature. The techniques described in the previous paragraph leave no doubt regarding the direction of the changes. The content summaries in ch. 2 are very inappropriate in their context (see n. 34). They would not have appeared in one of the first stages of writing. Further, the tendencies of this rewritten composition are clearly visible. I therefore believe that, in the main, the MT represents an early layer in the composition of 1 Kgs, and that 3 Kgdms reflects later rewriting.

The reshaping in 3 Kgdms involves the addition, repetition, omission, reordering, and changing of large sections as well as small details. These techniques are similar to those used in other compositions in the biblical realm, both within and beyond Greek and Hebrew Scripture. In the past, the techniques of 3 Kgdms have been compared to those of the midrash³⁹, not only because the rewriting in 3 Kgdms sometimes resembles midrash techniques, but also because of specific parallels with rabbinic literature in subject matter located by Gooding. The Hebrew composition behind 3 Kgdms rewrote⁴⁰ a book resembling the composition contained in the MT.

³⁶ SCHENKER, *Septante*, 151, mentions some elements of supposed revision in MT, but they do not cover the large differences between the two versions.

³⁷ TALSHIR, *Image*, 302.

³⁸ POLAK, *Solomon's Reign*, 143-148.

³⁹ Thus, especially Gooding (note the name of his summarizing study "Text and Midrash"); PETERCA, *Ein midraschartiges Auslegungsbeispiel*; TALSHIR, *Image*, 302, and TALSHIR, *Alternative Story*, 277-291, uses the same term.

⁴⁰ TALSHIR, *Image*, uses similar terms. The group of rewritten Bible compositions forms a category in its own right, described as follows by HARRINGTON, *Biblical Narratives*, 242: "Because they paraphrase the biblical text, they have been called targumic. Because these books interpret biblical texts, they have been seen as midrashic. But careful literary analysis has demonstrated that they are neither Targums nor midrashim."

The rewriting techniques of 3 Kgdms are illustrated by two text samples pertaining to the figure of Solomon⁴¹:

a) Solomon's wisdom as visible in the timing of his marriage

The wisdom of Solomon regarding his marriage to Pharaoh's daughter is included in the main text of 3 Kgdms where the texts about this topic have been rearranged. Early in the story in the MT, Solomon makes the marriage arrangements in a text that is formulated in an unusual, almost clumsy way:

1 Kgs 3:1

MT וַיִּתְחַתֵּן שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם וַיִּקַּח אֶת־בַּת־פַּרְעֹה וַיְבִיאָהּ אֶל־עִיר דָּוִד עַד כִּלְתּוֹ לְבָנוֹת אֶת־בַּיִתוֹ וְאֶת־בַּיִת יְהוָה וְאֶת־חוֹמַת יְרוּשָׁלַם סָבִיב

NRSV Solomon made a marriage alliance with Pharaoh king of Egypt; he took Pharaoh's daughter and brought her into the city of David, *until he had finished* building his own house and the house of the Lord and the wall around Jerusalem

LXX >

The implication is that Solomon married before he finished building his permanent palace (ch. 7) and the temple (ch. 6). The words "until he had finished building his own house", that is, until he had completed his religious duties, carry an almost accusatory tone against someone who wished to marry before completing his duty, and they probably were deemed unacceptable in the case of King Solomon. The verse is lacking in the LXX, but is adduced at a later point, in ch. 5, evincing the rearrangement of the text. This time the verse appears as an example of Solomon's wisdom, with the interpretation that Solomon made the marriage arrangements at a later stage in his life⁴². The verse appears in the middle of a long description of Solomon's wisdom.

1 Kgs 5:9

MT וַיִּתֵּן אֱלֹהִים חֲכָמָה לְשֹׁלֹמֹה וְתְבוּנָה הַרְבֵּה מְאֹד וְרוּחַב לֵב כַּחוֹל אֲשֶׁר עַל־שֵׁפֶת הַיָּם

NRSV God gave Solomon very great wisdom, discernment, and breadth of understanding as vast as the sand on the seashore.

⁴¹ Solomon's wisdom is enhanced in the LXX beyond that of MT, and even more so in later Jewish and Christian sources; see LOHSE, *Σολομών*.

⁴² See VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 62-81.

The description of Solomon's wisdom is very extensive (5:9-14), followed by the following plus in the Greek translation:

3 Kgdms 5:14a Καὶ ἔλαβεν Σαλωμων τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω ἑαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν πόλιν Δαυιδ ἕως συντελέσαι αὐτὸν τὸν οἶκον κυρίου καὶ τὸν οἶκον ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὸ τεῖχος Ιερουσαλημ.

NETS And Salomon took the daughter of Pharaos for himself for a wife and brought her into the city of David until he finished the house of the Lord and his own house and the wall of Jerusalem.

The story of Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter is more in place here than in MT 3:1, although also here the timing is too early. However, since this verse is adduced in the LXX as an example of Solomon's wisdom, we recognize here his planning regarding the lodging arrangements of his wife and, without changing the content of this verse, the LXX moved it to a better location.

Within the context of Solomon's wisdom, the LXX adds one additional example of his wisdom in the next added verse, v. 14b. That verse is also related to the marriage, and is out of place in MT 9:16 concerning Pharaoh's wedding gift to his daughter:

1 Kgs 9:16

MT פְּרָעָה מְלֶכֶת־מִצְרַיִם עָלָה וַיִּלְכֹּד אֶת־גָּזֶר וַיִּשְׂרֹפָהּ בְּאֵשׁ וְאֶת־הַבְּנֵי־נַעֲנִי הַיֵּשֶׁב בְּעִיר הַרְג וַיִּתְּנָהּ שְׁלֵחִים לְבֵתוֹ אֲשֶׁר תַּשְׁלֵמָה

3 Kgdms 5:14b τότε ἀνέβη Φαραω βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου καὶ προκατελάβετο τὴν Γαζερ καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν αὐτὴν καὶ τὸν Χανανίτην τὸν κατοικοῦντα ἐν Μεργαβ, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὰς Φαραω ἀποστολὰς θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ γυναικὶ Σαλωμων, καὶ Σαλωμων ὠκοδόμησεν τὴν Γαζερ.

NETS Then Pharaoh king of Egypt went up and captured Gazer and burned it and the Canaanite who lived in Mergab and Pharaoh gave them as send-off to his daughter, Salomon's wife, and Salomon built Gazer.

The actual move of Pharaoh's daughter to her permanent dwelling is repeated much later in the LXX, in 9:9a parallel with v. 24 of the MT:

1 Kgs 9:24

MT אִךְ בֵּית־פְּרָעָה עָלְתָהּ מְעִיר דָּוִד אֶל־בֵּיתָהּ אֲשֶׁר בְּנָה־לָּהּ אַז בְּנָה אֶת־הַמְּלוֹא

- NRSV But Pharaoh's daughter went up from the city of David to her own house that Solomon had built for her; then he built the Millo.
- 3 Kgdms 9:9a Τότε ἀνήγαγεν Σαλωμων τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω ἐκ πόλεως Δαυιδ εἰς οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ὃν ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῷ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
- NETS Then Salomon brought up Pharaoh's daughter from the city of David to his house that he built for himself in those days.

b) Chapter 11

The first eight verses of ch. 11 in the MT differ from the LXX. Both versions depict the sins of King Solomon in marrying foreign wives and being involved in idolatry, but the LXX makes that sin more acceptable to the reader. According to the LXX, the fact that he was married to foreign women in his old age made him more vulnerable and an easy prey for them and further, Solomon was a womanizer. In the MT, on the other hand, Solomon himself initiated idolatrous acts. The description of the sins in 1 Kings 11 was problematic also for the Chronicler who simply omitted the chapter in his account of Solomon.

1 Kgs 11:1

- MT מְהַלְלָהּ שְׁלֹמֹה אָהַב נָשִׁים נְכָרִיּוֹת רַבּוֹת וְאֵת-בְּתוּלַת-פְּרָעֹה מוֹאָבִיּוֹת עַמֹּנִיּוֹת אֲדָמִית צִדְדָנִית חִתִּית
- NRSV King Solomon loved many foreign women along with the daughter of Pharaoh: Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian, and Hittite women.
- 3 Kgdms 11:1 Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμων ἦν φιλογύναιος. καὶ ἦσαν αὐτῷ ἄρχουσαι ἑπτακόσσιαι καὶ παλλακαὶ τριακόσσιαι. καὶ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκας ἀλλοτρίας καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω, Μωαβίτιδας, Αμμανίτιδας, Σύρας καὶ Ἰδουμαίας, Χετταίας καὶ Αμορραίας
- NETS King Salomon was a philogynist. And he had seven hundred ruling women and three hundred concubines. And he took foreign women, both the daughter of Pharaoh, Moabites, Ammonites, Syrians and Idumeans, Chettites and Amorrites.

The differences between the two versions (change of sequence, addition/omission of details) create a slightly different image of the king. In the MT, the king sins against the Torah (see next verses), taking only foreign women,

and thus transgressing the laws of Deut 7:1-4 and 17:17 (“And he [i.e., the king] shall not have many wives, lest his heart go astray”). In the LXX, on the other hand, Solomon’s main vice was that he loved women, only *some* of whom were foreign. Some of the words of the LXX derived from v. 3. It is understood that King Solomon sinned against the Torah, but these sins were made more acceptable in the LXX because of his old age.

1 Kgs 11:4

MT

וַיְהִי לְעֵת זְקֵנָת שְׁלֹמֹה נָשְׂיוּ הַטּוֹ אֶת־לִבּוֹ אֲחֵרִי

אֲלֵהִים אֲחֵרִים וְלֹא־הָיָה לִבּוֹ שָׁלֵם עִם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו כְּלִבּ בְּיַד אָבִיו

NRSV

For when Solomon was old, his wives turned away his heart after other gods; and his heart was not true to the Lord his God, as was the heart of his father David.

LXX

καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν καιρῷ γήρους Σαλωμων καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τελεία μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ αὐτοῦ καθὼς ἡ καρδία Δαυιδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέκλιναν αἱ γυναῖκες αἱ ἀλλότριαι τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω θεῶν αὐτῶν.

NETS

And it happened at the time of Salomon’s old age that his heart was not perfect with the Lord, his God, as was the heart of his father Daud, and his foreign wives turned away his heart after their gods.

In the MT, the wives make Solomon change his mind, while in the LXX the altered sequence of the words gives a different twist to the meaning of the verse. In that version, it is Solomon’s old age and the imperfection of his heart that made him vulnerable to the influence of his foreign wives⁴³.

The changes in the Greek 3 Kgdms with regard to King Solomon are part of an overall picture of changes inserted in that book either by the translator or his Hebrew source, I believe the latter.

Conclusion

In conclusion to this study, the books of the Former Prophets are rather diverse in the LXX as expected for a multitranslational collection. By the same token, the figures are depicted in different ways in accordance with the

⁴³ See further TALSHIR, 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms.

translation character of the book. We found some features regarding Joshua, Hannah, David, and Solomon, but these are but some of the remarkable features of these translations. The lesson to take away is one of diversity.

Bibliography

- DOGNIEZ, Cécile: La figure de Moïse dans la Bible grecque des Septante. In: Michael Sommer et al. (Hrsg.): *Mosebilder, Gedanken zur Rezeption einer literarischen Figur im Frühjudentum, frühen Christentum und der römisch-hellenistischen Literatur* (WUNT 390), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 35-62.
- FOESTER, Werner: Ἰησοῦς. In: *TDNT* III (1965, Reprinted 1995) 284-293.
- GOODING, David W.: Pedantic Timetabling in 3rd Book of Reigns, *VT* 15 (1965) 153-166.
- GOODING, David W.: Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns, *Textus* 7 (1969) 1-29.
- HARRINGTON Daniel J.: Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies. In: Robert A. Kraft – George W. Nickelsburg (eds.): *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (SBLBIM 2), Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986, 242-247.
- JEREMIAS, Joachim: Ἡλ(ε)ίας. In: *TDNT* II (1964, Reprinted 1995) 928-941.
- JEREMIAS, Joachim: Μωυσῆς. In: *TDNT* II (1967, Reprinted 1995) 848-873.
- KITTEL, Gerhard – FRIEDRICH, Gerhard (eds.): *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Transl. by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964 – 1976.
- KUTSCHER, Eduard Yehezkel: *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1Q Isa^a)* (STDJ 6), Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- LOHSE, Eduard: Σολομών. In: *TDNT* VII (1971, Reprinted 1995) 459-465.
- LOHSE, Eduard: υἱὸς Δαυὶδ. In: *TDNT* VIII (1972, Reprinted 1995) 478-488.
- MAZOR, Leah: A Nomistic Re-Working of the Jericho Conquest Narrative Reflected in LXX to Joshua 6:1-20, *Textus* 18 (1995) 47-62.
- PETERCA, Vladimir: Ein midraschartiges Auslegungsbeispiel zugunsten Salomos. 1 Kön 8, 12-13 – 3 Reg 8,53a, *BZ* 31 (1987) 270-275.
- PISANO, Stephen: *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984, 78-86.
- POLAK, Frank H.: The Septuagint Account of Solomon's Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension. In: Bernard Taylor (ed.): *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 61), Atlanta: SBL, 2001, 139-164.
- ROFÉ, Alexander: The End of the Book of Joshua According to the Septuagint, *Hen* 4 (1982) 17-36.
- RÖSEL, Martin: Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches. In: Heinz-Josef Fabry – Ulrich Offerhaus (Hrsg.): *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und*

- Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, Vol. 1 (BWANT 153), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001, 197-211.
- SCHENKER, Adrian: *Septante et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CRB 48), Paris: Gabalda, 2000.
- SEELIGMANN, Isac Leo: Menschliches Heldentum und Göttliche Hilfe, die doppelte Kausalität im alttestamentlichen Geschichtsdenken, *ThZ* 19 (1963) 385-411.
- SEELIGMANN, Isac Leo: Menschliches Heldentum und Göttliche Hilfe, die doppelte Kausalität im alttestamentlichen Geschichtsdenken. In: Erhard Blum (Hrsg.): *Gesammelte Studien zur Hebräischen Bibel* (FAT 41), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004, 137-160.
- TALSHIR, Zipora: The Image of the Septuagint Edition of the Book of Kings, *Tarb.* 59 (1990) 249-302. (in Hebrew with English abstract)
- TALSHIR, Zipora: 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms – Origin and Revision, Case Study: The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11), *Textus* 21 (2002) 71-105.
- TALSHIR, Zipora: *Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z* (JBS 6), Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1993.
- THACKERAY, Henry Saint John: The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings, *JTS* 8 (1907) 262-278.
- THACKERAY, Henry Saint John: *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Vol. I: Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- THACKERAY, Henry Saint John: *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (SchL 1920), London: British Academy, ²1923.
- TOV, Emanuel: Different Editions of the Song of Hannah. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 433-455.
- TOV, Emanuel: Midrash-Type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 153-163.
- TOV, Emanuel: The Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 333-360.
- TOV, Emanuel: The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation. In: Emanuel Tov: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72), Leiden: Brill, 1999, 385-396.
- TOV, Emanuel: The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada. In: Emanuel Tov: *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 71-91.
- TOV, Emanuel: Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere. In: Emanuel Tov: *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 283-305.

- TOV, Emanuel: Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the MT, the LXX, and 4QJosh^a. In: Emanuel Tov: *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Vol. 3* (VTSup 167), Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill, 2015, 132-153.
- TOV, Emanuel: Textual Problems in the Descriptions of Moses' Ascent to Mt Sinai in Exodus 19, 24, 32, and 34. In: Evangelia G. Dafni (Hrsg.): *Gottesschau-Gotteserkenntnis: Studien zur Theologie der Septuaginta*, Bd. I (WUNT 387), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 3-18.
- TOV, Emanuel: Moses in the Septuagint. In: Géza G. Xeravits – Greg Schmidt Goering (eds.): *Figures Who Shape Scriptures, Scriptures That Shape Figures: Essays in Honour of Benjamin G. Wright III* (DCLS 40), Berlin – Boston: de Gruyter, 2018, 3-20.
- VAN DER MEER, Michaël N.: *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102), Leiden: Brill, 2004, 210-222.
- VAN KEULEN, Percy S.F.: *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11* (VTSup 104), Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- WELLHAUSEN, Julius: *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871.
- WEVERS, John William: Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of 1 Kings ii 12–xxi 43, *OS* 8 (1950) 300-322.

Zhrnutie

Táto štúdia rozoberá niekoľko hlavných postáv Izraela, ktoré vystupujú v skorších prorokoch, a skúma ich predstavenie v Septuaginte. Septuaginta je preklad, avšak prekladatelia jednotlivých kníh mohli znázorniť biblické postavy odlišne od ich zobrazenia v MT; napr. v gréckych prekladoch sa mohli dochovať pozostatky starovekých tradícií odlišných od tých v MT.

Je potrebné pamätať na to, že kánon v LXX sa skladá z rôznych typov prekladov. Grécka verzia Knihy Jozue napríklad odzrkadľuje iba niekoľko odlišných tradícií o Jozuem, zatiaľčo v gréckej verzii 1Kr nachádzame veľa tradícií o Šalamúnovi odlišujúcich sa od tých v MT. Grécka verzia Knihy kroník zase obsahuje len veľmi málo navzájom sa odlišujúcich tradícií. Preklad každej jednej knihy je teda osobitý.

Grécka forma 1Kr (3Kr^l v LXX) však predstavuje skôr výnimočný prípad. Dá sa povedať, že ide skôr o výnimku než o pravidlo. Len ak sa opis postáv v gréckej verzii líši od toho v hebrejskom texte, môžeme získať informácie o ich opise v LXX. Grécky preklad Septuaginty zdôrazňuje Šalamúnovu múdrosť a zmierňuje jeho hriechy, tiež pozitívnejšie rozpráva o hriešnikoch, akými boli Jeroboam a Achab.

Kľúčové slová: masoretský text, Septuaginta, skorší proroci, hlavné postavy SZ, teologické zmeny.

Summary

This study refers to a few major Israelite figures featuring in the Minor Prophets, examining their representation in the Septuagint. The Septuagint is a translation, but the translators of the various books could have presented these figures differently from their presentation in MT; for example, the Greek translations could have preserved vestiges of ancient traditions different from those of MT.

It should be remembered that the LXX canon is composed of translations of different types. Thus, the Greek Joshua reflects only a few variant traditions about Joshua, while the Greek book of 1 Kgs reflects many traditions about Solomon that differ from MT, and the LXX of Chronicles reflects again very few deviating traditions. The translation of each book stands by itself.

Thus, the Greek form of 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms in the LXX) presents a rather unique situation. I would say that this is the exception rather than the rule. Only if the description of the Greek figures differs from that of the Hebrew ones do we have some information about their depiction in the LXX. The Greek translation emphasizes Solomon's wisdom and whitewashes his sins, and it presents a more favorable account of the sinners Jeroboam and Ahab.

Keywords: Masoretic Text, Septuagint, Former Prophets, Major Old Testament Figures, theological changes.

Emanuel Tov
Department of Bible
Hebrew University
91905 JERUSALEM, Israel
emanuel.tov@mail.huji.ac.il

Obsah

Štúdie

Emanuel TOV

Niektoré hlavné postavy Izraela u Skorších prorokov
v tradícii Septuaginty 1-23

Peter DUBOVSKÝ

Porovnanie Eliášových a Elizeových zázrakov so zázrakmi
Ježiša Krista 24-42

Ladislav TICHÝ

Nevěstka Rachab v Novém zákoně 43-50

Petr MAREČEK

Eliáš. Jeho role a důležitost v Lukášově evangeliu 51-70

Helena PANCZOVÁ

Alegorická exegéza gréckych filozofov ako pozadie helenistickej
exegézy Biblie. Literárno-kultúrny prehľad 71-102

Abstrakty a recenzie 103-117

Správy a oznamy 118-124

Contents

Treaties

Emanuel Tov

Some Major Israelite Figures in the Former Prophets in
the Tradition of the Septuagint 1-23

Peter DUBOVSKÝ

From Miracle-makers Elijah and Elisha to Jesus and Apocrypha 24-42

Ladislav TICHÝ

Rahab the Prostitute in the New Testament 43-50

Petr MAREČEK

Elijah: His Role and Importance in the Gospel of Luke 51-70

Helena PANCZOVÁ

Allegorical Exegesis of the Greek Philosophers as Background of
Hellenistic Biblical Exegesis: Literary-cultural Survey 71-102

Abstracts and Reviews 103-117

Communications and References 118-124