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The making of a Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene text has brought to our team something more than a great deal of work: the challenge of putting face to face two texts in different languages, from different times, carrying with them only a partial evidence of their history.

In contrast with the Masoretic Hebrew Text (MT), the Greek Text, i.e. the Antiochene (Ant) and the rest of the Septuagint (LXXr), brings up the striking phenomenon of the organization of the books of Kingdoms. Although doublets and displacements take place in Greek as well as in Hebrew, most of them are small variations that can be explained on grounds of the principles of textual criticism, and fluctuation or inconsistency must be accepted as inner features of textual transmission. Complexity comes when facing other
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1 This article reproduces the paper read at the Xith Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden, 30-31 July 2004.
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questions: where, why and how large displacements or unlocalized 

fragments were generated.

The Greek text of the historical books reproduces a Hebrew text 
with lexical and literary differences from the received Masoretic 
text. No doubt that the Greek depends on the Hebrew text, but what 
text? 2

My proposal is based on different grounds: on the one hand, we 
must accept general assumptions as a starting point, and on the other 
hand we must go over concrete facts that show the peculiarities of 
the transmission.

In general we may assume that:

- Translators did not invent, they translated.
- Both Greek texts generally offer quite a literal translation in the 
books and sections coincident with MT.
- Greek texts have supported revisions of different kinds and with 
different purposes, regularly made as the Hexaplaric and the Antiochene, or sporadically, producing a more undefined text type. 
Undoubtedly, the Hebrew text has also been affected by revisions, 
being the Masoretic one the most important.
- The Greek texts represent a textual unity. The LXXrell and the 
Antiochene of 1 Kings go together in the sequence of events against 
the MT, they follow the same narrative thread, they both are 
Septuagint, although the numbering of chapters and verses varies.3

The MT usually constitute 
the referential text for judging 
the behaviour of other versions, and this is so because we have no other

---

2 About the strange correspondence between both texts, cf A. SCHENKER, 
Jesusst Testgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher (Fribourg - Göttingen 2004). Cf also G. GARRINI, Historia e ideologia en el Israel antiguo (Barcelona 2002).
3 Some isolated verses are lacking in LXXrell. Larger differences are 20:10b-13b, absent in LXXrell, and 22:40-51, absent in MT.

Hebrew original at our hand. But this text was selected from others 
and canonized by the Rabbis who locked their text; later on the 
Masoretes protected it against every tiny discrepancy in its own 
inside. Versions were not within the scope of the Masoretes and 
they run separately their problems.

The concrete facts that we are going to analyse will belong 
mostly to 1 Kings, where the contrast between the Greek and the 
Hebrew texts is stronger.

When comparing the Greek text of 1 Kings with the Masoretic 
Hebrew, difficulties of localization grow to be considerable. The 
texts are differently organized, the point is how to bring out which 
one was the organizer. The hebraica veritas leads us to think that 
the changes were operated in the translated text, but were there any 
thorough reason to re-arrange a text properly received? According 
to what text or criterion was it re-arranged?

The lack of agreement in the distribution of chapters between the 
Antiochene and MT-LXXrell of Samuel and Kings is only apparent. 
In the Antiochene the second book of Samuel goes up to the death 
of David, including the plot of Adonias upon which David took the 
decision of giving the kingdom to Solomon, with whom the first 
book of Kings begins. Although this rational break seems to be an 
Antiochene initiative, one may think that it comes from a pre-
Masoretic tradition, when the four books of Kingdoms were divided 
to two (Samuel and Kings).

In Antiochene chapter 2, the two fragments, one at the beginning 
and one at the end, are not found at that place in the MT. The first 
fragment is a praise of Solomon regarding his own person (2:1-14), 
and the second is also a praise regarding mainly his belongings
(2:26-37). A good number of these verses are found elsewhere as doublings, others have no equivalent.

Some of the corresponding verses of the MT have doublings, as 9:23 with 5:30, which is significant for the following: the meaning of 9:23 is somehow independent in the context of chapter 9, and goes along with chapter 5. Although both verses differ in the number of officers appointed to supervise the works of the temple (5:30 they are three thousand and three hundred, and in 9:23 five hundred and fifty), the affinity of verses is only easily damaged, considering the fluidity of ciphers within the Hebrew Bible and between related versions.

Verse 9:23, although out of context, is placed together with 24 and 25, all three corresponding to Ant 2:6-8. 11

The Masoretic group of verses 15-25 of chapter 9 is lacking in Greek at its place. 12 Most part of these verses are located in Greek in chapters 2, 5 (LXXeell 4) and 10. Thus, they are not lacking, they are displaced. All except 9:15 and 23, are not doubled. 13

There is no sound justification for these discordances. Considering that contents are not absolutely out of place either in Greek or in Hebrew, there is not a convincing justification to spread out one Hebrew fragment in a translation, a faithful one as the Greek is.

1 LXXeell 46.
2 In our forthcoming A Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiqene Text we have taken as equivalents the text closer to the Masoretic order. This does not mean a textual position of priority.
3 Also MT 5:30 has a contact with Ant 5:19 in the word θατρὶς as ἐκτὸς.
4 Three thousand and seven hundred in Antiqene (5:19 and also in 2:8 with a slight difference, a dot that separates the three thousand for the officers and the seven hundred for the supervisors). The LXXeell gives three thousand and six hundred (5:16). Josephus gives the number of five hundred and fifty with MT 9:23.
5 Remark that verses 6 and 7 have no Greek doubling.
6 Greek chapter 9 goes from verse 14 to 26.
7 Verse 16, quite long in Hebrew has no partner in Greek. It says about the conquer of Gezer by Pharaoh, how he put the Canaanites to death and gave the city to his daughter, Solomon's wife, as a marriage gift.

So, one might think that it should already be in that manner in the Hebrew Vorlage of the translators.

Other doublings deserve our textual attention:

- Verse 2:1' brings πλάτος καρδίας with MT 5:9 ὀψ ἄρχων, against χώμα καρδίας of the doublet 4:26. 14
- Verse 2:2' brings ὑπὸ ἄρχων (trsp. in LXXeell) with MT 5:10 ὑπὸ ἄρχατον, against ἄρχοντος ἄνθρωπον of the doublet 4:27. 17
- Verse 2:3' gives a Greek doublet with 5:1 19, with its second half repeated in 2:10. A few Antiqene expansions differentiate 2:3 from LXXeell, but both texts coincide, against MT, in the reading ἐν πρώτῳ, and in the sentence ἐν ἑταὶ ἔτοιμον ὑποίστησε καὶ συντέλεσε, and both are identical in the repetition of 2:10. They also go together against MT in the transposition of τῶν θυσίων Καρίου and in the omission of ἐπὶ 5:3 in 3:1. 20
- Verse 2:14' brings καὶ νῦν with MT 2:9 πᾶσι, against καὶ σῦ of the doublet 2Sa 26:9. 22 Although the fluctuation υπὸ for this word is quite common, it becomes significant for the πᾶσι near by.

In addition it is worthy to point out that many of these verses are disseminated in parts of the book that show some kind of problems, for example, the two verses 9 and 10 of the Masoretic chapter 5 discordant with their context, as well as verses 24 and 25 of Masoretic chapter 9.
The originality of verse 5 also presents some peculiarities. This verse is a summary of the municipal improvements carried out by Solomon in the city of David: the basin, the foundations, the main baths, the columns and the fountain of the palace, the bronze pool, the citadel and its turrets and the division of the city of David. Some unusual expressions can be detected, for instance, when speaking of the citadel (ἡ ἑρατία) the reference is made to the turrets (ἐπάλξεις) which is a hapax in the four books, while the most common is the fence (ὁ φραγμός); the verb δικαστεῖσθαι comes only this time in 1Kgs, and κρίνει comes once more for the fountain of Samaria in 22:38. The Antiochene coincides with LXXrev word for word with the exception of the syntax in one sentence:

LXXrev 2:35 καὶ ὕψωσεν τὴν ἀκραν ἐπάλξειν ἐπ' αὐτῆς («the high turrett on it»)

ANT 2:5 ὕψωσεν τὴν ἀκραν καὶ τὰς ἐπάλξεις αὐτῆς («the citadel and its turrets»)

The Antiochene reading here lies on a semitic construction. This fact and the unusual vocabulary could be an exponent of an old and unrevised text.

For this first fragment, 2:1-14, we may conclude that it may be a reconstruction, in a pre-Masoretic Hebrew redaction, of the qualities of Solomon, set out after the murders of Adonias and Joab, intending not to give a first portrait of Solomon as a cruel king, which, otherwise, was a sign of wise authority. This piece witnesses to other Hebrew redactions supporting political points of view diverging from the one that triumphed over many others in the 1st century.

In the second fragment, the one at the end of chapter 2, the doublets and the Masoretic equivalences are mainly placed within the margins of one chapter, chapter 4 for the doublets, and chapter 5 for the MT, with very few exceptions.

- Verse 2:28 has no Greek doublet nor Hebrew correspondence.
- Verse 2:29 takes only some data from MT 9:18.

LXXrev 2:46 is identical. In 2:32 (LXXrev 2:246) Antiochene has ἐγκρινομενεις: the whole sentence is absent in the corresponding MT 5:5, and present in MT 4:29 (last verse of chapter 4), where the reading ἐκρινομενεις goes with χάρισμας of ANT and LXXrev 2:26 / 2:46.

In Greek verse 1 of chapter 3 is lacking.

This is the case of 10:29 that cannot be taken as a doublet of 2:35 (MT 10:26).
Through these two fragments we have seen the difficulties of getting to a single theory, but, in the midst of the perplexity they generate, one is bound to simplify following the sense acquired in contact with both Hebrew and Greek texts. Many discrepancies can only be explained by assuming that Greek historical books were translated from a Hebrew text different from Masoretic.

Taking into account the literal character of the translation in most of 1-4 Kings, I am inclined to think that these chapters have been translated from a Vorlage different from MT. However, in the course of the transmission the Greek version has been diversely corrected towards other Hebrew texts in circulation, especially the MT. This fact explains at best, in my opinion, the main two phenomena we have perceived: a) the displacements and b) the numerous doublets coming from the corrections and the adaptation to the new order of the Hebrew text.

FIRST FRAGMENT

Doublets in the Antiochene Text

21 Καὶ ἔδωκεν Κώριος φρόνιμου τὸν Σολομώντι καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν σφοδρά καὶ πλάτος καρδίας ὡς καὶ ὡμος καὶ παρά τὴν θάλασσαν.

22 καὶ ἐπέλθεν ἐκ τοῦ Σολομώντος ὑπὲρ τὸν φρόνιμον πάντων ὑπὸν ὄρχησιν καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων φρονήματι Αἰγύπτου.

23 καὶ ἔδωκεν Σολομὼν τὴν πυγμαῖρα Φαραώ γυναίκα, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ πόλιν Δαυὶδ ἐως τοῦ συμφ.-

4.25 καὶ ἔδωκεν Κώριος φρόνιμον τὸν Σολομώντι καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν σφοδρά καὶ πλάτος καρδίας ὡς καὶ ὡμος καὶ παρά τὴν θάλασσαν.

4.26 καὶ ἔδωκεν Κώριος φρόνιμον τὸν Σολομώντι καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν σφοδρά καὶ πλάτος καρδίας ὡς καὶ ὡμος καὶ παρά τὴν θάλασσαν.

5.9 καὶ ἔδωκεν Κώριος φρόνιμον τὸν Σολομώντι καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν σφοδρά καὶ πλάτος καρδίας ὡς καὶ ὡμος καὶ παρά τὴν θάλασσαν.

5.10 καὶ ἔδωκεν Κώριος φρόνιμον τὸν Σολομώντι καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν σφοδρά καὶ πλάτος καρδίας ὡς καὶ ὡμος καὶ παρά τὴν θάλασσαν.
SECOND TRACTATE

Doubts in the Acharoneh Text

MT

283 and the Hebraists, and those who know the Greek, say that the word את is artificial and is not suited to the Hebrew text. Therefore, the word את is added. And the words מָצַּמִּים are later insertions. It seems that the word את was written רַע, but it was changed to את because the word רַע was not suitable.

Therefore, the word את is added. And the words מָצַּמִּים are later insertions. It seems that the word את was written רַע, but it was changed to את because the word רַע was not suitable.
μόσχου εκλεκτοὶ καὶ εἶπος βρέχες νομίζει καὶ εκτὸς πρίγγας, εκτὸς ἑλέρων καὶ δρόμου ῥα, καὶ ἐρήμων εκλεκτῶν καὶ νομίζων.

231 δὲ ὅτι ἦν ἄρχον ἐν παντὶ πέραν τοῦ πατριου.

232 καὶ ἦν αὐτῇ εἰρήνη ἐκ πάντων τῶν με-
πίνακος καὶ κυκλοφόρων.

233 καὶ κατόπιν Ἰω-
δίκας καὶ Ἰσραήλ πετο-
θάνει, ἐκθατος ἕως τὴν
κατεξουσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν συνέχειαν αὐτοῦ, ἐσπε-
ντες καὶ πίνοντες καὶ ἑσπεριδοῦντες, ὡς ἄν
καὶ ἔστειλεν πάντας τὰς Ἰμερᾶς Σολο-
μώνας.

234 καὶ οὗ ἦν Σαταν
όποις τὰς Ἰμερᾶς Σολο-
μώνας.

235 καὶ οὗτοι ὁι ἄρχο-
ντες τοῦ Σολομῶντος
ἀπαίρετος, ὡς Σαθάδος
τῶν ἐρήμων καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀκτώ
καὶ Ἐδών ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκτὸς
καὶ Σοφᾶς γραμ-
ματέως καὶ Βολᾶς ὄνος.

236 καὶ ἔγραψε Κύ-
ριος συνὸν τῷ Ἱω-
δίκῳ τοῦ Ἱσραήλτων

237 καὶ ἔγραψε Οὐ-
δίκας καὶ Ἰσραήλ πετο-
θάνει, ἐκθατος ἕως τὴν
κατεξουσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔστειλεν πάντας τὰς Ἰμερᾶς Σολο-
μώνας.
RESUMEN

Los problemas que presenta el texto griego bíblico de los libros históricos en relación con el texto hebreo masorético han de considerarse dentro de un pluralismo textual hebreo capaz de explicar los grandes desplazamientos y muchos de los dobletes griegos. La autora presenta y analiza dos fragmentos del texto antioqueno del libro primero de los Reyes como ejemplo de la falta de correspondencia entre ambos textos. La fuerte literalidad que se percibe en las secciones coincidentes con el texto masorético pone de manifiesto que la traducción griega de estos libros tendía a ajustarse al texto base, por lo que discrepancias de cierta magnitud como las presentadas aquí indican que el texto hebreo subyacente contenía importantes diferencias con el masorético.
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SUMMARY

The problems concerning the correspondence between Greek and Masoretic texts must be considered within the scope of a Hebrew textual pluralism, that could be able to explain large displacements and many of Greek doublets. The author presents and analyses two fragments of the Antiochene text of the first book of Kings as a sample of the lacking in correspondence with Masoretic text. As in coincident sections Greek is strongly literal, it seems that the Greek translation of these books tended to be faithful to the original, therefore the discrepancies of quite a great extent, as those presented here, show that the underlying Hebrew text held considerable differences from Masoretic.
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