

REVISITING 2 KINGS 13:14-21 (MT AND LXX): The Transposition of a Pericope and Multiple Literary Editions in 2 Kings

Matthieu RICHELLE, Vaux-sur-Seine

Textual multiplicity in the Book of Kings is the subject of an ongoing scholarly debate in which no consensus has yet emerged. Clearly, the Masoretic Text and the Old Greek reflect two different editions in several sections of 1-2 Kings/3-4 Kingdoms, but attempts to describe an overall scenario explaining the origins of textual diversity in the entire books of Kings have not yet convinced all the text critics. Rather, many studies are devoted to a detailed comparison between the textual witnesses in limited sections of the books of Kings. In this regard, the Solomon narratives (1 Kgs 2-11) have attracted much interest, albeit with contradictory results.¹ The Elijah cycle is but another example of an important part of 1 Kings that has recently been studied in detail.² In comparison, textual differences in 2 Kings have been paid less attention. Yet there exist significant divergences between the MT and the LXX there, some of them neglected by exegetes and the study of which could further research in significant ways. Among the most striking of these differences is a series of alterations scattered in 2 Kings, resulting in opposite evaluations in the comparison of the behavior of kings with that of their predecessors,³ or a different organization, in the Old

¹ J. Trebolle Barrera, *Salomón y Jeroboán. Historia de la recensión de 1 Reyes 2-12; 14* (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis Dissertationes 3; Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 1980); A. Schenker, *Septante et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 R 2-14* (CahRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000); P. S. F. van Keulen, *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); A. S. Turkanik, *Of Kings and Reigns: A Study of Translation Technique in the Gamma/Gamma Section of 3 Reigns (1 Kings)* (FAT-2 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), though the latter study has methodological flaws: see T. M. Law, "How Not to Use 3 Reigns: A Plea to Scholars of the Books of Kings," *VT* 61 (2011): 280-297.

² A. Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (OBO 199; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 14-33; P. Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18* (OBO 217; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006); idem, "Text and Literary History: The Case of 1 Kgs 19 (MT and LXX)," in *Soundings in Kings: Perspective and Methods in Contemporary Scholarship* (ed. K.-P. Adam and M. Leuchter; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2010), 15-34, 156-165.

Latin, of an entire section (MT 2 Kgs 17:7-23) in the epilogue concerning the Northern Kingdom.⁴

The present study will focus on what may well be the most spectacular of these phenomena in 2 Kings: the transposition of an entire pericope from ch. 13 to ch. 10, or maybe the other way round—this is precisely the question. Indeed, the last narrative involving Elisha (MT 2 Kgs 13:14-21) concerns King Jehoash of Israel in all witnesses except the Old Latin, where it is located in ch. 10 and concerns King *Jehu*. Is it possible to understand the textual evolution here? What is particularly fascinating in this text-critical problem is the fact that it involves not only “local” or “small” variants (due to modifications, additions or suppressions of words or expressions in some witnesses), but also a transposition, i.e. a literary difference, which reflects a compositional work on the text. Moreover, as we will see, both kinds of changes prove to be related here—yet another illustration of the entanglement of textual and compositional criticism.⁵

From a methodological point of view, this study will proceed in several steps.⁶ First of all, it is necessary to identify the textual tradition which is likely to reflect the Old Greek in the section under scrutiny. Secondly, by means of a synoptic reading of the main textual traditions, I will point out the most significant differences between them. In doing so, it will be metho-

³ This concerns Ahaziah of Israel, Yoram of Israel, Hosea and Manasseh. See Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher*, 116-117, 119-120; idem, “The Septuagint in the Text History of 1-2 Kings,” in *The Book of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (ed. B. Halpern and A. Lemaire; VTSup 129; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 3-17; J. Trebolle Barrera, “Histoire du texte des livres historiques et histoire de la composition et de la rédaction deutéronomiste avec une publication préliminaire de 4Q481A, ‘Apocryphe d’Élisée,’” in *Congress Volume Paris 1992* (ed. J. Emerton; VTSup 61; Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1995), 337-38.

⁴ See lately P. Torijano Morales, “Textual Criticism and the Text-Critical Edition of IV Regnorum: The Case of 17,2-6,” in *After Qumran. Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books* (ed. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and J. Trebolle Barrera; BETL 246; Leuven/Paris/Walpole: Peeters, 2012), 195-211; J. Trebolle Barrera, “Textual Pluralism and Composition of the Books of Kings: 2 Kings 17.2-23: MT, LXX^B, LXX^L, OL,” in *After Qumran* (ed. Ausloos, Lemmelijn, and Trebolle Barrera), 213-226; A. Piquer Otero, “What Text to Edit? The Oxford Hebrew Bible Edition of 2 Kings 17.1-23,” in *After Qumran* (ed. Ausloos, Lemmelijn, and Trebolle Barrera), 227-243.

⁵ This text-critical problem has been addressed by J. Trebolle Barrera in excellent pioneering works, which have probably not yet received all the attention they deserve; see especially J. Trebolle Barrera, *Jehu y Joas: Textos y composición literaria en 2 Re 9-11* (Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo para la investigación bíblica, 1984); idem, *Centena in libros Samuelis et Regum: Variantes textuales y composición literaria en los libros de Samuel y Reyes* (TECC 47; Madrid: Instituto de Filología CSIC, 1989), 177-183; idem, “Histoire du texte des livres historiques,” 339-341). It has also been studied by A. Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher*, 136-138. The present study summarizes an analysis which I have developed in my book *Le testament d’Élisée: Texte massorétique et Septante en 2 R 13,10-14,16* (CahRB 76; Pendé: Gabalda, 2010), and adds new arguments.

⁶ See Hugo, *Les deux visages d’Élie*, 120-125.

dologically important to distinguish between deliberate changes and differences which are due to textual corruptions or attributable to a translator, since the second category is immaterial to the reconstitution of the earliest literary history of the text. Then I will try to explain the textual evolution by identifying the origin of each significant difference between the textual traditions. Furthermore, I will explore different possible scenarios which could explain the overall situation. In particular, in order to gather all the available information concerning the deliberate variants, I will try to assess their impact on the narrative profile of the passage in its literary context (which differs according to the individual textual witness).

1. Textual witnesses

In 2 Kings, the Old Greek is often reflected by the Antiochian Text (LXX^L),⁷ but also by the Old Latin (OL), though only fragments of the latter are preserved. Generally speaking, it seems that the Greek *Vorlage* of the OL has often escaped later revisions influenced by the MT which have affected the Greek traditions in 1-2 Kings (LXX^B, LXX^L...).⁸ In particular, the *Palimpsestus Vindobonensis*⁹ provides parts of 2 Kgs 10, where the passage concerning Elisha appears between vv. 30 and 31; the king who is visiting Elisha is *Jehu* not Jehoash. Also, a few marginal glosses prove to be helpful.¹⁰ In 2 Kgs 13, there are good reasons to think that the OL, a literalistic rendition of its Greek model and the most distant witness from the MT in this passage (Paul de Lagarde's principle), globally reflects the Old Greek. The probability is even higher where the Antiochian text and the Old Latin agree.

As a result, the main textual witnesses we will compare here are the MT, the LXX^L and the OL.

⁷ N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, eds., *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia Griega, II, 1-2 Reyes* (TECC 53; Madrid: Instituto de Filología CSIC, 1992).

⁸ On these matters see Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Elie*, 38-39; idem, "Le Grec ancien des livres des Règles: 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, and R. D. Weis; VTSup 110; Leiden/Boston: Brill), 113-141. For a slightly more mitigated view of the textual relevance of OL, see N. Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1994).

⁹ B. Fischer, "Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L 115 for Samuel-Kings," *BIOSCS* 16 (1983): 13-87.

¹⁰ Cf. A. Moreno Hernández, *Las Glosas Marginales de Vetus Latina en las Biblias Vulgatas Españolas. 1-2 Reyes* (TECC 49; Madrid: Instituto de Filología CSIC, 1992).

2. Synoptic reading and identification of differences

The table at the end of this article consists in a synoptic presentation of the MT, the LXX^L and the OL (for the latter, the orthography of the manuscript has been used). In the discussion I will use the verse numbers of the MT. The presentation in columns allows the reader to immediately spot two *plusses* (in vv. 17-18). In addition, leaving aside a few insignificant differences, we can note other important textual divergences which are highlighted by frames in the table. All in all, this enables us to draw a list of seven significant differences:

- i. The formula used by the king towards Elisha in v. 14 is “My father, my father! The chariots of Israel and its horsemen” in the MT and “Father, Father! Chariot of Israel and its horsemen!” in LXX^L, but in the OL one reads “Father, Father! Chariot-driver (or: ruler) of Israel and its horseman (*rector israel et eques eius*)!” (one also finds *agitator* instead of *rector* in marginal glosses).¹¹ As I have tried to show in detail elsewhere,¹² this difference might simply be due to different vocalizations of the nearly identical formula רכב ישראל ופרשו, leading to the translation ἡνιόχος (or ἐπιβάτης) Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἰππεὺς αὐτοῦ then to *agitator* (or *rector*) *israel et eques eius*. This, in fact, is probably a better understanding of the original meaning of the expression, as shown by the parallel passage of 2 Kgs 2:12.¹³ Instead of a metaphor assimilating Elijah with chariots and horses or horsemen, which does not easily fit an individual, we understand that his disciple, when seeing him ascending on a chariot of fire, calls him a “chariot-driver,” which functions here as an honorific title for a person. Moreover, in 2 Kgs 13, there might be some irony when Elisha, immediately after having been called a “chariot-driver” by the king, makes the latter an *archer* (another military function) by ordering him to shoot an arrow (or even several in the OL). Note that in the Talmud, Elisha is said to have appeared to Rabbi Shimi bar Ashi with the appearance of a horseman (*bShabbat* 109b).
- ii. The location of the promised victories (v. 17) is Aphek in MT and LXX^L, but *aseroth quae est contra faciem samariae* according to the OL. There is no explanation to such a difference in the transmission or the translation processes, except a deliberate change.

¹¹ Hernández, *Glosas Marginales*, 136.

¹² M. Richelle, “Elie et Elisée, auriges en Israël. Une métaphore militaire oubliée en 2 R 2.12 et 13.14,” *RB* 117 (2010): 321-336.

¹³ In quotations we find a short formula: “pater, pater, agitator Israel” (G. F. Diercks, *Luciferi Calaritani opera quae supersunt* [CCSL 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1978], 36); “pater, pater, agitator Istrahel et eques ipsius” (C. Schenkl, *Sancti Ambrosii opera – Pars altera* [CSEL 32/2; Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1897], 508); “pater mi, pater mi, currus Israel et auriga eius” and “pater, pater, agitator Israel” (Hernández, *Glosas Marginales*, 123).

- iii. In v. 17 the MT has “the Lord’s arrow of victory, the arrow of victory in Aram” (or: “over Aram”) in MT, but instead of the latter precision we read “in Israel” in the LXX^L and the OL. This difference בארם/בישראל does not seem to be due to textual corruption.¹⁴
- iv. There is a *plus* in the OL in v. 17: *et aperuit fenestram secundam et dixit sagittare et sagittavit sagittam salutis dm̄ et sagittam salutis israel et dixit helisseus percuties syriā totam* (“and he opened a second window and said: ‘Shoot!’ and he shot the Lord’s arrow of victory and an arrow of victory of Israel, and Elisha said: ‘You will strike Syria in its entirety.’”). According to Fernández Marcos, this sentence disappeared by *parablesis* because of the repetition of ארם or Συρίαν.¹⁵
- v. Conversely, there is a *plus* common to MT and LXX^L in v. 18, according to which Elisha orders Jehoash to take five arrows. This is easily explained by a *homoiarcton* due to the repetition of the words “and he said” (וַיֹּאמֶר).
- vi. The king is Jehoash in the MT and the LXX^L, but Jehu in the OL (vv. 16.18). Which, of course, is related to the main difference:
- vii. The passage occurs in ch. 13 in MT and LXX^L but in ch. 10 in the OL.¹⁶

In sum, differences (i), (iv) and (v) might be due to mechanical errors which are irrelevant to the question of the earliest textual history of the pericope. Nevertheless, we will see later that (i) could well reflect a better understanding of the significance of the formula in its original context. By contrast, (ii), (iii), (vi) and (vii) most probably represent deliberate changes.

In what follows, I will begin with discussing the “small” changes (ii), (iii) and (vi), but it will shortly appear that all of them are related to the main difference (vii). Then I will return to (vii), which demands a special study.

¹⁴ A. Klostermann believed that the primitive text was באפרים (“in Ephraim”) and that it had been changed into בארם (*Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige* [Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften sowie zu den Apocryphen 3; Nördlingen: Beck, 1887], 438). If so, Ephraim, which is often used as a synonym for Israel, could explain the LXX^L. This seems unlikely however since one would have to assume that two letters were overlooked in the same word in the transmission process, and that Ephraim was changed into Israel in the Hebrew text (a change for which there does not seem to be any particular reason), or that the translator used the word Israel rather than Ephraim in Greek (which is unlikely given his literalistic translation and the fact that Ephraim appears in Greek in 2 Kgs 5:22 and 14:13).

¹⁵ Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators*, 70. For a more detailed discussion, see Richelle, *Testament*, 62-63.

¹⁶ In *Testament*, 18, I suggest the existence of yet another difference, regarding Elisha’s reaction in v. 19; but the verb used in LXX^L (ἐλπήθη) is a possible translation of the MT (וַיִּקְצֹר): see E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions to the Old Testament*, vol. 2 (repr., Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1975), 889.

3. “Small” changes

3.1. The location of the battles

In the OL, the location of the victories announced by Elisha in v. 17 is not Aphek but Aserot. Trebolle Barrera has suggested that the latter is a toponym which corresponds to ḤṢRT (*Ḥaṣerot*) in the Samaria ostraca, which date from the first half of the 8th century, that is, precisely the period the narrative refers to.¹⁷ This hypothesis sounds plausible. From a phonological viewpoint, the passage from Hebrew ḤṢRT to Latin *aseroth*, via the Greek *Vorlage* of the OL, would be similar to the passage from תְּצַרֹת (Num 11:35) to *aseroth* in the Latin translation of Eusebius’ *Onomasticon*.¹⁸ From an archeological viewpoint, several locations have been suggested for ḤṢRT: ‘Aṣiret el-Ḥaṭab,¹⁹ ‘Aṣiret el-Qibliyeh,²⁰ and El-Kebarrah,²¹ all three of them in the vicinity of Shechem, that is, near Samaria.²² Iron Age II pottery has been found during surveys on the three sites.²³

From a text-critical viewpoint, *Aserot* is the *lectio difficilior*: it is difficult to understand why someone would have changed Aphek into this insignificant toponym, whereas one easily understands the change into Aphek, which is the place of famous battles (1 Sam 4:1; 29:1), notably against the Aramaeans (1 Kgs 20:26).²⁴ The insignificance of Aserot as a place name is pointed out by the presence of the explanation *quae est contra faciem samariae*. On the one hand, it sounds like a gloss, which would have been added by a scribe desiring to help the reader to locate the unfamiliar toponym Aserot. On the other hand, one finds a similar expression in an Aramaic inscription from Arslan Tash dated to the 8th century B.C.: ḤLḤ.ZY.QDM. LLBN.²⁵ Here ḤLḤ and LLBN are towns or provinces. The expression

¹⁷ Trebolle Barrera, “Histoire du texte des livres historiques,” 341.

¹⁸ R. S. Notley and Z. Safrai, *Eusebius, Onomasticon: The Place Names of Divine Scripture, Including the Latin Edition of Jerome* (Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 9; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005), 10.

¹⁹ Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible* (New York: Burns & Oates, 1967), 325.

²⁰ R. Dussaud, “Samarie au temps d’Achab,” *Syria* 7 (1926): 12.

²¹ A. Zertal, *The Manasseh Hill Country Survey*, vol. 1: *The Shechem Syncline* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 21/1; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004), 74, 237-238.

²² The transformation of Ḥet into ‘Ayn at the head of Arabic names is attested to in other toponyms: see Y. Elitzur, *Ancient Place Names in the Holy Land: Preservation and History* (Jerusalem/Winona Lake: Magnes Press/Eisenbrauns, 2004), 297.

²³ Zertal, *The Manasseh Hill Country Survey*, vol. 1, 527-528, site no. 271.

²⁴ One should add that there might be an original alliteration in the *Vorlage* of the LXX: the Lord’s arrow (רַח) of victory, arrow (רַח) of victory in Israel, and you will strike Aram at תְּצַרֹת.

²⁵ W. Röllig, “Die Inschriften des Ninurta-Bēlu-Uṣur, Statthalters von Kār-Salmānu-Aṣarēd. Teil I,” in *Of God(s), Trees, Kings, and Scholars: Neo-Assyrian and Related Studies in*

ZY.QDM with toponym parallels *quae est contra faciem* with toponym. Thus, such a formula is not implausible in an early redaction of 2 Kings or of one of its sources. However, this might just show that it is a correct way of glossing Aserot in Antiquity. In any case, the presence of a gloss here would not change the analysis proposed here, because obviously, Aserot could not have been part of the gloss (otherwise there would be no toponym at all). On the contrary, this gloss confirms the fact that this town was not well known even in Antiquity.

Furthermore, the change Ḥaṣerot into Aphek might have been correlated with a transposition of the passage to ch. 13. Indeed, the name Aphek was probably already present in this chapter. It appears in 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L, a verse occurring only in the Antiochian text (but probably presupposing a Hebrew *Vorlage*): Καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἀζαήλ τὸν ἀλλόφυλον ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς καθ' ἑσπέραν ἕως Ἀφέκ. In the *Septuaginta Deutsch*, this verse is translated: “Und Azael nahm dem Andersstämmigen (das Gebiet) vom Meer im Westen bis Aphek aus seiner Hand.”²⁶ This verse, “quite enigmatic” as André Lemaire noted in his study of Hazael’s reign,²⁷ requires some elucidation.

According to some scholars, the “Sea to the West” is the Mediterranean Sea, and ἀλλόφυλον is, as usual, a designation of the Philistines. Their view is that Hazael took a territory extending from the Dead Sea to Aphek in the Sharon.²⁸ However, there are some difficulties with this analysis. First, this makes little sense in the historical and literary context of 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L. Admittedly, Hazael took Gath (2 Kgs 12:18), but a territory extending from the Mediterranean Sea to Aphek/Antipatris would be a thin strip of land since the latter town is located at 14 km from the sea. (And the geographical description does not indicate the north-south extension of the territory.) Furthermore, this would have little relevance in the literary context since the former verse (2 Kgs 13:21 LXX^L//13:22 MT) mentions the oppression of Israel by Hazael, and the next verses mention the re-conquest of *Israelite* towns (13:23-24 LXX^L//13:24-25 MT). Indeed, Hazael had taken from the Israelites territories in Transjordan (2 Kgs 10:32-33; cf. also Amos 1:3) and most probably in the north of Israel, as the archeological and epigraphical data seem to indicate: there seems to be an occupational gap in Megiddo at

Honour of Simo Parpola (ed. M. Luukko, S. Svärd, and R. Mattila; StudOr 106; Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2009), 265-278.

²⁶ W. Kraus and M. Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009), 456.

²⁷ A. Lemaire, “Hazaël de Damas, roi d’Aram,” in *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs: Etudes sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offerts à Paul Garelli* (ed. D. Charpin and F. Joannès; Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1991), 103 n. 85.

²⁸ E.g. E. Lipinski, *The Aramaeans: Their Ancient History, Culture, Religion* (OLA 100; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 386.

the end of the 9th century;²⁹ at the same period, the occupied surface at Tel Rehov was halved;³⁰ and a victory stela dated ca. 825 B.C.E., most probably written to the glory of Hazael, has been discovered at Tel Dan.³¹ In addition, 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L states that Hazael took the territory from his hand (ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ), which can only refer to Jehoahaz, mentioned in the preceding verse.

Second, the sea mentioned in 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L is certainly not the Mediterranean Sea. Firstly, this would be an unparalleled designation. There are thirteen other occurrences of the word ἑσπέρα in 1-4 Kingdoms:³² eleven times it translates עֶרֶב, and twice עֶרְבָּה (1 Sam 23:24; 2 Kgs 14:25). Schenker himself, who believes that 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L mentions the Mediterranean Sea, suggests a retroversion in this verse with עֶרְבָּה.³³ In 2 Kgs 14:25, ἕως τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς καθ' ἑσπέραν translates הַיָּם הָעֶרְבָּה. And הַיָּם הָעֶרְבָּה clearly designates the Dead Sea, as indicated by the apposition of הַיָּם הַמֶּלַח (“sea of salt”) in Deut 3:17; Josh 3:16; 12:3. This is corroborated by the historical context of 2 Kgs 14:25 (“from Lebo-Hamath to the Mediterranean Sea” would be meaningless there; historians understand here “Dead Sea”).³⁴ Finally, this is simply the sea geographically connected to the Arabah.³⁵ It would be very difficult to assume that הַיָּם הָעֶרְבָּה in 2 Kgs 13 is not the same sea as in the next chapter.

As a result, 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L claims that Hazael had taken a territory extending from the Dead Sea to Aphek. But this makes no sense if the latter is Aphek in the Sharon plain: it would be a territory encompassing lands in Judah and/or Benjamin, to the south of the Samaria hill country, a territory Hazael had not conquered. Moreover, it cannot designate a Philistine territory despite the expression τὸν ἀλλόφυλον. Furthermore, this territory had not previously been taken by Hazael from Jehoahaz, contrary to what is suggested by ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ. In fact, τὸν ἀλλόφυλον and ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ

²⁹ I. Finkelstein, A. Fantalkin, and E. Piasezky, “Three Snapshots of the Iron IIA: The Northern Valleys, the Southern Steppe, and Jerusalem,” in *Israel in Transition: From Late Bronze II to Iron IIA (1250-850 B.C.E.)*, vol. 1: *The Archaeology* (ed. L. L. Grabbe; Library of Hebrew Bible/OTS 491; New York/London: T&T Clark, 2008), 32-44.

³⁰ A. Mazar, “Rehov, Tel,” in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, vol. 5: *Supplementary Volume* (ed. E. Stern et al.; Jerusalem/Washington: Israel Exploration Society/Biblical Archaeology Society, 2008), 2013-2018.

³¹ A. Lemaire, “The Tel Dan Stela as a Piece of Royal Historiography,” *JSOT* 81 (1998): 3-14.

³² N. Fernández Marcos, V. Spottorno Díaz-Caro, and J. M. Cañas Reillo, *Índice griego-hebreo del texto antioqueno en los libros históricos*, vol. 1: *Índice general* (TECC 75; Madrid: Instituto de Filología CSIC, 2005), 190.

³³ Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher*, 114.

³⁴ E. g. J. M. Miller and J. H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (2nd ed.; London: SCM Press, 2006), 352.

³⁵ For a more detailed analysis, see M. Richelle, “Les conquêtes de Hazaël selon la recension lucianique en 4 Règles 13.22,” *BN* 146 (2010): 19-25.

seem to be mutually incompatible. Moreover, the singular ἀλλόφυλον is exceptional, as Schenker has noted.³⁶

A similar problem occurs in 2 Kgs 8:28. While the MT mentions here מֶלֶךְ־אֲרָם לְחָזַק and בְּעֶזְרִי offer Ἀζαήλ βασιλέως Συρίας, LXX^B and o have Ἀζαήλ βασιλέως ἀλλοφύλων. The latter probably reflects the OG, while the former (with Συρίας) seems to result from a revision influenced by MT (Paul de Lagarde's principle). There is absolutely no doubt that the correct expression is "Hazael king of Aram," but for some reason, OG reads "Hazael king of the ἀλλοφύλων." (Perhaps ἀλλοφύλων is understood in its etymological sense here). So it is conceivable that the same phenomenon occurred in 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L, and that the primitive text mentioned "Aram" not the Philistines. It is difficult to think of another way to make sense of this verse.

If this interpretation is correct, this verse would be an accurate description of the territories conquered by Hazael from Israel, recalled to memory just before the narrator goes on to speak of towns which Jehoash had reconquered from the Aramaean king. This territory would extend from the Dead Sea to Aphek in the Golan or to Aphek in the territory of Asher.³⁷ In the first case, the description corresponds to what has been described in 2 Kgs 10:32-33 as Hazael's conquests during Jehu's reign.³⁸ In the second case, the territory would encompass lands to the north of Israel, adding new losses during the reign of Joahaz to what had already been lost under Jehu.

Whatever the particulars of this verse, the point is that the name Aphek was already present in 2 Kgs 13 as a place on the boundary of the territories to be reconquered by the Israelites. Significantly, Aphek was the name of a place where Israel had fought against the Aramaeans (1 Kgs 20:26). Therefore one understands why a scribe moving the pericope to this chapter would have changed Aserot into Aphek: in ch. 13 it seems perfectly logical that Elisha announces victories on the northern boundary of the disputed territories. Thus, there seems to be a correlation between the transposition of the pericope and this small but significant change in its context.³⁹

³⁶ Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher*, 113.

³⁷ See R. Frankel, "Aphek," in *ABD*, 1:275-277. I am aware that the existence of Aphek in the Golan has recently been challenged by W. Zwickel ("Ein Afek im Golan?" in *Geschichte Israels und deuteronomistisches Geschichtedenken: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Winfried Thiel* [ed. P. Mommer and A. Scherer; AOAT 380; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010], 316-23).

³⁸ Cf. the literary and historical-geographical analysis of 2 Kgs 10:32-33 by Lemaire, "Hazaël de Damas, roi d'Aram," 101-105. This is what I suggested in "Les conquêtes de Hazaël," 22-25, and in *Testament*, 98-100. Contrary to what S. Hasewaga ("Looking for Aphek," *VT* 62 [2012]: 514) states, my argument does not imply a perfect parallel with Josh 12:3, where two seas form the boundary. The northern boundary of the territory may be designated by the Sea of Galilee as well as by Aphek in the Golan. This makes no difference since Aphek lies just to the east of this sea. My point is that it is the same territory in both cases.

³⁹ Since the submission of this paper, a very interesting article has been published by S. Hasewaga, in which he interacts with, among others, my proposal ("The Conquests of Hazael in 2 Kings 13:22 in the Antiochian Text," *JBL* 133 [2014]: 61-76). I cannot discuss it in detail

3.2. *Victory in Aram or in Israel?*

At first sight, it seems difficult to decide whether a scribe or a translator changed Aram into Israel or vice versa. At the very least, one can note that there is some logic in the fact that the witness according to which the battles are supposed to occur near Samaria, at the very heart of the Northern Kingdom, speaks of an arrow of victory *in Israel*. Similarly, if the victories occur in Aphek to the east of the Sea of Galilee, that is, at the boundary of a territory conquered by Hazael, it is reasonable to connect the arrow with a victory *in Aram* (or even “against” or “over” Aram if we are to understand the preposition ב in this sense).

There is however no symmetry in this matter. A scribe considering that the victory occurred near Samaria would have had no difficulty in speaking of a victory *in Israel* or *against Aram*, because the enemy remains the same in both cases. However, one would understand that a scribe speaking of a victory in Aphek in the Golan, *outside* the Israelite territory (or at least on the very boundary between Israel and Aram), would have found awkward to speak of an arrow of victory *in Israel* (and of course, *against Israel* would be absurd here). Therefore a correlation with the former variant seems possible. The change Ḥaṣerot into Aphek had led also to the change בארם into בישראל.

3.3. *The name of the king*

Since the name of the king in the OL appears in places (twice in v. 16, once in v. 18) where MT and LXX^L only have “the king of Israel,” one could argue that it was added in order to fit the new location of the passage. But if so, one wonders why the redactor had not simply changed the name where it occurred in the original text. One would have to assume that he deleted the name at least in the places where originally it had been present, then decided to add the new name in other places. Moreover, the same argument could be used conversely, leading to the conclusion that all the occurrences of “Jehoash” in MT and LXX^L are secondary. And we cannot rule out the possibility that in fact, the king was anonymous in the earliest state of the text. Thus, the arguments are inconclusive in this matter.

here; suffice it to say that, though I am very grateful to Hasewaga for brilliantly refining the debate, I am not convinced by his own solution which seems to me “highly speculative” (as he himself admits, 68). However, Hasewaga agrees that in 2 Kgs 13:17, “Aseroth was supplanted by Aphek when the entire episode was moved from 2 Kings 10 to 2 Kings 13” (74).

4. *The literary contexts*

4.1. *Methodological approach*

The most striking difference relates to the location of the pericope. How can such a difference be assessed text-critically? Three kinds of possible solutions may be suggested.

First, it might be that the content of the pericope itself has been affected during the transposition, for example in order to make some details fit the new context. As we have seen above, such “collateral changes” seem to have happened here (“Ḥaṣerot” into “Aphek” and “in Israel” into “in Aram”).

Second, one may hope to find traces of the compositional process. Since the very nature of the text-critical problem here corresponds to the problem studied by literary or compositional criticism, the same methods will be relevant (e.g. identification of *Wiederaufnahmen*). The entanglement between textual criticism and compositional criticism is now widely acknowledged in the scholarly debate.

Third, it could be that the evidence for the original location of the pericope comes to the fore because of the greater relevance of the pericope in this context (from a structural or a narrative point of view). Conversely, the pericope might appear artificial in the new context. Of course there is always the risk that a transposition is made precisely in order to give the pericope a better literary context. Therefore, caution is needed.

In addition, it is possible also that the textual traditions we have, and consequently the two contexts they give our pericope (chs. 10 and 13), reflect two different ways of inserting a pericope which was originally independent (cf. in New Testament textual criticism the famous case of the pericope of the woman caught in adultery, John 7:53-8:11).

4.2. *Analysis from the point of view of compositional criticism*

With regard to possible traces of a compositional process, it has long been noted that the last passage concerning Elisha disrupts the flow of the text in ch. 13, and even that this pericope lies outside the usual framework since it begins after the concluding formula about Jehoash (13:12-13).⁴⁰ In fact, there is another conclusion about this king in the next chapter (14:15-16). This is probably related to the fact that 14:8-14, a northern text (cf. “Beth-Shemesh, *which belongs to Judah*” in 14:11), still involving Jehoash, might have been transposed from the end of the section concerning the latter king to the section about Amasiah, as Klostermann has suggested.⁴¹ If this is correct, the other conclusion at the end of ch. 13, occurring only in the

⁴⁰ S. L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1991), 97.

⁴¹ Klostermann, 437-438.

Antiochian text (13:25-26 LXX^L), might be the original one, located after the original position of 14:8-14 in ch. 13. There is no simple solution to this complicated situation,⁴² but the point is that the overall organization of 13:10-14:16 MT seems messy.

What about 2 Kgs 10? In the OL, the pericope, together with the dynastic promise (10:30), is bracketed by two sentences containing identical statements about the imitation of Jeroboam I by Jehu:

- V. 29 “*But Jehu did not turn aside from the sins of Jeroboam son of Nebat, which he caused Israel to commit—the golden calves that were in Bethel and in Dan.*”
- V. 30 “The Lord said to Jehu, ‘Because you have done well in carrying out what I consider right, and in accordance with all that was in my heart you have dealt with the house of Ahab, your sons of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel.’”
- [Equivalent of 2 Kgs 13:14-21]
- V. 31 “*But Jehu was not careful to follow the law of the Lord God of Israel with all his heart; he did not turn from the sins of Jeroboam, which he caused Israel to commit.*”

In other words, there is a *Wiederaufnahme* formed by vv. 29 and 31.⁴³ One could argue that this is a compositional trace of the insertion of v. 30 alone, but the insertion may comprehend v. 30 *together with* 2 Kgs 13:14-21*. It is worth noting that the same phenomenon may lie behind the insertion of other prophetic narratives (see the *Wiederaufnahme* in 1 Kgs 12:32-33 and 13:33-34 enclosing the long narrative about a “man of God”)⁴⁴. This may be the case also in some Elijah/Elisha narratives (cf. a possible *Wiederaufnahme* in 2 Kgs 1:1 and 3:4-5 enclosing the last narratives concerning Elijah, although the presence of 1:1 seems secondary).

In sum, while absolute certainty is not possible here, we may well have a trace in ch. 10 of the insertion of the pericope in the books of Kings, by way of a classical compositional process. In addition to the fact that, by contrast, the present organization of 2 Kgs 13 MT seems disrupted by some modifications of its narrative flow and dtr frame, we have here good reasons to assume that the OL has preserved the original place of the passage. If one argues conversely that a scribe tried to improve a messy text by transposing the pericope from ch. 13 to ch. 10, one has to assume the occurrence of an improbable coincidence, since the scribe would have extended by chance the inner part of a *Wiederaufnahme* that would have been originally, and astonishingly, limited to one verse, 10:30.

⁴² See Richelle, *Testament*, 113-20, for a detailed discussion and a proposed solution.

⁴³ Trebelle Barrera, *Jehu y Joas*, 101-64; idem, “Textual Pluralism,” 226.

⁴⁴ T. Römer, *La première histoire d’Israël: L’école deutéronomiste à l’œuvre* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2007), 162.

4.3. Analysis of the literary contexts

4.3.1. Elisha's prediction and its fulfillment

Since the traditional location of the pericope is in ch. 13, there is no need to discuss this well-known context in detail.⁴⁵ The presence of 2 Kgs 13:14-21 in this chapter makes good sense because this narrative gives a prolepsis of vv. 22-25. Elisha announces Israelite victories to Jehoash, and the end of the chapter reports the fulfillment of this prediction. Moreover, since Jehoash conquered only some Israelite cities while Jeroboam II really restored the whole territory, and even extended it (14:25), this would match the incomplete success announced by Elisha.

This could lead to two opposite conclusions. On the one hand, this may mean that ch. 13 is the correct context for the pericope. However, there remains the problem of the disrupted organization of the chapter. On the other hand, the possible connection between this narrative and the victories of Jehoash could have motivated a redactor to insert the pericope here. If the original place of the narrative was in ch. 10, there was an ellipse regarding the fulfillment of Elisha's prediction since there is no account of battles by Jehu against the Aramaeans in the rest of the book. In a sense, 2 Kgs 10:32-33 implicitly alludes to such battles, but the absence of a detailed account might frustrate the reader. He cannot but interpret the victories announced by the man of God as insufficient to repel Hazael's army. This would explain why Elisha seems so disappointed. Again, this may be interpreted in two different ways. It could mean either that ch. 10 cannot be the original context of the pericope, or it was the reason of its transposition into ch. 13. Note, however, that even in ch. 13 no detailed account of Jehoash's victories is given.⁴⁶

4.3.2. Does the pericope fit the context of chapter 10?

In order to correctly assess the impact of the presence of the pericope about Elisha in 2 Kgs 10, more precisely at the end of the section concerning Jehu, we need to better understand what chs. 9-10 tell us about this king. Interestingly, two doctoral dissertations published in the same year (2007) draw different but complementary conclusions with regard to the way the dtr redactor(s) apprehended Jehu and his *coup d'Etat*.

In *Righteous Jehu and his Evil Heirs*, in a meticulous comparison with the dtr material about the other kings in 1 Sam to 2 Kgs, as well as with the Ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions, David T. Lamb points out striking

⁴⁵ For a recent study of this chapter, see J. W. Olley, "2 Kings 13: A Cluster of Hope in God," *JSOT* 36 (2011): 199-218.

⁴⁶ Another possibility is that the fulfillment should be regarded as postponed until the reign of one of Jehu's successors. Similarly the order given to Elijah in 1 Kgs 19:15 is (indirectly) obeyed by Elisha in 2 Kgs 9:1-4.

peculiarities in the manner in which the biblical text presents Jehu.⁴⁷ Against this background, it appears that positive aspects of Jehu's career are highlighted (e.g. his divine election and anointing), whereas some negative aspects are omitted (the tribute to Shalmaneser III), mitigated (the territorial losses) or justified (his violence). Moreover, according to Lamb, the positive characteristics of Jehu which are emphasized make him one of the favorite leaders in the Deuteronomistic History. Parallels with David show a pro-charismatic dtr bias. On the other hand, Dtr's handling of his sources concerning the heirs of Jehu reveal a negative stance (for instance, Jeroboam II's huge successes are mentioned only in passing). In sum, Dtr deliberately shaped the narrative about Jehu in a positive way and adopted a negative perspective on the rest of his dynasty, despite information from his sources which could lead to different evaluations. (According to Lamb, the reason for this is because Dtr wanted to discredit the principle of dynastic succession and to promote charismatic leadership.)

The second book, written by Lissa Wray Beal,⁴⁸ is devoted to the same subject but from the point of view of narrative criticism. According to her detailed analysis, the narrative voices suggest that Dtr ultimately *disapproves* Jehu's action. For instance,

the notice of fulfillment of 2 Kgs 10:17 carried authority because it was in the voice of the authoritative narrator, and Jehu's own notices of fulfillment sustained ambiguity because they were in the voice of a fallible character. It is the fact that Jehu proclaims his own prophetic words, and that Jehu proclaims those words' fulfillment, that shows him disapproved by Dtr.⁴⁹

This is not to say that Jehu is criticized in every respect and presented as a negative character. On the whole, Wray Beal discerns in the narrative an ambivalent portrait of Jehu, including both positive and negative elements, which were reflected in the final evaluation (10:29-31).

This is not the place to evaluate these two interesting works. Suffice it to say that they highlight complementary aspects of the characterization of Jehu. All in all, Jehu's evaluation by the dtr redactor(s), whether explicit in the final sentences or implicit in the narrative, is twofold, positive and negative. Lamb underscores the positive facet, while Wray Beal's work is precious in that it helps discern a subtle critique and thus better understand the negative facet of Jehu.

In our context the question is: to what extent does the presence of the passage concerning Elisha change the portrait of Jehu?

⁴⁷ D. T. Lamb, *Righteous Jehu and His Evil Heirs: The Deuteronomist's Negative Perspective on Dynastic Succession* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

⁴⁸ L. M. Wray Beal, *The Deuteronomist's Prophet: Narrative Control of Approval and Disapproval in the Story of Jehu (2 Kings 9 and 10)* (Library of Hebrew Bible/OTS 478; New York/London: T&T Clark, 2007).

⁴⁹ Wray Beal, *Deuteronomist's Prophet*, 187.

First of all, two details in the pericope could well allude to two features of the Jehu narratives. The main point in 2 Kgs 9-10 is the fact that Jehu killed a king by *shooting arrows* while on a *chariot* (9:24). His way of driving his own chariot seems to have been famous since a lookout recognizes him by it, noticing that “he drives like a madman” (9:20). In this light, the title used for Elisha by the king of our pericope (2 Kgs 13:14) would be far more meaningful if it were Jehu who is using it, not Jehoash. It is even true if we are to understand something like “chariots of Israel and its horsemen,” but it is much more striking if we were to read, like the OL, “chariot-driver of Israel and his horseman,” a sort of *hendiadys* for an individual. For Jehu this title would certainly be the most honorific title possible because it would be in line with his own practice and pride. In addition, there might be some irony in the fact that Elisha, in response, commands him to take a bow and *to shoot arrows*; this could be a veiled allusion to his regicide.

Secondly, Dany Nocquet has already noted the presence of a dtr frame (2 Kgs 8:25-29; 10:28-36) of the Jehu narratives.⁵⁰ The first part of this framework might even be extended to 2 Kgs 8:20-29. In both panels of the framework, we find similar themes: the bad behavior of the kings, the loss of territories and the dynastic succession. In the OG, this framework is even more extended because there is a new link resulting from the encounter and discussion between Elisha and a king or future king.

A. First panel of the framework:

Jehoram of Judah, a southern king like the northern kings

- *Elisha*: discussion with the future king Hazael, announcement of Aramaean oppression (2 Kgs 8:7-15)
- *etiology of Jehoram's behavior*: kinship with Ahab's house (8:18)
- *consequences*: defeats and loss of territories (8:20-22.28-29)
- *dynastic succession*: maintained in spite of the king's behavior (8:19)

B. Narratives concerning Jehu (9:1-10:27)

A'. Second panel of the framework:

Jehu, a northern king despite his yahwistic zeal

- *etiology of Jehu's behavior*: sin of Jeroboam (10:29.31)
- *consequences*: defeats and loss of territories (10:32)
- *dynastic succession*: maintained by divine promise (10:30)
- *Elisha*: visited by king Jehu, announcement of limited victories against Aram (13:14-21)

The second supplementary link is further strengthened by the numerous similarities between the two episodes (Elisha and Hazael in 2 Kgs 8:7-15; Elisha and Jehu in 2 Kgs 13:14-21*):

⁵⁰ D. Nocquet, *Le “livret noir de Baal”: La polémique contre le dieu Baal dans la Bible hébraïque et l'ancien Israël* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2004), 222-227.

	2 Kgs 8:7-15	2 Kgs 13:14-20
characters	Elisha; future king Hazael	Elisha; king Jehoash
“son” of Elisha	“your son Ben-Hadad” (v. 9)	“My Father! My Father!” (v. 14)
initial situation	“Ben-Hadad king of Aram was ill” (v. 7)	“Elisha had been suffering from the illness from which he died” (v. 14)
final situation	“[Ben-Hadad] died” (v. 15)	“Elisha died” (v. 21)
character weeping	“the man of God began to weep” (v. 11)	“[Jehoash] wept over [Elisha]” (v. 14)
Announcement of military victories	“I know the harm you will do to the Israelites... You will set fire to their fortified places...” (v. 12)	“You will completely destroy the Aramaeans at Aphek” (v. 17)

What is the effect of this extended framework on the characterization of Jehu? At least three elements are worth noting.

First, the parallels create a paradoxical contrast between, on the one hand, two Judaeen kings (Yoram and Ahaziah) whose attitude resembles the apostate northern kings and jeopardizes the dynastic stability of Judah, and on the other hand a northern king (Jehu) whose yahwistic behavior is “rewarded” by an unexpected dynastic promise for Israel. This wider context for the Jehu narratives enhances the “positive” side of his evaluation.

Second, the same framework draws parallels which highlight the fact that in spite of his zeal for yahwism, Jehu remains a northern king, who persists in the sins of Jeroboam, son of Nebat, and during whose reign Israel suffers severe territorial losses.

Third, the parallelism, and the intertextuality, between the two encounters with Elisha underscore a significant change: in the first meeting, Elisha weeps and promises to a future king terrifying victories; the second time, it is the king who is weeping, and the conclusion of the promises is that the victories will be limited. Moreover, Elisha’s sadness in our pericope echoes his sadness during his discussion with Hazael. He wept when he saw what Hazael would do to his people, he is sad when he understands that the Israelite king will not be able to completely defeat the Aramaeans. This makes better sense if this king is Jehu and if it occurs just before Hazael’s victories (which are mentioned almost immediately after our pericope in the OL).

All of this enhances the “negative” side of the evaluation of Jehu. In sum, the extended framework serves to acknowledge Jehu’s merits but also to relativize his achievements: he is nevertheless a northern king who acts as such, and he proves to be disappointing to Elisha; a relatively weak king who will not be able to subjugate the Aramaeans. As a result, the structure of the OG text not only is congruent with the subtle logic of approval/disapproval pointed out by Wray Beal, but enhances it.

5. Conclusion

This study has pointed out four main textual differences between the Masoretic Text and the Old Greek in 2 Kgs 13:14-21: three are “small” differences (Aphek/Ḥaṣerot in v. 17; in Aram/in Israel in v. 17; Jehoash/Jehu as the name of the king), and the fourth concerns the place of the pericope (ch. 13/ch. 10). Three scenarios may be suggested in order to explain these differences.

First, it could be that the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint has transposed the pericope from ch. 13 to ch. 10. In 2 Kgs 13, Elisha’s predictions fit the context since they are fulfilled at the end of the chapter. However, it seems difficult to explain why the place name Aphek would have been changed into Ḥaṣerot, a quite insignificant place, and why a victory “in Israel” would have been preferable to a victory “in or against Aram.”

Second, according to the opposite scenario, a redactor transferred the text from ch. 10 to ch. 13. Indeed, its location in the Old Latin reveals a possible *Wiederaufnahme* which might correspond to the place of the earliest insertion of the pericope in 2 Kings. Moreover, the transposition could have been motivated by a connection, made by a redactor, between Elisha’s prediction and Jehoash’s (limited) successes, while in ch. 10 there is only an elliptical allusion to battles against Hazael. At the same time, the seemingly messy state of 2 Kgs 13 MT might suggest the artificial situation thus created. In addition, Ḥaṣerot would have been changed into Aphek because the latter was mentioned in the same chapter (in 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L) as a boundary of the disputed territories, and this change, in turn, would have led to the change “in Israel” into “in Aram” because the place of the battles would not be in Israel any more. The name of the king would have been changed into Jehoash. In other words, all these changes are related, so that we have in reality a little network of correlated variants. Furthermore, the pericope seems to play an important role in the literary context of 2 Kgs 8-10, both from a structural and from a narrative point of view. In particular, the mention of “chariots” or “chariot-driver,” and the shooting of arrows, in 2 Kgs 13:14, would allude to two features of Jehu’s *coup d’État*.

A third scenario should be taken into account: the pericope (presumably involving an anonymous king) might have been an independent literary unit which two different editions of the books of Kings placed in two different contexts. This is an attractive but less “economical” hypothesis since the existence of a third situation is conjectural, not attested in preserved manuscripts. More importantly, the role played by the pericope in the context of 2 Kgs 8-10, both on the level of structure and of intertextuality, and the presence of two details in the very *content* of the pericope (namely the mention of “chariots” or “chariot-driver”, and that of “arrows”) which fit Jehu’s section, incline me to prefer the hypothesis that 2 Kgs 10 is the original context. The pericope may have been written within this context and for this context.

Of course, such difficult matters require humility on the part of scholars. As we have noted during the analysis, some arguments are reversible. One could also ask whether 2 Kgs 13:22 LXX^L was really there *before* the transposition of the pericope into ch. 13. Yet it seems significant that it is possible to describe a coherent scenario which explains all the variants as correlated. To the best of my knowledge, a coherent scenario in the opposite direction is still to be written, and scholars who regard the MT as more original in this chapter, have not yet provided an explanation for the state of the text in the Old Greek. In any case, further discussion may allow us to better understand what happened here.

Finally, one may wonder whether still another motivation lies behind the transposition. According to Trebolle Barrera, its purpose was to identify the “savior” of 2 Kgs 13:5 MT as Elisha. Indeed, where the MT speaks of a “savior,” the LXX mentions a “victory” (or “liberation”), the same word as in v. 17.⁵¹ But it is doubtful that the motivation for the transposition lies in this aspect. In fact, the pericope does not present Elisha as a “savior” at all. On the contrary, he only predicts disappointingly limited victories. Another hypothesis can be formulated. Olley has noted an intertextual link between 2 Kgs 13 and 1 Kgs 20:⁵² both Ahab and the king of 2 Kgs 13:14-21 are criticized by a “man of God” because they have not fought with the utmost energy against the Aramaeans (cf. 1 Kgs 20:33-34.42). Thus 2 Kgs 13:14-21 could well imply that the king has the same attitude as Ahab towards the Aramaeans. (In fact, several scholars believe that originally the king of 1 Kgs 20 was Jehoash himself.⁵³) Could it have been in the interests of a redactor, sensitive to the yahwistic action of Jehu, to exempt him from this comparison? Obviously, this remains very speculative.

To these analyses regarding 2 Kgs 13:14-21, one should add that a detailed comparison between the very next verses (vv. 20b-21)—a surprising episode indeed—shows that the MT represents a reworked text, while the OL more probably reflects the original state of the text (and LXX^L seems to be a compromise, having been revised to be in line with the MT).⁵⁴ Given the strong link between the two successive narratives (which share a “janus” sentence, v. 20a), one could argue that it enhances the probability that 2 Kgs 13:14-21 MT has been reworked too. However, one cannot rule out the possibility that these modifications have been made by different scribes at different times.

⁵¹ Trebolle Barrera, “Histoire du texte des livres historiques,” 340-341.

⁵² Olley, “A Cluster of Hope,” 207.

⁵³ E. g. A. Jepsen, “Israel und Damaskus,” *AfO* 14 (1942): 154-158; A. Lemaire, “La stèle araméenne de Bar-Hadad,” *Or* 53 (1984): 345; V. Fritz, *1 & 2 Kings* (CC; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 204-205.

⁵⁴ J. Trebolle Barrera, “Dos Textos para un relato de resurrección: 2 Re 13.20-21 TM LXX^B/LXX^L VL,” *Sef* 43 (1983): 3-16; Richelle, *Testament*, 73-87.

17	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשָׁבְתָּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם כִּי אֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם וְאֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם וְאֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם	17 και εἶπεν Ἐλισσαίε τῷ Ἰואς λαβὲ πέντε βέλη καὶ ἔλαβεν
18	וְיָשָׁבְתָּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם כִּי אֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם וְאֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם וְאֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם	18 Et iterum dixit helisseus ieu regi percute in terram et percussit ter et stetit
19	וְיָשָׁבְתָּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם כִּי אֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם וְאֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם וְאֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם	19 et contristatus est homo dñi pro eo et dixit si percussisses quinques aut sexies tunc percutiebas syriam totam usq. at finem et nunc percutes syriam ter
20a	וְיָשָׁבְתָּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם כִּי אֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם וְאֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם וְאֶתְּיָדִי אֶשְׂתָּרֵם	20a Et mortuus est helisseus et sepelierunt eum