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Abstract: The value of Old Latin witnesses in the textual criticism of Septuagint has been lately noted by a growing number of scholars. As a daughter version of the Septuagint, the Old Latin is an important witness to the textual history of the Septuagint, as well as to the Hebrew Vorlage behind it. This article seeks to elucidate and ascertain the text-historical position of the fifth century Old Latin manuscript Palimpsestus Vindobonensis (La115) in 2 Kings. This task is carried out by first mapping all the characteristic readings of the manuscript (248 cases in total) and then by studying fourteen most illuminating readings. In 2 Kings, the manuscript seems to be free of Hexaplaric and Vulgate influence and most probably also of kaige readings. There are few, if any, recensional Lucianic readings. For the most part, the text of La115 belongs to the proto-Lucianic layer and therefore mostly seems to preserve the Old Greek text—sometimes even when all preserved Greek witnesses have lost these Old Greek readings. La115 is thus argued to be an exceedingly important witness to the textual evolution of 2 Kings.

The value of Old Latin (OL) witnesses in the textual criticism of Septuagint (LXX) has been lately noted by a growing number of scholars.1 As a daughter version of the Septuagint—that is, its antique translation—OL is an exceedingly important witness to the textual history of the Septuagint, as well as the Hebrew Vorlage behind it. However, a systematic study of these witnesses and their textual affiliations has until recently been scarce and quite wanting.2 In this article the challenge is taken up to chart the possible (proto-)Lucianic, Old Greek (OG), and kaige readings in 2 Kings with the help of the fifth century OL manuscript Palimpsestus Vindobonensis (La115).3 Especially when the readings of La115 agree with the Antiochian text (L)

---

1 I would like to thank Tuukka Kauhanen for his kind remarks when writing this paper and Pablo Torijano Morales and Julio Trebolle Barrera, the editors of the Göttingen Septuagint of 1–2 Kings, for an access to their preliminary apparatus.


3 See Bonifatius Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L115 for Samuel–Kings,” BIOSCS 16 (1983), 13–87; for the edition of the manuscript. The term proto-Lucianic reading is often used as a synonym for an OG reading, especially in the context of 2 Kings. However, in
against the majority text, the reading is of great interest, since these readings have the most potential for shedding light on the character of the Lucianic text (L) of 2 Kings as well.

In earlier studies of La\textsuperscript{115}, which retains a fragmentary OL translation of 1 Samuel–2 Kings, it has been generally concluded that its Greek base text was old and of good quality.\textsuperscript{4} The translation technique of this manuscript is mostly literal, albeit not slavish, as the translator has aspired to translate his base text word for word by using set translation equivalents.\textsuperscript{5} There seems to be no Hexaplaric influence in the manuscript. The same is likely the case for Vulgate influence as well. The question of Hebraizing kaige influence in the manuscript has so far not been much discussed, since no systematical studies on its text in the so-called kaige sections have been conducted prior to this paper.\textsuperscript{6} However, those studies that have discussed the issue generally conclude that the kaige influence is either nonexistent or, at most, very limited.\textsuperscript{7} This makes the manuscript an extremely interesting—and potentially valuable—witness to the study of the OG of 2 Kings. Because of its old age, it is likely that La\textsuperscript{115} has—at least for the most part—avoided also Lucianic influence.\textsuperscript{8}

In addition to these considerations, some unique textual characteristics of La\textsuperscript{115} in 2 Kings should be briefly noted. Unlike any other witness, La\textsuperscript{115} has some notable transpositions of materials in its chapters 10 and 17, and the whole chapter 16 is missing from between verses

---


\textsuperscript{5} It is likely that La\textsuperscript{115} evidences an OL translation of Samuel–Kings known from no other source. Indeed, all known OL translations/manuscripts of Samuel–Kings are likely (mostly) independent from each other; see Kauhanen, “Septuagint in the West,” 309–25, and Timo Tekoniemi, The Textual History of 2 Kings 17, BZAW 536 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 17.

\textsuperscript{6} The kaige revision was a Hebraizing revision of the Septuagint made in the first centuries BCE and CE. The aim of kaige revision was to harmonize the Greek texts towards the (proto-)MT text using a very literal, word-for-word translation technique. The name of the revision comes from the idiomatic translation equivalent \textit{και γε} for the Hebrew \textit{וְגַם}; see for further studies James K. Aitken, “The Origins of KAI ΓΕ,” in Biblical Greek in Context: Essays in Honour of John A. L. Lee, ed. James K. Aitken and T. V. Evans, Biblical Tools and Studies 22 (Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 21–40; and the articles in Aejmelaeus and Kauhanen, Legacy of Barthélemy.

\textsuperscript{7} To my knowledge only Julio Trebolle Barrera, “Textos ‘Kaige’ en la Vetus Latina de Reyes (2 Re 10, 25–28),” RBib 89 (1982): 198–209, has argued that there might be some (albeit very limited) kaige influence in the manuscript. On the methodology of finding kaige readings, see Kauhanen, “Lucifer of Cagliari and the Kaige Revision,” in Kauhanen and Aejmelaeus, Legacy of Barthélemy, 146–68.

\textsuperscript{8} The question whether (or to which extent) La\textsuperscript{115} has been influenced by the Lucianic revision is still up to debate, since both Kauhanen, Proto-Lucianic Problem, 163–64, and Tekoniemi, “Is There a (Proto-)Lucianic Stratum,” 132–33, maintain that there may be some (very) sporadic Lucianic influence in the manuscript. Thus an agreement between \textit{L} and La\textsuperscript{115} does not by itself yet guarantee an OG reading (see also footnote 3 above).
15:38 and 17:1.\(^9\) In chapter 10, La\(^{115}\) also has a curious double narrative of Jehu destroying the temple of Baal, which is partly resounded also by \(L\). Why these phenomena appear is not yet completely clear, but it has been argued, quite persuasively in my opinion, that many of these deviations from rest of the Greek evidence may in fact be due to the OG nature of La\(^{115}\)’s text.\(^{10}\)

According to my calculations there are altogether 248 cases in 2 Kings in which an agreement pattern can be observed. The distribution according to different patterns is as follows:\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Percentage of cases</th>
<th>Percentages in 1 Kings(^{12})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La(^{115} = B \neq L)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27% (51 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La(^{115} = L \neq B)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26% (50 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La(^{115} = B \neq A)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9% (16 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La(^{115} = A \neq B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2% (4 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La(^{115} = \text{other MSS} \neq A B)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11% (21 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique readings</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25% (48 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100% (190 cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared with the data from 1 Kings (all of which comes from the nonkaige section), the picture is quite clear: as would be expected from potential OG witnesses in the kaige sections, the amount of agreements between La\(^{115}\) and \(L\) increases while the agreements between \(B\) and La\(^{115}\) decrease. It is interesting, however, that at the same time also the amount of unique readings increases in La\(^{115}\). While in 1 Kings most of the unique readings can easily be attributed to small independent changes or translation technique (explications of subjects, additions of conjunctions, etc.), in 2 Kings the differences are often much more substantial. Whether or not this is due to the influence of kaige in every other witness (even \(L\)) or even some putative revision on the part of La\(^{115}\) itself, this article may help us define more clearly the general textual affiliations of La\(^{115}\) in 2 Kings.

---

\(^9\) It is likely that chapter 16 was originally situated after chapter 17 in La\(^{115}\), since verse 15:38 mentions Ahaz as the son of Jotham as in the rest of the tradition. Why this chapter was transposed is not clear, but it may have something to do with the peculiar chronological situation of 2 Kgs 15–18. See Tekoniemi, *Textual History of 2 Kings* 17, 39–52, for further discussion.


\(^11\) As the space does not permit the enumeration of all the cases in this article, the collected cases (of both 1 and 2 Kings) may be found in Timo Tekoniemi, “Identifying kaige and (Proto-)Lucianic Readings in 2 Kings with the Help of Old Latin Manuscript La\(^{115}\)” (Collected Cases) (Dataset presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Boston, 19 November 2017, and updated since), available for free download at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4234627.

\(^12\) The numbers are from Tekoniemi, “Is There a (Proto-)Lucianic Stratum.”
Analyses of Cases La\textsuperscript{115} = L ≠ B

Of all the eighty-seven cases of pattern La\textsuperscript{115} = L ≠ B, only a handful (fourteen cases in nine verses) of the most significant and/or challenging cases can be analyzed here.\textsuperscript{13} These cases can help our understanding of the textual affiliations of La\textsuperscript{115} with kaige, (proto-)Lucianic text and other text forms.

6:8 εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸνδε τινὰ ελμωνι παρεμβαλω (אֶל־מְקוֹם פְּלֹנִי אַלְמֹנִי תַּחֲנֹתִי MT)
La\textsuperscript{115}; in locum phelminim insidia faciamus et fecerunt
τόνδε τινὰ] > τόνδε 247 488; > δε τινά 158; > τινὰ 82 489 71 342; om L\textsuperscript{-82} 246 158 La\textsuperscript{M}; illo et illo Vulg
ελμωνι [pr τὴν 71 342; φελμωνι/-μουνι 247 488 98' 158; τὸν (τοῦ 19') φελμουνι L\textsuperscript{82} 246 460; phelminim La\textsuperscript{115} La\textsuperscript{M}
παρεμβαλοι] ποιῆσωμεν ἔνεδρον 127; ποιῆσωμεν ἔνεδρον καὶ ἐποίησαν L\textsuperscript{82} 127 246 460;\textsuperscript{14} insidia faciamus et fecerunt La\textsuperscript{115}; obsessionem faciamus La\textsuperscript{M}; ponamus insidias Vulg; תַּחֲנֹתִי MT

The story of Elisha thwarting the Aramean attack with his prophecy starts with 6:8. In this verse there is a curious transcription ελμωνι, which has not been discussed very much in the research. It seems probable that the OG translator did not know the meaning of the Hebrew expression פְּלֹנִי אַלְמֹנִי “such and such,” since also in 1 Sam 21:3 the words are simply transcribed as Φελλαν Αλεμωνι.\textsuperscript{15} In L\textsuperscript{82}, La\textsuperscript{115}, and La\textsuperscript{M} only the first word φελμουνι, which seems like some sort of mixed form of both Hebrew words, is here transcribed with the second one missing, while the majority text has both a working translation of the construct (τόνδε τινὰ “this certain”) and a transcription ελμωνι for the latter Hebrew word.

The amalgam φελμουνι may be an accidental one (either in the Hebrew Vorlage or, not as likely, in Greek) but is already known in Hebrew; compare Dan 8:13 (פַּלְמוֹנִי).\textsuperscript{16} Therefore the difference could simply go back to differing copying practices in Hebrew, with one copyist writing the longer (MT) and the other the shorter (L OL) form of the same expression.\textsuperscript{17} Especially when the OL witnesses are taken into account, the reading seems proto-Lucianic, as the Lucianic reviser would have almost certainly preferred the good Greek form τόνδε τινὰ of the majority text had he known it. Peshitta (ܒܐܬܪ ܦܠܢ) lacks the mention of Αλεμωνι as well.

The question remains which reading is the OG. The witness of Aquila and Symmachus would seem to indicate that the better Greek variant τόνδε τινὰ of majority text is in fact here likely later.\textsuperscript{18} Indeed, Theodotion is attributed in 1 Sam 21:3 with precisely the same wording τόνδε τινὰ ελμωνι as in the case under discussion. The attestation of the Ethiopic in regione Felmon gives further proof for the antiquity of the reading of L and OL.

\textsuperscript{13} The large and substantial agreements between La\textsuperscript{115} and L in 10:23–28 and partly in 17:7–19 have to be skipped here, as they would require a study of their own. It may be here said that many of the agreements between L and La\textsuperscript{115} in both chapters are for the most part certainly proto-Lucianic and very probably go back to OG.

\textsuperscript{14} MS 158 has this plus erroneously in verse 12.

\textsuperscript{15} However, this transcription in 1 Samuel could be a later Hebraizing addition, since it is lacking in the majority text.

\textsuperscript{16} Thus Charles Fox Burney, Kings Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903), 285: “this form appears to be presupposed by Luc.”

\textsuperscript{17} T. R. Hobbs, 2 Kings, WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1985), 71, proposes that L simply takes the reading from Daniel, but this does not seem likely, since this verse and Dan 8:13 have nothing else in common.

\textsuperscript{18} α’ προς τὸν τόπον τὸν δεινα τοῦτο τινὰ σ’ κατα τοπον τοῦτο.
For the third case, the awkward MT reading תַּחֲנֹתִי is often translated as “my encampment.” This Hebrew reading has been customarily thought to be corrupted which is undeniably the case. The Greek majority text seems to take this as a first person verbal form of חנה, “to encamp,” with the usual translation equivalent παρεμβάλλω, while L and the OL witnesses—and even Vulgate—read differently ποιήσωμεν ἐνέδρον, “we make ambush.” Of these, the majority text is closer to the Masoretic wording and is probably due to the kaige reviser at the same time Hebraizing the reading and making the text a bit more readable. The reading of L, OL, and Vulgate is partly in line with verse 6:9, where all Greek and OL witnesses have either κέκρυπται, as in the majority text, or ἐνεδρεύουσιν, as in L. The LXX witnesses possibly translate ἔνεδρον against MT’s strange form ἐντριήμενος. Some commentators emend the MT wording to the LXX’s reading. However, the L and OL reading ποιήσωμεν ἐνέδρον of 6:8, while probably closer to the OG, seems somewhat paraphrasing (or, alternatively, this was a somewhat free rendering already in the OG), and does not seem to come straight from Hebrew. The use of the word ἐνέδρον in both verses 8 and 9 in L is suspicious due to its harmonizing flavor and likely recensional, at least in 6:9. As both OL witnesses seem to follow a text very similar to L here, this appears like a recensional Lucianic reading in them, though the exact base text of the OL witnesses is hard to discern—it is not certain that they follow exactly the wording of L, for instance. The original Hebrew possibly had in verse 6:9 the form תחנו רבי.

On the other hand, the plus of L-82 and La115, “and they made,” at the end of the verse is quite clearly a secondary, explicative addition, which was hardly made in both independently. In kaige sections, the differentiation between recensional Lucianic and proto-Lucianic readings is difficult, but taking into account the other phenomena in the verse, this plus should probably be seen as proto-Lucianic and ultimately as the OG reading (the secondary plus being extant already in the Vorlage), kaige having deleted the unnecessary explicative addition not found in MT.

---

20 La115 translates the verb παρεμβάλλω four times: 1 Sam 4:1 castra posuerunt, 11:11 castra posuit; 2 Sam 11:11 requiescent (contextual harmonization?), 17:26 castra constituit. As there seems to be some contextual variation in the translations of this expression, also here the insidia faciamus could, to some extent, even be argued to be such a free rendering.
21 La115 usually translates κρύπτω with abscondo; cf. 1 Sam 3:17 (absconder e, absconder e), 3:18 (celavit), 20:22 (absconsus est), 14:22 (absconsi erant); 2 Kgs 6:9 (abconsa est). The verb ἐνεδρεύω is also used in 1 Sam 15:5 (אכני) and 2 Sam 3:27 (אכני), showing that already the OG translator was indeed familiar with it. The verb is used especially in Judges, where it consistently translates אכני.
22 See Stade, *Book of Kings*, 205. Peshitta seems to also have in 6:8 a similar double reading: “in such and such place you shall set an ambush and hide” (�אָנִיבָנֵי נָטֹנֶת לָשֶׁת). Similarly, Stade, *Book of Kings*, 205.
23 The base text of La115 in the case of insidia may have been ἐνέδρον, but as this is quite a rare word in LXX, this becomes suspect. In 2 Kgs 17:4 insidia seems to translate ἐπιβουλή (against the ἀδικίαν of majority text), found again only in Lucianic witnesses. The base text of La115 is therefore not completely certain.
26 It is also possible that this plus was dropped at a very early point because of a homoioteleuton καὶ … καὶ, and the proto-Lucianic tradition was the only one to preserve the plus. There would therefore no need to suppose kaige influence here. See somewhat similarly also Siegfried Kreuzer,
The next three cases in 10:8–11 form a part of the story of Jehu’s rise to power and the massacre of King Ahab’s relatives. While the first two cases deal with simpler kaige-type phenomena, the third one may also have some broader literary critical repercussions.

There are two interesting textual phenomena in verse 10:8. First, the equivalent of "θύρα" for the Hebrew term פֶּתַח seems to be a kaige feature, as can be seen by both the distribution between kaige/non-kaige sections and by the manuscript attestation. The OG equivalent of פֶּתַח seems to have been πυλῶν/θυρώμα. Interestingly the OG equivalent "θύρα" for the Hebrew פֶּתַח keeps the same throughout Samuel–Kings and does not change as with many other kaige readings.

Second, the whole phrase רעשת חֵרָה, “the doorway of the gate” (= "θύρα τῆς πύλης") seems to be in Samuel–Kings more characteristic to MT/kaige edition than to OG. In OG, as here in 2 Kgs 10:8–9, the usual word combination is "the gate of the city" (most probably from Hebrew רָעָה חֵרָה). It seems that for some reason in the MT or in the Vorlage of OG the phrase was quite systematically changed. Indeed, in 1 Kgs 17:10 both LXX (πυλώνα τῆς πόλεως) and MT (רָעָה חֵרָה) have the phrase, “the gate of the city,” which may hint at the change to have happened in the edition of MT—though the reason for such a change is not very clear.


28 No manuscript gives the reading found in Rahlfs’s edition, as also indicated by his apparatus.

29 This feature has also been discussed by Takamitsu Muraoka, “Greek Texts of Samuel–Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity?,” AbrN 21 (1982–8193): 44, who nevertheless does not deem this as an outright kaige feature. Cf. פֶּתַח in 1 Sam 2:22 (>OG; θύρας in Hexaplaric witnesses); 2 Sam 10:8 (θύρα/θύραν A B M O a−127 b 64' 55 158 244 245 460 707 (πυλῶν rel), 11:9 (θύρα) πυλῶν L = portam La15); 11:23 (θύρα in all witnesses); 1 Kgs 6:8[13] (πυλῶν), 6:31[30] (θυρώματι), 6:33[31] (πυλῶν), 7:5[42] (θυρώματα), 14:6 (ανοιγματι A 247 127 CII 121 d 370 s 64' 554 =Hex.), 14:27 (πυλῶνα), 17:10 (πυλῶνα), 19:13 (>OG; the translator/Vorlage mistakenly read פֶּתַח as חֵרָה), 22:10 (πυλῶνις); 2 Kgs 4:15 (θύραν in all witnesses), 5:9 (θύρας in all witnesses), 7:3 (θύραν) πυλῶν 246 71 55; πυλῶν 460), 23:8 (θύρα in all witnesses).

30 In 1 Sam 3:15, 21:14, 23:7; 2 Sam 13:17, 18; 1 Kgs 6:31, 32, 34 (3x), 7:20 (2x), 16:34; 2 Kgs 4:4, 5, 33, 6:32 (2x), 9:3, 10, 18:16. Only in 2 Kgs 12:10 is the translation 2:12:10, but this variant seems to be due to contextual matters.

31 In 2 Sam 10:8 (πυλῶνις A B[ct] p m M O a−127 121 b 64' 55 244 245 460 707 (πυλῶν rel), 11:23 (πυλῶν) πυλῶνος L−915; πυλῶν 93−127 CII 69' 338 488 71 245 372); 1 Kgs 22:10 (ΟΓ: εν τας πυλας Σαμαιρειας); 2 Kgs 7:3 (θύραν τῆς πύλης), 23:8 (θύραν τῆς πύλης). In 1 Sam 21:14, LXX has an interesting double reading ἐπὶ τας ώρας τῆς πύλης ... ἐπὶ τας ώρας τῆς πύλης. Because of the prevalence of the phenomenon, it seems unlikely that the changes are simply due to accidental graphical/phonetic confusion (ΠΥΛΗ ~ ΠΟΛΗΣ). A graphical confusion in Hebrew (רָעָה ~ רָעָה) could be more probable but, again, unlikely due to the quite systematic nature of the change.

32 This change may a “kaige-like precursor” at the stage of Hebrew, i.e., a (semi-)systematic change made already on the level of the Hebrew tradition. See for a similar phenomenon of MT favoring certain (“proto-rabbinic”) cultic terms over others in Andrés Piquer and Pablo Torijano, “Between the Search in the Word and the Asking to God: Two Mantic Verbs in the Textual History of Samuel–Kings,” in the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli
The simple transcription of the rare Hebrew conjunction אֵפוֹא, “then,” is missing from $L$ and La$^{15}$, possibly telling of $kaige$ influence in the majority text. Similar Greek transcription αφφω is found only once elsewhere in 2 Kgs 2:14, where it is shared by all manuscripts, save for the Lucianic MS 82. It is hard to say whether the transcription goes back to the OG translator in 2:14, since the textual situation of this verse is quite problematic already in itself. If Julio Trebolle Barrera is right in asserting that the transcription αφφω is due to $kaige$ in 2:14, the coinciding minus of $L$ and La$^{15}$ here in verse 10:10 would likely go back to OG, as well. On the other hand, it would also suit the style of the OG translator to simply transcribe such a rare word if he was unsure of its translation. In such a case, the minus of $L$ and La$^{15}$ could be due to recensional stylizing (omission of an unnecessary and incomprehensible word). An accidental omission in either tradition does not seem likely. The translation technique of La$^{15}$ is usually quite literal, and it often gives transliterations of Greek words (or rather, Greek transliterations of Hebrew) it did not understand (such as $nasibus$ for νασιβ in 1 Kgs 16:28e). The coinciding minus of $L$ and La$^{15}$ would seem to warrant the label proto-Lucianic.

However, it needs to be noted that La$^{15}$ has here also a double reading “know and perceive,” which is missing from other witnesses. This is a somewhat frequent pair also in Hebrew. The first verb scitote is also found in La$^{M}$ (ut sciant). The Latin witnesses may be thus somehow related, although the semantic fields of the two verbs might be close enough to be even considered as two differing translations of the same underlying Greek verb. According to Bonifatius Fischer, scitote corresponds to γνῶτε, which is found also in Aquila, and ultimately to the $וּדְּע$ of MT. Either the reading of La$^{15}$ is thus a double translation of $יסֶה$, a conflated reading of OG and Aquila, a ($kaige$ type?) harmonization to the Hebrew idiom (independently or already in its Greek base text), or, very unlikely, it still preserves here the original Hebrew idiom $וּדְּע$ $וּרְאו$, which later became corrupted (because of graphical confusion?) to the simple $וּדְּע$ of MT and $וּרְאו$ (יסֶה) of LXX.

---

**Notes:**


35 It is unlikely this double reading has anything to do with the case above (αφφω). Even though either scitote or videte could be simply a guess made by the Latin translator, it is much more likely he would have simply transcribed the Greek instead of making a (quite bad) translational guess.

36 Cf. $נִיָּהּ$ $וּדְּע$ ($= \gamma νω\tau ε και \epsilon i\delta e$) in 1 Sam 12:17, 14:38; 1 Kgs 20:7; 2 Kgs 5:7. In 1 Sam 23:23 and Jer 5:1 the verbs are in reversed order.

37 Kauhanen, “Septuagint in the West,” 309–10, has indeed proposed that La$^{15}$ and La$^{M}$ likely go back not to one single OL translation but at least two separate translations. 2 Kgs 10:10 could then be another case supporting his theory, unless scitote is here seen as the original translation, which was only later supplemented with the second translation videte, which is also closer to the Greek text.

38 Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 83. Cf. $α\gamma νω\tau ε κατεπρ οτι ου ρεσεται$.

39 Interestingly also Symmachus ($\sigma\ ι\δε\τε\ ου\ νυ\ νον\ ο\τ\ ου\ ρεσεται$) seems to render with LXX only $נָר$ instead of $נִיָּהּ$. Kauhanen (personal correspondence) suggested me that it would not be impossi-
Although the decision is not an easy one, the simplest solution would be to see this as a double translation in La\textsuperscript{115}, which possibly even supplanted the Greek transcription αφφω.

10:11 καὶ ἐπάταξεν Ιου … πάντας τοὺς ἁδροὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς γνωστοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτοῦ
La\textsuperscript{115}: et percussit … proximos eius et notos eius et sacerdotes idolorum eius
πάντας 2°] om 125 La\textsuperscript{115}
ἁδροὺς 3°] + καὶ τοὺς ἁδροὺς αὐτοῦ L 460
La\textsuperscript{115}: proximos La\textsuperscript{M}; cognatos eius et propinquos
La\textsuperscript{M}: optimates Vulg; יִינָא MT

The equivalent ἁδρός, “thick, large, strong,” for יִינָא (ישן) “a mighty one,” has previously been suspected to be a kaige reading, but the conventional evidence has not been sufficient to definitely label it as such.\textsuperscript{40} Instead of τοὺς ἁδροὺς αὐτοῦ, La\textsuperscript{115’s proximos coincides with the L-text’s ἀγχιστεύοντας, “the nearest (ones), the next of kin.” This reading is further backed up by La\textsuperscript{M’s double reading/translation cognatos eius et propinquos eius, “his kinsmen and relatives.” Interestingly enough, L also gives the majority text’s reading καὶ τοὺς ἁδροὺς αὐτοῦ at the end of its own list, indicating that it might indeed be a misplaced kaige reading that was taken over by L.\textsuperscript{41} La\textsuperscript{115 does not have this reading in either place, likely going back to a Greek text which had no mention of ἁδροὺς.}

The reading ἀγχιστεύοντας of L and La\textsuperscript{115 seems to go back to the Hebrew word יִינָא, “kinsmen,” which is graphically quite similar to the MT’s יִינָא. There may have thus happened a graphical confusion in the copying process of either tradition. Overall, ἀγχιστεύω is one of the most common equivalents for the Hebrew root יִינָא in the Septuagint. It is remotely possible that ἀγχιστεύοντας is, in fact, a Hexaplaric reading, as the same equivalent is known to have been used by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.\textsuperscript{42} However, in 2 Sam 14:11, although in the kaige section, the cognate יִינָא is translated as ἀγχιστέα/ἀγχιστευοντες in all LXX witnesses.\textsuperscript{43} There are no meaningful variants for the cognate reading, and thus our only option is to take the reading as the OG in 2 Sam 14:11. This is probable evidence of OG translator (also) using

\textsuperscript{40} See Leonard J. Greenspoon, Textual Studies the Book of Joshua, HSM 28 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 337–38. In 2 Kings, the term is also found in verse 10:6: καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἦσαν ἑβδομήκοντα ἄνδρες οὗτοι ἁδροὶ (ἄνδρες οὓς οἱ ἁδροὶ L-700 f 158 245) τῆς πόλεως ἐξέτρεφον αὐτούς, which La\textsuperscript{115 translates as et fili regis erant LXX et omnes maiores civitates nutritiebat eos. Thus, instead of “men who were mighty,” La\textsuperscript{115 reads “all the mighty (ones).” The textual situation of La\textsuperscript{115 is not completely certain, however, since Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 83, proposes an emendation of omnes maiores to homines (et) maiores, which would bring the text to an agreement with the majority text. While La\textsuperscript{115 usually uses magnus to translate the Greek μέγας or its cognates, the current text of La\textsuperscript{115 could nevertheless work even with ἁδροὶ (a kaige reading?) as its Vorlage. Should we then emend a working Latin text, possibly farther from MT than any other manuscript, to a suggested kaige reading? In any case, the now confused textual situation of verse 10:6 is due to some textual corruption, since even the MT construct רָאשֵׁי אַנְשֵׁי בְּנֵי־אֲדֹנֵיכֶם “(the heads of the men of the sons of your master”) is unnaturally long and does not work in the logic of the narrative, since in 10:7–8 the sons themselves are killed.

\textsuperscript{41} See Trebolle, “Readings of the Old Latin,” 120–45, for many similar cases of slightly misplaced double readings.

\textsuperscript{42} Joseph Reider and Nigel Turner, An Index to Aquila (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 4. The Hexaplaric usage likely stems from the OG translation.

\textsuperscript{43} Cf. 2 Sam 14:11 (ἀγχιστέα) οἱ αγχιστευοντες L 318 554).
this translation equivalent, and it is thus likely that he used the same root also here in the case of 2 Kgs 10:11.44

Interestingly enough, the reading of L La115 LaM would also seem to suit the context better, since the context is about the destruction of the whole seed of Ahab (given in OG in a logical order “his kinsmen, his friends, his priests”), part of which the “mighty ones” exactly were not. Furthermore, the MT reading הגלו could be a deliberate harmonization towards verse 10:6, where the “mighty ones” are also found.45 This harmonization of MT may also be literary critically interesting, since in MT “the mighty ones” now seem to first kill the sons of Ahab (10:6) and then, unlike in OG, Jehu in turn kills not only the relatives of Ahab, but also the “mighty ones” who were raising the sons (10:10). His picture is therefore enhanced toward a somewhat more ruthless image.46

It seems in any case quite clear that at least here in 10:11 the word ἁδρός is indeed due to kaige influence and, on the other hand, that the reading “the nearest ones” is proto-Lucianic, and most probably OG.47 The kaige reviser likely saw the problematic translation of (later corrected) MT גְּדֹלוֹ as ἀγχιστεύοντας, and corrected it to the more suitable ἁδρός, since the root ἀγχιστ- no longer semantically represents the MT. The “Lagardean principle” is thus on the side of L La115. It may thus be concluded that ἁδρός as an equivalent for the Hebrew איש גדול is indeed a certain kaige reading at least in one of the two cases in Kings. 48

10:2949 πλὴν ἁμαρτιῶν Ιεροβοαμ... οὐκ ἀπέστη Ιου ἀπὸ ὄπισθεν αὐτῶν αἱ δαμάλεις αἱ χρυσαὶ ἐν Βαθύλ καὶ ἐν Δαν
La115: set a peccatis hieroboam... non discessit ieu rex set abit post vaccas peccati quae erant in Bethel et in Dan
ai damaleis ai chrysa in tov damaleon tov amartias tov chrysonov L-700; vaccas peccati La115; vaccarum peccati... LaB; בּוֹקֵי לִבְנֵי MT

44 In 1 Kgs 16:11 manuscript A alone gives the reading ἠγχιστεῖς, but this is quite clearly a Hexaplaric reading since OG lacks the end of the verse. Both OG and the Hexaplaric witnesses using the same translation equivalents is by no means impossible or unheard of, and thus both phenomena can (and often do) coexist—indeed, also in this case ἠγχιστεῖω is the customary equivalent on the level of whole Septuagint. One of the trickiest current challenges pertaining to detecting the kaige revision is indeed the fact that for the most part the kaige reviser(s) used the same translation equivalents as OG. Thus, when in the kaige sections we find all LXX witnesses agreeing verbatim with the MT, but in the customary OG style, it is practically impossible to know whether the readings are OG or actually due to later Hebraizations.

45 It is likely that 10:6b, or at least the passage אֶת־גְּדֹלֵי הָעִיר מְגַדְּלִים אוֹתָם, was originally an explicating gloss, bringing the “Ahab’s mighty” and Ahab’s seventy sons (cf. 10:7) only secondarily to the text. The mention of 6b is grammatically very awkwardly connected to the preceding text. If this is indeed the case, L and La115 would likely have the most original reading in 10:11, which was later harmonized in MT toward the later gloss of 6b.

46 Politically speaking, this course of action would only make sense to Jehu: the “mighty ones,” who were previously supposed to stay loyal to their king, now turn against their master by killing all his sons. How loyal would Jehu, a recent usurper, then expect them to be toward him?

47 Thus also Stade, Book of Kings, 228.

48 Besides 2 Kgs 10:6 and here, ἁδρός is also found a third time in 1 Kgs 1:9, but this case may be simply corruption from ἀνθρώπος (as given by A L 106 107 71 244 245 318 460 707 Arm Syr; om 509), unless this reading is due to Hexaplaric harmonization towards the MT יعوا ויהוה. Even if this is not the case, this equivalent being found in a kaige section is still suspicious nonetheless. The word is once more encountered in 2 Sam 15:18 in a lengthy LXX plus not found in MT.

49 This verse is full of small textual problems between MT and the different witnesses of LXX. Because of lack of space, only the most illuminating agreement between L and La115 will be here analyzed.
In this verse we are told that Jehu, despite being a pious king, nevertheless did not stray from the cultic crime and main sin of Jeroboam, that is, his golden calves. Among the many textual problems of this verse, the most interesting case is the adjectival plus “of sin,” τῆς ἁμαρτίας, to the calves in L, which is also rendered by both OL witnesses La\textsuperscript{115} and La\textsuperscript{M}. However, the OL witnesses completely lack the adjective “golden,” τῶν χρυσῶν. La\textsuperscript{M} is in its partiality hard to assess (though when disagreeing with L and Hexaplaric witnesses it likely preserves an old tradition), but La\textsuperscript{115} does give enough hints to evaluate L’s reading. The lack of the description τῶν χρυσῶν indicates that La\textsuperscript{115} (and La\textsuperscript{M}) did not know of the fuller text form of L and even more so B—if it did, it would have certainly given the second description as well. Accidental omission does not appear probable. This reading seems thus like a proto-Lucianic reading, L likely having been harmonized toward the B-reading. It does also have considerable probabilities for OG reading, as the “calves of sin” are nowhere else described as such—unlike the well-known “golden calves” of 1 Kgs 12:28, 32.\textsuperscript{50} A change from the usual “golden” to otherwise unknown calves “of sin” at the proto-Lucianic stage does not seem very likely. OL thus likely alone preserves the sole OG reading δαμάλεων τῆς ἁμαρτίας (*עֹגְלֵי חֲטָאת), to which L conflates the kaige correction αἱ χρυσαῖ/τῶν χρυσῶν (=הַזָּהָב MT).

Verses 13:14–21 recount the Elisha’s death narrative and his last prophecy to the king of Israel. La\textsuperscript{115} has multiple important (likely OG) textual variants in this narrative, and, even more interestingly, it transposes the whole textual unit after 10:30.\textsuperscript{51} It is quite clear that the lone minus of B is due to some accident in the transmission. This omission is easily explained if it is assumed that B had as its base text a text similar to that of (kaige/Hexaplaric?) A L-700 460, where the second mention of Ελισαιε is now missing, as also in MT.\textsuperscript{52} In such a case a simple homoioteleuton mistake ἐπεν . . . ἐπεν could have taken place in B. Alexandrinus then supplies the text from Aquila (ῥοῖζεν καὶ ῥοῖζησεν), probably because it had in its exemplar the short B-text that needed emendation.\textsuperscript{53} The majority text is hardly in any way dependent on this Hexaplaric reading.\textsuperscript{54}

The majority text could in fact be argued to stem from kaige, as the verb τοξεύω, albeit rarely, only starts to appear in the kaige sections of Samuel–Kings.\textsuperscript{55} The equivalent used for the Hebrew יִרְּאה in 1 Sam 20:20, 36, 37, 31:3 is ἀκοντίζω, “to throw a javelin,” while τόξον is used in

\textsuperscript{50} Also in 2 Chr 13:8 (and, of course, Exod 32).
\textsuperscript{51} See note 10 above for further reading on La\textsuperscript{115}’s text and transposition of this narrative.
\textsuperscript{52} The rest of the tradition has the second Ελισαιε, which is not found in the MT (יָרְאֵת אֲלֵיהֶם). It seems likely it was omitted secondarily by A L-700 460 due to Hexaplaric influence and by kaige in the exemplar of B.
\textsuperscript{53} The verb ῥοῖζω is used by Aquila to translate the Hebrew יִרְּאה. The word τόξον, on the other hand, is used by Aquila to translate ἀκοντίζω; see Reider and Turner, \textit{Index to Aquila}, 211.
\textsuperscript{55} The equivalent is also mentioned by Tim McLay, “Kaige and Septuagint Research,” \textit{Textus} 19 (1998): 133 (#55), as a (disputed) kaige-variant. Elsewhere in 2 Sam 11:20 (τοξευόσιν) πληγησθεσθε L\textsuperscript{–82} 318; πληγησθεσθαι B\textsuperscript{mg} 82 158), 11:24 (ἐτόξευσαν) κατεβαρυνθη L | oi τοξεύοντες] τε βέλη L;
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Samuel–Kings to translate קֶשֶׁת, “bow.”\textsuperscript{56} While the kaige origins of τοξεύω could be argued for, it is nevertheless more likely that this translation of the quite rare Hebrew verb ירה comes already from the OG translator. The translator may have been simply influenced in this passage by the nearby קֶשֶׁת in the previous verse to use an equivalent semantically closer to τόξον, since at least “throwing a javelin” clearly was not a fitting translation of the Hebrew in this context. La\textsuperscript{115} sagitto, “shoot arrows,” likely attests the majority—and OG—reading here, while L gives a slightly Hebraized form of the text.

13:20 καὶ μονόζωνοι Μωαβ ἦλθον ἐν τῇ γῆ ἐλθόντος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ.
La\textsuperscript{115}, et piratae moab venerunt in terram illam.

There are two phenomena to be assessed here. First, it should be noted that μονόζωνος as a translation of גְדוּד is a well-known kaige feature.\textsuperscript{57} Multiple differing renderings for גְדוּד are used in Samuel–Kings, but in the kaige-section μονόζωνος (“lightly armed soldier”) becomes the only one.\textsuperscript{58} Here La\textsuperscript{115} again confirms that this is indeed a kaige reading. Matthieu Richelle notes accordingly that the OG most probably read πειρατήρια, a term used also by L in the next verse.\textsuperscript{59} La\textsuperscript{M} seems to similarly translate a Greek text with πειρατήρια, reading praedones, “plunderer, robber.” It is interesting to note that L gives in this same verse first and alone an OG historical present θάπτουσιν against the kaige aorist ἔθαψαν, and right after this a kaige reading μονόζωνος—and in the next verse it has furthermore clearly gone through recensional Lucianic stylizing. This showcases well the mixed text type of L and how these three characteristics (as well as Hexaplaric readings) often go hand in hand in L.

In the second case the peculiar formulation of MT בָּא שָׁנָה (possibly “year having gone”) has challenged scholars for over a century, and some Medieval Hebrew manuscripts even give a slightly differing text (בָּא שָׁנָ, cf. Vulg, in ipso anno).\textsuperscript{60} It is then interesting to note that in La\textsuperscript{115} this problematic chronological note is lacking completely. The lack does not seem to be due to any kind of apparent copying mistake, and the respective Greek reading should have been quite easy for the Latin translator to handle. Most probably thus already the exemplar of La\textsuperscript{115} lacked this reading. Taking into account that in the following narrative 13:20–21 La\textsuperscript{115} seems to give a very old text (most probably the OG text, which should in turn be seen as the

\textsuperscript{56} In 1 Sam 2:4, 31:3; 2 Sam 1:22, 22:35; 1 Kgs 22:32; 2 Kgs 6:22, 9:24, 13:15 (2x), 16.

\textsuperscript{57} McLay, “Kaige and Septuagint Research,” 131 (#11).

\textsuperscript{58} The translator (or the scribe of the Vorlage) misread ירָד instead of יְרָד and therefore was forced to simply transcribe γεδοῦπ in 1 Sam 30:8, 15 (2x), 23. The word is translated in 2 Sam 3:22 (Ἐξόδους); and in 2 Sam 4:2 and 1 Kgs 11:24 (σωτερέμμα). The kaige reading μονόζωνος can be elsewhere found in 2 Sam 22:30; 2 Kgs 5:2 [μονόζωνοι] + πειρατήριον V CI CII a d \textsuperscript{68} 370 5\textsuperscript{64} 55 244 318 554, 6:23 (πειραται[ς] L Syr), 13:21 (πειρατήριον L-700), 24:2 (4x, no variants, though some manuscripts lack some instances of the word).

\textsuperscript{59} Richelle, Le Testament d’Elisée, 76. See for the evidence the note above.

oldest preserved version of the narrative), the possibility should be given thought that the lacking grammatically hard construct is, in fact, also the oldest reading attainable.

On this line of argument, Adrian Schenker suggests that the chronological note may have been later added to make the happening more miraculous: even after a full year the remains of Elisha were able of miracles. However, it could also be that this mention was added so that the reader would not be confused about the mention of bones of the next verse: while in the OL version the body could have still been fully intact without the bones yet showing, after a year this definitely would not have been the case. As this story follows directly the death and burial of Elisha, the reader does indeed get the impression that the actions should be temporally quite close to each other. Richelle also remarks that when taking into account the generality of the overall story, the quite precise indication of time of MT is somewhat unexpected.

While debatable, I would suggest that La115 alone preserves here the OG—and thus the oldest text attainable. This seems to be the case overall in the burial narrative 2 Kgs 13:20–21.

This verse deals with the exile of the Israelites into certain cities and regions in the Assyrian Empire. While most of the locations remain the same vis-à-vis MT, LXX, and La115, the place name “Gozan” is missing from La115, and the mention of “cities of Medes” is transposed to the very beginning of the list. The strange LXX rendering of the simple עָרֵי מָדָי, “the cities of Medes,” with a transcription Ορη Μήδων has incited surprisingly few comments in the research.

62 Schenker, Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher, 145.
63 Richelle, Le Testament d’Elisée, 75.
64 The editor, Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis,” 87, suggests that the singular civitatem medium of La115 is simply an “error for in civitates medorum.” This could well be the case.
65 For the cases 17:6 and 17:17, see also the fuller analyses in Tekoniemi, Textual History of 2 Kings 17, 61–86, 136–40.
66 While it is possible that this is simply a translation/transcription of הָרָהה, “hill, mountain,” instead of MT’s בָּרָה, this does not seem likely, since in any case one would expect here a dative case (corrected to dat.sg. בָּרָה in 328 527). Taking Ορη as accusative plural here does not seem likely (or at least original) due to the syntax of the context (καὶ κατοίκισεν αὐτούς ἐν Ἀλατ καὶ ἐν Ἀβωρ ποταμοῖς Γωζαν καὶ Ορη Μήδων of La115), et conlocavit eos in civitatem medium ἐν emath et ad flumen abyro usque in hunc diem ἐν Ἀλατ καὶ ἐν Ἀβωρ ποταμοῖς Γωζαν), and Ορη Μήδων in civitates medorum in emath et ad flumen abyro of La115), and Ορη Μήδων (in 17:6: καὶ κατοίκισεν αὐτούς ἐν Ἀλατ καὶ ἐν Ἀβωρ ποταμοῖς Γωζαν καὶ Ορη Μήδων). This could well be the case.
67 For the cases 17:6 and 17:17, see also the fuller analyses in Tekoniemi, Textual History of 2 Kings 17, 61–86, 136–40.
68 While it is possible that this is simply a translation/transcription of בָּרָה, “hill, mountain,” instead of MT’s בָּרָה, this does not seem likely, since in any case one would expect here a dative case (corrected to dat.sg. בָּרָה in 328 527). Taking Ορη as accusative plural here does not seem likely (or at least original) due to the syntax of the context (καὶ κατοίκισεν αὐτούς ἐν Ἀλατ καὶ ἐν Ἀβωρ ποταμοῖς Γωζαν καὶ Ορη Μήδων of La115), et conlocavit eos in civitatem medium ἐν emath et ad flumen abyro usque in hunc diem ἐν Ἀλατ καὶ ἐν Ἀβωρ ποταμοῖς Γωζαν καὶ Ορη Μήδων), and Ορη Μήδων in civitates medorum in emath et ad flumen abyro of La115), and Ορη Μήδων (in 17:6: καὶ κατοίκισεν αὐτούς ἐν Ἀλατ καὶ ἐν Ἀβωρ ποταμοῖς Γωζαν καὶ Ορη Μήδων). This could well be the case.
Interestingly enough, this transcription is missing in La, and a proper translation “the city of Medians” is actually found in it, although in a differing position from MT/LXX.67 The kaige revisers often used transcriptions, and from time to time they incorrectly transcribed common nouns as proper nouns.68 This phenomenon seems to have taken place here as well, as the Ορη Μήδων now finishes the long list of different place names of Israelites’ exile. Since La hardly has any connection to the L reading,69 it has probably here as the lone witness preserved the OG translation (*ἐν [ταῖς] πόλεσιν Μήδων).

Another OG reading to be found in La and also in L is the verse-ending plus ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, “until this day.” This term is recurrent in the chapter and probably works here as an original literary/compositional marker.70 There are also other proto-Lucianic and kaige readings to be found with the help of La in verses 17:3–6, analyzed in-depth by Pablo Torijano Morales.71

In this verse, the northern Israelites are denounced for taking part in certain prohibited mantic practices, due to which they were exiled to Assyria. In the middle of the list, L has a longer text vis-à-vis MT and the B-text, reading “they divined by divinations, and auspiced by auspices, and made ephod and teraphim.” This plus found in L has been often deemed a late (Lucianic) addition,72 and the addition of οἰωνισμοῖς, “by auspices,” is certainly due to Lucianic stylistic harmonization. However, the witness of La helps us see that καὶ ἐποίησαν ἐφοὺδ καὶ θεραφείμ might, in fact, be an OG reading or at the very least proto-Lucianic. If indeed OG, this plus may even reflect a Hebrew text ויעשׂו אפד ותרפים, older than even MT, as it alludes to an ephod, a vestment of the Yahwistic high priest, in Samaria. The idea of a legitimate Yahwistic (high) priesthood in Samaria would have been highly problematic for the later revisers of (proto-)MT, and this may have prompted the omission of the phrase here.73 La thus again helps us to find the oldest attainable text in this verse.

---

67 Torijano, “Textual Criticism,” 210, takes this reading as a possible sporadic influence from the Vulgate reading in civitatibus Medorum. While this is possible (though not exceedingly likely), it does not properly explain the lack of Ορη Μήδων in La.
69 If La had the L reading ὁρίοις, “boundaries,” as its base text, the translator would have likely been able to translate it correctly, as seen in 1 Sam 6:9 (orbitae), 12 (fines), 10:2 (finibus), 11:3, 7 (regionem).
71 Torijano, “Textual Criticism,” 195–211. See also Tekoniemi, Textual History of 2 Kings 17, 61–86.
73 See Timo Tekoniemi, “Between Two Differing Editions: Some Notable Text-Critical Variants in
The Gegenprobe: Lucianic Readings Confirmed by La\textsuperscript{115} as Recensional in 2 Kings

In addition to the discussion on the putative OG readings of La\textsuperscript{115}, a list of the twenty-five most clear recensional Lucianic readings lacking from La\textsuperscript{115} will be provided below, showing that La\textsuperscript{115} is indeed not a recensional Lucianic witness proper. Most of the cases are found with the pattern La\textsuperscript{115} = B ≠ L, thus showing that the B-text/majority text is still quite valuable a witness when discerning the OG textual layer of 2 Kings. While the readings enumerated below show quite clear and well-known signs of the Lucianic recension (explications of the subjects and actions, better Greek style, small additions and lexical changes, etc.), one should nevertheless bear in mind that in the \textit{kaige} section there is always a slight chance that even the seemingly clearest Lucianic readings could, in fact, originate from the OG layer of the text. In these cases, however, at least the witness of La\textsuperscript{115} would seem to speak against such judgment.

| Verse | Lucianic Reading | OG Text
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:6</td>
<td>ξύλον</td>
<td>pr Elissaeus L\textsuperscript{82} 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:7</td>
<td>ύψισσον σαυτῷ</td>
<td>μετεώρισόν καὶ λάβε σεαυτῷ L\textsuperscript{82} 246 460; lewa tibi La\textsuperscript{115}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td>φύλαξαι μὴ παρελθεῖν</td>
<td>πρόσεχε τοῦ μὴ διελθεῖν L\textsuperscript{82} 460; observa ne transeas La\textsuperscript{115}; cave ne transeas Vulg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ</td>
<td>τὸν τόπον τοῦτον L\textsuperscript{82} 246 460; om 107; in locum hunc La\textsuperscript{115}; in loco illo Vulg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td>ἔκει Συρία κέκρυπται</td>
<td>B 247 a 44 56 642 488 318 372; ἔκει Σύροι ἐνεδρεύουσιν L\textsuperscript{82}; ἔκει post Συρία tr rel; ibi Syria absconsa est La\textsuperscript{115}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td>ἐκεῖ</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τῶν τούτων L\textsuperscript{82} 460; om 107; in locum hunc La\textsuperscript{115}; in loco illo Vulg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>αὐτὸς ἐν</td>
<td>καὶ αὐτὸς Χίῳ L\textsuperscript{700} 460; &gt; αὐτὸς 46' 44-125; ipse La\textsuperscript{115}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:29</td>
<td>σύν ἄπεστη</td>
<td>+ ἀπ' αὐτῶν L\textsuperscript{700}; non discessit La\textsuperscript{115}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:14</td>
<td>πρὸς αὐτὸν</td>
<td>et Iouas βασιλεὺς Ισραηλ tr L\textsuperscript{700} 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15</td>
<td>ἐλαβέν</td>
<td>+ Iouas L\textsuperscript{460}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:16</td>
<td>ἐπεν</td>
<td>+ Elissaeus L\textsuperscript{460}; + Iouas 700; + at ieu La\textsuperscript{115}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:19</td>
<td>τρίς</td>
<td>τρίτον L\textsuperscript{700} 460; post Συρίαν tr La\textsuperscript{115}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:20</td>
<td>ἀπέβαλεν</td>
<td>et Elissaeus tr L\textsuperscript{700} 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:31</td>
<td>Iou</td>
<td>post ἐφιλαβέσθη tr L\textsuperscript{700} 460; om 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:32</td>
<td>Ἰουδα]</td>
<td>+ ἐπὶ (ἐν 93) Ἱεροσολύμῳ L\textsuperscript{700} 328 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:33</td>
<td>Ἰουδα]</td>
<td>+ Ἰωαθαμ L\textsuperscript{460}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:5</td>
<td>ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ</td>
<td>πάντα τὴν γῆν (αὐτῆς 19) L\textsuperscript{700} 460; &gt; πάση V CII\textsuperscript{128} d\textsuperscript{370} e\textsuperscript{64} f\textsuperscript{488} 707; om La\textsuperscript{115}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:5</td>
<td>Σαμάρειαν</td>
<td>+ καὶ εἰς πάνας τὴν γῆν αὐτῆς L\textsuperscript{19'} 700 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:6</td>
<td>[βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων]</td>
<td>et τὴν Σαμάρειαν tr L\textsuperscript{700} 460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Conclusions

In this article, fourteen textual cases in nine verses were studied. Of these cases, seven were OG agreements with L or other Greek witnesses (10:8, 11, 29, 13:17, 20, 17:6, 17), while in two cases La\textsuperscript{115} seems to have alone preserved the OG reading against all other witnesses (13:20, 17:6); three cases are best attributed to proto-Lucianic layer without yet deciding their exact provenance (6:8, 10:10); one case seems like Lucianic recensional influence on La\textsuperscript{115} (6:8); and one reading is a purely unique reading of La\textsuperscript{115} (10:10).

Most of the time, the text of La\textsuperscript{115} seems to therefore be a proto-Lucianic (~OG) witness, and sometimes it alone appears to preserve OG readings. There may be some very sporadic contamination from other sources like the Lucianic text and possibly even kaige. The Vulgate could be argued to have influenced La\textsuperscript{115}'s text only once (17:6), and even then the similarities are not striking enough to see this as very probable.

As a conclusion, La\textsuperscript{115} preserves in the studied portions of 2 Kings, as in 1 Kings, a very old and most of the time a highly reliable text.