

The Position of Old Latin Manuscript La¹¹⁵ in the Textual History of 2 Kings: Identifying *kaige* and (Proto-)Lucianic Readings in a *kaige* Section

Timo Tekoniemi, University of Helsinki

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 Treballe Barrera, the editors of the Göttingen Septuagint of 1–2 Kings, for an access to their preliminary apparatus.

² See especially Tuukka Kauhanen, *The Text of Kings and Lucifer of Cagliari*, SCS 68 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018); Julio Treballe Barrera, “Readings of the Old Latin (Beuron 91–95) Reflecting ‘Additions’ of the Antiochene Text in 3–4 Kingdoms,” in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: Fifty Years after the Les Devanciers d’Aquila*, ed. Tuukka Kauhanen and Anneli Aejmelaes, DSI 9 (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 2017), 120–45; Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 233–89

³ See Bonifatius Fischer, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L¹¹⁵ for Samuel–Kings,” *BIOCS* 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 La¹¹⁵, 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.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.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.⁶ However, those studies that have discussed the issue generally conclude that the *kaige* influence is either nonexistent or, at most, very limited.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 La¹¹⁵ has—at least for the most part—avoided also Lucianic influence.⁸

In addition to these considerations, some unique textual characteristics of La¹¹⁵ in 2 Kings should be briefly noted. Unlike any other witness, La¹¹⁵ has some notable transpositions of materials in its chapters 10 and 17, and the whole chapter 16 is missing from between verses

this article, this term simply denotes a reading that was extant in the base text of the Lucianic reviser(s), whether OG or not. Not all readings in this text form could have been original OG readings—at least some corruption (accidental mistakes, pluses/minuses of varying length, etc.) must have taken place. Proto-Lucianic readings could therefore be divided in two groups: the original OG readings and proto-Lucianic secondary readings.

- ⁴ See Tuukka Kauhanen, “Septuagint in the West: The Significance of the Post-Lucianic Latin Witnesses for the Textual History of Kings,” in *Die Septuaginta—Orte und Intentionen*, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund, WUNT 1/361 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 309–325; Tekoniemi, “Is There a (Proto-)Lucianic Stratum the text of 1 Kings of the Old Latin manuscript La¹¹⁵?,” in *On Hexaplaric and Lucianic Readings and Recensions*, ed. Kristin De Troyer, DSI 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020), 115–34.
- ⁵ It is likely that La¹¹⁵ 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.
- 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 *καὶ γέ* for the Hebrew *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*.
- ⁷ To my knowledge only Julio Treballe 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.
- ⁸ The question whether (or to which extent) La¹¹⁵ 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 *L* and La¹¹⁵ does not by itself yet guarantee an OG reading (see also footnote 3 above).

15:38 and 17:1.⁹ In chapter 10, La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵'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

Pattern	Number of cases	Percentage of cases	Percentages in 1 Kings ¹²
La ¹¹⁵ = B ≠ L	35	14%	27% (51 cases)
La ¹¹⁵ = L ≠ B	87	35%	26% (50 cases)
La ¹¹⁵ = B L ≠ A	4	1%	9% (16 cases)
La ¹¹⁵ = A ≠ B L	2	1%	2% (4 cases)
La ¹¹⁵ = other MSS ≠ A B L	28	11%	11% (21 cases)
Unique readings	92	38%	25% (48 cases)
TOTAL	248	100%	100% (190 cases)

When compared with the data from 1 Kings (all of which comes from the non*kaige* section), the picture is quite clear: as would be expected from potential OG witnesses in the *kaige* sections, the amount of agreements between La¹¹⁵ and *L* increases while the agreements between B and La¹¹⁵ decrease. It is interesting, however, that at the same time also the amount of unique readings increases in La¹¹⁵. 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 La¹¹⁵ itself, this article may help us define more clearly the general textual affiliations of La¹¹⁵ in 2 Kings.

⁹ It is likely that chapter 16 was originally situated after chapter 17 in La¹¹⁵, 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.

¹⁰ For the transposition of Elisha's death narrative, see Matthieu Richelle, *Le Testament d'Elisée: Texte Masoretique et Septante en 2 Rois 13.10–14.16*, CahRB 76 (Pendé: J. Garabaldo, 2010), 11–87; for the Jehu double narrative, see Adrian Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004), 149–67; and for the textual situation of chapter 2 Kgs 17, see Julio Treballe Barrera, "Textual Pluralism and Composition of the Books of Kings: 2 Kings 17,2–23," in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts: The Historical Books*, ed. Hans Ausloos, Benedicte Lemmelijn, and Julio Treballe Barrera, BETL 246 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 213–26, and Tekoniemi, *Textual History of 2 Kings 17*. In most of these cases, even *L* would have arguably been subjected to the Hebraizing *kaige* revision.

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 La¹¹⁵" (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 La¹¹⁵ = L ≠ B

Of all the eighty-seven cases of pattern La¹¹⁵ = L ≠ B, only a handful (fourteen cases in nine verses) of the most significant and/or challenging cases can be analyzed here.¹³ These cases can help our understanding of the textual affiliations of La¹¹⁵ with *kaige*, (proto-)Lucianic text and other text forms.

6:8 εἰς τὸν τόπον τόνδε τινὰ ελμῶνι παρεμβάλω (יְהִי־הַתְּנִיחַ לְיָמֵי אֲשֶׁר־לָךְ מִיְמֵי־לָךְ MT)
 La¹¹⁵: *in locum phelmunim insidia faciamus et fecerunt*
 τόνδε τινὰ] > τόνδε 247 488; > δε τινὰ 158; > τινὰ 82 489 71 342; om L⁻⁸² 246 158 La^M; *illo et illo*
 Vulg
 ελμῶνι] pr τήν 71 342; φελμῶνι/-μουνει 247 488 98' 158; τόν (τοῦ 19') φελμουνει L⁻⁸² 246 460;
phelmunim La¹¹⁵ La^M
 παρεμβάλω] ποιήσωμεν ἔνεδρον 127*; ποιήσωμεν ἔνεδρον καὶ ἐποίησαν L⁻⁸² 127 246 460;¹⁴ *insidia*
faciamus et fecerunt La¹¹⁵; *obsessionem faciamus* La^M; *ponamus insidias* Vulg; יְהִי־הַתְּנִיחַ MT

The story of Elisha thwarting the Aramean attack with his prophecy starts with 6:8. In this verse there is a curious transcription ελμῶνι, 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 יְהִי־הַתְּנִיחַ לְיָמֵי אֲשֶׁר־לָךְ, “such and such,” since also in 1 Sam 21:3 the words are simply transcribed as Φελλανι Αλεμῶνι.¹⁵ In L⁻⁸², La¹¹⁵, and La^M only the first word φελμουνει, 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 ελμῶνι for the latter Hebrew word.

The amalgam φελμουνει 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 (יְהִי־מִוֶּלֶךְ).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.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 (ܐܠܗܝܡܢܝܢ) lacks the mention of יְהִי־הַתְּנִיחַ 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.¹⁸ Indeed, Theodotion is attributed in 1 Sam 21:3 with precisely the same wording τόνδε τινὰ ελμῶνι 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.

¹³ The large and substantial agreements between La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵ in both chapters are for the most part certainly proto-Lucianic and very probably go back to OG.

¹⁴ MS 158 has this plus erroneously in verse 12.

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

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.”

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.

¹⁸ α' προς τον τοπον τον δεινα τονδε τινα σ' κατα τοπον τονδε.

For the third case, the awkward MT reading יְהַנְיֶה is often translated as “my encampment.” This Hebrew reading has been customarily thought to be corrupted which is undeniably the case.¹⁹ The Greek majority text seems to take this as a first person verbal form of הָנַח , “to encamp,” with the usual translation equivalent παρεμβάλλω , while *L* and the OL witnesses—and even Vulgate—read differently ποιήσωμεν ἔνεδρον , “we make ambush.”²⁰ 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*.²¹ The LXX witnesses possibly translate גַּחְבִּים^* against MT’s strange form יְהַנְיֶה . Some commentators emend the MT wording to the LXX’s reading.²² However, the *L* and OL reading ποιήσωμεν ἔνεδρον 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.²³ The use of the word ἔνεδρον 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.²⁴ The original Hebrew possibly had in verse 6:9 the form *תַּחְבוּ .²⁵

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,²⁶ 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.²⁷

¹⁹ Bernhard Stade, *The Books of Kings* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904), 205.

²⁰ La¹¹⁵ translates the verb παρεμβάλλω four times: 1 Sam 4:1 *castra posuerunt*, 11:1 *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 (*abscondere, absconderis*), 3:18 (*celavit*), 20:22 (*absconsus est*), 14:22 (*absconsi erant*); 2 Kgs 6:9 (*absconsa est*). The verb ἐνεδρεύω is also used in 1 Sam 15:5 (אָרַב) and 2 Sam 3:27 (בַּשִּׁלִּי), showing that already the OG translator was indeed familiar with it. The verb is used especially in Judges, where it consistently translates אָרַב .

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” ($\text{אֲבִלְחִסָּא אֲבִלְחִסָּא אֲבִלְחִסָּא אֲבִלְחִסָּא}$).

²³ Similarly, Stade, *Book of Kings*, 205.

²⁴ The base text of La¹¹⁵ in the case of *insidia* may have been ἔνεδρον , but as this is quite a rare word in LXX, this becomes suspect. In 2 Kgs 17:4 *insidia* seems to translate ἐπιβουλήν (against the ἀδικίαν of majority text), found again only in Lucianic witnesses. The base text of La¹¹⁵ is therefore not completely certain.

²⁵ Otto Thenius, *Die Bücher der Könige*, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 9 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1873), 300.

²⁶ Thusly already Alfred Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*, Septuaginta-Studien 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), 274–75. On the other hand, Burney, *Kings*, 285, prefers this reading as “a suitable introduction to v. 9.”

²⁷ It is also possible that this plus was dropped at a very early point because of a homoioteleuton $\text{καὶ} \dots \text{καὶ}$, and the proto-Lucianic tradition was the only one to preserve the plus. There would be therefore no need to suppose *kaige* influence here. See somewhat similarly also Siegfried Kreuzer,

10:8 καὶ εἶπεν θέτε αὐτάς βουνοὺς δύο παρὰ τὴν θύραν τῆς πόλης εἰς πρῶν

La¹¹⁵: *et dixit ieu ponite ea et illa e duobus ordinibus in porta civitatis usque mane*

θύραν τῆς πόλης scripsit Rahlfs]²⁸ θύραν τῆς πόλης πόλεως B^{txt*}; πόλην τῆς πόλεως L-700 460;

θύραν τῆς πόλεως rel; in *porta civitatis* La¹¹⁵; *introitum portae* Vulg; רַעַרְהַתַּפּ MT

Cf. 10:9 ἔστη A B 56 245 Arm Syr] κατέστη ἐν τῇ πόλει τῆς πόλεως L-700 460; + ἐν τῷ

πυλῶνι τῆς πόλεως rel; *stetit in porta civitatis* La¹¹⁵; רַעַרְהַתַּפּ MT

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 תַּפּ seems to be a *kaige* feature, as can be seen by both the distribution between *kaige*/non-*kaige* sections and by the manuscript attestation.²⁹ The OG equivalent of תַּפּ seems to have been πυλῶν/θυρώμα. Interestingly the OG equivalent θύρα for the Hebrew תַּפּ keeps the same throughout Samuel–Kings and does not change as with many other *kaige* readings.³⁰

Second, the whole phrase רַעַרְהַתַּפּ, “the doorway of the gate” (= θύρα τῆς πόλης) seems to be in Samuel–Kings more characteristic to MT/*kaige* edition than to OG.³¹ In OG, as here in 2 Kgs 10:8–9, the usual word combination is “the gate of the city” (most probably from Hebrew רַעַרְהַתַּפּ). 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 (πυλῶνα τῆς πόλεως) and MT (רַעַרְהַתַּפּ) 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.³²

Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission and Theology of the Septuagint, SCS 63 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 287–88.

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. תַּפּ in 1 Sam 2:22 (>OG; θύρας in Hexaplaric witnesses); 2 Sam 10:8 (θύρα/θύραν A B M O a⁻⁵²⁷ b 64' 55 158 244 245 460 707] πυλωνα rel), 11:9 (θύρα] πυλωνι L = *portam* La¹¹⁵), 11:23 (θύρας in all witnesses); 1 Kgs 6:8[13] (πυλῶν), 6:31[30] (θυρώματι), 6:33[31] (πυλῶνι), 7:5[42] (θυρώματα), 14:6 (ανοιγματι A 247 127 CII⁻³²⁸ 121 d⁻³⁷⁰ s^{-64'} 554 =Hex.), 14:27 (πυλῶνα), 17:10 (πυλῶνα), 19:13 (> OG; the translator/*Vorlage* mistakenly read תַּת as תַּת), 22:10 (πύλαις); 2 Kgs 4:15 (θύραν in all witnesses), 5:9 (θύρα(ι)ς in all witnesses), 7:3 (θύραν] πύλην 246 71 55; πύλη 460), 23:8 (θύρα[v] 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), 7:50 (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 different, but this variant seems to be due to contextual matters.

³¹ In 2 Sam 10:8 (πύλης A B^{txt.c pr m} M O a⁻⁵²⁷ 121 64' 55 244 245 460 707] πολεως rel), 11:23 (πύλης] πυλωνος L^{-93 127}; πολεως 93-127 CII^{-46'} 313 488 71 245 372); 1 Kgs 22:10 (OG: ἐν ταῖς πύλαις Σαμαρείας); 2 Kgs 7:3 (θύραν τῆς πόλεως), 23:8 (θύραν τῆς πόλης). In 1 Sam 21:14, LXX has an interesting double reading ἐπὶ ταῖς θύραις τῆς πόλεως ... ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας τῆς πόλης. Because of the prevalence of the phenomenon, it seems unlikely that the changes are simply due to accidental graphical/phonetic confusion (ΠΥΛΗ ~ ΠΟΛΙΣ). A graphical confusion in Hebrew (רַעַרְהַתַּפּ ~ רַעַרְהַתַּת) 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*

10:10 ἴδετε ἀφφω ὅτι οὐ πεσεῖται ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥήματος κυρίου εἰς τὴν γῆν
 La¹¹⁵: *scitote et videte quia non cadent verba domini in terram*
 ἴδετε ἀφφω] > ἀφφω L-700 246 460; *scitote et videte* La¹¹⁵; *ut sciant cuncti* La^M;
 אִפֹּא מַתְּ MT

The simple transcription of the rare Hebrew conjunction אִפֹּא, “then,” is missing from *L* and La¹¹⁵, possibly telling of *kaige* influence in the majority text. Similar Greek transcription ἀφφω 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.³³ If Julio Treballe Barrera is right in asserting that the transcription ἀφφω is due to *kaige* in 2:14, the coinciding minus of *L* and La¹¹⁵ here in verse 10:10 would likely go back to OG, as well.³⁴ 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 La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵ would seem to warrant the label proto-Lucianic.

However, it needs to be noted that La¹¹⁵ has here also a double reading “know and perceive,” which is missing from other witnesses.³⁵ This is a somewhat frequent pair also in Hebrew.³⁶ 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.³⁷ According to Bonifatius Fischer, *scitote* corresponds to γνώτε, which is found also in Aquila, and ultimately to the מַתְּ of MT.³⁸ Either the reading of La¹¹⁵ is thus a double translation of ἴδετε, 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 מַתְּ אִפֹּא, which later became corrupted (because of graphical confusion?) to the simple מַתְּ of MT and אִפֹּא (ἴδετε) of LXX.³⁹

Aejmelaesus, ed. Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström, CBET 72 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 299–330.

³³ See Timo Tekoniemi, “Enhancing the Depiction of a Prophet: The Repercussions of Textual Criticism for the Study of the Elisha Cycle,” *BN* 186 (2020): 77–82. The *Vorlage* of the majority text of 2 Kgs 2:14 likely had not the peculiar אִפֹּא־הִוִּי construct of MT but, as in 10:10, אִפֹּא.

³⁴ Treballe, “Readings of the Old Latin,” 130–31.

³⁵ It is unlikely this double reading has anything to do with the case above (ἀφφω). 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. אִפֹּא מַתְּ (= γνώτε και ἴδετε) 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 La¹¹⁵ 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. ἀ’ γνώτε καιπερ οτι ου πεσειται.

³⁹ Interestingly also Symmachus (σ’ ἴδετε ουν νυν οτι ου πεσειται) seems to render with LXX only אִפֹּא instead of מַתְּ. 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 La¹¹⁵, which possibly even supplanted the Greek transcription αφφω.

10:11 και ἐπάταξεν Ιου ... πάντας τοὺς ἀδρούς αὐτοῦ και τοὺς γνωστοὺς αὐτοῦ και τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτοῦ
 La¹¹⁵: et percussit ... proximos eius et notos eius et sacerdotes idolorum eius
 πάντας 2^o] om 125 La¹¹⁵
 ἀδρούς] ἀγγιστεύοντας L-700 460; ἀνδρας 527; proximos La¹¹⁵; cognatos eius et propinquos La^M;
 optimates Vulg; יִלְדָּי MT
 αὐτοῦ 3^o] + και τοὺς ἀδρούς αὐτοῦ L 460

The equivalent ἀδρός, “thick, large, strong,” for לוֹדָי (שׂא) “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.⁴⁰ Instead of τοὺς ἀδρούς αὐτοῦ, La¹¹⁵’s *proximos* coincides with the *L*-text’s ἀγγιστεύοντας, “the nearest (ones), the next of kin.” This reading is further backed up by La^M’s double reading/translation *cognatos eius et propinquos eius*, “his kinsmen and relatives.” Interestingly enough, *L* also gives the majority text’s reading και τοὺς ἀδρούς αὐτοῦ at the *end* of its own list, indicating that it might indeed be a misplaced *kaige* reading that was taken over by *L*.⁴¹ La¹¹⁵ does not have this reading in either place, likely going back to a Greek text which had no mention of ἀδρούς.

The reading ἀγγιστεύοντας of *L* and La¹¹⁵ seems to go back to the Hebrew word יִלְדָּי, “kinsmen,” which is graphically quite similar to the MT’s יִלְדָּי. There may have thus happened a graphical confusion in the copying process of either tradition. Overall, ἀγγιστεύω is one of the most common equivalents for the Hebrew root לָדָי in the Septuagint. It is remotely possible that ἀγγιστεύοντας is, in fact, a Hexaplaric reading, as the same equivalent is known to have been used by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.⁴² However, in 2 Sam 14:11, although in the *kaige* section, the cognate לָדָי is translated as ἀγγιστέα/αγγιστευοντες in all LXX witnesses.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

ble either that the double translation has been borne of an erroneous itacistic conflation of ἴδετε and οἶδατε.

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: και οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἦσαν ἑβδομήκοντα ἄνδρες οὗτοι ἄδρῳι (ἄνδρες οὗς οἱ ἄδρῳι L-700 f 158 245) τῆς πόλεως ἐξέτρεφον αὐτούς, which La¹¹⁵ translates as *et fili regis erant LXX et omnes maiores civitates nutriebant eos*. Thus, instead of “men who were mighty,” La¹¹⁵ reads “all the mighty (ones).” The textual situation of La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵ usually uses *magnus* to translate the Greek μέγας or its cognates, the current text of La¹¹⁵ could nevertheless work even with ἀδρῳι (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 בְּיָדָיִם בְּיָדָיִם אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר (“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.

⁴¹ See Treballe, “Readings of the Old Latin,” 120–45, for many similar cases of slightly misplaced double readings.

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

⁴³ Cf. 2 Sam 14:11 (ἀγγιστέα] οἱ αγγιστευοντες L 318 554^{mg}).

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* La¹⁵ La^M 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 יִלְדָּנָּ 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 ἀδρός 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 לָּנָּ as ἀγχιστεύοντας, and corrected it to the more suitable ἀδρός, since the root ἀγχιστ- no longer semantically represents the MT. The “Lagardean principle” is thus on the side of *L* La¹⁵. It may thus be concluded that ἀδρός as an equivalent for the Hebrew לִּשְׂנֵי גִּדּוּל is indeed a certain *kaige* reading at least in one of the two cases in Kings.⁴⁸

10:29⁴⁹ πλὴν ἁμαρτιῶν Ἱεροβοαμ ... οὐκ ἀπέστη Ἰου ἀπὸ ὀπισθεν αὐτῶν αἱ δαμάλεις αἱ χρυσαῖ ἐν Βαιθηλ καὶ ἐν Δαν

La¹⁵: *set a peccatis hieroboam ... non discessit ieu rex set abit post vaccas peccati quae erant in bethel et in dan*

αἱ δαμάλεις αἱ χρυσαῖ] τῶν δαμάλεων τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῶν χρυσῶν *L*-700; *uaccas peccati* La¹⁵; *vaccarum peccati*... La^M; הַזְּבִי הַזְּבִי MT

⁴⁴ In 1 Kgs 16:11 manuscript A alone gives the reading ἀγχιστεῖς, 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 ἀγχιστεύω 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 אֲחָב מְגִדְלִים אֶת־תְּנַדְלֵי הָעִיר מְגִדְלִים אֲחָב, 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 La¹⁵ 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, ἀδρός is also found a third time in 1 Kgs 1:9, but this case may be simply corruption from ἀνδρας (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 אֲנָשֵׁי יְהוּדָה. 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 the lack of space, only the most illuminating agreement between *L* and La¹⁵ 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 ἀμαρτίας, to the calves in *L*, which is also rendered by both OL witnesses La¹¹⁵ and La^M. However, the OL witnesses completely lack the adjective “golden,” τῶν χρυσῶν. La^M is in its partiality hard to assess (though when disagreeing with *L* and Hexaplaric witnesses it likely preserves an old tradition), but La¹¹⁵ does give enough hints to evaluate *L*’s reading. The lack of the description τῶν χρυσῶν indicates that La¹¹⁵ (and La^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, 32.⁵⁰ 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 ἀμαρτίας (*תאטת ל'גג), to which *L* conflates the *kaige* correction αἱ χρυσαῖ/τῶν χρυσῶν (= בִּהֲרִי MT).

13:17 ...καὶ εἶπεν Ελισαιε τόξευσον καὶ ἐτόξευσεν καὶ εἶπεν Ελισαιε

La¹¹⁵: *et dixit helisseus sagittare et sagittavit et dixit helisseus*

Ελισαιε 1°... Ελισαιε 2°] om *B*

τόξευσον... Ελισαιε 2°] om *CII* d⁻³⁷⁰ 246 s^{-64'} 488

Ελισαιε 2°] om *A L-700* 460 La^M (=MT)

τόξευσον καὶ ἐτόξευσεν] ροιζησον 245; ροιζησον καὶ εροιζησεν *A Arm Syr* (* a'); *sagittare et sagittavit* La¹¹⁵ La^M

Verses 13:14–21 recount the Elisha’s death narrative and his last prophecy to the king of Israel. La¹¹⁵ has multiple important (likely OG) textual variants in this narrative, and, even more interestingly, it transposes the whole textual unit after 10:30.⁵¹

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.⁵² In such a case a simple homoioteleuton mistake εἶπεν ... εἶπεν could have taken place in *B*. Alexandrinus then supplies the text from Aquila (ροιζησον καὶ εροιζησεν), probably because it had in its exemplar the short *B*-text that needed emendation.⁵³ The majority text is hardly in any way dependent on this Hexaplaric reading.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.⁵⁵ The equivalent used for the Hebrew ירה in 1 Sam 20:20, 36, 37, 31:3 is ἀκοντίζω, “to throw a javelin,” while τόξον is used in

⁵⁰ Also in 2 Chr 13:8 (and, of course, Exod 32).

⁵¹ See note 10 above for further reading on La¹¹⁵’s text and transposition of this narrative.

⁵² The rest of the tradition has the second Ελισαιε, which is not found in the MT (יהר עֲשֵׂה לְךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְיִרְדְּךָ מֵעַל הַיַּרְדֵּן). It seems likely it was omitted secondarily by *A L-700* 460 La^M due to Hexaplaric influence and by *kaige* in the exemplar of *B*.

⁵³ The verb ροιζέω is used by Aquila to translate the Hebrew ירה. The word τόξον, on the other hand, is used by Aquila to translate תִּשְׁלֵךְ; see Reider and Turner, *Index to Aquila*, 211.

⁵⁴ Contra Pablo Torijano Morales, “How Much Hexaplaric Material Entered into the Antiochene Textual Tradition?” in Kauhanen and Aejmelaesus, *Legacy of Barthélemy*, 114.

⁵⁵ The equivalent is also mentioned by Tim McLay, “Kaige and Septuagint Research,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 133 (#55), as a (disputed) *kaige*-variant. Elsewhere in 2 Sam 11:20 (τοξεύουσιν) πληγῆσθε L⁻⁸² 318; πληγῆσθε B^{mg} 82 158), 11:24 (ἐτόξευσαν) κατεβαρυνθη *L* | οἱ τοξεύοντες] τα βελη *L*;

Samuel–Kings to translate תִּשָּׁק, “bow.”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 תִּשָּׁק 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. La¹¹⁵ *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 ἤλθον ἐν τῇ γῆ ἑλθόντος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ.

La¹¹⁵: *et piratae moab venerunt in terram illam.*

μονόζωνοι] *piratae* La¹¹⁵; *praedones* La^M

Cf. 13:21 μονόζωνον] *πειρατήριον* *L* 460; *pirate* La¹¹⁵

ἑλθόντος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ] > τοῦ 46' 246; om La¹¹⁵; *post annum* La^M; שָׁנָה אֶבֶד MT

There are two phenomena to be assessed here. First, it should be noted that μονόζωνος as a translation of דִּדָּג is a well-known *kaige* feature.⁵⁷ Multiple differing renderings for דִּדָּג are used in Samuel–Kings, but in the *kaige*-section μονόζωνος (“lightly armed soldier”) becomes the only one.⁵⁸ Here La¹¹⁵ 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.⁵⁹ La^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 שָׁנָה אֶבֶד (possibly “year having gone”) has challenged scholars for over a century, and some Medieval Hebrew manuscripts even give a slightly differing text (בֵּה שָׁנָה; cf. *Vulg.* *in ipso anno*).⁶⁰ It is then interesting to note that in La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵ lacked this reading. Taking into account that in the following narrative 13:20–21 La¹¹⁵ seems to give a very old text (most probably the OG text, which should in turn be seen as the

2 Kgs 19:32. These attestations of *L* could similarly point to an interest on the part of *kaige* to use τοξεύω.

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

⁵⁷ McLay, “*Kaige* and Septuagint Research,” 131 (#11).

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

⁵⁹ Richelle, *Le Testament d'Elisée*, 76. See for the evidence the note above.

⁶⁰ Cf. Stade, *Books of Kings*, 245; Rudolf Kittel, *Der Bücher der Könige*, HKAT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900), 259; and August Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften (Nördlingen: Beck, 1887), 439. Giovanni de Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti*, 4 vols. (Parma: Bodoni, 1784–1785), 2:243, lists two medieval Masoretic manuscripts in favor of בֵּה שָׁנָה.

oldest preserved version of the narrative),⁶¹ 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.⁶² 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.⁶³

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.

17:6 καὶ κατώκισεν αὐτοὺς ἐν Αλαε καὶ ἐν Αβωρ ποταμοῖς Γωζαν καὶ Ορη Μήδων

La¹¹⁵: *et conlocavit eos in civitatem mediorum in emath et ad flumen abyro usque in hunc diem ἐν Αλαε καὶ ἐν Αβωρ ποταμοῖς Γωζαν] in civitatem⁶⁴ mediorum in emath et ad flumen abyro*

La¹¹⁵; *in Ala et in Habor iuxta fluvium Gozan* Vulg; גִּזְרֵי גִּזְרֵי בְּהָרֵי מְדֵי MT

Ορη Μήδων] ὄρει Μήδων 328 527; ἐν ὀρίοις Μήδων ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης L-700 460; + ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης CI 328 158 244 342; + *usque in hunc diem* La¹¹⁵; *in civitatibus Medorum* Vulg; מְדֵי מְדֵי MT

This verse deals with the exile of the Israelites into certain cities and regions in the Assyrian Empire.⁶⁵ 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 מְדֵי מְדֵי, “the cities of Medes,” with a transcription Ορη⁶⁶ Μήδων has incited surprisingly few comments in the research.

⁶¹ Similarly Richelle, *Le Testament d’Elisée*, 73–87. See, for analysis of the narrative of 2 Kgs 13:20–21, Julio Treballe Barrera, “Dos Textos para un relato de resurrección: 2 RE 13.20–21 TM LXX^B / LXX^L VL,” *Sefarad* 43 (1983): 8–16,” 8–16; and Tekoniemi, “Enhancing the Depiction,” 93–99.

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 mediorum* 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/misreading of הַר, “hill, mountain,” instead of MT’s עֵרִי, this does not seem likely, since in any case one would expect here a dative case (corrected to dat.sg. ὄρει 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 κατώκισεν αὐτοὺς ἐν), as dative would be expected—accusative plural Ορη as the second object of κατώκισεν seems very unlikely. *L* is easily explainable as contextual facilitation. Taking Ορη as a (mistaken) transcription, similar to NETS’ “Ore of Medes,” seems therefore like the best option. Similarly, Pablo 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. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, and Julio Treballe, BETL 246 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 210: “the reading Ορη seems to lie at the origin of the rest of the Greek variants.” The *Vorlage* may also have been some kind of mixed form, such as עֵרִי*. The translator would have apparently made the same mistake twice, as also in 2 Kgs 18:11 the same peculiar rendering is found. Furthermore, had he found Ορη in his base text, the translator of La¹¹⁵ would have easily been able to translate it correctly as *mons*, as he does in 1 Sam 14:22, 23; 2 Sam 13:34; 1 Kgs 11:43, 12:24, 16:24.

Interestingly enough, this transcription is missing in La¹¹⁵, 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 La¹¹⁵ hardly has any connection to the *L* reading,⁶⁹ it has probably here as the lone witness preserved the OG translation (*έν [ταῖς] πόλεσιν Μήδων).

Another OG reading to be found in La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵ in verses 17:3–6, analyzed in-depth by Pablo Torijano Morales.⁷¹

17:17 και ἐμαντεύοντο μαντείας και οἰωνίζοντο και ἐπράθησαν

La¹¹⁵: *et divinabant divinationes et fecerunt ephud et theraphin et augurabantur et auspicabantur*

και οἰωνίζοντο] + οἰωνισμοῖς και ἐποίησαν ἐφοῦδ και θεραφεῖμ L-700; + *et fecerunt ephud et theraphin* La¹¹⁵

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 La¹¹⁵ helps us see that *και ἐποίησαν ἐφοῦδ και θεραφεῖμ* 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 *וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֶפְד וְתַרְפִּים**, 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 La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵.

⁶⁸ Emanuel Tov, “Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament: A Further Characteristic of the *kaige*-TH. Revision?,” *Textus* 8 (1973): 81–82, 88–89.

⁶⁹ If La¹¹⁵ 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 (*finis*), 10:2 (*finibus*), 11:3, 7 (*regionem*).

⁷⁰ See Timo Tekoniemi, “On the Verge of Textual, Literary, and Redaction Criticism: The Case of 2 Kings 17:7,” in *On Hexaplaric and Lucianic Readings and Recensions*, ed. Kristin De Troyer, DSI 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020), 135–60; Treballe, “Textual Pluralism and Composition,” 223.

⁷¹ Torijano, “Textual Criticism,” 195–211. See also Tekoniemi, *Textual History of 2 Kings* 17, 61–86.

⁷² Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, *II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 11 (New York: Doubleday, 1988), 205–6 (Lucianic); Stade, *Book of Kings*, 264 (marginal gloss).

⁷³ See Timo Tekoniemi, “Between Two Differing Editions: Some Notable Text-Critical Variants in

The *Gegenprobe*: Lucianic Readings Confirmed by La¹¹⁵ as Recensional in 2 Kings

In addition to the discussion on the putative OG readings of La¹¹⁵, a list of the twenty-five most clear recensional Lucianic readings lacking from La¹¹⁵ will be provided below, showing that La¹¹⁵ is indeed not a recensional Lucianic witness proper. Most of the cases are found with the pattern La¹¹⁵ = 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 *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 La¹¹⁵ would seem to speak against such judgment.

6:6	ξύλον] pr Ελισσαιε L ⁻⁸² 460
6:7	ὑψωσον σαυτῶ] μετεώρισον καὶ λάβε σεαυτῶ L ⁻⁸² 246 460; <i>leua tibi</i> La ¹¹⁵
6:9	φύλαξαι μὴ παρελθεῖν] πρόσσεχε τοῦ μὴ διελθεῖν L ⁻⁸² 460; <i>observa ne transeas</i> La ¹¹⁵ ; <i>cave ne transeas</i> Vulg
6:9	ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ] τὸν τόπον τοῦτον L ⁻⁸² 460; om 107'; <i>in locum hunc</i> La ¹¹⁵ ; <i>in loco illo</i> Vulg
6:9	ἐκεῖ Συρία κέκρυπται B 247 a 44 56 642 488 318 372] ἐκεῖ Σύροι ἐνεδρεύουσιν L ⁻⁸² ; ἐκεῖ post Συρία tr rel; <i>ibi Syria absconsa est</i> La ¹¹⁵
6:13	εἶπεν] + ὁ βασιλεὺς (+Συρίας 246) L ⁻⁸² 246 460
6:14	ἐκεῖ] + (ὁ 19 460) βασιλεὺς Συρίας L ⁻⁸² 246 460
10:12	καὶ ἐπορεύθη] pr καὶ ἦλθεν A Arm Syr (sub * α'); + Ιου L-700; <i>et abit</i> La ¹¹⁵
10:12	αὐτὸς ἐν] καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν L-700 460; > αὐτὸς 46' 44-125; <i>ipse</i> La ¹¹⁵
10:29	οὐκ ἀπέστη] + ἀπ' αὐτῶν L-700; <i>non discessit</i> La ¹¹⁵
13:14	πρὸς αὐτὸν] et Ιωας βασιλεὺς Ἰσραηλ tr L-700 460
13:15	βέλη 1°] βολίδας L-700 460; <i>sagittas</i> La ¹¹⁵
13:15	ἔλαβεν] + Ιωας L 460
13:16	εἶπεν] + Ελισσαιε L 460; + Ιωας 700; + <i>at ieu</i> La ¹¹⁵
13:19	τρίς] τρίτον L-700 460; post Συρίαν tr La ¹¹⁵
13:20	ἀπέθανεν] et Ελισσαιε tr L-700 460
10:31	Ιου] post ἐφύλαξεν tr L-700 460; om 342
15:32	Ιουδα] + ἐπὶ (ἐν 93) Ἱερουσαλήμ L-700 328 460
15:33	ἦν] + Ιωαθαμ L-700
17:5	ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ] ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν (+ αὐτῆς 19') L-700 460; > πάσῃ V CII ⁻³²⁸ d ⁻³⁷⁰ s ^{-64'} 488 707; om La ¹¹⁵
17:5	Σαμάρειαν] + καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν αὐτῆς L ^{-19'} -700 460
17:6	βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων] et τὴν Σαμάρειαν tr L-700 460

2 Kings 17," in *The Last Days of the Kingdom of Israel*, ed. Shuichi Hasegawa, Christoph Levin, and Karen Radner, BZAW 511 (Berlin: De Gruyter: 2018), 223–26, for further discussion. See Juha Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 2013), 183–247, for the phenomenon of similar theological omissions in the Hebrew Bible.

17:7	καὶ ἐγένετο] + ὀργή κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ L-700 158; om La ¹¹⁵
17:15	ὀπίσω τῶν ἐθνῶν] και οπισω των θεων των εθνων L ⁹³ -700 460; + των θεων 158; <i>post gentes</i> La ¹¹⁵
17:19	καὶ γε Ιουδας] καὶ γε καὶ (>82) Ιουδας καὶ (>700) αὐτός L-700 460; <i>et iudas</i> La ¹¹⁵

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 La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵ (6:8); and one reading is a purely unique reading of La¹¹⁵ (10:10).

Most of the time, the text of La¹¹⁵ 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 La¹¹⁵'s text only once (17:6), and even then the similarities are not striking enough to see this as very probable.

As a conclusion, La¹¹⁵ preserves in the studied portions of 2 Kings, as in 1 Kings, a very old and most of the time a highly reliable text.