

USUAL AND UNUSUAL CONCLUDING FORMULAS IN 2 KINGS 13–14: A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE OLD GREEK AND ITS IMPLICATION FOR THE LITERARY HISTORY*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Masoretic text of 2 Kings 13–14 is full of several unsettled problems. First, the concluding formula of Israelite king Jehoash is repeated twice in 2 Kgs 13,12-13 and in 2 Kgs 14,15-16. While the latter is a usual concluding formula, the former is unusual. Moreover, the formulas in the Masoretic text (MT) differ from those in the Codex Vaticanus (G^B). Finally, the Lucianic text (G^L) has the narrative organized in a different way. In order to address these problems this paper first presents a short history of scholarly research concerning the repeated concluding formulas. The comparison of the textual witnesses serves as the point of departure for the reconstruction of the Old Greek text (OG). On the basis of this analysis I offer some remarks on the textual and literary history of 2 Kings 13–14.

II. PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTIONS

Let us start with a presentation of the problem the scholars have been discussing for more than a century, namely, the concluding regnal résumés¹ of Israelite king Jehoash (800-784 BC)² in the MT.

The text of 2 Kings 13–14 presents a synchronistic history of three Israelite kings (Jehoahaz, Jehoash, and Jeroboam II) and two Judahite kings (Joash and Amazia). The presentation of the Israelite kings starts

* This work was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the contract no. APVV-17-0001.

¹ The formulae and the regnal résumés have been an object of numerous scholarly discussions; see, for example, S.R. BIN-NUN, "Formulas from Royal Records of Israel and of Judah", *VT* 18 (1968) 414-432; A.R.W. GREEN, "Regnal Formulas in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Books of Kings", *JNES* 42 (1983) 167-180; B. HALPERN – D. VANDERHOOF, "The Editions of Kings in the 7th-6th Centuries B.C.E.", *HUCA* 62 (1991) 179-244; N. NA'AMAN, "Death Formulae and the Burial Place of the Kings of the House of David", *Bib* 85 (2004) 245-254; G. STEUERNAGEL – U. SCHULZE, "Zur Aussage עַם-אַבְתָּי וַיִּשְׁכַּב + עַם-אַבְתָּי in den Büchern der Könige sowie in II Chronik", *ZAW* 120 (2008) 267-275; M.K. HOM, "On the Use of עַם-אַבְתָּי and וַיִּשְׁכַּב + קָבַר Formulae in the Book of Kings", *BN* 172 (2017) 3-12.

² According to M. COGAN, *I Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10; New York 2001) 508.

with Jehoahaz (2 Kgs 13,1-9) and continues with Jehoash (2 Kgs 13,10-25). The reign of Jehoash is described in the form of a fixed pattern: the introductory and closing regnal résumés are followed by a long addendum on the interaction between Elisha and Jehoash and the defeat of Aram. Verse 14,1 moves the narrative to the kingdom of Judah reporting on the reign of the king Amaziah (14,1-22). The report on Amaziah also follows the same pattern: an introductory regnal résumé is followed by a description of the major events in his reign, in particular, the Judahite wars with Edom and Israel, and a closing regnal résumé with a short addendum on a conspiracy against Amaziah and his building activities. The narrative concludes with a report on Jeroboam II (14,23-29). As was the case in the previous section, Jeroboam II's narrative opens and closes with regnal résumés (14,23-24.28-29) that frame a short theological reflection on Jeroboam II's heroic deeds (14,25-27).

	<i>Judah: Amaziah (798-769 BC)</i>		<i>Israel: Jehoash (800-784 BC)</i>
		Introductory regnal résumé	In the thirty-seventh year of King Joash of Judah, Jehoash son of Jehoahaz began to reign over Israel in Samaria; he reigned sixteen years. ¹¹ He also did what was evil in the sight of the LORD; he did not depart from all the sins of Jeroboam son of Nebat, which he caused Israel to sin, but he walked in them. (2 Kgs 13,10-11; NRSV)
		First concluding regnal résumé	Now the rest of the acts of Joash , and all that he did, as well as the might with which he fought against King Amaziah of Judah, are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel? So Joash slept with his ancestors, and Jeroboam sat upon his throne; Joash was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel. (2 Kgs 13,12-13; NRSV)

	<i>Judah: Amaziah (798-769 BC)</i>		<i>Israel: Jehoash (800-784 BC)</i>
		Addendum	<i>Elisha story (2 Kgs 13,14-21) Liberation of Israel (2 Kgs 13,22-25)</i>
Introductory regnal résumé	In the second year of King Joash son of Joahaz of Israel, King Amaziah son of Joash of Judah, began to reign. He was twenty-five years old when he began to reign, and he reigned twenty-nine years in Jerusalem. His mother's name was Jehoaddin of Jerusalem. He did what was right in the sight of the LORD, yet not like his ancestor David; in all things he did as his father Joash had done. But the high places were not removed; the people still sacrificed and made offerings on the high places. (2 Kgs 14,1-4; NRSV)		
Events	<i>Wars with Edom and Israel (2 Kgs 14,5-14)</i>		
		Second concluding regnal résumé	Now the rest of the acts that Jehoash did, his might, and how he fought with King Amaziah of Judah, are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel? ¹⁶ Jehoash slept with his ancestors, and was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel; then his son Jeroboam succeeded him. (2 Kgs 14,15-16; NRSV)
		New synchronis- tic formula	King Amaziah son of Joash of Judah lived fifteen years after the death of King Jehoash son of Jehoahaz of Israel. (2 Kgs 14,17; NRSV)

	<i>Judah: Amaziah (798-769 BC)</i>		<i>Israel: Jehoash (800-784 BC)</i>
Concluding regnal résumé	Now the rest of the deeds of Amaziah , are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Judah (2 Kgs 14,18; NRSV)		
Addendum	They made a conspiracy against him in Jerusalem, and he fled to Lachish. But they sent after him to Lachish, and killed him there. They brought him on horses; he was buried in Jerusalem with his ancestors in the city of David. All the people of Judah took Azariah, who was sixteen years old, and made him king to succeed his father Amaziah. He rebuilt Elath and restored it to Judah, after King Amaziah slept with his ancestors. (2 Kgs 14,19-22; NRSV)		

The chart presented above shows that the normal pattern of the synchronistic description of Amaziah's reign is suddenly interrupted by an insertion (14,15-17) that repeats the concluding formula of Jehoash which had already been presented in 13,12-13. Furthermore, verse 14,17 has another synchronizing formula. The repetition of the regnal résumé of the same king and the synchronizing formula of 14,17 have no parallel in the Books of Kings, which has led scholars to ask: Why do verses 14,15-16 repeat the closing formula about the Israelite king Jehoash that had already appeared in 13,12-13? Is one of the formulas a later insertion and, if so, when and why was it added?

These questions generated multiple theories³. Observing the unusual wording of the first concluding formula (ישב על-כסאו) versus the

³ For a complete list of formulae, see STEUERNAGEL – SCHULZE, “Zur Aussage + ישב על-כסאו in den Büchern der Könige sowie in II Chronik”, 269-272. This formula, even though attributed to an Israelite king, is the closest equivalent of the formula used for the Judahite kings; HOM, “On the Use of + ישב על-כסאו and קבר Formulae in the Book of Kings”, 9.

usual formula (וימלך ירבעם בנו תחתיו), the different spelling of the name Jehoash (יהואש and יואש) and the absence of the verses 13,12-13 in the G^L, most scholars proposed that the first concluding formula (13,12-13) is a later addition⁴. This proposal was presented with different nuances. Thus, M. Cogan and H. Tadmor proposed that the description of the Jehoash-Amaziah war was originally a northern story that ended with a regnal résumé. When the story was moved to its present position, the concluding formula in 14,15-16 remained and Jehoash's reign needed a new concluding formula that was added after 13,11⁵. J. Gray had advanced a similar view two decades before, suggesting that verses 14,15-17 were “an excerpt from the annals of the northern kingdom and stood originally after the account of the revival of Israel under Joash at the end of c. 13 [...] After the transference of 14.8-14 with the Deuteronomic epilogue on Joash (14.15 f.), a later hand supplemented the deficiency of the epilogue in c. 13 by inserting 13.12 f., rather anomalously, immediately after the Deuteronomic introduction to the reign of Joash”⁶.

Some scholars, however, expressed their doubts about the proposal that the first concluding formula (13,12-13) is a later addition⁷. Thus, M. Sweeney concluded that since verses 13,12-13 contain the verb “to seat” instead of “to become king” this formula might reflect an earlier version⁸. B. Stade and F. Schwally thought that both concluding formulas (13,12-13 and 14,15-16) are later additions and originally there was only one concluding formula after 13,25, as in the G^L⁹. E. Würthwein reached a similar conclusion and added that the original version of the formula was the verb “to become a king” as in 14,16 of the MT¹⁰. The differences of versions in 2 Kings 13–14 and their meaning have been recently studied

⁴ C.F. KEIL – F. DELITZSCH, *The Books of the Kings* (Edinburgh 1872) 383; R. KITTEL – W. NOWACK, *Die Bücher der Könige* (Göttingen 1900) 258; C.F. BURNEY, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix* (Oxford 1903) 317; J.A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh 1951) 434; J. GRAY, *I & II Kings. A Commentary* (OTL; London 1964) 540; G.H. JONES, *I and 2 Kings. Based on the Revised Standard Version* (Grand Rapids, MI – London 1984) 500; G. HENTSCHEL, *2 Könige* (Würzburg 1985) 58-59; V. FRITZ, *I & 2 Kings. A Continental Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA 2003) 311; M. NOBILE, *I-2 Re* (Milano 2010) 361-362.

⁵ M. COGAN – H. TADMOR, *II Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 11; Garden City, NY 1988) 145. See also JONES, *I and 2 Kings*, 512; M.A. SWEENEY, *I & II Kings* (OTB; Louisville, KY 2007) 366.

⁶ GRAY, *I & II Kings*, 536-537.

⁷ W. BRUEGGEMANN, *I & 2 Kings* (Macon, GA 2000) 442.

⁸ SWEENEY, *I & II Kings*, 358. See also A. ŠANDA, *Das Zweite Buch der Könige* (Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 9.2; Münster 1912) 154.

⁹ B. STADE – F. SCHWALLY, *The Books of Kings. Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text (The Sacred Books of the Old Testament; Leipzig 1904) 248.*

¹⁰ E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Die Bücher der Könige*. 1. Kön. 17 – 2. Kön. 25 (Göttingen 1984) 363.

by M. Richelle in his *memoire* written at the EBAF and in a revised form written in English ¹¹. Both will be discussed below.

Since no consensus has been reached about these formulas, let us start with a detailed examination of the textual witnesses. For reasons of clarity, I will examine the textual witnesses independently.

The Masoretic Text

The MT has two concluding regnal résumés for King Jehoash. The first concluding formula (1 Kgs 13,12-13) is located in its “natural” place, i.e. in the section describing the reign of Israelite king Jehoash (13,10-25). Thus, the first formula separates the introduction (13,10-11) from a long addendum (13,14-25). The second formula and a new synchronistic formula (14,15-17) unexpectedly appear amid the description of Amaziah’s reign and split the account in two parts (14,1-14.18-22a). There are a few indications that we should pay attention to both 13,12-13 and 14,15-16.

The formula in 2 Kgs 13,13 contains the phrase ישב על-כסאו “Jeroboam sat on his throne” (Type I), whereas 2 Kgs 14,16 reads וימלך ירבעם בנו “Jeroboam his son reigned in his stead” (Type II). The difference between the formulas is furthermore underscored by two variants of Joash’s name (underlined below). The first parts of the formula (verses 13,12 and 14,15) display some differences in syntax and words (in italics). The order of segments in the second part of the formula differs: verse 14,16 follows a normal order of segments (cf. 1 Kgs 16,6.28; 2 Kgs 10,35; etc.), whereas the segments in verse 2 Kgs 13,13 are organized in an inverted order. Finally, the description of the accession to the throne is different as well. In sum, the differences between 13,12-13 and 14,15-16 as presented in the MT provide reasons to doubt that one of the formulas is a meaningless repetition or some kind of scribal error ¹².

<i>First concluding formula</i> (2 Kgs 13,12-13) <i>Type I</i>	<i>Second concluding formula</i> (2 Kgs 14,15-16) <i>Type II</i>
<p>ויתר דברי <u>יואש</u> וכל-אשר עשה ונבורתו אשר נלחם עם אמציה מלך-יהודה הלואיהם כתובים על-ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל</p>	<p>ויתר דברי <u>יהואש</u> אשר עשה ונבורתו ואשר נלחם עם אמציהו מלך-יהודה הלאיהם כתובים על-ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל</p>

¹¹ M. RICHELLE, *Le testament d'Élisée*. Texte massorétique et Septante en 2 Rois 13.10-14.16 (Pendé 2010); IDEM, “Revisiting 2 Kings 13:14-21 (MT and LXX): Transposition of a Pericope and Multiple Literary Editions in 2 Kings”, *Making the Biblical Text*. Textual Studies in the Hebrew and the Greek Bible (ed. I. HIMBAZA) (OBO 275; Fribourg 2015) 62-81.

¹² The Syro-hexapla follows the MT, and so does the Peshita and the Vulgate.

<i>First concluding formula</i> (2 Kgs 13,12-13) Type I	<i>Second concluding formula</i> (2 Kgs 14,15-16) Type II
13 וישכב יואש עם־אבתיו וירבעם ישב על־כסאו ויקבר יואש בשמרון עם מלכי ישראל:	16 וישכב יהואש עם־אבתיו ויקבר בשמרון עם מלכי ישראל וימלך ירבעם בנו תחתיו:
12 And the rest of the acts of <u>Joash</u> , and all that he did, and his mighty exploit(s) that he fought against Amaziah king of Judah, are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel? 13 So <u>Joash</u> slept with his fathers, and Jeroboam sat upon his throne; <u>Joash</u> was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel. (author’s translation)	15 And the rest of the acts <i>that</i> <u>Jehoash</u> did, and his mighty exploit(s) and how he fought against Amaziah king of Judah, are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel? 16 So <u>Jehoash</u> slept with his ancestors, and was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel; then his son Jeroboam reigned in his stead. (author’s translation)

Codex Vaticanus (G^B)

The G^B has the same order of events and the location of the concluding formulas as the MT. However, the text of the G^B is significantly different. The first major difference concerns verse 13,12. The G^B reads: “his mighty acts which he performed (together) with Amaziah king of Judah” instead of “his mighty exploit(s) that he fought against Amaziah king of Judah” as in the MT. The G^B, thus, does not follow the MT in describing a war between the two kings but rather a collaboration between the two. Moreover, verse 13,13 is also significantly different in the G^B (in gray). There are also some minor differences. Thus, the G^B reads וּגְבוּרָתוֹ as a plural αἱ δυναστεῖαι αὐτοῦ in 13,12, but as a singular in 14,15. The G^B also harmonizes the name Joash in 14,15-16 and uses the same proper name Ἰωαῶς for יואש and יהואש (underlined below). Moreover, the syntax of verse 14,15 is partially changed (in gray and italics).

<i>First concluding formula</i> Type I	
MT (2 Kgs 13,12-13)	G ^B (4 Kgdms 13,12-13)
12 ויתר דברי יואש וכל־אשר עשה וגבורתו אשר נלחם עם אמציה מלך־יהודה הלוא־הם כתובים על־ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל	12 καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων <u>Ἰωαῶς</u> καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ αἱ δυναστεῖαι αὐτοῦ ἃς ἐποίησεν μετὰ Ἀμεσσιου βασιλέως Ἰουδα οὐχὶ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν Ἰσραηλ

<i>First concluding formula</i> <i>Type I</i>	
<i>MT (2 Kgs 13,12-13)</i>	<i>G^B (4 Kgdms 13,12-13)</i>
<p>¹³ וישכב יואש עם-אבתיו ירבעם ישב על-כסאו ויקבר יואש בשמרון עם מלכי ישראל:</p>	<p>¹³καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωᾶς μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰεροβοαμ ἐκάθισεν μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν Σαμαρεία μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν Ἰσραηλ</p>
<p>¹² And the rest of the acts of <u>Joash</u>, and all that he did, and his mighty exploit(s) that he fought against Amaziah king of Judah, are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel? ¹³ So <u>Joash</u> slept with his fathers, and Jeroboam sat upon his throne; <u>Joash</u> was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel. (The author's translation)</p>	<p>¹²And the rest of the things of Joash, and all that he did and his mighty deeds which he performed (together) with Amaziah king of Judah, are these things not written in a book of things of the days for the kings of Israel? ¹³And Joash slept with his fathers and Jeroboam sat (down) with his fathers and in Samaria with the brothers of Israel. (The author's translation)</p>

<i>Second concluding formula</i> <i>Type II</i>	
<i>MT (2 Kgs 14,15-16)</i>	<i>G^B (4 Kgdms 14,15-16)</i> <i>(thus also G^A)</i>
<p>¹⁵ ויתר דברי יהואש אשר עשה וגבורתו ואשר נלחם עם אמציה מלך-יהודה הלא-הם כתובים על-ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל ¹⁶ וישכב יהואש עם-אבתיו ויקבר בשמרון עם מלכי ישראל וימלך ירבעם בנו תחתיו:</p>	<p>¹⁵καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωᾶς ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν δυναστεία αὐτοῦ ἃ ἐπολέμησεν μετὰ Αμεσσειου βασιλέως Ἰουδα οὐχὶ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν Ἰσραηλ ¹⁶καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωᾶς μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν Σαμαρεία μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν Ἰεροβοαμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ</p>
<p>¹⁵ And the rest of the acts <i>that</i> <u>Jehoash</u> did, and his mighty exploit(s) and <i>how</i> he fought against Amaziah king of Judah, are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel? ¹⁶So <u>Jehoash</u> slept with his fathers, and was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel; then his son Jeroboam reigned in his stead. (The author's translation)</p>	<p>¹⁵And the rest of the things of <u>Joash</u>, <i>how much</i> he did in his might, <i>which</i> (referring to things) he fought with Amaziah king of Judah, <i>behold</i> are these (things) not written in a book of things of the days for the kings of Israel? ¹⁶And Joash slept with his fathers and was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel and Jeroboam reigned in his stead. (The author's translation)</p>

It is tempting to consider verses 13,12-13 in the G^B as a corruption of the MT due to haplography (ἐποίησεν ... ἐποίησεν and μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ... μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ). Furthermore, the phrase μετὰ Αμεσσιου can be derived from the MT that has the preposition עַם, The root לָחַם normally takes the preposition כּ to express “to fight against someone”. However, in some cases the verb takes the preposition עַם to convey “to fight against” (2 Sam 10,17; Josh 9,2; Judg 11,4, etc.). Hence the preposition μετὰ may be a literary translation of the Hebrew עַם.

However, there are signs in the G^B that warn us against a rushed conclusion that all the differences between the MT and the G^B can be explained as a corruption of the MT. First, the MT of 2 Kgs 13,12 has an awkward syntax: גְּבוּרָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר נִלְחַם עִם אֲמַצְיָה מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה “his mighty exploit(s) that he fought against Amaziah king of Judah”. In all other cases when the syntagma גְּבוּרָתוֹ occurs, it takes the verb עָשָׂה (1 Kgs 15,23; 16,27; 22,46; 2 Kgs 20,20); only in 2 Kgs 13,12; 14,15.28 does it take the verb נִלְחַם. Thus, the G^B having the verb ἐποίησεν would represent a more usual syntax. Second, all the Greek manuscripts, including Hexaplaric versions, as well as Ethiopic and Syriac versions support the G^B reading the verb “to do” instead of “to fight” in 13,12. Third, verse 13,13 in the G^B does not mention the burial of Jehoash and enthronement of Jeroboam, but rather that Jeroboam lived in Samaria, a kind of sitting with, i.e. cohabitation, aiming at a certain goal (cf. Ruth 2,23; 1 Sam 27,3; Ps 25,4). Fourth, the second μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ occurs only in the G^B, whereas the other manuscripts (Alexandrinus, Syriac, Armenian, Vulgate, and Ethiopic) read ἐπι τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ.

Codex Alexandrinus (G^A)

The G^A follows the order of event as in the MT. However, when the G^B differs from the MT, then the G^A sometimes follows the MT, sometimes the G^B. In particular, as for the formula of Type II, in verse 13,12 the G^A follows the G^B (it substitutes the verb “to fight” with “to do”); however, in verse 13,13 the G^A follows the MT. As for the formula of Type I the G^A follows the G^B, namely, it harmonizes the name and uses for שִׂיאָה and שִׂיאָה the same proper name Ἰωαῶς, and in 14,15 it follows the syntax of the G^B (see above).

Lucianic text (G^L)

The G^L contains many more differences that regard, above all, the reorganization of chapters 13 and 14. The chart below shows the major differences in the order of the narrative (in italics) ¹³.

<i>King</i>	<i>Event</i>	<i>MT</i>	<i>G^L</i>
Jehoahaz	Introductory formula	13,1-2	13,1-2
	Events	13,3-7	13,3-7
	<i>Covenant</i>	<i>Not present</i>	<i>13,8</i>
	Concluding formula (Type II)	13,8-9	13,9-10
Jehoash	Introductory formula	13,10-11	13,11-12
	Concluding formula (Type I)	13,12-13	Not present
	Elisha addendum	13,14-21	13,13-20
	<i>Covenant</i>	<i>13, 23</i>	<i>Not present</i>
	<i>Captives</i>	<i>Not present</i>	<i>13,22</i>
	Hazael and Aphek	13,22-25	13,23-24
	Concluding formula (Type II)	Not present	13,25-26
Amaziah	Introductory formula	14,1-4	14,1-4
	Events	14,5-14	14,5-14
	Jehoash concluding formula	14,15-16 (Type II)	14,16 (abbreviated Type I)
	New synchronistic formula	14,17	14,17
	Amaziah concluding formula	14,18-21	14,18-21
	Addendum	14,22a	14,22a
	Another synchronizing	14,22b	14,22b

This comparison shows that not only the events but also the formulas are exchanged and located in different places (in bold) ¹⁴. The first major difference between the concluding formulas in the MT and the

¹³ There are also some changes that are not relevant to the focus of this paper. For example, the G^L has a partially different description of the Aphek episode. For an erudite analysis, see S. HASEGAWA, "The Conquests of Hazael in 2 Kings 13:22 in the Antiochian Text", *JBL* 133 (2014) 61-76.

¹⁴ Unfortunately, leaves XXI 2-7 of the *Vindobonensis palimpsest* are missing, and we can only hypothesize that the *Vetus Latina* had the following sequence: 2 Kgs 13,10-11.22-25. However, it is impossible to ascertain whether the concluding summary in the *Vindobonensis palimpsest* was located as it is in the MT, i.e. after verse 13,11, or as it is in the G^L, i.e. after 13,25.

G^L regards the reign of Israelite king Jehoash. The unusual concluding formula containing the verb יָשַׁב (Type I) is not in the G^L after the introductory formulas as it is in the MT, but there is a usual concluding formula (Type II) in 13,25-26 in the G^L, i.e. after verse 13,25 of the MT. Moreover, the G^L does not have verse 14,15, and verse 14,16 has an unusual formula (Type I) whereas the MT has the usual formula (Type II).

In sum, the analysis of the G^L showed that the formulas in the G^L and in the MT are exchanged. The concluding formula in 14,16 of the G^L is abbreviated and corresponds to that occurring in 13,13 in the MT. The formula in 13,12-13 of the G^B is different from that of the MT.

III. A COMPARISON OF THE CORRESPONDING FORMULAS

Let us now investigate the corresponding formulas in the MT, G^B, G^L, and G^A. The usual concluding formula (Type II) expresses the succession on the throne by means of the verb מָלַךְ (the differences are in grey)¹⁵:

<i>MT (14,15-16)</i>	<i>G^B (14,15-16)</i>	<i>G^A (14,15-16)</i>	<i>G^L (13,25-26)</i>
ויתר דברי יהואש אשר עשה וגבורתו ואשר נלחם עם אמצייהו מלך־יהודה הלא־הם כתובים על־ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל:	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωᾶς ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν δυναστείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἃ ἐπολέμησεν μετὰ Ἀμεσσειου βασιλέως Ἰουδα οὐχὶ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς βασιλευσιν Ἰσραηλ	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωᾶς ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν δυναστείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἃ ἐπολέμησεν μετὰ Ἀμεσσειου βασιλέως Ἰουδα οὐκ ἰδοῦ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς βασιλευσιν Ἰσραηλ	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωᾶς καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ αἱ δυναστεῖαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ὡς ἐπολέμησε μετὰ Ἀμεσσειου βασιλέως Ἰουδα οὐκ ἰδοῦ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς βασιλευσιν Ἰσραηλ
וישכב יהואש עם־אבתיו ויקבר בשמרון עם מלכי ישראל וימלך ירבעם בנו תחתיו:	καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωᾶς μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ <u>ἐτάφη</u> ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἔβασίλευσεν Ἰεροβοαμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ	καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωᾶς μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ <u>ἐτάφη</u> ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἔβασίλευσεν Ἰεροβοαμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ	καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωᾶς μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ <u>θάπτεται</u> ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραηλ ἔβασίλευσεν Ἰεροβοαμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ

¹⁵ For the translation of these verses see above.

The unusual formula (Type I) contains the verb ישב in the MT, G^B, G^L, and G^A:

<i>MT (13,12-13)</i>	<i>G^B (13,12-13)</i>	<i>G^A (13,12-13)</i>	<i>G^L (14,16)</i>
ויתר דברי יואש וכל־אשר עשה וגבורתו אשר נלחם עם אמצייה מלך־יהודה הלואהם כתובים על־ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל:	¹² καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων <u>Ἰωας</u> καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ αἱ δυναστεῖαι αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐποίησεν μετὰ Ἀμεσσιου βασιλέως Ἰουδα οὐχὶ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν Ἰσραηλ	¹² καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων <u>Ἰωας</u> καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ αἱ δυναστεῖαι αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐποίησεν μετὰ Ἀμεσσιου βασιλέως Ἰουδα οὐχὶ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν Ἰσραηλ	Not present
וישכב יואש עם־אבתיו וירבעם ישב על־כסאו ויקבר יואש בשֶׁמֶרֶן עם מלכי ישראל:	¹³ καὶ ἐκοιμήθη <u>Ἰωας</u> μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰεροβοαμ ἐκάθισεν μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν Ἰσραηλ	¹³ καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωας μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰεροβοαμ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐτάφη <u>Ἰωας ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ</u> <u>μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων</u> <u>Ἰσραηλ</u>	καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωας μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ <u>θάπτεται</u> <u>ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ μετὰ</u> <u>τῶν βασιλέων</u> <u>Ἰσραηλ</u> καὶ ἐκάθισεν Ἰεροβοαμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ ¹⁶

Comparing the G^L with the MT and the G^{BA} it seems that the concluding formula of the MT in 14,15-16 and that found in the G^L in 13,25-26 represent the same concluding formula. This conclusion can be buttressed by the presence of the conjunction καί/waw. This conjunction divides the sentence in three subordinate segments, while the MT of 13,12 has only two segments.

<i>G^L (13,25-26)</i>	<i>MT (14,15-16, Type II)</i>	<i>MT (13,12-13, Type I)</i>
καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωας	ויתר דברי יהואש	ויתר דברי יואש
1 καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν	אשר עשה 1	1 וכל־אשר עשה
2 καὶ αἱ δυναστεῖαι αὐτοῦ	וגבורתו 2	2 וגבורתו אשר נלחם
3 καὶ ὡς ἐπολέμησε μετὰ Ἀμεσσιου βασιλέως Ἰουδα	ואשר נלחם עם אמצייהו מלך־יהודה	3 עם אמצייהו מלך־יהודה

¹⁶ Since the translations of the other texts have been presented above, we add only the translation of the G^L: “And Joash slept with his fathers, and was buried in Samaria with the kings of Israel and Jeroboam, his son, sat upon his throne” (author’s translation).

<i>G^L</i> (13,25-26)	<i>MT</i> (14,15-16, Type II)	<i>MT</i> (13,12-13, Type I)
οὐκ ἰδου ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωασ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ θάπτεται ἐν Σαμαρεία μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν Ἱεροβοαμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ	הלא־הם כתובים על־ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל וישכב יהואש עם־אבתיו ויקבר בשמרון עם מלכי ישראל וימלך ירבעם בנו תחתיו	הלוא־הם כתובים על־ספר דברי הימים למלכי ישראל וישכב יואש עם־אבתיו וירבעם ישב על־כסאו ויקבר יואש בשמרון עם מלכי ישראל:

We must bear in mind that the formula of Type II (13,25-26) in *G^L* contains elements that link it not only with the formula of Type II but also with the formula of Type I. Thus, the *G^L* of 13,25-26 has the additional καὶ πάντα that corresponds to וכל of the *MT* of 13,12-13. Moreover, the translations גבורתו in 13,25-26 of the *G^L* is the same as the *G^B* has for 13,12-13 (αἱ δυναστεῖαι). In sum, the *G^L* has the concluding formula exchanged, but the formula of Type II in 13,25-26 of the *G^L* contains the elements that occur both in 13,12-13 and 14,15-16 of the *MT* and of the *G^B*.

IV. A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE OLD GREEK OF THE CONCLUDING FORMULAS

The differences among textual witnesses prompt us to reconstruct what may have been the old(est) text¹⁷. There are good reasons to believe that in the case of Jehoash's concluding formulas the *G^L* contains the OG.

1. The "Typical" Concluding Formula (Type II)

M. Richelle suggested that the OG had the formula after 13,25 as in the *G^L*¹⁸. This idea can be indirectly supported by his and J. Treballe's

¹⁷ For the techniques of reconstruction of a Hebrew *Vorlage*, see E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Completely Revised and Expanded Third Edition (Winona Lake, MI 2015). It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the problems of proto-Masoretic and pre-Masoretic texts and their development. Several scholars have argued that the *G^L* together with the *Vetus Latina* in most cases contain the Old Greek dated prior to the *MT*. For a more recent evaluation, see A. AEJMELAEUS, "Textual History of the Septuagint and the Principles of Critical Editing", *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and its Editions*. Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot (eds. P.A. TORIJANO – A. PIQUER OTERO) (Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 1; Leiden 2017) 160-179, here 167-171; P. HUGO, "The Books of Kingdoms Fifty Years after the *Devanciers d'Aquila*. Development of the *Kaige* Theory within Barthélemy's Works, and Some Implications for Present Research", *The Legacy of Barthélemy*. 50 Years after "Les *Devanciers d'Aquila*" (eds. A. AEJMELAEUS – T. KAUFMAN) (De Septuaginta investigationes 9; Göttingen 2017) 23-40, here 23-26.

¹⁸ RICHELLE, *Le testament d'Élisée*, 117-119.

research on the Elisha section in the *Vetus Latina*¹⁹. They suggested that the original place of the Elisha episode (13,14-21 in the MT) was in the Jehu narrative as attested by *Vindobonensis* palimpsest $\xi 115$, i.e. between verses 2 Kgs 10,30 and 10,31. This would leave the narrative on Jehoash with verses 13,10-11,22-25. Furthermore, the G^L moves the verses on covenant (13,23 in the MT) from Jehoash's reign to Jehoahaz's reign (13,8 in the G^L). This abbreviated narrative on Jehoash's reign finds a perfect parallel in 14,23-29 of the G^L. The OG sequence could have been as follows:

	<i>Joash (OG)</i>	<i>Jeroboam II</i>
Introductory formula	2 Kgs 13,10-11	2 Kgs 14,23-24
Enemies' oppression, God's mercy, and the king's heroic deeds	2 Kgs 13,22-25	2 Kgs 14,25-27
Concluding formula (Type II)	13,25-26 (G ^L)	2 Kgs 14,28-29

Moreover, by comparing the concluding formula of Jeroboam and Jehoash in the G^L we can notice that the problematic parts (in grey) are translated in the same way.

<i>The G^L of 13,25 (Jehoash's reign)</i>	<i>The G^L of 14,28 (Jeroboam's reign)</i>
καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωαῶ καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ αἱ δυναστεῖαι αὐτοῦ καὶ...	καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰεροβοαμ καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ αἱ δυναστεῖαι αὐτοῦ καὶ...

Based on this comparison, we suggest that in the OG the usual concluding formula (Type II) was located at the end of chapter 13, as it is in the G^L.

2. *The Unusual Concluding Formula (Type I)*

The comparison between two unusual formulas (Type I) as in the MT of 13,12-13 and in the G^L of 14,16 reveals differences that lead us to prefer the G^L as the OG. First, the G^L omits verse 14,15. This suggests that the second concluding formula for Jehoash, which was inserted in the midst

¹⁹ Cf. also A. SCHENKER, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher*. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als Älteste Textform der Königsbücher (OBO 199; Göttingen 2004) 108-115, 195.

of Amaziah's reign, was an incomplete version of a different type of concluding formula, which this paper classifies as Type I. Second, as shown above, the order of the concluding formulas in the MT of 13,13 and in the G^L of 14,16 is different. Whereas the former has an irregular order of events (death, succession, burial), the latter follows a normal order of the concluding formulas (death, burial, succession). Third, all concluding formulas in 1-2 Kings are constructed as a series of *wayyiqtol*s, whereas the verb in the MT of 13,13 is in *waw-x-qatal* (ישב על-כסאו). The G^L of 14,16, however, reads καὶ ἐκάθισεν that would correspond to a *wayyiqtol* וישב. This further confirms that the G^L has the usual verbal sequence in the concluding formula. Finally, the MT of 13,13 omits a typical identification of the new king as “son of” בנו that is in the G^L of 14,16. For these reasons we suggest that the OG of 14,16 would be as in the G^L:

καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωας μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ θάπτεται ²⁰ ἐν Σαμαρεία μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐκάθισεν Ἰεροβοὰμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ

A retroverted Hebrew version of the OG:

וישכב יואש עם-אבתיו ויקבר בשמרון עם מלכי ישראל וישב ירבעם בנו על-כסאו

V. A POSSIBLE TEXTUAL HISTORY OF JEHOASH'S CONCLUDING FORMULAS

Recent advances in the textual criticism and studies of the Septuagint of 1 Samuel – 2 Kings focus not only on the reconstruction of the Old Greek, but also on the textual history of these books ²¹. In keeping with this approach, the following paragraphs represent an attempt to reconstruct the textual history of the concluding formulas.

Based on the reconstruction presented above, the OG had the concluding formula (Type II) in 13,25-26 as in the G^L. The second concluding formula (Type I) was in 14,16. The latter was an unusual formula. It contained the verb וישב as in the G^L, and it was not preceded by verse 14,15 of the MT.

²⁰ A difference between the Greek translations of the G^{BA} and the G^L is in the translation of the ויקבר. The G^L translates it as θάπτεται instead of ἐτάφη as in G^{BA}. This difference can be explained as the translation technique.

²¹ J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA, “From Secondary Versions through Greek Recension to Hebrew Editions. The Contribution of the Old Latin Version”, *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and its Editions. Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot* (eds. P.A. TORIJANO – A. PIQUER OTERO) (Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible; Leiden 2017) 180-216, here 180-182.

The OG partially represented by the *Vetus Latina* probably did not contain the Elisha episode (13,14-21 in the MT) which was originally part of the Jehu narrative. Once the Elisha section was transferred from chapter 10 to chapter 13, chapters 13 and 14 were significantly changed²². So, chapters 13 and 14 underwent a complicated process of revision and harmonization. We can only hypothesize about some steps in this process.

While the G^L maintained the original position and form of the concluding formulas, the MT and the G^B exchanged the formulas and moved them to different places. The formula in 13,25-26 of G^L was moved after 14,14 creating an usual and complete concluding formula (Type II) as attested in 14,15-16 of the MT and G^{BA}. The unusual formula (Type I) was moved from its original place in 14,16 of G^L to 13,12-12 of the MT and the G^{BA}. The vestiges of this transfer have been preserved in the G^{BA}; the error in the G^B was caused by homoioteleuton (see above) and the G^A corrects it as follows:

καὶ Ἰεροβοαμ ἐκάθισεν μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν Ἰσραηλ (G^B)
καὶ Ἰεροβοαμ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐτάφη Ἰωαβ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραηλ (G^A)

We may also speculate about the reason for such a rearrangement of the chapters. The G^{BA} does not mention the war between Jehoash and Amaziah in chapter 13 but only in chapter 14. Thus the transfer of the formula and its correction as in the G^{BA} create a new paradigm for Jehoash-Amaziah relations. The version as preserved in the G^{BA} does not describe a bellicose relationship between Judah and Israel but rather their mutual collaboration, which was a continuation of joint Israelite-Judahite enterprises (cf. 1 Kgs 22,4; 2 Kgs 3,7). Verse 13,13 of the G^B, even though is quite corrupted, goes in the same direction. It does not mention Jeroboam's ascension to the throne nor the war with Jehoash. It rather emphasizes Jeroboam's living (sitting) with his brothers in Samaria.

According to the G^{BA} the bellicose relationship between Judah and Israel started only after Amaziah's consolidation of the Judahite kingdom and the conquest of Edom (2 Kgs 14,5-7). In sum, the changes from the OG to the G^{BA} emphasize the gradual worsening of the Israelite-Judahite relationships, whereas the G^L suggests that the relations between Jehoash and Amaziah were never pacific. The MT seems to harmonize both formulas and reads in both: "he (Jehoash) fought against Amaziah".

²² Some aspects of this process were studied by J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA, "Histoire du texte des livres historiques et histoire de la composition et de la rédaction deutéronomiste avec une publication préliminaire de 4Q481A, 'Apocryphe d'Élisée'", *Congress Volume Paris 1992* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (VTSup 61; Leiden 1995) 327-342, here 339-342; RICHELLE, *Le testament d'Élisée*, 56-70.

VI. FROM TEXTUAL HISTORY TO LITERARY HISTORY

A. Schenker distinguished textual variants from those variants “which seem to be created precisely in order to modify the biblical text on the literary level by reshaping its main purpose”²³. Just as P. Torijano Morales used textual criticism to illuminate the redactional strata of 2 Kgs 17,2-6²⁴, so did S. McKenzie for understanding the Elijah cycle²⁵ and S. Hasegawa for a reconstruction of the battle at Aphek described in 2 Kgs 13,22²⁶. M. Richelle demonstrated the importance of the presence or absence of the Elisha episode for understanding Jehu and Jehoash²⁷. In keeping with this approach, we will now consider some aspects of the literary history of 2 Kings 13–14.

The textual-critical analysis presented above shows that the OG had an unusual formula (Type I) 14,16 of the G^L that contained the phrase **וַיֵּשֶׁב יִרְבֵּעַם בְּנוֹ עַל-כִּסֵּאֵא**. The expression “to sit on (his) throne” as a sign of becoming the king is well known²⁸, but in 1-2 Kings it is used only in the succession narrative of Solomon in 1 Kings 1–2. An equivalent of this formula occurs in 1 Kgs 2,10-12, speaking of Solomon sitting on the throne of his father, but it is never found in other concluding formulas²⁹. This would suggest that the formula of Type I with the verb **יָשַׁב** comes from a different source than the other formulas in 1-2 Kings. The ancient

²³ A. SCHENKER, “What Do Scribes, and What Do Editors Do? The Hebrew Text of the Masoretes, the Old Greek Bible and the Alexandrian Philological *Ekdoseis* of the 4th and 3rd Centuries B.C., Illustrated by the Example of 2 Kings 1”, *After Qumran. Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts — The Historical Books* (eds. H. AUSLOOS – B. LEMMELIJN – J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA) (BETL 246; Leuven 2012) 275-295, here 275. See also A. SCHENKER, “Die *Tiqune Sopherim* im Horizont der biblischen Textgeschichte. Theologische Korrekturen, literarische Varianten in alttestamentlichen Text und Textvielfalt: Wie gehen sie zusammen?”, *Making the Biblical Text. Textual Studies in the Hebrew and the Greek Bible* (ed. I. HIMBAZA) (OBO 275; Fribourg 2015) 33-47, here 33-35.

²⁴ P. TORIJANO MORALES, “Textual Criticism and the Text-Critical Edition of IV Regnum: The Case of 17,2-6”, *After Qumran. Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts — The Historical Books* (eds. H. AUSLOOS – B. LEMMELIJN – J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA) (BETL 246; Leuven 2012).

²⁵ S. MCKENZIE, “‘My God is YHWH’: The Composition of the Elijah Story in 1-2 Kings”, *Congress Volume Munich 2013* (ed. C.M. MAIER) (Leiden 2014) 92-111.

²⁶ S. HASEGAWA, “The Conquests of Hazael in 2 Kings 13:22 in the Antiochian Text”, *JBL* 133 (2014) 61-76.

²⁷ RICHELLE, *Le testament d’Élisée*, 11-103; IDEM, “Revisiting 2 Kings 13:14-21”, 72-81.

²⁸ This formula refers mainly to Solomon as the successor of David (1 Kgs 1–2; 3,6; 8,20,25), then to Elah (1 Kgs 16,11) and especially to Jehu’s dynasty (2 Kgs 10,30; 11,19; 13,13; 15,12). See also 1 Kgs 22,10.19.

²⁹ On the contrary, the “typical” formula **וַיִּמְלֹךְ יִרְבֵּעַם בְּנוֹ תַחְתֵּי** (Type II) is a standard formula in the regnal résumés; see, for example, 1 Kgs 11,43; 14,20.31; 2 Kgs 12,22; 14,29; 15,7.22.38.

date of the unusual formula (Type I) coincides with equivalent texts in Mesopotamian documents. To sit on the throne occurs in the regnal formulas of Babylonian chronicles *ina kussê ittāšab* “he sat on the throne” (*ABC 1 i* 2.10.13, etc.). It was a standard formula used in this chronicle to coordinate the reigns of Assyrian, Babylonian, and Elamite kings. However, the Babylonian chronicles have no equivalent of the expression, “And the rest of the acts of ... are they not written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel?”

Thus, we can gather the following unusual elements in chapters 13 and 14. First, verse 14,16 is the only place in the Bible when the concluding formula of the Israelite king (Jehoash) is inserted into the midst of the account of a Judahite king (Amaziah). The OG of this inserted formula shows that it was an unusual and incomplete formula. Its phraseology is similar to that of the Babylonian chronicles. Thus, it can be concluded that the unusual formula (Type I) predates a usual formula (Type II).

The reconstruction of the OG shows that the original period for the insertion of this unusual concluding formula was in the midst of Amaziah’s reign. Reading this formula in the light of the following verse, “King Amaziah son of Joash of Judah lived fifteen years after the death of King Jehoash son of Jehoahaz of Israel” (2 Kgs 14,17) would illuminate the meaning and the date of verses 14,16 in the G^L. These two verses, and probably also verse 14,22³⁰, introduce a different type of synchronization between the northern and southern kings.

The meaning of this new type of synchronization can be explained from the context. According to 2 Kgs 14,8-13, stubborn Amaziah was defeated and captured by the Israelite king Jehoash, and Jerusalem and its temple were looted. Immediately after the description of the looting, there is a concluding summary of the reign of the Israelite king Jehoash (14,16) instead of that of Amaziah, which comes only later. Amaziah’s reign in fact starts in 2 Kgs 14,1-3 with an introductory formula typical for southern kings. But after the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, Amaziah’s reign continues with Jehoash’s regnal résumé, and a new synchronization

³⁰ There is another strange formula in 2 Kgs 14,22: “he rebuilt Elath and restored it to Judah, after the king slept with his ancestors”. Who is “the king”? Is he the Israelite king Jehoash or the Judahite king Amaziah? The text allows for both translations. Some less important Greek manuscripts add Amaziah, so the translation would be: “He (Azariah) rebuilt Elath and restored it to Judah, after King (Amaziah) slept with his ancestors”. Thus, this verse would refer to the deeds of Amaziah’s son Azariah. But the translation that coordinates the southern king with the northern is also possible and, in my view, preferable, “He (Amaziah) rebuilt Elath and restored it to Judah, after King (Joash) slept with his ancestors”. This opinion can be supported by the fact that the addenda after the concluding regnal résumé normally describe the reign of the previous king (Amaziah) and not of the new king (Azariah).

of the Israelite and Judahite kings starts (2 Kgs 14,17). In this way the OG shows that after Israel had plundered Jerusalem and Amaziah had been taken captive, Judah became dependent on Samaria. In other words, after Judah became a vassal of Israel, the Judahite kings had to be synchronized with the Israelite kings. Thus, the unusual and seemingly incomplete formula in 14,16 of the G^L, and a new formula in 14,17, not only represent the oldest version of the text (OG) but also preserve an older northern tradition that told the story of the Judahite kings from the standpoint of their Israelite conquerors³¹. Consequently, the OG represents the oldest preserved synchronization of the history of the southern vassal kings according to their northern overlords³². This older northern tradition, which was problematic after the fall of Samaria and during the post-exilic period, was edited by a Deuteronomist³³. The revision of chapter 13 and 14 as attested in the MT and the G^{BA} shows that the process of redaction did not stop with the Deuteronomistic revision but continued even at the end of the first millennium.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Piazza della Pilotta, 35
I-00187 Rome

Peter DUBOVSKÝ

SUMMARY

This article reconstructs the Old Greek of 2 Kgs 13,12-13 and 14,15-16. The investigation suggests that the Old Greek can be reconstructed from the G^L with some minor changes. The formula in 14,16 is atypical and the author concludes that it represents an older synchronization of the histories of the northern and southern kingdoms after the conquest of Jerusalem by Jehoash.

³¹ For these historical periods, see N. NA'AMAN, "Historical and Chronological Notes on the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the 8th century BC", *VT* 36 (1986) 71-92; S. HASEGAWA, *Aram and Israel during the Jehu Dynasty* (BZAW 434; Berlin 2012) 107-128; I. FINKELSTEIN, "A Corpus of North Israelite Texts in the Days of Jeroboam II?", *HeBAI* 6 (2018) 262-289.

³² The vestiges of the northern formula might be still reflected in the account of Israelite king Elah in 1 Kgs 16,11 that reads: "When he began to reign, as soon as he had seated himself on his throne, he killed all the house of Baasha" (NRSV).

³³ P. DUBOVSKÝ, "The Birth of Israelite Historiography: A Comparative Study of 2 Kings 13–14 and Ninth-Eighth-Century BCE Levantine Historiographies", *Stones, Tablets, and Scrolls. Periods of the Formation of the Bible* (eds. P. DUBOVSKÝ – F. GIUNTOLI) (ArcB 3; Tübingen 2020) 65-111.