CRITICAL NOTES

ONCE MORE: "JEROBOAM'S RISE TO POWER"

In 1970, I concluded a brief text-critical note by listing four arguments and resultant conclusions:

Thus the lack of support in LXX for "Jeroboam" in 1 Kings 12:19, the absence of the sentences dealing with Jeroboam in the uncorrected LXX of vss. 2-5a, the conflated character of 1 Kings 12a MT combining variants in the Chronicles text tradition, and the reading of 1 Kings 12a in both MT and LXX suggest that in an earlier recension of 1 Kings 12, Jeroboam played no role in the Shechem parliament before the murder of Adoram, and that his ambiguous and contradictory role in 1 Kings 12 MT results from additions from the Chronicler's account. That the text of 1 Kings 12 has been supplemented from Chronicles may also be seen in vs. 17 which is absent from Kings LXX (Reigns) but attested in both MT and LXX of Chronicles.¹

D. W. Gooding has now raised serious questions about the interpretation of the evidence, the methodology, and my conclusions, which require a brief reply.²

My first argument (the lack of support in the LXX for "Jeroboam" in 1 Kings 12:12) was questioned since Gooding doubts that every difference between the MT and the LXX presupposes that same difference in a Hebrew Vorlage. While this objection is correct in principle, his primary counter data were the following table of six readings purporting to demonstrate that not every variant in every strand of the Greek evidence presupposes a different Hebrew text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>לֵלִי יִשְׂרָאֵל</th>
<th>πᾶς Ἰσραήλ</th>
<th>ommis populus Israel La.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vs. 3</td>
<td>לֵלִי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>ὁ λαὸς</td>
<td>omnis populus Arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. 12</td>
<td>לֵלִי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>πᾶς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>πᾶς ὁ λαὸς 74-242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. 16</td>
<td>לֵלִי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>πᾶς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>πᾶς ὁ λαὸς b ο cs cs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. 20(1)</td>
<td>לֵלִי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>πᾶς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>Ισραήλ Ax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>לֵלִי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately the table is inaccurate and misleading. The Hebrew expression in vs. 3, for example, is not translated in the LXX; the reading he cites, ὁ λαὸς, is from vs. 3a instead of 3a! Next, the MT in vs. 12 actually reads וַיִּקְרָא הָיְמֵה, for which the over-

¹ "Jeroboam's Rise to Power," JBL 89 (1970) 217-18. I would now supplement the last sentence by proposing that לֵל in 1 Kgs 12:5, which is absent from the uncorrected Old Greek, may also be an addition to the MT of Kings from Chronicles. Note the plural verb and the singular subject.
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whelming majority of the LXX manuscripts have a highly divergent reading. In vs. 1, the variant in the "Greek" evidence comes only from a daughter translation, while the variant in the Lucanian family of manuscripts of vs. 16 has a good chance of being a Proto-Lucanian reading. The omission of τὰς in MSS A and x (reading [1] in vs. 20) no doubt occurred independently of any Hebrew text, perhaps resulting from parablepsis (homoeoarchton) in an uncial text. Finally, the unanimous shorter reading of the LXX (reading 2 in vs. 20) could have resulted from parablepsis (homoeoteleuton) in the Hebrew Vorlage. Thus the table offers no support for the alleged arbitrariness of the Greek evidence.

My second argument (the absence of the sentences dealing with Jeroboam in the uncorrected LXX of vss. 2-3a) has frequently been noted by text critics. I still believe that the inclusion of material similar in content and length at 11:43 in the LXX is a correction by a later hand. Gooding concedes that the positioning is secondary but apparently doubts the relative lateness of this material since it contains one verb in the historic present. Even Gooding, however, admits that this is not sure evidence of antiquity. Moreover, this verb and the clause in which it occurs ("to make a beeline and he comes to his city which is in the land of Sarira, which is on Mt. Ephraim") is a replacement for vs. 3a in order to make it fit the alien context at 11:43 (note the doubling of the regnal formula). A possible source for this replacement is found in the supplements to the LXX at 12:24. In any case this one historic present is hardly enough to support the antiquity of the passage in itself and its location in the Old Greek at 12:2-3a, especially since it contradicts vs. 20 (see below).

In my third argument, I appealed to the conflate character of 1 Kgs 12:3a (MT). Montgomery had proposed earlier that vss. 2-3a, absent in the Old Greek, were an intrusion from Chronicles, and now I made the additional observation that the Chronicles text tradition contained synonymous variants in the MT and the Hebrew behind LXX that were later conflated in the MT of Kings.

Gooding divides his criticism of this argument into four parts. In part one he again questions the equation of variant details in the LXX with divergent Hebrew texts. But since this argument rests at least in part on his table of six readings analyzed above, it lacks cogency. He also suggests that LXX may not be the original LXX reading. Even if we were to follow Rahlfs who prefers LXX, the presence of ἐκκλησία (ἐν ἡσ) and ἔλθων in this manuscript has no counterpart in the MT. When Gooding surmises in part two of his criticism, therefore, that LXX could be "original," he should also concede that it would seem to presuppose a different Vorlage than the MT. On the other hand, if it is not original, it is more than just the result of accidental variation of common phrases, as Gooding proposes; it is a variation from LXX which is itself non-MT. The best etiology of LXX still seems to be: LXX represents a Vorlage different from the MT, and LXX represents a partial correction of this Old Greek toward the MT.

In part three of his critique, Gooding misunderstands my reference to "LXX, cf. LXX." By "cf." I only meant to note that the non-masoretic ἐκκλησία of LXX is con-
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tained in LXX as well. Whether the synonymous Hebrew variants (וֹדֵל הָיוֹת/יוֹדֵל הָיוֹת) were conflated by the scribe who expanded Kings or by an earlier scribe in the Chronicles text must remain sub judice; it is irrelevant to note that no extant Hebrew text of Chronicles contains the three words of this conflation. After all, a secondary (sol) text in Kings does contain them. In any case, it seems highly unlikely that an original reading וֹדֵל הָיוֹת would have split into the synonymous variants represented by the MT of Chronicles and LXX, as we would have to suppose if we followed Gooding’s suggestion (p. 533) that the text of Chronicles was influenced by Kings. The fourth part of his critique of this argument depends for its validity on agreement with the first three parts.

As for my fourth argument (the reading of 1 Kgs 12:20 in both the MT and the LXX precludes the presence of vss. 2-3a in the original account) Gooding denies that vss. 2-3a are explicitly contradicted by vs. 20, and he brands as “only an inference” the statement that “Jeroboam could not have returned earlier than vs. 20, otherwise the people would have heard of it earlier.” But he fails to note that the antecedent of “they” in the MT’s vs. 3 (“they sent and called him, i.e., Jeroboam”) is “all Israel” (vs. 1). To my mind, vs. 20 explicitly contradicts this when after the narration of the negotiations it states: “And when all Israel heard that Jeroboam had returned, they sent and called him to the assembly. . . .” Thus the text of vs. 20 in the MT and the LXX makes it unlikely that vss. 2-3a were part of the original account.

Despite Gooding’s reservations, I still would argue that in an earlier recension of 1 Kings 12, Jeroboam played no role in the Shechem parliament before the murder of Adoram, and that his ambiguous and contradictory role in 1 Kings 12 (MT) results from additions from the Chronicler’s account.

RALPH W. KLEIN

CONCORDIA SEMINARY, ST. LOUIS, MO. 63105

DEUT 31:7, מַהֵר or מֵתוֹב?

In a recent note in these pages, Bernard Grossfeld adduced new evidence, seemingly in favor of a reading מַהֵר in Deut 31:7. His argument was basically as follows:

1. By rendering the phrase, מִדְּמַר תַּבִּר, Neofiti I presupposes “a Hebrew text that reads מַהֵר תַּבִּר, a hiphil plus accusative particle.”

2. From an internal statistical point of view, a reading מַהֵר תַּבִּר in the MT “is quite unlikely,” since “none of the seven occurrences of the sequence מַהֵר plus preposition מַהֵר exists in the Pentateuch. In fact, the only time this verb occurs in the Pentateuch followed by the preposition “with” the Hebrew reads יִהְיֶה and not מַהֵר.”

3. While the LXX and the targums are in agreement with the MT, other versions such as the Peshitta, the Vulgate, the Samaritan and one manuscript of Onqelos reflect a reading of מֵתוֹב in the Hebrew.

Grossfeld, therefore, concludes that the reading מַהֵר תַּבִּר in the MT is the result of a scribal error that substituted a מַהֵר for a מֵתוֹב.

1 JBL 91 (1972) 533-34.
Further study of the evidence, however, does not support this conclusion. First, the construction תָּעַבַּד in the sense of "come with" occurs at least two additional times in the Pentateuch, viz., Exod 1:17, 11:6, where לְשׁוֹאֵל וְאָסַף מִדְרַשְׁתֵּהוּ תְּעוּבַּד אֵל. "come with Jacob"; and Deut 19:5, אִם רֹאֶשׁ בֶּן אָבִי רְאוּ יֵעֵבַּד יִשְׂרָאֵל, "goes with his neighbor." In fact, these two instances plus the vs. in question, Deut 31:7, תִּקְרָא לְמִדְרַשְׁתֵּהוּ:תָּעַבַּד אֵל, "you shall go with this people," outnumber the pentateuchal occurrences of תָּעַבַּד יִשְׂרָאֵל. 5

Second, לְעָבָד is not the usual haphel form in Neofiti 1. In the similar vs. of Deut 31:23, לְעָבָד מַה אֲנָהָנָה שֵׁבֶד אֲנָהָנָה, as well as in Gen 6:19, לְעָבָד אֲנָהָנָה, which is rendered לְעָבָד מַה אֲנָהָנָה, and the מַה אֲנָהָנָה follows the radical מַה אֲנָהָנָה. On the other hand, the peal form, מַה אֲנָהָנָה, the מַה אֲנָהָנָה between the לְעָבָד and the מַה אֲנָהָנָה. Inasmuch as מַה אֲנָהָנָה lacks the characteristic מַה אֲנָהָנָה of the peal, we cannot assign it to that construction with any certainty. However, by the same token, the position of the מַה אֲנָהָנָה makes it methodologically wrong to adduce מַה אֲנָהָנָה as evidence of a hiphil in the Vorlage of Neofiti 1.

Third, the word מַה אֲנָהָנָה as the preposition "with" is sometimes mechanically translated מַה אֲנָהָנָה instead of מַה אֲנָהָנָה in Neofiti 1. A case in point is Gen 39:2, מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה, מַה אֲנָהָנָה (MT); cf. מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה, מַה אֲנָהָנָה (N), "and the Lord was with Joseph." 6

In conclusion, the reading מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה in the targum (Neofiti 1) of Deut 31:7 does not necessarily contradict the reading מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה that is preserved in the MT and other versions.

Michael Klein
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5 As noted by Grossfeld in n. 16, these are Gen 29:6, 9; but he writes "(twice)" mistakenly, after the second of these references. Note also the two additional pentateuchal cases of מַה אֲנָהָנָה in Gen 7:7, 13. However, in both of these vss. מַה אֲנָהָנָה has a suffix מַה אֲנָהָנָה; in the latter of the two, the pronoun suffix is not in agreement with the antecedent verb מַה אֲנָהָנָה.

6 The same form of the haphel occurs in the 1st sg. masc. מַה אֲנָהָנָה (Deut 31:20), as opposed to מַה אֲנָהָנָה for the peal (Gen 29:21).

7 This is not to claim for Neofiti 1 orthographic uniformity either with this word or with others. See my note, "Text and Vorlage in Neofiti 1" (VT 22 [1972] 491) for examples of the contrary. I merely indicate here that dubious grammatical forms such as מַה אֲנָהָנָה cannot legitimately be made to evidence of variant Vorlagen.

8 Other possible examples are Gen 14:9 (contrast vs. 2), and Deut 29:14b. In both of these cases, the preceding verses contain the inflected מַה אֲנָהָנָה, clearly indicating the prepositional nature of the following מַה אֲנָהָנָה. It is, nevertheless, possible that Neofiti 1 does not view these two vss. as linked to the verbs of the preceding vss. Still another example is Gen 6:13, מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה, מַה אֲנָהָנָה "I will destroy them with the earth" (MT), 'א מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה מַה אֲנָהָנָה, מַה אֲנָהָנָה "I will destroy them and the earth" (N), in contrast with Onqelos and Targum Jonathan. In this case, however, N has added a מַה אֲנָהָנָה to מַה אֲנָהָנָה, creating a compound accusative.