

Jonathan Miles Robker
The Jehu Revolution

Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Herausgegeben von
John Barton · F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp
Reinhard G. Kratz · Markus Witte

Band 435

De Gruyter

Jonathan Miles Robker

The Jehu Revolution

A Royal Tradition of the Northern Kingdom
and Its Ramifications

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-028489-8
e-ISBN 978-3-11-028501-7
ISSN 0934-2575

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2012 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/Boston

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Acknowledgements

The journey to complete this dissertation was a long and arduous one, covering a period of some three years, from March of 2008 until May of 2011, when I completed my *Rigorosum*. Over the course of this academic wending, too many people have rightfully earned my gratitude to all be listed here, but several deserve to be noted in a special way.

First and foremost, I must extend my thanks to my family for their support and for understanding my longing to complete this degree in Germany, far away from the land I since birth have called my home. To my second family, the Hildenspergers of Scheppach, I must extend my eternal gratitude for the welcoming spirit and cheerful, uplifting attitude that has always greeted me there. To Anja I continue to offer thanks for the support that you have given me, both with linguistic matters in Latin and Spanish, and with the practical support you have provided me in day-to-day living, in spite of my sometimes less-than-sunny disposition.

From a scholastic perspective, my gratitude is extended to Professor Dr. Jürgen van Oorschot and Professor Dr. Hans-Christoph Schmitt, both of whom have undertaken the extensive task of guiding my research from the conception of this project. Further, my thanks are extended to Professor Dr. Markus Saur for his encouraging words at the right times. Finally, I offer thanks to the members of the *alttestamentliches Forschungsseminar* in the years 2006–2010 in Erlangen, especially Dr. Lars Allolio-Näcke, Andrea Beyer, Philipp Herrmannsdörfer, Dr. Gerhard Karner, Delia Klingler, and Sarah Schulz for questioning, criticizing, and probing my hypotheses in a friendly, collegial atmosphere.

On the practical side of life, I extended my deepest gratitude to Villigst for their financial support. Without the stipend they were gracious enough to extend to me, this research could not have been undertaken, not to mention the research trips to London, Jerusalem, Tartu, and Helsinki, which of course, without the financial support of Villigst, would have remained the dream they turned out to be. For their diligent work in correcting part or the whole of the manuscript, I thank Anja Hildensperger, Delia Klingler, Jonathan Kühn, Nicholas Loup, and Frani Scheler. Their work was both efficient and thorough, yet any errors that remain are my responsibility alone.

Further, I must extend my thanks to Prof. Dr. Siegfried Kreuzer and Prof. Dr. Aaron Schart, who gainfully employed me in Nordrhein-Westfalen, yet still provided me with enough freedom to complete the final phase of editing this

manuscript for publication. My gratitude is also offered to the editors of the series *BZAW* for accepting this dissertation into their series and to the publishers at de Gruyter, especially Dr. Albrecht Döhnert and Sabina Dabrowski, as well as Steve from technical support at Nota Bene, for their assistance with the formatting and editing of the final manuscript.

Finally, I would like to offer my thanks to the individuals who took the time to remind me that life is more than composing a dissertation or earning a doctoral degree. The residents of the WEH and my students in the *Fachbereich Theologie* in Erlangen must be recognized in this capacity. My special thanks goes out to the *Akademischen Rat* Dr. Gerhard Karner, Delia Klingler, Eduard W. Schlichtinger, and Markus Westhauser for the many hours of discussion, sometimes heated, and relaxation that we could all enjoy. My love and thanks are extended to Anja Hildensperger for all of her support in every facet of my life.

Thank you.

Jonathan Robker
Wuppertal, 18 June 2012

The abbreviations used in this dissertation follow the *SBL Handbook of Style*.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	V
Chapter 1: Introduction: Objectives and Methodology	1
The Problem.....	1
Objectives	2
Methodology	6
Excursus: The Greek Text of Kings.....	8
Chapter 2: The Literary Jehu: A Construct and its Ramifications	17
The Oldest Biblical Jehu Tradition: 2 Kings 9–10*.....	17
Literary Criticism.....	35
Analysis of Style	58
Date of Composition.....	62
Form and <i>Sitz im Leben</i>	65
Chapter 3: The Jehuide Dynasty	70
Excursus: A Judean Redaction or a Judean Source?.....	81
2 Kings 13:1–9*.....	83
Translation and Textual Considerations	83
Narrative Considerations	84
2 Kings 13:10–14:22*.....	86
Translation and Textual Considerations	86
Narrative Considerations	90
1 Kings 20:1–34*.....	99
Translation and Textual Considerations	99
Narrative Considerations	105
2 Kings 14:23–29*.....	110
Translation and Textual Considerations	110
Narrative Considerations	111
Chapter 4: The Israel Source in the Book of Kings: From Jeroboam II through Joram	117
David and Solomon: 1 Kings 1:1–11:25*.....	117
Jeroboam I: 1 Kings 11:26–14:20*.....	118
Translation and Textual Considerations	119

Narrative Considerations	123
Nadab through Joram: 1 Kings 15:25–16:34 + 22*; 2 Kings 1*	130
Translation and Textual Considerations	130
Narrative Considerations	138
The Plausibility of a Political Source in the Time of Jeroboam I	157
Concluding Remarks	164
Chapter 5: Historicity and the Bible: Evaluating the Biblical Materials for Reconstructing Israel's History	
Introduction	166
The Israel Source	166
Other Material in Kings	171
Hosea	174
Amos	181
Chronicles	188
Josephus	193
Concluding Remarks and Evaluations	195
Chapter 6: Akkadian Sources	
Shalmaneser III	197
The Campaign of 853	201
The Campaign of 849	210
The Campaign of 848	211
The Campaign of 845	213
The Campaign of 841	215
The Campaign of 838	223
Summary of Shalmaneser III	225
Adad-nārārī III and Shalmaneser IV	225
The Assyrian Texts	229
Chapter 7: Levantine Epigraphy: Tel Dan, Mesha, Zakkur, Samaritan Materials	
Textual Sources in Syria and Palestine	232
The Mesha Inscription	232
General Matters and Dating	232
Translation	233
Historical Considerations and Reconstruction	236
The Tel Dan Inscription	240
General Matters and Dating	240
Reconstruction and Translation	246
Historical Considerations and Reconstruction	265
The Zakkur Inscription	275

General Matters and Dating	275
Translation	275
Historical Considerations and Reconstruction	277
Samarian Stele Fragments	278
The Samaria Ostraca	279
General Information and Dating.....	279
Contents	280
Historical Considerations	282
Conclusions.....	283
 Chapter 8: Conclusions	285
Historical Reconstruction	285
Impulses for Further Study	301
 Appendix: The Israel Source.....	303
Bibliography	315
Index of Biblical Citations	333

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Objectives and Methodology

The Problem

The text of Kings has always played a significant role in any reconstruction of Israel's history, particularly in cases where interest has developed surrounding specific events rather than general social or economic trends. Many of the historical textbooks reflecting on Israel's history offer a basic recounting of the biblical narrative, with greater or lesser complexity and artistic flair. The narrative about Jehu's political putsch in 2 Kings 9–10 represents a famous example of such a narrative from the book of Kings being often cited in historical reconstructions of Israel's history.¹ The story of Jehu, one of the most violent in all of the Bible, recounts his rise to power via the slaughtering of his predecessor, his predecessor's ally, and their respective families. Other sources from the ancient Near East, most especially the Akkadian sources from Shalmaneser III and the so-called Tel Dan Inscription, have suggested that the biblical image of Jehu may not be entirely trustworthy. In order to develop an informed opinion about the reliability of the narrative of Kings, first it must be established what material in the story is what age. Only then can it be adequately interrogated as to whether it can provide details to the modern historian about the ninth century in Israel. This leads us to a number of problems: 1) What is the oldest narrative about Jehu in 2 Kings 9–10? 2) Did this narrative originally exist in iso-

1 For an example of an extremely brief recounting of the biblical narrative of Jehu's revolt, based largely on the biblical image with some references to the Akkadian materials, cf. Jan Alberto Soggin, *Einführung in die Geschichte Israels und Judas: von den Ursprüngen bis zum Aufstand Bar Kochbas* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991), 146–48. For a much more artistic rendering of the biblical narrative, cf. Herbert Donner, *Von der Königszeit bis zu Alexander dem Großen mit einem Ausblick auf die Geschichte des Judentums bis Bar Kochba* (vol. 2 of *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 274–80.

lation or was it part of a more substantial whole? 3) How old is the oldest narrative about Jehu? 4) What can its *Tendenz* tell us about its reliability and usefulness in reconstructing Israel's history? 5) How does this narrative in Kings relate to other sources of information regarding the history of the ancient Near East in the ninth century? 6) When considered together, compared and contrasted, can these sources be used to reconstruct a plausible history for the events supposedly surrounding Jehu's political revolution in Israel in the ninth century? Further study and explication remains necessary, as the academic literature addressing these matters in the last 20 years has failed to produce any kind of consensus. This study seeks to answer these questions in a manner that does justice to all of the relevant sources.

Objectives

Two major objectives define this work: on the one hand, this study attempts to reconstruct the textual history of the narrative in 2 Kings 9–10 and any related texts within the book of Kings. Initially, this seemed to be a simple enough task, as only limited levels of redaction can be read out of the narrative. However, in the course of the development of this reconstruction of the textual history, it became obvious that the narrative in 2 Kings 9–10 was originally part of a much larger whole, from which it cannot be separated without exceptional violence to the text. Many readers will immediately say, “of course! This story is one narrative link in the Deuteronomistic history!” However, the Deuteronomistic text is not the oldest narrative of which the story in 2 Kings 9–10 was but a part.² This will all become clear in the course of this study.

On the other hand this undertaking attempts to offer a historical reconstruction of the events surrounding the revolt of Jehu as described in 2 Kings 9–10. This reconstruction will not be based solely on the biblical materials, but will consider epigraphic materials. Again, this may seem to be an easy task at the outset, but there are many sources that play a role in such a reconstruction. Beyond this, the historical context of Jehu's revolt must be established before one can consider the historicity of the narrative account of these events in 2 Kings. One must further look beyond the immediate time-frame of Jehu's

2 The oldest narrative identified in the course of this study is referred to as the Israel Source.

supposed revolution (i.e., 842–841 BCE) to see if there is evidence outside of the Bible to support such claims. In this matter, other textual finds become especially relevant.³ I believe that the various sources reflecting on the history of Israel at that time must be compared and contrasted with no single source being given priority over all others all of the time. Rather, the sources must be studied and criticized independently, then contrasted, in the hopes that a composite image can be constructed, offering a plausible historical reconstruction for Israel in the ninth and eighth centuries.

From these objectives, the nature of the study should become clear: this is a primarily historical study, whether one considers the reconstruction of the events behind the narrative or the reconstruction of the history of the narrative. This is not a primarily theological work, but does have important ramifications for any history of Israel's religion. More significantly, this study will make a new (or renewed) suggestion about how the text of Kings came to exist. While the extra-biblical sources can be dated with more or less certainty, the dating of the Kings narrative presents an especially thorny issue. This is also true for the narrative of the Jehu revolution, which has been dated into the Neo-Babylonian period by some scholars⁴ and within the dynasty of Jehu by others.⁵ These dates represent a difference of at least one hundred and fifty years, a time in which a tradition could change a considerable amount. While it is clear that the current version of the biblical narrative concerning Jehu has been through a number of redactions, transforming the final draft of the text into a narrative

3 It is not a major objective of this work to compare and contrast all of the various histories of Israel written relying on Kings. Since this study considers the original source materials, only limited references to scholastic postulations in the textbooks remains necessary. This is especially true since many of the histories of Israel pre-date the discovery of the Tel Dan Inscription, e.g., Donner, *Geschichte*; Soggin, *Einführung*; John Bright, *A History of Israel* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1960); and Gösta W. Ahlström, *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Paleolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest* (JSOTSup 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), just to name a few.

4 E.g., Thomas C. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London; New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 154, who suggests that in the Neo-Babylonian period, the narrative of 2 Kings 9:1–10:27* was part of the Deuteronomistic literature.

5 E.g., Susanne Otto, *Jehu, Elia und Elisa: Die Erzählung von der Jehu-Revolution und die Komposition der Elia-Elisa-Erzählungen* (BWANT 152; Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2001).

culminating at the earliest in the Persian period,⁶ there are clear indications that the oldest narrative level of the text comes from a much earlier period.

My suggestion here, which will be supported with significant evidence in the following chapters, is that one must reckon with some pre-Deuteronomistic source(s), at least one of which came from political circles in the Northern Kingdom. I am not the first to suggest a pre-Deuteronomistic source for material in the Book of Kings. Others, especially Weippert, Mayes, Campbell, Provan, Lemaire, Halpern and Vanderhooft, and Schniedewind have all assumed as much, placing the composition of the original text in either the time of Jehoshaphat or, more often, Hezekiah.⁷ Conspicuously, all of these authors presume Judean compositional priority for the oldest reconstructable level of the narrative.⁸ One must question whether such a presumption is necessarily

6 One should remember that the text used as the base in the diplomatic edition BHS, Codex Leningradensis, comes from the eleventh century CE, i.e., some 2000 years after the events it describes in the narrative of 2 Kings 9–10. The last major redaction of this text may have been around the beginning of the Common Era; cf. Adrian Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (OBO 199; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004).

7 Cf. Helga Weippert, “Die ‘deuteronomistischen’ Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher,” *Bib* 53 (1972): 301–39; A. D. H. Mayes, *The Story of Israel Between the Settlement and the Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1983); Anthony F. Campbell S.J., *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1–2 Kings 10)* (CBQMS 17; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986); Iain W. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Book of Kings* (BZAW 172; Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988); André Lemaire, “Toward a Redaction History of the Book of Kings,” in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 446–71; Baruch Halpern and David S. Vanderhooft, “The Editions of Kings in the 7th–6th Centuries B.C.E.,” *HUCA* 62 (1991): 179–244; William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: University Press, 2004). One should note that there are voices against this approach; cf. e.g., Erik Aurelius, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts* (BZAW 319; Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 21–57, who dates the oldest layer of the Deuteronomistic history into the exilic period. His denial of the possibility of a narrative of Kings from the time of Hezekiah (or even earlier) is based on a refutation of the reliability of using the variant Deuteronomistic evaluations of various kings to date redactional levels. My study does not require consideration of these evaluations in order to demonstrate that a level of narrative from the time of Hezekiah (and even earlier) can be plausibly postulated.

8 Schniedewind remains unclear on this point, suggesting that the materials originated in Hezekiah’s time, but that the work at that time was largely editorial: “If there was an integration of northern literary traditions in Jerusalem, it makes more sense to place the process in the immediate aftermath of the fall of Samaria, with its concomitant influx of refu-

legitimate. While the idea of a pre-Deuteronomistic source is not an especially novel idea, considering the possibility of an Israelite heritage—especially a textual provenance outside the auspices of prophetic circles—for such a text is. In my opinion, the biblical (and to a certain degree, archaeological) evidence suggests just such a postulation.

In this matter I am perhaps more “conservative” than many of my contemporaries. What I mean by this is, that I believe that a text must have some substance in order to be worth passing down as a textual tradition. I find it improbable that fractions of sentences were passed down over hundreds of years in order to one day be compiled into a larger literary structure. To me, it seems more probable that narratives (some longer and some shorter) would be passed down over time, occasionally being expanded by later redactors. Some narratives may come from royal sources; some may be legends. Some presumably come from Israel, while others presumably come from Judah. Such a conclusion does not preclude a number of redactions in the history of a text; it does however tend to diminish (to a greater or lesser degree) the activity attributed to the various redactors. Exactly how I anticipate the development, redaction, and historical circumstances behind narrative texts will hopefully become obvious in the considerations of the various pericopes, beginning with that found in 2 Kings 9–10.

The original text of 2 Kings 9–10* did not exist in a narrative vacuum, but was passed on within a larger narrative. This assertion is based on stylistic and literary links between the text of 2 Kings 9–10* and other texts within the current corpus of Kings. Once these texts have been established in the oldest reachable level of composition, one can consider the historical reasons for the existence of the text and historical reliability of its claims. As the original narrative of 2 Kings 9–10* did not spring into existence from a cultural vacuum, the texts of neighboring cultures must also undergo a similar examination. This brings us to considerations of methodology.

gees to the south, than to place it a century later amid religious reforms aimed at eradicating northern cultural influences.” (Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 89) “There seems to have been a pre-exilic account written during the period of Hezekiah that probably reflected upon the fall of Samaria and the survival of Jerusalem.” (Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 79)

Methodology

The study at hand is divided into two easily identifiable parts. The first part examines the biblical text of Kings, while the second part focuses on a critical evaluation of the biblical materials, as well as the extra-biblical materials relevant to Israelite history, as historical sources. As will become immediately obvious, the examination of the biblical materials consumes much more space than the other individual sources discussed. A twofold problem underlies this necessity: 1) the extensive amount of the biblical material; and 2) the long redactional history of the biblical material reflected in the various textual traditions passed down through the millennia.⁹ For these reasons, the examination of the biblical witnesses must consume a disproportionate amount of the study. However, the other sources will be examined as thoroughly and with a similar methodology in order to assure a reliable usage of the data acceptable for a historical reconstruction.

The underlying method for the majority of the work in part one can be summarized in three words: historical-critical method. By historical-critical method I mean the traditional approach to regarding biblical texts considering especially text- and literary-critical matters. In recent history, some considerations of the Jehu Revolution have been published which focus only on the *Endgestalt* of the text.¹⁰ While focusing on the final draft is a legitimate method for theological or ethical approaches to a text, it is inappropriate for any historical reconstructions other than that of the final redactor of the text.

Complicating the text- and literary-critical issues of Kings are the two major textual traditions of these book: Greek (in Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, and

9 The history of the book of Kings remains a particularly thorny issue, especially when one considers the various Greek editions of the text; cf. especially Schenker, *Textgeschichte* and Jong-Hoon Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1 – 19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).

10 E.g., David T. Lamb, *Righteous Jehu and His Evil Heirs: The Deuteronomist's Negative Perspective on Dynastic Succession* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007) and Lissa M. Wray Beal, *The Deuteronomist's Prophet: Narrative Control of Approval and Disapproval in the Story of Jehu (2 Kings 9 and 10)* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies; New York & London: T & T Clark International, 2007).

the “Lucianic” texts¹¹) and Hebrew (most importantly the Leningrad and Aleppo Codices). “For the most part the *Vorlage* [of LXX] must have corresponded to the MT, otherwise they could not be regarded as representatives of the same Scriptures.”¹² “Sie [MT und LXX vom Königeuch] decken sich auf weite Strecken so genau, dass sie meistens, grob gesprochen in etwa 80% der Gesamtsubstanz, denselben Text darstellen.”¹³ In spite of these largely similar traditions, some differences must be addressed and studied in order to determine not only the oldest level of the text, but also the shape of some of the redactional levels as well.¹⁴ For this reason the biblical texts will first be researched in terms of text-critical problems: where are there differences in the traditions of the text? How did such differences come about? Do these differences represent intentional changes? What does any possible intention tell us about the context of the person editing the text? Can the differences be chronologically organized? etc. Each of the text-critical problems must be addressed on its own; i.e., there is no specific guiding principle presuming the over-

11 This study refers to Lucian both as Lucian and as the Antiochene text (= Ant.) due to the identification of texts matching Lucianic readings in Josephus, *Vetus Latina*, early Christian authors, and Qumran; this implies the existence of a pre- or proto-Lucianic text before the fourth century CE. Cf. John Wm. Wevers, “Proto-Septuagint Studies,” in *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek* (ed. W.S. McCullough; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), 69: “There was thus a Lucianic text before Lucian, in fact, at least 200 years before Lucian. There is to my mind no doubt that the Antiochian text was an early revision of the Septuagint text.” And more recently, cf. Siegfried Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns,” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 42 (2009): 34–51. For an overview of Lucian, cf. Kristin De Troyer, “Der lukianische Text,” in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel Band 2* (ed. Siegfried Kreuzer and Jürgen Peter Lesch; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), 229–37. For the importance of Lucian in reconstructing the textual history of Kings, cf. especially Natalio Fernández Marcos, “Der antiochenische Text der griechischen Bibel in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern (1–4 Kön LXX),” in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel Band 2* (ed. Siegfried Kreuzer and Jürgen Peter Lesch; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), 177–213 and Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions”.

12 Anneli Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know About the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?” in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (by Anneli Aejmelaeus; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 73.

13 Schenker, *Textgeschichte*, 1.

14 Cf. Raymond F. Person, *The Deuteronomistic School: History, Social Setting, and Literature* (Society of Biblical Literature / Studies in Biblical Literature; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2002), 31–50 for an illuminating discussion of how textual criticism aids in the reconstruction of redaction history within the Deuteronomistic History.

whelming merit of a singular textual tradition, whether Greek¹⁵ or Hebrew.¹⁶ The older reading can sometimes be found in a Greek tradition; sometimes one finds it in MT.¹⁷ In both instances, one must decide based on the evidence in each individual case.

Excursus: The Greek Text of Kings

Before any legitimate redaction-critical study of the book of Kings can be undertaken, one must consider the textual history of Kings. The most important evidence for the development of the text of Kings can be found within the Greek tradition and their presumed *Vorlage*(n). “There are four major stages in the development of the Greek text in Samuel and Kings: the Old Greek, proto-Lucian, the KR [καρυε recension], and the Hexaplaric recension.”¹⁸ The three major Greek traditions considered here are the Lucianic tradition (Ant.), Vaticanus (B), and Alexandrinus (A). While some matters are consistent in all three of these traditions (e.g., the reversal of material found in 1 Kings 20–22 MT), there are different levels of recensional activity that can be identified in each of these traditions, which must be identified and studied in order to arrive back at the oldest Greek translation of the book of Kings (= Old Greek, traditionally “Septuagint”) and hence its Hebrew *Vorlage*. Several studies have played an important role in the identification of recensional activity in the Greek tradition.

Based on some translational features, Thackeray divided the Greek tradition of Reigns (= Samuel and Kings) into five sections: α (1 Reigns/Samuel), ββ (2 Reigns/Samuel 1:1–11:1), βγ (2 Reigns/Samuel 11:2–3 Reigns/1 Kings 2:11), γγ (3 Reigns/1 Kings 2:12–21:43 LXX), and γδ (3 Reigns/1 Kings 22:1–4 Reigns/2 Kings 25). He initially thought that the α, ββ, and γγ sections were translated first, with the other portions being translated at a later date.¹⁹ This position was later revised following

15 And by extension, its presumed Hebrew *Vorlage*. “If and only if we have at our disposal the original Greek text of the translators is there any hope of reaching the *Vorlage*... If and only if we are acquainted with the way the translators proceeded from their *Vorlage* to the translation can we hope to trace the same way back in the opposite direction, from the translation to the *Vorlage*.” (Aejmelaeus, “Hebrew *Vorlage*,” 72)

16 “It is generally thought that the MT represents a well preserved and in most cases the original text. It must, however, be realized that a generalization like this is only valid if it is based on observations made on the details of the text. The general probability of a text preserving original readings is the sum of individual cases of original readings.” (Aejmelaeus, “Hebrew *Vorlage*,” 104)

17 “For the textual critic concerned with establishing the original text, this variation means that there are no self-evident probabilities as to where to find it. In one book the MT has been corrupted, in another perhaps the *Vorlage* had been. But these textual conditions cannot and should not be anticipated by an overall conception of OT textual criticisms before the texts have been studied in detail.” (Aejmelaeus, “Hebrew *Vorlage*,” 72)

18 James Donald Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 21.

19 Cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings,” *JTS* 8 (1907): 262–78.

Barthélemy, who identified the *kaige* recension, named after the translation of the Hebrew כּאִיג with the Greek καίγῃ, and present in particular in the Kings text as found in Vaticanus.²⁰ Since the time of Barthélemy, the βγ and γδ sections of Reigns in Vaticanus have been identified as the *kaige* sections of the text, reflecting recensional activity seeking to correct the Greek text on the basis of a contemporary Hebrew *Vorlage*,²¹ which could be dated into the last century before the Common Era.²² This implies that texts from the *kaige* recension could *per definitionem* not represent the Old Greek translation of Kings, which in turn implies that the Old Greek text of these portions of Kings must either be sought elsewhere or no longer exist.

Siegfried Kreuzer believes that the Antiochene tradition (often also called the Lucianic recension) represents the Old Greek in general, especially when contrasted with the portions of Vaticanus that underwent the *kaige* recension.²³ This is based on the identification of a pre-Lucianic Antiochene text, which has been generally accepted in Septuagint studies.²⁴ Kreuzer: “Dieser antiochenische Text war nicht von der *kaige*-Rezension erfasst und er repräsentiert ein älteres Stadium des Septuaginta-textes der Bücher der Königtümer, das der ersten, ursprünglichen Form der Septuaginta sehr nahe steht.”²⁵ In another context, Kreuzer also concludes that “the Antiochene text is older than the *kaige* recension, going back at least to the first century B.C.E.”²⁶ While Kreuzer can provide some examples where this may be true, the study at hand will demonstrate that it is more methodologically sound to consider texts on a case by case basis, rather than presuming the historical priority of one Greek tradition over all others.

Other factors also play a significant role, such as the relationship of the individual manuscripts to the Hexapla of Origen. In the Codex Vaticanus, “...Hexaplaric influence in III. Kgs [sic!] is apparently but a negligible factor, whereas in IV Kgs. it is certainly an influence with which one must reckon.”²⁷ The text of Alexandrinus, on the other hand, follows the Hexaplaric text in 3 Reigns 11–12, distinguishing it from both Vaticanus and the Antiochene tradition.²⁸ “[T]he recensional activity did not begin with

20 Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

21 This recensional activity was probably not undertaken by a single individual: “...the *καίγῃ* revision was a project or tradition of non-uniform revisions made by a group of authors which was to include a slight Hebraising revision in favour of the proto-Masoretic text...” Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 148.

22 Cf. Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 152.

23 Cf. e.g., Siegfried Kreuzer, “Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and *Kaige* Recension),” in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 239–53.

24 For an introductory discussion, cf. Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 232–36 and the literature cited there.

25 Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, eds., *Septuaginta Deutsch* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009), 301.

26 Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions,” 49.

27 John Wm. Wevers, “A Study in the Textual History of Codex Vaticanus in the Books of Kings,” *ZAW* 64 (1952): 189.

28 Cf. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development*, 18–21.

Origen, nor was it even motivated by Jewish-Christian polemics, but goes back to a period quite close to the origins of the translation itself, when the LXX was transmitted within the Jewish communities and had not yet cut the umbilical cord that tied it to the Hebrew text.”²⁹ This further suggests plurality in the textual history of Kings, extending into the Common Era.

Beyond the Greek traditions, one must consider their relationship to extant Hebrew manuscripts, particularly Medieval manuscripts and the manuscript tradition of Qumran.

In the end we must conclude that the Hebrew variants have perpetuated pre-Masoretic traditions which were the basis for certain readings in \mathfrak{G} and the later Greek recensions. Possibly most significant of all are the many instances of striking agreements of Luc with the Hebrew variants, since Lucian revised \mathfrak{G} on the basis of a Hebrew text older than \mathfrak{M} — whether mediately or immediately is of little present concern to us.³⁰

The attestations of readings known from the Greek tradition in medieval Hebrew manuscripts confirm the plurality of Hebrew traditions, even in late pre-masoretic times. This, therefore, implies the importance of the Greek traditions in determining readings older than those known from the Codex Leningradensis; the Greek traditions, when compared to Hebrew manuscripts, affirm textual plurality in the book of Kings. “It is now apparent that the uncritical position that all extant Hebrew mss. go back to one original text, namely, \mathfrak{M} , and that its variants are all post- \mathfrak{M} , can no longer be held, at least, as far as the Books of Kings are concerned.”³¹ Rather, the position must be taken that there were several strongly-related versions of the book of Kings known from the earliest times of translation:

...the translation [into Greek] was completed at a particular time in history and later the Hebrew texts of some of the books were re-edited with expansions, revisions or alterations of a different kind. Editions were put into circulation that were later replaced by new revised editions of the same book, revised editions which became official in the canonisation process of the Hebrew text. As a result, the first editions have only been preserved for posterity either by chance, as in the case of the texts found in Qumran, or else because they were transmitted by non-Jewish communities, such as the Christian community in the case of the LXX.³²

Bearing these factors in mind, one must give the Greek traditions of Kings substantial attention in any reconstruction of the text and redaction history of Kings, as they attest an older version of Kings than that found in the Aleppo Codex and the Codex Leningradensis.

At this point, a brief notice about the editions used for this paper is in order. The starting point for the text-critical work is of course the *Biblia Hebraica*

29 Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 71.

30 John Wm. Wevers, “A Study in the Hebrew Variants in the Books of Kings,” *ZAW* 61 (1948): 75.

31 Wevers, “Hebrew Variants,” 76.

32 Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 79–80.

Stuttgartensia (BHS) edition of Kings.³³ At times, however, I have moved beyond this and consulted facsimile editions of the two most important Hebrew manuscripts: Codex Leningradensis and the Aleppo Codex.³⁴ When referring to issues in the Septuagint, the Rahlfs edition has generally been consulted first.³⁵ However, in instances where the Rahlfs edition or the critical apparatus of BHS is unclear, facsimile editions of the Greek relevant manuscripts—i.e., Vaticanus and Alexandrinus (Sinaiticus for Kings does not exist)—have been consulted.³⁶ For the Greek Antiochene text (i.e., the “Lucianic recension”), the critical edition from Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz has served as the basis.³⁷

The narrative structure of the book of Kings is distinct in the three relevant textual traditions, each one having slight, but significant differences within the framework of the book of Kings. As the refrain-like structure remains distinct in the various traditions, this factor should be examined more closely than has traditionally been done. The structures of MT, Ant., and LXX (i.e., Vaticanus and Alexandrinus) are each distinct and may present evidence relevant for any redaction history of Kings. This is particularly true when one considers the Greek tradition vis-à-vis the Hebrew tradition. Previous scholarship has generally ignored this text-critical matter when composing a literary and redaction history of Kings.

Following the translation and text-critical analysis and having established what I will argue is the oldest attainable version of the narrative based on text-critical matters, we can turn our attention to literary criticism. This refers not especially to a “close-reading” of the text known primarily from Anglophone contexts, but rather to the traditional methodological approach known prima-

33 Alfred Jepsen, ספר מלכים = *Liber Regum* (Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1974).

34 Cf. David Noel Freedman, *The Leningrad Codex* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998) and Ben-Zvi Institute, Jerusalem, *The Aleppo Codex* (<http://www.aleppocodex.org>).

35 Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979).

36 Cf. *Biblorum SS. Graecorum Codex Vaticanus 1209 (Cod. B) Pars Primae Testamentum Vetus Tomus II* (Pagg. 395–944) (Codices e Vaticanis Selecti: Phototypice Expressi; Mediolani: Hoepli, 1906) and *The Codex Alexandrinus in Reduced Photographic Facsimile: Old Testament Part II — 1 Samuel–2 Chronicles* (London: British Museum, 1930).

37 Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega II 1–2 Reyes* (Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC: Departamento de Filología Bíblica y de Oriente Antiguo, 1992).

rily in German contexts: are there literarily identifiable redactional levels in the text? How are they chronologically related? Who was responsible for these redactions, if any historical context can be identified? etc. Only after these considerations have been finished can we consider historical matters about the text. This methodology will distinguish and identify the oldest level of the biblical narrative and sketch its development over the millennia.

Contrary to some attempts to sketch a historical development of the biblical texts, the work at hand seeks to avoid beginning with a historical or literary framework and then applying this to the texts, putting various pieces into previously identifiable redactional constructs. What this means is that texts with the words “prophet” or “man of God” will not be *a priori* assigned to a level of redaction known primarily in the German literature as DtrP.³⁸ Rather, the text will first be examined to see if information warranting such a construct can be found within the text. This represents a return to the more traditional historical-critical method, relying on the text first in order to develop redactional levels, rather than relying on scholastically postulated redactional levels to take apart a text and assign various portions into various levels. There is one exception to this rule: Deuteronomism.

The plausibility of a Deuteronomistic redaction of the book of Kings is very high.³⁹ Such a redaction in Kings must not necessarily have occurred at

38 Cf. Ernst Würthwein, “Erwägungen zum sog. deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk: Eine Skizze,” in *Studien zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (ed. Ernst Würthwein; Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 5–6. For an excellent and useful example of such a literary-critical analysis of the Kings text, cf. Ernst Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige 1. Kön. 1–16* (ATD 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985) and Ernst Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige 1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25* (ATD 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

39 In the interest of space, I have avoided offering a *Forschungsgeschichte* of the Deuteronomistic History. For a recent history of the research addressing the Deuteronomistic History, cf. Jeremy M. Hutton, *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 396; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 79–101. In the course of this work, it will become clear that I find the position of Alfred Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (Halle (Saale): VEB Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1953), with some significant changes, as being the most plausible reconstruction of the circumstances surrounding the composition of the Deuteronomistic History. The observations in this study could also be used as supporting evidence for the thesis of Würthwein that Kings provided the oldest narrative level and the impetus for the writing of the Deuteronomistic history, though the dating of materials in his thesis must be reconsidered in light of the evidence presented here; cf. Würthwein, “Erwägungen”.

the same time as, for example, a Deuteronomistic redaction of Judges. However, there are texts within the book of Kings which clearly have the flavor of Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic theology.⁴⁰ Texts that clearly have been influenced by the theology of (or behind) Deuteronomy will be regarded as coming from the Deuteronomistic level of redaction. Further, from the texts considered here, it seems that there was presumably only one Deuteronomistic redaction, and that this was probably during the “exilic” period. While a number of redactional levels of the book of Kings can be identified, some of them coming before the Deuteronomist and some of them coming after the Deuteronomist, the tensions within these various levels suggest that only one of them be identified as “the” Deuteronomistic redaction.⁴¹

What language can be legitimately identified as Deuteronomistic? “For this purpose, there is a scholarly consensus that Weinfeld’s appendix of Deuteronomic phraseology is the most extensive, comprehensive, and careful compilation on the topic of Deuteronomic language.⁴² As such, it will be used as the basis for the work below where issues of Deuteronomic language are con-

40 While not everyone maintains this distinction, it is worth mentioning that one could potentially identify two types of textual corpora related to Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: Deuteronomic (i.e., related to the postulated D source of the *Urkundenhypothese*) and Deuteronomistic (those texts inspired by or redacted to be theologically consistent with Deuteronomy and found in the corpus of the Deuteronomistic history). Due to the lacking security surrounding any D source within the Pentateuch, such a distinction can largely be considered as out of date. For a discussion, cf. Person, *Deuteronomic School*, 4–7. While I agree with Person’s collapsing of these terms, I have chosen—in contradistinction to him, but referring to the same materials—to refer the material as Deuteronomistic, referencing the term Deuteronomic only when discussing the works of others.

41 This is contrary to Person, *Deuteronomic School*, 31–50, who argues for multiple Deuteronomistic redactions, most especially for one in the Persian period. My disagreement here remains largely within the confines of taxonomy. I prefer to think of this as a redaction inspired by the Deuteronomistic redaction and would hope that we could identify it with a unique nomenclature. One wonders if it might be connected with a potential Enneateuch redaction. Further, as will become clear in the course of the study, some redactional work—most specifically smoothing texts and making them more consistent—apparently continued well into the Hellenistic period, which becomes apparent when one compares MT and LXX. Since this redaction also contains elements that one could identify as “Deuteronomistic” (e.g., fulfillment of prophecy, repetitive style), we would also have to refer to this as a Deuteronomistic redaction, even though it would have been centuries after the first Deuteronomistic redaction, which Person himself admits should be found in the “exilic” period; cf. Person, *Deuteronomic School*, 28.

42 Person is referencing Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 320–65.

cerned.”⁴³ As this was true at the time of Person’s writing, so it is true today. While in some instances that will be handled individually in the specific contexts of the text- and literary-critical analyses I disagree with Weinfeld’s assessment, it still represents the starting point from which the conversation about Deuteronomistic textual provenance should begin. Chapters 2–4 of this paper regard the relevant text- and literary-critical matters reflected in the Kings text, which has a long and difficult textual history.⁴⁴

How much can we trust the oldest reconstructed level of the biblical narrative?⁴⁵ This matter will be handled in chapter 5, dealing not only with the narrative of Kings, but also briefly with Amos, Hosea, Chronicles, and the materi-

43 Person, *Deuteronomic School*, 21.

44 Here, one must consider two works of the last decade, namely those of Schenker and Kim. These works come up with two solutions for the textual history of Kings based on the relationship between MT and LXX. While Schenker suggests a continuing tradition between the two texts (“Die hier vorgelegte Untersuchung möchte den Nachweis führen und zur Diskussion stellen, dass ein solcher [literarischer] Zusammenhang [zwischen LXX und MT] tatsächlich besteht, und dass daher mit einer solchen Bearbeitung zu rechnen ist, die ihre Vorlage an einigen strategischen Punkten in sparsamster Weise retouchiert hat, ferner, dass diese Bearbeitung literarischer (und somit auch theologischer) Art ist, und dass sie für uns im MT bewahrt ist, während uns ihre hebräische Vorlage in der alten LXX in griechischer Gestalt aufgehoben und greifbar geblieben ist.” [Schenker, *Textgeschichte*, 2]), Kim identifies parallel traditions going back to a common Hebrew source at some time before the composition of Ur-LXX and Proto-MT (Kim, *Textformen*, 402–16). This should serve to demonstrate just how hotly debated (and insecure) the textual history of Kings is. In my opinion, one can determine the relative age of the variant readings between LXX and MT, without being completely sure of the chronological priority of the entire textual tradition. E.g., The MT narrative of Jeroboam’s rise to power looks to be older than LXX’s recounting of the same narrative; cf. Chapter 4. For a brief introduction to the Qumran evidence of multiple concurrent traditions of what later became biblical books, cf. Eugene Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James Vanderkam; Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 77–93.

45 I am perfectly willing to admit that the oldest level of narrative presented in this study is a reconstruction. What does that mean? It is a reconstruction in that it cannot be proven (with current methodology and material remains) that this text ever existed historically in the form presented here. This postulated text remains a reconstruction, just as Noth’s postulated Deuteronomistic History must remain a reconstruction. As with every reconstructed text, I am offering a postulation of an original narrative and a postulated redactional history that best fits the evidence in my understanding. I am perfectly willing to consider alternative reconstructions, should the evidence merit such. Further, I am willing to offer this as a theoretical possibility in the hopes that it increases discussion about the textual history of the Bible and most especially the book of Kings. I hope that I am not so dogmatically bound to my theories that I consider revision impossible.

als from Josephus referencing this period. In order to offer a legitimate reconstruction of Israelite history in the ninth and eighth centuries BCE, the extra-biblical literary materials reflecting on this period must be questioned to uncover the level of their reliability; the Akkadian materials will be handled in Chapter 6, while Chapter 7 will address the Syrian and Palestinian materials. The chronological framework of these texts must be established, as must be their individual authors or benefactors⁴⁶—inasmuch as this is possible. Potential motivations for writing the text will play a role in discovering how reliable its portrayal of ancient Near Eastern history is. In this matter, a discussion of the genre of the texts becomes relevant.

After a consideration of the various relevant source materials for a history of Israel, they will be compared and contrasted⁴⁷ to one another in the hopes that a clearer reconstruction of the historical events behind the texts shall emerge.⁴⁸ This resulting reconstruction of Israelite history during the ninth and eighth centuries BCE⁴⁹ along with the conclusions of my research and the impetus for further research can be found in Chapter 8. While much of this historical construction will reflect opinions offered previously in the secondary literature, some new elements will emerge. Most importantly from a methodological standpoint is the evaluation of materials based on comparison with other texts:

46 As I seriously doubt that the monarchs wrote the inscriptions themselves, we are not really looking for the authors as much as we are looking for those who financed the composition.

47 The evaluation of each source must first and foremost occur in a vacuum. The comparison and contrasting of various sources should occur after this and aid in identifying tensions or contradictions. These tensions or contradictions must then be evaluated and the history of Israel reconstructed. Prematurely compressing witnesses into other witnesses should be avoided, unlike the cases presented in V. Philips Long, "How Reliable Are Biblical Reports? Repeating Lester Grabbe's Comparative Experiment," *VT* 52, no. 3 (2002): 367–84, where sources are immediately read into one another.

48 As with the literary history of the biblical texts, the reconstruction of historical events is just that: a reconstruction based on the evidence. Claims of truth about the historicity of the events described in the texts is limited to the theoretical level and should be used as a basis for discussion of the plausibility of the historical events. Again, this theory may need revision as further evidence becomes available, but I have sought to offer the most plausible reconstruction based on the information available.

49 The dates presented here follow Mordechai Cogan, "Chronology," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 1 (ed. David Noel Freedman; New York; London; Toronto; Sydney; Auckland: Doubleday, 1992), 1002–11, contra Lic. Joachim Begrich, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda und die Quellen des Rahmens der Königsbücher* (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie; Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1929) and Alfred Jepsen and Robert Hanhart, *Untersuchungen zur israelitisch-jüdischen Chronologie* (BZAW 88; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964), 1–48.

what is substantiated in multiple witnesses? What is denied by other witnesses? And what is unique in each witness? These findings will then be used to help evaluate the sources and increase the plausibility of the reconstruction. This generally follows the methodological approach offered by Grabbe,⁵⁰ though I approach the matter differently in that I first undertake a literary-critical analysis of the biblical sources before using them and I distinguish more explicitly between the often monolithic appearance of the extrabiblical materials; the contrast should not remain only between biblical and extrabiblical materials, but each witness—biblical or extrabiblical—should be compared and contrasted with each other witness.

In the course of the study, it will become clear that a larger narrative was composed in the eighth century BCE focusing on the history of Israel. This document, which can be reconstructed from portions of the current text of Kings, can be used to some degree for a critical historical reconstruction of the events surrounding the events of Jehu's political machinations. Other data, critically evaluated, also aid in this reconstruction. The most logical place to begin this study is with a critical evaluation of the narrative of the Jehu Revolution as recounted in 2 Kings 9–10.

50 Cf. Lester L. Grabbe, *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* (London: T & T Clark, 2007) and Lester L. Grabbe, "The Kingdom of Israel from Omri to the Fall of Samaria: If We Only Had the Bible...", in *Ahab Agonistes: The Rise and Fall of the Omri Dynasty* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 54–99.

CHAPTER 2

The Literary Jehu: A Construct and its Ramifications

This chapter will propose a redaction history for 2 Kings 9–10 and examine the literary character Jehu as presented in that narrative. The first logical step in this process is examining the traditional text of 2 Kings 9–10 using the historical-critical exegetical method in order to arrive at the earliest stage of the Jehu story. In order to accomplish this task, textual variants and literary expansions will be explored. This will be done in order to arrive at the earliest identifiable text about the Jehu Revolution. Following the identification of this level of the text, a brief examination of the narrative will be undertaken, as well as considerations offered about its time of composition and *Sitz im Leben*.

The Oldest Biblical Jehu Tradition: 2 Kings 9–10*¹

1) And Elisha the prophet called to one of the sons of the prophets and said to him: Gird your loins and take this jug of oil in your hand and go to Ramoth-Gilead. 2) When you arrive there and see Jehu ben Jehoshaphat ben Nimshi² there, you will go and take him from the midst of his brothers and bring him into the innermost chamber. 3) Then you will take this jug of oil and pour it

-
- 1 For the purposes of this translation, the text will be marked as follows: *glosses*–; *Deuteronomistic*; **Judean**.
- 2 In 9:2, בִּנְיָהוּשָׁפָט is missing in the Peshitta and it follows בִּנְיָנִשִּׁי in Ant. The editors of BHS recommend deleting it. However, since Leningradensis agrees with all other Hebrew manuscripts and the Septuagint, it seems more probable that Peshitta deleted בִּנְיָהוּשָׁפָט and Ant. simply transposed it in order to make the patronym here match that in v. 20 and 1 Kings 19:16, i.e., the macro-context determines the reading of L as *lectio difficilior*. This is also true for the occurrence in 9:14. Based on the reconstruction of this verse in M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân: Textes* (DJD 3; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 110, it seems probable that the Qumran text 6QKgs also attests this reading.

upon his head and say: Thus says יהוה: I am anointing you king over³ Israel. Then you will open the door and flee and not tarry. 4) So ~~the servant the servant~~⁴ the prophet went to Ramoth-Gilead. 5) He arrived, and behold! The commanders of the army were sitting and he said: there is something for me [to give] to you,⁵ commander! Then Jehu said: To whom from among all of us? And he said: To you, commander. 6) Then he arose and entered the house and poured the oil on his head and said to him: Thus says יהוה *the god of Israel*: I am anointing you king *over the people of יהוה*, over Israel. 7) *You will strike*⁶

-
- 3 In v. 3 a problem confronts the reader that occurs on a number of occasions within the pericope in question, namely the confusion of the prepositions אל and על. In this instance, the context determines that the preposition be translated as “over,” Hebrew: על. Yet contrary to expectation, MT reads אל. According to Wilhelm Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, in Verbindung mit H. Zimmern, W. Max Müller und O. Weber, bearbeitet von Frants Buhl* (Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1962), 38, one can translate the preposition אל with the word “over,” as this occurs a number of times in the Hebrew Bible. It has also been suggested that this prepositional usage typifies the dialect of “Israelian Hebrew;” cf. Gary A. Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2002), 32–36 and 111. This seems more plausible when one considers the Akkadian preposition *eli* 𒂍 [UGU], which can have the meaning “upon, over;” cf. Rykle Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon* (AOAT 305; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004), 395 #663 and the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III line 85. With this in mind, it becomes unnecessary to emend the text of MT. The same is true for the two occurrences of this phenomenon in v. 6 and the ones in vv. 12 and 14, as well as the occurrence in 2 Kings 10:15.
- 4 The word “servant/youth” (הנער) in v. 4 must be deleted in at least one occurrence, as it occurs twice, causing the nonsensical phrase “the servant the servant the prophet went”. The duplication presumably crept in as a result of dittography. In this instance the texts of some Hebrew manuscripts (16, to be exact, according to Wevers, “Hebrew Variants,” 53), as well as 6 and 5, commend the emendation. In terms of textual criticism, we must assume that only one הנער is to be removed; if the other occurrence of the word is to be removed falls outside of the realm of textual criticism and will be handled below in the literary critical examination of the text on page 38.
- 5 Ant. adds that the message is “secret” κρυπτός as an explanatory gloss. Cf. Alfred Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher* (Septuaginta-Studien III; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), 276.
- 6 The Greek in v. 7 reads καὶ ἐξολεθρεύεις, which the editors of BHS have reconstructed as the Hebrew והכרתה, meaning “and you will cut off”. Presumably the translators of LXX changed this passage, either knowingly or unknowingly to be consistent with the promise of Elijah, offered in 1 Kings 21:21. Here, one also finds the verb “to cut”; Hebrew: כרת. In the Greek, one finds the same term: ἐξολεθρεύσω. It seems probable that this was a willful emendation to the text in order to fit it in the Deuteronomistic schema of prophecy and fulfillment. Cf. v. 8.

the house of Ahab, your lord, that I might avenge⁷ the blood of my servants the prophets and the blood of all the servants of יהוה⁸ from the hand of Jezebel. 8) And the whole house of Ahab will perish⁹ and I will cut off from Ahab everyone who pisses against a wall, bound and free, in Israel. 9) And I will make the house of Ahab like the house of Jeroboam ben Nebat and like the house of Baasha ben Ahijah. 10) And Jezebel shall the dogs eat in the field of Jezreel and there will be no one to bury [her]. Then he opened the door and fled.

11) And Jehu went out to the servants of his master and [someone] said¹⁰ to him: Peace? Why did this madman come to you? And he said to them: You know the man and his complaint. 12) And they said: A lie! Please tell us. And he said: this and that he said to me, saying ‘thus says יהוה: I am anointing you king over Israel. 13) So they hurried and each took his garment and set it under

7 The Septuagint amends the verb ונקמתי to read in the second person instead of the first. This change occurred presumably to maintain consistency about who is acting in the sentence. Since the first verb is in the second person, the translators of LXX continued this syntax by making the second verb in sentence also in the second person. Cf. again v. 8. One could also explain this in theological terms, should that be preferable: the translators of LXX sought to protect God from the concept of vindictiveness. God does not avenge the death of the prophets; rather Jehu enacts revenge on those responsible for the death of the prophets. In verse 8 one finds the same phenomenon.

8 The editors of BHS suggest that the phrase ודמי כלי-עבדי יהוה be omitted. They offer no textual evidence for this suggestion. If necessary, we will return to this point in the discussion of literary criticism.

9 In v. 8, *lectio difficilior* once again favors MT. Rather than read a verb at the beginning of the verse, LXX reads “and through the hand of” καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς. This makes the opening of the verse parallel to the end of the previous verse: the prophets and servants of יהוה will be avenged from the hand of Jezebel and Ahab in the Greek text, as opposed to only Jezebel in Hebrew text. While this difference seems huge in English, in Hebrew it would only mean a difference of two consonants: וימִיד vs. ויאבִד. One could also explain this as a parablepsis that occurred during the transmission or recopying of the text. To note here is also that the majority of ancient witnesses corroborate against LXX; the Syriac, Targum, and Vulgate all read with MT. With this in mind, no conspicuous reason to change the Hebrew text remains.

10 While Leningradensis records a singular (ויאמר), many other manuscripts, the Sebirin [it should be noted briefly here that the notice of the Sebirin is neither in Leningradensis nor in Aleppo at this point; one does find it in the Bomberg *Biblia Rabbinica*], and the translations read the plural (ויאמרו). *Lectio difficilior* supports Leningradensis, here being understood as “someone said” instead of just “he said”. In order to clarify this, some of the traditions changed it to the plural, reading “they said.” Alternatively, one could explain this through haplography; the scribe writing Leningradensis failed to write the ו at the end of the word. This suggestion gains plausibility when one considers the similar forms of ו and ר, especially in the paleo-Hebrew script. Either of these would be an acceptable explanation. It remains ultimately unclear which reading is the most accurate. I prefer to read it in the singular.

him on [...] ¹¹ the stairs and they blew the horn and said: Jehu rules! 14) So Jehu ben Jehoshaphat ben Nimshi conspired against Joram. *Now Joram was on guard in Ramoth-Gilead, he and all Israel, from before Hazael King of Aram.* 15) *And Joram the King returned to recover in Jezreel from the wounds that the Arameans inflicted upon him* ¹² *in his fighting with Hazael King of Aram.* And Jehu said: If your life is with me, ¹³ let no refugee go out from the city to go report ¹⁴ [this] in Jezreel. 16) And Jehu rode and came to Jezreel, for Joram

-
- 11 The word גרם (bone), does not make sense in this context. The text literally reads “to the bone of the stairs,” a nonsensical phrase. One could offer the suggestion from Hebrew that the text should read גרן, but “threshing floor” makes as little sense as the current text. Even looking to cognate languages provides little assistance. The Akkadian *garum*, “totality,” is a possibility, but such a usage is unknown in Hebrew. Arabic is a bit far afield, although one could offer it as a possibility, namely “a natural depression in stone” (from *ḡm*); cf. John Gray, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (The Old Testament Library; London: SCM Press Ltd, 1970), 543. This requires both a change in root and comes from a language more distantly related. Based on all of these considerations, I find that the best solution is a *crux*, that this word is not able to be reconstructed with any certainty. It will be left out. Cf. LXX γαρεμ. The corruption of Ant. Manuscript 82 (γαρ ἔνα) is also based on this untranslated word in Greek; cf. Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien III*, 223–24.
- 12 The verb יכרו in v. 15 has caused some people to suggest emendations. This process of correction began even within the Bible. While the same form of this verb is found in the parallel passage of 2 Kings 8:29, 2 Chronicles 22:6 has corrected the form to read יכרו. The authors of Chronicles clearly understood this verb as past tense, and therefore chose the perfect, as opposed to the imperfect as recounted in 2 Kings. However, due to the flexibility of both tempora and aspect in Hebrew grammar, I see no need to change this text to align with the text of Chronicles. Alternatively, one could consider a possible confusion of the letters ה and י in the paleo-Hebrew script.
- 13 Before the word נפשכם many manuscripts add את. The only emendation that seems to help with the understanding of the passage is the suggestion of LXX; it adds the phrase μετ’ ἐμοῦ to the sentence, thus making it more understandable. The Hebrew here would have to read אתי, just one letter different from the form recorded in many other manuscripts. In this case *lectio difficilior* favors Leningradensis. However, one almost must make use of the LXX, lest one remain unable to translate the text. It seems most likely that the LXX *Vorlage* preserved the original text, which the scribes of the other sources miscopied. I will recommend the use of אתי, though I admit that this conclusion must remain speculative. Cf. Wevers, “Hebrew Variants,” 53, who also suggests that the two Hebrew words אתי and נפשכם were transposed before the final י of אתי was lost.
- 14 Leningradensis and Aleppo read גִּיד, where it is clear that a letter is missing. The masoretes had already solved this problem and recorded the ה that was missing between the ל and the ג. This also corresponds with many other manuscripts. In this case, one must conclude that Leningradensis and Aleppo contain an error within the tradition. It will have to remain unclear how this came about, but presumably the ה was missing in the *Vorlage* that Leningradensis used, but the scribes were careful enough to note this absence in the *masorah qatanah*.

the king of Israel was recovering in Jezreel from the arrow wounds that the Arameans had shot him ~~in Ramat~~¹⁵ in battle with Hazael king of Aram,¹⁶ for he was a mighty man and a military man.¹⁷ And Ahaziah King of Judah came down to see Joram.

17) And the sentinel was standing on the tower in Jezreel and saw the abundance of Jehu in his approach. And he said: I see an abundance!¹⁸ And Joram said: Take a chariot and send [it] to meet them and he should say, ‘peace?’ 18) And the charioteer went to meet him and said: Thus says the king, ‘peace?’ And Jehu said: What [is this] to you about peace? Wheel around to follow me! So the sentinel reported [this], saying: the messenger went up to them,¹⁹ but did not return. 19) Then he sent a second charioteer and he came up to him²⁰ and said: Thus says the king: ‘peace?’²¹ And Jehu said: What [is this] to you about peace? Wheel around to follow me! 20) And the sentinel reported

15 Cf. 15a, which was originally a copy of a portion of this verse. There “in Ramat” is absent; it was presumably added to make 9:16 ♂ consistent with 8:29.

16 Emend this verse to read with B and Ant. The duplicate information found in this verse and 14–15 suggests that someone may have removed it from MT at a later date.

17 Although Ant. provides the more succinct reading, namely without the phrase “for he was a mighty man and a military man,” it seems more likely that someone would later remove this positive image of the king of Aram than that someone would add it at a later date; therefore, the reading of Vaticanus will be maintained here.

18 The scribes misread a ה as a ת in the second occurrence of the noun שפעת. This led them to record the form in the construct state, which doesn’t make any sense in this context. This error becomes more understandable, as the text had just used this root in precisely this form. While the construct was warranted in the first case, it remains unwarranted in the second case. Leningradensis must be emended here. Ant.’s explanatory gloss is unnecessary; cf. Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien III*, 276.

19 The form עדיהם must be changed to עדיהם, as the editors of BHS suggest. The form recorded in Leningradensis [and Aleppo, which reads identically, but adds a notice in the *masorah qatanah* that we are dealing with a *hapax legomenon*] is otherwise unknown. Potentially, the scribe misread his source, mistaking the ך for a ך. For this reason, it seems most appropriate to change the text. One must change the text to fit the evidence we possess about the Hebrew language and suggest that there was presumably a textual corruption here.

20 The LXX presumably retains the original singular “to him”. The Hebrew text emended the suffix based on the immediate context, i.e., the plural suffixes in verses 18 and 20.

21 שלום should be emended to השלום as it is in many other manuscripts. The oldest manuscripts containing this reading are numbers 1 (*Bodlejan. Laud. A172,162*) and 4 (*Hunting. 11,12*) of the Kennicott coalition according to Giovanni Bernardo de Rossi, *Vol. I: Prolegomena et Clavis Codicum Seu Descriptio Manuscriptorum Editorumque Codicum Sacri Textus Libri Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus. Vol. II: Libri Numeri, Deuteronomium, Josue, Judges, Samuel, Reges* (Reprinted from the Parma 1784–1785 ed.; Amsterdam: Philo Pr., 1969), LIX and 238. This emendation brings it in line with the parallels vv. 18 and 22. Haplography is the simplest explanation.

[this], saying: He went up to them,²² but didn't return. And the steering is like the steering of Jehu ben Nimshi, because he is steering like a madman.

21) So Joram said: Mount up! And he mounted²³ a chariot.²⁴ And Joram King of Israel and Ahaziah King of Judah went out, each in his own chariot and they came out to meet Jehu and found him at the lot of Naboth the Jezreelite. 22) And when Joram saw Jehu, he said: Peace, Jehu? And he said: What peace²⁵ as long as²⁶ the whoredoms of Jezebel your mother and her

-
- 22 The text of Leningradensis should be emended at v. 20 as the editors of BHS suggest. While they did not include any textual evidence to support their claim that עֲדִיָּהִם should be changed to עֲדִיָּהִם, this seems to be the most logical conclusion, especially when one considers the evidence of LXX which only has the one preposition: ἔως. The scribe of Leningradensis was presumably influenced by the two previous verses, in which עֲדִיָּהִם and עֲדִיָּהִם each occur one time in connection with the army. This led him to this curious form.
- 23 Two traditions (Ant. and S) recount Joram's command in the plural, while other traditions (LXX without Vaticanus, Vulgate, and again S) use the plural of the verb in order to describe the action taken. This depersonalizes the command. Whereas in the Hebrew text Joram commands the single tower guard to ready his chariot, which the guard then does, the Syriac (and other traditions) suggest that Joram commands whomever was standing there, apparently a plurality in that textual tradition. This plurality then goes and readies the chariot. While this makes more logistical sense, it moves the action away from the character of the tower guard. Up to this point in the story, he is the only person with whom Joram interacts. While *lectio difficilior* could be used to support an argument for the Syriac and Ant. (the mysterious plurality of people who are present), the consistency of the other ancient sources seems to testify against such a decision. Only the Syriac and Ant. read this way, with the others unable to offer a consistent image. For these reasons, it seems best to maintain the integrity of the Hebrew text vis-à-vis the other witnesses.
- 24 The Hebrew text reads, "and he prepared his chariot," whereas the LXX and Syriac read "a chariot." Presumably a scribe of the Hebrew text added the suffix י at some point, bringing the text in line with vv. 21b and 24, which also contain the word "his chariot." The Hebrew preempts this comment in v. 21b, by stating that the guard prepared Joram's chariot, and not just any chariot, in v. 21a. For this reason, the Greek and Syriac texts should be given priority.
- 25 In v. 22 there is a clear case of dittography. When the scribe meant to write מָה שְׁלוֹם, he instead doubled the ה and thus wrote מָה הַשְׁלוֹם. This presents the simplest explanation for how this sentence became so incoherent. Both the LXX and the Targum comply with this interpretation strengthening the case for the removal of the superfluous article.
- 26 The LXX (and the Vulgate, relying on LXX) translated עַד with the word ἔτι, "still." This makes sense in the context of the passage and it has the advantage of allowing one to maintain the consonantal text of the Hebrew, changing only the vowel and thus reading עַד instead of עָד. Therefore, it should be regarded as a legitimate understanding of the consonantal text by the translators of LXX. Two Hebrew manuscripts use the preposition "with" עִם, which seems to be difficult to maintain in this capacity both in terms of semantic range and quantity of sources. For these reasons, it seems best to stick with LXX, as per the recommendation of the editors of BHS.

sorceries persist? 23) Then Joram turned his hands²⁷ and fled and said to Ahaziah: Treason, Ahaziah! 24) And Jehu filled his hand with the bow and struck Joram between his shoulders so that the arrow came out from his heart and he collapsed in his chariot.²⁸

25) Then he said to his adjutant²⁹ Bidkar: Lift [and] throw him into the lot of the field³⁰ of Naboth the Jezreelite, for remember³¹ when you³² and I were

-
- 27 Instead of the plural “his hands,” the Vulgate and one Hebrew manuscript read the singular “his hand.” This means the one Hebrew manuscript left out the י. Haplography explains this easily enough. The Vulgate either had access to such a copy of the Hebrew, or misread the word, either from the Hebrew or the Greek, since the plural and singular forms of the words are very similar in both cases. At any rate, it would seem that the text of וַיִּפֹּל and וַיִּשָּׁק should be preserved.
- 28 *Lectio brevior* favors MT in v. 24, reading “in his chariot” (five consonants) instead of “onto his knees” (seven consonants [plus maqeph]), as could be postulated based on the Septuagint. The MT formulation also makes more sense in this context, making it clearer that Joram is dead. He died in his chariot, which precludes the possibility that he merely fell “onto his knees.” There are several occurrences of the phrase “fell upon his knees” in the so-called Deuteronomistic History, including every remaining occurrence of the root כרע in the Book of Kings: Judges 7:5; 7:6; 1 Kings 8:54 and 2 Kings 1:13. The difference in these phrases is not as overwhelming in Hebrew as it is in English: על־כַּרְעֵי vs. בְּרַכְבּוֹ. With this in mind, it is easy to see how the translators of LXX or the tradents of its *Vorlage* could easily record “onto his knees” instead of “in his chariot.”
- 29 Bidkar should be identified as “his adjutant,” thus Leningradensis must be emended to read שליש instead of שָׁלֵשׁ. The masoretes suggest this correction in Qere recorded in the *masorah qatanah*; some manuscripts maintain this reading. Cf. further Paul Haupt, “The Phrase רכבים צמדים in 2 Kings 9:25,” *JBL* 21, no. 1 (1902): 76 and Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery* (trans. M. Pearlman; London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963), 298, who identify the שליש as the shield-bearer based on graphic evidence; i.e., three people rode in (royal) chariots: a driver (in this case Jehu), a warrior/king (Ahab), and a “third” (shield-bearer; Bidkar). While this explanation works for 2 Kings 9:25, it cannot be understood in this capacity in 2 Kings 10:25.
- 30 Some manuscripts, as well as the Peshitta and the Vulgate, are missing “the field of” שדה. *Lectio difficilior* favors Leningradensis in this case, as the inclusion of this word causes a virtual doublet, a feature removed in the Peshitta and the Vulgate, simplifying the reading. LXX contains the same virtual doublet. For these reasons, the other textual witnesses should be regarded as corrupt against Leningradensis.
- 31 This verb reads as an imperative in Leningradensis, whereas most other versions and one Hebrew manuscript read it as a participle: זָכַר vs. זָכֹר. The usage of the imperative forms a parallel with the opening of Jehu’s speech, which uses an imperative to address Bidkar. Scribal error may be to blame, as the defective spelling of the two forms (at least in terms of the consonantal forms) would be identical: זָכַר.
- 32 How the את following אתה came to be in the text is a bit of a mystery (copyist error via dittography?); nonetheless it seems probable that it should be deleted.

riding side by side³³ behind his father Ahab and יהוה raised up against him this oracle: 26) For the blood of Naboth and the blood of his sons I saw yesterday, oracle of יהוה, I will repay to you in this lot, oracle of יהוה! Now lift [and] throw him into the lot, as per the word of יהוה. 27) And Ahaziah King of Judah saw [this] and fled on the path of Beth-Haggan, but Jehu pursued him and said: Him too! And he struck him³⁴ upon his chariot³⁵ in the ascent to Gur, that is Ibleam, but he fled to Megiddo and died there. 28) ~~And his servants brought him³⁶ to Jerusalem and buried him with his fathers³⁷ in the city of David. 29)~~

33 It is also unclear why Ant. and the Targum record צמדים as a singular. They apparently did not understand it in the sense of “side by side,” as it can be translated in the English. Cf. Gray, *Kings*, 545 n. h.

34 Leningradensis must presumably be emended in v. 27; in it Jehu merely gives the command to kill Ahaziah, without this action ever being explicitly taken. Two methods exist for correcting this: either changing the text to match the Greek or changing the text to match the Syriac. The Greek text reads “him too. And he killed him,” meaning that the Hebrew text would only have to be changed from גַּם־אִתּוֹ וַיַּכּוּ סָגְמֵי־אִתּוֹ הַכּוּרִי. The other alternative would be to add the phrase “and they killed him” after Jehu’s command to kill him; this represents the textual tradition of the Syriac and some manuscripts of the Vulgate. *Lectio brevior* favors the reading of the LXX. This seems to be the most probable explanation. At some point in the transmission of the Hebrew text, a scribe misread הָאִי. The Septuagint contains the original tradition, with Jehu shouting “him too!” and then recounting that Jehu killed Ahaziah. The Syriac then expanded this to include Jehu’s command and then the fact that his soldiers, not Jehu himself, killed Ahaziah.

35 The editors of BHS suggest deleting אֶל־הַמִּרְכָּבָה without offering any textual evidence. This is presumably because the preposition אֶל would have to have the meaning “in” or “upon” in this context. However, as we have seen above, there are a number of instances in which אֶל can have the meaning “upon.” Therefore, it seems premature to dismiss this possibility, especially since the Septuagint contains this phrase in its translation of the Hebrew text; cf. text-critical note on verse 3a.

36 The Greek explicitly adds the word “chariot” to the beginning of the verse, reading “and his servants set him upon the chariot and brought him to Jerusalem.” This corresponds with the Syriac. However, it is unnecessary to emend the text in this fashion. The Hebrew can be read “and his servants brought him (via chariot) to Jerusalem.” This occurs because the Hebrew root רכב can be used in noun forms as “chariot” but in verb forms as “to ride or drive,” referring to both animals and chariots. The Greek translates this root inconsistently, cf. 2 Kings 9:16 (ἔπευσεν) and 9:28 (ἐπεβίβασαν...ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρμα). Therefore, it seems probable that the translators of the text added the phrase “upon the chariot” to the text to clarify how the servants brought Ahaziah’s corpse to Jerusalem. Because of Hebrew semantics, in this case the use of the Hiphil, there is no need to include the chariot, which can already be implicitly read in the verb. For this reason, I suggest following MT.

37 The phrase “with his fathers” is missing in LXX. In this case, the Septuagint presumably has the older reading, when one considers a few factors. First and most obviously, *lectio brevior* favors this reading. Secondly, the book of Kings uses the phrase “with his fathers” almost exclusively for kings who died peacefully. Since Ahaziah did not die peacefully, it seems unlikely that they would have incorporated this phrase with the notice of his death.

~~And in the eleventh year of Joram ben Ahab, Ahaziahu reigned over Judah.~~ 30) Then Jehu entered Jezreel. When Jezebel heard, she put antimony on her eyes and made her head good and looked down from the window. 31) And Jehu entered into the gate³⁸ and she said: Peace, Zimri, murderer of his lord? 32) He raised his face³⁹ to the window and said: Who is with me? Who? Then two ~~three~~⁴⁰ eunuchs⁴¹ looked down to him. 33) And he said: cast her down.⁴² And they cast her down such that some of her blood splattered onto the wall and onto the horses and they trampled her.⁴³ 34) Then he went in and ate and drank

Presumably this phrase made its way into the text at a point when this conventional structure of referencing the burial (or sleeping) with the fathers was no longer apparent to the scribe. The Septuagint offers the original reading.

- 38 The Hebrew reads “Jehu entered the gate,” whereas the Greek reads “Jehu entered the city.” In this case, *lectio difficilior* would seem to favor the Hebrew text. The translators changed “the gate” to read “the city” so that it would be clear to the reader that this is the city gate, and that by entering it, Jehu is entering the city of Jezreel. MT should be maintained.
- 39 Leningradensis reads “he raised his face,” whereas one other Hebrew manuscript, Ant., and the Syriac of the London Polyglot (from 1654!) read “he raised his eyes.” Based on the quality and quantity of the witnesses, Leningradensis (with LXX) remains the preferred reading. The others presumably changed it to make it more dramatic; by concentrating on his eyes, the text offers imagery conducive of a Peter Jackson film. The drama of the verse is further increased in the Septuagint, which reads significantly differently than the Hebrew text. Septuagint: “And he raised his face to the window and saw her and said ‘who are you? Come down to me!’ And two eunuchs bent down towards him.” Hebrew: “And he raised his face to the window and said ‘who is with me? Who?’ And two eunuchs looked down to him.” In the Greek, Jehu makes a personal challenge to Jezebel, whereas he merely seeks someone to do his dirty work in the Hebrew. It is also interesting that the Greek text adds “and he saw her,” perhaps remembering the action of Elisha in 2 Kings 2:24. The Greek emended the text to recount a personal encounter between the two, whereas Jehu just ignores Jezebel in the Hebrew. The Hebrew text reads like the older text in this instance, having been changed during the transmission to read more dramatically.
- 40 The number three, שלשה, should be removed from the text. It remains without any context. If it were connected with any kind of conjunction, then it could be maintained, as is the case in the Latin. However, since this is not the case and it is missing in LXX, it seems better to remove it.
- 41 For the insecurity regarding whether or not these officials were castrated eunuchs or merely some kind of court official, cf. Sakkie Cornelius, “‘Eunuchs’? The Ancient Background of *Eunouchos* in the Septuagint,” in *Septuagint and Reception* (ed. Johann Cook; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2009), 321–33.
- 42 In keeping with the suggestions of the Masoretes and many other Hebrew manuscripts, שמשו should be read שמשוה. This was potentially a scribal error unique to the tradition responsible for Aleppo and Leningradensis.
- 43 The word וירמסנה has been translated as a plural in the versions. The pre-masoretic scribes apparently misread ו as וירמסנה vs. וירמסנה. The Masoretes then interpreted this form as a third person masculine singular with a *nun-energicum* and a third person singular feminine suffix.

and said: please attend to that cursed woman and bury her, for she is the daughter of a king. 35) And they went out to bury her, but did not find her, except for her skull and [her] feet and the palms of [her] hands. 36) *Then they returned and told him, and he said: the word of יהוה is this, which he spoke by the hand of his servant*⁴⁴ *Elijah the Tishbite, saying: in the portion of Jezreel shall the dogs eat the flesh of Jezebel.* 37) So the corpse of Jezebel was⁴⁵ like dung on the surface of the earth⁴⁶ *in the portion of Jezreel*⁴⁷ such that no one could say: this was Jezebel.

10:1) And Ahab had 70 sons in Samaria. Then Jehu wrote letters and sent [them] to Samaria to the princes of Israel⁴⁸ ~~the elders and to the guardians of~~

44 Leningradensis and Aleppo identify Elijah as the servant of יהוה in v. 36, while Vaticanus and Alexandrinus do not. It is much more likely that the scribes would add a comment that Elijah is the servant of יהוה than that someone would remove it. For these reasons, I recommend removing this from the text.

45 The opening verb of the verse should be changed in accordance with the Qere and many manuscripts from והיתה to והיה. This is a minor transition that brings the subject and verb in agreement. Contra Jerome T. Walsh, "Short Note: On היה in 2 Kings 9:37," *VT* 60, no. 1 (2010): 152–53, whose translation of this word as "chasm" or "destruction" seems less plausible than the minor change of the verb. There is also no need to translate this verb in the future tense, cf. 2 Kings 14:14, which cannot be understood as a future tense!

46 Two Hebrew manuscripts read האדמה instead of השדה. The Peshitta and the Vulgate imply a *Vorlage* reading similarly. Since these words have a similar semantic range, this decision is especially difficult. *Lectio difficilior* would seem to favor the traditions outside of Leningradensis and the LXX. Potentially, the scribes responsible for the tradition of Leningradensis could have changed the word to make it accord with the prophecy that they knew from 1 Kings 21:24 (MT) and 2 Kings 9:25. Here the word השדה also occurs. For these reasons, I favor the reading האדמה, but would like to state that I am far from positive that this is the best reading.

47 The Antiochene tradition is missing the phrase בזהלך ירעאל in v. 37 and presumably represents the older tradition. MT and the other witnesses of the LXX presumably added this phrase in order to make the passage better match 1 Kings 21:23 (MT).

48 The Hebrew suggests that Jehu sent letters princes of Jezreel in Samaria. Why would it be necessary for Jehu to send letters to Samaria in order to contact the princes of Jezreel? One Hebrew manuscript and the LXX (with the exception of Ant.) record "Samaria." Ant. reads "of the city," which the editors of BHS also commend. Another possibility exists. This could be a transmission error of the name Israel. When one compares the Hebrew, ירעאל vs. ישראל, the difference becomes apparent, namely two consonants. In terms of pronunciation, the names are remarkably similar. This corruption was presumably very early in the transmission, which led all of the other ancient authorities astray. I am not suggesting the necessity of an oral tradition, merely that this could represent that this text was misunderstood aurally. As one person read this text to another, the text was misunderstood. Such a correction leads to a minor surgery in the text as opposed to the bypass that would be caused by reading either שמרון or העיר instead of ירעאל. The burden of proof lays with those who would try to change the text this substantially. In the context of the verse, Israel would also make sense; Jehu sent letters to the "princes of Israel" in the capital, Samaria.