

3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions

Emanuel Tov

3 Kingdoms (1 Kings)¹ poses a greater challenge for the researcher than the other three books of the Greek Kingdoms (1–2, 4 Kingdoms). The many problems discussed over the past half-century relating to the *kaige*-Theodotion revision in 2 and 4 Kingdoms and the evaluation of the Hebrew text of 1–2 Samuel in the wake of the Qumran discoveries are very complex. However, they are less complicated than the evaluation of the Greek text of 1 Kings. From the many studies published in the past half century it has become clear that there is no consensus concerning the evaluation of that version.

The discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek texts resulted from changes made in either MT or the LXX, and cannot be described easily in neutral terms. The 2005 monograph by P. S. F. van Keulen, which includes an excellent summary of the previous research and of the issues themselves, describes the features of 3 Kingdoms as follows:² “The student of 3 Regum is not only struck by the high rate but also by the diversity of differences vis-à-vis 1 Kings that are contained in the book. Pluses and minuses are frequent, as well as word differences. Some of the pluses in 3 Regum consist of duplicate renderings of passages appearing elsewhere in the translation. One plus even involves a rival version of events already recounted in the preceding narrative (i.e., 3 Reg 12: 24a–z). Furthermore, corresponding sections may appear at different positions in 3 Regum and

¹ Modern research distinguishes between:

- (1) Kingdoms α (1 Samuel)
- (2) Kingdoms $\beta\beta$ (2 Samuel 1:1–11:1)
- (3) Kingdoms $\beta\gamma$ (2 Samuel 11:2– 1 Kgs 2:11)
- (4) Kingdoms $\gamma\gamma$ (1 Kgs 2:12–21:15) to be referred to below as “3 Kingdoms”
- (5) Kingdoms $\gamma\delta$ (1 Kgs 22:1–2 Kgs 24:15)

² P. S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11* (SVT 104; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2005) 1.

1 Kings, thus causing a different arrangement of narrative materials. Most of these sequence differences occur in the first half of the book. Another peculiar deviation from MT, typical of the second half of 3 Regum, pertains to the chronological data for kings following Solomon.” Van Keulen focused on the first half of the book in which these features are evident, but they also occur in the second half, albeit less frequently. Among other things, in the second half there are no parallels to the Summaries of chapter 2 or the alternative version in chapter 12.

1. Background of the Discrepancies between 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms

In evaluating the extensive differences between the two versions, scholars consider that the LXX reflects either a Hebrew text like MT³ or forms a faithful translation of a Hebrew book very different from 1 Kings. In the latter case, we are confronted with two different compositions rather than scribal developments.

Several studies, some of them book-length, have focused on individual chapters in 1 Kings, especially chapter 2, while others are devoted to the book as a whole. The latter studies have the advantage of offering an overall view; the former are more detailed, but are limited with regard to the validity of their conclusions. Thus, one of the problematic aspects of the studies, including my own,⁴ of the Summaries (“Additions”) in 1 Kgs 2

³ In this case, the major differences between the Hebrew and Greek were created either by a Greek reviser (see below) or by a free translator. The latter option was embraced by J. W. Wevers: “Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of 1 Kings ii 12–xxi 43,” *OTS* 8 (1950) 300–322. Wevers identified various tendencies in relatively small details in the LXX, but he did not suggest often that a different Hebrew text lay at the base of the LXX. Nor did he realize that the LXX reflects a completely different composition.

⁴ J. A. Montgomery, “The Supplement at End [*sic*] of 3 Kingdoms 2 (I Reg. 2),” *ZAW* 50 (1932) 124–9; G. Krautwurst, *Studien zu den Septuagintazusätzen in 1 (3.) Könige 2 und ihren Paralleltexen* (Ph.D. diss., Mainz 1977); E. Tov, “The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in 1 Kings 2,” *Textus* 11 (1984) 89–118; revised version: *The Greek and Hebrew*

(see below, paragraph 4), is that they refer to a very small unit without linking the analysis to the major features of the other Solomonic chapters or the book as a whole.

Gooding was the first scholar to submit the problems of the Greek translation to a thorough discussion. In a long series of studies (1964–1969),⁵ including a monograph on chapter 2⁶ and a summary article in 1969,⁷ he presented the deviations in the LXX as reflections of Midrashic exegesis (as he did in other LXX books as well).⁸ Gooding's argumentation is innovative, clear, and appealing, but has weaknesses. Like most theories explaining a multitude of details, Gooding's reasoning is flawed by one-sidedness. The LXX indeed rewrites the MT, but probably only in some cases⁹ do these revisions reflect rabbinic exegesis. Gooding demonstrated that the changes in the LXX are not isolated phenomena, but are part of a deliberate scheme of re-ordering and re-interpreting. His summarizing article discusses the question of at which level the changes entered the LXX. He concludes that the majority of the changes were probably inserted by an inner-

Bible—Collected Essays on the Septuagint (VTSup 72; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1999) 549–70. For Gooding's monograph on this chapter, see n. 6.

⁵ D. W. Gooding, "Ahab According to the Septuagint," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 269–80; "Pedantic Timetabling in the 3rd Book of Reigns," *VT* 15 (1965) 153–66; "The Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct," *ibid.*, 325–35; "An Impossible Shrine," *ibid.*, 405–20; "Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the MT and the LXX," *VT* 17 (1967) 143–72; "The Septuagint's Rival Version of Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *ibid.*, 173–89; "The Shimei Duplicate and Its Satellite Miscellanies in 3 Reigns II," *JSS* 13 (1968) 76–92; "Text-Sequence and Translation-Revision in 3 Reigns IX 10–X 33," *VT* 19 (1969) 448–63.

⁶ *Relics of Ancient Exegesis, A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2* (SOTSMS 4; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

⁷ "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969) 1–29.

⁸ For an analysis along the lines of Gooding's, see R. P. Gordon, "The Second Septuagint Account of Jeroboam: History or Midrash," *VT* 25 (1975) 368–93; *id.*, "Source Study in 1 Kings XII 24a–n," *TGUOS* 25 (1973–1974 [1976]) 59–70 and M. Aberbach—L. Smolar, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *JBL* 88 (1969) 69–72.

⁹ Note, for example, the Greek version of 1 Kgs 15:5 "For David had done what was pleasing to the Lord and never turned throughout his life from all that he had commanded him, *except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite*." The omission of the italicized words in the LXX may well represent an attempt to "whitewash" Solomon (Gooding's explanation in "Text and Midrash," 21 was preceded by H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship—A Study in Origins* [The Schweich Lectures, The British Academy, 1920; London: the British Academy, 1923] 18, who used exactly the same term without referring to rabbinic exegesis). Gooding's special contribution is the reference to rabbinic literature, where in Gooding's words "there is a similar attempt to whitewash king David:" "Rab said: When you examine [the life of] David, you find nought but 'save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite.' Abaye the Elder pointed out a contradiction in Rab[']s dicta]: Did Rab say thus? Surely Rab said, David paid heed to slander? The difficulty remains." (*b. Shabb.* 56a).

Greek reviser of the LXX: “This revision was probably based, at least in part, on written Hebrew (or Aramaic) traditions of one kind or another.”¹⁰ These traditions may be pinpointed in some cases in rabbinic sources and Gooding provisionally calls them “haggadic midrash.” Gooding’s many studies speak of inner-Greek Midrashic revision, usually without referring to a Hebrew base, and only in his summarizing study does he systematically invoke the possibility of this Greek revision being based on a Hebrew source of some sort. Throughout his studies, Gooding explains the LXX as being revised on the basis of (proto-)rabbinic traditions by an inner-Greek reviser, and not a translator.¹¹ This complicated construction of inner-Greek activity probably involves an unnecessary stage. However, we are very much in debt to Gooding who, with his developed literary feeling, identified tendencies in the LXX, which help us to achieve a better understanding of its background.

Like Gooding, Talshir describes the LXX as a Midrashic edition elaborating on MT.¹² Although her conclusions pertain to all of 3 Kingdoms, she bases herself mainly on two chapters analyzed at earlier occasions, 1 Kgs 11¹³ and 12.¹⁴ Talshir describes the Midrashic edition as having been created in Hebrew and translated faithfully by the

¹⁰ “Text and Midrash,” 2.

¹¹ Although the possible involvement of a translator was mentioned (e.g. “Text and Midrash,” 17), ultimately Gooding does not accept this option. Such a possibility would be defensible in light of parallels in Greek Scripture, mainly Job, were it not that the *Vorlage* of the LXX of 3 Kingdoms often differed from MT. See below, paragraph 2.

¹² “The Image of the Septuagint Edition of the Book of Kings,” *Tarbiz* 59 (1990) 249–302 (302) (Heb. with English abstract). See also [Talshir’s studies](#) “The Contribution of Diverging Traditions Preserved in the Septuagint to Literary Criticism of the Bible,” in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich; SBLSCS 41; Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1995) 21–41 [and the study quoted in n. 14 \(pp. 277–91\)](#).

¹³ “1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms—Origin and Revision, Case Study: The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11),” *Textus* 21 (2002) 71–105.

¹⁴ Z. Talshir, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom 3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6; Jerusalem: Simor, 1993).

LXX.¹⁵ Like Gooding,¹⁶ Talshir recognizes several parallels between this early Greek revision of 1 Kings and the work of the Chronicler in Hebrew.¹⁷

Polak likewise describes the LXX as representing a Greek version of an earlier Hebrew edition of 1 Kings.¹⁸ Differing from other scholars who posit a Hebrew version behind the LXX, Polak reconstructs a complex transmission history of the Hebrew book. Both the LXX and MT reflect recensions of an earlier text, the LXX being a late one (“RecL”) and MT an earlier one, or the main one (“RecM”).¹⁹

Trebolle Barrera and Schenker followed a similar line to that of Talshir and Polak in assuming that 3 Kingdoms is based on a Hebrew composition that differs from MT. However, they describe that composition as being anterior rather than subsequent to MT, and superior to it. MT is a later text in which various editorial developments have taken place since the time of the LXX translation. Credit is due to Trebolle Barrera for being the first to develop this line of thinking, which he named “historia de la recension.”²⁰ In a detailed study,²¹ Schenker continues this approach, but gives it more content. Schenker,

¹⁵ See p. 256.

¹⁶ “Text and Midrash,” 27.

¹⁷ Z. Talshir, “The Reign of Solomon in the Making. Pseudo-Connections between 3 Kingdoms and Chronicles,” *VT* 50 (2000) 233–49.

¹⁸ F. H. Polak, “The Septuagint Account of Solomon’s Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension,” in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 2001) 139–64.

¹⁹ In Polak’s words, “I thus propose the hypothesis that MT and the Hebrew text reflected by LXX both contain a secondary recension of the ancient Solomon account. This account served as a literary source text for the recension embodied by MT (the main recension, recM) and the recension reflected by the LXX (the late recension, RecL)” (p. 149).

²⁰ J. C. Trebolle Barrera, “Testamento y muerte de David,” *RB* 87 (1980) 87–103 (the quote is from p. 102). See especially his monograph *Salomon y Jeroboan, Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes, 2–12; 14* (Institución San Jerónimo 10; Bibliotheca Salamanticensis 3; Valencia 1980), esp. 278, 321; “Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings,” *BIOCS* 15 (1982) 12–35; “The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in the Books of Kings,” in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989* (ed. C. E. Cox; SBLSCS 31; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1991) 285–99.

²¹ A. Schenker, *Septante et texte Massorétique dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CahRB 48; Paris 2000). [For a thorough critique of this book, see M. Pietsch, „Von Königen und Königsbücher,“ ZAW 119 \(2007\) 39–58.](#) Among other things, Schenker’s view is based on the Greek version of 1 Kgs 2:35. According to the MT of this verse, Solomon appointed ‘Zadok the priest’ instead of Ebiatar, while according to the LXX, Zadok was appointed as ‘the first priest.’ Schenker considers the LXX to be the earlier version, reflecting the appointment of the high priests by

more so than Treballe Barrera, identifies the tendencies of “the late text” of MT in some verses dating to 250–130 BCE, probably closer to the later end of this spectrum. Both Treballe Barrera and Schenker provide a number of text examples, sometimes referring to minute details. In a recent study, P. Hugo continues this line of research.²²

Van Keulen’s²³ main conclusions regarding the Greek translation of 1 Kgs 2–11 are close to those of Gooding. In a detailed and refined analysis, he shows that the LXX reworked MT, but unlike Gooding he does not define this reworking as Midrashic. He describes in detail the differences between the structure of MT and the LXX, the latter revising the former. The LXX reflects a rewritten and reorganized composition, into which the Summaries have been added (p. 274). Although van Keulen occasionally recognizes Hebrew words behind elements of the LXX that deviate from MT, he concludes that the revisional activity took place at the Greek level.²⁴

In sum, scholars who offered an overall explanation of the features of the LXX described the LXX as reflecting either: (1) an inner-Greek revision of an earlier Greek translation (Gooding, van Keulen) or (2) a faithful Greek translation of a rewritten Hebrew text. That rewritten composition was either (2a) anterior (Treballe Barrera, Schenker, Hugo) or (2b) subsequent (Talshir, Polak) to MT. Also Gooding and van

the kings, while MT reflects a later situation, which was initiated with Simon Maccabee in 140 BCE when kings could no longer make such appointments. According to Schenker, MT repressed the earlier formulation in this case as well as in one other. The singular *בית המזבח* of MT 1 Kgs 12:31 and 2 Kgs 17:29, 32 replaced the earlier plural reading of *οἶκους ἐφ’ ὑψηλῶν* (et sim.) in the LXX. According to Schenker (pp. 144–6), the plural of the LXX reflected the earlier reality of more than one sanctuary in Shechem, which was changed by MT to reflect the building of a single Samaritan sanctuary. Therefore, this correction (also reflected in the Old Greek version, reconstructed from the Vetus Latina, in Deut 27:4) may be dated to the period of the existence of a temple on Mt. Gerizim between 300 and 128 BCE. Equally old elements are found in the LXX version of 1 Kgs 20:10–20 that mentions groups of dancing men as well as King David’s dances, elements that were removed from MT, according to Schenker, probably in the second century BCE.

²² P. Hugo, *Les deux visages d’Élie—Texte massorétique et Septante dans l’histoire la plus anciennes du texte de 1 Rois 17–18* (OBO 217; Fribourg/Göttingen: Academic Press/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

²³ Van Keulen, *Two Versions*.

²⁴ P. 302.

Keulen (1) admit that the inner-Greek revision was ultimately based on a Hebrew source.²⁵ This range of possibilities is usual within LXX scholarship.²⁶ Theory 1 is intrinsically less likely than theories 2a and 2b because of the lack of parallels for inner-Greek content revisions in the LXX. The only parallels of this type appear in Gooding's own writings, who surmised similar inner-LXX revision in Exodus 35–40²⁷ and Joshua 5,²⁸ but in both cases internal Greek activity is very unlikely. Parallels for rewriting Scripture in Hebrew (2b) abound within Hebrew Scripture itself (especially Chronicles), at Qumran and elsewhere (see below, paragraphs 6, 7). This view is followed here.²⁹

2. The Discrepancies between 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms Originated in Hebrew

²⁵ Gooding, "Text and Midrash," passim (e.g. p. 29); van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 302.

²⁶ With such diverse solutions given, how is it possible, asks van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 19, that scholars came up with such differing theories. They probably turned to different types of reference material: "Gooding and Talshir refer to early Jewish exegesis and to biblical and para-biblical rewriting tendencies in order to demonstrate the Midrashic character of 3 Regum. Schenker, on the other hand, draws attention to historical, religious and geographical data which may suggest that the version attested by the LXX is anterior to the MT-version." (p. 19). This observation is probably correct, but we should also realize that some scholars lean more towards MT, while others favor the LXX. Diametrically opposed suggestions have been proposed for all discrepancies between the MT and LXX. For example, the translations of Esther and Daniel are viewed by some as preceding MT and by others as rewriting those books. For references, see my study "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible. The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuaginta Reconsidered* (ed. A. Schenker; SCS 52; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 2003) 121–44 (129–30). Likewise, the LXX of Job is explained by some as having been shortened by the translator, while others consider it as reflecting a short Hebrew text. Therefore, the differences between the views expressed regarding 3 Kingdoms should not surprise us.

²⁷ *The Account of the Tabernacle* (TS NS VI; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959). The discrepancies between the LXX and MT in these chapters probably constitute the greatest challenge for LXX scholarship. The problems may not be more vexing than those in 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel, but the difficult subject matter complicates the analysis. For a brief summary, see my *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd ed., Revised and Enlarged; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997) 256. A. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993) 116–30 (125) probably indicated the correct direction for a solution by pinpointing variant readings in the translator's Hebrew *Vorlage* and by studying his translation technique.

²⁸ "Traditions of Interpretation of the Circumcision at Gilgal," *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977) 149–64. In this paper, the background of the LXX of Josh 5:4–5 is described as rabbinic (cf. *Shir Hashirim Rabba* I, 12, 2). However, in my view, the deviating translation of this section resulted from syntactical-exegetical difficulties presented by some rather awkward Hebrew sentences.

²⁹ My earlier research (Tov, "LXX Additions") referred to the Summaries only. The suggestion expressed there concerning the lack of a coherent plan in these Summaries is now abandoned.

Since it is difficult to decide between the two opposing explanations regarding the nature of 3 Kingdoms, the decision as to whether the deviations were created at either the Hebrew or Greek level would limit the options.

The following types of arguments could support the suggestion that the discrepancies were created at the Greek level: (1) indication of original Greek; (2) lack of Hebraisms; (3) differences between the translations of parallel passages.³⁰ The following arguments could support the suggestion that the discrepancies were created at the Hebrew level: (1) presence of Hebraisms;³¹ (2) reflection of Hebrew readings in the LXX differing from MT;³² (3) recognition of faithful translation technique.³³

Turning to some or all of these criteria does not necessarily guarantee objective results, since every type of result may be interpreted in different ways. In my view no compelling arguments have been presented in favor of the assumption of revision at the Greek level, neither by Gooding nor by van Keulen. The Greek renderings of parallel passages differ occasionally,³⁴ but such inconsistency also occurs in translations produced by a single

³⁰ See, however, notes 34–35.

³¹ For the background, see Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 83–85.

³² That the rewriting took place in Hebrew and not in Greek can be seen in 3 Kingdoms 10:22a-b in which the sequence of the ideas is: Solomon's building activities (22a) were completed in order that the Canaanites would not dominate him (22b). This sequence, which makes little sense, is based on the misunderstanding of ממשלתי (his kingdom) at the end of 9:19 as ממשל/הו (so as not to dominate him). In MT 9:19-20 the sequence is logical since 9:20 introduces 9:21 explaining why Solomon employed the offspring of the first generation of the Canaanites living under Israelite occupation. In the LXX we see no connection between the verses (for a different view, see van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 200). Undoubtedly the relocation of MT 9:15-22 in 3 Kingdoms 10:22a-c took place in a Hebrew source which was misunderstood by the Greek translator. **If this note stays, change the numbering of the next notes.**

³³ Analysis of the level of freedom and literalness in the translators' approaches forms a key element in our understanding of them and their use as an ancient document in the study of Hebrew Scripture. In short, the argument runs as follows. If a translator represented his Hebrew text faithfully in small details, we would not expect him to insert major changes in the translation. Therefore, when we find major differences between the LXX and MT in relatively faithful translation units, they must reflect different Hebrew texts. These differing Hebrew texts are of central importance to our understanding of Hebrew Scripture. On the other hand, if a translator was not faithful to his parent text in small details, he also could have inserted major changes in the translation.

³⁴ See Gooding, "Text and Midrash," 18 and *Relics*, 111; van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 274, 302.

translator.³⁵ Besides, the various translations, even when differing slightly, share several unique renderings.³⁶ On the other hand, there are compelling arguments in favor of a Hebrew source at the base of 3 Kingdoms: Tov³⁷ records Hebraisms in the Summaries,³⁸ described in greater detail by Polak³⁹ and Schenker (relating to all of 1 Kings),⁴⁰ and Tov⁴¹ and Schenker⁴² list variants reflected in the LXX. Even Gooding accepts the view that 3 Kingdoms has a Hebrew base. The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the duplicate version of the Jeroboam story (1 Kgs 12:24a–z) has been reconstructed by Debus⁴³ and Talshir,⁴⁴ while that of the Summaries in chapter 2 has been reconstructed in my own study.⁴⁵ Wevers⁴⁶ and Talshir⁴⁷ indicate that the translator of 1 Kings rendered his source faithfully.

As a result, there is sufficient support for the assumption that 3 Kingdoms was based on a Hebrew source. This text could have been anterior or subsequent to MT. Since the tendencies of the Greek 3 Kingdoms are easily recognized (see below), and since no overall reverse theory has been suggested for corresponding tendencies in MT,⁴⁸ we accept Talshir's view⁴⁹ that the *Vorlage* of 3 Kingdoms reworked a text resembling MT. Polak expressed a similar view.⁵⁰ Ultimately, this view is close to Gooding's theory,

³⁵ See, for example, T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translation or Recensional Activity?" *Abr-Nahrain* 21 (1982-3) 28–49 (30–31).

³⁶ For some examples relating to chapter 2, see Tov, "LXX Additions," 568.

³⁷ Tov, "LXX Additions," 568.

³⁸ 35g, k, l.

³⁹ Polak, "Septuagint Account," 143–8.

⁴⁰ Schenker, *Septante*. E.g. pp. 54 (relating to 10:23–25), 130–39 (chapters 6–8), 149.

⁴¹ Tov, "LXX Additions," 551–62.

⁴² *Septante*, 5-9.

⁴³ J. Debus, *Die Sünde Jerobeams* (FRLANT 93; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 55–65.

⁴⁴ *The Alternative Story*, 38–153.

⁴⁵ Tov, "LXX Additions."

⁴⁶ "Exegetical Principles," 300.

⁴⁷ Talshir, "Image," 256.

⁴⁸ Schenker, *Septante*, 151 mentions some elements of supposed revision in MT, but they do not cover the large differences between the two versions.

⁴⁹ Talshir, "Image."

⁵⁰ Polak, "Septuagint Account."

except that he believes that the rewriting activity was carried out in Greek by a reviser and not in the Hebrew text consulted by the translator.

3. Characteristic Features of 3 Kingdoms

The following features not only characterize the Greek 3 Kingdoms but are in most cases unique to it:

i. Addition in chapter 2 of two theme *summaries*⁵¹ (previously named Additions or Miscellanies) focusing on Solomon's wisdom. These summaries repeat various sections occurring elsewhere in the book (see further below).⁵² To the best of my knowledge, this device is not used elsewhere in MT or the Greek Bible.⁵³ The closest parallel is the added summary before the LXX of Daniel 5 (see below), although that summary is not a theme summary.

ii. *Duplication* of sections based on the rewriting tendencies. Beyond the passages mentioned in section i, referring to summaries that constituted new literary compositions, the rewritten text of 3 Kingdoms repeated 1 Kgs 22:41–51 (description of Jehoshaphat's activities) in 3 Kingdoms 16:28a–h and 1 Kgs 9:24 in v. 9a of the same chapter in 3

⁵¹ To the best of my knowledge, this term has been used only by J. Gray, *1 & 2 Kings—A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1964) 45.

⁵² See below, paragraph 4. The location of these summaries is inappropriate since Solomon is not yet a central person in this chapter. Possibly the location was determined by the scope of the ancient scrolls. Summary 1, after 1 Kgs 2:35, occurred at the end of a scroll containing the second half of 2 Samuel (Kingdoms βγ), while Summary 2, after 2 Kgs 2:46, occurred at the beginning of the scroll of 3 Kingdoms (Kingdoms γγ).

⁵³ Schenker, *Septante*, 9 compares the theme summaries with Josh 10:40–42; 12:1–8; 13:2–7; Judg 2:11—3:6, even Judg 1—2:5, but these texts are of a different nature. Most of them indeed include an element of summary of previous stories or data (Judges 1 does not!), but they rephrase the earlier narratives, while most of the summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2 simply repeat complete verses occurring elsewhere. MT contains many additional summaries (for example, summarizing historical accounts like Joshua 24 or historical Psalms like Psalm 106), but none of them creates a mosaic of verses like the theme summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2.

Kingdoms. To the best of my knowledge, the device of repeating sections is not used elsewhere in the Greek Bible or MT.⁵⁴

iii. Inclusion of an *alternative version*. An alternative history of Jeroboam extant only in the LXX (3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z) presents a rival story juxtaposed with the original one found in all textual sources including the LXX (1 Kgs 11, 12, 14). The technique of juxtaposing two versions of the same story was used from ancient times onwards in the composition of Hebrew Scripture. For example, different accounts of the creation and the flood were juxtaposed and partially intertwined in Genesis. In all these cases, the two versions are now included in all textual witnesses. However, with one exception (1 Samuel 16–18),⁵⁵ there is no parallel for the juxtaposition of two alternative versions appearing in one textual witness but not in the others.

iv. The transposition of verses to other environments in accord with the reviser's tendencies: For example, 1 Kgs 3:1 and 9:16–17 are repositioned as 3 Kgdms 5:14a,⁵⁶ 1 Kgs 5:7–8 is repositioned as 3 Kgdms 5:1 (see paragraph 4); 1 Kgs 5:31–32 and 6:37–38 are moved to 3 Kgdms 6:1a–d; 1 Kgs 8:11–12 is placed in 3 Kgdms 8:53a,⁵⁷ verses from

⁵⁴ The case of the duplicated verses in the MT of Joshua–Judges, especially in Joshua 24 and Judges 1–2 is a different one, as these duplications resulted from complications in the creation of these books. Among other things, possibly an initially combined book Joshua–Judges was separated into two different ones.

⁵⁵ In these chapters the originally short story of the encounter of David and Goliath as narrated in the LXX was joined by an alternative story in MT. See my analysis in “The Composition of 1 Samuel 17–18 in the Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint Version,” in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J. H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985) 97–130. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 333–60; D. Barthélemy et al., *The Story of David and Goliath*.

⁵⁶ See the sample from 1 Kgs 3 below.

⁵⁷ According to Gooding, “Text and Midrash.” 22–25 the transposition of these verses to v. 53a created a new text sequence in the beginning of the Greek chapter 8 in which Solomon is now portrayed in a more pious way. After the glory entered the Temple, the king immediately turned his face away. See also van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 164–80.

9:15–22 are placed in 10:22a–c;⁵⁸ etc. This technique is also evidenced elsewhere in the LXX and MT.⁵⁹

4. 3 Kingdoms as a Rewritten Version of 1 Kings

Having established that 3 Kingdoms is based on a Hebrew source, and having described some special techniques used in that composition, we now focus on its nature. The techniques described in the previous paragraph leave no doubt regarding the direction of the changes. The content summaries in chapter 2 are very inappropriate in their context (see n. 52). They would not have belonged to an initial stage of writing. By the same token, repetition of verses and the juxtaposition of an alternative account are secondary features. Further, the tendencies of this rewritten composition are clearly visible (see below). We therefore believe that, in the main, MT represents an earlier layer in the composition of 1 Kings, and that 3 Kingdoms reflects later rewriting.

The reshaping in 3 Kingdoms involves the addition, repetition, omission, reordering, and changing of large sections as well as small details. These techniques are similar to those used in other compositions in the biblical realm, both within and beyond Greek and Hebrew Scripture. In the past, the techniques of 3 Kingdoms have been compared to those of the Midrash,⁶⁰ not only because the rewriting in 1 Kings sometimes resembles Midrash techniques, but also because Gooding located specific parallels with rabbinic

⁵⁸ The transposition possibly shows that Solomon's measures against the Canaanites are now presented as another token of his wisdom (thus van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 191–201).

⁵⁹ Cf. several transpositions elsewhere in the LXX, for which see my paper "Some Sequence Differences between the MT and LXX and Their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible," *JNSL* 13 (1987) 151–60. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 411–18.

⁶⁰ Thus especially Gooding (note the name of his summarizing study "Text and Midrash"); V. Peterca, "Ein midraschartiges Auslegungsbeispiel zugunsten Salomos. 1 Kön 8, 12–13–3 Re 8,53a," *BZ* 31 (1987) 270–5. Talshir, "Image," 302 uses the same term.

literature in subject matter (above, note 9). This is not the place to analyze these parallels, not all of which are equally relevant, but it would perhaps be more appropriate to describe the technique as rewriting Scripture.⁶¹ The Hebrew composition behind 3 Kingdoms rewrote a book resembling the composition contained in MT. The comparison with rewritten Bible compositions at Qumran and elsewhere is illuminating, but it also opens up a Pandora's box of problems, as pointed out by Bernstein in another context.⁶²

The reshaped compositions, both within and beyond the Greek and Hebrew Scripture canons, were not intended to create new entities. The revisers wanted their new creations to be as close as possible to the old ones, thus ensuring that they would be accepted as authentic. The rewriting sometimes merely involved contextual exegesis, but at other times it included tendentious changes.

Some of the tendencies of the Greek version of 3 Kingdoms, already recognized by Thackeray,⁶³ were described well by Gooding and van Keulen. Gooding presents the simplest analysis by describing the first ten chapters as being rewritten around Solomon's wisdom, including the whitewashing of his sins, chapters 11–14 as presenting a more favorable account of Jeroboam, and chapters 16–22 as whitewashing Ahab.⁶⁴ For Gooding, 3 Kingdoms takes the form of a Greek commentary on 1 Kings.⁶⁵ Likewise, for van Keulen (p. 300), one of the main features of the first part of this rewritten

⁶¹ Talshir, "Image," uses similar terms. The group of rewritten Bible compositions forms a category in its own right described as follows by D. J. Harrington, S.J., "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies," in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (ed. R. A. Kraft and G. W. Nickelsburg; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 242–47: "Because they paraphrase the biblical text, they have been called targumic. Because these books interpret biblical texts, they have been seen as midrashic. But careful literary analysis has demonstrated that they are neither Targums nor midrashim" (p. 242).

⁶² M. J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?", *Textus* 22 (2005) 169–96 (p. 181: 'One person's reworked Bible is another's Bible').

⁶³ Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 18. See also by the same author: "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907) 262–78; *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: University Press, 1909) 9–10.

⁶⁴ Gooding, "Text and Midrash," *passim*.

⁶⁵ Gooding, "Text and Midrash," 28.

composition was the presentation of a more favorable picture of Solomon and a rearrangement of the sequence of events (named “pedantic timetabling” by Gooding⁶⁶).

The rewriting techniques 1 Kings are illustrated by three text samples:

1. The MT of 1 Kgs 2 covers the end of David’s reign and Solomon’s accession to the throne (vv. 1–12), the tragic end of Adonijah (vv. 13–35), and the death of Shimei (vv. 36–46). The parallel text of the LXX covers the same events, but in the middle and end of the chapter it adds two long “theme summaries” relating to Solomon’s wisdom. The summaries were intended to stress the God-given (cf. v. 35a) wisdom of Solomon, just as 1–2 Chronicles and 11QPs^a col. XXVII stress David’s wisdom. The first one, Summary 1, inserted after v. 35, contains fourteen verses denoted 35a–o. Summary 2, inserted after v. 46, contains eleven verses denoted 46a–l. Summary 1 is not connected to the context, while Summary 2 is. These summaries repeat verses occurring elsewhere in 1 Kgs 3–11. They are out of chronological order, since the Solomonic history only starts with chapter 3. The clearest indication of the assumed rewriting process is probably the reworking of the story of Pharaoh’s daughter. While several episodes of this story occur in different chapters in MT and the corresponding passages in the LXX, it is only in the added Summary 1 that they have been combined into one organic unit. Solomon’s building activities (vv. d–g), placed between the two parts of the story, form an integral part of the narrative.

2. Several of the elements in chapter 5 of MT are included in the LXX in a different sequence, while others are newly added or are lacking. The sequence in the LXX is: the provisions brought to Solomon (v. 1 = vv. 7–8 MT), his daily consumption of food (vv.

⁶⁶ Gooding, “Pedantic Timetabling.”

2–3), the extent of his realm (v. 4), his wisdom (vv. 9–14), Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter (v. 14a = MT 3:1; 14b = MT 9:16–17), his negotiations with Hiram (vv. 15–26), and the forced labor (vv. 27–32). Several verses of MT that are lacking in the LXX translation of this chapter are found in Summary 2 after 2:46: vv. 4:20–5:1 (the extent of Solomon’s realm and its internal prosperity) appear in 2:46a–b and vv. 5–6 (internal prosperity, provisions) in 2:46g, i. These verses did not fit the topic of the rewritten and abbreviated form of chapter 5 in the LXX. More so than MT, the LXX forms a literary unity, which was probably generated after the creation of the disharmonious text of MT in which diverse material is often juxtaposed.

3. The content of the first eight verses of chapter 11 of MT differs from that of the LXX. Both versions depict the sins of King Solomon in marrying foreign wives and being involved in idolatry, but the LXX makes the latter sin more acceptable to the reader. The fact that he was married to foreign women in his old age made him an easy prey for them, since they induced him to venerate non-Israelite gods. In MT, on the other hand, Solomon himself initiated idolatrous acts.⁶⁷

5. Why Only 3 Kingdoms or Why Only 1 Kings?

Before turning to a comparison of the rewriting techniques in the Greek 3 Kingdoms with Qumran compositions, we turn to the question regarding why only the Old Greek of 3 Kingdoms or MT of 1 Kings was rewritten within 1-4 Kingdoms.⁶⁸ To the best of my

⁶⁷ The description of the sins in 1 Kings 11 was problematic also for the Chronicler who simply omitted the chapter in his account of Solomon.

⁶⁸ Greek Scripture contains an amalgam of old and new, namely the Old Greek versions of Kingdoms α and $\beta\beta$ and $\gamma\gamma$ (see n. 1) and the *kaige*-Th revision of Kingdoms $\beta\gamma$ and $\gamma\delta$.

knowledge, this issue has not been addressed in the literature.⁶⁹ The question can be posed in two different ways referring to either the Greek or Hebrew book.

i. Did the rewriting contained in the *Greek* 3 Kingdoms cover once also 1-2, and 4 Kingdoms? Since we do not know why 3 Kingdoms would have been singled out for content rewriting, it is possible that all four books of Samuel-Kings (or just the two books of Kings) were rewritten in Hebrew and that the rewritten versions were rendered into Greek. The issue is complex, since we have no access to the Old Greek translation of all of 1–4 Kingdoms any more. However, we do have the Old Greek translations of 1 Samuel (Kingdoms α) and of the first half of 2 Samuel (Kingdoms $\beta\beta$) and they do *not* reflect any rewriting such as in 3 Kingdoms. If these two segments were translated by the person who rendered 3 Kingdoms, as is likely,⁷⁰ we do not know why 3 Kingdoms differs so drastically from 1–2 and 4 Kingdoms.⁷¹ We therefore conclude that it is unlikely that a *Greek* rewritten text of all of 1–4 or 1–2 Kingdoms ever existed.

ii. Did a *Hebrew* version of 1–2 Samuel and 2 Kings that rewrote MT in a similar way to the Hebrew source of 3 Kingdoms once exist? This option is very well possible. The Hebrew 1 Kings was probably contained in one of the two scrolls of Kings. We suggest

⁶⁹ A related question has been posed, namely why does 3 Kingdoms start at its present place in 1 Kgs 2:12, but no fully acceptable reply has been offered to that question. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 18 merely distinguished between the Old Greek and revised sections (see previous note), but he did not realize that the Old Greek sections differ much among themselves. According to Thackeray, the sections that now contain the *kaige*-Theodotion revision “were omitted as unedifying by the early translators” (p. 18; similarly: “Greek Translators,” 263). Another related question was answered by Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 140–41: why was section $\beta\gamma$ (2 Sam 11:2—1 Kgs 2:11) revised by *kaige*-Th.? Barthélemy suggested that the translator wished to correct the chapters relating to the “failures and calamities of the house of David.” These chapters were not covered well in the Old Greek, and because there existed no Greek version of these chapters in Chronicles, their correction was an urgent task for the reviser.

⁷⁰ Thackeray, “The Greek Translators,” produces some evidence for the distinction between the translations of 1 Samuel and 1 Kings, but the evidence is not convincing (pp. 274–6). Muraoka, “The Greek Texts” assumes the unity of the Old Greek of Kingdoms α , $\beta\beta$, $\gamma\gamma$ (p. 45), while focusing on the relation between these sections and the “Lucianic” manuscripts in Kingdoms $\beta\gamma$, $\gamma\delta$. D. Barthélemy describes the Old Greek as “composite,” but he only refers to the internal problems of 3 Kingdoms: “Prise de position sur les communications du colloque de Los Angeles,” *Etudes d’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 255-88 (258).

⁷¹ It cannot be countered that the content of these two books differed from 3 Kingdoms, since also 1 Kingdoms and the first part of 2 Kings provide sufficient occasion for rewriting, especially in the stories about Saul and David.

that the Old Greek translator mistakenly used a mixed set of Hebrew scrolls for his translation, one scroll of the rewritten type (1 Kings) and three unrevised scrolls.⁷² This theory cannot be verified, since the Old Greek translations of Kingdoms $\beta\gamma$ and $\gamma\delta$ have been lost. Crucial to this scenario is the assumption of the use of scrolls of different types, which would have been understandable due to the scarcity of scrolls. Equally crucial is the assumption that at least the two Hebrew books of Kings were included in two separate scrolls. Support for this suggestion comes from the realm of the LXX, where a shift in translation character in some books has been ascribed to the use of different scrolls in the archetype of Greek Scripture.⁷³ There is no direct support from Qumran for the writing of the Hebrew book of Kings in two separate scrolls. The only (negative) evidence relates to the books 1–2 Samuel that are joined in 4QSam^a.⁷⁴ On the other hand, the great majority of the other Scripture books, including the books of the Torah and the Five Scrolls, are contained in separate scrolls.⁷⁵ This evidence does support the assumption that 1–2 Kings would have been contained in two different scrolls.

6. Comparison with Rewritten Bible Compositions in Hebrew

The technique used by the Hebrew source of 3 Kingdoms is that of rewriting an earlier source. Within the LXX the closest parallels for this assumed technique are the

⁷² The circulation of four different scrolls, although of different sizes and of a different nature, was also assumed by D. Barthélemy, "Prise de position," 257.

⁷³ For the bisection of 2 Samuel, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel in the LXX scrolls, see E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula, Mont. 1976) 161–65. Likewise, in the classical world large compositions were subdivided into independent units (scrolls), often regardless of their content. See Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seiner Verhältniss zur Literatur* (Berlin 1882; repr. Aalen: Scientia-Verlag, 1974) 131–40; H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven, Conn./London: Yale University Press, 1995) 42–66 with references to earlier literature.

⁷⁴ However, the division of scrolls for Samuel was not necessarily identical to the one in Kings.

⁷⁵ A few Torah scrolls contained two books. For details, see my book *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004) 74–79.

translation of Esther whose major deviations reflect a Hebrew composition freely translated into Greek. Another parallel within Greek Scripture is Daniel 4–6.⁷⁶

We now expand our observations to other rewritten Hebrew Bible compositions as found among the Qumran scrolls and in the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The Samaritan version of the Torah rewrote a composition like MT. The rewriting is partial, as all rewriting, but it is manifest. In the main, the rewriting in the SP does not bear a Samaritan character, since earlier non-sectarian texts from Qumran (named pre-Samaritan)⁷⁷ carry the exact same content as the SP. However, the SP contains a small number of Samaritan sectarian readings. Together these texts are named the “SP group.”

Some of the Qumran compositions likewise resemble the rewriting in the LXX books, even more so than the SP group. The best preserved rewritten Bible texts⁷⁸ from Qumran are 11QT^a cols. LI–LXVI, 4QRP (4Q158, 4Q364–367), the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), and Jubilees.⁷⁹ These parallels strengthen our aforementioned assertions relating to the rewriting in some LXX books and reversely the LXX helps us in clarifying the canonical status of the Qumran compositions.

The main feature these compositions have in common with the reconstructed sources of the LXX translations relates to the interaction between the presumably

⁷⁶ The parallels between these three texts have been pointed out in my studies “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere” – *volume Wuppertal Septuaginta Deutsch*; “The LXX translation of Esther: A Paraphrastic Translation or a Free Translation of a Rewritten Version of MT?”, *Fs Pieter van der Horst*.

⁷⁷ Especially 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b; see Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions.”

⁷⁸ For the evidence and an analysis, see G. J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2000) 2:777–81; E. Tov, “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen–Exod,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant, The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994) 111–34; M. Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005) 10–29; Harrington, “Palestinian Adaptations.”

⁷⁹ Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* and Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* also provide valuable parallels, but they are less relevant since they make no claim to sacred status.

original Scripture text and exegetical additions. All the Qumran compositions present long stretches of Scripture text, interspersed with short or long exegetical additions, especially 4QRP (4QReworked Pentateuch). Among the Qumran rewritten Bible compositions this text exhibits the longest stretches of uninterrupted text that may be classified as Scripture as found in either MT or the pre-Samaritan text.⁸⁰ As far as we can tell, it has a relatively small number of extensive additions. The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several pluses comprising 1–2 lines and in some cases more than 8 lines.⁸¹ This composition also rearranges some Torah pericopes.⁸² 11QT^a cols. LI–LXVI (constituting a paraphrase of the legal chapters of Deuteronomy)⁸³ changes the text sequence more frequently than 4QRP and also adds several completely new sections (for example, cols. LVII:1–LIX:21, providing the statutes of the king).⁸⁴ The SP group likewise inserts a number of extensive additions.⁸⁵

The recognition of a group of rewritten Bible compositions at Qumran and elsewhere is accepted among scholars, even though they disagree with regard to the

⁸⁰ The underlying text of 4Q158 and 4Q364 is clearly pre-Samaritan, that of 4Q365 possibly so (see *DJD* XIII, 192–6). See n. 89.

⁸¹ The most clear-cut examples of this technique are the expanded “Song of Miriam” in 4Q365 (4QRP^c), frgs. 6a, col. ii and 6c counting at least 7 lines. By the same token, the added text in 4Q158 (4QRP^a), frg. 14 counts at least 9 lines. 4Q365 (4QRP^c), frg. 23 contains at least ten lines of added text devoted to festival offerings, including the Festival of the New Oil and the Wood Festival. Further, if 4Q365a, published as “4QTemple?”, is nevertheless part of 4Q365 (4QRP), that copy of 4QRP would have contained even more nonbiblical material (festivals, structure of the Temple) than was previously thought.

⁸² In one instance, a fragment juxtaposing a section from Numbers and Deuteronomy (4Q364 23a–b i: Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14) probably derives from the rewritten text of Deuteronomy, since a similar sequence is found in SP. In the case of juxtaposed laws on a common topic (*Sukkot*) in 4Q366 4 i (Num 29:32–30:1; Deut 16:13–14), one does not know where in 4QRP this fragment would have been positioned, in Numbers, as the fragment is presented in *DJD* XIII, or in Deuteronomy.

⁸³ The close relation between that scroll and Hebrew Scripture is reflected in the name given to the scroll by B. Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, “The Fragmentary Remains of 11QTorah (Temple Scroll),” *HUCA* 62 (1991) 1–116.

⁸⁴ For additional material supplementary to the Pentateuchal laws, see the list in Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vols. 1–3 (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University, Shrine of the Book, 1983) 1.46–70.

⁸⁵ For a detailed analysis, see Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions.”

characterization of specific compositions⁸⁶ and the terminology used for the group as a whole.⁸⁷

In the past, the LXX translations were not associated with the Qumran rewritten Bible texts. When making this link, we recognize the similarity in the rewriting style of Scripture books. More specifically, the LXX translations meet some of the characterizing criteria that Segal set for rewritten Bible compositions: new narrative frame, expansion together with abridgement, and a tendentious editorial layer.⁸⁸ In all these matters, 3 Kingdoms (as well as the LXX of Esther and Daniel) resembles several rewritten Bible texts from Qumran and elsewhere, including the SP. We will now review the similarities in techniques:

Two of the central techniques used in 3 Kingdoms, not known from MT or Greek Scripture, were used in the SP group, viz., the duplication of various sections in 3 Kingdoms and the insertion of theme summaries.

a. *Duplication.* Central to the literary principles of the SP group is the wish to rewrite Hebrew Scripture based on its editorial principles without adding new text pericopes. The addition of new passages would have harmed the authenticity of the rewritten Bible compositions, and therefore the SP group limited itself to copying passages. For this purpose they duplicated all the segments of Moses' first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 in Exodus and Numbers as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy.⁸⁹ In both texts, the duplications have a certain purpose. In 3 Kingdoms, they serve an exegetical or chronological purpose, while in the SP group the duplication of segments from

⁸⁶ See n. 103 below with regard to 4QRP.

⁸⁷ See M. J. Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible."

⁸⁸ Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 20–26.

⁸⁹ For a detailed analysis, see Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions."

Deuteronomy in Exodus and Numbers is meant to make Deuteronomy 1–3 comply with the earlier books.⁹⁰

b. *Theme summaries.* The two collections of verses in 3 Kingdoms 2 summarize in the beginning of the Greek book verses relating to the central theme of the first ten chapters, Solomon’s wisdom. By the same token, the added tenth commandment of SP (not found in the pre-Samaritan texts) is a theme summary of verses describing the sanctity of Mt. Gerizim. The added⁹¹ tenth commandment of SP in both versions of the Decalogue describing and prescribing the sanctity of Mount Gerizim is made up of verses occurring elsewhere in Deuteronomy.⁹²

In its major features 3 Kingdoms thus shares significant features with several rewritten Bible texts from Qumran and elsewhere. The same pertains to Esther and Daniel.⁹³

7. Text and Canon

The recognition that the Greek versions of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel represent rewritten versions of MT has important implications for our understanding of the canonical status of these books and of canonical issues in general. All three Greek books were considered to be authoritative by ancient Judaism and Christianity alike. In due course, they were rejected within Judaism, but for Christianity they remained authoritative in different ways.

⁹⁰ A similar duplication is found in 4QDeutⁿ V 5–7 where the motive clause for the Sabbath commandment in Exod 20:11 has been added after the motive clause of Deuteronomy. See J. H. Tigay, “Conflation as a Redactional Technique,” in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 53–96 (55–7).

⁹¹ The Samaritans consider the first commandment of the Jewish tradition as a preamble to the Decalogue, so that in their tradition there is room for an additional commandment.

⁹² Deut 11:29a, 27:2b–3a, 27:4a, 27:5–7, 11:30—in that sequence.

⁹³ See Tov, “Three Strange Books.”

It is no coincidence that two of the three books (Esther, Daniel) suffered a similar fate within the Christian canon, since they have much in common. They share large expansions that were considered disturbing and therefore were ultimately removed from the running text in the case of Esther. The large expansions of Esth-LXX now have a deuterocanonical status in the Catholic Church even though they never existed separately. At the same time, the medium-sized expansions were left in the text. The medium-sized expansions of Daniel were likewise left in the text (4:14a [17a], 33a–b, 37a–c). However, two book-sized appendixes were placed at the beginning or end of the book (Susanna, Bel and the Serpent), while the large Expansion named the “Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men”⁹⁴ was left in the text between 3:23 and 3:24 but given deuterocanonical status. 3 Kingdoms could have undergone the same fate, but all the expansions including the large ones in chapters 2 and 12 were left in the text.

When the LXX translation was produced, the Hebrew source of 3 Kingdoms was considered to be as authoritative as 1 Kings, at least in some circles. Otherwise it would not have been rendered into Greek. This pertains also to the assumed Hebrew (Aramaic?) sources of Esther and Daniel.⁹⁵ The Greek translators and the Alexandrian Jewish community considered the original Hebrew and Aramaic versions, as well as their Greek translations, as authoritative as Baruch⁹⁶ or any other book included in those collections.

⁹⁴ Although placed in the text itself, this added text is usually believed to have enjoyed a separate existence. This Addition is composed of three or four separate compositions: the Prayer of Azariah (vv. 1–22), the prose narrative (vv. 23–28), the Ode (vv. 29–34), and the Psalm (vv. 35–68). See Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 40–76.

⁹⁵ See Collins, *Daniel*, 195–207, 405–39.

⁹⁶ The book was translated by the same translator who rendered Jeremiah into Greek and was revised by the same reviser who revised at least the second part of the LXX of Jeremiah. See my study *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*.

Several scholars assume that the canonical conceptions behind the “Alexandrian canon” reflect the views of the mother community in Palestine.⁹⁷ The link with Palestine is even closer for Esther, as there is strong evidence that this book was translated in that country.⁹⁸

The Greek canon includes 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel, constituting rewritten versions of earlier books such as now included in MT. The rewritten books were considered authoritative in their Semitic as well as Greek forms, although by different communities. The SP, likewise a rewritten version of MT, as well as its pre-Samaritan forerunners, enjoyed similar authority. Rewritten versions, as well as the earlier versions on which they were based (for example, the MT of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel), were considered equally authoritative, by different communities and in different periods.

This brings us back to the rewritten Bible compositions found at Qumran. We do not know to what extent these compositions were accepted at Qumran or elsewhere, if at all, but probably at least some of the “non-canonical” books were accepted as authoritative by that community.⁹⁹ Jubilees, represented by 15–16 copies at Qumran, may have had

⁹⁷ Especially Sundberg, *The Old Testament*, 60–65.

⁹⁸ The main manuscripts of the LXX contain a note at the end of the book, the only such note in the LXX, translated by E. J. Bickerman, “The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther,” in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (ed. E. J. Bickerman; AGAJS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1976) 225–45 (245) as follows: “In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra <78–77 BCE>, Dositheus –who said he was a priest,– and Levitas, and Ptolemy his son deposited the preceding Letter of Purim, which they said really exists and had been translated by Lysimachus (son of) Ptolemy, (a member) of the Jerusalem community.” The implication of this note is that the Greek version of Esther was produced in Jerusalem and deposited (*eisfero*) in the year 78–77 BCE in an archive in Egypt.

⁹⁹ For an analysis, see G. J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible.”

such a status.¹⁰⁰ The same may be said about 4Q–11Q Temple, but several types of evidence need to be taken into consideration.¹⁰¹

The decision is very difficult since no group has survived like Judaism, Christianity or the Samaritans that endorsed some of these compositions. Because of the lack of convincing evidence we turn to the one composition which from the point of view of its contents is so close to Hebrew Scripture and to the rewritten works within Greek Scripture that it probably enjoyed the same authoritative status as Greek Scripture. We refer to 4QReworked Pentateuch.¹⁰² This composition, published as a non-biblical composition, now has to be reclassified as a Bible text similar in character to some of the rewritten LXX books like 3 Kingdoms.¹⁰³ For a more detailed analysis of the issues involved, see my study elsewhere.¹⁰⁴

In conclusion, our analysis of 3 Kingdoms suggested that this Greek translation rendered a Hebrew composition that reworked 1 Kings. The reworking was rather penetrating involving the addition of long summaries and an alternative story as well as

¹⁰⁰ Jubilees is quoted expressly in CD 16:2–3: “As for the exact determination of their times to which Israel turns a blind eye, behold it is strictly defined in the *Book of the Divisions of the Times into their Jubilees and Weeks*.” The book is written as authoritative Scripture, with God announcing Israel’s future to Moses on Sinai. For an analysis, see J. VanderKam, “Jubilees,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:437.

¹⁰¹ In this composition Israel’s laws are rewritten, especially in cols. LI–LXVI that follow the sequence of Deuteronomy, albeit with many differences. God is mentioned in the first person. This composition is known from five Qumran manuscripts (three from cave 11, and two from cave 4), a number that is probably large enough to assume its popularity at Qumran. It is less clear whether this composition is quoted in the Qumran writings.

¹⁰² E. Tov and S. A. White, “4QReworked Pentateuch^{b–e} and 4QTemple?” in H. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 187–351, 459–63 and plates XIII–XXXVI.

¹⁰³ S. White Crawford, who published 4QRP together with me, recognizes the possibility that this text possibly was an authoritative Bible text, but decides against it because of lack of positive evidence: “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible at Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; N. Richland Hills, Tx: Bibal, 2000) 173–95; eadem, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, forthcoming.

¹⁰⁴ “The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” forthcoming. M. Segal and E. Ulrich were ahead of us when claiming in 2000 that this text is Scripture: M. Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Fifty Years After Their Discovery—Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000) 391–99; E. Ulrich, “The Qumran Biblical Scrolls: The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000) 76.

the duplication of passages. The revision involved tendentious changes regarding Solomon, Jeroboam, and Ahab. As a result, the composition included in the LXX reflects a stage subsequent to that in MT. We believe that the Greek translations of Esther and Daniel 4–6 attest to similar stages. All three books were based on Semitic texts, and their underlying texts rewrote compositions resembling MT. We found several characteristic features in these three compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran, especially 4QRP. These findings have implications for the LXX translations, the Qumran scrolls, and canonical conceptions.