CHAPTER 1

Text and Literary History: The Case of 1 Kings 19 (MT and LXX)

Philippe Hugo

The context of my paper is the question of the relationship between text criticism and redaction criticism: how can text history contribute to a better knowledge of the literary development of the books of Kings? The discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls profoundly renewed the knowledge of the most ancient transmission of the biblical text and, in particular, of the place that the Septuagint (LXX) occupies in it. Some fragments, such as 4QSam[a] or 4QJer[b], confirm that the LXX is not the simple product of an approximation or the fantasy of translators, but is probably founded on a Hebrew text that differs from the Masoretic Text (MT).[1] This is not some kind of methodological a priori. Some recent research on many biblical books has come to the conclusion that the Hebrew source of the LXX must represent a different literary form than that of the MT, and is sometimes older than it.[2] The most famous case is the double transmission of the book of Jeremiah,[3] but other prophetic books certainly attest to the same phenomenon, for example Ezekiel[4] and Haggai.[5] The Former Prophets show many such cases in Joshua,[6] Samuel,[7]—in particular the famous story of David and Goliath[8]—and in Kings, as we will see, just as some books of the Writings, like Ezra–Nehemiah[9] and Daniel.[10] The Pentateuch attests also to two distinct forms in some sections, as in Exodus 35–40[11] and in the Decalogue.[12]

In sum, in the first century BCE, the Hebrew Bible was attested to by a multiplicity of textual forms, to which the MT, the LXX, and the fragments

of Qumran (and the Samaritan Pentateuch) bear witness. This multiplicity appears to be the result of the entangling of the textual and literary history of the Hebrew Bible.[13] In other words, the period of the most ancient transmission of the text was again marked by some activities of literary creation. It becomes difficult to make an airtight distinction between the period of the production of the text and the period of its transmission.[14] Thus, the two disciplines (text criticism and redaction criticism) find themselves modified. On the one hand, text criticism is given a new task: more than purifying the text of its errors of transmission, it must identify (in the textual witnesses at its disposal) the eventual distinct literary forms and place them in the course of the history of the text.[15] On the other hand, redaction criticism must reevaluate its results in light of the textual witnesses (in particular the LXX) that attest to possible literary forms more ancient than the MT. It is to this debate that I intend to contribute, as an historian of the text, by the analysis of 1 Kings 19.

Methodological Preliminaries

When one carefully reads the MT parallel to the LXX in the books of Kings (as I will do for 1 Kings 19), one finds a multitude of small differences. This observation raises a series of questions regarding research on text history, to which several recent studies have attempted to bring some elements of response.[16] The first question concerns the nature of the differences: are they strictly textual, that is to say, are they due to corruptions in the manuscript transmission or due to harmonizations, assimilations, or explanations; or should one consider them to be literary, as witnessing to voluntary and thoughtful intentions in order to modify the narrative and theological sense of an account?[17] Once the corruptions are identified and explained, one can confirm the literary nature of the other differences. It is thus suitable to wonder who produced them: do they find their origin in the translation techniques, in the ideological interpretation of the translators (Wevers,[18] Turkanik[19]), or even the midrashic methods employed by later Greek editors (Gooding,[20] van Keulen[21])? Do they rather witness to two different Hebraic forms? If one admits that the LXX generally represents Hebrew *Vorlage* distinct from the MT, how must we judge the relationship between these two Hebrew texts? Three models are possible: first, the two literary forms attest to two parallel currents developed from a common source (Stipp,[22] Bösenecker[23]); second, the Hebrew source of the LXX is the product

of literary activity of the midrashic type (Talshir[24]); third, the predecessor of the MT (the proto-MT) is the result of a work of a literary edition that (for narrative, theological, and ideological motives) modified the most ancient form attested to by the *Vorlage* of the LXX (Trebolle Barrera,[25] Schenker,[26] Hugo).

We must submit each variant, each passage, and each biblical book to these questions. In fact, the most ancient transmission of the biblical text was never totally homogeneous, and all the mentioned phenomena are attested to in turn. However, the analysis of large narrative units (passages, chapters, or a whole of chapters) permits one to progressively extract the general tendency of the evolution of a text.

My study on 1 Kings 17–18[27] led me to confirm the hypothesis that Julio Trebolle Barrera and Adrian Schenker had already formulated concerning the antiquity of the Hebrew source of the LXX and of the secondary or editorial character of the proto-MT.[28] Generally, the MT and the LXX attest to two distinct literary forms of the history of the prophet Elijah, two faces of Elijah (*Les deux visages d'Élie*). Except for some rare exceptions, the MT bears witness to a coherent revision project, which can be summarized in three principal features. First, prophetic theology is modified accentuating the supremacy of the action of God over that of the prophet, the obedience of the prophet to the divine word, and the prophet's fidelity to the Torah. Second, the portrait of King Ahab is also modified in order to point out his guilt. Finally, the idolatry of the royal house is rendered more concrete and overwhelming. My detailed examination of chapter 19 aims to pursue this inquiry and to test these conclusions.

Analysis of the Text

The questions I posed in the preceding paragraph will guide my analysis of the differences between the MT and the LXX[29] in 1 Kgs 19. I will therefore begin by identifying the phenomena that are clearly of textual nature—the corruptions, the explanations, the harmonizations—in order to progressively move on to the literary interventions in which one can discern a narrative and theological intention. With this approach, one must not forget that the text must be read as a unit and that, if suitable, to distinguish the differences and to classify them according to their nature, one must not proceed with an atomistic reading of the text. The text is a sense unit that has undergone a textual and literary evolution in its most ancient transmission.

Textual Corruptions

Textual corruptions are the first category of differences. To this group probably belongs the most important difference of the chapter (materially speaking), in verse 2. The LXX causes Jezebel to say *ei sy ei Ēleiou kai egō Iezabel*, "if you are Elijah, myself, [I am] Jezebel." This "plus" is attested to by the whole of the Greek tradition as well as by the *Vetus Latina* (VL): "Et dixit: Si tu es Helias, et ego sum Iezabel, Et dixit: Haec faciant mihi Dii."[30] Numerous authors since Thenius (1849) estimate that this phrase translated from a Hebrew text is probably the most ancient form: *'m 'th 'lyhw w'ny 'yzbl*.[31] In fact, this formula has no parallel in the Hebrew Bible, so much so that it is hard to see it as a secondary addition in the Hebrew and even harder to see it as having been formulated in Greek. Its difficulty speaks in favor of its originality.[32] The question is therefore to figure out why this clause disappeared in the MT.[33] Otto Eissfeldt gave the most convincing explanation.[34] Based on the VL, he shows that the Old Greek certainly read a Hebrew text in which the statement of Jezebel contained two elements, each one introduced by *l'mr*, translated by *et dixit*. The VL (as it also happens sometimes in Reigns[35]) represents here the most ancient form of the LXX, which disappeared from the Greek witnesses. The Hebrew *Vorlage* would therefore contain a text as: *l'mr 'm 'th 'lyhw w'ny 'yzbl l'mr kh y'śwn 'lhym* . . . The scribe's error consists of passing from the first *l'mr* to the second, leaving out part of the intermediate phrase. Therefore, the omission of Jezebel's violent interrogation is due to a *parablepsis*, the passage from the same to the same. This is at least a provisional conclusion, which will be reconsidered below.

One encounters a second possible corruption in verse 11. During the passage of the wind before Elijah, the *Codex Vaticanus* (B) does not deny the presence of the Lord in the wind, but says: *kai pneuma mega krataion dialyon orē kai syntribon petras enōpion kyriou en tō pneumati kyriou*, "and a great wind broke the mountains and crushed the rock in front of the Lord, in the Lord's wind." All the other witnesses from the Greek translation, except for Origen's citations of the text,[36] read as a negation here: *ouk en tō pneumati kyrios*, "but the Lord [was not] in the wind." The syntax leads me to think that this is not an error internal to the Greek, but rather the omission of the negation in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. In fact, besides the absence of the negation, B contains a genitive *kyriou*. One understands it very well if the translator had read a text such as: *wmšbr sl'ym lpny yhwh brwḥ yhwh*. A corruption internal to the Greek would not have necessarily reconciled the syntax. I think therefore that the error is already found in the Hebrew source of the Old Greek. Since it is probably a corruption, it remains difficult to know exactly how this negation

was left out, but in light of the fact that there are so many negations in this passage, it makes the phenomenon of the omission of this negation plausible.

Naming of the Characters

A second type of textual difference (that is to say, attributable to a scribe) is the more or less spontaneous or deliberate explanations, which tend to clarify the account by specifying or naming characters, the subject or object of the verbs. It is a common phenomenon in the LXX, maybe even attributable to the translator. For example, in verses 3, 6, 10, and 14, the LXX makes the subject of the verb explicit by naming Elijah, *Ēleiou*,[37] just as Elisha is named in verse 20. In verse 1, the Greek specifies Jezebel as the wife of Ahab, *gynaiki autou*. One encounters the same phenomenon when dealing with personal pronouns, for example in verse 9 (MT), *wy'mr lw*, and in verse 10 LXX, *kai zētousi tēn psychēn mou labein autēn*.

Apart from these insignificant phenomena, the MT of this chapter attests to some "pluses" that also seem to be explanations. These additions (if they are indeed additions) are not as spontaneous and fall under the heading of certain types of narrative harmonizations. In verse 2, the MT specifies that Jezebel sent a messenger, *ml'k*, to Elijah. The verb *šlḥ* in this context does not need an object complement, and the LXX represents a completely adequate formulation.[38] It seems more likely that the complement has been added in the MT instead of suppressed in the LXX.

In verse 5, MT attests once again to the same term, *whnh zh ml'k ngʿ bw,* which is absent in the LXX, *kai idou tis ēpsato autou:* "an *angel* (MT)/*someone* (LXX) touched him." One sees this term again in verse 7, attested to in Greek by *ho angelos*. It is very likely that the MT harmonized these two verses by introducing the subject, which was already explicit in verse 5.[39] The two passages (v. 2 and vv. 5-7) and their mention of *ml'k* could be voluntarily tied in the MT: to the messenger of death sent by Jezebel, God responds with a messenger of life, an angel who comes to feed and comfort Elijah.

In verse 20, one perceives what is probably the same type of expansion in the "plus" of the MT to Elisha's response: *'šqkh-n' l'by wl'my,* "Let me kiss my father and *my mother* please." It is even more likely that this is coming from an addition rather than from suppression.[40]

Finally, I would like to highlight a final case that could be classified in this category of spontaneous explanations, even if it is not in this case referring to a person. In verse 21, the MT contains a "plus" once again in a phrase in which the order is also different from the LXX. The Hebrew presents the sacrifice of Elisha in this way: *wyzbḥhw wbkly hbqr bšlm hbśr wytn lʿm*,

"and he sacrificed *it* [the pair of oxen], and with the coupling of the oxen he cooked them *the meat*, and he gave to the people." The LXX, in a different order, contains the same logic: *kai ethysen kai hēpsēsen auta en tois skeuesi tōn boōn kai edōken tō laō*, "and he sacrificed and he cooked it [the yoke of oxen] with the coupling of the oxen and gave to the people." Everything leads us to think that *hbśr* is a note to explain the masculine plural suffix of the verb *bšl*.[41]

If we establish that the LXX has the tendency to specify the names of subjects, these few examples show us above all that, on a level that we must still qualify as textual, the MT introduced explanatory notes in order to aid comprehension.

Development of the Formulas Indicating God

The following phenomenon is on a fine line between the spontaneous gloss of a textual nature and the theological intervention of an editor. One observes two occurrences where the MT attests to formulas in reference to God that are more developed. In verse 8 first of all, the MT names the destination of Elijah's journey *hr h'lhym ḥrb*, "the mountain *of God*, Horeb." The absence of the mention of God in the LXX should be noted, for in Exod 3:1, where one finds the exact same expression, this mention is also absent from the Greek. Montgomery estimates that the mention of God was suppressed by the LXX in the two passages because only Zion is the mountain of the Lord.[42] But this argument can be countered with the fact that the contexts of the only three other occurrences of the expression *hr h'lhym* lead one to attribute them to Horeb, Exod 4:27; 18:5; 24:13. Even though one cannot resolve the question in a definitive manner, it seems to me more reasonable to think that the MT harmonized these designations by adding *h'lhym* to it.[43]

If my conclusion is accurate, it leads us to question once again certain conclusions of redaction criticism, according to which an ancient compositional layer only contained the expression "the mountain of God" in Exod 3:1 and 1 Kgs 19:8, as in other cited passages. The name of Horeb would have been introduced in a later redaction.[44] The absence of *h'lhym* in the Hebrew source of the LXX leads me to conclude the opposite. Relying only on the subject of the redactional character of the designation of Sinai as Horeb, the textual witness cannot say anything further.

The second case concerns the name "YHWH *Lord* of hosts," *lyhwh 'lhy ṣb'wt*, translated in verses 10 and 14 by *tō kyriō pantokratori* in B.[45] One finds in the whole of Samuel and Kings only one other time that this expression, *yhwh 'lhy ṣb'wt*, is used (in 2 Sam 5:10), and the LXX does not even have an equivalent for *'lhym*. In contrast, the expression *yhwh ṣb'wt* appears thirteen

times[46] in the same literary body and it is translated in a very diverse manner.[47] The fact is that the Hebrew source of the LXX contains an equivalent to *'lhym* twice, which is not verified in the MT: 1 Sam 1:3, *theos*, and 1:11, *elōai*, the transliteration proves that the word was in the *Vorlage* of the Greek.[48] It does not seem possible to me to draw a conclusion from the tendency to complete the divine name in one or the other textual form. The fact is that the most complete form (that is, the form with *'lhym*) is most likely secondary.

Narrative and Rhetorical Harmonizations

The fourth type of difference between the MT and the LXX is at the frontier between the textual and the literary. It concerns some cases in which the narrative strategy or the rhetorical structure of the account is modified or harmonized without transforming the meaning of the account. The connection between text history and redaction criticism is even more apparent in light of redaction criticism. Two cases from chapter 19 are classified in this section.

The first case concerns the repetition of the formulation in verses 4 and 5, *tḥt rtm 'ḥḏ*, "under a broom tree." The two formulations already pose a small question in Hebrew since verse 4 gives in the *Ketiv* the feminine *'ḥt*, corrected by the *Qere* to masculine as seen in verse 5. The two other occurrences of the substantive *rtm* (which designate a bushy tree, probably the broom tree), are also in the masculine (Ps 120:4 translated by *erēmikos* and Job 30:4 rendered by *halimon*). The LXX does not have the same formulation in the two verses, but *hypokatō rathmen*, "underneath a *rathmen*," in verse 4 and *ekei hypo phyton*, "there under a tree," in verse 5. The expression of verse 4 is certainly a transliteration. The Greek tradition testifies to this transliterated word in diverse manners, but it is always acting on the same phenomenon: *rathmein* in *L, ramath* in A, *sub virgultis raphem* in VL.[49] In this sense, Rahlfs interprets the Greek and corrects it to show the transliteration better: *hypo rathm hen*.[50]

How should the repetition in the MT and the difference in the LXX be interpreted? According to Stade and Šanda,[51] the repetition is the product of the introduction of a marginal note in the wrong place (v. 5), which was aiming to correct verse 4 due to a fault of gender. The LXX of verse 5 is itself a posterior note introduced by assimilation to the MT. Burney pursues the same hypothesis by considering that the original form of verse 5 read only *ekei*, *šm*, attested to by the LXX: "he lay down and slept there."[52] As for the rest, the MT and the LXX annotated their text source. Without seeing *ekei* as original, Thiel also thinks that the MT and the LXX added precision to the place by assimilation to verse 4.[53]

Trebolle Barrera makes an argument of a literary nature.[54] He says that verse 5a (MT) is secondary, and the repetition of *tḥt rtm ʾḥd* is explained by the editor's desire to add the idea of lying down and sleeping, which notes a narrative evolution in relation to verse 4, "he went and sat under a broom tree." It is therefore purely a narrative or rhetorical contrivance that the editor introduces here. Curiously, starting from the textual difference of the MT and the LXX, Trebolle Barrera comes to an explanation that ignores the Greek witness, and considers it, without explanation, as "less good" than that of the MT.

I would propose an explanation midway between textual and literary. One must start from the disagreement of the expression in verses 4 and 5 in the LXX. It is not impossible to interpret verse 5 in Greek as an explanation or a reliable translation of what was transliterated in verse 4. The repetition of the term would have given the translator the possibility of shedding light on the comprehension. As *rtm* is rendered by different terms, *phyton* is a possible translation of this. However, the faithfulness of the translation in 3 Kgdms leads one to think instead that, if the translator had found an equivalent to *rtm*, he would have also used it in verse 5. Eventually, he would have added an explanation to the transliteration, but logically it would have found a place in the first occurrence of the word and not in verse 5. It therefore seems more likely to me that in verse 5 the LXX attests to a different text than the MT. What could be the Hebrew substratum of *phyton*? It usually translates the Hebrew words *sbk*, "undergrowth, shrub" (Gen 22:13), *mtʿ*, "a plant, which is planted" (Ezek 31:4; 34:29), and *nṣr*, "branch" (Deut 11:7). As *phyton* renders many rare words, it can translate another synonym here. For example, the famous *snh* of the burning bush (Exod 3:2 three times; 3:3; 3:4; Deut 33:16), but this one is systematically translated by *batos*. The word *śkyʾḥ* is the most plausible. One encounters it in the sense of "shrub" in Gen 2:5 (*chlōros*) and 21:15 (*elatē*), and Job 30:4 (*halimos*). Two arguments make me inclined to hypothesize that the Hebrew source of the LXX read *śyḥ* here. First of all, the syntactical context is close to that of Gen 21:15, with the idea of being beneath (*tḥt*) the shrub. Secondly, Job 30:4 puts the shrubs and the broom trees in exactly the same parallel phrase: *hqtpym mlwḥ ʿly-śyḥ wšrš rtmym lḥmm*, "they gathered salt herbs under the *bushes*, and the root of the *broom tree* was their food," which are translated into Greek by the same word *halimos*. One can therefore suppose that *ekei hypo phyton* translates a text like *šm tḥt šyḥ ʾḥd*.

In text criticism, two identical forms have more of a chance of being secondary and harmonized, whereas two different forms are probably originals.

I think that we are dealing with a similar case in this passage, the ancient form being attested to by the Hebrew source of the LXX. The MT manifests well a narrative and rhetorical evolution, as Trebolle Barrera shows: Elijah walks then sits under a broom tree (v. 4a); he complains to the Lord and expresses his hopelessness (v. 4b), then he sleeps under the same broom tree (v. 5a). I think that the MT specified the *šm* (*ekei*) contained in the *Vorlage* of the Greek by replacing the possible *śy'ḥ* (or one of its synonyms) by the *rtm* of verse 4 in order to clarify that he is talking about the same place. If the sense of the account is not modified by it, it is clarified and harmonized. We are at the limit of the literary intervention in the textual transmission.

A second case of the same type is found in the sequence of verses 5-8. I have already talked elsewhere about this question but am also adding some elements to it.[55] In the cycle of Elijah, one finds what I call an "order/execution" construction. I have shown that, generally, the MT is more faithful in literally aligning the executions with the orders given by Elijah or by God. Now precisely in the present case, it is the LXX that is apparently more faithful to this construction, since in the command of the angel (or of *tis*) in verse 5, "rise and eat," the Greek makes the execution correspond to verse 6 "*he rose* [absent in the MT], and ate and drank," *kai anestē kai ephagen kai epien*. The order is then repeated in verse 6 before finally being literally accomplished and in the same terms as in the LXX and the MT in verse 8, "he rose, he ate and drank," *wyqm wy'kl wyšth*. If we can not exclude the possibility of a harmonization in the LXX, which would complete this construction, I do not think that we can exclude the inverse argument, which is founded on narrative logic. In fact, in the MT the narrative structure is progressive, while in the LXX it is simply repetitive (two identical orders have as a consequence two identical actions). In the MT, at the angel's first order, Elijah does not completely obey since he does not rise but rather eats, drinks, and lies down again. It is only at the angel's second command that Elijah rises, eats, and drinks in order to then leave "in the strength of this food." This narrative finesse is not accidental. If the MT is habitually more faithful to the order/execution construction, this infringement of the stylistic rule could accurately be the exception that proves the rule: the MT precisely shows that Elijah does not completely obey until the second injunction of the angel; there is a change in his behavior. This phenomenon seems to me probably to be secondary, a type of rhetorical intervention at the border of literary intervention.

Trebolle Barrera[56] introduces another element in the discussion that I did not discuss in my book. He notes that certain Antiochian witnesses, 82 (o), 127 (c_2), and 93 (e_2), are shorter between verses 6 and 8 than the other

Greek witnesses and also that of the MT. In fact, after the first execution of the order in verse 6, "he rose and ate and drank," the account immediately follows in verse 8, which continues, "and he walked in the strength of the food." The short form skips the fact that Elijah lies down again, and remains in this manner until after the second intervention of the angel and the second execution. Trebolle Barrera rightly shows that it is possible to draw two conclusions to explain this "minus." It can first of all come from an internal textual accident in the Greek by *homoioteleuton*: the scribe would have passed from the first phrase, *kai anestē kai ephagen kai epien*, in verse 6, to that of verse 8, which would have led to the omission of the central part. This is the reasoning I consider to be the most likely.[57] But he notes shortly after that it is not impossible to interpret this passage as an addition, marked by the literary phenomenon of *Wiederaufnahme*, an editor repeating a phrase in order to introduce a new idea. In this case, these witnesses would attest to a literary Hebrew form that is older, and the MT would have developed the narration in order to introduce the idea of progression in Elijah's reaction and in order to identify the person in verse 5 of the LXX, *tis*, an angel of YHWH, a phenomenon that I talked about earlier.

To sum it all up, whether one adopts Trebolle Barrera's explanation—which I think is unlikely—or one which is simpler (the one that I proposed), the MT is the product of a rhetorical type of literary development that refines the narration without radically changing the reading of it.

Explicit Modifications of the Narrative Logic of the Account

More so than the differences I just analyzed, this fifth category of variants is of the clearly literary type. The differences (which sometimes remain relatively small, materially speaking) have some narrative and/or ideological consequences of such importance that it is not possible for them to be accidental. I will classify here three cases from chapter 19.

The first difference classified in this section concerns the reaction of Elijah (v. 3) to Jezebel's threat (v. 2). According to the MT, "he saw, rose, and fled for his soul" (in order to save his life), *wyr' wyqm wylk 'l-npšw*. The LXX, the Vulgate, some Hebrew manuscripts,[58] and Flavius Josephus[59] attest the same consonantal text, but the first verb is vocalized (*wayyirā'*), "he feared," *kai ephobēthē* and not *wayyar'*, as in the MT. This form is easy to understood in the narrative logic; it goes together even better than the MT. It is natural for Elijah to fear Jezebel's violent threat, and it is natural for this fear to cause him to flee. Now, this is precisely the problem that raises this issue. In the wake of authors who correct the MT,[60] Carmel McCarthy[61] and Dominique

Barthélemy[62] have rightly shown that the vocalization in "to see" is a secondary euphemism, a *tiqqûn soferim* (correction of the scribes): it is not adequate to describe the prophet of the Lord as terrified when faced with the threat of an idolatrous queen. It authenticates the prophetic action faced with the royal apostasy. If this modification changes the portrait of Elijah, it has consequences on the representation of Jezebel herself: is the queen a threat to the prophet? The MT seems to want to minimize this danger, or at least its repercussions on Elijah.

The question raised by this literary intervention invites us to reconsider the differences from verses 2-3. Indeed, the attenuation of the threat that Jezebel represents casts a new light on the "plus" of the LXX in the queen's intervention in the beginning of the verse: "if you are Elijah, I am Jezebel," *ei sy ei Ēleiou kai egō Iezabel*. I showed earlier that the disappearance of this phrase could be due to a textual accident. Now, if one correlates the two differences, we notice a deep coherence. The "plus" attested to by the LXX is a threat that lends Jezebel the pretension of being the equal of, or even more powerful than, Elijah. One understands this phrase very well in light of the confrontation between the two characters described by the whole of the account. Jezebel, the idolatrous queen of foreign origin, exterminates the prophets of YHWH (1 Kgs 18:4, 13) and feeds the prophets of Baal and Asherah at her table (1 Kgs 18:19). Elijah, the last survivor of the prophets of YHWH (1 Kgs 19:10, 14), has himself put to death all the prophets of Baal (1 Kgs 18:40). In this context, Elijah and Jezebel are the last survivors of their respective clans. The prophet of YHWH and the protector of the prophets of Baal are put in a face-to-face confrontation. In this way, as far as the LXX is concerned, the conflict is between the two protagonists rather than between Ahab and Elijah. From the MT side, it is otherwise. In these two verses alone, the confrontation is less head-on: there is no direct challenge from Jezebel, and Elijah does not express so much fear. One must recognize therefore that, if the absence of this phrase is due to an accidental error, the chance omission produces a very coherent text.

In conclusion, the literary intervention in verse 3 MT is so coherent with the absence of Elijah's reprimand of Jezebel in verse 2 MT that we are right to wonder if this disappearance is not voluntary after all. Without denying the possibility of a textual corruption, I therefore formulate the hypothesis of the suppression of this phrase by the editor of the proto-MT as springing from narrative and ideological motives: that is to say, to smooth out the portrait of the queen in order to avoid the face-to-face confrontation with the prophet.[63] In fact, I often raised the issue in my study *Les deux visages d'Élie* that the MT has the tendency to point out King Ahab's guilt even if it

means smoothing out the picture of Jezebel (1 Kgs 18:4, 19, 21[20], 27).[64] The features of the MT are coherent in chapter 19 and could attest to the same kind of correction.

This case takes on an important methodological value for me. The nature of the witnesses at our disposal obliges us to consider a strictly textual cause as a primary hypothesis in the variances between the MT and the LXX. Yet the placement in relation to the differences as well as the reading compared to the forms of the text as sense units can lead us to revise this judgment and to envisage a type of literary evolution, as could be the case here.

A second passage seems to me to attest to a literary difference, even if the evaluation of this case requires caution. Verse 11, where God orders Elijah to leave the cave, is sprinkled with many differences from which the beginning synopsis of the verse will permit a view of the whole.

MT	LXX
wyʾmr ṣʾ wʿmdt bhr lpny yhwh whinh yhwh ʿbr	*kai eipen exeleusē aurion kai stēsē enōpion kyriou en tō orei idou pareleusetai kyrios*
And he said: "leave and stand on the mountain in front of YHWH. And behold YHWH passes by . . ."	And he said: "you will leave tomorrow and you will stand before the Lord on the mountain. Behold the Lord will pass by . . ."

The most obvious difference is the Greek adverb *aurion*, "tomorrow," attested to by the whole of the Greek tradition, the VL,[65] and by Josephus.[66] This adverb (which translates *mḥr*) is logically accompanied in the LXX by two future tense verbs: *exeleusē* and *stēsē*. According to the LXX, the order clearly means the next day. In the MT, the formulation is that of an immediate command, imperative and accomplished consecutively. Next, the structure of the phrase is different, while *bhr* precedes "before the Lord" and *en tō orei* is found after this same expression. Then, *whnh*, normally translated as *kai idou* (cf. vv. 5, 9, 13), is rendered as *idou* only, probably *hnh*.[67] Finally, the participle of the MT *ʿbr* is rendered as a future construction, *pareleusetai*,[68] probably ordered by the adverb *aurion*.

In sum (setting apart the structure of the phrase), the whole of the differences could depend only on the presence of the adverb *mḥr* in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. This would have led the translator to understand the verbs in this

phrase as being in the future tense, which is grammatically possible. According to the possible Hebrew source of the Greek, God announces his passing as occurring on the next day, while in the MT, the command of the Lord and that which one may call the theophany happens in a unit of time.

These observations point to another difficulty of the text, both in the MT and the LXX. Where does the direct discourse stop? Does *whnh* already introduce the description of the event itself: "and behold, the Lord is passing by"?[69] Or should we think that the whole of verses 11-12 are in direct discourse and must be understood as an announcement by the Lord?[70] The future of the LXX fits very well with this understanding,[71] and the nominal phrase in the MT seems also to be interpreted in this way. So the narrative logic is clear: verses 11-12 report YHWH's speech and prediction, and verse 13 describes the realization of YHWH's order. So, there is no more tension between the order to go to the mountain (v. 11) and the fact that Elijah is still in the cave (v. 13). Only the time conception of the Greek delays the realization of the theophany until the next day. How can we explain this difference?

If one cannot exclude the accidental omission of the adverb in the source of the MT, it cannot be explained at all. DeVries,[72] rather, suggests a corruption of *bhr* into *mḥr*. Indeed, the confusions *h*/*ḥ* and *b*/*m* are paleographically possible.[73] However, the Geek already contains an equivalent to *bhr* in *en tō orei*, but we notice that the order of the phrase is different and the placement of the word *aurion* (*mḥr*) does not correspond to that of "mountain" in the MT or in the LXX. DeVries argues that the Greek *en tō orei* is a secondary explicative gloss. This solution is contradictory because it supposes a corruption on the one hand and an explanation on the other. Moreover, it is hard to see *en tō orei* as an internal correction of the Greek because a recension had introduced the expression in the same place as in the MT. The expression seems rather to be part of the Old Greek.[74] I think therefore that one has to distinguish the two questions: on the on hand the attendance of *aurion* (*mḥr*) in the LXX, and on the other the different placement of the geographical specification *bhr*, *en tō orei*.

Concerning the structure of the phrase, the different placement of *bhr* and *en tō orei* in the MT and the LXX is not the sign of the accidental moving of the expression, but rather of its introduction. In other words, this difference seems to be the textual clue of the secondary nature of the word: the proto-MT and the *Vorlage* of the LXX, each on their side, feel the necessity to localize explicitly the theophany on the mountain, following verse 8. This addition was made parallel and not at the same place in the two witnesses.

Regarding the temporal indication *aurion* (*mḥr*), Otto Thenius[75] argues that the original text was more clearly oriented toward the future. In fact, according to Thenius, the preposition *whnh yhwh ʿbr*, "YHWH will pass by," was followed by the announcement of the Lord: *wyhy mmḥrt whnh yhwh ʿbr*, "and it happened, the next morning, that YHWH was passing by." The same formulation would have therefore provoked the omission of the phrase by *homoioteleuton*. This conjecture does not hold in any ancient textual witness and therefore remains hypothetical. Besides, it does not explain the entire textual situation because it does not furnish a single explanation as to the disappearance of *mḥr* in the beginning of the verse. According to Thenius, the reason for this hypothesis resides in the parallel with Exod 34:2: "be ready for tomorrow morning [*lbqr*, *eis to prōi*] you will come up in the morning [*wʿlyt bbqr*, *kai anabēsē*] on Mount Sinai and you will stand before me there, on the top of the mountain." For him, the relationship between the two passages is original and not secondary.

It is the relationship to the same passage from Exod 34:2 that leads Montgomery to make the opposite suggestion and to think that *aurion*, *mḥr* would have been introduced here by assimilation.[76] But against this hypothesis, one should point out the fact that *aurion* is never chosen for *lbqr*[77] but *mḥr* or *mḥrt*. It is therefore unlikely that it is any different here. In fact, if there is a secondary assimilation, one expects rather the editor (context permitting) to choose common vocabulary between the two passages that he is seeking to bring together. I do not believe that the simple approximation of meaning allows us to suppose assimilation. Besides, the narrative logic is different between the two passages. In Exod 34, if the encounter is set for the next morning (v. 2), it is because Moses has work to do until then: he has to make two stone tables (v. 1). In 1 Kgs 19, nothing keeps the meeting from taking place immediately. If it remains possible, the assimilation to Exod 34:2 does not seem to be a convincing explanation to me.

Certainly, the relationship between the events of Moses at Sinai/Horeb and the account of Elijah at Horeb is clear, as most authors have shown.[78] However, it seems to me that another relationship between the two accounts is possible. In the two stories, there is the question of "forty days and forty nights." Exod 24:18 and 34:28 make mention of the time that Moses spent on the mountain (Deut 9:9; 9:11; 9:18; 10:10). In 1 Kgs 19:8, the forty days and forty nights mark the period during which Elijah draws near to Horeb, the "mountain of God" (MT). On the fortieth day, when Elijah has arrived at Horeb, the Lord speaks to the prophet (v. 9). The relationship between Moses and Elijah is evident here since the expression only appears in relation

to these two people,[79] setting aside the duration of the rain during the Flood in Gen 7:4, 12. In this context, the temporary mention of the LXX, *aurion*, *mḥr*, "tomorrow," defers the theophany and the return to the forty-first day! Verse 11 therefore disagrees with verse 8 and with the reference to Moses. It seems to me that the intertextual influence (Exod/Kgs) could have led the editor of the proto-MT to suppress this delay by making the theophany directly follow the command of God so that all would take place on the fortieth day. If the possibility of the voluntary suppression of this mention in the MT—and therefore the antiquity of the form attested to by the LXX—keeps a part of the hypothesis, it seems to me that it is more likely than the assimilation proposed by Montgomery.

One must also wonder if the temporary mention modifies the narrative logic of the account itself. This passage contains one other difficulty, noted by all of the commentators. The repetition of the dialogue between God and Elijah in verses 9b-10 and 13b-14 appears as a double reading. This gave way to diverse redactional theories considering some verses as secondary, or on the contrary, supporting the original literary unity.[80] Does the delay that exists in the LXX change the perception of these problems? In fact, the events brought back in a unit of time in the MT take place in two days in the LXX, which suppresses the perception of a double reading in the repetition. The first encounter between the Lord and Elijah (vv. 9b-11) concludes with a command for the next day (v. 11a), which can be paraphrased as: "I will come tomorrow and I will tell you." The pace of the narrative is slowed down: God does not immediately respond to the prophet's complaint; the prophet must wait, and he must prepare himself. Instead, the next day, the second encounter begins with the theophany (*ēkousen Ēleiou kai epekalypsen to prosōpon autou*) and finishes with a new dialogue. The Lord appears, but in a paradoxical manner, and does not respond to the expectation of Elijah, who was tormented by anxiety over death, the war, and the massacres (v. 14). This leads to the second dialogue that is not the double to the first, but the repetition of the prophet's unresolved complaint. God will respond to it in verses 15-18.

If we extend the scope of our inquiry, we perceive that the presence of this temporal indication alters the account even before verses 9b-14. In fact, the preceding verses (vv. 4-8) take on another narrative function, especially verse 8, which contains the mention of the forty days and forty nights. In the LXX, the forty days and forty nights show the power of the food received from the angel's hand (vv. 7-8); they are not connected to the theophany. In the MT, the absence of the delay makes the forty days and forty nights the

immediate preparation for the theophany. This symbolic preparation leads to the encounter with the Lord without further delay, as in Deut 9:11: "at the end of the forty days and the forty nights, the Lord gave me the two stone tables of stone, the tables of the covenant." The importance of the relationship with the figure of Moses is once again emphasized.

Faced with this narrative logic, two types of reasoning are possible. First of all, the temporal mark *aurion*, *mḥr*, should be secondary: the editor would have felt the narrative tensions between verses 9-11 and 13-14, and would have tried to lessen them by adding a temporal discrepancy between the two dialogues. But one can also make the opposite argument: it was important for the editor of the proto-MT that the announcement of the theophany (vv. 11-12) should be followed immediately by the mention that Elijah "heard and wrapped his face" (v. 13). The delay is much more difficult to understand in the narrative logic. Moreover, the connection with verse 8 shows that, for the MT, the theophany had to be prepared by an initiatory itinerary of forty days and forty nights, which afterward leads to the encounter with the Lord without further delay. The theophany should share the theological and symbolic value of the forty days and forty nights in Exodus and Deuteronomy.

The group of difficulties that often raises the different conception of time in the MT and the LXX (whether for the immediate context or intertexual relationships) shows that one is faced with a problem of a literary nature. It is the meaning of the account that is transformed. At this moment, it seems premature to me to definitively break off the question of chronology between the literary forms, but I am inclined to think that the MT testifies to a secondary form. I believe that the theological or ideological motives were more constraining for the editors of the biblical text than the harmonizations of a purely narrative nature.

The third case to classify in this section of narrative interventions concerns the tiny difference from verse 18. The Lord gives Elijah a group of commands aimed at the period that will follow the ministry of Elijah (vv. 15-18). The last (v. 18) concerns salvation for those who will remain faithful to YHWH and who will not have succumbed to idolatry. The MT formulates this verse under the form of a Lord's promise in the first person: *whš'rty byśr'l*, "*I* will leave in Israel," while the formula in the LXX is an order in the second person, *kai kataleipseis*,[81] "*you* will leave," which translates the Hebrew *whš'rt*.

Stade and Schwally think that the first person was written defectively, which would have led the translator to understand it as second person.[82]

But the difference in first and second person does not have anything to do with plene or defective writing here. It would be better to think therefore that the *yôd* might have fallen out by accident,[83] even though this remains unconfirmed. According to Wevers, the Greek translators changed the person to avoid the understanding that God was leaving behind or abandoning his people.[84] Kittel and Noth in the *BH*[85] estimate, on the contrary, that the second person is closest to the original.

In my opinion, the MT is the result of a correction of a literary nature. On the one hand, the formulation in the second person (as a command of God) corresponds completely to the context: Elijah must consecrate Hazael and anoint Elisha (vv. 15-16), and following the description of the vengeance that will come (v. 17), God demands that Elijah (who has already wiped out the prophets of Baal, 18:40) spare the Lord's faithful ones. But on the other hand, this formulation is in disagreement with verse 17, which announces the divine vengeance through Elijah's successors. Therefore, I think that the editor of the proto-MT corrected it and introduced the first person form: it is the Lord himself, in the future, who will leave a remnant.

In this sense, there is a decisive argument that seems to me to be in favor of the antiquity of the LXX and of the secondary character of the MT. My study of 1 Kgs 17–18 showed that one of the specific literary traits of the revision of the MT is the tendency to emphasize the primacy of the divine action over the action and the initiative of the prophet.[86] I believe that this is an explicit case of this type of correction: it is not Elijah who must establish and preserve a faithful remnant, but the Lord himself. If this editorial intervention is of a narrative nature, it uncovers in reality a theological motivation, for it concerns the image of God that is pictured by the account.

Interventions of a Theological Type

The final type of difference concerns the literary interventions of an explicitly theological nature. The first case is found again in verse 2, in the oath pronounced by Jezebel. In the MT, she says, *kh-yʿśwn ʾlhym wkh ywspwn*, "may the gods do this and may they add this . . ." while, according to the LXX, the formulation does not engage the gods but God: *tade poiēsai moi ho theos kai tade prostheiē*, "may God do this to me and may he add this . . ." Other than the presence of *moi*, *ly*, it is the singular that draws attention. The formulation of the LXX affirms that Jezebel swears by the unique and only God.

Two arguments are possible. First, the LXX has introduced the singular to overwhelm Jezebel and to prepare her violent death, which appears like

the carrying out of his oath and the punishment of the God of Israel (2 Kgs 9:30-37).[87] But one must note that Jezebel's death is described as the consequence of the murder of Naboth (1 Kgs 21, 23; 2 Kgs 9–10) without any relation to her oath in chapter 19.[88] The second argument seems to me to be more convincing. The MT wants to protect the image of God and to underline the idolatry of the queen by making her swear by the Baals, because it is not fitting for Jezebel, the idolatrous queen, to swear by the God of Israel.[89] This theological motivation is rooted in the conception that an oath is sworn by one's own deity or deities[90] (cf. Exod 22:10; Deut 10:20; Jer 12:16; Amos 8:14). The inverse change (from plural to singular) is therefore much more difficult to understand.[91] In addition, the same phenomenon repeats itself in 1 Kgs 20[21]:10 in the mouth of Ben-Hadad: *kh-yʿśwn ly ʾlhym wkh ywspw*,[92] *tade poiēsai moi ho theos kai tade prostheiē ei ekpoiēsei*. The tendency toward the correction is coherent: Jezebel and Ben-Hadad are idolaters and swear by their gods.

This theological correction harmoniously completes the portrait of Jezebel just as it appears in this rejoinder (cf. above). If the MT is applied to avoid the formulations that would show the threatening and frightening power of Jezebel, it endeavors to manifest that while serving the Baals and in swearing by them, Jezabel has no relation at all to the God of Israel.[93]

The second case of theological divergence is found in Elijah's two parallel complaints (vv. 10 and 14), where the prophet designates the apostasy of the Israelites as the source of his hopelessness. In the MT, Elijah complains: *ky-ʿzbw brytk bny yśrʾl*, "because the sons of Israel have abandoned your covenant." But, according to the LXX, it is God they have abandoned: *hoti enkatelipon se hoi huioi Israēl*, "for they have abandoned *you*."[94] I have already dealt with this question by tackling the similar case in 1 Kgs 18:18.[95] In fact, in this verse, the formulation is practically identical. Elijah accuses Ahab and his house of having abandoned *ʾt-mṣwt yhwh*, "the commandments of YHWH," in the MT, but *ton kyrion theon hymōn*, "the Lord your God," according to the LXX.

In these three passages, the MT is clearly the witness of a theological correction,[96] which Dominique Barthélemy identifies as the "Deuteronomistic" type.[97] This is an important note in order to qualify the theological background of the editors of the proto-MT. At the time of the most ancient transmission (between the third and second centuries BCE), the editors corrected the biblical text, led by a concern analogous to that of the Deuteronomistic editors.[98]

Conclusion

My goal in studying the textual differences between the MT and the LXX in 1 Kgs 19 has been to retrace the most ancient history of the text: to determine the ancient form and to identify the reasons that motivated the changes to it. The results of the analysis seem to confirm the hypothesis of the antiquity of the LXX and of the editorial character of the MT in the cycle of Elijah. Already on the textual level, if the LXX has the tendency to complete the subjects of the verbs, it seems that the MT gives witness to the naming of characters (vv. 5, 20, 21), to developments of the formulas designating God (vv. 8, 10, 14), and to the narrative harmonizations (v. 5). But it is on the literary level that its secondary nature appears most distinctly. Verses 2-3 are the most reworked in the chapter. If the "plus" attested to by the LXX could have been omitted by accident, it appears that the sense of each one of the forms is very coherent. As to the LXX, Jezebel threatens Elijah as her alter ego and swears by God to kill him. That provokes Elijah's terror. In the MT, Jezebel is less threatening and aggressive, but her apostasy is emphasized, since her oath calls on the gods, on the Baals. These differences are not accidental but come perfectly within the tendency that, throughout the entire Elijah cycle, the MT tends to smooth out the portrait of the king and queen in order to highlight their apostasy. In verse 18, the MT is also secondary: as in 1 Kgs 17–18, the editor seeks to emphasize the supremacy of God's action over that of the prophet. Finally, even if the textual evolution of verse 11 appeals to prudence of judgment, it is likely that the MT sought to make the theophany arrive unexpectedly on the fortieth day of Elijah's journey toward Horeb, just like Moses in Exodus and Deuteronomy. In order to do this, the editor suppressed the delay until the following day, which is attested to by the LXX. In sum, if the literary differences have a bearing on the narrative logic, it is theological reasons that guided the editor of the proto-MT: prophetic theology, the characterization of idolatry, and divine sovereignty.

Based on these results, we prove that text history enters into dialogue with redaction criticism on two levels. First, the establishment of the most ancient textual form immediately leads us to reexamine certain conclusions of redactional analysis. The primitive or later character of certain terms, formulas, or verses (for example, vv. 4 and 8), as well as the attributions of certain rhetorical or theological expressions to some Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic redactors, is sometimes contradicted by the textual witness (vv. 10 and 14). Second, on the level of comparison of literary forms, text

history is methodologically close to redaction criticism. The two methods aim to identify a redaction—text history will speak of *edition*—while seeking to understand the theological or ideological reasons that led the redactor/editor to modify his source text. However, a major difference exists here between the two approaches. Text history compares existing literary forms, attested to by the manuscript tradition. The analysis is based on the objectivity of the textual evidence that it seeks to explain. The literary phenomena that it describes took place between the second half of the third century and the first century BCE, that is to say, between the translation of the books of Kings into Greek and the fixation of the proto-MT. In short, the contribution of textual criticism to the study of the literary history of Kings leads to a better knowledge of the theological characteristics of the final literary form of the Hebrew Bible probably attested to by the MT, if my demonstration is correct.