CHAPTER TWO

GREEK OR HEBREW TEXTUAL CHANGES

There are a number of variants which it is impossible to put into one clear-cut category. At some point along the textual line changes of various kinds have evidently taken place in the text, but whether within the course of Heb or Gk transmission it is now hard to determine.

1. Assimilation

The context or a similar passage elsewhere sometimes moulds the text to a different shape.

(a) Substitution

I 2.42 מिशר : Marœisa B O, assimilated to M.² מִרְשָׁא (Rudolph). Benzinger, Kittel, Rothstein and Goettsberger change with Par, striking out אֲבָא as a gloss.

12.3 פְּלִס : Ιωφάλη (not -et, as BH prints) G, assimilated to the beginning of אֶלֶי just before in the Vorlage or to Iωηλ. Rothstein suggested that ν has been lost in MT after ν, comparing the form אַלֶי, but this is less likely.

24.15/14 בחיר : Xηζεων B, corresponding to a Vorlage יְזִית according to BH. The form has been influenced either by יִבְךָ in v. 17 or by Iαχεων* in v. 16. For the Heb name see Rudolph’s comment.

25.25 נַחֲנָה : 'Avavias G R. Cf. v. 23 נַחֲנָה : 'Avavias G O L.

29.14 טֵבָר : δ ῥαὸς σου G O. Either this stands for תֵבָר, influenced by v. 17f., or else μου LR is original and σου has been influenced by σου at the end of v. 13.

v. 20 Αλαβίς (יויחו) : (κύριον) τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν G O. Either Αλαβίς (BH) is presupposed under the influence of v. 16 Υν Αλαβίς; or ὑμῶν L R is original and has been assimilated to κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

II 1.9 דָּבָר : τὸ δοματί σου G O R. Cf. I 17.24 רָאָם ... שְׁמֶךָ. G O omit, but the clause once stood in Par.¹

¹ See p. 55.
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7.9 ... וַיָּשֹּ֖ךְ : כָּלָ֝הּ וַיָּשֹּ֗ךְ G O L R. Cf. v. 7 וַיָּשֹּ֖ךְ : וַיָּשֹּ֗ךְ twice, and v. 8 וַיָּשֹּ֙ךְ : כָּלָ֝הּ וַיָּשֹּ֗ךְ.

18.8 מְלָךְ אֲשֶׁר לֶאֱוִיאֵל יְשַׁעַיְאֵל : δ ἔβασιλεὺς G R, influenced by מְלָךְ : δ ἔβασ. at the end of v. 7.

20.37 τὰ πλοῖα σοῦ G O (L) R = perhaps אֲשֶׁר (BH), assimilated to מְלָךְ. Or else τὸ ἐργον σοῦ G O was the magnet.

31.4 כָּלָהּ וַיָּשֹּ֙ךְ קַאֲשָׁר מָרָ֣ב? The number has been mechanically assimilated to the next verb קַאֲשָׁר : κατασχύσας/ὡς.

34.33 ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ καὶ ἐν Ἰσραήλ G O L (R). Cf. v. 32 καλότερες ἡμέρας. Four Heb mss. so read here. On the other hand the two names are notorious variants in Gk mss because of the similarity of their abbreviated forms ἸΑΗ and ἸΗΑ. At some stage the correction has slipped into the text alongside the error.

ibid. ... וַיָּשֹּׁךְ בַּאֲשֶׁר : אֶצֶקֶלעֵן ... וַיָּשֹּׁךְ G O L R. Cf. v. 2 אֲשֶׁר .בַּאֲשֶׁר : אֶצֶקֶלעֵן. After the verb was adapted either the suffix or the pronoun was made singular.

36.19 יְרֵשׁ ... וַיָּשֹּׁךְ : כָּלָהּ וַיָּשֹּׁךְ וַיָּשֹּׁךְ G O L R ... κ. κατέσκαψεν G O L ... וַיָּשֹּׁךְ G O L R. In the first two cases h has plurals. The verbs have been conformed to the singulars before and after.

(b) Addition

I 6.33/48 לֶאֱוִיאֵל יְשַׁעַיְאֵל : εἰς πᾶσαν ἔργασιάν λειτουργίας G O R. Either לֶאֱוִיאֵל יְשַׁעַיְאֵל (Rothstein) is presupposed, in which case לֶאֱוִיאֵל has come in from v. 34/49, or else the original Gk was εἰς π. λειτουργίαν* and ἐργ. came in from εἰς π. ἔργασιάν in the next verse, and λ. was made genitive.1

15.24 לֶאֱוִיאֵל : + τοῦ θεοῦ G O L R. The fuller phrase occurs earlier in the verse.

16.4 בַּאֲשֶׁר : τῆς κυβοῦτος διαθήκης κυρίου G O L R. Rothstein takes the fuller phrase back to the Vorlage. Cf. 15.28f.

v. 9 הַאֲשֶׁר שָׂפָה : + δ ἐποίησεν κύριος G O L R. Cf. v. 12 הַאֲשֶׁר שָׂפָה : (BH). κύριος is doubtless a Gk amplification (contra BH) linked with the Gk omission of מְלָךְ v. 8.

17.4 לֶאֱוִיאֵל : +ἐν αὐτῷ G O L R. Cf. II 2.2/3 לֶאֱוִיאֵל : κατακεκυάσει ἐν αὐτῷ.

23.5 מְלָךְ : + τῷ κυρίῳ G O (L) R. Cf. the phrase ἐν κυρίῳ ἀλήθεια.

1 S. Daniel, Le Vocabulaire du culte, p. 90 note 114, suggests a longer Gk rendering for clarity's sake.