The book of Kings contains many passages of Deuteronomistic provenance, ranging from theological verdicts on individual kings to lengthy orations and reflections. These texts are generally held to represent a later stage in the compositional history of the book. For that reason they are of special significance for assessing the text-historical relationship between the oldest witnesses to the text of Kings, i.e., MT and the LXX. In theory, differences regarding the representation and distribution of the Deuteronomistic material may reveal whether 3 Regum represents a literary stage in the development of the book that either precedes or follows that reflected by 1 Kings.

It is evident that this question can only be addressed satisfactorily when all the Deuteronomistic texts in 1 and 2 Kings are taken into consideration. Such an enterprise goes beyond the scope of this study. However, since the question also affects the text-historical assessment of chs. 1–11, a few remarks are in order here.

The vast majority of Deuteronomistic texts are represented in 1 Kings and 3 Regum alike. A few passages are lacking in 3 Regum: 6: 11–14; 14: 7–11, 14–16. Conversely, 3 Regum contains no Deuteronomistic materials that do not appear in 1 Kings. Small-scale differences (mostly word differences) are scattered about the materials shared by both witnesses. In this respect the Deuteronomistic texts do not differ from the non-Deuteronomistic ones.

This state of affairs allows us to conclude that the version offered by 3 Regum does not precede the stage of Deuteronomistic activity as a whole. However, since 3 Regum contains less Deuteronomistic material than 1 Kings there is a possibility that the Greek version reflects a stage in the formative history of the book that is prior to one (i.e., the final) phase of Deuteronomistic activity.

Nowadays most redaction critics agree that Kings, and indeed the Deuteronomistic History as a whole, underwent several Deuteronomistic
redactions.\textsuperscript{1} Opinions, however, differ on the rationale behind these redactions and the materials produced by them. We need not discuss the wide range of redactional theories that have been advanced over the last fifty years; here it suffices to say that none of the many Deuteronomistic layers proposed by redaction critics coincides with the Deuteronomistic materials (pluses/minuses and word-differences) unique to 1 and 2 Kings and lacking from 3 and 4 Regum. This does not rule out that some editorial connection between parts of this material exists; in fact, such a possibility is considered in ch. 9 (6: 11–14) of this study. Yet, as a whole this material is too diverse in form and content to assign it to one redactional layer. Moreover, some of the elements prove to be tightly connected with Deuteronomistic passages that are actually represented in 3 Regum. From the viewpoint of redaction criticism there is no good reason to ascribe these elements to a separate redactional stage. Trebolle Barrera’s assertion that recensional history takes priority over redaction criticism,\textsuperscript{2} so that, with regard to Kings, redactional theory should take its point of departure with the text of 3 Regum rather than with that of 1 Kings, must be dismissed on two grounds: 1. It does not do justice to the position of literary criticism as an independent discipline which analyzes, or at least should analyze, all versions of a biblical book unprejudiced; 2. It is based on the presupposition that the version of 3 Regum is anterior to that of 1 Kings, which should be proven first.

While the text of 3 Regum does not seem to predate any Deuteronomistic redactional stage present in Kings, it may precede the appearance of single passages of Deuteronomistic tone in Kings, or it may offer an earlier version of a Deuteronomistic text that it shares with Kings. In previous chapters we discussed some of these passages: 1 Kgs. 6: 11–14; 8: 58; 9: 4; 11: 1–8, 33. None of them could convincingly be shown to reflect a textual situation secondary to that of 3 Regum, however.