3 Kingdoms (1 Kings)\(^3\) 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: 24–2). Furthermore, corresponding sections may appear at different positions in 3 Regum and 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.

---

\(^1\) Modern research distinguishes between:
1. Kingdoms α (1 Samuel).
2. Kingdoms ββ (2 Sam 1:1–11:1).
4. Kingdoms γγ (1 Kgs 2:12–21:15) to be referred to below as “3 Kingdoms.”

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 MT\(^5\) 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 Kings 2 (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–
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