FROM THE "OLD LATIN" THROUGH THE "OLD GREEK" TO THE "OLD HEBREW" (2 KINGS 10:23-25)

Julio Trebolle

The different Latin, Greek and Hebrew texts of 2 Kgs 10:23-25 are the starting point for an inquiry into the recensional approaches to the Old Greek text and ultimately to its Hebrew Vorlage. This approach is sometimes only

possible by means of the Old Latin version with the occasional help of some Greek minuscules and other secondary testimonies. We have further to establish the critical value of the Hebrew text represented by the Old Greek (OG) and Old Latin (OL) texts. For that purpose we have to engage in an interdisciplinary dialogue between textual criticism and literary criticism, facing even historical questions relating to the textual variants.  

I

In the *kaige* section (γ6) of the Books of Kings (1 Kgs 22 - 2 Kgs), the text followed by the Codex Vaticanus (LXXB) represents that of the *kaige* recension. According to the scope of this recension its text conforms almost faithfully to that of the Hebrew known to us through MT, except for some minor changes like that of the singular καὶ εὐσήλθεν instead of the plural MT ἡνῆλθαν (v. 24). In v. 23 LXXL adds καὶ d'Aquila*, Studia Evangelica 5, ed. F.L. Cross, TU 103 (Berlin 1968) 176-181; E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian. Toward a New Solution of the Problem", *RB* 79 (1972) 101-113.

έξαποστεύλατε αὐτούς καὶ ἐξηκον οὖν εἴσοδον. In v. 25 a second addition of LXX reads as follows: καὶ οὖν ἦν ἐκεῖ τῶν δούλων κυρίου καὶ ἦς ἔλαλησεν Ιου διὰ ἀλλ’ ἦν δοῦλοι τοῦ Βααλ μονώτατος (cf. v. 23). LXX also transposes v. 24b before v. 24a; the plural of v. 24a καὶ εἰσήλθον (=MT) is immediately followed by the plural ὃς συνετέλεσαν πολλούς, as distinguished from the singular of MT/LXX that = ἄσσεσαν τοῦ νου.

The OL text has as its regular Vorlage a Greek text analogous to the basic text of the Lucanian recension. However, in our case OL exhibits substantial deviations from LXX. OL places v. 24b before vv. 23-24a and ignores the first phrase of v. 25a (MT ἢ διὰ τοῦ ἐξάλησεν Ιου, as well as the addition of LXX in v. 25a. Furthermore the OL addition in v. 23 is very much longer than that of LXX, agreeing twice with phrases of LXX in v. 25a: et eicite omnes servos dæmi = καὶ ἔξαποστεύλατε αὐτοὺς, (et factum est) sicut locutus est Ieu rex = LXX v. 25 καὶ ἦς ἔλαλησεν Ιου, et cum nemo fuisset ibi de servio dæmi = καὶ οὖν ἦν ἐκεῖ τῶν δούλων κυρίου, cf. v. 23 οὖν εἴσοδον. The most impressive fact is that OL here turns out to be the literal translation of a Greek text like that transmitted by mss. h i j n u v x z: καὶ ἔξαποστεύλατε πάντας τοὺς δούλους κυρίου τοὺς εὐρυσκομένους ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ἦς ἔλαλησεν Ιου διὰ οὖν ἦν ἐκεῖ τῶν δούλων κυρίου.


3 The text of OL is that of the Palimpsestus Vindobonensis, according to the transcription of B. Fischer, Palimpsestus Vindobonensis, Texte corrigé d'après la copie nouvelle faite sur le manuscrit même (mai 1942).
-citu. 

24b Et dixit eis quicumq' saluatus fuerit uiororum quos ego trado in manus uestras anima illius pro anima eius erit. 

23 Et intrauit Ieu rex Israel et Ionadab filius Recab in tempulum Bahal et dixit Ieu ad seruos Bahal scrutinate et uidete ne sit uobiscum ex seruis Dmi et eicite omnes seruos Dmi qui inuenti fuerint in tempulum Bahal. Et factum est sicut locutus est Ieu rex et cum nemo fussset ibi de seruis Dmi nisi soli serui Bahal. 

23 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ᾿Ιού καὶ ᾿Ιωναδαβ υἱὸς Ῥηχαβ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Βααλ καὶ ᾿ἐπεν ᾿Ιοῦ τοὺς δούλους τοῦ Βααλ Ἔρευνησατε καὶ ᾿ὅδετε εἶ ᾿ἔστι μεθ᾽ ᾿ὑμῶν τῶν δούλων Κυρίου καὶ ᾿ἐξαποστεύλατε αὐτούς 

καὶ εἶπον Οὐκ εἰσίν τοῦ Βααλ μονώτατοι
καὶ ἐσῆλθεν Ελου 23

καὶ Ἰωναδαβ οὗς Ρηχαβ
εἰς σόλιον τοῦ Βααλ
καὶ εἶπεν
τοὺς δούλους τοῦ Βααλ
"ἐρευνήσατε καὶ ζητεῖτε
eἰ ἐστὶν μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν
tῶν δούλων κυρίου"

ריבא יћוז

רִיחוֹרֵכִּ֖נּוֹ נָכְב
בִּיהַ חַמַל
לְעַבְדֵּי הָבֵּֽ֔ל
חַפְּשָׁה רָאוֹ
פָּר יִשָּׁפָ֖ח עַמָּם
מֵעַבְדֵי חָוָֽה

[5]
24a Et introierunt ut facerent
sacrificia et holocausta

24b Quia Iou estaxen eautus

τρισχιλίους ἀνδρας
ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ
καὶ εἶπεν
'Ανήρ δε ἐὰν διασωθῇ
ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν
δὲν ἐγὼ εἰσάγω
ἐπὶ χεῖρας ὑμῶν
ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ
ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ

24a καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸν οἶκον
τοῦ προσοχθῆσαν τοῦ πολεμάων
τὰ σῶμα καὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα

25a καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσαν
πολοῦντες τὴν ὀλοκαυτωσίν
καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ τῶν δοῦλων κυρίου
καὶ ἂν ἐλάλησεν Iou
ὅτι ἂλλῃ ἢ οἱ δοῦλοι
τοῦ Βααλ μονώτατοι

et dixit rex
precursoribus
et triariis
intrate et percutite
nemo saluetur ex eis.

καὶ εἶπεν Iou
τοῖς παρατρέχουσι
καὶ τοῖς τριστάσσαις
Εἰσελθόντες πατάξατε αὐτοὺς
ἀνήρ μὴ διασωθῆτω ἐξ αὐτῶν.
καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὰ θύματα καὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ ἔταξεν ἐαυτῷ ἐξεῖν "οὐδενὶ ἀνδρὶς τὸ ἵππος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἀνελεῖ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ οὕτως συνετέλεσεν ὁ εὐθεῖος τῆς ὀλοκαυτώσεως ἐνοχάρμων ἀνὴρ καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐξ αὐτῶν.
Julio Trebolle

The last words in OL/LXX \textsuperscript{min}, de servis \textsuperscript{dim} = τῶν δοῦλων κυρίου, reflect the last words of MT before the addition מִבְּרֵד יְהוָה. Prior to that, MT seems to present a double reading עָבָדָה יְהוָה. In fact, the Greek and Latin know only \textsuperscript{mē} \textsuperscript{ā} \textsuperscript{yōmān}, \textit{vobiscum}; in the next addition they have twice \textit{ἐκεῖ}, \textit{ibī}, with the same local reference as MT \textit{nim}, but in two different phrases. The Greek and Latin separated the double reading, ascribing each element to a different phrase. The result is a repetition, indicating one of two possible phenomena: the loss by homoeoteleuton of the portion of text which was embraced between מִבְּרֵד יְהוָה and מִבְּרֵד יְהוָה or the insertion of the same text by the device known as ring-composition.

It is hard to imagine that a Hebrew editor, not to speak of a Greek translator, would create \textit{ex novo} a text so well fitted to the context, allotting each one of the two references of MT עָבָדָה \textit{nim} to two different phrases embracing the inserted gloss. The proof that this is rather a further case of


Following MT, the hexaplaric text adds \textit{δοῦ} A x \textit{γ}, Arm. Sir-Hex.

\textit{ἐκεῖ} = \textit{дум} and \textit{δοῦ} = \textit{nim} are the usual correspondences. In Jehu's speach the narrator uses obviously the adverb \textit{nim}, but in the narrative section the expected adverb is \textit{дум}, as reflected in the Greek \textit{ἐκεῖ}. 

[8]
haplography in the MT is obtained by the analysis of the Hebrew expression which follows thereafter: ...דַּנְיָה always follows a negative ...יִנְיָה (ןַיְנָה / יְנָה) exactly as it is reflected in the Greek version οὐκ ἢν ... ἀλλ' ἢ. This is the rendering characteristic of the OG: דַּנְיָה = ἀλλ' ἢ. The kaige recension shifts to a more distinct rendition of the Hebrew: ὅτι (יו) ἀλλ' ἢ.

a) Apart from our passage, 2 Kgs 10:23, the expression ...דַּנְיָה ...יִנְיָה is found in 16 cases in the kaige sections of I-IV Reigns (2 Sam 11:1 - 1 Kgs 2:11 and 1 Kgs 22 - 2 Kgs).
In 10 instances the recensional version ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ is found, 2 Sam 13:33; 19:29; 21:2; 1 Kgs 22:18 (ὁ ὅτι); 2 Kgs 4:2; 5:15; 14:6; 17:36.39; 23:23. In 5 of these occurrences the pre-lucianic text (LXX L OL Arm.) omits ὅτι, preserving the OG version ἀλλ' ἢ, 2 Sam 19:29; 21:2; 1 Kgs 22:18; 2 Kgs 4:2; 14:6. 8 In the remaining 6 cases the old version is attested

7 Klostermann had already observed that דַּנְיָה has to refer to a preceding negation. But he wrongly found this negative in the correct addition of LXX L in v. 23. A. Klostermann, Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige, KK A III (Nördlingen 1887) 425, followed by N. Schleiel, Die Bücher der Könige, Kurzgefasster Wissenschaftlicher Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments I/3 II. (Wien 1911) 251.

In the remaining cases the omission of ὅτι in other witnesses of the manuscript tradition has to be taken into consideration: 2 Sam 13:33 om. ὅτι q; 2 Kgs 5:15 om. <14>; 17:36 om. d; 17:39 om. B; 23:23 om. <71.246>, n x y ᾿αλλ' ἢ ὅτι.
by the whole manuscript tradition, 2 Sam 12:3; 1 Kgs 22:8.31; 2 Kgs 5:17; 13:7; 19:18.

b) In non-\textit{kaige} sections the Hebrew negative + \textit{DN ḫ} appears 13 times. In 5 instances LXX offers the primitive version \textit{ἀλλ’ ḫ}, 1 Sam 2:10; 8:19; 18:25; 1 Kgs 8:19; 17:12. In the remaining 8 occurrences we find the composite form \textit{ὅτι ἀλλ’ ḫ}, which is expected in the non-\textit{kaige} sections; in fact, in 5 of these cases the old version is preserved by LXX\textsuperscript{L} (OL Arm.) which omits \textit{ὅτι}, 1 Sam 10:19; 21:7; 30:17.22; 1 Kgs 18:18.\textsuperscript{10} In the last three cases the composite form does not seem to be original, 1 Sam 2:30; 12:12; 21:5.\textsuperscript{11}

The assumed addition of LXX\textsubscript{min} OL with the primitive rendering \textit{οὐκ... ἀλλ’ ḫ} proves also to belong to the original Greek version and to be based on a Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} containing the negative + \textit{DN ḫ}. Additional proof is provided by the antiochian text. LXX\textsuperscript{L} is here a typically lucianic amalgam.

\textsuperscript{9} The case of 1 Sam 2:10 is included. LXX presupposes here this Hebrew expression, according to the parallel text Jer 9:23. In 1 Sam 2:30; 10:19; 12:12, MT offers only \textit{ὅ}, and not \textit{DN ḫ}. In 1 Sam. 18:25 K\textsuperscript{Or} 9 MSS \textit{DN ḫ} (MT ilitating).

\textsuperscript{10} 1 Sam 10:19 om \textit{ὅτι} Abcosxa\textsubscript{2}c\textsubscript{2}e\textsubscript{2}, Aeth. OL; 21:7 om. biowyza\textsubscript{2}c\textsubscript{2}e\textsubscript{2}, Arm(uid). Or-gr. Eus.; 30:17 om. begiovvxc\textsubscript{2}e\textsubscript{2}; 30:22 om. bova\textsubscript{2}c\textsubscript{2}e\textsubscript{2}, Aeth.; 1 Kgs 18:18 b\textsuperscript{e}ou, Chr.

\textsuperscript{11} 1 Sam 2:30 om. \textit{ὅ}, Arm. Aeth. Thdt, \textit{οὐχ οὐτως} fmsv, also in a preceding context bgo\textsubscript{2}e\textsubscript{2} Thdt; 12:12 \textit{ἀλλ’ ḫ} \textit{ὅτι} in an inverted order; this fact proves the independence of the variants (cf. 1 Sam 10:19; 2 Sam 19:29) om. \textit{ὅτι} Afrm\textsuperscript{b}swya\textsubscript{2}, Aeth(uid); 21:5 \textit{ὅτι} πλην bg\textsubscript{2}oc\textsubscript{2}a\textsubscript{2}, \textit{ὅτι} \textit{κατ} deflmp-tw.
a mixture of the *kaige* (LXX$^B$) and the Old Greek text. To the *kaige* text belongs the expression of LXX$^L$ in v. 25 ὅτι ἄλλῃ ἴν οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ Βααλ μονήταιοι, duplicating the same expression of the OG in v. 23. To the OG belongs the phrase καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἔκει τῶν δούλων κυρίου καθ' ὡς ἐλάλησεν Ισρ. Slightly differing from the OG in v. 23, LXX$^L$ turns out to be also a witness to the OG. 12

The OG text of v. 23 fits perfectly in the preceding and following context. Jehu orders the devotees of Baal to inquire if there are any devotees of Yahweh "with them" and to expel all who were found "there". This order is immediately executed, "according to what Jehu had told". Then, "when there were no devotees of Yahweh "there", but only devotees of Baal, these proceeded to offer sacrifices and holocausts". The stories of Jehu (2 Kgs 9 - 10) like those of the cycles of Elijah and Elisha are characterized by the frequent use of the literary structure "order - execution" and the perfect correspondence of the discursive and narrative parts (imperative - wayyiqtol). It could be said that a Hebrew editor, well trained in this narrative technique, inserted here the explicit reference to the fulfillment of Jehu's orders. In such a case we cannot but admire the artistic and technical skills of this Hebrew glossator, who mastered

likewise the technique of the ring-composition and supplied the needed negation to the following ...ונ ז. It could still be said that the construction of MT is absolutely normal, with ש ד folly fulfilling the function of the expected negation, as in 1 Kgs 17:12 ש ד. MT obviously retains a certain intelligibility and grammatical correctness, without which the same haplography would not have occurred. However, the resultant phrase in MT sounds rather hard. The stylistic gifts of the narrator of 2 Kgs 9 - 10, recognized by H. Gunkel, are so great as to constitute a valid, even if negative, criterion to discount those readings that also for other reasons appear as unworthy of the author's narrative art. Finally, when referring to the argument from presumed glosses and tendencies ("Tendenzkritik"), the assumption of an omission of a rather cumbersome allusion to the presence of devotees of Yahweh among the pagan worshippers seems more feasible than the assumption of glossing by a later editor on such a disturbing conduct by devotees of Yahweh.

II

In v. 24 the plural of MT וּלְפָּדְתָּם can refer to the worshippers of Baal, to an impersonal subject (those present in Baal's temple), or to Jehu accompanied by Jehonadab.

In v. 25 the singular suffix of MT יִהְיֶה כָּלְלָתוֹ takes for granted that Jehu offered the holocaust, thus favouring the singular reading of LXX in v. 24a καὶ εἰς ἱερὰς, which many modern critics and translators are eager to accept. Those critics at large do not pay attention here to the lucianic text, so successfully discredited by A. Rahlfs since 1911; they refer in passing to the lucianic "large supplement" (Montgomery), "embellishing expansions" (Stade) or "erweiternde Zusätzte" (Benzinger). The omission of this passage in Rahlfs' study on the lucianic text strikes one as rather odd. In LXX the phrases of vv. 24a and 25a


15 J. Montgomery, The Books of Kings (1951) 415; B. Stade, The Books of Kings (1904) 232; I. Benzinger, Die Bücher der Könige (1899) 154; Klostermann declares the text of LXX in v. 25 as "Zusatz, um den Mord auf die Götzendiener zu
follow each other, so that v. 24b precedes v. 24a καὶ εὐσήλθον... τοῦ ποιήσαι τὰ θύματα καὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσαν πολλοὺνες τῆν ὀλοκαυτώσων... OL for its part presents also the plural reading et introiemunt and reverses in a different way the order of verses, so that v. 24b precedes v. 23.

V. 24b has therefore three different locations: TM/LXX\textsuperscript{B} 23.24ab.25; LXX\textsuperscript{L} 23.24b.24a.25; OL 24b.23.24a.25.

V. 24b begins with an inversion x-\textit{qatal} ... יש והנה, that denotes a pause in the narrative. The whole of v. 24b has the character of a parenthesis. Its contents can be accommodated to the different contexts in which it appears: there it is said that Jehu posted soldiers "outside" (MT LXX\textsuperscript{B}) or in a "hide-out" (LXX\textsuperscript{L}) and threatened them with death-penalty if a single one of the Baal worshippers would escape.

In MT (LXX\textsuperscript{B}) these data (v. 24b) are placed between the two correlative phrases of v. 24a and 25a:
- v. 24a רומא ידועים יעה ועה
- v. 25a יהוה כצל חן לעשה

The interjection of v. 24b between these phrases does not allow any doubt about the singular subject (Jehu) of v. 25a. The story according to MT tells us that Jehu "entered" the temple of Baal with Jehonadab (v. 23), both proceeded to

beschränken", A. Klostermann, \textit{Die Bücher Samuels und der Könige} (1887) 425. According to Stade, the additions of LXX\textsuperscript{L} in vv. 22ff. are due to a wish to emphasize the extermination of the heathen, B. Stade, 231f.
offer sacrifices and holocausts (24a) and finally Jehu alone is said to have finished offering the holocaust (25a). If this should reflect the original form of the story, it seems rather strange that two "comings" (καιροί) are referred to, apparently with the same subject, but in the first case the verb being singular and in the second plural.

The singular of LXX seems to be more consistent with the context, but it is certainly not original. At least this singular has the advantage of not leaving room for doubt about the subject of v. 24, otherwise the reader would imagine that the plural subject of 24a could be the worshippers of Baal. In fact, the foregoing phrase reports on those worshippers in Baal's temple, who then "proceeded" (v. 23) to offer sacrifices to Baal. The OG turns this assumption into certainty. According to the OL those who proceeded to offer the sacrifices were the worshippers of Baal. A short text, without the first phrase of v. 25, provides a direct sequence of events and a close relationship between the phrases: et introierunt ut facerent sacrificia et holocausta et dixit rex praecursoribus et triariis intrate et percute eos nemo saluetur ex eis. As soon as the baalists "entered", Jehu ordered the soldiers to "enter" and sacrifice all of them.

The location of v. 24b before v. 23 suits the progress

16 The reading of OL LXX nemo saluetur ex eis = ἀνηρ μὴ διασωθήτω ἐξ αὐτῶν corresponds to MT LXX nemo ἵνα σῶση = ἀνήρ μὴ ἐξελθάτω ἐξ αὐτῶν. The OG preserves here the same expression as in v. 24b (saluatus fuerit – διασώθη – ὑπερ, once ὑπερ; ?), whereas MT LXX have in v. 25 the verb "go out" (κατα – ἐξελθάτω), while in MT the counterpart to ἐξ αὐτῶν (διασώθη) is lacking.

[15]
of the plot better. Jehu orders appropriate vestments to be brought out for all the devotees of Baal and posts soldiers in a hide-out outside the temple. Jehu enters with Jehonadab and orders all yahwists present there to be expelled. As the worshippers of Baal enter to offer the sacrifices, Jehu orders the soldiers to enter and destroy all of them. The plot follows a direct movement from outside into the temple, without any flash-back. In the MT arrangement, on the contrary, v. 24b becomes a backward step, reminiscent of something which happened previously.

The transition in the OL from v. 24a directly to v. 25 is attested also by LXX. This provides a further proof that the MT location of v. 24b between vv. 24a and 25a is not a fixed datum in the textual tradition nor is it suitable in the course of the narration. However, the arrangement of verses and phrases in LXX is a new and secondary mixture of MT and OG elements. The pluses located by LXX at v. 25a belong to the text of v. 23 (cf. LXX min OL). The OG version may then be reconstructed as:

'Ερευνήσατε καὶ έδεστε εἰ ἔστι μεθ' ὑμῶν τῶν δούλων κυρίου καὶ ἐξαποστείλατε πάντας τοὺς δούλους κυρίου τοὺς εὐρυσκομένους ἐκεῖ καὶ ἔγενετο καθ’ ὡς ἐλάλησεν Ιου καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ τῶν δούλων κυρίου ἀλλ’ ἐὰν ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Βααλ μονώτατοι καὶ εἰσῆλθον τοῦ ποὺ ἔστη τὰ χώματα καὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ εἶπεν Ιου τοῖς παρατρέχουσι καὶ τοῖς τριστάταις Ἐσελθόντες πατάξατε αὐτοὺς ἁνὴρ μὴ διασωθήτω ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπάταξεν (-αν)... (v. 24b precedes v. 23 according to OL).

[16]
The conciseness, liveliness, dramatic vigour and internal logic of this form of the story speak for themselves. In a perfect structure of order-execution, the question if there were any yahwists among the baalists corresponds to the immediate verification that there were no yahwists on the spot. As the worshippers of Baal enter, so the soldiers enter after them.

From a historical point of view, the distinctive mark of this form of the story is the radicalism with which Jehu conducts himself and carries out his plot. Jehu does not participate in the pagan worship. Those who proceed (καὶ) to offer the sacrifices are exclusively the baalists. Even more, Jehu could not have given time to the baalists to perform their pagan cults. According to OL, as soon as they proceed to the offering, Jehu's soldiers proceed to their sacrifice. But the first phrase of v. 25, יְהִי כָּלָלָה לְשָׁוְתַו הָעֵלָה, even if wanting in OL, could very well have belonged to the OG in the plural form of LXX: καὶ ἐξέτετο ὡς συνετέλεσαν πολλοί τε τῆν ὀλοκαύτωσιν. Jehu's way of acting is the most consistent with the radicalism of his religious reform. It is true that Jehu had promised "to offer a great sacrifice to Baal, a greater one than that which Ahab had ever done" (v. 19a), in order to mislead the worshippers of Baal. But this ploy is to be no more than a trick; the deceit succeeds in the assemblage of all the devotees of Baal. V. 21 accounts for the fulfilment of Jehu's order and the success of his trick: "all the devotees of Baal arrived, not a man was left who did not attend". What
follows has nothing to do with the previous trick. The effective accomplishment of the false promise is absolutely superfluous, it minimizes the astuteness of the stratagem, and contradicts the aims and spirit of Jehu's reform. The picture of a champion of a religious revolution by fire and sword, who offers a sacrifice to Baal along with the most fanatical rekabite Jehonadab, does not correspond to reality.

The plural הָעֲדָד (MT), a "lectio difficilior" in its context, has been preserved in MT, in spite of the loss of the preceding phrases specifying this plural subject as the Baal's worshippers. However, this loss evokes hesitation on the subsequent subject of the action; this is to be dissipated in the following phrases. Jehu now becomes the only protagonist and worshipper to Baal. This change is favoured by past records of the story. In v. 23 it was noted that "Jehu went into the temple of Baal", and v. 19 had recorded a promise by Jehu of offering a great sacrifice to Baal.

Furthermore, the presence of v. 24b, with Jehu as subject, smoothes the path to the initial phrase of v. 25. Here Jehu appears offering alone the sacrifice to Baal. Only after having performed the pagan ceremony all the way, does he order the soldiers to proceed manu militari against his correligionists for the occasion. In this way the prophetic and deuteronomistic doom against Jehu's pagan cults found also a historical justification (cf. vv. 29.31). The reading καὶ εὐσῆλθεν is a further step in the same tendency of MT to assign to Jehu the chief role in the offering to Baal. Modern
critics, who follow the variant of LXX\textsuperscript{B}, ascribe to the B text an original status, which it does not have in the \textit{kaige}-section; moreover, they extend the tendency emerging in the proto-masoretic text, that makes of Jehu an inconsistent and ridiculous character, caught in his own trap, quite the opposite of the hawkish and astute hero, undefiled by pagan apostasies and deserving God's praise: "Since you have done properly what was pleasing in my sight..." (v. 30).

Internal criticism alone confirms the conclusions of this study. They receive further credibility in the light of the parallel history of the Hebrew and Greek text, such as is now known through the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls (in particular 4Q Sam\textsuperscript{abc} and the Nahal Ŧever Dodekapropheton). It appears now likely that OL can bear a unique witness to the OG; its \textit{Vorlage} was a non-\textit{kaige} text, analogous to the basis of the lucianic recension. Via the OL, LXX\textsuperscript{L} and other Greek mss., the Hebrew of Chronicles, the Greek of Josephus, and occasional readings of the Armenian and Syro-hexaplaric versions, we now have access to the OG text in 2 Kgs. This OG text reflects a form of the Hebrew different from MT, but no less original. In some cases, more frequent than is generally admitted, this "traditio non recepta" preserves the better and "older Hebrew". In our case, in 2 Kgs 10:23-25, it preserves an older version of the story with better stylistic qualities and closer to the related facts of the history.
To sum up, the only way to trace the OG text and its Hebrew Vorlage in 2 Kgs 10.23-25a, is by means of OL, sustained by the Greek mss. h i j n u v z y B and partly by the lucianic text. MT has suffered here a homoeoteleuton, reflected also in the kaige text of LXX B. In v. 24, however, MT preserves the plural reading "נְמֵי" (= LXX L), a lectio difficilior in its context, but perfectly understandable in the original context reflected by the OG. In this as well as in other cases in 2 Kgs, OL, through the OG, reflects an Old Hebrew text. Finally, this Old Hebrew text, partly surviving in MT "נְמֵי", related in 2 Kgs 10:23ff. not to Jehu's offering to Baal (MT), but Jehu's slaughter of the baalists even before they could offer their sacrifice to Baal (LXX).