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A Touch of Chronicles:  
The Provenance of 3 Reigns 10:26–26a

P. S. F. van Keulen

Abstract: At 3 Rgns 10:26 the LXX offers a text that does not match the Hebrew of the corresponding passage 1 Kgs 10:26. Comparison with Chronicles shows that 3 Rgns 10:26–26a closely corresponds to a Hebrew text which is presented by the synoptic parallel to 1 Kgs 10:26 at 2 Chron 9:25. Moreover, the Greek translation of 2 Chron 9:25–26 appears to be virtually identical with the text of 3 Rgns 10:26–26a.

This paper examines the text-historical relationship between the aforementioned texts. It is argued that 3 Rgns 10:26–26a is a real translation of 2 Chron 9:25–26 rather than a rendering of a different Vorlage of 1 Kgs 10:26. Certain semantic-exegetical features of the Greek text suggest that it originated in 3 Rgns and was subsequently taken over by Paralipomena. Nevertheless, 3 Rgns 10:26–26a is more likely to derive from a later reviser than from the original translator of 3 Rgns. It is proposed that this editor replaced the original translation of 1 Kgs 10:26 by a rendering of 2 Chron 9:25–26 in order to bolster the image of Solomon as a mighty ruler. The paper concludes with discussing two texts, namely 3 Rgns 9:5b and 2 Rgns 8:4a, which by virtue of their affinity with 3 Rgns 10:26–26a are also capable of throwing light on the background of the passage in question.

I

The passage under consideration appears in a section describing Solomon's fame, wealth and military power. When we compare the Greek text of vv. 23–27 with the corresponding Hebrew text of the MT, it is at once clear that the texts are different in various respects:
From v. 23 to v. 25 the Greek follows the Hebrew rather closely. There are a few minor differences: at v. 23, "מָלְאָךְ" is not represented in the Greek text; at v. 24, LXX has a plus over against the MT: בַּאֲשֵׁרָה; and at v. 25 a rendering of כִּמָּה is missing in the LXX. From v. 26 onward the differences are bigger. In the first place the
LXX has no counterpart to the first clause of MT v. 26: “And Solomon assembled chariots and horses.” Also at v. 26, the LXX makes mention of 4,000 broodmares for chariots, whereas the MT speaks of 1,400 chariots. The most notable difference obtains at 3 Rgns 10:26a, where the LXX has an extensive plus vis-à-vis the MT. At v. 27 both texts seem to converge again, the LXX having the plus “and the gold.”

When we compare vv. 26–26a with the Chronicles text running parallel to 1 Kgs 10:26, that is, 2 Chron 9:25–26, it is surprising to see that the Hebrew of Chronicles exactly matches the Greek text of vv. 26–26a. Apparently, the LXX at vv. 26–26a has translated a Hebrew text identical with 2 Chron 9:25–26 but different from 1 Kgs 10:26. Moreover, the Greek text of vv. 26–26a appears to be virtually identical with the Greek translation of the Chronicles passage at 2 Par 9:25–26. How to explain this most curious state of affairs? This paper aims at finding an answer to that question.

Before we concentrate on the background of the Greek text we must briefly deal with the question of the relationship between the Hebrew texts in 2 Chron and 1 Kgs. Where did the Chronicler get his text of ch. 9:25–26 from? In figure 2 the left column sets out the text of 2 Chron 9:24–27, whereas the right column provides the parallel passages from Kings.
Through most of 2 Chron 9, the Chronicler’s account parallels 1 Kgs 10. Vv. 25–26, however, clearly diverge from what Kings offers at the corresponding position at ch. 10. Only the second part of v. 25 takes up material from 1 Kgs 10:26.¹ The first part of v. 25 probably draws on 1 Kgs 5:6, while v. 26 might go back to 1 Kgs 5:1a. The most notable difference between the parallel texts concerns the number of stalls; the 40,000 at 1 Kgs 5:6 has been reduced to 4,000 in 2 Chron 9:25.

We see that the Chronicler’s text through vv. 24–27 is a partial parallel to MT 1 Kgs 10. Now it is important to note that the Chronicler has included the material of 1 Kgs 10:26–29 earlier in his account, namely at 2 Chron 1:14–17. In contrast to 2 Chron 9, the passage at ch. 1 is a rather faithful reproduction of the text of 1 Kgs 10:26–29.

So we find that the section covering 1 Kgs 10:26–28 has been rendered twice in Chronicles: the first time at 2 Chron 1 (vv. 14–16), and the second time at 2 Chron 9 (vv. 25–28). The latter section however is not a strict parallel to 1 Kgs 10, but takes up material from 1 Kgs 5 as well.

¹However see Josephus, Ant. VIII, 4, where it appears that in the Hebrew text used by Josephus, 1 Kgs 5:6 was followed by a passage identical with 1 Kgs 10:26b (=2 Chron 9:25b; 1:14b).
The Provenance of 3 Reigns 10:26-26a

The strong similarities between 3 Rgns 10:26-26a and the parallel texts in 2 Chron 9 and 2 Par 9 give rise to several questions about their interrelation. The identity of 2 Par 9:25-26 and 3 Rgns 10:26-26a especially calls for an explanation. Before we focus on that problem, however, we should deal with another question first: do vv. 26-26a present a true translation of 2 Chron 9:25-26, or do they rather follow a Hebrew text in the Vorlage of 3 Rgns that was similar to the Chronicler's text? The issue here is not whether the Hebrew Vorlage already saw the adoption of the Chronicler's passage into vv. 26 and 26a or not. The question rather is whether the Vorlage of our Greek verses originally consisted of a Hebrew text of the same type as 2 Chron 9:25-26.

There are good reasons to answer this question in the negative. In the first place, when the distribution of all the materials relating to the numbers of Solomon's horses and chariots over each biblical book is taken into consideration, this distribution proves to be particularly unbalanced in 3 Rgns. The argument has been put forward by D. W. Gooding in "Text-sequence and Translation-revision in 3 Rgns IX 10–X 33," VT 19 (1969), 448–63, esp. 460–61.

Some explanation is in order here. The books of 1 Kgs, 2 Chron, and 2 Par all contain two types of passages. One category refers to 4,000 or 40,000 stalls (or mares) for chariots. The other category says that Solomon gathered chariots and horses, and it speaks of 1,400 chariots owned by Solomon. Either category is represented by one passage in each book, except for 3 Rgns. At the position where the other books exhibit a passage of the second category (1 Kgs 10:26; 2 Chron 9:25; 2 Par 9:25), 3 Rgns offers a passage of the first category (3 Rgns 10:26). As a result, this book lacks a passage of the second category, but exhibits two passages of the first category. Since the situation in 3 Rgns 10:26 is directly responsible for the textual imbalance in 3 Rgns, v. 26 is less likely to represent the original Hebrew as well as the MT does.
Second, if it is assumed that vv. 26–26a render a Hebrew text in the Vorlage of 3 Rgns, the conclusion is difficult to resist that 2 Chron 9:25–26 reproduces that Hebrew text. This view, however, has problematic implications. As was noted above, the passage at 2 Chron 1:14–17 is generally traced to 1 Kgs 10:26–28. If a Hebrew text identical with 2 Chron 9:25–26 originally held the position of 1 Kgs 10:26, the possibility is ruled out that 2 Chron 1:14–17 derives from a different Hebrew text in the same position. Where would the Chronicles paragraph come from then? Could it present an original creation of the Chronicler himself? This view has the improbable implication that the counterpart of 2 Chron 1:14–17 in 1 Kgs 10:26–29 was borrowed from Chronicles rather than the other way around. Perhaps the Chronicler had among his source-material two different versions of Samuel-Kings each presenting a different text-tradition at 1 Kgs 10:26. The Chronicler may have employed both text-traditions in his account, presenting one in its authentic setting and moving the other to 2 Chron 1:14–17. The great majority of scholars, however, do not endorse the view that the Chronicler had at his disposal two divergent versions of (the prototype of) Samuel-Kings. Generally, 2 Chron 1:14–17 is considered to have been borrowed from MT 1 Kgs 10:26f.

Therefore, vv. 26–26a are more likely to be a rendering of 2 Chron 9:25–26 than of an original passage in the Hebrew Vorlage. Now this conclusion does not imply that vv. 26–26a necessarily represent the original Greek translation of the Chronicles passage.

---


10Thus H. Hrozny, Die Abweichungen des Codex Vaticanus vom hebräischen Text in den Königsbüchern (dis.), (Leipzig 1909), 28.

11H. G. M. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, NCeB (Grand Rapids, 1982), 196, 236. Especially Japhet (523–24, 532) and Kalimi (252) point out that the duplication of 1 Kgs 10:26f. in Chronicles serves a literary purpose.
It will be remembered that the Greek of 2 Par 9:25–26 is virtually identical with 3 Rgns 10:26–26a. This leaves room for the possibility that the passage in Reigns was directly borrowed from 2 Par 9:25–26. In fact, the simplest way to account for the Greek text in vv. 26–26a is by regarding it as a duplicate of the Paralipomena passage. Nevertheless, we should also admit the possibility that 3 Rgns 10:26–26a presents the original Greek text, which in a later stage was taken over by 2 Par 9:25–26.

In order to decide the issue, we may first ask which of both possibilities is most likely to accord with the general pattern of the relationship between Reigns and Paralipomena. It is a well-known fact that the Greek of both translations is conspicuously similar in the synoptic portions. If the text of Paralipomena in these passages can be shown to have predominantly been drawn from 3 Rgns, it is extremely likely that 2 Par 9:25–26 too presents a duplicate of the parallel passage in 3 Rgns. However, research into these translations has revealed that their relation is both complicated and ambiguous. Scholars have found that the text of Reigns influenced Paralipomena, but also that sometimes the reverse is the case, even to the extent that Reigns shows more affinity with MT Chronicles than with MT Samuel-Kings.

This state of affairs means that we must rely on concrete clues in our passages that may give us insight into their text-historical relation. Thus it may be asked which of both passages

---


7A few scholars take this view: I. Benzinger, Die Bücher der Chronik, KHC 20, (Tübingen, 1901), 95; G. Krautwurst, Studien zu den Septuaginta- zusätzen in I. (3.) König e 2 und ihren Paralleltexten (diss.) (Mainz, 1977), 189; Rehm, Untersuchungen, 98.

regarding vocabulary and diction fits in best with the broad context of the translation unit to which it belongs. The passage revealing expressions, terms, etc. that are unusual for its translation context may be most likely to be secondary to it.

In my view, certain features of the Greek of the parallel passage suggest that the translation has a better chance to be original in 3 Rgns than in Paralipomena:

1. The most important indication involves the Greek renderings of the term ἄμματα, "stall," "crib," in 2 Chron 9:25 and 3 Rgns 10:26. In Chronicles, the only other occurrence of ἄμαξ appears in 2 Chron 32:28. There, the Greek translator rendered it as φατνη, "crib," "trough." This translation reflects an understanding of the word utterly different from what is shown by the rendering θηλεια, "female," which in 2 Par 9:25 occurs in the phrase θηλεια ἄμαξι, "mares." The same phrase θηλεια ἄμαξι is found in 3 Rgns 10:26. Within the setting of 3 Rgns, θηλεια ἄμαξι can be found to be conceptually similar to the Greek translation of σφήνα ὡν in 1 Kgs 5:6 (cf. 3 Rgns 2:46i) by τοξοδές ἄμαξι. Thus it may seem that the rendering θηλεια is better at home in 3 Rgns than in 2 Par. We will return to this issue later.

2. The phrase εἰς ἄμματα in 3 Rgns 10:26 and 2 Par 9:25 does not present an exact translation of the Hebrew found at 2 Chron 9:25 שבעה. The same Greek phrase is found in 3 Rgns 2:46i, where in all likelihood it matches רַבִּים of 1 Kgs 5:6 as a translation. It is tempting to assume that εἰς ἄμματα in 3 Rgns 10:26 was copied from 2:46i.

3. The second part of 2 Chron 9:25 parallels the second part of 2 Chron 1:14b. The translator of the latter passage read the verb form שָׁבַע and rendered it as κατέλαβεν στόκα. In 2 Par 9:25 and 3 Rgns 10:26, however, the same verb is rendered as εἴδε το στόκα/στόκος. Furthermore, the Hebrew expression יְהַבֹּר, "he had," which 2 Par 1:14 has translated as καὶ ἐγένετο στόκος, is rendered in 2 Par 9:25 by καὶ ἥραν τῷ Σαλσάπα. These variations in rendering do not necessarily point to the activity of two different translators. All the same, they emphatically suggest the possibility.

---


10Josephus, when paraphrasing 1 Kgs 5:6, likewise translates the Hebrew term as φατνη (Ant. VIII, 41).
4. Two observations suggest that the verses immediately preceding 2 Par 9:25–26 were taken from the corresponding verses of 3 Rgns. First, ἴππος in 2 Par 9:24 is a term occurring only here throughout the entire book. The standard equivalent used by Paralipomena for Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל, “spices,” is ἀρωμάτα. In 3 Rgns, on the other hand, ἴππος appears four times as an equivalent of מִנְיָם. Furthermore, the term ἱερατεύμα in 1 Kgs 10:24 and 2 Chron 9:23 is represented by ἄρωματα in both Greek translations. Elsewhere in Paralipomena, ἱερατεύμα is consistently rendered as σωματα (cf. v. 22). 2 Par 9:23 is the only instance in the books where ἄρωματα appears as an equivalent of ἱερατεύμα. In 3 Rgns, on the other hand, ἄρωματα is often found as a rendering of ἱερατεύμα. If the translation of 2 Chron 9:22–24 basically reproduces the corresponding passage of 3 Rgns, there is a good chance that vv. 25–26 too are based on the Reigns parallel.

Admittedly, none of the above observations as such is conclusive evidence in favour of the view that 2 Par 9:25–26 was copied from 3 Rgns 10:26–26a rather than the other way around. Nevertheless, taken together they may be a strong indication in favour of the originality of the Reigns passage.

The next question that must be dealt with is whether 3 Rgns 10:26–26a are original in the context of the translation unit of 3 Rgns. Were these verses present from the very outset or were they inserted afterwards as part of some editorial activity? One important factor that must be taken into account in finding an answer to this question is that both v. 26 and v. 26a have counterparts elsewhere in 3 Rgns. It was already noted that the first part of v. 26 may be compared with 3 Rgns 2:46i. The parallel of v. 26a follows immediately on 3 Rgns 2:46i, namely at v. 46k. Thus, the order of ch. 10:26–26a is roughly paralleled by the sequence vv. 46i–k in ch. 2.

The problem of the text-historical relationship between these verses is an intricate one. With regard to v. 46i, the following observations can be made. In all likelihood, the verse corresponds to MT 1 Kgs 5:6. Thus τοκάδες ἱπποι matches MT’s ἡτοιμασία τοιαῦτα. We

---

11Thus in 1 Chron 9:29, 30; 2 Chron 9:1, 9 (two times); 16:14; 32:27.
12In 3 Rgns 10:2, 10 (two times), 25.
13In 3 Rgns 3:28; 5:9, 10; 10:4, 6, 8, [23], 24:11:41.
already noted that the same Hebrew phrase underlies the translation ḥāle'vi 'ippōi, in 3 Rgns 10:26. Neither ḥāle'vi 'ippōi, literally “female horses,” nor tokādes 'ippōi, “brood mares,” “mares in foals,” comes close to the probable meaning of ḥara'ah, “stalls for horses.” This raises the possibility that the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX verses differed slightly from what is presented by the MT. Now it proves to be difficult to link ḥāle'vi 'ippōi with a Hebrew not too different from MT's ḥosî ḥara', but tokādes 'ippōi appears to offer a good possibility. It is well conceivable that this translation goes back to an interchange of 𐤇 and 𐤇 in the Vorlage, producing the reading ḥosî ḥara',"14 “mares carrying foals.”15

Several exegetes have claimed that the two Greek translations tokādes 'ippōi and ḥāle'vi 'ippōi reflect the same idea.16 Both translations indeed agree in their making reference to mares. However, it is important to note that the notion “for breeding” is

---

14 ḥara'ah = pl. cs. ḥara', “pregnant” (HALAT, 245). In no other instance in the MT, however, is ḥara'ah followed by a nomen rectum designating the identity of the foetus. Therefore we should take the possibility into consideration that the translator took ḥara'ah as a plural in the absolute state and ḥosî ḥara'ah as an apposition to it, thus disregarding the difference in gender (which in fact might have been easy for him because the female form ḥosî is extremely rare in the OT). The fact that the phrase tokādes 'ippōi does not reveal a significant effort on the translator’s part to reflect a genitive construction in the Vorlage may also speak in favour of this view.


not represented in any sense by the phrase θηλειαι ἵπποι. For this reason, θηλειαι ἵπποι is unlikely to present a direct translation of a Hebrew text reading ייש תユーザ. More probably, the Greek rendering at 3 Rgns 10:26 was influenced by the translation τοκάδες ἵπποι of 3 Rgns 2:46i. The translator may have adopted from v. 46i the idea that the Hebrew refers to “mares.” However, he did not adopt the notion τοκάδες, “for breeding,” and contented himself with referring to mares proper. Possibly he varied the translation on account of the discrepant numbers of horses given in these texts. Thus he could have wished to create the impression that both passages dealt with different categories of horses. Or, if there were two translators rather than one, the later one may have opted for mares proper in 3 Rgns 10:26 because they are more likely to serve as horses for chariots than brood mares.

The issue of the relationship between 3 Rgns 10:26a and 2:46k is barely less complicated than the connection between v. 26 and v. 46i. Apparently both verses present translations of exactly identical Hebrew. Only v. 46k involves an utterly different translation from 3 Rgns 10:26a. Here we have the interesting phenomenon that the Greek translation of Kings offers two different renderings of a Hebrew text which is not extant in the MT of 1 Kgs, but appears in the MT of 2 Chron.

Both vv. 46i and k form part of the so-called Second Miscellany, an extensive section numbered 46a–i which in that position has no counterpart in the MT. The greater part of the Second Miscellany presents a translation of what MT offers at 1 Kgs 5:1–6. V. 46i is among this material. V. 46k does not form part of the

---


18 Moreover, there is little chance that the same corruption developed independently in the Hebrew Vorlagen of 3 Rgns 2:46i and 2 Par 9:25.
Greek verses that correspond to the Hebrew of 1 Kgs 5, yet there are good reasons to consider v. 46k simultaneous with them.\textsuperscript{19}

So we find that vv. 46i–k stem from one Greek translator, and vv. 26–26a of ch. 10 from another. Since especially v. 26 underwent influence from 3 Rgns 2:46i, the material in ch. 10 must be secondary to the Second Miscellany. The implication of this is that 3 Rgns 10:26–26a cannot possibly have been part of the primitive

\textsuperscript{19}The phrase \(\tilde{\text{n}} \, \delta \rho \chi \omega \nu \, \epsilon \nu \, a + \text{dat. of v. 46k} \) also appears in vv. 46b and f. Since v. 46b is likely to be a (partial) translation of 1 Kgs 5:1, \(\tilde{\text{n}} \, \delta \rho \chi \omega \nu \, \epsilon \nu \) is to be linked to Hebrew \(\tau \, \nu \, \chi \). If v. 46k is regarded as the translation of a Hebrew text identical with what we have at 2 Chron 9:26, there too the Greek phrase can be found to represent \(\tau \, \nu \, \chi \). The literalism involved in the Greek rendering sets these verses in the Second Miscellany apart from the text of 3 Rgns 10:26a, where \(\tau \, \nu \, \chi \) is represented by \(\tilde{\text{n}} \, \gamma \gamma \sigma \omicron \mu \epsilon \nu \omicron \zeta \, + \text{gen} \). There is a theoretic possibility that v. k and the preceding verses originate with different translators who employed the same translation technique. However, the Second Miscellany presents itself as a more or less carefully devised literary unit built around the theme of Solomon’s dominion (see D. W. Gooding, \textit{Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Rgns 2}, SOTSMS 4, [Cambridge, 1976], 13–17, 23–29). V. k must be considered an integral part of this unit because it is one of the verses that state the theme by the formulaic phrase (\(\Sigma \alpha \lambda \omega \omega \mu \iota \omega \nu \)) \(\tilde{\text{n}} \, \delta \rho \chi \omega \nu \, \epsilon \nu \ldots \) (vv. b, f, k).

The origins of v. k are difficult to retrieve. Gooding (\textit{Relics}, 44) thinks that the verse is based on a Hebrew text which represents a text-tradition of 1 Kgs 5:1 somewhat different from the MT version. This alternative text tradition would also be exhibited by 2 Chron 9:26.

Another option may also be worth considering. Several scholars have drawn attention to the fact that vv. i–k parallel the sequence of vv. 26–26a in 3 Rgns 10 and vv. 25–26 in 2 Chron 9. (J. A. Montgomery, “The Supplement at End of 3 Kingdoms 2 [I Kgs 2],” ZAW 50 (1932), 124–29, esp. 128; Gooding, \textit{Relics}, 48) Possibly v. k, rather than recording a different text-tradition of v. 1 in ch. 5, matched a Hebrew text that originally stood immediately after 1 Kgs 5:6. This text rather than v. 1 of ch. 5 may have been duplicated in 2 Chron 9:26. When the original Greek translation of ch. 5:1–6 was transposed to the Second Miscellany, the text of v. k was likewise moved to its present position. Afterwards, the Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} of v. k was dropped in MT 1 Kgs 5.

The second proposal is capable of explaining the curious parallelism of 3 Rgns 2:46i–k and 2 Chron 9:25–26, but it has the obvious disadvantage that the assumption of a Hebrew counterpart of v. k once existing in ch. 5 is entirely speculative. Whatever the view taken on the origin of v. k, its point of departure must be that vv. i–k are prior to 3 Rgns 10:26–26a.
Greek translation. This view concurs well with the conclusion reached above that the literary unit represented by vv. 26–26a is not original in ch. 10. Presumably the original text of 3 Rgns 10:26 involved a translation of MT 1 Kgs 10:26. In a later stage a reviser replaced it by a direct translation of 2 Chron 9:25–26, which for its part became the model for 2 Par 9:25–26.

III
This raises the question why 3 Rgns 10:26–26a offers a translation of the synoptic parallel in Chronicles rather than the corresponding passage in 1 Kgs. In order to find an answer, it may be wise first to establish how the inclusion of the Chronicles passage into 3 Rgns 10:26–26a affects the understanding of the context. Once the literary effects of the inclusion are described, we may get an idea of the motives underlying it.

The immediate effects become apparent when we compare the literary contexts of vv. 26–26a in Reigns and v. 26 in Kings. Both in the Greek and Hebrew texts, vv. 23–27 are devoted to the subject of Solomon's wealth. The theme prevailing through this section is briefly summarized at the beginning, at v. 23: Solomon's fame beyond all kings of the earth in the areas of wealth and wisdom. The next verses elaborate on and exemplify this theme. In these verses, however, 3 Rgns and 1 Kgs go separate ways.

In 3 Rgns 10 the foreign kings continue to play an important role after v. 23. V. 24 explicitly mentions them as seeking Solomon's presence to hear his wisdom. They are also the implicit subject of v. 25: "And they brought each their tributes, year by year." As a result, the foreign kings are presented as the donors of the items which are listed in v. 25b. As a kind of conclusive remark, v. 26a once more stresses Solomon's supreme position among his fellow kings: "And he was ruler of all the kings from the river until the land of the Philistines, and until the borders of Egypt." After v. 26a, the focus shifts to the related subject of Solomon's riches and his horse trade.
When we compare the MT-version of the account with the LXX, two differences immediately draw the attention. First, the subject of vv. 24 and 25 is “all the earth” rather than “all the kings of the earth.” Second, the MT does not offer a counterpart to 3 Rgns 10:26a. As a result, the account following v. 23 is entirely devoid of references to the foreign kings. Hence the predominant theme of the MT version is the material effect of Solomon’s wisdom rather than his glorious position among his fellow kings. Obviously, the LXX reviser has succeeded in thoroughly changing the tenor of the original.

For two reasons it is tempting to assume that it was the desire to highlight Solomon’s glory among his fellow kings that prompted the reviser to change the Greek text at v. 26. First, the plus exhibited by the Greek text at v. 24 (βασιλείας) may seem to indicate the same desire. Second, a concern for Solomon’s image—in particular his relation with other kings—is discernable in other parts of the Greek Solomon narrative as well. Reference could be made to 3 Rgns 5, where material from Kings seems to have been rearranged with a view to exemplifying Solomon’s prestige among his fellow kings. Against this background it is very conceivable that the reviser upon noticing that the parallel text of 2 Chron was better in keeping with his own interests than the original translation of v. 26, decided to replace the original Greek by a rendering of 2 Chron 9:25–26.

It is not to be ruled out that other concerns regarding Solomon’s image also played a part. Gooding has made the suggestion that the clause at 1 Kgs 10:26 “and Solomon gathered together chariots and horsemen,” might have been considered harmful to the image of Solomon because it exposed Solomon as a violator of the rule of Deut. 17:16 prohibiting the king to acquire many horses. The original Greek translation of 1 Kgs 10:26 would have been replaced by a rendering of 2 Chron 9:25 since the latter passage did not contain the potentially harmful clause. The

omission of that clause also allowed a sequence of thought between v. 25 and v. 26 that suggests that Solomon’s 4,000 mares actually were the horses listed among the tributary gifts mentioned in v. 25.

But, as Gooding himself points out, if the Greek text really wished to excuse Solomon over the fact that he possessed so many horses, it is strange to see that the passage concerning the import of horses from Egypt in 1 Kgs 10:28–29 was maintained in 3 Rgns 10:28–29. For that reason, it is difficult to believe that whitewashing Solomon’s character was the reviser’s main motive in changing the older Greek translation in 10:26. All we can say is that it perhaps played some role.

Finally, note should be taken of two passages outside ch. 10, which by virtue of certain affiliations with 3 Rgns 10:26–26a may cast further light on the background of our text. The first of these passages obtains at 3 Rgns 9:5b:

2 Par 7:18b  2 Chron 7:18b
οὐκ ἐξαρθησεται σοι  ἀλά Ἰσραήλ
ἀνὴρ ἡσούμενος ἐν Ἰσραήλ

3 Rgns 9:5b
οὐκ ἐξαρθησεται σοι  ἀλά Ἰσραήλ
ἀνὴρ ἡσούμενος ἐν Ἰσραήλ

For two reasons this text calls for a comparison with 3 Rgns 10:26a. In the first place, it is the only instance of 3 Rgns outside 10:26a where the term ἡσούμενος appears. Second, this text bears the same relationship to its counterparts in Kings, Chronicles and Paralipomena as 3 Rgns 10:26a. That is to say, rather than offering a translation of the Hebrew counterpart of 1 Kgs, like the surrounding verses do, it renders the parallel text from 2 Chron 7:18b. Just like 3 Rgns 10:26a, the Greek of 9:5b is identical with the Greek of the parallel text in 2 Par.

In my opinion, the points of contact between 3 Rgns 10:26a and 9:5b noted here render it very likely that these passages derive from the same hand. In order to understand the background of 3 Rgns 9:5b, we must consider its immediate literary context. In 3
Rgns 9:3–9 YHWH makes a promise to Solomon regarding his kingship in the future. V. 5 says that if Solomon keeps YHWH’s commandments, then YHWH shall establish the throne of Solomon’s kingdom forever as: “I spoke to David your father, saying, there shall not fail you a man to rule in Israel.” The MT has in v. 5b: “…there shall not fail you a man on the throne of Israel.” In light of 3 Rgns 10:26a it becomes clear that the ruler of Israel once promised to David must be identified as Solomon himself. This connection between chs. 9:5 and 10:26a once more is an indication that the reviser of 3 Rgns 10 wished to highlight glory and legitimisation of Solomon’s rule.

The second passage that may be of interest as a background to 3 Rgns 10:26–26a is 2 Rgns 8:4a.

1 Par 18:4a 1 Chron 18:4a
καὶ προκατέλαβε τὸν Δαυίδ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπάνω ἐπὶ τὰ ἀνδρῶν πεζῶν
χίλια ἀρμάτα καὶ ἐπάνω ἐπὶ τὰ ἀνδρῶν πεζῶν
καὶ εἴκοσι χιλίαδας ἵππων
μετὰ καὶ ἐπάνω ἐπὶ τὰ ἀνδρῶν πεζῶν
3 Rgns 8:4a 2 Sam. 8:4a
καὶ προκατέλαβε τὸν Δαυίδ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπάνω ἐπὶ τὰ ἀνδρῶν πεζῶν
χίλια ἀρμάτα καὶ ἐπάνω ἐπὶ τὰ ἀνδρῶν πεζῶν
καὶ εἴκοσι χιλίαδας ἵππων...

This text reads: “And David took his 1,000 chariots and 7,000 horsemen and 20,000 footmen.” Here, too, the Greek text of Reigns deviates from its Vorlage to offer a translation of the synoptic parallel in Chronicles. The interesting thing about this passage is that just like 3 Rgns 10:26 it is concerned with military force, in particular with the number of chariots and horsemen. And just like the 3 Rgns passage, it follows the numbers of the Chronicles parallel over against the numbers provided by its Vorlage.

With regard to 3 Rgns 10:26, Gooding has proposed that its primary purpose was to alleviate the discrepancy between Kings and Chronicles concerning the number of brood mares indicated.21

---

In his view, a later editor of the Greek text took offence at the divergent numbers in the Greek translation of 1 Kgs 5:6 and 2 Chron 9:25. He then solved the problem by banishing the original translator’s rendering of ch. 5:6 to the miscellany and placing a rendering of 2 Chron 9:25 at 3 Rgns 10:26. Apparently this later editor considered the numbers supplied by Chronicles more reliable than the numbers provided by 3 Rgns, and accordingly corrected the Greek text by borrowing the Chronicles version.

A similar concern for consistency between Reigns and Chronicles text regarding numbers reveals itself in 2 Rgns 8:4a. This may lend support to Gooding’s conviction that the issue of divergent numbers between Chronicles and 3 Rgns was in fact an important, if not the conclusive, factor behind v. 26.

It is not to be ruled out that the correction of 2 Rgns 8:4a and 3 Rgns 10:26 towards the parallel text of Chronicles was carried out by the same editorial hand. These passages belong to different translation sections of 1–4 Rgns. Though it is believed that these sections each renders the text of the Old Greek, they are usually attributed to different translators. Yet, it is not to be ruled out that a later editor worked during a stage of textual transmission when the books of 1–4 Rgns had already begun to form one tradition complex.

To sum up, several possible motives present themselves why vv. 26–26a were revised according to the Chronicles account. Some features suggest that the revision aimed at highlighting Solomon’s prestige and glory. Other features point to a concern for the legitimation of Solomon’s kingship. A desire to bring the divergent numbers of horses mentioned in Kings and Chronicles into agreement with each other may also have played a role. It is hard to tell which motive, if any, was decisive. For more specific answers, we have to await further results of the research into the creative processes underlying the present shape of 1–4 Rgns.

---

### Appendix: Synoptic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Reigns–miscellany</th>
<th>1 Kings</th>
<th>3 Reigns–main text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:23</strong> Καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη</td>
<td><strong>Καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη</strong></td>
<td><strong>Καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σαλωμὼν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς βασιλείς τῆς γῆς πλουτὼς καὶ φρονήσει</td>
<td>Σαλωμὼν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς βασιλείς τῆς γῆς πλουτὼς καὶ φρονήσει</td>
<td>Σαλωμὼν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς βασιλείς τῆς γῆς πλουτὼς καὶ φρονήσει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:24</strong> καὶ πάντες βασιλείς τῆς γῆς ἐξήτουν τὸ πρόσωπον Σαλωμῶν τοῦ ἀκούσαν τῆς φρονήσεως αὐτοῦ ἢς ἔδωκεν κύριος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>καὶ πάντες βασιλείς τῆς γῆς ἐξήτουν τὸ πρόσωπον Σαλωμῶν τοῦ ἀκούσαν τῆς φρονήσεως αὐτοῦ ἢς ἔδωκεν κύριος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>καὶ πάντες βασιλείς τῆς γῆς ἐξήτουν τὸ πρόσωπον Σαλωμῶν τοῦ ἀκούσαν τῆς φρονήσεως αὐτοῦ ἢς ἔδωκεν κύριος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:25</strong> καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔφερον ἐκαστὸς τὰ δώρα αὐτοῦ σκεύη χρυσᾶ καὶ ἰματισμὸν στακτῆς καὶ ἱδύσματα καὶ ἔππον καὶ ἡμίονος τὸ κατ’ ἐναυτὸν ἐναυτῷ</td>
<td>καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔφερον ἐκαστὸς τὰ δώρα αὐτοῦ σκεύη χρυσᾶ καὶ ἰματισμὸν στακτῆς καὶ ἱδύσματα καὶ ἔππον καὶ ἡμίονος τὸ κατ’ ἐναυτὸν ἐναυτῷ</td>
<td>καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔφερον ἐκαστὸς τὰ δώρα αὐτοῦ σκεύη χρυσᾶ καὶ ἰματισμὸν στακτῆς καὶ ἱδύσματα καὶ ἔππον καὶ ἡμίονος τὸ κατ’ ἐναυτὸν ἐναυτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 10:23</td>
<td>2 Paralipomena 9:22</td>
<td>καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:24</td>
<td>9:23</td>
<td>καὶ πάντες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>9:24</td>
<td>οἱ βασίλεις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2:46i
καὶ ἦσαν τῷ Σαλωμόν
tεσσαράκοντα χιλιάδες
tοκάδες ἵπποι
eἰς ἄρματα
καὶ δώδεκα χιλιάδες
ἵππεων

5:6
καὶ ἦσαν τῷ Σαλωμόν
tέσσαρες χιλιάδες
θήλειαι ἵπποι
eἰς ἄρματα
καὶ δώδεκα χιλιάδες
ἵππεων
καὶ ἔθετο αὐτὰς
ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν
tῶν ἄρματων
καὶ μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως
ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ

2:46k
καὶ ἦν ἄρχων
ἐν πᾶσιν
τοῖς βασιλεύσιν
ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ
καὶ ἕως
γῆς ἀλλοφύλων
καὶ ἕως ὀρίων Αἰγύπτου

10:26a
καὶ ἦν ἐν θαμβώ
τοῖς βασιλεύσιν
ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ
καὶ ἕως
γῆς ἀλλοφύλων
καὶ ἕως ὀρίων Αἰγύπτου
Appendix

9:25
καὶ ἤσαν τῷ Σαλωμῷ
τέσσαρες χιλιάδες
θηλείαι ἱπποῖ
εἰς ἀρμάτα
καὶ δώδεκα χιλιάδες
ἵππεων
καὶ ἑτέροις αὐτοῖς
ἐν πόλεσιν
τῶν ἀρμάτων
καὶ μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως
ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ.

1:14 Καὶ συνήγαγεν

9:26 καὶ ἤρχατος
ἀρμάτα καὶ ἱππεῖς
καὶ ἑγέρνετο αὐτὸ
χίλια καὶ τετρακόσια
ἀρμάτα
καὶ δώδεκα χιλιάδες
ἵππεων
καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτὰ
ἐν πόλεσιν τῶν ἀρμάτων
καὶ

ὁ λαὸς
μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως
ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ.

9:26 καὶ ἤρχατος
πάντων τῶν βασιλέων
ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ
καὶ ἔως
γῆς ἄλλοφύλων
καὶ ἔως ὁρίου Αἴγυπτου