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Prefatory Note

The apparatus criticus in this present sample page from 2 Kgs 1:1-6 uses in an extensive way the different sigla of G textual criticism. This option has been taken due to the lack of a published Göttingen Septuagint for Kings and the special relevance which the different versions of G play in the history of the biblical text of Kings. The differences between the Old Greek text (in this passage corresponding to the γδ kaige section reflected by the non-recensional readings of G L and, when extant, OL, along with the pre-Hexaplaric readings in the Armenian version) and the recensional texts (basically G\textsuperscript{AB} and the recensional readings of G\textsuperscript{L}) arguably mirror a similar process in the Hebrew text: an “Old Hebrew” (our column A) which experienced an editorial process which would result in a revised text (edition B). The revised Hebrew text provided the base for kaige or kaige-like revisions which ultimately produced the recensional texts of G.

1:1 (ed B) M G (καὶ ἠθέτησεν Μωὰβ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ, μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν Ἀχαάβ) sim S (…) > ed A

The initial verse of the book, preserved in all MS evidence, offers, nevertheless, some text-critical difficulties: when examining the beginning of 2 Kings in conjunction with the closing verses of 1 Kings in the G tradition, it is remarkable how, in the G\textsuperscript{L} family, the inclusion of the phrase violates a standard convention of book transitions in G, where the first verse of the next book is anticipated at the end of the previous one (defining therefore a connector of sorts). In the case of G\textsuperscript{L} 1 Kgs 22:54, the connecting phrase is καὶ ἀνέβη Ὀχοζείαϛ εἰϛ τὸ δικτυωτὸν ὑπερῷον αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ, repeated in the present state of the text at 2 Kgs 1:2. The sentence of 2 Kgs 1:1 is lacking at the end of 1 Kings in G\textsuperscript{L}, therefore, its presence at 2 Kgs 1:1 violates the “connecting phrase” principle and can be explained as consequence of a recensional revision which edited the Old Greek text according to the Hebrew edition B. Edition B likely introduced the phrase in an attempt to harmonize the text with 2 Kgs 3:5 (ויהי אחאב מוהב רפשת מלך, מוהב מלך ירש). A fact which may be pointed at by S, which stands closer to 3:5 than the other versions (with the inclusion of the element).}


3 Cf. Montgomery and Gehman, ICC Kings, 348. The repetition of this phrase could also be working as an editorial marker for the Wiederaufnahme of the royal histories, framing the prophetic Elijah narratives. In particular, its presence in 2 Kgs 1:1 ed B can be related to the displacement of Ahab’s death episode from the continuation of his successors’ line by the inclusion of Jehosaphat of Judah at 1 Kgs 22:41.
1:2 (ed A) G\(^L\)=OG (καὶ ἀνέβη Ὑχοζείας εἰς τὸ δικτυωτὸν ύπερῴον αὐτοῦ τῷ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ) OL (et ascendit Ohosias in superioribus domus suae in Samaria) ] > (ed B) M G\(^{AB}\) (homoi?)

This verse shows two different redactions of the same event, one attested in Old Greek by G\(^L\) in concordance with OL, in which Ahaziah ascends to the upper floor before falling through the window; another (in M, G\(^{AB}\) and the remaining versions) where the ...*... sentence does not appear and therefore the position of subject and local complement exhibits a different arrangement (ヶ月יאז ב’ גנרטה במרון איש במשמרין). The agreement between G\(^L\) and OL would indicate that G\(^L\) represents here the Old Greek text, whereas G\(^{AB}\) would be due to a pre-Hexaplaric kaige-like revision and therefore closer to M. In accordance with chronology of other features in the Vorlage of G\(^L\), we have proposed an earlier date for that version, and thus its belonging to ed. A\(^4\). Though it is possible a conscious editorial stylistic revision in A (which would make the narrative more agile via the suppression of an obvious action, Ahaziah has to ascend before falling), it is also conceivable that B experienced a phenomenon similar to homoiarkton by completely skipping the initial element in the series of wayyiqtol sentences and consequently attaching the subject and complement to the second.

For the ascription of this redaction of the sentence to ed. B, cf. the previous commentary entry.

…* (ed A) G\(^L\)=OG (ἐπερωτήσατε) S (Δημήτριος) ] > (ed B) M G\(^B\) (theol)

The form שאל has been reconstructed from the G\(^L\) + OL (interrogate) rendering, which also coincides with S (Δημήτριος). This verb is more clearly defined in the BH corpus as a mantic technical word and is more widely attested in combination with the prepositional regime – (דרש בת) – (דרש ב) is extremely rare in the Bible and mostly located in 2 Kgs, a fact that would point to an editorial substitution). The form שאל of ed B (in M and G\(^{AB}\)) could be interpreted as an ideological-theological substitution in which the original mantic verb שאל (clearly attested in Northwest Semitic as an specialized expression already in the Ugaritic texts\(^5\)) is replaced with a word connected with consultation practices more contemporary to the redactor’s temporal background: the investigation and exegesis (דרש > דרשה) which would mature later in Rabbinic Midrashic practice (in the same vein that “consulting the Word of God” is explicitly alluded to in M v.16\(^6\)). Therefore, the ed B reading (which also entered G\(^B\) as a recensional reading), would be both a “modernization” and theological substitution of שאל*, an older construction which would be the Hebrew

\(^4\) Stade, Haupt (tr.), *The Book of Kings* (Notes), 180, considers G\(^L\) a “clumsy expansion”, but does not discuss the agreement with OL.


\(^6\) That phrase is remarkably missing from Old Greek and the reference to “the word” fits clearly in later religious paradigms, more akin to the “Rabbinic” thought. Vid. supra n. 1.
Vorlage to the Old Septuagint text (defined here by $G^L$ and OL)\textsuperscript{7}. Furthermore, the usage of $זבוב$ in S would point in the same direction, indicating that the revision undertaken by the B redactor left traces of the original form.

* (ed A) Symm (ζεβούλ) Hex ἔβρ. (ζεβούλ) [זבוב (ed B) M sim G ($
υιαν$) (theol)

The second part of this composite Baal-divine name, a *hapax legomenon* in the Biblical text, has been reconstructed from Symmachus and part of the Ms evidence from Origen’s ἔβρ. ($βαλ$, ζεβούλ; Ms z). This choice is also supported by the clear relationship between the element $זבוב$ and $זבוב$ as a divine title, attested in the Ugaritic texts in special connection with Baal\textsuperscript{8}. Given the quite widespread tendency of Biblical editors to subtly – or bluntly – transform the names of foreign gods via derogatory or moralizing puns, it is quite possible to understand $זבוב$ as one of such derogatory puns played upon an older Northwest Semitic divine name. The meaning of the word (“fly”) fits this kind of joke, as it relates to pestilence, reeking and body waste\textsuperscript{9}. There would exist a possibility of the pun of $זבוב$ being the original form known to the very first stages of composition of the Biblical text, but then, given that the form (an eschatological joke related to stench or filth) has made its way into the totality of M, G and the other versions, it is striking that a non-punned (and fitting to the independently attested Semitic divine name) appears at such late date as Symmachus’ version, as well as in the Hexapla. Also, the form $בֶּל זבוב$ is attested in several passages of the NT (Mt 10:25; 12:24; Mk 3:22; Lk 11:15) and, were it to be thought that the NT represents a different supernatural entity which could in turn have contaminated Symmachus’ and Origen’s text due to phonetic similitude, it should be noted that in three of the four NT cases (Mt 12:24; Mk 3:22 and Lk 11:15) the entity appears in contexts of healing and exorcism (Jesus or his followers are accused of casting off demons by Beelzebul’s power), too much of a coincidence with the consultation about sickness in 2 Kgs \textsuperscript{10}. To this contextual / historical evidence it has to be added the particularly complex reception of the whole phrase $עקרון אלהי זבוב בבעל$ in the G traditions: the case disagreement between $ἐν τῷ$ (GAB) / διὰ τοῦ (G\textsuperscript{L}) $Βάαλ$ and $μυῖαν θεὸν Ἀκκαρών$ (with a literal translation of $זבוב$) is particularly meaningful as this break in the syntax could be connected to a change in prepositional regimes (Israel for the section with preposition, ἃ for the accusative of $μυῖαν$) dependent of the verbal construction employed ($בֶּל זבוב$ vs. $דרש$ ἀνθρώπου, vid. supra in the discussion on $דרש$ which would, in turn, indicates the operation of a revision upon the text (the change of the mantic verb – and the necessary prepositional readjustment – would have been concurrent with the introduction of the punned form $בֶּל זבוב$). The revision of


\textsuperscript{8} Cf. the tablets of the *Ugaritic Baal Cycle* (KTU 1.1-1.6), especially, KTU 1.5 VI-1.6 I, for the title $b'l zbl$ ’rs.

\textsuperscript{9} Cf. e.g. *ABD* I, 554.

\textsuperscript{10} Cogan and Tadmor, *2 Kings (ABC)*, 25, cast doubts on the connection “between the god worshipped at Ekron and the demonic Baal-zebub”, but without including the testimony of Sym. or ἔβρ. in the discussion.
the prepositional regime of such a large chain of names and epithets propitiated the syntactical
disagreement in \( G \) (especially after the presence of a non-declinable form as \( Βάαλ \)) and the grammatical
breach (beginning with \( \muυιαν < \) \( זבוב \) in \( G \) (recensional in all text families in this passage) takes place right
at the point where the revised word is inserted (\( \) \( זבוב \), which would be governed by a verb with \textit{nota accusativi})\(^\text{11}\). The previous part of the divine name (\( Βααλ \)) keeps the older structure with prepositional
regime. The case disagreement in \( G \) as reflection of an addition-revision of the punned epithet is supported
by the Coptic version of \( G \), which has “\( Βααλ, \) who is called the Fly-God of Ekron” thus indicating that in
the \( G \) traditions \( בּוּל \) and the epithet \( זבוב \) are not understood as a unit but as a divine name plus an
additional epithet (the recensional element which would have obliterated the original non-punned name).
The Coptic grammar is clear, as it separates Baal from the rest of the phrase through a standard relative
clause formula for the introduction of epithets and appositions and additionally constructs “fly” as a
composite name with “god”. This interpretation could be considered part of the Coptic translator’s
exegesis, but given its similarity to an OL rendering of the passage (\textit{muscam dea} in OL), as well as the
coincidence of its appearance in connection with the syntactical breach in Greek, it can be taken as further
evidence of the editorial nature of the inclusion of \( \muυιαν \) in \( G \), which would therefore reflect a revision
according to the Hebrew edition \( B \), which replaced the original divine epithet \( בּוּל \) with a pngned form.

\[ (*) \text{ed} A \] \( G^{AB}=\text{OG} (και \epsilon πορευθησαν \epsilon περοστησαι δι' αυτου) \text{OL (et abierunt interrogare per eam)} \text{sim G}^{\text{i}} (> \deltaι' \alphaυτου) > (\text{ed} B) \text{M} \)

This sentence at the end of v.2 is attested by all the \( G \) traditions (as well as the OL \textit{et abierunt interrogare per eam})
and is missing from \( M \), as well as \( S \), \( T^1 \) and \( V \). The agreement between OL and \( G^{\text{i}} \)
would indicate that this phrase belongs to the Old Septuagint text and implies a distinct redaction (ed A). It
could be argued that the shorter and more agile represented by \( M \) (ed B in our proposal) is to be preferred
as an older redaction and that the more extensive version of A can be the work of the Septuagint’s
translator. Nevertheless, the structure of the paragraph in A (command by the king plus messengers’
departure, …\( \) \( וָיִלְכֵּו \) \( רָאָלָה \)) is remarkably close to the text of v. 4 (command by the angel plus Elijah’s departure,
…\( \) \( וָיִלְכֵּו \)), so, from the point of view of the literary structure of the passage, the text of A would be a possible
original Hebrew redaction\(^\text{12}\). As for the reasons for the omission of the sentence in \( B \), it is possible to
conceive that the editorial process was following an euphemistic attitude and therefore trying to devoid the
text of any references which could be interpreted as the messengers actually getting to consult the divinity

\(^{11}\) The present state of ed B (in \( M \)) indicates that the merging of the original structure with \( ב \) (and probably
a verb \( שָׁאָל \), as indicated in the previous entry) and the revised construction with \textit{nota accusativi} (and a verb
\( דָּרָשׁ \)) has left no traces of the later in \( M \), but can be inferred from the accusative \( \muυιαν \) in \( G \), as well as for
the different constructions of \( דָּרָשׁ \) throughout the Bible, where the construction with \textit{nota accusativi} (or
with directional particles) is overwhelmingly more attested than the construction with \( ב \), which is, in turn,
widely attested with \( שָׁאָל \).

\(^{12}\) Cf. Burney, \textit{op. cit.}, 260, who, regardless, proposes a Vorlage \( יִלְלָה לְדָרָשׁ מָאתו \), which does not take
into account the verb used in \( G \) or the prepositional regime.
of Ekron, thus emphasizing the fact that their journey is cut short by Elijah’s appearance. To this revised
version of the narrative could also contribute the effect produced by the insertion of the second narrative
unit of the chapter (Elijah and the three captains in vv. 7-16) as well as the placement of the prophet on top
of a mountain instead of running across the messengers on the road (cf. v. 9 ed B), a fact which produces
several discrepancies between A and B in the choice and editing of verbs of motion (see below v. 3).13

1:3 (ed A) G (πορεύουσι) sim G^B (δεῦρο) G^L (ἀπαντᾶτο) [על מ (ed B) M

Versus a generic verb of motion in ed A (preserved by the Old Greek, which in this case is attested in G^A
and partially in G^L14 and also in the kaige reading of G^B, δεῦρο15), ed B (M) introduces the idea of ascension.
This idea of ascension would come out of a clear rationale in B’s edition: if Elijah appears at the top of a
mountain in v.9, he must have climbed it in a previous moment of the episode. This reading therefore aligns
itself with the series of changes which B operates in order to integrate Elijah’s situation in a mountain. As
for the more neutral reading of A, it has also to be noted how it agrees with the last sentence in v.4, "לך
אליה", therefore the usage of forms of לך in both instances would agree with the standards of correlation in
command-fulfillment schemata.

1:4 (ed A) G^L=OG (ἐπερωτάσθη) S (לשאל) (ed B) M G^AB (theol)

For the considerations on the substitution of לשאל* with לדרש in edition B, vid. supra the explanation of
the same phenomenon operating on לשאל* in v.2.

1:4 (ed A) [ номер (ed B) M sim G (㎜יון) (theol)

We have conjecturally reconstructed the divine name in A in agreement with the evidence and
considerations under the same entry in v. 2.

1:4 init ] + † (ed B) MV (κατι) (> ed A: G^L S V) (near-dittog יו?)

It is difficult to assess the value of such a small variant as the addition or omission of † before a particle.
Its inclusion seems to be unique to M and the recensional versions of G (G^AB), whereas it does not appear
in G^L or in S and V. That could indicate that the addition of † belongs to ed B, but the reasons for its
inclusion (especially when it is the case that the particle is missing in the parallel instances of the sentence
in vv. 6 and 16) cannot be deduced from this isolated case, beyond the general remark of the accumulation

13 Cf. Trebolle, Centena in Libros Samuelis et Regum, 156 ff. for the composite character of the chapter and
the literary and text-critical issues brought about by the placement of Elijah on the mountain top in v. 9.

14 The Lucianic text uses a Greek verb, ἀπαντάω, specialized in “meeting people,” versus the generic
πορεομαι of G^A. Nevertheless, according to LSJ, p. 178, ἀπαντάω conveys the meaning of “moving
somewhere to meet somebody”, therefore, even if Lucian’s version contracts in a single word the expression
לך תלשא*, the spirit of the meaning stands closer to a Vorlage with לך, in agreement here
with G^A, than to the idea of ascension expressed by עלי.

15 This expression is characteristic for the translation of imperative forms of עלי in the kaige revision of
of particles being a possible sign of a later revision. Also, it is possible to propose as a hypothesis that the appearance of ד is not connected to an editorial process per se, but that it is a purely scribal mistake (a near-dittography caused by the precedent sequence of ד and ד in the previous word תעור in v.3) which made its way into the proto-Masoretic text and hence into the recensional revision of G\textsuperscript{AB}.

The reading ד has been included as part of both editions. It is attested both in M and in the Old Septuagint (G, which exhibits a doublet composed of the recensional reading oυχ oυτος and δια τουτο\textsuperscript{16}). In addition to the text-critical evidence in its favor, the particle is a standard element of prophetic formulae in which Yahweh transmits a verdict of condemnation or salvation. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the variant reading ד* attested by G\textsuperscript{AB}: though the traditional proposals consider it part of the translation technique of the Septuagint, and therefore an intra-Greek phenomenon, that reading is alien to the Old Greek text (as seen in G and in OL, in this and in parallel passages) and connected to kai-ge-like revisions of G. That could point in the direction of the reading ד* ד* being a minor variant in the Hebrew text -as it would be a proto-M text the one which would be the base for the revision of G\textsuperscript{AB} – one which has not made its way into the text of M. The reasons for this reading could be aural, due to the phonetic similitude between ד and ד, but it could also be connected to an exegetical principle similar to the Rabbinic 'al tiqre\textsuperscript{17}.

Here there is a discrepancy between versions in the word used for the retrospective element in the relative clause עליה. Whereas M and G\textsuperscript{AB} use a locative adverb, לא, both G\textsuperscript{L} and S coincide in presenting a construction with particle + pronoun, with a proposed Hebrew Vorlage עליה. The textual evidence of the Lucianic text, which here would correspond with the Old Greek, and its agreement with S, is supported by further textual and stylistic considerations: first, the graphic context suggest that the prepositional construction could have been omitted at some point in the textual tradition due to a scribal error caused by homoiarkton (the preceding verbal form עליה). Also, the usage of a preposition + suffix structure in this relative clause establishes a stronger correlation with the next sentence in Yahweh’s oracle, ממנה תרד לא, therefore constituting a more intense literary unit. For the appearance of the adverb in M and G\textsuperscript{AB}, it can be postulated that, after the prepositional regime being lost to homoiarkton in part of the Hebrew tradition, some redactor or scribe felt the necessity to correct the grammar of the relative clause

\textsuperscript{16} In the parallel passage pf v. 6 the OL reading is ideo, therefore indicating that the second part of the Lucianic doublet is an Old Septuagint reading.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Trebolle, \textit{Salomón y Jeroboam}, 328-331; Piquer, “Flies, Idols and Oracles. On a Collection of Variants to MT in 2 Kgs 1”, (IOSOT 2004, publication pending). Cf. also Prijs, \textit{Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta, pass}. This variant reading would be related with the progressive loss of awareness of the prophetic speech unit structure, a phenomenon which has left traces in other instances in which actually there are textual differences between editions A and B (cf. below vv.6 and 16, as well as the already mentioned substitution of the specialized mantic word של with דרש (vid. supra v. 2).
with the inclusion of a retrospective element and subsequently used ס. Nevertheless, it is not possible to assess the scope of this variant, whether it was part of the B tradition as a whole or just a minor problem in the transmission of proto-M which in turn affected part of its dependent (through recension or translation) versions. Thus, facing this conundrum, in the edition the form with ס has been left in B as agreeing with the copy-text.

Both editions of the text present the causal construction with כ. Nevertheless, it is interesting to remark how some versions (S and V) attest an adversative reading for the particle. This variant would imply a variation in the appreciation of the prophetic speech (the closing causal clause which constitutes the death sentence for the whole speech becomes an adversative clause to the preceding phrase) which in some measure would weaken the rhetoric force of Yahweh’s sentence. Therefore, it has been considered a secondary reading. From a textual criticism point of view, the variation could have been brought about by an aural phenomenon which would have affected word-division: כ ת can be aurally dissociated into כ + ס (with a mute ס). This phenomenon could have taken place in the translating phase, but, especially given its presence in two different versions (S and V), it is also possible that the aurally-influenced word division affected part of the Hebrew textual tradition.

At the end of v.4, GABL coincide in including an additional phrase, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς. Although this text is easily translated into a Hebrew אליהם ויאמר, it is difficult to discern whether the phrase reflects a Vorlage or it is part of the translator’s activity, which would try to smooth an elliptic text. Compared with the end of v.2, in which GABL also offer a longer text – which in this edition has been considered as part of ed A – the present phrase lacks the same level of coincidence in the verbal roots used between the command (לך + דבר in v. 3 ed. A) and the fulfillment, as λεγεῖν would not reflect דבר, which is repeatedly translated in this passage with the Gk. λαλεῖν. Also, grammatically, it is to be noted that in v. 2 ed. A the fulfillment of the king’s commands is rendered with a single sentence, וילך + an auxiliary (לשאל). In v.4, Elijah’s departure (וילך) would be enough to establish a correlation with the angel’s words. To these considerations of style and structure, a textual criticism element has to be added: an phrase ויאמר אליהם appears in v.5 (pronounced by Ahaziah) in close proximity to the point where GABL presents καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς. Given the elliptic quality of the passage and the frequent changes of speaker and addressee, it is conceivable that either a scribe or translator just anticipated Ahaziah’s phrase at the end of v.4, generating a duplicated reading.

---

18 The adversative is also attested in the G-dependent Armenian version, though GABL agrees in this case with M.

19 Cf. Trebolle, Centena, 109-11 for a more far-reaching interpretation of the discrepancies between G and M in the usage of כ and ס (ὁτι ἀλλὰ αὐτ) in Sam-Kgs. In the present case, nevertheless, the coincidence of the particle with a following ס in ס and the almost total absence of the adversative from the G versions calls for postponing a similar evaluation until the edition has progressed further and more cases have been examined in detail.
Nevertheless, whether this phrase belongs to a Hebrew Vorlage\textsuperscript{20} (either as part of the features of edition A or as a scribal phenomenon caused plausibly by the anticipation of part of v.5) or to the translation features of the Septuagint cannot be discerned on the basis of a single sample, but only after a thorough survey of similar cases in the whole book.

\textbf{1:6} אֱלֹהִים אָמַר יְהוָה כֹּה (ed B) M G (τάδε λέγει κύριος) (> ed A: S) (transp)

The position of the prophetic formula פֶּן יְהוָה אָמַר כֹּה defines a difference between eds. A and B in this verse. The versions indicate that, whereas M and the whole G tradition include the formula at the beginning of Elijah’s words, therefore constituting a generic introduction to Yahweh’s words, S situates it further in the passage, right after the particle \(לָכֵן\); the formula then works as a specialized introduction which precedes Yahweh’s decree or verdict (in this case an oracle of doom for Ahaziah). To the evidence of S, it must be added the doublet in G\textsuperscript{1}: the Lucianic text includes the formula פֶּן יְהוָה אָמַר כֹּה (τάδε λέγει κύριος) both at the beginning of Elijah’s words (in agreement with G\textsuperscript{AB} and M) and in the same position than S, before the prophecy of the king’s death. This Lucianic doublet would reflect the inclusion of a recensitional reading (in agreement with the revised versions G\textsuperscript{AB} and with M) and the preservation of the Old Septuagint reading\textsuperscript{21}, which would here agree with S, as well as with the first instance of the oracle in v. 4. The explanation of the differences between A and B can be found in a progressive loss of awareness of the prophetic consultation structure (vid. supra for similar phenomena with this basis under נָא* and \(לָכֵן\)), which would take a formula whose usage is specialized in the introduction of Yahweh’s sentence in oracles and turn it into a generic introduction of Yahweh’s words at large\textsuperscript{22}. Within B, the discrepancy between the position of the formula in v.4 and vv.6 and 16 could be explained by the redactor’s feeling a situation difference between them, as in the first one it is the angel who speaks, whereas in the two remaining cases the speaker is Elijah, and therefore the need could be felt to include a formula indicating that the paragraph is the word of Yahweh at the very beginning of the speech.

\(לָכֵן\) (ed A) G (πορεύην) ] (ed B) M (רומא ב) (transp)

Against the whole G tradition, which reads פֶּן יְהוָה, following the recurring verbal pair in vv.2 and 3 (פֶּן + נָא), M introduces a form פֶּן יְהוָה which is reminiscent of the previous פֶּן יְהוָה in v.6 and of the פֶּן יְהוָה in v.2.

\textsuperscript{20} Such seems to be Gray’s posture in his commentary, as he considers the omission of Elijah’s speech to the messengers as an “error”. Stade, on the other hand, defends that the phrase should be accounted as a scribal expansion to smoothen the text. Cogan – Tadmor incide in the abrupt nature of the narrative sequence, but at the same time consider it “a case of deferring a key scene to a later sequence in order to heighten the dramatic effect”. In any case, the different commentaries do not produce solid evidence on the precedence of the expansion / ellipsis, be it translational, scribal, editorial or redactional.

\textsuperscript{21} The Patristic evidence from Or-Lat, quia haec dicit Dominus also points in this evaluation of G\textsuperscript{1} as Old Septuagint.

The option taken agrees with Burney\textsuperscript{23} in the secondary character of the M reading (a facilitating change, as Ahaziah does not physically “go”, but one which disregards the unity of “go to enquiry”) and it has been ascribed to the editorial labor of B.

For the considerations on this entry, vid. supra v.3, with the only difference that in the present case the whole G tradition has been affected by a revision akin to M and therefore only S, along with a comparison with vv. 2, 3 and 16, offers textual support for the proposed A reading.

We have conjecturally reconstructed the divine name in A in agreement with the evidence and considerations under the same entry in v. 2.

For the considerations on the variant reading for this particle, vid. supra the entry at v. 4

For the explanation of the differences of placement of the prophetic formula between A and B, vid. supra the first entry on this same verse.

Vid. supra the same textual phenomenon at v. 4.

For the reflections on this possible variant reading, vid. supra v. 4.

\textsuperscript{23} Op. cit. 262.