

other instance of the same semantic development in Hebrew from "rage, be aroused to anger" to "be aroused sexually."

NAHUM M. WALDMAN

AKIBA HEBREW ACADEMY  
MERION, PENNSYLVANIA, 19066

### JEROBOAM'S RISE TO POWER

According to a common interpretation of I Kings 12 Jeroboam's presence at the Shechem parliament is both affirmed (vss. 2, 3a, and 12) and denied (vs. 20).<sup>1</sup> Although Montgomery-Gehman, Gray (in part), and other commentators have proposed on the basis of LXX that vs. 2 and 3a are additions from II Chronicles, D. W. Gooding has recently argued that only a pedantic timetabling and an effort to whitewash Jeroboam lie behind the LXX's transposition of 12 2 and 3a (?) to a position after 11 43 and behind its omissions in vs. 12, and that MT is consequently to be retained.<sup>2</sup> In this note we hope to demonstrate via textual criticism that the contrary is true, i.e., that the LXX bears witness to an old Hebrew tradition according to which Jeroboam did not return from Egypt or participate in the Shechem assembly until after the murder of Adoram.

Our case begins with a reading from I Kings 12 12.

MT ויבו ירבעם וכל העם

LXX καὶ παρεγένοντο πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ

Many commentators (see also *Biblia Hebraica*) delete ירבעם "with the Greek." We must not fail to note, however, that the LXX is even more divergent, presupposing not just a shorter text, but a different one: ויבא כל ישראל. This verse states, therefore, that all Israel — with no explicit mention of Jeroboam — came to Rehoboam the third day.

Secondly, an examination of I Kings 12 2-3a discloses not only that the LXX omits these verses, but that their presence would seem to be precluded by I Kings 12 20 which reports that Jeroboam returned from Egypt only *after* the initial negotiations at Shechem. LXX<sup>B</sup>'s inclusion of material similar in content and length to vss. 2-3a in 11 43 is a correction by a later hand, requiring the awkward doubling of the regnal formula.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The RSV renders these verses as follows: "And when Jeroboam the son of Nebat heard of it (for he was still in Egypt, whither he had fled from King Solomon), then Jeroboam returned from Egypt. And they sent and called him; and Jeroboam and all the assembly of Israel came . . ." (vss. 2-3a). "So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam the third day . . ." (vs. 12). "And when all Israel heard that Jeroboam had returned, they sent and called him to the assembly . . ." (vs. 20).

<sup>2</sup> D. W. Gooding, "The Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *VetT*, 17 (1967), pp. 173-89.

<sup>3</sup> Plausible reasons for this doubling are presented by Gooding. While it may be that this misplacement required the recasting of the equivalent of vs. 3a, a misplaced correction itself is not unusual and need not be complicated by Gooding's timetabling hypothesis.

Furthermore, a close study of I Kings 12 3a and its parallel in II Chronicles 10 3a demonstrates that the half-verse in Kings can *only* be interpreted as an addition from Chronicles, as the following readings from Chronicles make clear.

MT וכל ישראל וידברו

LXX<sup>B</sup> και πασα η εκκλησια ηλθον<sup>4</sup>

LXX<sup>A</sup> και πασα η εκκλησια Ισραηλ

If the *Vorlage* of LXX<sup>B</sup> was וכל הקהל באו, the reading in LXX<sup>A</sup> can be interpreted as a partial correction containing translations for קהל and MT's ישראל, though, like Vaticanus, lacking any word for וידברו. Consequently the Kings MT reading וכל קהל ישראל is a conflation of "synonymous" variants וכל ישראל (MT) and וכל הקהל (LXX<sup>B</sup>, cf. LXX<sup>A</sup>), attested separately in Chronicles texts. The secondary character of I Kings 12 3a MT is reasonably certain.

Thus the lack of support in LXX for "Jeroboam" in I Kings 12 12, the absence of the sentences dealing with Jeroboam in the uncorrected LXX of vss. 2-3a, the conflate character of I Kings 12 3a MT combining variants in the Chronicles text tradition, and the reading of I Kings 12 20 in both MT and LXX suggest that in an earlier recension of I Kings 12, Jeroboam played no role in the Shechem parliament before the murder of Adoram, and that his ambiguous and contradictory role in I Kings 12 MT results from additions from the Chronicler's account. That the text of I Kings 12 has been supplemented from Chronicles may also be seen in vs. 17 which is absent from Kings LXX (Reigns) but attested in both MT and LXX of Chronicles.

RALPH W. KLEIN

CONCORDIA SEMINARY, ST. LOUIS, MO., 63105

#### THE ENCLITIC PARTICLE TA/I IN HEBREW

In a recent article I attempted to isolate a hitherto unrecognized enclitic particle *ta/i* in Amorite and Amarna Canaanite.<sup>1</sup> The function of the particle, I argued, is similar to that of the enclitic *ma/i*, which is widely attested in early Northwest Semitic. However, I was unable to find any examples of the enclitic *ta/i* in Hebrew.

Upon further examination of data extant in the Bible, I should like to cite several possible examples of the enclitic in Hebrew. If the present analysis is correct, it does help resolve an outstanding problem of Hebrew morphology.

There are in Hebrew several examples of verbs which appear to exhibit both the preformative of the imperfect as well as the affirmative of the perfect. From the standpoint of the morphology of the Semitic verb, these forms are anomalies. The most com-

<sup>4</sup> ηλθον presumably represents a divergent Hebrew text. Compare the Syriac: *wkllh ysryl 'tw (!) w'mryn*, "and all Israel came [pl. verb] and said."

<sup>1</sup> C. R. Krahmalkov, "The Amorite Enclitic Particle TA/I," *JSS*, 14 (1969), pp. 201-204.