

1 KINGS 6:1 AND THE DATE OF THE EXODUS FROM THE MASORETIC AND SEPTUAGINT TEXTUAL TRADITIONS

HENRY B. SMITH JR., ASSOCIATES FOR BIBLICAL RESEARCH

1 Kings 6:1 is a crucial biblical text lying at the heart of the debate over the date of the Exodus. Fifteenth century BC Exodus proponents have predominantly adopted the reading from the Masoretic Text (MT), “in the 480th year.” The majority of Greek Septuagint manuscripts contain “in the 440th year,” while several others match the MT. This forty-year difference obviously impacts how relevant Levantine and Egyptian archaeological and historical evidence correlates with the biblical text. In the discussion that follows, I review and analyze evidence for the preservation of these two ordinal numbers. This includes (1) Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, (2) translations derived from both textual traditions, and (3) external witnesses which document the readings. I will also sketch out the highly complex translational and transmissional history of the Greek text of 1 Kings and how those complexities might impact text critical decision making. The concluding section surveys archaeological and historical evidence from the late divided kingdom era directly related to the number and how that evidence aids in adjudicating this chronologically precise textual variant.

KEY WORDS: 1 Kings 6:1, Date of the Exodus, Septuagint, Masoretic Text

INTRODUCTION

1 Kings 6:1 is a crucial biblical text for determining the date of the Exodus. Both fifteenth and thirteenth century BC Exodus proponents have predominantly adopted the reading from the Masoretic Text (MT), “in the 480th year.”¹ The majority of Greek Septuagint manuscripts contain “in the 440th year,” while several others match the MT. This forty-year difference obviously impacts how relevant Levantine and Egyptian archaeological evidence correlates with the biblical text. The difference is particularly pertinent in debates over the identification of the Exodus Pharaoh,² in understanding how the Amarna Letters might correlate with the conquest narratives, or in dating the destructions of Jericho, Ai, and Hazor. While much debate has centered around the interpretation of 1 Kings 6:1, very little

text critical analysis has been published by those who regard the Exodus/Conquest as historical.

In the discussion that follows, I review and analyze evidence for the preservation of these two ordinal numbers. This includes (1) Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, (2) translations derived from both textual traditions, and (3) external witnesses which document the readings. In doing so, I will sketch out the highly complex translational and transmissional history of the Greek text of 1 Kings and how those complexities might impact text critical decision making. The concluding section surveys archaeological and historical evidence from the late divided kingdom era directly related to the number and how that evidence aids in adjudicating this chronologically precise textual variant. A summary argument is then made for the original reading.

¹ The thirteenth (Hoffmeier 2007) vs. fifteenth century BC Exodus debate goes beyond the scope and intent of this paper, though its concluding section has implications for that debate. For my own hermeneutical and exegetical rationale for the fifteenth century date,

see Smith Jr. (2021).

² For example, Collins (2012) adopts the Greek reading and thereby dates the Exodus to 1406 BC while Petrovich (2006) follows the MT and dates the Exodus to 1446 BC.

DEFINITION AND BACKGROUND OF THE SEPTUAGINT

The term LXX (Septuagint) or “the seventy” originates from an apocryphal story in the *Letter of Aristeas* that 72 (or 70) Jewish scholars from Israel translated the Pentateuch into Greek in Alexandria, Egypt (§§ 301–10). This document “offers us a foundation myth of origins for the LXX’s transformed function/position as an independent scriptural authority” (Wright III 2008, 295). Despite the fantastical elements in *Aristeas*, many studies have established an early third century BC date for the original Greek translation of the Pentateuch (Joosten 2010, 53–72; Collins 1992). The original Greek translations of the post-Pentateuchal books were subsequently completed before 130 BC (Gentry 2009, 24). These books circulated as individual scrolls (Tov 2015, 429–48), including 1 and 2 Kings, respectively (Barrera 2013, 193). The Greek of 1 Kgs is also referred to as III Reigns or III Kingdoms or III Regnorum. The Jerusalem-based Jewish aristocrat Eupolemus (ca. 160 BC) interacted with Hebrew and Greek texts of the OT and cited portions of the temple building narratives from 1 Kgs 5–8 and 2 Chr 2–5 (Wacholder 1974, 248–58). Demetrius the Chronographer (ca. 220 BC) alludes to Samuel–Kings, perhaps pushing the date of origin back even further (Law 2015, 149, 160). The first Greek translation of 1 Kgs may therefore predate 160 BC.

Hereafter, I will refer to the original Greek translations as OG (Old Greek), and subsequent translations will be distinguished from it. After the original production of the OG, Jewish scribes soon began revising it to improve upon the syntax and vocabulary and/or to bring the Greek into better conformity with Hebrew manuscripts (MSS) in their possession. How frequently and to what degree these revisions were made is not fully known. The dominant Hebrew text in use during this period was the proto-Masoretic text (proto-MT), the precursor to the medieval MT (Gentry

2009, 44–45). Hebrew MSS deviating from the proto-MT also circulated in antiquity, evidenced by some of the Qumran scrolls.³ Using a modern-day analogy, English translations of the OT are often updated in efforts to improve upon the language in its present context and to bring the translation into better conformity with the best available Hebrew MSS. Like English translations, the subsequent Greek translations deviating from the OG can also be markedly different from one another due to different language preferences, communication objectives, and target audiences.

Scholars have identified one of the earliest OG revisions as *kaige* (Aitken 2015, 21–40). This term derives from the pervasive translation of $\text{וְ$ (also) and וְאִי (and also) into $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon$ (and indeed). Other linguistic and syntactical features also help distinguish *kaige* from the OG (Kreuzer 2008, 247–50; Law 2015, 152). The first century BC Greek Minor Prophets Scroll discovered at Naḥal Ḥever provides direct proof of *kaige* (Mäkipelto 2021, 195). *Kaige* is generally not considered a brand-new translation, but instead entails a revision of the OG. With the OG in hand, the translator(s) sought to achieve “formal equivalence at the word level between the Greek and the authoritative Hebrew versions” (Mäkipelto 2021, 196). McLay disputes the idea that *kaige* represents a “homogenous” work by the same translator(s) and questions whether it is a large-scale revision of the OG (1998, 127–39). Therefore,

[t]he extent of the influence of the *Kaige* revision is still a disputed and open issue. It can be clearly observed in the B text (*Codex Vaticanus* and related Greek manuscripts) of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings. In the B text, the whole of Judges is heavily influenced by this revision, while in Samuel–Kings (1–4 Kingdoms) it is mainly visible in two sections: 2 Samuel 10 [through] 1 Kings 1 and 1 Kings 22 [through] 2 Kings 25 (Mäkipelto 2021, 196).

Beyond *kaige*, Jewish translators known as the “Three”—Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion—produced Greek translations throughout the

³ The significance and implications of these differences are often overstated. For a corrective analysis, see Ferguson 2018.

second century AD. Aquila created a brand-new, rigidly literal Greek translation of the proto-MT. Theodotion used the proto-MT to revise the OG, and some of his translation work resembles *kaige*. Symmachus also utilized the proto-MT, with the goal of improving upon Greek style (Jobes and Silva 2015, 13–33).

THE HIGHLY COMPLEX HISTORY OF GREEK 1 KINGS

The relationship between the OG, *kaige*, and the Three became even more complicated after Origen produced the Hexapla, a six-column synopsis of the OT text (Jobes and Silva 2015, 39–46). The Hexapla's readings were transmitted in a variety of ways, often contaminating OG MSS. Later, the fourth century church in the region of Syrian Antioch received and amended the Lucianic Greek recension (Jobes and Silva 2015, 46–49, 171–80). Add scribal errors into the mix, and modern scholars are left trying to untangle an extremely complicated Gordian knot. While much progress has been made in differentiating between the OG and the aforementioned revisions and translations, “[t]he precise line of demarcation between original Greek translations and later revisers in this corpus of texts has, in fact, not yet been clearly established” (Gentry 2009, 24).

The OG, *kaige*, the Three, Hexaplaric, and Lucianic layers/readings are blended into MSS of 1 Kgs in a variety of ways, and their relationships are the ongoing subject of intense scholarly interest

(Barrera 2020). Moreover, some of the large-scale differences between the Greek of 1 Kgs and the medieval MT likely originated at the Hebrew level (Law 2015, 153–60; Gentry 2009, 39–41, esp. n. 77).⁴ Not all Greek OT books possess the multiple layers described above, but MSS of 1 Kgs often do, making it one of the most complex books in the Greek OT corpus. Tov summarizes the issues at hand:

The Greek text of 1 Kings differs greatly from its Hebrew counterpart: it omits parts, adds elements, contains important duplicate translations (cf. especially 1 Kings 2), its text is differently arranged and its chronological system differs from that of MT (1999b, 498).

As if this were not enough, 1 Kgs in its variegated Greek forms was translated directly into other languages such as (Old) Latin, Ethiopic, Armenian, Syriac, Arabic, Georgian, and various Coptic dialects (Piquer et al. 2008). These “daughter” or “secondary” versions are valuable witnesses to the Greek text, sometimes attesting to its early stage (Cox 2021) and “in some cases the recensional activity [in the Greek] has so obscured our view of the OG that we must rely upon the versions” (Law 2015, 149).

Identifying the Greek *Vorlage* underlying a secondary version is a complex task due to the nuances of translation, the multilayered history of the Greek text, and because “the secondary version has its own textual history, which might be quite complicated in its own right” (Cox 2021, 214). The versions were often translated from a single Greek MS and thus do not represent the broader Greek tradition. Critical editions are largely lacking,

⁴ Gentry's discussion of the large-scale differences between the MT and LXX is especially important (2009, 39–44). He concludes: “Up until the fall of Jerusalem, Judaism was highly variegated, and textual transmission answers to a broad continuum of texts ranging from repetition to resignification. Scribes in the circle of the temple nearly always preferred texts representing repetition rather than resignified texts. After the fall of Jerusalem, in the Hebrew textual transmission there was only repetition and no longer any resignification. This gives the impression that the text was standardized at this time, but, in fact, this is an incorrect conclusion. Let me be absolutely clear: the consensus view that the text was standardized

in the first century AD is wrong. Rather, what was dominant before the fall in terms of repetition, was likewise dominant after the fall—the proto-MT. Since there was no longer any resignification, it only appears that the text is now standard and not before this time” (pp. 44–45). Resignification refers to “manuscripts that represent scribes revising and updating the text to make it relevant to the current circumstances and generation” while repetition refers to “manuscripts that represent a simple, straightforward copying and transmitting of the text precisely as received” (p. 33). In the case of the Greek of 1 Kgs, resignification often won out over repetition (Marcos 1994, 24).

Table 1: Secondary Versions and Their Dates of Origin (adopted from Cox 2021, 216)

Old Latin	As early as the second century AD
Ethiopic	Fourth to sixth centuries AD
Armenian	Early fifth century AD (ca. 406)
Coptic Dialects	Third and fourth centuries AD
Georgian	Fifth to eighth century AD
Syro-Hexapla	Seventh century AD

so printed or diplomatic editions must be relied upon but used with considerable caution. Despite the challenges, the versions aid in ascertaining how the Greek language was understood at that time and enhance our understanding of the Greek textual history.

Beyond these considerations, we must also note the problems with the oldest MS preserving 440th in 1 Kgs 6:1, Codex Vaticanus (B):

Whole chapters [in B] are in different order. Sections are included more than once, some drawn from Supplements (MT Chronicles), while others have no known counterpart in the Hebrew Bible or the LXX. The sections are: Chapters 2.35a–n, 46a–l; Ch. 5. 14a, b; Ch. 6.1a–d; 6.36a; Ch. 9.9a; Ch. 10.22a–c; Ch. 12.24a–z; Ch. 16.28a–h13; also, chapters 20 and 21 are in reverse order... (Taylor 2007, 248)

The origin of these differences may be due to resignification of the text at the Hebrew level or possibly at the point of translation into Greek (Gentry 2009, 42, n. 82). Since our study focuses on a single chronological data point, these multiple layers of textual development may or may not have adversely affected the preservation of either 440th or 480th for 1 Kgs 6:1. For example 1 Kgs 1:1–2:11 and 22:1–54 in B represent the *kaige* recension, while the rest of B is usually considered OG (Taylor 2007, 244–48). Taken alone, this might support 440th as being representative of the OG since 1 Kgs 6:1 is in the non-*kaige* section. However, a scribe has inserted material from 1 Kgs 5:17–18, 6:37–38, and 6:14 between 6:1 and 6:2 (Taylor 2007, 248). How much do these interpolations impact the

veracity of the 440th reading in B? It is difficult to determine since 440th could have been preserved from an OG text regardless of the interpolations. Or, it could have been changed simultaneously along with the interpolations. B is the oldest LXX MS which preserves the number, but these interpolations and the extensive presence of *kaige* elements in B must at least be acknowledged and their influence considered before jumping to any definitive conclusions.

Turning now to the variant itself, much of the available data comes from the Cambridge Septuagint of 1–2 Kgs, published in 1930 by Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (hereafter BMT). This diplomatic edition used B as its base text and compared, collated, and organized other textual data in relationship to B. The Cambridge series ceased publication in 1940. The Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities has been publishing critical editions of the OG since 1931. These are a collection of the oldest recoverable texts, carefully restored book by book. Unlike BMT, no individual MS is deemed “best” or is used as a base text. Göttingen draws on the widest possible array of relevant textual data and attempts to systematically reconstruct the OG. Göttingen 1 Kgs is still a work in progress (Torijano and Treballe 2022), so we must rely on BMT as a baseline for this study. Wherever possible, I will reference newer sources and online images to confirm, supplement, and/or correct data gleaned from BMT.

Table 2 records the Greek MS data and includes the following: the date, the MS sigla in

BMT and Rahlfs's/Göttingen,⁵ sources confirming the reading, the location of the MS, folio numbers and other data, and links to additional data and images. In 1 Kgs 6:1, twenty-four Greek MSS preserve 440th, while seven preserve 480th. Most are written in lowercase Greek (minuscules) and date to AD 1000 and later. Several important MSS with uppercase letters (majuscules or uncials) are older. Secondary versions and external witnesses also attest to Hebrew and Greek MSS containing either 440th or 480th. In the following sections, the evidence for both readings will be spelled out.

IN THE 440TH YEAR

Codex Basiliano-Vaticanus (eighth century)

Codices Basiliano-Vaticanus (N) and Venetus (V) were part of a single codex originally (Orsini 2019, 183–84).⁶ Written in a script known as “liturgical majuscule” (Orsini 2019, 165–91), N is presently stored in the Vatican, while V can be found in St. Mark's Library in Venice. BMT (1930, 223) records 440th for N, visually confirmed in the Vatican Digital Library (folio 76v).⁷

Codex Coislinianus (seventh century)

Written in uncial script, M preserves portions of the Pentateuch, Josh, Judg, Ruth, 1 Sam, and 1–2 Kgs.⁸ The codex is stored at the National Library of France. BMT (1930, 223) documents a reading of 440th for M, visible online (folio 224r).⁹

Sulpitius Severus (AD 363–420)

Severus wrote several works, including a chronology from creation to ca. AD 400 (Schaff and

Wace 1885, 3–4). Chapter 40 of his *Sacred History* reads:

... Solomon ... laid the foundation of [the Temple] about the fourth year of his reign. This was about the five hundred and eighty-eighth year after the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt, although in the third Book of Kings the years are reckoned at four hundred and forty. (Schaff and Wace 1885, 221)

Here, Severus notes the tension between his 588-year consecutive chronological reckoning of the era between the Exodus and Solomon (largely consisting of the Judges period), and the 440th year reading in his Greek text. He deemed 440th to be a scribal error and not the original text, though he does not explain how it arose, nor does he mention the MT's reading. Regardless, he confirms 440th as extant in a Greek MS at the beginning of the fifth century AD.

Ethiopic (fourth to sixth century)

Most Ethiopic (Ge'ez) MSS date to the 14th century and later. Only in recent decades have scholars been able to access older MSS preserved in Ethiopia (Reíllo 2021, 165). *The Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament Project* has thus far discovered a “remarkable uniformity” in the tradition, which may go back to a single recension (Fox et al. 2020, 87, 80–110). Ethiopic 1 Kgs has not yet been collated into a critical edition, so the data set is limited and conclusions therefore tentative. BMT (1927, vii) relied on two MSS analyzed in an 1871 printed edition published by Augustus Dillman, who deemed MSS A and S to be the best witnesses to the most ancient form of the Ethiopic text. The reading in S was translated into Latin in BMT (1930, 223) as follows: “where it was the four hundred and eighty-fourth year.”¹⁰ The extra four years are likely due to a scribal error at the Greek

⁵ Göttingen maintains Rahlfs's Septuagint MS catalog online: <https://septuaginta.uni-goettingen.de/catalogue>

⁶ In Rahlfs's catalog, the data for N has been merged into that of V. https://septuaginta.uni-goettingen.de/catalogue/Ra_V

⁷ https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.2106

⁸ <https://archivesetmanuscripts.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc25169m>

⁹ <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84683074/f455.item.zoom>

¹⁰ Ubi fuit quadringentesimus octogesimus et quartus annus.

level (Gehman 1931, 93). Gehman (1931) analyzed A, S, and other Ethiopic MSS, but documented no additional MSS preserving either 440th or 480th. BMT (1930, 223) translated the number in MS A from Ge'ez into Greek, which reads "400th and 40th."¹¹ Future studies should yield more data, but for the moment the two readings effectively cancel one another out.

Armenian (early fifth century)

The Armenian version of the OT was translated from Greek beginning in ca. AD 406. Only a critical edition of Job has been produced thus far (Cox 2021, 217–23). BMT (1930, 223) utilized a diplomatic edition published by Hovhannes Zohrapian in 1805. Zohrapian used nine witnesses, including six complete and one partial Armenian Bible, and a seventeenth century printed edition (Cox 1994, 234–37). BMT (1930, 223) records 440th in Greek (τετρακοσιοστῷ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ) and documents no variants from Zohrapian's study. Gehman's study included the Zohrapian edition plus two other witnesses but revealed no additional data on our variant. He concluded these editions were translated from a Greek manuscript(s) similar to Codex Alexandrinus (1934, 59). From this limited data, we can tentatively conclude one portion of the Armenian tradition contained 440th in the fifth century.

Codex Alexandrinus (fifth century)

Stored in the British Library, Codex A is one of the three major uncial codices along with Sinaiticus (א) and B. Divided into four volumes, A contains nearly all the OT, non-canonical books such as 1 Maccabees, and the NT.¹² In 1 Kgs, A has been significantly influenced by the Hexapla's fifth column (Law 2011, 36, n. 108; 362). BMT (1930, 223) records 440th, visible online at the *Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts* (folio 204r).¹³

¹¹ τετρακοσιοστῷ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ.

¹² For more details, see: https://septuaginta.uni-goettingen.de/catalogue/Ra_A

Codex Vaticanus (fourth century)

Codex B is stored in the Vatican Library. It is written in uncial script and contains most of the books of the Old and New Testaments. Along with A and א, B is one of the most important and (almost) complete MSS of the Greek Bible. The text of 1–4 Kingdoms in B is widely considered pre-Hexaplaric (Hill 2022, 257), thereby escaping the influence of Origen. BMT (1930, 223) records 440th in B, visible in the Vatican Digital Library (folio 405).¹⁴

Eusebius of Caesarea (AD 310)

In *Chronicle* chapter 33, Eusebius (AD 266–339) documented readings from both Hebrew (480th) and Greek MSS (440th). He maintained that 480th was original, but his main concern centered around the apparent discrepancy between 480 years and his 600-year calculation from the Exodus to Solomon's fourth year. Eusebius reconciled the numbers by concluding 120 years of foreign oppression during the Judges era were excluded from the 480-year total recorded by the author of 1 Kgs 6:1 (Adler 1992, 471–72, 481). He does not explain how 440th originated, but his Greek MS likely dated to the mid to late third century AD.

Origen (AD 250): Hexapla → Tetrapla → Syro Hexapla

The Christian theologian, philologist, and textual scholar Origen (ca. AD 185–254) produced the Hexapla between AD 234 and 250 (Gentry 2021, 227). This work contained the following materials in six parallel columns:

1. The Hebrew OT text to which Origen had access.
2. A Greek transliteration of the Hebrew consonantal text with the vocalization tradition.
3. The Greek translation of Aquila (א').

¹³ https://manuscripts.csntm.org/manuscript/View/GA_02

¹⁴ https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209

4. The Greek translation of Symmachus (σ').
5. The Old Greek, or "the seventy" (ο').
6. The Greek translation of Theodotion (θ').

The original Hexapla may have consisted of forty codices (Gentry 2021, 242) but survives today only in fragmentary form. Several sources confirm its existence and the six-columned format, including the testimony of patristic scholars and MSS from the Cairo Genizah (Gentry 2021, 229–40). Barber. gr. 549 in the Vatican beautifully preserves columns of the Hexapla for Hosea 11:1 (folio 17v).¹⁵

Scholars have traditionally maintained that when Origen reproduced the OG in the fifth column, he also included signs when the Greek and Hebrew deviated from each other. He marked the OG passages lacking in the Hebrew with an obelos (+). If there were Hebrew passages extant but absent from the OG, he marked those with an asterisk (*). Origen also included a metobelus (- or ↙) to mark the end of the textual insertion. Then, scribes transmitted the fifth column independently from the other columns. Several Greek MSS preserve this material, including portions of Ezra, Proverbs, and the Pentateuch. MS 922 (AD 250–350) and 928 (AD 250–325) are particularly significant because they date within 50–75 years of Origen's death and contain asterisks and obeli (Gentry 2021, 230–31).

Jobs and Silva note that other scholars argue the "fifth column contained an uncorrected text" of the OG (2015, 41). On this view, the Hexapla served as a massive depository of raw data. In a subsequent work called the Tetrapla, Origen assessed the Hexapla synopsis and then highlighted his corrections in the Tetrapla by using the signs. The Tetrapla and its signs were further developed by Pamphilus (d. AD 309) and Eusebius. The Tetrapla included the OG with the accompanying Origenic signs, and important readings from the Three. "Thus, the Tetrapla was 'fourfold'; that is, it supplied four editions of the text" (Gentry 2021, 240).

A significant translation derived from the Hexapla/Tetrapla is the Syro-Hexapla (SyH). Between AD 613 and 617, Paul of Tella translated Greek material derived from the fifth column into Syriac. Specialists note the Syriac syntax and vocabulary in SyH is slavishly bound to the underlying Greek (Law 2011, 18–24). This allows scholars to convert (called retroversion) the Syriac back into Greek to reconstruct the text as it appeared in Paul's MS.

1 Kgs 6:1 is preserved in only one SyH MS, the eighth century "Br. Lib. Add. Ms. 14,437," warehoused in the British Library. In his 1875 magnum opus, Frederick Field collated and analyzed evidence for Origen's Hexapla and produced Greek retroversions of the SyH text (Norton 2005, 10–18). For 1 Kgs 6:1, Field's notation reads: "The Syro-Hexapla has it like this: And it came to pass in the 40th year and 400th year [from] the Exodus" (1875, 1:602).¹⁶ He concluded 440th originally appeared in the Hexapla's fifth column (1875, 1:602). I believe this is correct, but with the following caveats and supporting evidence. According to Gentry, raw textual data from the Hexapla was mediated through the Tetrapla and eventually deposited in the SyH:

Origen made his own ἑκδόσις [edition] from the Hexapla. The format of this document was exactly what we see in the Syro-Hexapla and was, in fact, the Tetrapla... Thus, an edition was produced from the Fifth Column of the Hexapla that eventually became textually distant from that of the [original] Fifth Column (2021: 236).¹⁷

Consequently, 440th was recorded in the fifth column of the Hexapla from a Greek MS of 1 Kgs 6:1, adopted into the Tetrapla by either Origen, Pamphilus, or Eusebius, transmitted in subsequent Greek MSS, and finally translated and preserved in the SyH by Paul of Tella. There is therefore some distance in time and textual transmission between the original Hexapla (third century) and what

¹⁵ https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.549

¹⁶ "In Syro-hex. locus sic habet: καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν τῷ ἔτει τετρακοσιοστῷ καὶ τεσσαρακοντα ἔτη τῆς ἐξόδου." The Greek in B is slightly different: καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν τῷ τεσσαρακοστῷ καὶ τετρακοσιοστῷ ἔτει τῆς ἐξόδου. BMT (1930, prefatory note) references Paul de Lagarde's 1892

edition of the SyH and provides this Latin translation: "in anno quadringentorum et quadraginta annorum" [in the year of four hundred and forty years] (1930, 223)

¹⁷ Law similarly concludes that "scholars should cease claiming Syh is a [direct] translation of the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla" (2011, 369).

appears in the SyH (early seventh century).

In his extensive study of MS 14,337, Law documented 541 Origenic signs (2012, 189). However, neither Law (2011, 202–203), nor de Lagarde (1892, 198)¹⁸ nor Field (1875, 1:602) document any signs next to 440th. To the best of my knowledge, no asterisks or obeli appear next to 440th in any extant Greek MSS, either. Wherever I have been able to visually confirm 440th online, no signs have been found. If correct, either the sign(s) were lost in transmission, or they were never marked next to 440th in the Tetrapla from the outset. Whether Origen compared the OG reading to the Hebrew or found any deviation between them, we simply do not know.

While we cannot confirm which reading Origen deemed original, MS 14,337 contains a colophon that solidifies the four-hundred-year bridge between the number deposited in the Hexapla and the SyH. Gentry's translation of it reads:

The manuscript, that in our possession (?) was translated from Greek into Syriac, was taken from the Hexapla, that is, from the "Six Columns" that was among the manuscripts of the "Six Columns" of the Library of Caesarea, Palestine, and was collated to a copy in which there was noted at the end as follows: "I, Eusebius, corrected as accurately as possible." (2021, 235)

According to this notation, Eusebius carefully examined and corrected a Greek MS which had been ultimately derived from the fifth column of the Hexapla and noted it as such. This colophon was then copied over into subsequent Greek MSS, eventually making its way into the Greek MS used by Paul of Tella for the SyH of 1 Kgs. Combining this evidence with his *Chronicle* commentary, we can conclude Eusebius thought 440th was the correct OG reading even though he believed 480th was the number penned by the original author of 1 Kgs. This data supports Field's deduction that

Origen recorded 440th in the fifth column of the Hexapla in the mid-third century AD.

Old Latin (ca. AD 200-250)

The first Old Latin (OL) books originated in Italy and North Africa in the second century AD. The writings of Tertullian (AD 120–130) and Cyprian (d. AD 258) attest to their early circulation. No single extant MS preserves the entire OL Bible. The evidence is disparate, ranging from MS fragments to marginal readings in Spanish versions of Jerome's Vulgate to patristic citations and liturgical texts (Kedar 2004, 299–300). The OL largely predates Origen's Hexapla and often preserves the OG, especially when its readings are corroborated by other pre-Hexaplaric witnesses (Marcos 1994, 41–87). Moreover, the OL tends to be a more literal translation of the Greek, making it easier to identify the underlying *Vorlage* (Gesche 2018, 256).

The OL of 1 Kgs may have originated as early as the late second century since it is referenced by Cyprian and Irenaeus (d. 202), although scholars cannot firmly determine if these authors translated the Greek into Latin or if they cited an OL text directly (Gesche 2018, 259–63). Two OL MSS preserve portions of 1 Kgs (Kauhanen 2018, 12), but 6:1 is preserved in only one: the *Quedlinburg Itala* (La 116; Lat. fol. 485).¹⁹ Studies of possible *kaige*, Hexaplaric, or (proto) Lucianic elements in *Quedlinburg* have not yet been published.²⁰ La 116 is the oldest known illustrated biblical MS and has been dated to AD 420–440 (Levin 1985, 67–71). Written in uncial letters, 1 Kgs 6:1 reads "in the 400th and the 40th year" (Levin 1985, 98–99; folio 5r).²¹ The early fifth century date of *Quedlinburg* and the broader data make a late second century or early third century date for 440th in the OL highly plausible.

¹⁸ According to de Lagarde, lines 14 and 15 preserve the verse.

¹⁹ The OL evidence cited in BMT is largely from printed editions or is outdated.

²⁰ Martijn Beukenhorst, PhD student in Theology (Biblical Studies) at the Catholic University of Leuven,

has written three separate articles accepted for publication about *Quedlinburg* which will explore these issues in detail. Personal email correspondence, March 4, 2024.

²¹ "in quadri[n]gentesimo et quadragesimo anno."

IN THE 480TH YEAR

All known Hebrew MSS of 1 Kgs 6:1 record 480th. An exhaustive study by Wevers (1945, 43–76) revealed no variants in the Masoretic textual tradition. The Leningrad Codex preserves 480th and can be seen online (folio 188).²²

Codex Zuqninensis (sixth century)

Codex Z is a palimpsest with majuscule Greek text underlying the ninth century Syriac *Chronicle of Zuqnin*. Z consists of 179 folios—173 in the Vatican and six in the British Library. Of these, 129 are palimpsests (Harrak 1999, 1). Catholic scholar Eugene Tisserant published an in-depth study of Z in 1911 and designated the Greek books as follows: Jdgs (Z1), 1 Kgs (Z2 and Z3), Ps (Z4), Ez (Z5), and Dan (Z6). The folios in the Vatican preserving 1 Kgs²³ received the designation “Z2” (XLIV–LII, 40–86).²⁴ Z2 has been identified as Antiochene/Lucianic (Marcos and Saiz 1992, xvii–xviii; Orsini 2019, 75). It preserves 480th (Tisserant 1911, 56; BMT 1930, 223; Marcos and Saiz 1992, 15) and the reading is visible online (folio 71r).²⁵

Ethiopic (fourth to sixth century)

One documented MS reads 480th. See above.

Latin Vulgate (fourth century)

Jerome translated 1–2 Kgs from the proto-MT into Latin, ca. AD 392. His translation of 6:1 reads: “And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year.”²⁶ According to Sutcliffe, Jerome may have borrowed Hebrew MSS from synagogues and then copied them for his library. He apparently spent a considerable amount of his own money purchasing

biblical MSS. These scrolls were probably several decades old when Jerome copied or acquired them (1948, 195–204), plausibly pushing his witness to 480th back to ca. AD 300–325.

Eusebius of Caesarea (AD 310)

Eusebius’s Hebrew MS with 480th likely dates to the mid to late third century (see above).

Syriac Peshitta (ca. AD 150–250)

Peshitta means something like “in common use” (Romeny 2005, 76–77). The translation of the Hebrew OT into Syriac in the region of Edessa began in the middle of the second century and involved multiple translators (Romeny 2005, 90–95). The Hebrew *Vorlage* used for the translation of 1–2 Kgs was very similar to the medieval MT, with occasional exceptions (Dyk and van Keulen 2013, 480–81). The translator(s) utilized Aramaic Targums and drew on Jewish exegetical traditions (Maori 2001, 411–18). 1 Kgs 6:1 reads: “It was in the four hundred and eightieth year after the going forth of the children of Israel...” (Greenberg and Walter 2018, 41). There are no deviations from 480th in the manuscript tradition (Peshitta Institute 1976, 18).²⁷ Based on the known evidence, it seems reasonable to date the reading in the Syriac Peshitta to around AD 200.

Symmachus (ca. AD 200)

The Jewish scholar Symmachus produced his Greek translation of the OT in the region of Caesarea. His translation generally stands “midway between Aquila and the Old Greek” (Jobes and Silva 2015, 30). Law has documented 117 readings from 1 Kgs attributed to Symmachus and surmised he was

²² https://manuscripts.sefaria.org/leningrad-color/BIB_LENCDX_F188A.jpg

²³ 2:19–25; 2:35–39; 2:46–3:2; 3:27–4:9; 4:28–6:16; 7:27–8:33, 21:26–39.

²⁴ Z3 was assigned to the folio in the British Library preserving 1 Kgs 8:58–9:1 (Tisserant 1911, 84–86).

²⁵ https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.sir.162

²⁶ factum est igitur quadringentesimo et octogesimo anno.

²⁷ Thanks to Dr. Rodney Cloud of Amridge University who helped me decipher the Syriac in the textual apparatus.

more of a translator than a reviser (2008, 278, 292). For 1 Kgs 6:1, Symmachus recorded 480th, preserved in the top left margin of folio 224r of Codex M (Field 1875, 1:602; BMT 1930, 223). The scribe recorded 440th in the main body of the MS, but he also preserved the much older ca. AD 200 reading handed down from Symmachus' translation.

***Seder 'Olam Rabbah* (ca. AD 140–160)**

Seder 'Olam (SO) was developed and adopted by the rabbinic leadership as the official world chronology of post-Temple Judaism (Milikowsky 1981, 12–24). The Talmud attributes its authorship to Yose ben Halafta, a student of Rabbi Akiba and “... the most authoritative among [his] students....” (Guggenheimer 1998, x). SO's history begins with Adam in the equivalent of 3761 BC and ends with the Second Jewish revolt (AD 132–135). SO's unreliability in chronological matters is well known. For example, the writers compressed the Persian era down to about 52 years, an historical impossibility (Sexton and Smith Jr. 2016, 47–48). While this and other chronological calculations in SO are not historically reliable or biblically accurate, two pieces of data can be confirmed as trustworthy and contribute positively to our analysis (Young 2024a; 2024b).

First, chapter 24 of SO documents that the eighteenth year of Josiah (2 Kgs 2:23) “was also the beginning of a Jubilee” (Young 2006, 74). The accuracy and implications of this time marker will be discussed further below. Second, chapter fifteen reads: “It was in the 480th year after the Exodus, in the fourth year, in the month of Ziv, that is the second month, of Solomon's rule over Israel, that he built the Temple” (Guggenheimer 1998, 141). The author(s) used proto-MT texts which descended from Hebrew MSS that had escaped the Temple's destruction. Despite SO's numerous chronological problems, the raw 480th year data point cannot be deemed corrupt since it has been independently verified elsewhere. SO's citation of 1 Kgs 6:1 likely points to late first century AD provenance and closely follows the medieval MT.

Aquila (ca. AD 140)

The Jewish scholar Aquila of Pontus produced a new Greek translation around AD 140 (Jobes and Silva 2015, 26–28). It was widely distributed throughout Greek speaking Jewish communities (Tov 2008, 184–88) and “is extremely literal in its fidelity to the MT” (Würthwein 2014, 107). Aquila's translation has been preserved in MSS from the Cairo Genizah, in patristic citations, in the Hexapla's third column, and in margins of the SyH and LXX MSS. Aquila's 480th year reading appears in the margin of Codex M alongside Symmachus's. This dual witness demonstrates that the scribe had access to material from both translations and together they represent strong evidence for the antiquity of the reading. Aquila's proto-MT MSS could come from around the year AD 100, taking the 480th reading back to the end of the first century.

Lucianic/Antiochene Greek Recension (first century BC)

One of the most complicated areas within Septuagint studies is the content, history, and origin of the Greek text used by the church in Syria during the Roman era. This text type (hereafter Luc.) is named after the presbyter and martyr Lucian of Antioch (AD 250–312). Prominent figures such as John Chrysostom, Diodorus, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia were also part of the Antiochene tradition, known for its vibrant biblical exegesis (Marcos 2000, 223). In the late fourth century, Jerome identified three main Greek text types competing for primacy in the church, one of which was associated with Lucian (Jobes and Silva 2015, 39).

Specialists have detected two main phases of development within Luc. (Kreuzer 2008, 245). Some Luc. readings have been found elsewhere only in secondary variants preserved in medieval Hebrew MSS of 1–2 Kgs (Wevers 1945, 43–76; Barrera 2013, 199–202). The Syriac church had no access to these MSS, so the unique Luc. readings originated from earlier Hebrew texts which long

predate the Antiochenes (Marcos 1994, 13; Kreuzer 2008, 241).²⁸ More broadly, Lucianic readings in Sam-Kgs from Qumran, the Peshitta, secondary versions (Piquer et al. 2008, 280), Josephus, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and pre-Hexaplaric church fathers confirm a proto-Lucianic Greek text arose before the turn of the era (Mäkipelto 2021, 204–205; Morales 2013, 177; Tov 1999a, 479–85). “It cannot be coincidental that so many diverse sources reflect a proto-Lucianic text in the books of Reigns” (Tov 1999a, 480). There is little doubt that the Greek recension received by the Antiochenes originated in at least the first century BC.

Second, after proto-Luc. made its way to Syria, the Antiochene exegetes revised the Greek grammar and style (Kreuzer 2009, 38), added explanatory material, harmonized parallel texts, and sometimes adopted readings from the Hexapla and the Three (Tov 1999a, 482; McLay 2008, 296). Luc. has not been corrupted by *kaige* (Marcos 1994, 13), but other particulars are disputed. Tov argues that Luc. contains a “substratum” of the OG or another now unknown text close to the OG (1999a, 479).²⁹ Kreuzer asserts Luc. primarily preserves the OG (2008, 239–53; 2009, 34–51), while Law and Kauhanen (2010, 73–87) and Robker (2013, 207–18) maintain that such determinations must be made on a case-by-case basis.

Several Luc. MSS preserve 480th, including the sixth century Codex Z and minuscules 19, 93, 108, and 127, dated to the tenth century and later (table 2). These MSS can be definitively connected to the Antiochene church and the proto-Luc. MSS from which they were derived. As such, they attest to 480th in Greek MS from centuries earlier. The

main question here is whether the Antiochenes changed 440th to 480th, or if they received Greek MSS already containing 480th.

A few points can be made favoring the latter. First, critical chronological data points in the Luc. MSS of 1–2 Kgs inherited by the Antiochene church deviate from the MT (Shenkel 1968, 26–42). These divergences may have originated with even older Greek MSS or a Hebrew *Vorlage* where scribes had attempted to internally harmonize perceived errors in the divided kingdom chronology. In any case, the Antiochenes did not change the numbers to bring them into conformity with those found in the medieval MT (assuming they even had direct access to Hebrew MSS, which is uncertain). The preservation of the non-MT chronological data points in Luc. supports the conclusion they also did not alter 1 Kgs 6:1 to bring it in line with the MT.

Moreover, one of the distinguishing features of Luc. is the frequent translation of יְהִי (to be, become) into the aorist middle, ἐγένετο.³⁰ The OG tends to translate the Hebrew into the aorist passive, ἐγενήθη instead. The Antiochenes might be responsible for this “atticizing” tweak (Tov 1999a, 483), but it also could have been done before the turn of the era (Kreuzer 2009, 51).³¹ This variation pertains directly to our study since 1 Kgs 6:1 begins with יְהִי. The five Lucianic MSS which preserve 480th also translate יְהִי into ἐγένετο. However, Luc. MS 82 (Marcos and Saiz 1992, xx–xxi) preserves 440th and ἐγενήθη (BMT 1930, 223; table 1), and both appear to be from the OG’s substratum. MS 82 also contains other readings in 6:1–2 which deviate from Luc. (Marcos and Saiz 1992, 15–16). Moreover, the non-Lucianic

²⁸ It is not clear if Lucian himself even knew Hebrew (Jobs and Silva 2015, 173; McLay 2008, 298).

²⁹ Tov states the Greek text used for the BC proto-Lucianic revision could have been the OG text (1999a, 479).

³⁰ From γίνομαι.

³¹ This “atticizing” of the Greek away from koine and towards the less vulgar Attic was quite common. Kreuzer notes: “It is certainly correct that the Antiochene text is atticizing in comparison with the hebraizing *kaige* text,

but atticisms are not proof of a late text. Atticism was the ideal and en vogue throughout most of antiquity, even in the first century C.E., as the letters of Pliny show. It was an ideal for the literary language (besides the koine, which was spoken and written in everyday life) in Alexandria in the third and second centuries B.C.E., in the time when the Septuagint was translated” (2009, 51, n. 44).

minuscule 56 combines 480th with ἐγένετο instead of 440th and ἐγενήθη (BMT 1930, 223),³² indicating the readings existed side by side outside of Luc. influence.

In summary, MS 56 shows that the number and the “atticizing” tweak circulated outside Antiochene textual circles and are likely remnants of proto-Luc. The Hebrew text underlying the proto-Luc. text was not strictly a proto-MT text since the divided kingdom chronology inherited by the Antiochenes deviated from the MT in several places.³³ Despite these variations and their accompanying internal difficulties, they exercised restraint and left the chronology intact. Changing 1 Kgs 6:1 from 440th to 480th or vice versa would have radically altered its chronological meaning, something the Antiochenes show no evidence of doing elsewhere, especially in the case of MS 82. The evidence *in toto* demonstrates that 480th was extant in the proto-Lucianic Greek and the Hebrew manuscript(s) from which it was derived in the first or possibly second century BC.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE TEXTUAL EVIDENCE

Despite all the complexities involved with the transmission of the Greek of 1 Kgs, the 440th year reading appears early and is spread across a wide array of MSS and other witnesses. It can be definitively traced back as early as ca. AD 200 in the OL, pointing to a mid to late second century AD Greek exemplar. 440th is most likely the original OG reading, possibly originating in the first or second century BC. The 480th reading also comes from a widespread textual tradition, but one that was more stable overall. The reading is preserved

in four sources which are either contemporaneous with 440th in the OL or predate it—Symmachus, *Seder 'Olam*, Aquila, and the Lucianic Recension. The Hebrew text used for proto-Luc. would surely date to the mid-first century BC, and possibly the second. Proto-Luc. and its 480th year reading does possess some quasi-independence from the MT in that other elements of its divided kingdom chronology depart from MT. The totality of evidence would seem to somewhat favor 480th, especially since it has a greater number of the oldest witnesses attesting to it. Even so, the choice of 480th as the original would by no means be a text critical slam dunk.

We must therefore turn to other biblical evidence and external data which bears directly on the reading. I propose that we can definitively resolve this text critical problem by looking closely at the chronology of the Israelite monarchy. During this era, very precise dates can be verified from various biblical texts along with archaeological evidence and other ancient literature. Since our reading entails a “to the year” chronological data point, similarly precise archaeological and historical evidence can be used to adjudicate this variant.³⁴

THE CONVERGENCE OF LATE DIVIDED KINGDOM EVIDENCE

The Tyrian King List and several additional lines of evidence have definitively established 967 BC as the date for the start of the Temple’s construction in Solomon’s fourth year (Young and Steinmann 2012, 224–26, esp. 226 n. 8).³⁵ The 440th year reading would therefore place the start of

³² According to Holmes and Parsons (1818, np), MSS 44 and 144 combine ἐγένετο with 440th, while 246 combines 480th with ἐγενήθη. This information is not recorded in BMT. MSS 44 and 246 appear in Rahlfs’ catalog as preserving 1 Kgs, while MS 144 preserves Ps, not 1 Kgs. We must wait for the publication of the Göttingen critical edition to verify and correct this data.

³³ It is even possible “Lucian worked with a previous Greek text that reflected a Hebrew original older than MT...” (Morales 2013, 185).

³⁴ In an unpublished synopsis, Douglas Petrovich includes archaeological evidence from the mid-second millennium BC and uses it to support his case for the originality of 480th. In this section, I approach the problem from the other direction. https://www.academia.edu/5987760/Resolution_of_1_Kings_6_1_Textual_Variant

³⁵ The year of Solomon’s death and the beginning of the divided monarchy in 931 BC (Young 2007b, 163–89) is also widely agreed upon by many scholars from diverse worldview backgrounds (Young 2006, 81, n. 23).

Joshua's conquest in 1366 BC ($967 + 439 - 40$), while 480th would place it in 1406 BC ($967 + 479 - 40$). Additionally, it was noted above that *Seder 'Olam* chapter 24 documents that the eighteenth year of Josiah was the beginning of a jubilee year. This statement can be tested to see if the Israelites had accurately tracked jubilees cycles beginning with their entrance into Canaan (Lev. 17–26). If we can determine that this jubilee counting was accurate and began in either 1406 or 1366 BC, it would verify the authenticity of one date and disqualify the other as spurious. Due to space limitations, I will summarize the extensive research already done by Rodger C. Young³⁶ and other scholars on the evidence from this period.

1. Young and Edwin Thiele have independently confirmed that Josiah came to the throne in the Judean regnal year that began on Tishri 1 of 641 BC (Young 2005, 246; Thiele 1983, 179). The public reading of the Torah recorded in 2 Kgs 22:3 took place in the first six months of Josiah's eighteenth year, which began in Tishri of 623 BC (Young 2006, 75).

2. *Megillah* 14b of the Talmud indicates that "the sixteenth jubilee occurred in the eighteenth year of Josiah" (Young 2006, 73, n. 5). If we add sixteen jubilees ($16 \times 49 = 784$ years) to 623 BC, we get 1406 BC, inclusively reckoned.

3. *SO* chapter 11 records that a jubilee year began at the time of Ezekiel's vision (40:1) and designates it as the seventeenth jubilee.

4. *Arakin* 12a of the Talmud also records his vision fell at the beginning of a jubilee year.

5. Both *SO* 11 and *Arakin* 12b specify Ezekiel's vision occurred in the seventeenth jubilee (Young 2006, 80). If we add one jubilee to 623 BC (Josiah's eighteenth year, the sixteenth jubilee), we get 574 BC ($623 \text{ minus } 49$).

6. Several chronological referents in Ezek 40:1 independently confirm the accuracy of 574 BC: "In the twenty-fifth year of our exile, at the beginning of the year [Rosh Hashanah], on the tenth day of

the month, in the fourteenth year after the city was struck down, on that very day..." (ESV).

7. Rosh Hashanah was observed on the tenth of the month only in a jubilee year, confirming that *Arakin* 12a, 12b, and *SO* 11 are correct on this point (Young 2008, 113; Young 2006, 71).

8. The fall of Jerusalem occurred in the summer of 587 BC (Young 2004, 38), "which was the year that began in Tishri (the fall) of 588 BC by Judean court reckoning" (Young 2006, 72). The fourteen years of Ezek 40:1 brings the date of Ezekiel's vision to 574 BC by non-inclusive reckoning ($588 \text{ minus } 14$).

9. Working back from 574 BC, "the twenty fifth year of our exile" would place the deportation to Babylon in the year which began in Tishri of 598 BC by inclusive reckoning ($574 \text{ plus } 24$).

10. The date of Jehoiachin's capture and thus the start of the exile in Ezekiel's reckoning (1:1–3a)³⁷ is recorded in the Babylonian Chronicle—the second of Adar, or March 16, 597 BC (Wiseman 1956, 73). Therefore, "[Jehoiachin's] first year of captivity was in the Judean regnal year that began in Tishri of 598 BC" (Young 2006, 72). This completely independent evidence confirms the date of Jehoiachin's capture (597 BC), which then correlates with the fall of Jerusalem (587 BC),³⁸ the time of the vision (574 BC, the twenty-fifth year of Jehoiachin and Ezekiel's exile according to Ezekiel 40:1), and the eighteenth year of Josiah (623 BC).

11. Zedekiah's release of slaves in Jer. 34:8–10 took place in a sabbatical year, Tishri of 588 BC (Young 2008, 115). As a multiple of seven, a jubilee year is always a sabbatical year. Two sabbatical cycles (14 years) from Zedekiah's emancipation of the slaves bring us to 574 BC, again confirming the date of Ezekiel's vision ($588 \text{ minus } 14$).

12. If we add seventeen jubilees (833 years) to 574 BC, we again get 1406 BC, inclusively reckoned.

13. The 1366 BC date does not fall at the beginning of a jubilee cycle and is out of accord with the evidence just surveyed.

³⁶ My thanks to Rodger Young for providing feedback on this paper, especially in this section.

³⁷ "In the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month, as I was among the exiles by the Chebar canal, the heavens were opened, and I saw

visions of God. On the fifth day of the month (it was the fifth year of the exile of King Jehoiachin), the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel the priest..." (ESV)

³⁸ Ezekiel's two methods of dating confirm the 587 BC date (Young 2006, 72).

14. 440th also runs into further difficulties with the Judges era. Conservative authors have published exegetical solutions which correlate with the MT (i.e. Steinmann 2011, 87–109). A case for 440th should entail an exegetical analysis that internally reconciles the Judges data with the OG's reading. In my judgment, it is difficult to foresee how this reconciliation might be accomplished. In particular, in Judg 11:26, Jephthah states that Israel had settled in the Trans-Jordan region 300 years before his time. This may be an approximation, but it will not do to try to make Jephthah's 300 years forty years less. Had that been the case, Jephthah would have used 260 or 250 years as an approximation. After his statement, Jephthah judged Israel for six years, followed in succession by Ibzan (seven years), Elon (ten years), and Abdon (eight years). The time from the conquest of the Transjordan to the end of the rule of Abdon would be approximately $300 + 6 + 7 + 10 + 8 = 331$ years. A 1446 BC Exodus ends this string of judges in about $1407 \text{ BC} - 331 = 1076 \text{ BC}$, whereas a 1406 BC Exodus would end the judgeships forty years later, ca. 1036 BC. However, 1036 BC extends well into the reign of Saul, whose kingship started ca. 1050 BC (McFall 2010, 530). Any attempt to change the chronology of Saul's reign to accommodate such

changes would have a domino effect resulting in manifold chronological difficulties in subsequent eras, including the date Solomon began to build the Temple.

In conclusion, if construction on Solomon's Temple began in the 440th year from the Exodus so that the entry into the land was in 1366 BC rather than 1406 BC, then a jubilee would not have been observed in Josiah's eighteenth year or at the beginning of Ezekiel's vision (Young 2024a; 2024b). Where then did these two jubilee remembrances come from, since they are not derived from rabbinic calculations? It appears that the Israelites accurately tracked their jubilees cycles, faithfully passing them down through the generations into the post AD 70 era. Even though rabbinic literature is notorious for its chronological inaccuracies, the record of jubilee counting escaped that customary corruption and was remarkably preserved in *Seder 'Olam* and the Talmud. The sixteenth and seventeenth jubilees precisely coincide with both the biblical data and external archaeological evidence, sometimes to the very month and even day. The convergence of the mathematical data can only support a 1406 BC conquest date, verifying the authenticity of 480th in the MT and other witnesses preserving the number.

Table 2: Greek MS data for 1 Kings 6:1

LXX Manuscript	Reading	Date	Rahlf's/ Göttingen	Brooke- McLean- Thacker- ay¹	Location	Confirmed in/by	Other
Codex Vaticanus (Vat. gr. 1209)	440th	4th c.	B	B	Vatican	BMT/ Visually	Folio 405
Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS 1 D. V-VIII)	440th	5th c.	A	A	British Library	BMT/ Visually	Folio 204r; Image Id: 142565; 02_0203a. jpg; CSNTM website
Codex Coislinianus (Cois. Gr. 1)	440th	7th c.	-	M	National Library of France	BMT/ Visually	Folio 224r; Aquila/ Symmachus marginal readings = 480th
Codex Basiliano-Vaticanus (Vat. gr. 2106)	440th	8th c.	V	N	Vatican	BMT/ Visually	Folio 76v; Merged with Codex Venetus (V) in Rahlf's/ Göttingen database
B. VI. 22	440th	8th c.	158	g	Basel University Library, Switzerland	BMT	minuscule
Reg. gr. 1	440th	10th c.	55	h	Vatican	BMT	1 Kgs folio range 282r-301v; minuscule

LXX Manuscript	Reading	Date	Rahlf's/ Göttingen	Brooke-McLean-Thackeray ¹	Location	Confirmed in/by	Other
Grec 2.	440th	10th c.	64	<64>	National Library of France	BMT via Holmes-Parsons	1 Kgs starts at folio 310v; minuscule
Grec 7.	440th	10th c.	119	n	National Library of France	BMT	1 Kgs starts at folio 79v; minuscule
Gr. Z. 3 (coll. 335)	440th	10th c.	121	y	Library of St. Mark, Venice	BMT	minuscule
Coislin 8	440th	10th c.	243	j	National Library of France	BMT/ Visually	Folio 53v; minuscule
Cod. gr. 454	440th	10th c.	489	f	Bavarian State Library, Munich	BMT	1 Kgs starts at folio 115r; minuscule
Acq. e Doni 44	440th	10/11th c.	52	e	Laurentian Library, Florence	BMT	minuscule
Grec 8	440th	11th c.	92	m	National Library of France	BMT/ Visually	Folio 102r; minuscule
Plut. V 1	440th	11th c.	134	t	Laurentian Library, Florence	BMT	minuscule
gr. Z. 4 (coll. 419)	440th	11th c.	120	q	Library of St. Mark, Venice	BMT	minuscule
Vat. gr. 333	440th	11th c.	244	-	Vatican	Visually	Folio 78v; minuscule
Coislin 3	440th	12th c.	82	o	National Library of France	BMT/ Gehman (p. 93)/ Marcos-Saiz ²	Folio range 208–228; minuscule; ἐγενήθη; Lucianic

LXX Manuscript	Reading	Date	Rahlf's/ Göttingen	Brooke- McLean- Thacker- ay ¹	Location	Confirmed in/by	Other
Vat. gr. 334	440th	12th c.	245	v	Vatican	BMT/ Visually	Folio 124r; minuscule
Urb. gr. 1	440th	12th c.	247	x	Vatican	BMT	Folio range 56r-97r; minuscule
Theol. gr. 23	440th	13th c.	130	s	Austrian National Library, Vienna	BMT	minuscule
-	440th	13th c.	314	w	National Library of Greece	BMT	minuscule
Cl. II. 188	440th	1334	107	d	Biblioteca Ariostea, Italy	BMT	minuscule
Cl. II. 187 I	440th	14th c.	106	p	Biblioteca Ariostea, Italy	BMT	minuscule
Grec 133	440th	14th c.	554	z	National Library of France	BMT/ Visually	Folio 98; minuscule
Codex Zuqninensis (Vat. sir. 162)	480th	6th c.	-	Z	Vatican	BMT/ Tisserant (p. 56)/ Marcos- Saiz ³ / Visually	Folio 71r; Z2; palimpsest; Lucianic; ἐγένετο
Grec 3	480th	1093	56	i	National Library of France	BMT/ Gehman	minuscule; ἐγένετο
Sinod. gr. 31 (Vlad. 1)	480th	10th c.	127	c ₂	State Historical Museum, Moscow	BMT/ Marcos- Saiz ⁴	minuscule; ἐγένετο; Lucianic
Vat. gr. 1238	480th	1195	246	<246>	Vatican	Holmes- Parsons/ Gehman	minuscule; ἐγενήθη

LXX Manuscript	Reading	Date	Rahlf's/ Göttingen	Brooke-McLean-Thackeray ¹	Location	Confirmed in/by	Other
Chig. R. VI. 38 (gr. 30)	480th	12th c.	19	b'	Vatican	BMT/ Gehman/ Marcos-Saiz ⁵	"b" in BMT = b' (19) + b (108); minuscule; ἐγένετο; Lucianic
Vat. gr. 330	480th	13th c.	108	b	Vatican	BMT/ Gehman/ Marcos-Saiz ⁶	"b" in BMT = b' (19) + b (108); minuscule; ἐγένετο; Lucianic
Royal 1 D II	480th	13th c.	93	e ₂	British Library	BMT/ Gehman/ Marcos-Saiz ⁷	Lucianic; ἐγένετο

¹ BMT 1930: 223; 1927: v–viii. < > indicates where BMT rely upon Holmes-Parsons.

² 1992: xx–xxi, 15.

³ pp. xvii–xviii, 15.

⁴ pp. xxii–xxiii, 15.

⁵ pp. xviii–xix, 15

⁶ pp. xix–x, 15

⁷ pp. xxi–xxii.

APPENDIX – ORIGIN OF THE 440TH YEAR READING

There are three possible explanations for the origin of the 440th year reading:

1. Scribe(s) may have made an exegetical emendation at the Hebrew level. Some of the faulty numbers in the LXX's divided kingdom chronology likely originated from failed harmonization efforts in the underlying Hebrew *Vorlage*, not the Greek translator. The MT's numbers all cohere with the biblical and external data throughout this era,³⁹ but attempts to reconcile the LXX's numbers, both internally and in relationship to the archaeological and historical data, have not been successful (Young 2007a, 282). It is possible that 440th was the product of one such harmonization effort prior to the OG translation.

2. The second option is that a scribal gloss occurred at the Hebrew level and was then translated into the OG. "In the fourth year" (בשנה הרביעית) appears in the same verse. Perhaps the scribe conflated a portion of "fourth" (רביעי) with "80th" (בשמונים שנה) since both phrases contain the word "year" (שנה). Or the scribe mentally conflated the four in "four hundredth year" (וארבע)

שנה) into "80th" year (בשמונים שנה) by accident.⁴⁰ The two-fold appearance of year (שנה) may have been a contributing factor. This latter suggestion is the more likely of the two.

3. A third solution is at the Greek level. For 1 Kgs 6:1, the number 40th (τεσσαρακοστῷ) now in most Greek MSS could have arisen very early. In Codex B and other MSS, 1 Kgs 6:2 reads: "And the house that King Salomon built for the Lord, **forty** cubits its length..." (Taylor and McLean 2007, 302; BMT 1930, 224). The scribe could have accidentally picked up τεσσαρά from the front part of forty (τεσσαράκοντα) in 6:2 and replaced the original "8" in "80th" (ὀκτακοστῷ) in 6:1. Since kappa (κ) and omicron (ο) follow ὀκτα and τεσσαρά in both numbers, the error could easily have been made. There is precedent for a numerical error originating in the Greek and extending far and wide into the LXX manuscript tradition—Methuselah's begetting age of 187 was accidentally replaced by 167 in Gen 5:25 and spread to numerous LXX MSS and external witnesses (Smith Jr. 2017).

³⁹ As demonstrated by the combined works of Valerius Coucke, Edwin Thiele, Leslie McFall, and Rodger C. Young. See the reference section for works by Young, who in turn cites these other three scholars and

interacts with them in considerable detail.

⁴⁰ Eber's incorrect remaining years in Gen 11:17 of the MT (430) vs. the correct figure in the LXX (370) arose in a similar fashion (Smith Jr. 2018, 130).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, William. 1992. "Eusebius' Chronicle and Its Legacy." In *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, edited by Harold W. Attridge and Gōhei Hata, 467–91. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Aitken, James K. 2015. "The Origins of KAI ΓΕ." In *Biblical Greek in Context: Essays in Honour of John A. L. Lee*, edited by James K. Aitken and Trevor V. Evans, 21–40. Biblical Tools and Studies 22. Leuven: Peeters.
- Barrera, Julio Treballe. 2013. "Agreements between LXX^{BL}, Medieval Hebrew Readings, and Variants of the Aramaic, Syriac and Vulgate Versions in Kaige and Non-kaige Sections of 3–4 Reigns." In *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*, edited by Melvin K. H. Peters, 193–205. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- . 2020. *Textual and Literary Criticism of the Books of Kings: Collected Essays*. Edited by Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 185. Leiden: Brill.
- Brooke, Alan E., Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray, eds. 1927. *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus*. Vol. II: The Later Historical Books Part I-I and II Samuel. London: Cambridge University Press.
- , eds. 1930. *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus*. Vol. II: The Later Historical Books Part II-I and II Kings. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, Nina L. 1992. "281 BCE: The Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch into Greek under Ptolemy II." In *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*, edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, 403–503. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Collins, Steven. *Let My People Go! Using Historical Synchronisms to Identify the Pharaoh of the Exodus*. Albuquerque, NM: Trinity Southwest University Press, 2012.
- Cox, Claude. 1994. "The Zohrab Bible." In *Studies in Classical Armenian Literature*, edited by John A. C. Greppin, 227–61. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.
- . 2021. "The Septuagint and the Secondary Versions." In *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny, 210–26. New York: T&T Clark.
- Dyk, Janet W., and Percy S. F. van Keulen. 2013. *Language System, Translation Technique, and Textual Tradition in the Peshitta of Kings*. Edited by R.B. ter Haar Romeny. Vol. 19. Studies in the Syriac Version of the Bible and Their Cultural Contexts. Leiden: Brill.
- Ferguson, Anthony Michael. 2018. "A Comparison of the Non-Aligned Texts of Qumran to the Masoretic Text." PhD diss., Louisville, KY: The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Fernández-Marcos, Natalio. 1994. *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 54. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- . 2000. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill.
- Fernández-Marcos, Natalio, and José Ramón Busto Saiz. 1992. *El Texto Antioqueño de la Biblia Griega*. Vol. II: 1–2 Reyes. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC.
- Field, Frederick. 1875. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt: Veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, George, Daniel Assefa, Steve Delamarter, Ralph Lee, Curt Niccum, and Garry Jost. 2020. "The Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament Project (THEOT): Goals and Initial Findings." *Textus* 29:80–110.
- Gehman, Henry S. 1931. "The Old Ethiopic Version of 1. Kings and Its Affinities." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 50 (2): 81–114.
- . 1934. "The Armenian Version of I. and II. Kings and Its Affinities." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 54 (1): 53–59.

- Gentry, Peter J. 2009. "The Text of the Old Testament." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52 (1): 19–45.
- . 2021. "The Septuagint and Origen's Hexapla." In *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny, 227–44. New York: T&T Clark.
- Gesche, Bonifatia. 2018. "The Versions of the Vetus Latina and their Relation to the Versions of the Septuagint in 1 Kings." In *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz*, edited by Martin Meiser, Michaela Geiger, Siegfried Kreuzer, and Marcus Sigismund, 256–73. 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.–24. Juli 2016. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Greenberg, Gillian, and Donald M. Walter. 2018. *The Syriac Peshitta Bible with English Translation: Kings*. Translated by Gillian Greenberg and Donald M. Walter. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.
- Guggenheimer, Heinrich W. 1998. *Seder Olam: The Rabbinic View of Biblical Chronology*. Translated by Heinrich W. Guggenheimer. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Harrak, Amir, trans. 1999. *The Chronicle of Zuqnān, Parts III and IV: A.D. 488–775*. Medieval Sources in Translation 36. Ontario: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies.
- Hill, Charles E. 2022. *The First Chapters: Dividing the Text of Scripture in Codex Vaticanus and Its Predecessors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoffmeier, James. 2007. "What is the Biblical Date for the Exodus? A Response to Bryant Wood." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 50 (2): 225–47.
- Holmes, Robert, and James Parsons. 1818. *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. 2015. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Joosten, Jan. 2010. "The Aramaic Background of the Seventy: Language, Culture and History." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 43:53–72.
- Kauhanen, Tuukka. 2018. *Lucifer of Cagliari and the Text of 1–2 Kings*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 68. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Kedar, Benjamin. 2004. "The Latin Translations." In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*, edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, 299–338. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried. 2008. "Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and Kaige Recension)." In *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007*, edited by Melvin K. H. Peters, 239–53. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- . 2009. "Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, Kaige, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 42:34–51.
- Lagarde, Paul de. 1892. *Bibliothecae Syriacae. Veteris Testamenti Graeci in Sermonem Syriacum Versi: Fragmenta Octo*. Göttingen: L. Horstmann.
- Law, T. M., and Tuukka Kauhanen. 2010. "Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 43:73–87.
- Law, Timothy M. 2008. "The Translation of Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms)." In *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007*, edited by Melvin K. H. Peters, 277–92. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Law, Timothy Michael. 2011. *Origenes Orientalis: The Preservation of Origen's Hexapla in the Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus, Kristin De Troyer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Emanuel Tov. Vol. 2. De Septuaginta Investigationes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 2012. "An Often Neglected Witness to the Textual History of the Septuagint: The Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms." In *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera*, edited by Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales, 179–92. Florilegium Complutens. Leiden: Brill.

- . 2015. “3–4 Kingdoms (1–2 Kings).” In *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, edited by James K. Aitken, 147–66. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Levin, Inabelle. 1985. *The Quedlinburg Itala: The Oldest Illustrated Biblical Manuscript*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Mäkipelto, Ville. 2021. “The Septuagint and the Major Recensions.” In *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny, 194–209. New York: T&T Clark.
- Maori, Yeshayahu. 2001. “Is the Peshitta a Non-Rabbinic Jewish Translation? Review of The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction, by Michael P. Weitzman.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 91 (3–4): 411–18.
- McFall, Leslie. 2010. “The Chronology of Saul and David.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53 (3): 475–533.
- McLay, R. Timothy. 2008. “Recension and Revision: Speaking the Same Language with Special Attention to Lucian and Kaige.” In *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007*, edited by Melvin K. H. Peters, 293–303. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- McLay, Tim. 1998. “Kaige and Septuagint Research.” *Textus* 19:127–39.
- Milikowsky, Chaim. 1981. “Seder Olam: A Rabbinic Chronography.” PhD diss., Yale University.
- Morales, Pablo Torijano. 2013. “Different Distribution of Agreements between LXX¹ and Medieval Hebrew Variants in Kaige and Non-kaige Sections of III–IV Regnorum.” In *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*, edited by Melvin K. H. Peters, 175–92. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Norton, Gérard J. 2005. *Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Translated and annotated by Gérard J. Norton. Cahiers de La Revue Biblique 62. Paris: J. Gabalda.
- Orsini, Pasquale. 2019. *Studies on Greek and Coptic Majuscule Scripts and Books*. Vol. 15. Studies in Manuscript Cultures. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Peshitta Institute Leiden, ed. 1976. *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version, Part II Fasc. 4. Kings*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Petrovich, Douglas. 2006. “Amenhotep II and the Historicity of the Exodus Pharaoh.” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 17 (1): 81–110.
- Reillo, José Manuel Cañas. 2021. “The Septuagint and Textual Criticism of the Greek Versions.” In *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny, 153–66. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Robker, Jonathan M. 2013. “The Greek Framework of Kings: Indicators of Recension.” In *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*, edited by Melvin K. H. Peters, 207–18. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Romeny, Bas ter Haar. 2005. “The Syriac Versions of the Old Testament.” In *Sources Syriaques 1. Nos Sources: Arts Et Littérature Syriaques*, edited by Maroun Atallah, 75–105. Antélias: CERO.
- Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace, eds. 1885. *Sulpitius Severus, Vincent of Lerins, John Cassian*. Translated by Alexander Roberts. Vol. 11. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Sexton, Jeremy, and Henry B. Smith Jr. 2016. “Primeval Chronology Restored: Revisiting the Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11.” *Bible and Spade* 29 (2–3): 42–49.
- Shenkel, James Donald. 1968. *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*. Vol. 1. Harvard Semitic Monographs. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith Jr., Henry B. 2017. “Methuselah’s Begetting Age in Genesis 5:25 and the Primeval Chronology of the Septuagint: A Closer Look at the Textual and Historical Evidence.” *Answers Research Journal* 10 (August): 169–79.
- . 2018. “The Case for the Septuagint’s Chronology in Genesis 5 and 11.” In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Creationism*, edited by John H. Whitmore, 117–32. Pittsburgh, PA: Creation Science Fellowship.
- . 2021. “Wild West Evangelical Hermeneutics (Part One): The Failure of Comparative Archaeological Method.” *Bible and Spade* 34 (2): 21–27.
- Steinmann, Andrew E. 2011. *From Abraham to*

- Paul: A Biblical Chronology*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. 1948. "St Jerome's Hebrew Manuscripts." *Biblica* 29 (3): 195–204.
- Taylor, Bernard. 2007. "The Old Greek Text of Reigns: To the Reader." In *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title*, edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, 244–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Bernard, and Paul D. McLean. 2007. "3 Reigns." In *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title*, edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, 297–319. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thiele, Edwin R. 1983. *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. 3rd Revised Ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan/Kregel.
- Tisserant, Eugène. 1911. *Codex Zuqninensis Rescriptus: Veteris Testament: Texte Grec des Manuscrits Vatican Syriaque 162 et Mus. Brit. additionel 14.665*. *Studie Testi* 23. Roma: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana.
- Torijano, Pablo A., and Julio Treballe. 2022. "The Edition of III–IV Kingdoms: The Critical Reconstruction of the Old Greek Text and the Construction of the Critical Apparatus." In *Editing the Septuagint: The Unfinished Task*, edited by Felix Albrecht and Frank Feder, 53–80. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Torijano, Pablo, Andrés Piquer, and Julio Treballe Barrera. 2008. "Septuagint Versions, Greek Recensions, and Hebrew Editions. The Text-Critical Evaluation of The Old Latin, Armenian, and Georgian Versions of III–IV Regnorum." In *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism*, edited by Hans Ausloos, Johann Cook, Florentino Garcia Martinez, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, and Marc Vervenne, 251–81. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 213. Leuven: Peeters.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1999a. "Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem." In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, 72:477–88. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1999b. "The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attention to the Problems in Samuel-Kings—The State of the Question." In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, 72:489–99. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2008. "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues." In *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, 171–88. Text and Studies in Ancient Judaism 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2015. "Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations." In *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays*, 3:429–48. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 167. Leiden: Brill Academic.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. 1974. *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press.
- Wevers, John W. 1945. "A Study in the Hebrew Variants in the Books of Kings." *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 20:43–76.
- Wiseman, D. J. 1956. *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings in the British Museum*. London: Trustees of the British Museum.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. 2008. "The Letter of Aristeas and the Reception History of the Septuagint." In *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*, 275–95. Supplements to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 131. Leiden: Brill.
- Würthwein, Ernst. 2014. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. Edited by Alexander Achilles Fischer. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Young, Rodger C. 2003. "When Did Solomon Die?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 46 (4): 589–603.
- . 2004. "When Did Jerusalem Fall?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 47 (1): 21–38.
- . 2005. "Tables of Reign Lengths from the Hebrew Court Records." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48 (2): 225–48.
- . 2006. "The Talmud's Two Jubilees and Their Relevance to the Date of the Exodus." *The*

- Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (1): 71–83.
- . 2007a. “Review of: M. Christine Tetley, *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005).” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 45 (2): 278–83.
- . 2007b. “Three Verifications of Thiele’s Date for the Beginning of the Divided Kingdom.” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 45 (2): 1–27.
- . 2008. “Evidence for Inerrancy from a Second Unexpected Source: The Jubilee and Sabbatical Cycles.” *Bible and Spade* 21 (4): 109–22.
- Young, Rodger C. 2024a. “Ezekiel’s Jubilee: Real or Rabbinic Fiction? Part 1: Ezekiel 40:1 and 1 Kings 6:1.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 67.3.
- . 2024b. “Ezekiel’s Jubilee: Real or Rabbinic Fiction? Part 2: The Jubilee/Sabbatical Year Cycle.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 67.4 (in press).
- Young, Rodger C., and Andrew E. Steinmann. 2012. “Correlation of Select Classical Sources Related to the Trojan War with Assyrian and Biblical Chronologies.” *Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament* 1 (2): 223–48.