



17 וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה הִלְלָה בְּיַד אֲשֶׁרָה בַּעֲלַת תְּבִיט וַיְהִי חֲלִיו חֲזָק מְאֹד עַד אֲשֶׁר  
 לֹא-נִזְתָּרָה-בּוֹ נְשָׁמָה: 18 וַתֹּאמֶר אֶל-אֱלֹהֵיהִי מִה-לִּי וְלִךְ אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים בָּאתָ אֵלַי לְהַזְכִּיר  
 אֶת-עֲוֹנֵי וּלְהַמִּית אֶת-בְּנֵי: 19 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֶיהָ תִּנִּי-לִי אֶת-בְּנֵךְ וַיִּקְחֶהוּ מִחִיקָה וַיַּעֲלֶהוּ  
 אֶל-הָעֵלְיָה אֲשֶׁר-הוּא יֹשֵׁב שָׁם וַיִּשְׁכַּבְהוּ עַל-מִטָּתוֹ: 20 וַיִּקְרָא אֶל-יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה  
 אֱלֹהֵי הָגִם עַל-הָאֱלֹמָנָה אֲשֶׁר-אֲנִי מִתְנַזֵּר עִמָּה תִרְעוֹת לְהַמִּית אֶת-בְּנֵיהָ: 21 וַיִּתְמַדְד  
 עַל-הַיְלֵד שְׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים וַיִּקְרָא אֶל-יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי תִשְׁבֵּי נָא נִפְשֵׁי-הַיְלֵד הַזֶּה  
 עַל-קִרְבּוֹ:

A

B

22 וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה בְּקוֹל אֱלֹהֵיהִי וַתִּשְׁבֵּי  
 נִפְשֵׁי-הַיְלֵד עַל-קִרְבּוֹ וַיַּחֲי:

22 וַיַּחֲי כֵן וַיִּקְרָא הַיְלֵד

23 ׀ ׀ ׀ וַיִּרְדֶּהוּ מִן-הָעֵלְיָה תְּבִיטָה וַיִּתְנַחֵהוּ לְאִמּוֹ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהֵיהִי רְאֵי תִי בְּנֵךְ: 24 וַתֹּאמֶר  
 הָאֲשֶׁרָה אֶל-אֱלֹהֵיהִי עֲתֵה נָה וְדַעְתִּי כִּי אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים אַתָּה וְדַבֵּר-יְהוָה בְּפִיךָ אֲמַת: פ

[ אל יהוה 20 ] || (equal) (עלמהמטה?) G ἐπι τῆς κλίνης G [ על מטתו ] || S (exeg) G Ἡλείου + [ ויאמר 19 ] ||  
 G (metath?) Oἱμοι, κύριε [ יהוה אלהי ] || G (equal) (אליהו) Ἡλείου ||  
 [ ויתמדד 21 ] || G (crisp) (עד\*) G ὁ μάρτυς [ הגם על ] || (S T V) (assim 8:28) M אלהי + [ יהוה  
 ויקח אליהו את pre ] || G (L) ↓ || 23 A = M, B = G ↓ || T (theol) G (וייפח?) ἐνεφύσησεν  
 [ האשה אל אליהו 24 ] || S (equal) || S (T V) (exeg) ↓ || M (explicit cf v 19) > G ↓ || [ ויאמר ] + S

## Textual commentary

v 1

M מתשביי [ G Jos ] cj מתשביי

The phrase מתשביי גלעד is problematic. תושב expresses temporary residency which does not fit the context. G\* ἐκ Θεσβῶν “from Tisbe” (cf. Josephus Θεσσαβώνης [Ant 8:319]) suggest that מתשביי should be vocalized מתשביי (note the plural form Θεσβῶν) or corrected to מתשבה “from Tisbe”, cf Tob 1:2 Θισβης. The phrase “from Tisbe of Gilead” comes to specify the adjective תשביי, perhaps so as to distinguish the prophet’s hometown from Tisbe of Naphtali.

M (S T V) (harm 11:31, 14:7, etc.) + אלהי ישראל [ יהוה ]

The exegetical gloss in M is a harmonization with v 1 and other parallel occurrences (11:31, 14:7, etc.). There is an alternating use of the phrases אלהי ישראל and אלהי צבאות (18:15, 19:10,14). The first one mostly appears as redactional, as it seems to be the case here (cf. Burney 217).

v 3

לך ] ופניית לך > G (equal)

The plus from M could be seen as a scribal expansion (so Stade 23, 149). But since it stands as a *hapax legomenon*, no decisive conclusion can be drawn.

v 4

הָעֲרָבִים ] הָעֲרָבִים “the Arabs” (cj cf 2 Chr 22:1, 26:7)

M seems to reflect a tradition that stresses the miraculous aspect of God sending an animal to feed the prophet (see 1 K 13:28). But the case is amazing since the raven is known as an impure animal (cf Lev. 11:15), and some exegetes conjecturally suggest to read הָעֲרָבִים “the Arabs” as in 2 Chr. 22:1 and 26:7 instead of הָעֲרָבִים (so Gray, Seale, Wenham, Lemaire), or to interpret הָעֲרָבִים in the sense of merchants (cf Ezek. 27:27), which is logical with regard to v 9 where God commands a strange woman (a Sidonian) to take care of the prophet, but not supported by any textual witness.

v 5

ויילך ] + *pre* ויילך M (harm v 3) > G + Ηλιου G (exeg); + כדבר יהוה M > G (harm v 2)

G seemingly attests a shorter text which did not have ויילך. Its insertion at the beginning of the verse results from a harmonization with v 3. The phrase כדבר יהוה has been added under the influence of v 2.

v 6

לחם ] M לחם ובשר בבקר ולחם בבקר בערב לחם... בערב (reform)

Many exegetes prefer the tradition witnessed by M because of the contrast between the ambient scarcity and the abundance in which God maintains His messenger, thus underlining the miraculous dimension of the narrative (so Gunkel 1906: 9, Barthélemy 359-360, Cogan 2008: 427). But G gives a more ascetic image of the prophet in relationship with Exod. 16:8,12, and reflects better ancient oriental diet habits (cf Stade 150). M results from a reformulation that aims at showing the rich nourishment of His prophet by God.

v 9

לצידון ] + וישבת שם M (expan) > G<sup>(-mss)</sup>

The phrase וישבת שם is a free expansion from M.

v 10

צרפתה ] + ויבא M (gram ?) > G + τῆς Σιδωνος G<sup>L</sup> (harm v 9)

This plus of M aims at a syntactical reconstruction of the sentence: since ויילך is already completed by צרפתה, the preposition אל needs another verb, which is supplied by ויבא. The addition of τῆς Σιδωνος in G<sup>L</sup> is a harmonization with v 9.

v 12

וְלִבְנֵי ] καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις μου (וְלִבְנֵי\*?) G (vocal)

G presupposes וְלִבְנֵי, and this vocalization must have been influenced by וְבֵיתָהּ (her household) in v 15. This is the same in v 13.

מעונג ] מנג ] “nothing” (מאומה?) S T (graph?)

The word מעונג is used only here and in the obscure text of Ps 35:16. The most common one is ענה, as in v 13. The readings of S מנג ל אג א and T אמ אית לי מדעם “I have nothing” presuppose אמ יש לי מאומה.

v 15

] > G\* (inc) ] כדבר אליה

The text of M is more fluent. The fact that some mss read καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ (לו\*) ויתן לו\*) indicates that something seemed to be missing at this place, and that M corrected the text by supplying it. The completed text is thus secondary, but that of G\* seems secondary alike. The pattern " עשה כדבר " is so usual in M, especially in this verse (v 5, 13, 15) that it may be seen as a harmonization. However, since this is uncertain, the reading of M must be kept, but only by conjecture.

M<sup>K</sup> הוא והיא ] M<sup>Q</sup> היא והוא

The *ketiv* is theologically motivated, so as to avoid giving precedence to a foreign woman. This can be considered as a kind of *tiqqun sofer*. All the major versions (G, S but not V) have adopted the *qere*.

v 16

] חסר ] חסרה (cj Stade, Burney)

The adjective חסר should grammatically be accorded to צפחה which is feminine (so Stade 23, 168 and Burney 219). But the lesson of M can be explained as a *constructio ad sensum*.

v 20

] יהוה אלהי ] Oἱμοι, κύριε (לי יהוה) \*אוי לי יהוה or \*אהה יהוה?) G (metath?)

The lesson of G is strange but attested by all Greek manuscripts. This means that it was already in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of G. The change may have resulted from a metathesis that accidentally transformed אלהי into לי אוי.

] הנם על ] ὁ μάρτυς (\*עד) G\* (crrp)

The lesson of G\* makes no sense. It reflects a corruption of ל that looks like a ד. The *Vorlage* of G\* may have already have עד (cf Hugo 130-131), but the construction רעע על hiphil is not attested in the biblical tradition, but it is found in the fragment of Jubilees (Jub. 37:24 – 4Q223-224 f2 col IV l 13). The probable scenario is that, having read על as עד, the translator didn't know what to do with הנם and decided to omit it, unless it came from his *Vorlage*.

v 21

] ויתמדד ] καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν (\*ויפח) G\* (theol)

It is hardly probable that G\* had had ויפח in its *Vorlage* as suggested by the phrase καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν. Since the root מדד means to measure (hitpaal “to measure oneself”), and that the practice was not understood by the translator (cf. Montgomery 296), he interpreted it according to the context as “breathing upon” (in v 17, we were told that the kid was so

severely sick that “there was no breath left in him”). By doing so, he theologically escaped a practice that could be compromising. He may also have been influenced by Gen. 2:7.

v 22

A = M, B = G<sup>(-L)</sup>

The short text of G\* can be seen as a conflate reading resulting in the *Vorlage* of G from a drop by *homoioteleuton* of על-קרבֹו נפש-הַיֶּלֶד וְתָשָׁב נֶפֶשׁ-הַיֶּלֶד עַל-קַרְבּוֹ. This drop may have been occasioned by the repetition of the phrase נֶפֶשׁ-הַיֶּלֶד (הַנֶּה) עַל-קַרְבּוֹ at the end of vv 20 and 22 (so Burney 220). The passage had been reconstructed with the remaining וַיְחִי at the end of v 22. The word וַיְחִי had been construed as וַיְהִי (καὶ ἐγένετο) and supplied by כֵּן (οὕτως) in the *Vorlage* of G\* (McKenzie), and the phrase וַיִּקְרָא הַיֶּלֶד added under the influence of וַיִּקְרָא אֶל-יְהוָה (v 21) or וַיִּקַּח אֶל-יְהוָה (v 23). The original text had partially been restored by G<sup>L</sup>, especially 19 that omits the phrase καὶ ἐγένετο. The scenario of a free expansion in M (so Stade 151, Hugo 133-134, 175) sounds less probable. Consequently, we have two distinct textual traditions, but G\* obviously originated from M.

v 23

M וַיִּקַּח אֶל-יְהוָה אֶת הַיֶּלֶד *pre* ] G\* וַיְרַדְהוּ > G

This plus can be considered as an explicative expansion from M under the influence of v 19 instead of an omission from G\*.