

JONG-HOON KIM, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königsbücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2009). Pp. xviii + 452. €84.07.

There is an ongoing dispute about the priority of textual forms, and it is especially controversial for some books, for example, Samuel, Jeremiah, and Job. Kim enters this area of research for 2 Samuel with this thesis written in Wuppertal under the direction of S. Kreuzer (2008). His goal is to investigate the Antiochene recension of the LXX text (p. 32), taking as an example the narrative of Absalom's insurrection in 2 Sam (LXX 2 Kgdms) 15:1–19:9.

Kim supplies a short history of research and a list of the textual witnesses, before entering into the description and analysis of the text itself. K. divides the text into sections of between four and ten verses. Painstakingly, he observes the smallest differences among the main textual forms, namely, the Hebrew text of the MT, the *kaige* recension of the LXX, and the Antiochene recension of the LXX and 4QSam^{al/c}. He takes into account also the differences among various manuscripts. For issues of broader relevance, K. provides nine excursuses, offering the reader a larger picture, often touching on aspects of the whole of 1 Samuel through 2 Kings. In addition, he regularly uses charts to illustrate his observations.

The immense amount of material collected in the main part of this thesis serves as the basis for the classification of the variants and as an overall presentation of the Hebrew and Greek textual forms of Samuel and Kings, concluding with a short outline of the textual history of these historical books. K. conceives of a stemma with three to five different Hebrew *Vorlagen*, leading to (1) Proto-MT, (2) the original form of the LXX ("Ur-LXX"), (3) the *kaige* recension, (4) 4QSam^{al/c}, and (5) the Antiochene recension. The *Vorlagen* for (1) and (3) are close to one another, as are those for (4) and (5). Both (3) and (5) depend on (2). Codex Vaticanus (B, fourth century C.E.) and Codex Alexandrinus (A, fifth century C.E.) testify to (3); the later codices of M and N, stemming from the seventh to eighth centuries, show a mixture of (3) and (5).

Kim's interpretation of the various text forms is based on the assumption of differing *Vorlagen* and is therefore highly speculative. He does not sufficiently reckon with the possibility that the differences go back to the act of translating. He shows a preference for the Antiochene recension (e.g., on pp. 102-3, where the "40 years" of 2 Sam 15:7 in the MT and also in the *kaige* recension certainly seems to be the *lectio difficilior*; on pp. 150-51, where in 2 Sam 15:21 the Antiochene text conforms to other passages and is longer, going against the criterion of *lectio brevior*; and similarly on pp. 187-88, 300-301, and 346 for explanations of 2 Sam 15:34, 36; 18:3; 19:1). As a result, his judgments often appear to be biased. This shows up again in the evaluation of the classification of the variants, where he does not sufficiently consider the quality and value of the different traditions. Readers of his study will also miss a theological interpretation of the many differences visible in the various text forms.

Kim is Korean and writes in German, which is an enormous and difficult task. He is diligent, knows his field well, and presents his observations in a clear, well-organized way. His book is the most thorough treatment of the topic up to now and gives valuable insights into the differences among the various text forms of Samuel.

Yet there are signs of a certain carelessness in the editing of his book. Sometimes hyphens within words that stem from previous syllable divisions have remained (from p. 3 through p. 406). Occasionally spaces between words or periods at the ends of sentences are missing (e.g., p. 250 at the reference to n. 17, p. 54, and p. 139). On pp. 198-99, two lines appear twice. The author index (pp. 448-50) contains inaccurate indications (Irenaeus, p. 24 instead of p. 25; Stephen Pisano, p. 189 instead of p. 188; the deviations are mostly “off” by a page). There are also several mistakes in German, but generally his exposition is clearly understandable. Overall, K.’s work is worth consulting, but his interpretations have to be dealt with cautiously.

*Georg Fischer, S.J., Theologische Fakultät der Universität Innsbruck,
A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria*