UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

https://helda.helsinki.fi

The Origins of the Kaige Revision

Aejmelaeus, Anneli

Hakola, Raimo; Huotari, Paavo; Orpana, Jessi

2022

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/343111

Aejmelaeus, A 2022, The Origins of the Kaige Revision. in R Hakola, P Huotari & J Orpana (eds), Scriptures in the Making : Texts and Their Transmission in Late Second Temple Judaism. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology, vol. 109, Peeters, Leuven, pp. 285-311.

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository. https://helda.helsinki.fi
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.
Please cite the original version.

This pdf is a digital offprint of your contribution in R. Hakola, J. Orpana, P. Huotari (eds), *Scriptures in the Making*, ISBN 978-90-429-4679-8

https://www.peeters-leuven.be/detail.php?search_key=9789042946798&series_number_str=109&lang=en

The copyright on this publication belongs to Peeters Publishers.

As author you are licensed to make printed copies of the pdf or to send the unaltered pdf file to up to 50 relations. You may not publish this pdf on the World Wide Web – including websites such as academia.edu and open-access repositories – until three years after publication. Please ensure that anyone receiving an offprint from you observes these rules as well.

If you wish to publish your article immediately on open-access sites, please contact the publisher with regard to the payment of the article processing fee.

For queries about offprints, copyright and republication of your article, please contact the publisher via peeters@peeters-leuven.be

Raimo Hakola
Jessi Orpana
Paavo Huotari

SCRIPTURES IN THE MAKING: TEXTS AND THEIR TRANSMISSION IN LATE SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM

PEETERS
LEUVEN – PARIS – BRISTOL, CT
2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Raimo HAKOLA, Jessi ORPANA, and Paavo HUOTARI
Introduction IX

SECTION 1: MAKING OF SCRIPTURES IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Jason M. SILVERMAN
Are the Concepts of 'Torah' and 'the Prophets' Texts or Something Else? Educational, Media, and Elite Contexts from the Persian Empire Onwards 3

Mika S. PAJUNEN
Glocal, Local, or Group Specific? Origins of Some Particular Scribal and Interpretive Practices in the Qumran Scrolls. 33

Sebastian FINK
What is Moses but Plato speaking Hebrew? An Inquiry into Literary Borrowings 57

Raimo HAKOLA
Jewish Cultural Encounters with the Greco-Roman World: A Critical History of Research and New Theoretical Perspectives 81

Rick BONNIE
Monumentality and Space: Experiencing Synagogue Buildings in Late Second Temple Palestine 111

SECTION 2: SCRIBAL AGENTS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES

Catherine HEZSER
Jewish Scribes in the Late Second Temple Period: Differences Between the Composition, Writing, and Interpretation of Texts . . 149

Jutta JOKIRANTA
Supervisors of Behavior: Evidence for Vulnerability of the Legal System from Qumran Texts and the Psalms of Solomon. 173

Jessi Orpana
Assessing the Priestly Provenance of the Qumran Aramaic Texts 199

SECTION 3: SCRIPTURES UNDER REVISION: CONTEXTS AND REWRITINGS

Kristin De Troyer
Recording Things in the Books of Esther 217

Ville Mäkipelto
Rewriting Joshua Traditions in Late Second Temple Judaism: Judean-Samaritan Relations as a Catalyst for Textual Changes . . 239

Tuukka Kauhanen
Josephus' Sources and Motivations in Depicting Davidic Kingship 265

SECTION 4: SCRIPTURAL TRANSLATION REVISED AND INTERPRETED

Anneli Aejmelaeus
The Origins of the *Kaige* Revision 285

Paavo Huotari and Katja Kujanpää
Hebraizing Revision in Isaiah Quotations in Paul and Matthew . . 313

Marika Pulkkinen
Psalms as Prophecy: Paul's Use of Psalms in First Corinthians 15 and the Source of the Psalm Text 343

SECTION 5: REFLECTIONS

Martti Nissinen
Textual Plurality and Changing Contexts: Concluding Reflections 367

Index of ancient sources 387

Index of modern authors 399

THE ORIGINS OF THE *KAIGE* REVISION

Anneli AEJMELAEUS

The starting point for my presentation is a discovery in the Judaean Desert almost seventy years ago: the discovery of a Greek Minor Prophets scroll at Naḥal Ḥever, some forty kilometers south of Qumran, not far from the Dead Sea. The main part of the fragmentary manuscript came into the hands of Dominique Barthélemy in August 1952, and he immediately announced the discovery as "a missing link of the textual history of the Septuagint" without even knowing the exact provenance of the manuscript.[1] About a decade later some further fragments were found that ascertained the provenance as Naḥal Ḥever.

This discovery meant the beginning of a new era in our understanding of the textual history of the Septuagint. But the discovery as such would not have had this effect without its correct interpretation. Dominique Barthélemy – a biblical scholar in his early 30s – was the right person in the right place. Anyone could have noticed that the Greek text of the Naḥal Ḥever scroll did not contain the normal Septuagint translation of the Minor Prophets, but Barthélemy could immediately recognize it as a revised form of that text and connect it with traces of similar revisions elsewhere. What he had in his hands was authentic evidence of Jewish revisional activity on the Greek text of the Septuagint from around the turn of the era and thus earlier than any of the Christian recensions known so far. This phenomenon was later to receive the name *kaige*.

What I wish to do in this presentation is to give a concise overview of the *kaige* revision and then to discuss a few questions concerning its origins, questions that have been neglected or forgotten in the scholarly literature: What was the motive behind the revision? What was it needed for? What does it tell us about attitudes to translation and interpretation of Scripture, about exegesis? What kind of context does it presuppose? Where could we look for the initiators?

[1] Dominique Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chainon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," *RB* 60 (1953): 18–29.

1. What is the so-called *kaige* revision or recension?

The Naḥal Ḥever scroll contains a most thorough revision of the Septuagint text of the Minor Prophets according to the Hebrew text, practically the proto-Masoretic text. The Greek text of the scroll has been brought into line with the Hebrew, both in a quantitative and a qualitative respect. The quantitative, word-for-word correspondence was achieved by omitting words that had no correspondence in Hebrew and adding words that were not present in Greek. Even small details of the text like articles, particles, prepositions, and pronouns had to accord with the Hebrew text, although the Greek language of course has different rules for their use. Lexical items were changed as well, with the goal of employing, in a concordant manner, always the same equivalents for certain Hebrew words. As for the verbal forms, the revisers seem to have had a system for their translation too. The result is a very literal or literalistic translation of the Hebrew text into Greek.

Nevertheless, Barthélemy, who first published the fragmentary scroll (1963), spoke of a recension rather than a new translation, and so did Emanuel Tov in the final publication of the manuscript in the series Discoveries in the Judean Desert (1990).[2] Even if the revision was very thorough, there are details in the text that connect it with the Septuagint translation and can be explained only as dependence on the Old Greek translation of the Minor Prophets.[3]

However, the most important question is not whether to call this text a new translation or just a revision of the old translation – or a recension, that is, a new, systematically revised edition of the text. What caused the great turn in scholarship was the fact that this discovery was and is the missing link that helps solve old puzzles of the textual history of the Septuagint. Barthélemy saw connections between the translation features of the Naḥal Ḥever scroll and the translation of a few books and certain sections of books in manuscripts of the Septuagint that are several centuries later. The initial dating of the scroll by Barthélemy was the first century CE, but in the final publication the manuscript is dated to the late first century BCE.[4] It is clearly a Jewish revision from the late Second

[2] Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, VTSup X (Leiden: Brill, 1963); Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)*, *(The Seiyâl Collection I)*, DJD VIII (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

[3] Old Greek is a term used for the original Greek translation in order to distinguish it from revisions or recensions.

[4] Peter J. Parsons, "The Scripts and Their Date," in Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)*, DJD VIII (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 19–26 (esp. 25–6).

Temple period, and it seems to have originated in Palestine. Until this discovery, only two Christian recensions of the Septuagint were known: the Lucianic and the Hexaplaric recensions. And now there was authentic evidence of a clearly earlier Jewish revision, a revision that followed totally different principles compared with the Christian recensions.

Barthélemy pointed out a series of translation features that connected the Naḥal Ḥever scroll with the Jewish translations known as Aquila and Theodotion that were produced in the second century CE to replace the Septuagint. The same features can be found in the B text of Judges and in the Books of Samuel and Kings (that is, the Four Books of Kingdoms according to the Greek tradition), in sections that were early on observed to be different from the rest of the books (2 Samuel 10:6/11:2 – 1 Kings 2:11 and 1 Kings 22 – 2 Kings 25),[5] as well as in the translations of Lamentations, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, 2 Esdras, and Ruth, and the so-called Theodotion text of Daniel and the additions to Job.

Barthélemy's list of revised details that are characteristic of the Naḥal Ḥever scroll and connect it with the mentioned other translations is well known:[6] (1) The first one to be mentioned is the feature that gave the revision its name, namely the particle καίγε which was used to render גם or וגם. In a recent article, James Aitken gives a survey of the origins, meaning, and distribution of the particle καίγε and comes to the conclusion that it is actually a very good match for the Hebrew גם or וגם and at the same time a choice for literary Greek. It shows that those who introduced it into biblical translation were well-educated people. Aitken also shows that the combination καίγε became more common in genuine Greek texts as well from the first century BCE onwards.[7] Even this little particle is thus more than just a curiosity and certainly not a barbarism, whereas some other features may justifiably be called barbarisms, such as (2) making a differentiation between the two forms of the pronoun "I" – in Hebrew אני and אנכי – by translating the short form with ἐγώ

[5] The division of Samuel–Kings into sections with different translation styles was first discussed by Henry St. John Thackeray, "The Greek Translation of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907): 262–78. The beginning of the first *kaige* section at 2 Sam 11:2, based on Thackeray's suggestion, has been challenged several times. A beginning in 2 Sam 10:6 has been argued for by Raimund Wirth, "Dealing with Tenses in the *Kaige* Section of Samuel," in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after* Les Devanciers d'Aquila, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Tuukka Kauhanen, DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 185–97.

[6] Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 31–80.

[7] James K. Aitken, "The Origins of ΚΑΙ ΓΕ," in *Biblical Greek in Context: Essays in Honour of John A. L. Lee*, ed. James K. Aitken and Trevor V. Evans, BTS 22 (Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 21–40.

and the longer form with ἐγώ εἰμι even in cases where the sentence already contains a finite verb. (3) Another feature that makes the language less idiomatic is the translation of **איש** 'man' always literally with ἀνήρ and thus replacing the nice pronominal translation ἕκαστος 'each' found in the Septuagint. (4) In the historical books, we have numerous cases of the historical present which have been changed by the revisers to the aorist, as this was thought to be the proper translation for the narrative forms (in Hebrew the imperfect consecutive and the perfect). (5) A recurring feature is also etymological translation, exemplified by the translation of the Hebrew verb **יצב** *hitp.* 'to stand' by στηλόω, because it is derived from the same root as **מַצֵּבָה** 'a pillar,' in Greek στήλη. Further characteristic features are: (6) the translation of **אין** by οὐκ ἔστιν without regard to the tense, (7) the translation of **מעל** by ἐπάνωθεν, (8) the translation of **לקראת** by εἰς συνάντησιν or εἰς ἀπαντήν (instead of εἰς ἀπάντησιν), and (9) the differentiation between **שׁופר** κερατίνη and **חצצרה** σάλπιγξ.

All in all, the typical changes include linguistic features in which the revisers wished to make a differentiation in Hebrew visible in Greek, or the other way around, do away with Greek differentiations where the Hebrew does not make any. The list of features given by Barthélemy is, however, hardly meant to be exhaustive or to give even the most significant features of this translation style. It simply provides examples that reveal the connection between the texts in question and shows that they are part of one and the same phenomenon. Barthélemy called these texts the *kaige* group, probably because some of these texts exemplify revision, some others original translation.

Later studies have added several more features to those mentioned by Barthélemy,[8] but it seems futile to try to list all translation features typical of the *kaige* revision or the *kaige* group. Depending on the content of different texts, new features keep coming up and they need not even be very frequent to qualify as *kaige* features. Features of the *kaige* revision

[8] James D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, HSM 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968); Kevin G. O'Connell, *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek*, HSM 3 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972); Walter R. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments*, HSM 23 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980); Leonard J. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*, HSM 28 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983). See Tim McLay, "*Kaige* and Septuagint Research," *Textus* 19 (1998): 127–39.

can be recognized especially by those principles of revision that differ from the Hexaplaric recension: change of lexical items to accord with parallel cases or with the concordance principle and omission of words and passages not present in the (proto-)Masoretic text.

A significant part of Barthélemy's thesis is that there was a continuum from the revisional activity in the late Second Temple period to the translation of Aquila in the second century CE. He spoke of "the forerunners of Aquila" and saw Aquila's translation as the consummation of the *kaige* style. Previously, the Jewish translators Aquila and Theodotion, along with Symmachus, had been known through the work of Origen, who compared the Three (Jewish translators from the second and early third centuries CE) with the traditional Septuagint and with the Hebrew text in his Hexapla.[9] As a result of Origen's text-critical work, readings of the Three were preserved in the margins of manuscripts as well as in Patristic commentaries and by and by spread into the text of the Septuagint. The recognition of the earlier phase of Jewish revisional activity made it clear that correction of the Septuagint into closer conformity with the Hebrew text had taken place already before Origen and before the Three.

In fact, today it is common to think that Theodotion, one of the Three, was not a novel translation of the second century CE but a revision of the traditional Septuagint which was being developed around the turn of the era. This explains the fact that readings attributed to Theodotion occur in texts older than the second century CE, for instance, in the New Testament.[10]

The translation style of *kaige* seems to have been a tradition developed and practiced over a longer period, and it may have had somewhat different manifestations depending on the scholars who practiced it, and on the tasks, either revision or new translation, that it was employed for.[11] More essential than listing further features of *kaige* is to understand the nature of this phenomenon and the motives behind it. It is not primarily

[9] For the relationship of the Three to each other and to the Septuagint, see Lester Grabbe, "The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?" in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings (Manchester 1990)*, ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars S.S.F., SCS 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press 1992), 505–56.

[10] For examples of New Testament quotations from Isaiah, see Paavo Huotari and Katja Kujanpää, "Hebraizing Revision in Isaiah Quotations in Paul and Matthew," in the present volume.

[11] See Peter Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*, SCS 38 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 497.

a question of linguistic features or literalistic translation.[12] The literalistic approach is in the service of a more important cause. It is not only a translation technique, there is also a philosophy and theology connected to it.

2. What was the motivation behind the *kaige* revision?

It is a commonplace to say that all translation is interpretation. Even more so, scriptural translation always involves interpretation of Scripture. Barthélemy has been heavily criticized for connecting the *kaige* phenomenon with the proto-rabbinic schools of the first century CE, known for their literal interpretation of Scripture.[13] In principle, he was right, but the idea that certain historical figures of the first century CE would have given the decisive impulse to the phenomenon cannot be correct for the sake of the final dating of the Naḥal Ḥever scroll a century earlier. The phenomenon must have its roots deep in the first century BCE, as the Naḥal Ḥever scroll is most probably just a copy and not an original piece of the revision.[14]

I think it is evident that the kind of revision or translation represented by the *kaige* group is connected to interpretation of Scripture. Its goal was to make the correspondence of the Greek translation with the Hebrew source text so exact that the minutiae of the Hebrew text would be reflected in the translation. This shows that the smallest details of the Hebrew text were important. Such a translation would allow its reader to reconstruct the source text behind it. In a way, it gives a reader without knowledge of Hebrew access to the Hebrew text, but most importantly, it allows its interpreter to make the same exegetical conclusions that are possible on the basis of the Hebrew text.[15]

The motivation and the goal of the original Septuagint translation, often called the Old Greek, especially of the Pentateuch, was different.

[12] Against McLay ("*Kaige*," 138), according to whom the only common feature of the various texts that have been attributed to the καίγε group is that they tend to formal equivalence; this is his conclusion after listing 96 translation features (131–34) based on the studies of Barthélemy, Shenkel, O'Connell, and Greenspoon (see note 8 above) as well as Peter Gentry, *Asterisked Materials*, and Tim McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*, SCS 43 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

[13] See note 31 below.

[14] Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 187–88, 198.

[15] Similarly, Adrian Schenker, "What Were the Aims of the Palestinian Recension, and What Did They Achieve? With Some Biographical Notes on Dominique Barthélemy," in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after* Les Devanciers d'Aquila, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Tuukka Kauhanen, DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 14–22.

It was motivated by the need of the Jewish Diaspora community to understand their sacred text that was constitutive for their identity as Jews.[16] They needed to understand it in order to live by it. The first translators did not have a conscious system of translating but rather proceeded intuitively, proceeding most of the time by small segments of the text – as inexperienced translators often do – but time and again using idiomatic equivalents for words and phrases. The goal of the Old Greek translation was to bring the message of the original to the reader.

By contrast, the translation philosophy of *kaige* aimed at bringing the reader to the Hebrew original. This speaks for a deep reverence for the Hebrew Scripture, for each and every word and small detail of it. We can see here an indication of change – an evolution – in the Jewish attitudes to sacred texts. If each and every detail of the text is important and needs to be reflected in the translation, then the text is in fact regarded as unchangeable; it has reached the status of immutable sacred Scripture. In the case of the Torah, this development had probably already taken place during the second century BCE at the latest, but other books that later became part of the canon were still under development. Different communities still had different collections of sacred texts that they held in reverence.

We are now talking about a phenomenon of the first century BCE and the turn of the era. Even if we know very little about the activities of the scribes and scholars, what they did at their gatherings and how they practiced their profession, we can see the results of their work reflected in the texts that we have. We can see the emergence of the proto-Masoretic text among the discoveries in the Dead Sea area and we can see the translation philosophy of *kaige* in revisional activity using the proto-Masoretic text to correct the Old Greek translations that were felt to be unsatisfactory as well as in translations of a few books that probably had no Old Greek translation at all. No doubt, the coincidence of the proto-Masoretic text, its literal interpretation and translation, as well as evolution in the concept of Scripture suggest that it is a question of phenomena that are closely connected and form one coherent trajectory in early Judaism.[17]

[16] See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint and Oral Translation," in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki 2010*, ed. Melvin K. Peters, SCS 59 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013), 5–13.

[17] The methodology used in this paper to trace the origins of the *kaige* phenomenon follows the model of the "evidential paradigm," a micro-historical approach introduced by Carlo Ginzburg, "Clues: Roots of an Evidential Paradigm," in: Carlo Ginzburg,

3. The example of the Books of Samuel

I would like to bring a few more aspects into the discussion of the *kaige* phenomenon by taking up an example or two from the Books of Samuel, which have a most intricate textual history. In fact, whatever aspect of textual history is being discussed, it is important to differentiate between the individual books, and especially, between the Torah and the other books that later became part of the wider canon of Scripture.

The Old Greek translation of the Books of Samuel can be dated towards the end of the second century BCE.[18] After this point, there was still much editorial activity going on with the Hebrew text of Samuel. For instance, the image of David was being polished and certain details of the text were changed in order not to give people false models of behavior. These books were probably just reaching the status of sacred Scripture, and the changes were made in preparation of the books for that status and their eventual inclusion in the canon. When the Old Greek translation of these books was compared with the proto-Masoretic text, there were numerous differences that were caused by the different *Vorlage*, as the Hebrew text had since been changed. On the other hand, the differences caused by the translator were not just free, idiomatic renderings but also erroneous translations. This translator was not always up to his task. There are many contextual guesses and direct errors in his translation. It is no wonder then that revision of the Greek text was felt to be needed in the textual history of these books in particular.

The earliest layer of corrections in 1 Samuel resulted in numerous doublets that consist of the Old Greek translation of a phrase or a short passage and its correction. The secondary part of the doublet, the correction, must have been first added to the margin of a manuscript from where it slipped into the text, sometimes before the original counterpart, sometimes after it, and sometimes at a different location. These doublets also mark the earliest phase of the textual history attested in the manuscripts, as they are present in practically every manuscript. These early

Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method, trans. John and Anne C. Tedeschi (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 96–125. The "evidential paradigm" is characteristically employed in inquiries that are based on evidence consisting of plentiful details from which the researcher attempts to infer what happened – "deducing the causes from their effects" (117).

[18] See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "When Did the Books of Samuel Become Scripture?" in *From Author to Copyist: Essays on the Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zipi Talshir*, ed. Cana Werman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 263–81.

corrections do not always show translation features that would connect with the *kaige* translation style, but there is always something that prompted revision.

1 Sam 4:14–16

Rahlfs

14 καὶ ἤκουσεν Ἠλὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς βοῆς. **καὶ εἶπεν Τίς ἡ βοὴ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης; καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος σπεύσας εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ Ἠλί.** – 15 καὶ Ἠλὶ υἱὸς ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπανέστησαν, καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπεν. **– καὶ εἶπεν Ἠλὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν τοῖς περιεστηκόσιν αὐτῷ Τίς ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἤχου τούτου;** 16 **καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ σπεύσας προσῆλθεν πρὸς Ἠλὶ** καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἥκων ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς …

14 And Eli heard the sound of the cry **and said, "What is the cry of this sound?" And the man, hurrying, entered in and told Eli**, – 15 and Eli was a son of ninety years, and his eyes were "rebelling," and he could not see – **and Eli said to the men standing around him, "What is the sound of this noise?"** 16 **And hurrying the man came to Eli** and said to him, "I am the one who has come from the camp …"

Early archetype

14 καὶ ἤκουσεν Ἠλὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς βοῆς ↗
15 καὶ Ἠλὶ υἱὸς ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπανέστησαν καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπεν **καὶ εἶπεν Ἠλὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν τοῖς περιεστηκόσιν αὐτῷ Τίς ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἤχου τούτου 16 καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ σπεύσας προσῆλθεν πρὸς Ἠλὶ** καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἥκων ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς…

↗
καὶ εἶπεν Τίς ἡ βοὴ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος σπεύσας εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ Ἠλί

In this case, the doublet was partially caused by the different location of the parenthetical mention of Eli's advanced age and his blindness. According to the proto-Masoretic text, the story was expected to continue before the parenthesis, and the "missing" part of the text was thus doubled and given in a marginal note. It is also obvious that the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint represented a somewhat different formulation of the passage.

Revision that more clearly conforms to the *kaige* translation is seen in the so-called *kaige* sections: in the Books of Samuel, the second half of 2 Samuel. Similar variants are however also sporadically found in

1 Samuel, showing that there probably existed a *kaige* revision for 1 Samuel as well, and this has had influence on the manuscript tradition of the Old Greek. I will show one example, a case that I have used as an illustration many times.

1 Sam 15:11 נִחַמְתִּי כִּי־הִמְלַכְתִּי אֶת־שָׁאוּל לְמֶלֶךְ

μεταμεμέλημαι ὅτι ἔχρισα τὸν Σαοὺλ εἰς βασιλέα

μεταμεμέλημαι] μεταμεληματι V 46*-313 55* 71 460; μεμεταμελιμαι 245; μεταμελομαι *d* 554; **παρακεκλημαι B A 247 93^{mg}-108^{mg} 121*(vid) Ra: cf MT**; παρακεκληκαι με 376 │

om ὅτι ἔχρισα A │ ἔχρισα] **εβασιλευσα B *O L* 121-509 244 460 Ra = MT** │

θ′ παρακέκλημαι σ′ μετεμελήθην 243-731(s nom)

This is the message that Samuel receives concerning Saul: God has rejected Saul saying, "I regret having made Saul king." There are two different kinds of corrections in this example. In the first one, the Hebrew verb נחם, which obviously represents the *niph*. in this context, meaning 'to regret,' has been correctly translated in the Old Greek by μεταμέλομαι but this was changed to παρακαλέομαι which corresponds to the meaning of the Hebrew verb in the *pi*. 'to comfort,' and more precisely, to its passive in *niph*. 'to be comforted.' The change produces a concordant translation of the Hebrew verb with the same Greek verb in all its different forms, although the context demands another equivalent. The resulting text is hardly comprehensible – at least to a reader who was not able to back-translate the word into Hebrew.[19]

The second case is a simpler one. There was a difference in the Hebrew text: the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek contained the verb משׁח 'to anoint,' whereas the Masoretic text has been changed to מלך *hiph*. 'to appoint to be king' (cf. the parallel 15:35).[20] In these two cases as well as elsewhere in Samuel, the main witness for the corrected text is Codex Vaticanus,

[19] It is hard to find an appropriate translation for this usage: 'to be appeased,' 'to be calmed down,' or perhaps 'to be soothed.' None of these however fits the case at 1 Sam 15:11.

[20] The change of the Hebrew verb was inspired by the parallel case in 1 Sam 15:35. The prepositional phrase למלך reveals the change, as it is not needed in connection with מלך *hiph*. (cf. 1 Sam 15:1 and 35). See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, JSJS 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 353–66.

accompanied by a few other manuscripts, and so these secondary readings have ended up in all editions of the Greek text.[21]

4. Theological and exegetical motivations behind the revision

Let us look more closely at the first correction. The reviser clearly wanted to avoid the expression of "God regretting." The theological motivation of the correction is obvious. It is spelled out in a later verse of the very same chapter:

> **1 Sam 15:29**
> For he (*i.e.* God) is not a human being
> that he should regret (נחם *niph.*).
>
> Shall he 'decree' and not keep to it?[22]

Interestingly enough, a close parallel to this theological statement is found in Balaam's second oracle in the Torah:

> **Num 23:19**
> God is not man, that he should lie,
> nor a human being, that he should regret (נחם *hitp.*).
> Has he said and will he not do it?
> Or has he spoken and will he not keep it?"

The formulations of the two verses are very similar,[23] the difference being that Balaam refers to something positive, namely, God's irreversible blessing of Israel, whereas it is Saul's rejection, something negative, that cannot be reversed in 1 Sam 15. It is obvious that the former has served as a model for the latter. Many commentators agree that chapter 15 is one of the latest passages in 1 Samuel,[24] obviously written at a

[21] For the analysis of these and similar cases, see Anneli Aejmelaeus, "*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel," in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after* Les Devanciers d'Aquila, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Tuukka Kauhanen, DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 169–84.

[22] The third stichos is not present in the MT but has been reconstructed on the basis of the Septuagint (and the Targum). Whether אמר 'say,' as in Num 23:19, or, for instance, גער 'rebuke,' or perhaps גזר 'decree,' as in the Targum, was the Hebrew verb translated by ἀπειλέω 'threaten' is impossible to say (Aejmelaeus, "A Kingdom at Stake," 362–64).

[23] Both verses contrast God with human beings and introduce a question by ההוא αὐτός "does he?"/"shall he?" – a fairly rare form for a question.

[24] See, for instance, P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*, AB 8 (New York: Doubleday, 1980), 269–71, 277–78; Graeme Auld, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary,* The Old Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 166–67, 180; Jürg Hutzli, "Distinctiveness of the

time when building bridges to the Torah was on the program. If God in principle never regrets, the controversial formulation had to be removed by correcting the translation,[25] whereas the Hebrew text did not need a change other than interpreting the verb differently.

In a comparable case, of the well-known phrase "to see God's face" (meaning "visiting a sanctuary"), a change was also made early on. In numerous cases, the phrase was changed to "to appear before God" – this becomes visible in the Masoretic text often just by change of vocalization to the *niph.*, in the Old Greek by use of the passive voice, and similarly in the Targums (e.g., Exod 34:20, 23, 24). The criterion for this change was found in Exod 33:20, according to which it is fatal for human beings to see God's face. Both examples reveal early theological reflection and resulting interpretation of the traditional text. Both kinds of changes interestingly also find a parallel in the Targum.[26]

Moreover, the problem concerning the expression of God's regretting already seems to be anticipated in the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch, in that the Greek verbs μεταμέλομαι and μετανοέω do not occur there at all with the divine subject.[27] In those cases where נחם *niph./hitp.* has a divine subject the translation is a kind of circumlocution, avoiding the direct translation "to regret."[28] Expressions touching upon the divine sphere seem to have already directed the earliest interpreters to choose what was thought to be a more reverent formulation.

Nevertheless, most of the non-Pentateuchal Old Greek translators did not show the same sensitivity but used the direct translations μεταμέλομαι and μετανοέω in connection with the divine subject. This called forth revision not only in the Books of Samuel but also elsewhere. It is

Samuel Narrative Tradition," in *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History*, ed. Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala, AIL 16 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013), 171–205 (esp. 191–92).

[25] Curiously enough, the controversial expression is left in its place at 1 Sam 15:35, which confirms the sporadic nature of the corrections in 1 Samuel.

[26] See Etan Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context*, BZAW 174 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988), 54: "the targum paraphrases to remove any reference to divine changeability." Levine connects this trait in the Targum to the belief in God's omniscience.

[27] With a human subject, there is just one case of μεταμέλω at Exod 13:17.

[28] Gen 6:6 ἐνεθυμήθη 'he considered', 6:7 ἐθυμώθην 'I am angry'; Exod 32:12 ἵλεως γενοῦ 'be merciful', 32:14 ἱλάσθη 'he was merciful'; Num 23:19 ἀπειληθῆναι 'to be threatened'. Interestingly, there is just one case in the Pentateuch in which the rendering παρακαλέομαι is used, namely in the Song of Moses at Deut 32:36, which is paralleled by Ps 135(134):14, also revealing παρακαλέομαι. In the Psalter, one further case is found at Ps 90(89):13.

remarkable that the same correction of the expression of God's regretting can be found in different texts. It happens to be preserved in the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll in Jonah 3:9 and 10 (μετανοέω > παρακαλέομαι). These are the only two cases that have been preserved of the eight cases of this kind in the Minor Prophets, and most probably the other six cases had been changed as well. Another example of the same change is found in 2 Sam 24:16, that is, in one of the *kaige* sections.

Thus, the replacement of μεταμέλομαι (or μετανοέω) 'to regret' ('to change one's mind') by παρακαλέομαι 'to be comforted' in connection with the divine subject – and especially without a negation – links the sporadic correction in 1 Samuel with the previously known exemplars of the *kaige* group. In a marginal note to 1 Sam 15:11, the corrected form also happens to be attributed to Theodotion. In several other cases in which the Old Greek μεταμέλομαι (or μετανοέω) has been preserved, the same correction is found in marginal readings attributed to Aquila or Theodotion, exemplifying the continuum from *kaige* to Aquila.[29]

No doubt we are dealing here with a further feature of the *kaige* revision, one that has not been listed before and one with a clearly theological motivation. The concordant translation was not introduced into the Greek text just for the linguistic effect. It served the theological interpretation of the passage and created a link between all the mentioned cases with the same wording. It seems clear to me that one aspect of the revision was precisely to create links between passages with shared vocabulary in Hebrew. A less spectacular example of this feature is the use of παραβιβάζω 'to remove' to translate עבר *hiph*. 'to let pass by' in the two passages that speak of God's forgiveness of David's sins in the *kaige* section of 2 Samuel (12:13 and 24:10; cf. Dan 11:20 θ′). In the Old Greek, the two passages had different translations (ἀφαιρέω and περιαιρέω) – very close in their meaning to παραβιβάζω 'to remove' which was used in the revision – but those words were reserved for other Hebrew verbs in the *kaige* revision, and they did not create the needed link between the two passages. The theme of David's sin and its forgiveness is also theological in nature.

Whether or not we should be talking about early examples of the rabbinic interpretative method of *gezerah šawah*, it seems to me that we are

[29] According to Joseph Reider, *An Index to Aquila*, VTSup XII (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 183, (and in greater detail in Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, II, ad loc.) παρακαλέομαι for נחם *niph*. is found in marginal readings, e.g., in Isa 57:6; Jer 4:28, 15:6, 20:16; Amos 7:3; Joel 2:13 with an attribution to Aquila and Symmachus (and Theodotion).

dealing here with at least initial tendencies in that direction.[30] It is not always obvious that the concordant choice of translation equivalents creates theologically meaningful links between the verses in question, but it surely leaves this possibility open for future interpreters. To enable the same interpretation on the basis of the translation as on the basis of the original was certainly one of the concerns of the revisers.

When more research is done on the phenomenon, not just looking for frequent equivalents but looking more closely into individual cases where changes have taken place, I am confident that the exegetical and theological aspect of the revision will find more and more illustration.[31] The decision to reinterpret expressions of God's regretting already reveals far-reaching theological reflection that seems to relate to the conviction that God is omniscient and unchanging – not like human beings who speak but do not keep their word (cf. Num 23:19). The reinterpretation, however, creates a conflict with – or at least sets limits to – the possibility of human repentance, whereas several biblical passages present it as an act of mercy that God regrets and withdraws an imminent disaster when people repent (e.g., Exod 32:12, 14; Jer 18:8; Ps 106:45). This seems to suggest that the group behind the revision represents a rather rigorous interpretation of Judaism.

[30] For reservations concerning similar features in other early writings, see Friedrich Avemarie, "Interpreting Scripture through Scripture: Exegesis Based on Lexematic Association in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles," in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 85 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 83–102.

[31] Barthélemy discusses the influence of the hermeneutics of R. Akiba and the school of Hillel on Aquila and his predecessors at length (1963, esp. 3–30), for which he has been criticized. For a review of the reception of Barthélemy's thesis, see Leonard Greenspoon, "Recension, Revisions, Rabbinics: Dominique Barthélemy and Early developments in the Greek Traditions," *Textus* 15 (1990): 153–67. For instance, Lester Grabbe, "Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis," *JJS* 33 (1982): 527–36, does not find any evidence for specific links between Aquila's translation and the exegesis or theology of any rabbinic school; similarly, Olivier Munnich, "Contribution à l'étude de la première révision de la Septante," in *Religion (Hellenisches Judentum in römischer Zeit, ausgenommen Philon und Josephus)*. ed. Wolfgang Haase, ANRW (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987), 20.1:205-06, underlines the purely linguistic and stylistic character of the *kaige* revision; both of the scholars mentioned agree that the motivation behind the revisions was in the first place consideration of style rather than exegesis. Greenspoon concludes (not without irony), "While contacts with rabbinic traditions cannot be ruled out (it would be remarkable indeed if there were none at all), no specific links join this recension to any identifiable school or strand of rabbinic thought" (162).

5. The question concerning the provenance of the *kaige* revision

It is time to pose the question concerning the provenance of the *kaige* tradition. It is a tradition, not the work of one person or one group but rather a school. There is a continuum over decades, even more than a century. This continuum exists not only in the philosophy of translation from *kaige* to Aquila, but also in reliance on the textual tradition of the proto-Masoretic text which obviously functioned as the source text for the *kaige* revision as well as for the translation of Aquila. Furthermore, there seems to have been a continuum in the exegetical practice that tended towards a literalistic interpretation of even the smallest details of the Hebrew text and paid attention to lexical analogy between verses in different parts of Scripture. As mentioned above, this also seems to indicate an evolution in the concept of Scripture towards greater authority and immutability of the text. The fact that our clearest examples of the *kaige* revision are from books outside the Pentateuch hints at a development towards the tripartite collection of Scripture.

In the scholarly literature, the *kaige* revision is often described as Palestinian, which the Naḥal Ḥever discovery seems to confirm.[32] The dating of the Minor Prophets scroll to the first century BCE – instead of CE – was already discussed above. Considering that knowledge of the Hebrew language and orientation by the Hebrew Scriptures had declined among the users of the Septuagint in the Diaspora, it seems even more plausible that the revisional activity was a phenomenon at home in Palestine, and more precisely, in Jerusalem.[33] The intrinsic connection of the

[32] Thackeray already connected those sections in Samuel–Kings that were later recognized as part of the *kaige* group with Palestine. See Thackeray, "The Greek Translation," *JTS* 8 (1907). The Palestinian rabbinate is even mentioned in Barthélemy's subtitle (1963).

[33] The different attitudes to the Septuagint in the Diaspora and Palestine are well exemplified by Philo, on the one hand, for whom the Greek Torah is inspired Scripture which should be kept as it is without "omitting, adding or transposing" anything (*Mos*. 2.25–44) and Josephus, on the other, who turns the "canon formula" of the *Letter of Aristeas* upside down: "… if anyone saw any further addition made to the text of the Law or anything omitted from it, he should examine it and make it known and correct it" (*Ant*. 12.108–9). The criterion for correction would always have been the current Hebrew text, which was believed to be identical with the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint. See Alison Salvesen, "The Tabernacle Accounts in LXX Exodus and their Reception in Hellenistic Judaism," in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Texts in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, ed. Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström, CBET 72 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 555–71; Sebastian Brock, "To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings (Manchester 1990)*, ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars S.S.F., SCS 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 301–38.

kaige phenomenon to some central trajectories of Judaism from the pre-70 CE to the rabbinic period – emergence of the MT and the tripartite canon as well as (proto-)rabbinic exegesis – points in the same direction. The ideological and social location of the *kaige* revision is to be sought within those circles in Jerusalem that were promoting the mentioned trajectories, with the sole distinction that the language concerned is Greek and not Hebrew.

Since Barthélemy, scholars have seldom attempted a more precise determination of the provenance of the *kaige* tradition. In a recent article, Jan Joosten makes an exception and argues that the Psalms of Solomon show language features that connect this pseudepigraph with the *kaige* tradition.[34] He suggests that the same group of people should be regarded as responsible for both. Joosten bases his thesis on the assumption that the Psalms of Solomon were not a translation but originally written in Hebraistic Greek.[35] He assumes that the group in question composed new literature in Hebraistic Greek and that they could be identified by vocabulary that they share with revised biblical translations or Aquila. As for the vocabulary, the evidence offered by Joosten is meager, a few single occurrences of rare words and a few allusions to biblical verses in revised form,[36] hardly establishing anything close to identity of authorship. However, Joosten's more general conclusion that "there were circles in Jerusalem at the beginning of the Roman period, with a strong interest in Scripture, who expressed their piety in Greek" is worthy of attention.

Indeed, through the Psalms of Solomon we can get a glimpse of the theology and sentiments of the community behind the text. According to Felix Albrecht, who recently published a critical edition of the pseudepigraph,[37] the psalms were composed and edited over some time

[34] Jan Joosten, "New light on Proto-Theodotion: The Psalms of Solomon and the Milieu of the *Kaige* Recension," in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz*, ed. Martin Meiser et al., WUNT I 405 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 304–15.

[35] For a more detailed argument, see Jan Joosten, "Reflections on the Original Language of the Psalms of Solomon," in *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Patrick Pouchelle, EJL 40 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 31–47.

[36] Joosten's evidence ("New light on Proto-Theodotion," 310–14) includes four single words and one root that can be found in alleged Aquila or *kaige* readings (Pss. Sol. 9:1 ἀποικεσία, 16:1 καταφορά, 4:5 συνταγή, 16:8 ἀνωφελής; 4:6 ὑπόκρισις, 4:20, 22 ὑποκρίνομαι) and another five cases that seem to be allusions to a biblical verse with a revised reading, albeit with vocabulary also occurring in the Old Greek (Pss. Sol. 5:3, 9:9, 17:1, 3, 23–24). The latter seem to point to the availability of revised texts, but the origin of these references can hardly be identified.

[37] Felix Albrecht, *Psalmi Salomonis*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum, Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum XII, 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &

from the Hasmonean to the Herodian period, although it is evident that the main cause of the distress felt by the "pious" and expressed in the psalms was the Roman conquest 63 BCE and the foreign rule in Jerusalem. According to Albrecht, the theological content of the pseudepigraph is characterized by strict obedience to the Law connected with a strong emphasis on righteousness and the freedom to choose it for oneself, observance of ancestral tradition, messianic hope, and belief in resurrection. This kind of theology has been traditionally attributed to the Pharisees.[38] Irrespective of the nomenclature, the Psalms of Solomon seem to bear witness to the existence of a strong Greek-speaking community that observed a rigorous form of Jewish piety in Jerusalem during the early Roman period. Even if the connection between the Psalms of Solomon and the *kaige* revision is not as direct as suggested by Joosten, there are several points of contact between the two in theological emphases. It is intriguing that the pseudepigraph interprets the imminent destruction by the foreign occupier as a punishment for the "sinners," leaving little room for their repentance.[39] Furthermore, the rich use of scriptural allusions in the text of the pseudepigraph reveals the authors' learnedness and bears witness to the use and study of not just the Law but a wide range of biblical books, which is not self-evident during the first century BCE.[40]

Theological orientation is not irrelevant to our quest. It is logical that strict observance of the Law generates intensive study of Scripture. The

Ruprecht, 2018), 206–209. Albrecht confirms the view that the psalms were mainly written in Greek, although there is perhaps an older kernel in the collection that was translated from a Hebrew original (181–82).

[38] In recent discussion, the Pharisaic origin of the Psalms of Solomon has largely been challenged, although no other solution has gained universal acceptance; see Eberhard Bons and Patrick Pouchelle (eds.), *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology*, EJL 40 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), especially the editors' introduction pp. 1–6. On the one hand, different unknown sects have been suggested as the group behind the poems; on the other, the beliefs and practices reflected in the text have been considered as common to most Jews. A mediating position might be to connect the very rigorous form of observance and the clear-cut opposition of the "pious" to the "sinners" to a branch within the Pharisaic movement. For instance, Joosten, "Reflections on the Original Language of the Psalms of Solomon," 42, sees the social location of the Psalms of Solomon close to the Pharisees; Albrecht; *Psalmi Salomonis*, 198, differentiates between the various parts of the text, attributing the earlier parts to Hasidean and the editorial layers written after 63 BCE to Pharisaic circles.

[39] The word μεταμέλεια 'repentance' appears just once at Pss. Sol. 9:7, but most probably in reference to the "pious." The emphasis on the unchangeableness of divine judgments found in the above examples from the *kaige* revision seems to find a parallel here.

[40] See also Joosten, "Reflections on the Original Language of the Psalms of Solomon," 33–38.

Law is often mentioned as the sole object of study, but as the Prologue of Sirach indicates, study of the prophets and other writings were understood as beneficial for "the life according to the Law," and were thus to be included in the curriculum. Intensive study again calls forth literalistic interpretation – reverence for the exact wording of Scripture – and this can be assumed to lead to word-for-word translation in situations where scriptural translation is needed.

6. Profiling the initiators of the *kaige* revision

We need to do some more profiling in order to get further in our pursuit. One important clue in this inquiry comes from the Greek language usage. As mentioned above, James Aitken argues that the particle καίγε is a sign for literary Greek, which reveals the good educational background of its users.[41] An increased use of καίγε can be seen in genuine Greek texts of the late Hellenistic and early Roman period, precisely the time when the *kaige* group is emerging. The overall appearance of the Greek language used in the *kaige* revision tends to be judged as artificial and not idiomatic Greek, but this is only due to the Hebrew *Vorlage* and the translation philosophy behind the phenomenon. For the profiling of the people behind the phenomenon, this means that we are looking for a group of people in Palestine who are (1) well educated and (2) speak Greek, most probably as their first language, (3) who can read and write Greek – and of course, (4) who have the proficiency to interpret Hebrew Scriptures.

The decisive question is: Where do we find a context for the *competence* in both Hebrew and Greek as well as the *parallel use* of the proto-Masoretic text and the Old Greek and comparison between them? The two texts had to come into contact with each other before the need to bring the Greek into line with the Hebrew text could arise. It is not so easy to notice differences between two biblical texts unless they are compared verse by verse, word by word. And no one will do this painstaking work unless an accurate translation of the text is needed. Where and in what kind of a situation was this comparison and the resulting revision of the Greek translation needed?

Initially, translations of Hebrew Scriptures were needed to accompany Scripture reading because Hebrew was rarely spoken any more. In the Diaspora, the Greek Pentateuch eventually replaced the Hebrew Torah and was regarded as Scripture in its own right, but among Aramaic-

[41] Aitken, "Origins," 32.

speaking Jews Hebrew Scripture reading was traditionally accompanied by an oral translation. Even among Diaspora Jews, oral translation was probably practiced before the writing down of the Greek Pentateuch.[42] Nevertheless, it is not unthinkable that there were groups of Greek-speaking Jews who were able to read Hebrew Scriptures and accompanied their reading with a Greek translation.[43] This would most probably not have happened in the Diaspora but rather in Palestine, most likely in Jerusalem.

Considering the textual findings in the Books of Samuel, the earliest revisional activity was found to appear in the manuscripts as doublets, which were presumably first added to the margin of a manuscript and from there inadvertently inserted into the text. This activity could very well have had its origin in the situation where the Old Greek translation was used to interpret the Hebrew proto-Masoretic text to a Greek-speaking audience, or possibly, to rehearse for an oral performance of such an interpretation. Such marginal readings could have been added by the scholar responsible for the interpretation, who did not need to be a professional scribe.[44] In the next step, the marginal readings could have been included into the text by scribes when copying new manuscripts. The emergence of doublets is explained by the fact that these scribes just copied a Greek model manuscript without comparing it with the Hebrew text. At a later stage, a Greek-speaking, competent interpreter might have dictated the fully revised translation to a scribe.[45] The distribution of the *kaige* revision was, however, not very wide. For instance, the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll has not had any influence on the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint, and in the case of the historical books the influence has been partial or excerptive.[46]

[42] Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint and Oral Translation," 5–13, and "The Origins of the Septuagint – for Jews or Gentiles?" in *Translation and Transmission: Collection of Articles*, ed. Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila and Ilkka Lindstedt, IHAMNE 3 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2018), 13–21.

[43] For the attitudes to translations and in particular to the use of Greek in Judaism, see Willem F. Smelik, *Rabbis, Language and Translation in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: University Press, 2013), esp. pp. 91–92, 122–26, 185–87.

[44] Marginal readings in manuscripts often reveal an unprofessional hand.

[45] For the roles of scholars and scribes, see Catherine Hezser, "Jewish Scribes in the Late Second Temple Period: Differences Between Composition, Writing, and Interpretation of Texts," in this volume.

[46] The influence of the *kaige* revision on Septuagintal manuscripts seems to have happened mainly through the Egyptian text-type, which is represented by Codex Vaticanus (B; 4th cent.) but was formed already around 200 CE to deduce from Origen's familiarity with it. Compare the example 1 Sam 15:11 above, in which the Hexaplaric

Moreover, Hebrew Scripture reading accompanied by Greek translation presupposes that the writing in question already enjoys scriptural authority in the community. Especially in the case of the historical books, which were later included in the Former Prophets, this was certainly not the case in the Diaspora, and the authoritative status of these books was hardly incontestable in Palestine either until the first century BCE.[47] On the other hand, the presence of the Old Greek translation in Palestine would be thinkable through the mediation of Diaspora Jews only. Thus, favorable circumstances for the initiation of revisional activity in the case of the historical books could have been found in a Greek-speaking educational context. This could presumably be found in connection with a Greek-speaking synagogue, where scholars representing high competence in the interpretation of Hebrew Scriptures would have been in contact with Jews from the Diaspora.

7. Evidence of Greek-speaking synagogues in Jerusalem

It is a fact that Greek was widely spoken in Palestine and that there were Greek-speaking synagogues already prior to 70 CE even in Jerusalem.[48] It is logical to assume that at least in some Greek synagogues the Hebrew text would have been recited and translated orally into Greek for those members of the community who did not master Hebrew. Such a community could include Diaspora Jews who had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem or stayed there for a longer period for study purposes as well as other Greek-speaking Jews who lived in Palestine.

Authentic, hard evidence for a synagogue of this kind can be seen in the so-called *Theodotos inscription*, discovered in Jerusalem, south of the Temple Mount, and dated to the late Second Temple period (1st century CE):[49]

manuscripts (*O* = 247-376) follow B. In the *kaige* sections of Samuel–Kings, B is the main witness of the revised text.

[47] The historical books do not seem to have been widely known, let alone acquiring a scriptural status, during the second and first centuries BCE, at least not among the Egyptian Diaspora. See Aejmelaeus, "When Did the Books of Samuel Become Scripture?"

[48] For the Hellenization of Jerusalem, see Hezser, "Jewish Scribes in the Late Second Temple Period: Differences Between Composition, Writing, and Interpretation of Texts," in this volume.

[49] The text is published and discussed in John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Dating Theodotos (CIJ II 1404)", *JJS* 51(2000): 243-80, and Anders Runesson, Donald D. Binder, and Birger Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 52–54. Kloppenborg Verbin especially argues on archaeological

Θ[ε]όδοτος Οὐεττήνου, ἱερεὺς καὶ
ἀ[ρ]χισυνάγωγος, υἱὸς ἀρχισυν[αγώ]-
γ[ο]υ, υἱωνὸς ἀρξισυν[α]γώγου, ᾠκο-
δόμησε τὴν συναγωγὴν εἰς ἀν[άγν]ω-
σ[ιν] νόμου καὶ εἰς [δ]ιδαχ[ὴ]ν ἐντολῶν, καὶ
τ[ὸ]ν ξενῶνα κα[ὶ τὰ] δώματα καὶ τὰ χρη-
σ[τ]ήρια τῶν ὑδάτων εἰς κατάλυμα τοῖ-
ς [χ]ρήζουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ξέ[ν]ης, ἣν ἐθεμε-
λ[ίω]σαν οἱ πατέρες [α]ὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ πρε-
σ[β]ύτεροι καὶ Σιμων[ί]δης.

Theodotos, son of Vettenus, priest and
ruler of the synagogue, son of a ruler of the synagogue,
grandson of a ruler of the synagogue,
built the synagogue for the reading
of the Law and the teaching of the commandments, and
the guest chamber and the upper rooms and the (ritual)
pools of water for accommodating
those needing them from abroad, which
was founded by his fathers and the
elders and Simonides.

Theodotos, or one of his forefathers, might have come from the Diaspora, as his patronym Vettenus suggests.[50] If his father and grandfather were already ἀρχισυνάγωγοι of the same synagogue community, as the inscription seems to presuppose, this Greek-speaking synagogue must have existed for at least two generations before the building of new facilities for the community, which the inscription documents. The community might thus have been founded some time during the first century BCE. It is remarkable that these leading figures of the synagogue community were of priestly lineage.[51]

The synagogue building is said to have rooms for reading the Torah and teaching the commandments as well as guest-rooms and other facili-

and paleographic grounds for a dating prior to 70 CE and against tendencies to date the inscription to the second or third century.

[50] Kloppenborg Verbin (*ibid*., 261–64) does not find evidence for the interpretation that one of the forefathers of Theodotos had been a freed prisoner of war and suggests that the Latin patronym simply exemplifies the practice of giving Latin names, known from Egypt, Cyrenaica and Rome.

[51] Kloppenborg Verbin (*ibid*., 277) emphasizes the wealth of the priestly family and their connections to the aristocracy. No doubt members of priestly families belonged to the educated elite and could also function as Torah scholars and in various leading positions of the community. See E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE* (Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International, 1992), 170–82; Catherine Hezser, *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 69–77.

ties for those who come from the Diaspora. Pilgrims who stayed for a short time would of course need the guest-rooms, but there were others who stayed longer, even for a lifetime, which is possibly exemplified by the priestly family of the ἀρχισυνάγωγος.

The study room of the synagogue is of interest to us. It would certainly also have been used for the study of sacred writings other than just the Torah.[52] An inscription naturally needs to be limited to the most essential things. The study room was probably also used to study the historical books which we have been focusing on. These books may have been considered either as already Scripture or just as history of the nation. If there was a reading group for teaching sacred history to Greek-speaking pilgrims, it would soon become obvious – at least to their instructors who could read the Hebrew text – that there are numerous smaller and greater differences between the Hebrew proto-Masoretic text and the Old Greek translation that called for revision. Adding marginal readings and corrections to the Old Greek manuscript available would have been a response to this problem.

Further evidence of Greek synagogues in Jerusalem is found in the New Testament. Acts 6:9 mentions the synagogue(s) of Hellenistic Jews from different areas around the Mediterranean.

> Acts 6:9 ἀνέστησαν δέ τινες τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερτίνων καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας συζητοῦντες τῷ Στεφάνῳ …
>
> Then some of those who belonged to the synagogue of the Freedmen (as it was called), and of the Cyrenians, and of the Alexandrians, and of those from Cilicia and Asia rose up and disputed with Stephen … (Trans. ESV).

Whether it is one synagogue that is referred to, or perhaps two or several, is not crucial to the argumentation here.[53] A Greek synagogue would have been the original community of many of those Hellenistic Jews who

[52] This could be inferred from the recommendation of the Prologue of Sirach to study the prophets and other ancestral writings for the benefit of "a life according to the Law."

[53] For a summary of research on this question, see Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 45. The traditional interpretation in commentaries of Acts seems to be one synagogue, but, for instance, Jakob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, KEK 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 225, concludes that there were two synagogues. The synagogue of Theodotos has been identified by some interpreters with (one of) the synagogue(s) mentioned in Acts 6:9 (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 45, 54).

were among the first Christians, and certainly known to and visited by Paul, a Diaspora Jew well known to us, while staying in Jerusalem.

Paul, who confesses having been a Pharisee (Phil 3:5), would have attended Greek-speaking synagogues that represented a more rigorous, presumably Pharisaic, interpretation of Judaism.[54] This is how he describes his early career:

> Gal 1:14 καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.
>
> And I was advancing in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers (Trans. ESV).

The study room of his synagogue might have been the context where he cultivated his competence in Scripture,[55] and in this context, he may have come in touch with such learned circles in which the Septuagint text was being revised. In Paul's days, the revision activity had already been going on for a considerable time, so that it was possible that Paul came across manuscripts that contained not just marginal corrections but a revised text. This could explain some of his quotations that diverge from the Septuagint and accord with the Hebrew Masoretic text.[56]

This is as far as we can get with the aid of profiling and interpreting the existing evidence. In order to reach a more precise identification we would need more evidence from new discoveries.

[54] Albrecht (*Psalmi Salomonis*, 210–11) gives a brief review of research history concerning connections between the Psalms of Solomon and the Wisdom of Solomon on the one hand, and the dependence of the Apostle Paul on both Solomonic writings, especially in his emphasis on righteousness, on the other. Albrecht also associates both writings with the Pharisaic movement, with which Paul would thus have been in contact.

[55] For the centrality of the study of Scripture in the synagogue for all Jews, see E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE*, 197–200. Even if Paul acquired his education mainly in Tarsus, attending the synagogue in Jerusalem would have made him familiar with further aspects of Hebrew Scripture and its exegesis.

[56] For examples, see Huotari and Kujanpää, "Hebraizing Revision," in this volume. See also Katja Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans: Paul's Argumentation by Quotations*, NTSup 172 (Leiden: Brill, 2018); e.g., Romans 11:3–4 quoting 3 Kgdms 19:10, 18 is very instructive (212–23).

8. Conclusion

It is among the Greek synagogues in Jerusalem that I suggest the *kaige* tradition was most probably initiated. In particular, learned Jews from the Diaspora who had returned to Jerusalem and functioned there as scholars and teachers of Scripture as well as synagogue officials would have had the skills needed for the revision or translation of biblical texts according to the literalistic translation philosophy. Their usage of Greek would have been on a very competent level, and in Jerusalem, they would have acquired the competence in interpreting Hebrew Scriptures as well as the textual basis needed for their work, the Hebrew proto-Masoretic text. Being native speakers of Greek, they would have seen the advantage of having proper translations of Scripture in writing. Just like Paul, learned Jews from the Diaspora might have been susceptible to a more strict branch of Judaism and eager to put their rigorous interpretation of Scripture into practice in the revision of biblical texts.

Researchers have often wondered why there is a concentration of the *kaige* phenomenon in certain books, the historical books above all. Nothing comparable to the revisions in the historical books can be found in the Pentateuch.[57] If I should be right in suggesting that the initiators of the *kaige* phenomenon were Greek-speaking Jews with a Diaspora background in Jerusalem, it would be understandable that they first of all concentrated their efforts on books that did not belong to the curriculum in the Diaspora (for instance, the historical books) and books that had not previously been translated at all (such as Lamentations, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Ruth). Moreover, the Greek Torah already seems to have been sacrosanct as inspired Scripture for them.

Thus, there might not have been a *kaige* recension for all the books of the Hebrew Bible – unless we conclude that the second century CE translation of Theodotion was the final, complete *kaige* recension. Barthélemy spoke of *kaige*-Theodotion. In that case, the name Theodotion would have been given to the final collection of revised texts of which some were considerably older. But who was this Theodotion? Is it by chance that the ἀρχισυνάγωγος of the inscription had practically the same name, Theodotos?

[57] Or has not been discovered so far; cf. Salvesen, "The Tabernacle Accounts in Exodus," esp. 565, 571.

Bibliography

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*." Pages 353–66 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. JSJS 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

—. "The Septuagint and Oral Translation." Pages 5–13 in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010*. Edited by Melvin K. Peters. SCS 59. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013.

—. "When Did the Books of Samuel Become Scripture?" Pages 263–81 in *From Author to Copyist: Essays on the Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zipi Talshir*. Edited by Cana Werman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

—. "*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel." Pages 169–84 in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after* Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Tuukka. Kauhanen. DSI 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.

—. "The Origins of the Septuagint – for Jews or Gentiles?" Pages 13–21 in *Translation and Transmission: Collection of Articles*. Edited by Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila and Ilkka Lindstedt. IHAMNE 3. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2018.

Aitken, James K. "The Origins of ΚΑΙ ΓΕ." Pages 21–40 in *Biblical Greek in Context: Essays in Honour of John A. L. Lee*. Edited by James K. Aitken and Trevor V. Evans. BTS 22. Leuven: Peeters, 2015.

Albrecht, Felix. *Psalmi Salomonis*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum, Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, XII, 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018.

Auld, Graeme. *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011.

Avemarie, Friedrich. "Interpreting Scripture through Scripture: Exegesis Based on Lexematic Association in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles." Pages 83–102 in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Barthélemy, Dominique. "Redécouverte d'un chainon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante." *RB* 60 (1953): 18–29.

—. *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda: précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat Palestinien*. VTSup X. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Bodine, Walter R. *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments*. HSM 23. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.

Brock, Sebastian. "To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation." Pages 301–38 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings (Manchester 1990)*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars S.S.F. SCS 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Field, Fridericus. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*. I and II. Oxford: Clarendon, 1875.
Grabbe, Lester. "Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis." *JJS* 33 (1982): 527–36.
—. "The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions." Pages 505–56 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings (Manchester 1990)*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars S.S.F. SCS 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
Gentry, Peter. *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*. SCS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
Ginzburg, Carlo. *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*. Translated by John and Anne C. Tedeschi. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
Greenspoon, Leonard J. *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*. HSM 28. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
—. "Recension, Revisions, Rabbinics: Dominique Barthélemy and Early developments in the Greek Traditions." *Textus* 15 (1990): 153–67.
Hezser, Catherine. *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
Hutzli, Jürg. "Distinctiveness of the Samuel Narrative Tradition." Pages 171–205 in *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala. AIL 16. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013.
Jervell, Jakob. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. KEK 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
Joosten, Jan. "Reflections on the Original Language of the Psalms of Solomon." Pages 31–47 in *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology*. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Patrick Pouchelle. EJL 40. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
—. "New Light on Proto-Theodotion: The Psalms of Solomon and the Milieu of the *Kaige* Recension." Pages 304–15 in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz*. Edited by Martin Meiser et al. WUNT I 405. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. "Dating Theodotos (CIJ II 1404)." *JJS* 51(2000): 243–80.
Kujanpää, Katja. *Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans: Paul's Argumentation by Quotations*. NTSup 172. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
Levine, Etan. *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context*. BZAW 174. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988.
McCarter, P. Kyle. *I Samuel*. AB 8. New York: Doubleday, 1980.
McLay, Tim. *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*. SCS 43. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
—. "*Kaige* and Septuagint Research." *Textus* 19 (1998): 127–39.
Munnich, Olivier. "Contribution à l'étude de la première révision de la Septante." Pages 190–220 in vol. 20, part 1 of *Religion (Hellenisches Judentum in römischer Zeit, ausgenommen Philon und Josephus)*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. ANRW. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987.

O'Connell, Kevin G. *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek*. HSM 3. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Parsons, Peter J. "The Scripts and Their Date." Pages 19–26 in Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr): The Seiyâl Collection I*. DJD VIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Reider, Joseph. *An Index to Aquila*. Completed and revised by Nigel Turner. VTSup XII. Leiden: Brill, 1966.

Runesson, Anders, Donald D. Binder, and Birger Olsson. *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Salvesen, Alison. "The Tabernacle Accounts in LXX Exodus and their Reception in Hellenistic Judaism." Pages 555–72 in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Texts in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström. CBET 72. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE*. Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International, 1992.

Schenker, Adrian, O.P. "What Were the Aims of the Palestinian Recension, and What Did They Achieve? With Some Biographical Notes on Dominique Barthélemy." Pages 14–22 in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after* Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Tuukka Kauhanen. DSI 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.

Shenkel, James D. *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*. HSM 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Smelik, Willem F. *Rabbis, Language and Translation in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: University Press, 2013.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. "The Greek Translation of the Four Books of Kings." *JTS* 8 (1907): 262–78.

Tov, Emanuel. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)*. DJD VIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Wirth, Raimund. "Dealing with Tenses in the *Kaige* Section of Samuel." Pages 185–97 in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after* Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Tuukka Kauhanen. DSI 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.