



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI



<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Helda

Recognizing Kaige-Readings in Samuel-Kings

Kauhanen, Tuukka

Eisenbrauns

2020

Kauhanen, T & Pessoa da Silva Pinto, L 2020, 'Recognizing Kaige-Readings in Samuel-Kings', *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, no. 53, pp. 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.2143/JSCS.53.0.3289025>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/334416>

10.2143/JSCS.53.0.3289025

cc_by_nc_nd

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

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.

Recognizing Kaige-readings in Samuel-Kings

Tuukka Kauhanen and Leonardo Pessoa

ABSTRACT

Recognizing kaige-readings is necessary for recovering the Old Greek translation in Samuel-Kings. Our article aims at establishing tangible criteria for recognizing such readings. Lexical criteria include considerations on the semantics and exegetical significance of the Greek equivalent of the underlying Hebrew lexeme, observations of the usage of the OG translator, as well as comparison with the usage in other Greek translations. Syntactic criteria touch upon verbal tenses and voices. External criteria relate to the attestation of the putative kaige reading. The criteria must be used together, and they must be balanced with knowledge of the OG translation technique as well as the traits of the Lucianic revision.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of early hebraizing revision is among the most important ones for the study of the textual history of the LXX of Sam-Kgs. This phenomenon, commonly called the kaige revision, poses significant problems for recovering the Old Greek translation (OG) of these books. The history of the discovery of the kaige revision by Dominique Barthélemy and its impact on Septuagint studies has been discussed fairly extensively in recent research.¹ Instead of refining the theory, our article concentrates on observing concrete kaige readings in Sam-Kgs (1–4 Kingdoms).

¹ See esp. R.A. Kraft, “Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy’s Devanciers, Forty Years Later,” *BIOSCS* 37 (2004): 1–28; the methodological debate about the relationship between kaige, *L* and the OG in Sam-Kgs presented in T.M. Law and T. Kauhanen, “Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer,” *BIOSCS* 43 (2010): 73–87; A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen, eds., *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d’Aquila*, DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017). For an overview on kaige, see J.M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 81–84.

The big text-historical picture is that kaige readings are mostly witnessed by *Codex Vaticanus* (B) and manuscripts closely related to it. In the kaige sections (2 Sam 10:1²–1 Kgs 2:11, 1 Kgs 22–2 Kgs), many kaige readings are shared by the majority of the manuscripts, but often the Lucianic (or “Antiochian”) text, which is witnessed by the manuscript group *L* (19-82-93-108-127 and, partly, 700), managed to avoid them. Therefore, the readings in *L* can be divided into Lucianic recensional readings and Proto-Lucianic readings. The former result from a revision, ostensibly carried out in Antioch at around 300 CE. The base text of the revision, the Proto-Lucianic text, was an old text very close to the OG.

Several previous studies have proposed features of the kaige revision, and they mostly consist of the usual Hebrew-Greek equivalents. L. Greenspoon presented a list with kaige traits in various biblical books or sections.³ However, a single feature is rarely present in all texts associated with the kaige group, which suggests that the revisional guidelines or the thoroughness with which they were carried out may vary from book to book. T. McLay complemented Greenspoon’s list by adding observations on which features have been found in which book. McLay showed that many kaige traits are inconsistent through the texts associated with that group.⁴ Furthermore, new features have been discovered and discussed in recent literature.⁵ In this article, we seek to present criteria for recognizing kaige-readings. A complete list of all the proposed kaige features as well as their instances in the texts of Sam-Kgs will be, of course, a result of the work for the critical editions of the Septuagint of Sam-Kgs, which are under preparation by teams in Helsinki and Madrid.⁶ Such a list would best serve as an online database, and it should allow scholars to find previously proposed kaige features and to suggest new ones.

² Some scholars still adopt Thackeray’s (“The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings,” *JTS* 8 (1907): 262–278) boundaries for the βγ section, taking 2 Sam 11:2 as the starting verse. However, R. Wirth, *Die Septuaginta der Samuelbücher: Untersucht unter Einbeziehung ihrer Rezensionen*, DSI 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 199–201, argues that the kaige section begins in 2 Sam 10:6. See the discussion in L. Pessoa da Silva Pinto, “The Beginning of the KAIGE Section of 2 Samuel,” *Biblica* 100/1 (2019): 14–33.

³ See L.J. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies*, 269–273.

⁴ T. McLay, “Kaige and Septuagint Research,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 127–139.

⁵ E.g., T. Kauhanen, *Lucifer of Cagliari and the Text of 1–2 Kings*, SCS 68 (Atlanta: SBL, 2018), 347–50; T. Tekoniemi, *A Game of Thrones: Textual History of 2 Kings 17 in Light of the Old Latin* (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2019), 258.

⁶ The forthcoming editions and their editors in the series *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum (SVTG)* by the Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities are: A. Aejmelaeus, *Regnorum liber I (Samuelis I)* (SVTG 5,1); T. Kauhanen, *Regnorum liber II (Samuelis II)* (SVTG 5,2); J. Trebolle Barrera & P.A. Torijano Morales, *Regnorum liber III–IV (Regum I–II)* (SVTG 6,1–2).

In a paper published in 2017⁷, Kauhanen proposed a list of criteria for the identification of kaige readings, especially in Samuel-Kings. The purpose of this article is to develop and clarify some of those criteria and to offer a discussion about their relative weight for evaluating potential kaige readings. The criteria for the identification of a kaige reading in Samuel-Kings can be classified as lexical, syntactic, or external. Those are summarized below and explained in more depth in the following sections.

A putative kaige reading is likely to fulfil one or many of the following criteria:

Lexical criteria:

- 1) The Greek word reproduces the basic meaning of the MT, or of a plausible Hebrew *Vorlage*, demonstrable by retroversion to Hebrew.
- 2) The underlying Hebrew term may be theologically meaningful, especially for the purpose of rabbinical exegesis.
- 3) The same rendering is found more often or exclusively in the kaige sections of 1–4 Kingdoms.
- 4) The same rendering is found more often or exclusively in the kaige related translations, namely, the B-text of Judges, Ruth, the putative kaige section in Ezek 28–39, Psalms, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs.
- 5) The same rendering can be found in Aquila or Theodotion's translation or in the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll.
- 6) The reading produces the same number of elements (particles and lexemes) as the corresponding Hebrew reading.
- 7) The competing reading in *L* fits the Old Greek translation technique or presents a slightly revised version of it.

Syntactic criteria:

- 1) The competing reading in *L* preserves a historical present.
- 2) The reading describes an action in the past with the aorist against the competing reading in *L* with the imperfect or perfect tense.
- 3) Kaige substitutes the passive voice of γίνομαι with the middle voice when translating וְיָהָיָה.

External criteria:

⁷ See T. Kauhanen, "Lucifer of Cagliari and the *Kaige* Revision," in *Legacy of Barthélemy*, 147–148.

- 1) In the kaige sections, the reading is found in the B-text and the vast majority of the witnesses, but not in *L*;
- 2) In the non-kaige sections, the reading is typically found in the B-text with some support in the minuscules, but not in *L* and the majority;
- 3) The reading in *L* is supported by pre-Lucianic witnesses or other witnesses that are known for being mostly free from kaige influence.

In the following discussion, these criteria will be explained and illustrated with examples from 2 Sam.⁸ Since a kaige reading might fulfil one or many of the criteria above, it is necessary to evaluate their relative importance for the task of identifying kaige readings.

1. LEXICAL CRITERIA

1.1 *The Greek word reproduces the basic meaning of the MT*

Kaige readings tend to adhere to the basic meaning of the Hebrew word or expression of the Hebrew reference text, often in a literalistic fashion. The Hebrew text of the kaige revisers seems to have been very close to the MT. When the putative kaige reading can be explained as a rendering that is faithful to the basic meaning of the MT, the probability that a kaige reading has been identified increases.

(1) 2 Sam 11:25 Μὴ πονηρὸν ἔστω ἐνώπιόν σου
ἐνώπιον *L* La^M] εν οφθαλμοις rel Ra = MT

The rendering of the Hebrew בְּעֵינַי with ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς in the non-Lucianic manuscripts illustrates a strict adherence to the basic meaning of the Hebrew expression. *L* has preserved the OG translation ἐνώπιον which is reflected in a Latin marginal reading as well (*coram te*). As far as the first part of this principle is concerned, it must be said that the Hebrew base text of the kaige revisers was very similar to MT, but not identical to it. Thus, there will be cases where the potential kaige reading disagrees with MT, but a plausible Hebrew retroversion can

⁸ The provisional text and apparatus for Greek 2 Samuel are from the forthcoming critical edition by Kauhanen: *Regnorum liber II (Samuelis II)* (SVTG 5,2; forthcoming). Manuscript grouping: majuscules B A V M; minuscule groups *O* = 247-376; *L* = 19-82-93-108-127, 19' = 19-108; *CI* = 98-243-379-731, 98' = 98-379; *CII* = 46-52-236-242-313-328-530, 46' = 46-52, 242' = 242-328; *a* = 119-527-799; *b* = 121-509; *d* = 68'-74'-107', 68' = 68-122, 74' = 74-106-120-134-370, 107' = 44-107-125-610; *f* = 56-246, *s* = 64-92-130-314-381-488-489-762, 64' = 64-381, 488' = 488-489; ungrouped minuscules 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 342 372 460 554 700 707. For bibliographical details of the manuscripts, see A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, MSU 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1914) and *idem*, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments; Bd. I,1: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*, ed. D. Fraenkel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

be offered. In such cases the probability that a kaige reading has been identified is reduced to some degree, but not drastically.

(2) 2 Sam 14:17 καὶ ἐρεῖ ἡ δούλη σου Γενηθήτω δὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου μου

ἐρεῖ – δὴ] εἶπεν ἡ γυνὴ εἰη δὴ B A (O) a 509 Ra

ותאמר שפחהך יהיה־נא דבר־אדני

The same witnesses attest εἶη δὴ against the OG γενηθήτω δὴ. The former is a fairly clear kaige reading: in Sam-Kgs, the jussive for הִיּהוּ is rendered with γίνομαι a few times elsewhere (1 Sam 25:26, 2 Sam 18:32, 1 Kgs 2:33), whereas the rendering with an optative εἰμί is found elsewhere only in 1 Kgs 1:37 in B and the majority, while the *L* text reads ἔσται καί. Because of the uniform attestation, it is reasonable to suggest that the entire segment εἶπεν ἡ γυνή: εἶη δὴ is kaige even though the lexeme γυνή is against the MT. A plausible retroversion for γυνή is שֶׁהָאֵלֹהִים* which corresponds to the usage in verses 8, 12, 13, 18, and 19 against the MT.

Another point worth considering is that the Greek translator of Samuel was also committed to a faithful reproduction of the Hebrew, and he is considered among the most literal translators of the Septuagint books. This complicates the task of distinguishing kaige readings from original renderings: the degree of literalism alone cannot be the decisive factor. Other criteria must be considered too.

1.2 The underlying Hebrew term may be theologically meaningful, especially for the purpose of rabbinical exegesis.

In Barthélemy's view, the work of kaige was related to principles of rabbinical exegesis.⁹ Anneli Aejmelaeus has given a prominent example of this: passages stating explicitly that God does not regret, notably in the Torah and 1 Sam 15, provided the motivation for kaige-type corrections that aimed at eliminating the translations of the Hebrew נִפַּח *nip'al* by the Greek μεταμέλομαι 'to regret' or μετανοέω 'to change one's mind' when the subject is God. These renderings were replaced by the verb παρακαλέομαι 'to be comforted,' the passive voice for the regular rendering of נִפַּח *pi'el* 'to comfort.'¹⁰

The same phenomenon is found once in the kaige section:

(3) 2 Sam 24:16 καὶ μετεμελήθη Κύριος ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ

μετεμελήθη *L*] παρεκλινεν 245; παρεκλήθη rel Ra

⁹ See D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du dodécapropheton trouvés dans le désert de Juda* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 31.

¹⁰ A. Aejmelaeus, "Does God Regret? A Theological Problem that Concerned the Kaige Revisers," in *Legacy of Barthélemy*, 52–53.

A similar case of theological change in the $\gamma\delta$ section occurs in 2 Kgs 13:23 where the revisor replaced the OG verb μεταμέλομαι preserved in *L* (13:8) with the verb ἐλεέω.

However, examples of this phenomenon are not ample, and other authors have found the association of kaige with rabbinical hermeneutics unfounded, preferring to explain the peculiarities of kaige more simply as adherence to certain translation techniques.¹¹ While of limited applicability, this criterion acknowledges that, in addition to the concordance principle, the kaige revisers likely paid attention to the semantics of their preferred equivalents.

1.3 The same rendering is found more often or exclusively in the kaige sections of 1–4 Kingdoms

In the kaige sections, it is noticeable that the lexical preferences of the revisers were different from those of the original translators. The result is that some renderings of Hebrew words and expressions occur exclusively in the kaige sections or their use grows proportionally in those sections. In addition, the revisers show a tendency to use stereotyping renderings. This can be seen in greater consistency in the use of certain renderings in the kaige sections.

(4) 2 Sam 12:31 καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν Δαυὶδ καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

ἀνέστρεψεν M L C I a 121 68' f 488 29 71 158 318 342 372 707] απεστρεψε(v*) V;

επεστρεψε(v) B A O C II 509 d^{-68'} s⁻⁴⁸⁸ 55 244 245 460 554 Ra; υπεστρεψε(v) 44 245

The Hebrew בָּשַׁח is rendered with ἀνέστρεψεν in the OG, preserved in *L* and a number of other strands of transmission. In Sam-Kgs, בָּשַׁח *qal* is matched by ἀναστρέφω in Rahlfs 27 times out of 74 (36%) in the non-kaige section, but only eight times out of 65 (12%) in the kaige section. By contrast, the respective figures for ἐπιστρέφω are 24 (32%) and 36 (55%). The significant change in the prevalence of ἐπιστρέφω is best explained by a slight preference for it by the kaige revisers.¹² Of course, in any given instance where no significant variation occurs, ἐπιστρέφω can well be OG. To use ἐπιστρέφω for בָּשַׁח *qal* is not in itself a kaige feature since the OG translator does that too. However, sporadically changing renderings of בָּשַׁח *qal* to ἐπιστρέφω can be considered a possible kaige feature.

¹¹ See L.J. Greenspoon, "Recensions, Revision, Rabbinics: Dominique Barthélemy and Early Developments in the Greek Traditions," *Textus* 15 (1990): 153–167; L.L. Grabbe, "Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis," *JJS* 33 (1982): 527–536.

¹² See also the discussion in J.H. Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1-19,9*, BZAW 394 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2009), 144–145.

It is interesting to note that the same preference is found in the kaige influenced B-text of Judges,¹³ which brings us to the next criterion.

1.4 The same rendering is found more often or exclusively in the kaige related translations.

Translations that are usually considered to be related to kaige include the B-text of Judges, Ruth, the putative kaige section in Ezek 28–39, Psalms, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs.

Barthélemy proposed that the kaige group included the translation of Lamentations, Song of Songs and Ruth, the majority text of the βγ and γδ sections of Sam-Kgs, the B-text of Judges, the Theodotionic text of Daniel, the Theodotionic additions in Job, the additions to the LXX of Jeremiah, the Theodotionic column of the Hexapla and the fifth column of the Psalms, and the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll.¹⁴ He thought that the translation of chapters 28–39 of Ezekiel shared some interests with the kaige group but did not belong to it. Today, however, it is believed that this section of LXX Ezekiel is related to kaige.¹⁵ The translation of Ecclesiastes is also often thought to be related to one of the phases of kaige, since the association with Aquila can no longer be maintained.¹⁶ There has been an attempt to relate 2 Esdras (=MT Ezra-Nehemiah) to kaige, but even those who sustain the connection admit that the book is only peripherally related to it and not strictly kaige.¹⁷ Therefore, the translation technique of 2 Esdras does not give us certain clues to the identification of kaige readings. Ruth displays typical kaige features, and its association with the group seems clear.¹⁸ For the Psalms, Munnich has argued that its original literalistic translation technique influenced the kaige revisers, who applied some of its principles in their recensions or translations.¹⁹ The

¹³ See W.R. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments*, HSM 23 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980) 54–56.

¹⁴ See Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 47.

¹⁵ McGregor sees a different translator here, but according to him the new section starts in chapter 26; see L.J. McGregor, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of its Homogeneity*, SCS 18 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

¹⁶ See J.K. Aitken, “Ecclesiastes,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. J.K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury, 2015) 356–369.

¹⁷ See T. Janz, “The Second Book of Ezra and the ‘Kaiγe’ Group,” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge, 1995*, ed. B.A. Taylor, SCS 45 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 153–170; G. Wooden, “2 Esdras,” in *T&T Clark Companion*, 195–202.

¹⁸ See E. Bons, “Ruth,” in *T&T Clark Companion*, 118–126.

¹⁹ See O. Munnich, “La Septante des Psaumes et le groupe KAIGE,” *VT* 23/1 (1983): 85–86; “Contribution à l’étude de la première révision de la Septante,” *ANRW* II 20/1 (1987): 190–220.

probability that a kaige reading has been identified in Sam-Kgs grows if the reading is also a feature of kaige related texts in other books.

(5) 2 Sam 12:4 τοῦ ποιῆσαι τῷ ξένῳ ἐλθόντι πρὸς αὐτόν

ξένῳ A O L 121 68^γ + (τω) οδοιπορω rel Ra = MT

All manuscripts attest τῷ ξένῳ, which has no direct counterpart in the MT. Kaige has added ὀδοιπόρω for אָרַל—unusually after, rather than before, the OG counterpart. The root אָרַ is not found elsewhere in Sam-Kgs. However, the same usage ὀδοιπόρος for אָרַ part. occurs in Judg 19:17: אָרַרַּשׁ אֶת־הָאִישׁ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ὀδοιπόρον. In this case, the usage in Judges can be seen as corroborating the possibility that the reading ὀδοιπόρω was added by the kaige revisers. However, there is much more variation within the clause as a whole, and revision has taken place in many stages of the transmission.²⁰ It cannot be ruled out that an original (τῷ) ὀδοιπόρω was lost in the Hexaplaric or Lucianic revision.

1.5 The same rendering can be found in Aquila or Theodotion's translation or in the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll.

Barthélemy has demonstrated the similarities between kaige in 1–4 Kingdoms and the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll regarding translation technique.²¹ As mentioned above, he associated the phenomenon of kaige with the work of Theodotion for some books. After Barthélemy, the presence of kaige has been maintained and studied in other biblical books or sections, such as the Theodotonic version of Exodus²² and the Theodotonic readings in Joshua.²³ Barthélemy underscored the connection between kaige and Aquila.²⁴ In his view, the literalistic and stereotyping tendencies in kaige were later developed in Aquila's work. Because of this, the probability that a certain reading in Sam-Kgs is a kaige reading increases if the same or a similar rendering is also present in Aquila or Theodotion's translation/revision.

(6) 2 Sam 12:25 καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἴδεδὶ ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου.

ἐν λόγῳ V M L C I a 121 68^γ f 64^γ 29 55^ε 71 158 245 318 342 372 707 La^M] ενεκεν B A O CII⁻⁽²⁴²⁾ 509 d^{-68^γ} s^{-64^γ} 55* 244 460 554 Ra↓ = MT

²⁰ L. Pessoa da Silva Pinto, *Different Literary Editions in 2 Samuel 10–12: A Comparative Study of the Hebrew and Greek Textual Traditions*, TECC 81 (Madrid: CSIC, 2019), 238–239.

²¹ See D. Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante,” *RB* 60 (1953): 18–29.

²² K.G. O'Connell, *The Theodotonic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).

²³ Greenspoon, *Textual Studies*.

²⁴ See Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 250–252.

α' σ' ... ἔνεκεν Κυρίου 243-731(s nom)

θ' ... ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου 243-731(s nom)

The Septuagint *Vorlage* read בדרב* against בעבר in the MT. The variation is likely due to corruption in either direction.²⁵ Aquila and Symmachus clearly follow a Hebrew text equal to the MT here, and they choose the expected translation ἔνεκεν. Theodotion, whose work was essentially a revision of the Septuagint, has retained the OG reading together with about a half of the Septuagint manuscripts.

(7) 2 Sam 13:18 καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἦν χιτῶν ἀστραγαλωτός

ἀστραγαλωτός M^{mg} L 372 554^{mg} La^M (*stragoletos*) Tht *Quaest* 28] καρπωτός rel Ra

Hexaplaric apparatus: ἀστραγαλωτός] α' καρπωτός 379^{cat} 313^{cat}-328^{cat}-530^{cat} 554^{cat} Tht

Quaest 28; σ' χειριδωτός 313^{cat}-328^{cat} 554^{cat}

Translation technique does not help here as the underlying Hebrew טפ is not found elsewhere in Sam-Kgs, and both Greek words are very rare in the Septuagint: the root ἀστραγ- is found elsewhere only in Zech 11:16 and καρπωτός only here. Much doubt remains as the Lucianic reviser could have changed καρπωτός to a perhaps more familiar word. In addition, in a Greek context, the notion of a tunic extending to the wrists may not have implied that it extended to the ankles as well. The motivation behind the reading ἀστραγαλωτός could be that Tamar presently wore only the undergarment, for which a specification of its length may be necessary. However, the use of καρπωτός by Aquila—witnessed by Theodoret's quotation preserved in the *catena* part of several manuscripts—suggests that the term was considered to be more in accordance with the Hebrew טפ, which, in turn, is rendered with ποικίλον three times in Genesis (37:3, 23, 32).

1.6 The reading produces the same number of elements (particles and lexemes) as the corresponding Hebrew reading.

One of the principles of the kaige revision is to prefer quantitative equivalence whenever possible. This means that the number of elements found in the Hebrew source text tends to be reproduced in Greek on a one to one basis. Like other kaige traits, this principle is not always followed consistently: it is a regular tendency of the reviser rather than a rule. Therefore, the translation that adheres to quantitative equivalence is suspected of being a revision *vis a vis* the freer rendering.

Example:

²⁵ Pessoa, *Different Literary Editions*, 259 gives references to authors supporting either the MT or the proposed reading of the Septuagint *Vorlage*.

(8) 2 Sam 11:20–21 πληγήσεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους; (21) ... ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους
20 ἀπό L 318] ανωθεν M 158; επανω O 707; απανωθεν (επ. V CII^{-236 313c} a b d^{-120 134} f 381-
488 55 71 245 460) rel Ra = MT; de La^M

21 ἀπό L⁻¹⁹] απο ανωθεν O 381; ανωθεν 55; επανωθεν (απ. A V M CIf s^{-381 488} 29 318
342 372) rel Ra = MT

The readings ἀπάνωθεν and ἐπάνωθεν, variously attested by B and the majority in both verses, reproduce both prepositional elements in the underlying Hebrew expression לַגֹּבַיִם. Thus ἀπό is probably the OG reading in both verses. On the other hand, the reading ἀπό could result from the Lucianic reviser preferring more simple prepositions. However, the likelihood of ἀπό being OG is enhanced by it being used twice in similar expressions in verse 22 in a long OG plus against the MT. There the same variation between ἀπό and ἀπάνωθεν/ἐπάνωθεν is not found.

1.7 The competing reading in L fits the Old Greek translation technique or presents a slightly revised version of it

In 1–4 Kingdoms, problems related to kaige go hand in hand with the issues concerning the Lucianic text. It is generally recognized that, in the kaige sections, the Lucianic text is the only Greek textual tradition almost untouched by the kaige reviser. The Lucianic text, however, has its own recensional traits. Analyses differ concerning the question of whether the Lucianic text is generally nearer to the OG than the B-text and to what extent the nature of the text-types changes between the kaige and non-kaige sections.²⁶ As our article is about recognizing kaige features, we do not want to take a stance on the relevant merits of the Lucianic text and the B-text. For our purpose, it is important to note that the OG is not found in a pure state in *L*. Thus the comparison between a putative kaige reading and a reading in the Lucianic text must also take the tendencies of the latter into consideration. To define criteria for the identification of kaige renderings presupposes knowledge of the criteria for identifying Lucianic readings: the two problems are unavoidably connected. Only after considering the traits of the two independent revisions can the probability that the OG is preserved by *L* be evaluated properly. The probability that the Lucianic reading preserves the OG decreases if the *L* reading reflects a known recensional feature of the Lucianic text. Some

²⁶ For recent discussions, see S. Kreuzer, *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung*, ed. M. Sigismund, DSI 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); A. Aejmelaeus, *Legacy of Barthélemy*; and T. Kauhanen, “The Best Greek Witnesses for 2 Samuel,” in E. Bons, M. Geiger and M. Meiser, *Die Septuaginta: Themen – Manuskripte – Wirkungen* ed. M. Sigismund, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

of these features have been studied by Rahlfs, Brock, and Allen,²⁷ and literary principles of *L* have also been suggested by Fernández Marcos.²⁸ In order to find out what belongs to the latest phases of the Lucianic text, one must look to its behavior in the non-kaige sections. For the cases not contemplated in previous studies there is still a need to check whether the renderings of a Hebrew word or expression in *L* in the non-kaige sections fits the OG translation technique. If it does, it is reasonable to suppose that the renderings would not change in the kaige sections. By contrast, the corresponding renderings in the B-text should display a change between the sections. If they do, it can be assumed that *L* preserves the OG in most of the occurrences in the kaige sections. This kind of inspection has a higher degree of certainty when the number of occurrences is high (ten or more).

Apart from the recognition of the recensional features present in *L*, it is important to compare the putative kaige readings with the typical features of the OG of Sam-Kgs, whose criteria can be learned through the study of the translation technique in the non-kaige sections. The behavior of the OG in the non-kaige sections gives us the rule for measurement of the readings in the kaige sections, that is, the means to identify recensional developments.

(9) 2 Sam 15:10 Ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι ὑμᾶς τὴν φωνὴν τῆς σάλπιγγος

om τὴν *L*⁻⁸² | om τῆς *L* |

σάλπιγγος *L*] κερατινῆς rel Ra

In 2 Sam 2:28 and 6:15 (non-kaige section), שופר is rendered with σάλπιγξ. In addition, the expression תקע בשופר is rendered with σάλπιγγι σαλπίζει in 1 Sam 13:3. The rendering κερατίνη is found only in the kaige sections and only in B rel; this fulfils criterion 1.3. In most of those instances, *L* attests σάλπιγξ (2 Sam 18:16; 20:1, 22; 1 Kgs 1:34, 39; in 1 Kgs 1:41 *L* has a different reading) and it attests κερατίνη only once (2 Kgs 9:13; see also 2 Chr 15:14). The phenomenon is best explained by *L* attesting the OG in these instances, and kaige unifying the renderings to κερατίνη. It should be noted that the omission of the articles in *L* is likely secondary: the question regards the general hearing of a trumpet sound, not a specific sound of a specific trumpet.²⁹

²⁷ A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*, Septuaginta-Studien 3 (Göttingen 1911); S. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel*, Quaderni di Henoch 9 (Torino: Silvio Zamorani, 1996); L.C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text. I. The Translator's Craft*, VTSup 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1974).

²⁸ See N. Fernández Marcos "Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text of Kings," *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986*, ed. C.E. Cox, SCS 23 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987): 287–304.

²⁹ Law and Kauhanen, "Methodological Remarks," 79–80.

Finally, the likelihood that *L* has preserved the OG for a given reading is also reinforced if other criteria are met. This is especially true of the external criterion 3.3: the reading is supported by witnesses that are known for being mostly free from kaige influence (see below).

2. SYNTACTIC CRITERIA

Apart from lexical preferences, kaige displays several traits concerning the syntax of the Greek text. The clearest examples regard the kaige preference for the aorist in the face of other tenses.

2.1 *The competing reading in L preserves a historical present*

A known feature of kaige is the elimination of the historical present and its substitution with the aorist.³⁰ One of the problems in the kaige section is that the Lucianic text also tends to eliminate the historical present, and it is possible that the OG contained a large number of historical presents that have disappeared from the whole Greek manuscript tradition. In any case, *L* has preserved several historical presents that have been cut off by the kaige reviser.

(10) 2 Sam 12:24 καὶ παρεκάλεσεν Δαυὶδ Βηρσάβεε ... καὶ εἰσηλθεν ... καὶ κοιμᾶται μετ' αὐτῆς, καὶ συνέλαβεν καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱόν, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ..., καὶ Κύριος ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν.

κοιμᾶται *L*] εκοιμηθη rel Ra: cf MT (כבשׁוּ); exactly similarly 2 Sam 11:4, 9; 13:6

Cf. 13:14 κοιμᾶται 372] εκοιμηθη B *L* rel Ra

The long series of aorists in 2 Sam 12:24 is interrupted by a historical present: “laying with” is emphasized with the choice of tense to create an antithetical parallelism with the adulterous sex between the same couple in 11:4. The Lucianic reviser could use the historical present in a similar manner, but his tendency is rather to unify the use of tenses within the near context. In this instance, *L* would have more likely changed an original historical present to an aorist. The kaige revisers did exactly that and thus achieved greater consistency in rendering the consecutive imperfect.

2.2 *The competing reading in L preserves a perfect or an imperfect against an aorist*

The kaige preference for the aorist led the reviser to substitute other tenses describing past actions with aorists. Consequently, the competing reading in *L* is often preferable when it

³⁰ Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 63–65. The phenomenon in Samuel is treated most extensively by Wirth, *Samuelbücher*, 188–214.

preserves a verb in the perfect or imperfect against the aorist attested by the kaige witnesses.³¹

Example:

(11) 2 Sam 11:26 καὶ ἤκουσεν ἡ γυνὴ Οὐρίου ὅτι τέθνηκεν Οὐρίας ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς
τέθνηκεν L] απεθανεν rel Ra

In 2 Sam 11:26 the Hebrew נָח, “(he) died” is rendered with τέθνηκεν (perf.) in *L* and with ἀπέθανεν (aor.) in *LXX rel*. Both Greek readings render the basic meaning of the Hebrew adequately, and lexical criterion 1 is insufficient to indicate whether we have here a kaige reading. The reading ἀπέθανεν, however, is likely a kaige revision because of its tendency to substitute other tenses with aorists.

However, caution is called for since the OG translator used the aorist as an easy choice when he was not sensitive to the temporal aspects in the narrative, and the Lucianic reviser had stylistic reasons to change tenses:

(12) 2 Sam 10:19 καὶ εἶδαν πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ δοῦλοι Ἀδράαζαρ ὅτι ἔπταισαν ἔμπροσθεν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἠὲτομόλησαν μετὰ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐδούλευσαν αὐτοῖς.

ἔπταισαν] επταικασιν *L* = 1 Chr 19:19

ἠὲτομόλησαν] διεθεντο διαθηκην *L* La^{115.117} (cf. διεθεντο 1 Chr)

ἐδούλευσαν (1 Chr)] εδουλευον *L*

The aorist ἐδούλευσαν might be a kaige correction towards the imperfect consecutive ׀עבדוּ in the MT. On the other hand, the Lucianic reviser might have a reason to prefer the imperfect because the former enemies (“all the kings”) have now become subjects to David for a long period of time. The thought-out tense scheme in *L*, “the kings saw that they had been defeated (perf. = 1 Chr), they made a covenant at once (aor.), they became subjects from now on (impf.),” makes Lucianic revision the better explanation. Agreement with 1 Chr 19:19 in the readings ἐπταίκασιν and διεθεντο (διαθήκην) also make Lucianic harmonization with Chronicles a partially viable explanation.

2.3. *Kaige substitutes the passive voice of γίνομαι with the middle voice when translating ׀עבדוּ*

Kaige tends to prefer the middle voice καὶ ἐγένετο over the passive καὶ ἐγενήθη as a translation of Hebrew ׀עבדוּ. The problem for the reconstruction of the OG in the kaige sections, however, is that this principle was followed by *L* as well:³² for that reason, an

³¹ See Wirth, *Samuelbücher*, 178–182.

³² Wirth explains that the use of the passive voice in the B-text drops from 56% in the non kaige sections of Samuel to 20% in the kaige section; see Wirth, *Samuelbücher*, 45–46.

original passive may have been lost underneath the two independent recensions in some instances.

3. EXTERNAL CRITERIA

3.1 In the kaige sections, the reading is found in the B-text and the vast majority of the witnesses, but not in L.

As explained above, the Proto-Lucianic text remained almost untouched by the kaige revision, unlike the rest of the Greek textual transmission. Examples of this are ample. The following selection is given in descending order of certainty: those near the top are very clear cases, whereas the *L* readings in the examples near the bottom might be Lucianic.

2 Sam 12:7 Ἐγὼ ἔχρισά σε εἰς βασιλέα ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐξειλάμην σε ἐκ χειρὸς Σαούλ ἐγὼ¹ *L*] καὶ 460; + εἰμι rel Ra: cf MT.

(Cf. ἐγὼ² *L* CII 527 *d*^{-68'} *s*^{-64'} 554] + εἰμι B A V M O etc.)

2 Sam 12:14 καὶ ὁ υἱὸς σου ὁ τεχθεὶς σοι θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται.

καὶ *L*] + γε rel Ra: cf MT (But *L* may foll. Theodotion here.)

2 Sam 10:6 καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμὼν καὶ μισθοῦνται τὴν Συρίαν Βαιθροὺβ ἀποστέλλουσιν *L*] απεστειλαν rel Ra = MT | ... μισθοῦνται *L*] εμισθωσαντο rel Ra = MT

2 Sam 10:7 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν Ἰωάβ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιάν, τοὺς δυνατοὺς στρατιάν *L* 554^{mg}] δυναμιν rel Ra: cf MT. 554^{mg} almost always follows *L*.

2 Sam 10:14 καὶ φεύγουσιν ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἀβессά

φεύγουσιν *L*] εφυγαν (-εν 488 245) rel Ra: cf MT

2 Sam 12:21 καὶ ὡς ἀπέθανεν τὸ παιδάριον

ὡς *L*] ηνικα rel Ra

2 Sam 10:8 καὶ παρατάσσονται τὸν πόλεμον

τόν⁽¹⁾ *L*] > rel Ra = MT

2 Sam 11:10 Οὐχὶ ἐξ ὁδοῦ παραγέγονας σύ;

παραγέγονας σύ *L*] συ ερχη rel Ra = MT

2 Sam 13:3 καὶ Ἰωναδάβ ἀνὴρ φρόνιμος σφόδρα

φρόνιμος *L* 554^c] σοφος rel Ra: cf MT

3.2 In the non-kaige sections, the reading is typically found in the B-text with some support in the minuscules, but not in L and the majority.

Aejmelaeus has observed that there are kaige-type readings in 1 Samuel, which belongs to the non-kaige section. The witnesses that most often transmit these readings are the B-text and

the Hexaplaric text.³³ A noteworthy feature of the kaige readings in 1 Samuel is that they are confined to a rather small group of witnesses, mainly A B O b and, less frequently, 68' 64' 55 244 245 460 707. A similar typology is put forward by Kauhanen in his assessment of the text-types of 2 Samuel.³⁴

The same phenomenon is often visible in the kaige section too. The degree of contact between the non-Lucianic manuscripts and kaige is not uniform, and Barthélemy considered manuscripts Bha₂ (= B 55 509) the best representatives of kaige in the βγ section of Sam-Kgs.³⁵ Furthermore, sometimes even the best witnesses to the kaige text, like *Codex Vaticanus*, may attest non-kaige readings or preserve the OG against the majority. This phenomenon is not easy to explain, but it at least supports the idea that the common archetype of the manuscripts reworked by kaige was a good and old text. Therefore, a reading cannot automatically be considered kaige only because it is found in manuscripts where kaige revisions are attested, and these external criteria, though important, must be combined with others.

(13) 2 Sam 14:6 καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν

ἐξαιρούμενος B A O 19' a 509 f 64'-488 55 244 372 460] συλλυσιων (vel sim.) rel La^M

In Sam-Kgs, לַצַּי is rendered with ἐξαιρέω ca. 13 times out of 17 in the non-kaige section and 11 times out of 22 in the kaige section. Συλλύω, by contrast, is found elsewhere in the LXX only in 1–2 Maccabees. Thus, the translation technique would suggest accepting the reading ἐξαιρούμενος of the B-text. In addition, it is supported by witnesses that do not frequently join kaige readings that are preserved mainly by the B-text, but not the majority: a, f, 372, and, most notably, the subgroup 19' of the L group. If ἐξαιρούμενος is OG, the best explanation for the reading συλλυσιων is that it is a widespread early variant, perhaps deriving from Symmachus, although no external evidence for this hypothesis is preserved. This decision is uncertain, however, since ἐξαιρούμενος could result from kaige revisers who wanted to unify the renderings of לַצַּי.

3.3 The reading in L is supported by pre-Lucianic witnesses or other witnesses that are known for being mostly free from kaige influence.

If there is a kaige reading in the B-text, the reading of the Lucianic text is likely OG. When the reading in L is supported by witnesses that precede Lucian's time, there is a good chance

³³ A. Aejmelaeus, "Kaige Readings in a Non-Kaige Section in 1 Samuel," in *Legacy of Barthélemy*.

³⁴ T. Kauhanen, "The Best Greek Witnesses for 2 Samuel," in *Septuaginta: Themen*.

³⁵ See Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 125.

that the agreement points to the OG. The condition is that the witness has not been influenced by kaige, nor by the last phases of the Lucianic text. Among these witnesses can be mentioned Old Latin versions (OL), allusions by Josephus, the Qumran biblical texts, and patristic quotations of Sam-Kgs preceding Lucian's time. Among the patristic witnesses, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen are especially noteworthy. Since 4QSam^a is related genetically with the *Vorlage* of the OG, both distinguished from MT,³⁶ the agreements between *L* and 4QSam^a could also point to the OG. In such cases, 4QSam^a has retained the reading of the *Vorlage*, and *L* attests the OG rendering. While many of the OL witnesses are generally considered to be based on Greek texts close to the OG and mostly free from kaige influence, all of them present signs of contamination from various Greek traditions. In addition, some of them may have been sporadically revised according to either the Greek majority text or the Lucianic text. Thus, they may occasionally present readings that go back to Greek kaige readings.³⁷ Of course, since many of the kaige variants are lexical variants, many of them cannot be reflected in Latin.

(14) 2 Sam 11:7 καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν Δαυὶδ εἰς εἰρήνην ... καὶ εἶπεν Εἰς εἰρήνην.

om καὶ εἶπεν εἰς εἰρήνην B A V M O CI CII a⁻⁷⁹⁹ 121 d⁻¹²⁵ f s⁻⁴⁸⁸ 29 55 158 245 372 460 707
Ra = MT

εἰς εἰρήνην^{ult} 509 (125 318) 554] υγιαίνει *L* 799 488 71 342 = θ'

et dixit urias omnes recte sunt La¹¹⁵

et respon[dit] omnia [rec]te s[unt] La¹¹⁷

The two OL witnesses support the plus καὶ εἶπεν Εἰς εἰρήνην (Uriah's answer to the king) found in *L* 799 509 125 488 71 318 342 554 and Theodotion. Josephus (*Ant.* 7:132) also reports the answer. Kaige has omitted it in accordance with the MT. However, the exact wording of Uriah's answer varies in the witnesses supporting the plus.

4. WEIGHTING THE CRITERIA

Above we have presented seven lexical, three syntactic, and three external criteria for recognizing kaige readings. In practice, when it comes to evaluating individual readings, the criteria may be in conflict. In addition, not all of them carry equal weight and few, if any, of them can be used in isolation. Especially criterion 1.1, the Greek word reproduces the basic

³⁶ See J.K. Driesbach, *4QSamuel^a and the Text of Samuel*, VTSup 171 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 101, 180, 281; C. Seppänen, *The Hebrew Text of Samuel: Differences in 1 Sam 1 – 2 Sam 9 between the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and the Qumran Scrolls*, (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2018) 90–108, 169.

³⁷ See J. Treballe Barrera, "Textos 'Kaige' en la *Vetus Latina* de Reyes (2 Re 10, 25-28)," *RB* 89 (1982): 203.

meaning of the MT, does not work alone: most of the time, the OG rendering fulfils this criterion.

To cite another example, in 2 Sam 12:7 (see 3.1 above), the kaige reading ἐγώ εἰμι for אנכי does not, strictly speaking, produce the same number of grammatical elements as the Hebrew reading (criterion 1.6). However, it is the typical rendering in various kaige-related books or sections (criteria 1.3, 1.4), and it is used by Aquila (criterion 1.5). This means that lexical criteria 3, 4, and 5 prevail over criterion 6, especially when combined.

Since there is variation within the kaige group, lexical criterion number 3 should be ranked in a higher position than criteria 4 and 5, for there could be features typical of the kaige sections of Sam-Kgs that are not found in other books associated with kaige and vice-versa.

(15) 2 Sam 12:5 καὶ ἐθυσμώθη ὀργῆν Δαυὶδ σφόδρα τῷ ἀνδρὶ

וַיַּחַרְרֵם אֶת הַיְיָ בְּאֵשׁ מְאֹד MT

2 Kgs 23:26 οὗ ἐθυσμώθη ὀργῆν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰουδα ἐπὶ τοὺς παροργισμοὺς

אֶת הַיְיָ בְּאֵשׁ מְאֹד בְּיְהוּדָה עַל כָּל־הַפְּעֻשִׁים

According to Bodine, rendering ἄρα ἔρα with ὀργίζομαι θυμῷ is a kaige feature in Judges.³⁸

However, this characteristic does not apply to Sam-Kgs: the expression is found both in the non-kaige section (1 Sam 11:6, 19:22, 20:30) and kaige section (2 Sam 12:5; 2 Kgs 1:18d, 23:26) with no significant variation. Thus, it is, in all likelihood, the OG expression.

Another important remark regarding lexical criterion 3 has to do with the number of occurrences. If the number of occurrences of a given rendering in the kaige sections is small, the identification of a kaige reading is less certain. The identification of a kaige reading is, therefore, favored when the word or expression recurs frequently, whereas the identification tends to remain uncertain for rarer words.

The external criterion 1 states that kaige readings are expected to be found in the majority of the Greek witnesses, excluding *L*. This is true especially in the kaige sections. However, since *L* in its final form has recensional features of its own, it is also possible that the reading in *L* originates from one of the last phases of the Lucianic text and that B and the majority have preserved the OG.

(16) 2 Sam 11:11 ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἀγροῦ παρεμβάλλουσιν·

ἀγροῦ] πεδίου *L* 342; *campi* *La*¹¹⁵

³⁸ See W. R. Bodine, “Kaige and Other Recensional Developments in the Greek Text of Judges,” *BIOSCS* 13 (1980): 47.

In Sam-Kgs, both ἀγρός and πεδίων are used to render the Hebrew תַּדְּשָׁן, the former much more frequently (46 times; πεδιον 6 times). While either could be OG, the Lucianic reviser had a good reason to change the lexeme to a better expression for “battle-field.” Brock has shown that in 1 Samuel πεδίων is one of the lexical preferences of *L*.³⁹ Here, external criterion number 1 (in the kaige sections, the reading is found in B and the majority but not in *L*) must be used together with lexical criterion number 7 (the competing reading in *L* fits the OG translation technique). In this case, internal considerations lead to rejecting the putative kaige reading in B and the majority.

Barthélemy had already admitted the possibility that in many cases we cannot be sure of the OG reading because, in the kaige section, both *L* and the B-text display recensional features in different directions.⁴⁰ There are situations in which the variant readings could be explained either as a revision on the side kaige or on the side of *L*.

(17) 2 Sam 12:17 καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθη καὶ οὐ συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς ἄρτον
ἐβουλήθη scripsi] εβουλετο *L*; ηθελησεν rel Ra: cf MT (הבא נל)

Cf. 2 Sam 24:3 θέλει scripsi] θελη *L*; βουλεται rel Ra: cf MT (רפה part.)

A clear kaige tendency is to favour βούλομαι in positive and οὐ θέλω in negative clauses when rendering רפה⁴¹—see, especially, 2 Sam 24:3. A similar pattern can be observed in the renderings of הבא in negative clauses: οὐ + βούλομαι is preserved in *L* in, e.g., 2 Sam 13:14, 16, 25; 23:16 and 17 (by contrast, all witnesses read οὐ + θέλω in 14:29). When it comes to the voice, *L* favours the imperfect middle over the aorist passive for βούλομαι (esp. 1 Sam 28:23⁴²). Thus, here in 2 Sam 12:17 it is best to retain the aorist passive of B and the majority, and the verb βούλομαι of *L*. Thus “ἐβουλήθη scripsi”: the reading is an editorial emendation not attested by any witness. The probability of this decision is decreased by the kaige tendency not being as clear with הבא as it is with רפה. Additionally, the middle in οὐ + βούλομαι is not infrequent in the OG (in the non-kaige sections: 1 Sam 15:9, 18:25, 20:3, 31:4; 2 Sam 2:23, 6:10; 1 Kgs 16:28g). Nevertheless, in the individual instance in 2 Sam 12:17 the aorist passive best explains the evidence. It is best pointed out that the syntactic

³⁹ See Brock, *Recensions*, 287. Similarly Wirth, *Samuelbücher*, 200–201.

⁴⁰ See D. Barthélemy, “Les problèmes textuelles de 2 Sam 11,2 – 1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des ‘devanciers d’Aquila’,” in *1972 Proceedings for IOSCS and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar*, ed. R.A. Kraft, SCS 2 (Missoula, MT: Scholar Press, 1972) 16–18, 28–30.

⁴¹ Wirth, *Samuelbücher*, 180–181.

⁴² In Sam-Kgs, this happens in 15 out of 16 instances of βούλομαι in the *L*-text. The only exception is ἐβούληθησαν B *L multi* 1 Sam 22:17

criterion number 2 (*L* preserves a perfect or an imperfect against an aorist) carries little weight here: the kaige reading is identified on a lexical basis, and the variation aorist-imperfect is evaluated on the basis of the tendencies of the Lucianic reviser. In other words, the decision on the OG tense of the verb will not affect the evaluation of the reading of B and majority as a kaige reading.

Another example where the OG is not preserved in any manuscript:

(18) 2 Sam 10:8 καὶ ἐξῆλθαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμὼν καὶ παρατάσσονται τὸν πόλεμον
παρατάσσονται scripsi (cf. 1 Chr 19:9) παρετάξαντο codd Ra: cf MT (קלל קלל) *qal*
τὸν *L*] > rel Ra = MT

Cf. 10:9 παρετάξαντο ... 10:10 παρετάξαντο (no significant variants)

Cf. 1 Chr 19:9 καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀμμὼν καὶ παρατάσσονται (παραεταξαντο be₂) εἰς πόλεμον
... 19:10 παρετάξαντο ... 19:11 παρετάξαντο (Brooke-McLean)

While all the manuscripts of 2 Samuel read the aorist παρετάξαντο, the historical present παρατάσσονται is a plausible emendation. Kaige changed it to aorist in conformation with the imperfect consecutive in the MT, and the Lucianic reviser made the same change in conformation with the narrative aorists before and after (see vv. 7, 9–10). The Greek Chronicles should not be regarded as a textual witness to 2 Kingdoms but its readings, nevertheless, provide insight into the translator’s usage in Kingdoms as well. As can be seen in 1 Chronicles, there is a subtle difference between the temporal aspects of the “arraying for battle” in v. 8 and vv. 9–10: The portrayal of the Ammonites coming out to meet Joab leads to the battle scene (vv. 9–14) that is the focus of the narrative. The historical present παρατάσσονται sets the scene, and the two subsequent arrayings by the two Israelite divisions are punctual actions, appropriately translated by aorists.⁴³

To sum up: among the lexical criteria, numbers 3, 4, and 5 are the most important, especially criterion number 3. Among the external criteria, criterion 1 carries the most weight. The combination of the aforementioned criteria gives a very high probability that the reading can be identified as kaige.

CONCLUSION

Recognizing kaige features and their instances in individual readings is a highly important, yet difficult task in the textual criticism of the Books of Kingdoms. Objectivity of text-critical decisions can be enhanced by adopting tangible criteria against which the decisions can be

⁴³ The analysis agrees in substance with that of R. Wirth, “Das Praesens Historicum in den griechischen Samuelbüchern,” in K. de Troyer *et al.* ed., *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2014) 131–132.

evaluated and their probabilities assessed. Kaige-readings can be recognized with lexical, syntactic, and external criteria. None of the criteria can alone determine a kaige reading, but the criteria must be used together and their relative weights must be evaluated. In addition, the kaige criteria must be balanced with knowledge of the OG translation technique as well as the traits of the Lucianic revision. All of these considerations must be applied case by case. In the future, findings of new kaige characteristics and their instances should be published in an online database, currently being designed by the authors of this paper. Such a database should be set up in connection with the work for the critical Septuagint editions of Sam-Kgs, optimally integrated in the future digital editions of the *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*.

Tuukka Kauhanen
Academy Research Fellow
Faculty of Theology
University of Helsinki

tuukka.kauhanen@helsinki.fi

Leonardo Pessoa
Postdoctoral Researcher
Biblical Faculty
Pontifical Biblical Institute

leoteopessoa@yahoo.com.br