

KAIGE AND SEPTUAGINT RESEARCH

Tim McLay

I. *Kaige* and Septuagint Research

In the wake of the publication of Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers D'Aquila* a significant proportion of research on the Septuagint has been devoted to the readings designated by the siglum θ (traditionally attributed to *Theodotion*).¹ For instance, the works of Shenkel (S), O'Connell (O), Bodine (B), and Greenspoon (Gr) focus on determining the degree to which the θ readings in the textual witnesses of the books they examine exhibit the same recensional characteristics as Barthélemy isolated in The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll.² The presence of some common agreements with the characteristics that Barthélemy identified was

¹D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers D'Aquila: Première Publication Intégrale du Texte des Fragments du Dodécaprophéton* (VTSupp 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963). One can trace the development of *kaige* research through the following studies: A. Schmitt, "Stammt der sogenannte θ Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?" *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* 9 (1966) 281-392; J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, HSM 1 (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1968); K. G. O'Connell, *The Theodotianic Revision of the Book of Exodus* (HSM 3; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972); W. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges* (HSM 23; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980); L. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*, (HSM 28; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983); O. Munnich, *Étude Lexicographique du Psautier des Septante* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1982); P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); T. McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SCS 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

²In the research of these scholars the "recensional characteristics" are all based on the lexical equivalents employed by θ to render (proto)MT. Except for #2 in the table below, the first twenty-four characteristics are those enumerated by Barthélemy. This explains the unusual situation in the table below where there are cases when none of the biblical books examined agree with (eg. #'s 4, 5) or exhibit (eg. #'s 12, 18) a particular characteristic.

enough justification for these scholars to identify the θ readings in the biblical book in which they were working as belonging to *kaige*. Once the θ readings of a given book were identified as belonging to *kaige*-Theodotion each of these scholars was then free to discover further *kaige* characteristics which, by the completion of Gr's thesis, ballooned to a total of 96.³ Thus, the growth of this list of *kaige* traits is attributable to the common assumption that *kaige*-Theodotion is in most books of the Septuagint a homogenous recension of the Old Greek (OG) towards (proto)MT by an individual or school of translators.⁴

Can *kaige* be defined as a homogenous recension of OG toward (proto)MT? If we are to break this definition down, then there are three claims with which we must deal: 1) *kaige* is homogenous; 2) *kaige* is a recension of OG; 3) *kaige* is a correction of OG toward (proto)MT.⁵ The adequacy of the second and third parts of this definition may be immediately questioned when we remember that certain biblical books that Barthélemy identified as members of *kaige* (Canticles, Lamentations, Ruth) are, given our present knowledge, first translations and thus equivalent to OG. Furthermore, Peter Gentry (Gn) concludes that the *kaige*-Theodotion text of Job is an independent translation, and I (M) argue similarly for Daniel.⁶ For these reasons, it is misleading to describe *kaige* as a recension of OG or as a correction of the Greek towards (proto)MT. It may be that θ readings

³See the list Greenspoon provides, 270-273. Three further attributes of *kaige* have been proposed since the publication of Greenspoon's volume, but only the one by Bodine is published. Two more were proposed at the IOSCS meeting at Cambridge in 1995, but I did not have access to their papers. Therefore, it is more convenient to confine this paper to the 96 in Gr because they were all treated by Gr, Gn, and M. See also W. Bodine, "Kaige and Other Recensional Developments in the Greek Text of Judges," BIOSCS 13 (1980) 45-57.

⁴Shenkel, 11-13; O'Connell, 291; Bodine, 2-4; Greenspoon, 2.

⁵O'Connell, 291, gives three criteria for identifying *kaige*: "know[ing] its intermediary position between the OG and Aquila, its tendency to revise the OG toward the Hebrew text ... and its sharing of known KAIGE stylistic or translational characteristics." Bodine, 42 refers to these criteria and then states that "the second half of the third of these is the most objective, especially now that so many translational characteristics have been isolated and made known through publication."

⁶Gentry, 381; McLay, 214-215. Schmitt has already argued that θ in Daniel is not equivalent to the θ in the remainder of the sixth column of the Hexapla. He restates his position in "Die griechischen Danieltexte (« θ » und «o») und das Theodotionproblem," BZ 36 (1992) 1-15.

exhibit one or both of these attributes in some books, but certainly not in all. Specialists, of course, are aware of the inadequacy of this definition.

However, is it even possible to retain the first attribute of *kaige* in the above definition, that is, is *kaige* homogenous? The unity of *kaige* hinges on the seemingly impressive list of 96 characteristics that have been claimed to exist within its members. If such uniformity in the work of translation/revision exists within *kaige*, then this would be significant for defining *kaige*. However, one of the common threads in the research of S, O, B, and Gr is that, following Barthélemy's lead, they tend to focus on agreements with the *kaige* traits and do not look at the consequences of disagreements among the so-called *kaige* books.⁷ Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to analyze the distribution of the characteristics in these texts that have been associated with *kaige* and determine whether this distribution supports the view that *kaige* is a homogenous recension.

II. Table of Agreements

In order to determine how consistently the characteristics are distributed through a number of books I employ the monographs of S, O, B, Gr, Gn, and M as the database. The research of these writers provides some control over the results, and, except for Shenkel, they provide the data for the 96 characteristics.⁸

In the table below each of the proposed 96 characteristics is listed and the θ readings from the biblical books researched by the aforementioned scholars are

⁷It is not my concern in the present paper to dispute the validity of specific characteristics. For example, the *kaige* reading supplied by O in 82 is based on one passage. Besides the fact that the equivalent is expected, according to J. Wevers, *Exodus* (Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate societatis litterarum gottingensis editum 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 364, it is also OG. Additional arguments against proposed characteristics are found in McLay, 223-236; Gentry, 398-410. Pietersma also argues that many of the characteristics that Bodine delineates are actually OG. See A. Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues," *VT* 35 (1985) 304-306.

⁸For Shenkel's work on Samuel and Kings I only chart the results for the characteristics that he specifically mentions. Obviously, O'Connell's work was also published prior to the characteristics proposed by Bodine and the two by Greenspoon, but the characteristics can be charted because his volume includes an index of Theodotianic words found in Exodus.

In the chart of 96 characteristics 3 traits have been proposed by researchers other than those already mentioned. See M. Smith, "Another Criterion for the *kaige* Recension," *Bib* 48 (1967) 443-45; J. A. Grindel, "Another Characteristic of the *Kaige* Recension: $\eta\zeta\eta$ /vīkos," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 499-513; E. Tov, "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament," *Textus* 8 (1973) 78-92.

charted according to one of four results: 1) agreement with the characteristic; 2) disagreement; 3) mixed or neutral results; 4) not applicable, i.e. the Hebrew equivalent is not present in the text. In order for the θ reading to meet the criteria of agreement for a proposed characteristic it has to employ the *kaige* trait in at least 75% of the cases where a θ reading is recorded for the Hebrew, while 50-75% usages are marked as mixed. In any instance where the *kaige* trait is employed in fewer than 50% of cases it is recorded as a disagreement. For the most part the results from the use of these criteria align with the conclusions of the original researchers, but my standards are generally more rigid than those of O, B, and Gr. Those instances evaluated differently from the original researchers are marked with the number sign (#). I also mark with an asterisk every case where the Hebrew term appears fewer than 3x in the *Vorlage* of the book in order to provide an indication of the scarcity of the evidence upon which the evaluation is based. Finally, if the majority of mss. or the θ reading in any book retains the so-called characteristic in agreement with OG in any passage, that use is not included in the statistics in order to determine the percentage of occurrence of that characteristic. For example, #44 B notes that there are six instances where $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$ appears without variation, but there is one case that the B text of Judges reads $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$ while other major witnesses only have the pronoun. Though the evidence is slim, it is recorded as an agreement and the asterisk indicates that the evaluation is based on fewer than three passages.

Although the proposed criteria may appear somewhat arbitrary it is reasonable to expect the characteristics to meet some meaningful standard. What value is there in claiming that *kaige* employs a characteristic term for the Hebrew if the term does not appear in the majority of cases in a particular book? It is especially important to employ some agreed upon criteria because there are many instances when the proposed characteristic is either common in OG or even the primary equivalent in OG.⁹ Others may not agree with the criteria proposed here, but it is my contention that some objective standards are necessary.

⁹For obvious examples, see #'s 14, 15, 29, 31, 43, 44, 45, 50, 61. For the record, it should be noted that in my thesis (and SCS volume) I mistakenly wrote that #49 was a disagreement in Daniel when I intended to state that it should be discarded as a characteristic.

Kaige Characteristic	Agree	Disagree	Mixed	NA
1. םג/םגו = καίγε	B, Gn	O, Gr	M*	
2. קר=πλήν	Gr			O, B Gn, M
3. שא=άνήρ	B, Gn	Gr	O#	M
4. למ=ἐπάνωθεν (ἀπάνωθεν) + gen.		O*, B# Gr, M*		Gn
5. נצב/נצב=στηλόω		B, Gr Gn*		O, M
6. הוצצה=σάλπιγξ/רופר=κερατίνη	B		Gr#	O, Gn, M
7. Elimination of Historical Present	Gn*	B*		O, Gr, M
8. ון=οὐκ ἔστιν in a series of aorist verbs		Gr, Gn, M	B	O
9. אנכי=ἐγὼ εἶμι	O, Gn*	Gr	B#	M
10. לקראת=εἰς συνάντησιν/εἰς ἀπαντην	B			O, Gr Gn, M
11. רודג=μονόζωνος	Gn*			O, B, Gr, M
12. צבאות 'ה=κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων				O*#, B, Gr, Gn M
13. אל=ίσχυρός	Gn	Gr, M		B, O
14. נגר=forms of ἔναντι	Gr*	Gn	B#, M	O
15. לפני=ἐνώπιον		O*, Gr	B#, Gn, M	
16. על/זאת על כן=διὰ τοῦτο		B*	Gn*	O, Gr, M
17. לעלם=εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα		Gr*, M*		O, B, Gn
18. ויה=οὐαί				O, B, M, Gr, Gn
19. אסא=συνάγω	Gn*, M*	Gr	B	O
20. כמר=χωμαρείμ				O, B, Gr, Gn, M
21. אפלל=σκοτία/לרפל=γνόφος				O, B, Gr, Gn*, M
22. ון=ἕξοδος		Gr* Gn*		O, B, M
23. ודר/הדרה=εὐπρέπεια		Gn, M		O, B, Gr
24. מהר=ταχύω		B#, Gr		O, Gn, M

25. הרה=φωτίζω		B*, Gn*		O, Gr, M
26. בעני=έν ὀφθαλμοῖς	Sh, B	Gr		O, Gn M
27. פ=στόμα				O, B, M GR, Gn
28. חז=θυσιάζω	Sh		O, B*	Gr*, Gn, M
29. הר=διώκω	Sh, B, Gr			O, Gn M
30. צב(ה) ש=ἄρχων (τῆς) δυνάμεως	Sh	Gr*, M*		O, Gn B*
31. ככ=σοφ-	Sh, O* Gn, M			B*#, Gr
32. רש=κωφεύω/הש=σιωπάω	Sh, Gn	B, Gr*		O, B, M
33. ע=ἀνομία	Sh	Gr*, M		O, B Gn,
34. הרה=έν γαστρι ἔχω or λαμβάνω	Sh	B		O, Gr Gn, M
35. אבא ל=(ἐ)θέλω	Sh	B		O, Gr*, Gn, M
36. נצ=νίκος	Gn*			O, B, Gr, M
37. אד(pu. part.)=πεπυρ(ρ)ωμένος	O*			B, Gr Gn, M
38. לה=σκέπη/שכ=σκηνή	O	Gr, Gn, M*		B
39. ארים=φωτισμοί	O*			B, Gr Gn, M
40. אליה=κέρκιον	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
41. אלם=μογιλαλόν	O*	M		B, Gr, Gn
42. אשה=πυρ(ρ)όν	O*			B, Gr*#, Gn, M
43. בין=ἀνὰ μέσον	O, Gn*	Gr		B, M
44. בקרב=έν μέσφ	O, B*	Gr#		Gn, M
45. בתוך=έν μέσφ	Gn*		Gr#	O, B, M
46. בשמים=ἀρώματα	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
47. בתים=θήκαι	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
48. וים=κόσμοι	O			B, Gr, Gn, M

49. קזק(pi.)=ένισχύω	O*, B M*	Gr*		Gn
50. רב=ρόμφαία	O*, B, M*	Gr		Gn
51. שב(π.)=μηχανώματος, μηχανήματος	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
52. שן=λόγιον	O			B, Gr, Gn, M
53. קק=γαμβρός/קק=νυμφίος	O*, B			Gr, Gn, M
54. ילדים=παιδιάρια, παιδία	O*		M	B, Gr, Gn
55. רר=τοξεύομαι	O*	Gr*		B, Gn, M
56. רת=περιτόν	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
57. כפרים=έξιλασμός	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
58. מעיל=έπενδύτης, έπιδύτης	O*, Gn*			B, Gr, M
59. ת(ו)צבצב=συνεσφιγμένοι, συνεσφραγισμένοι	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
60. חוח=ευάρεστησις	O*	M*		B, Gr Gn
61. עבד=δουλ-	O, Gr, Gn	B#	M	
62. עבת and עבתת=άλυσιδωτά or άλύσεις	O			B, Gr, Gn, M
63. ערע(vb.)=νωτοκοπέω	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
64. פרע=διασκεδάζω, διασώζω	O			B, Gr, Gn, M
65. קרסים=περόναι	O			B, Gr, Gn, M
66. קרש=σανίς	O			B, Gr, Gn, M
67. שהם=όνυξ	O, Gn*			B, Gr, M
68. שולים=πρός ποδών	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
69. שלם(pi.)=άποκτιννύω	O	Gn		B, Gr, M
70. שרש=έξέρπω	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M
71. שרשרת/תשרש=χαλαστά	O*			B, Gr, Gn, M

72. תמים=τελειότητες	O*	Gn*		B, Gr, M
73. תרומה=ἀπαρχή	O*			B, Gr Gn, M
74. אשר יען=ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα		Gr*		O, B* Gn, M
75. Various=ἡνίκα		B		Gn, Gr M
76. זחא=κρατέω	B	Gr*	Gn	O, M
77. גלה=ἀποικίζω	B*			O, Gr, Gn, M
78. טוב=ἀγαθός	B	Gr	Gn*, M*	O
79. ישר=εὐθύς	M*	Gr*	B#	O, Gn
80. לין=αὐλίζω	B, Gn*	Gr		O, M
81. נצל=ρύομαι		Gr, M	B#	O, Gn
82. שוב(q.)=ἐπιστρέφω	O*		B#, Gr#, Gn*, M	
83. אור=διαφύσσω	B*	O*, M*		Gr, Gn
84. הביא=φέρω, εἰσφέρω	B	Gr, Gn*, M		O
85. קצק/צק=βοάω	M*	Gn*	B#	O, Gr*
86. הרך=ὀργίζομαι θυμῷ	B	Gn*	Gr*	O, M
87. נלחם=παρατάσσομαι	B	Gr, M*		O, Gn
88. מלחמה=παρατάξις	B	Gr, M		O, Gn
89. נתץ=καθαίρω	B			O, Gr, Gn, M
90. סרן=ἄρχων	B	Gr*		O, Gn M
91. פגע=συναντάω/ἀπαντάω	B, Gn*	Gr#		O, M
92. קצין=ἀρχηγός	B*	M*		O, Gr*#, Gn
93. רעה=πονηρία	O*, B	Gn, M		Gr
94. Transliteration of Unknown Words	B, Gr, Gn, M			
95. (איש) גדול=ἀδρός		Gr, M		O, B, Gn
96. אבל=καί μάλα		M*		O, B, Gr, Gn

III. Analysis

a. Disputed Cases

There are nineteen cases where I disagree with the authors' evaluation of the proposed characteristic, and in the majority of those cases the authors believe that the θ readings of their book support the characteristic. The differences are based on the criteria I have defined. I have selected six of these cases for review to justify my evaluations.

#3. שׂא=ἀνήρ

In this instance O notes that the *kaige* revision appears 3/5x, so I have rated it as mixed rather than as an agreement.¹⁰ Although one might argue that my requirement of 75% agreement in this instance is too arbitrary, the expectation that the characteristics will meet a reasonable standard is the point of this exercise. Furthermore, there are only five θ readings for שׂא when it actually appears in a distributive sense 33x in Exodus and 83x in total.¹¹ One of the three agreements appears in Exod 16:16, however שׂא occurs twice in that verse as a distributive and there is no revision recorded in the other instance.

#4. מַעַל=ἐπάνωθεν (ἀπάνωθεν) + gen.

Bodine argues that the B text of Judges gives evidence of this characteristic since the revision is present 3/10x.¹² According to the criteria I have outlined this cannot be classified as revision.

#6. הַצַּרָה=σάλλιγξ/שׁופר=κερατίνη

Gr notes that הַצַּרָה does not appear in MT Joshua. שׁופר appears 14x and almost all MSS have שׁופר=σάλλιγξ 5x. In the remaining 9x OG does not represent שׁופר, but the *kaige* characteristic is witnessed to in a number of manuscripts. 7x.¹³ Whereas Greenspoon has on the basis of 7/9 that Joshua exhibits this trait, I would argue that Joshua offers mixed evidence *at best*. First, the fact that there is no textual evidence of change in 5 cases that are contrary to the characteristic means that our ratio is only 7/14 or 50%. Second, the fact that הַצַּרָה does not appear in MT

¹⁰O'Connell, 275-278.

¹¹Ibid., 275-276.

¹²In 13:20 most MSS read ἐπάνωθεν. See Bodine, 12-13.

¹³Greenspoon, 282-284.

means there is no basis for comparison that anyone made a distinction in the translation of Joshua. What we have is evidence of the use of a stereotyped equivalent for OG minuses where MT employs שופר.

#12. צבאות 'ה=κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων

צבאות 'ה does not actually appear in Exodus, but O argues that the Syriac reading of the plural אַבְרָהָם (for צבאות) in 12:41 is equal to the plural of δύναμις where OG has the singular.¹⁴ In the first place, צבאות 'ה does not appear in Exodus so this characteristic cannot be measured for its validity. Second, צבאות appears 4x elsewhere and there are no citations of Aquila or θ in these passages. In addition, we may well question whether O is not somewhat optimistic in his evaluation of the one reading given the fact that we are dealing with a witness that must be retroverted, and whose plural reading may also have been influenced in textual transmission by the plural (אַבְרָהָם) attributed to Aquila and Symmachus.

#44. בקרב=ἐν μέσῳ

Gr finds that in 6/16 passages “Aq., Aq.-Sym.-Th., or an addition of Origen” employs the *kaige* trait.¹⁵ Besides the fact that בקרב=ἐν μέσῳ is the most common OG equivalent for בקרב, it is only a θ reading in Joshua 4x at most.

#61. עבד=δουλ-

עבד occurs 17x in Judges and there are a total of 8x that δουλ- appears in all witnesses. In the remaining cases there are 4x in which δουλ- occurs in the B text.¹⁶ Not only is 4/9 less than half, but עבד=δουλ- is a common equivalent in OG.¹⁷

¹⁴O'Connell, 282-283.

¹⁵Ibid., 302-303.

¹⁶Bodine, 27-28.

¹⁷Gentry, 407; McLay, 233.

b. Agreements with Proposed Characteristics

Cases with 4 books in agreement – 2.¹⁸

Cases with 3 books in agreement – 4.¹⁹

Cases with 2 books in agreement – 14.

Only 20x do two or more books share one of the proposed *kaige* traits. In addition to these statistics we should note that in 31 cases where only one biblical book exhibits the supposed characteristic, it is found in only one or two passages!

c. Distribution of Shared Agreements Among any Two Books

O and Gn	6x	B and Gn	5x	Gr and Gn	2x	Gn and M	3x
O and B	5x	B and M	3x	Gr and Sh	1x	Gn and Sh	1x
O and M	3x	B and Sh	2x	Gr and M	1x		
O and Sh	1x	B and Gr	1x			Sh and M	1x
O and Gr	1x						

Given the relatively low number of total agreements with the proposed characteristics in *b.* above, the scarcity of shared agreements between books is expected.

d. Neutral/Not Applicable Witness for the Proposed Characteristic

Cases with 5 books that are neutral – 5.²⁰

Cases with 4 books that are neutral – 31.

Cases with 3 books that are neutral – 28.

In 64 cases there are at least three books that do not even have the Hebrew term that is the basis for the proposed characteristic. Therefore, at the very least, it is misleading to speak of 96 *kaige* characteristics when a majority of the biblical books examined do not even exhibit more than two-thirds of the proposed traits.

¹⁸See #'s 31, 94.

¹⁹See #'s 29, 49, 50, 61.

²⁰See #'s 12, 18, 20, 21, 27.

e. Disagreements with the Proposed Characteristic

Cases with 4 books in disagreement – 1.²¹

Cases with 3 books in disagreement – 4.²²

Cases with 2 books in disagreement – 17.

The number of disagreements among two or more books with the proposed characteristics (22x) is greater than the number of agreements!

IV. Conclusion

Based on the comparison of the six monographs with the proposed *kaige* traits there are three conclusions that we can draw that should represent a consensus. First, it is clear that there are no grounds for the assertion that 96 characteristics have been isolated for the *kaige* recension. More than two-thirds of the Hebrew words are not even represented in three or more books. Second, less than one-quarter of the characteristics are in agreement in two or more books. Third, there are no two books that exhibit significant agreement with each other in sharing the same *kaige* traits.

The following conclusion would not represent a consensus, but would seem prudent given the results of the analysis. Based on the examination of the θ versions in these monographs there are no grounds upon which to postulate the existence of a monolithic *kaige* recension. What we can say is that the θ versions in these books employ a common approach to translation, i.e. they exhibit formal equivalence to their *Vorlage*. However, they are not nearly so homogenous that we can conclude that they originate from the same individual or a group that attempted to standardize translation equivalents. The available data does not support a more definitive description of these so-called *kaige* texts. In order to advance our understanding of the nature and extent of *kaige*-Theodotion, it is essential that a more rigorous methodology be employed to investigate θ readings in books for which a critical text has been established. Such a methodology would require that we account for the disagreements in translation equivalents between texts as well as the agreements, and that there be a significant percentage of occurrence of a translation equivalent (e.g. 75%) in order for it to qualify as an agreement. Syntactical criteria could also be employed to refine the

²¹See # 4.

²²See #'s 5, 8, 38, 84.

methodology as well. Only a more refined methodology will provide the means to determine which texts, if any, may be so closely related as to justify the conclusion that they originate from the same individual or school of translators.