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1. Introduction

Advertising experts would doubtless hand out a failing grade for such a title, especially where the first word is almost unprounounceable. What, one may well ask, are the asterisked materials in the Greek Job? The answer is as sinuous as the quirks and twists of history. The Greek translation of the Book of Job transmitted to us by the Christian church — the Ecclesiastical Text as we may call it — is, in effect, a genetic monstrosity hybridised from different sources. According to our historical traditions, it was Origen who took the Old Greek text of Job current in his time, a text shorter than his Hebrew text, and adapted it to bring it into quantitative alignment with the Hebrew. He did this by supplementing lacunae in the Old Greek text from another rendering of Job in Greek attributed to Theodotion and marked these additions by an asterisk at the beginning and a metabolus at the end.

While our extant Greek MSS do not, for the most part, transmit the diacritical markings introduced by Origen, printed editions such as the critical edition of Ziegler (and those of his predecessors Rahlfs and Grabe) do have them on the basis of a few reliable witnesses. To this corpus of asterisked materials from the Ecclesiastical Text may be added snippets of text in the Second Apparatus (App II) of the Göttingen Edition — some asterisked and some not, but all attributed exclusively to Θ’ — which derive variously from hexaplaric, patristic and other sources.2

---

1A paper presented to the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, November 1966, and dedicated to Professor Albert Pietersma, my first instructor in Hellenistic Greek and co-supervisor of my doctoral dissertation.

2When added to the body of asterisked materials in the Ecclesiastical Text, the additional snippets constitute approximately 10% of the total. Analysis of the asterisked materials cannot, therefore, be adversely affected by including these snippets and may even be enhanced.

[Textus 19 (1998) 141-156]
The asterisked materials in the Greek Job have been identified by previous studies as belonging to the "Kaige Recension" or the "kaige group" of texts. It was Homer Heater in his 1976 Ph.D. dissertation who classified the asterisked materials as "Kaige Recension" whereas Olivier Munnich in his Ph.D. dissertation simply used the term "kaige group." Claims such as these actually go back to Barthélemy who, it must be noted from the outset, was careful in his terminology and only employed the term "kaige recension" for the ky section of the Books of Kingdoms (viz. 2 Sam 11:2-1 Kgs 2:11). Elsewhere he referred to the "kaige group of texts" and included the asterisked materials in the Greek Job in this group.

These claims are reassessed in research carried out recently for my doctoral dissertation. A number of factors motivated this research. The appearance in 1982 of a critical text of the Greek Job made possible for the first time reliable study of the asterisked materials. Since the corpus of asterisked materials in the Greek Job is large, relatively speaking, and also contains complete clauses, it may offer an Archimedean Point from which to clarify and evaluate not only the claims made that these materials belong to the kaige group, but more importantly, some of the central issues raised by analysis of kaige and Theodotionic materials over the last forty years. Moreover, in a corpus such as this there is the real possibility of analysis of translation technique and not merely — as is common practice in hexaplaric studies — of assembling a set of lexical equivalencies. Finally, neither the problem of correlating somewhat. Sound methodology, moreover, requires including them since they, like the asterisked materials in the Ecclesiastical Text, are solidly attributed to the same source — the rendering of Theodotion — and from the point of view of translation technique, they belong to the same work.

4See Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, 47.
5P. Gentry, The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job (SBLCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
6J. Ziegler, Job (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Vol. 12.4; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1982).

the Greek to its Hebrew parent text nor the question of a bilingual parent text plague study of the asterisked materials, as is the case in the materials attributed to Theodotion in the Book of Daniel — another large corpus of Theodotionic materials.

The results of my research show that the question of relationship to the ἱκαῖε group of texts is not as simple as formulated in previous studies. Indeed, an attempt to describe the relationship between the asterisked materials in the Greek Job and the ἱκαῖε group necessitates at the same time reviewing the history of analysis of ἱκαῖε materials, clarifying the issues in question, and evaluating previous and present methods and results. Interest in the ἱκαῖε group is not abating. Two papers on this topic were presented at the IXth Congress of the IOSCS in Cambridge, 1995. The purpose of this paper then, is not only to provide a brief summary for those who may not have had occasion to peruse thoroughly the full publication of my work, but to clarify precisely what we are studying and what methods may best serve in the future for analysis of ἱκαῖε materials.

Research on the asterisked materials in the Greek Job was divided into three topics. First, I delimited the corpus of asterisked materials by careful attention to textual witnesses. Translation technique was used to decide cases where textual attestation was weak or uncertain.

Second, an exhaustive analysis of the character, habits, and patterns of translation exhibited by the asterisked materials was undertaken. This constituted the bulk of the study. Since the approach of the translator to his task was literal and quantitative, the methodology followed suit. The analysis distinguished between lexical and structural features and examined correspondence between Hebrew and Greek nouns, pronouns, verbs, and particles. The characterisation of the materials also considered the level of phrases, clauses, word order and the problem of transliterations.

Exhaustive description of translation technique made possible the third topic: the question of the place of the asterisked materials in the textual history of the Septuagint and in particular, the relationship of the materials to the ἱκαῖε group. While reviewers suggest this may be the most interesting part of the work, it must be stressed that only a pilot study was undertaken.

The present paper correlates analysis of the asterisked materials in the Greek Job with four discernible divisions in the history of research on the ἱκαῖε group: (1) Barthélemy, (2) post-Barthélemy studies, (3) O. Munnich and A. Pietersma, and

---

10See, for example, the notice by L. Greenspoon in Old Testament Abstracts 19 (1996) 161.
(4) recent studies. These divisions will assist both in reviewing and evaluating past καίγε studies and in correlating analysis of the asterisked materials with them.

For convenience, the corpus of asterisked materials in the Greek Job as defined earlier will be referred to simply as Theodotion (Theod). This use need not prejudge such questions as the date or identity of Theodotion, the connection between the Joban materials and materials attributed to θε elsewhere, or the relationship of the Joban materials to the καίγε group — an item which cries out for better definition itself.

2. Barthélemy and the ‘καίγε Group’

Study of the early history of the Septuagint was completely revolutionised by the discovery in 1952 of the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naţal ever and by the brilliant interpretation of the significance of the Scroll given by Père Dominique Barthélemy in 1963. The Minor Prophets Scroll (hereafter abbreviated MP) is a recension of the Old Greek of the Twelve Prophets. One of its most striking traits of translation technique is the consistent rendering of מ/מ by καίγε. The book in which Barthélemy presented this to the scholarly world was far more than just a discussion of the manuscript and an initial presentation of its text. With prodigious research he showed that the recensional characteristics of MP are also found elsewhere in the Greek Old Testament, both in recensions of earlier translations and in texts which seem to be the earliest or original Greek translation. The revisions and translations which shared the common set of traits identified by Barthélemy were dubbed the "καίγε group" on the basis of its characteristic treatment of מ/מ.

Barthélemy not only posited an array of peculiar traits of translation technique characteristic of and therefore the identifying markers of the members of the καίγε group, he also argued throughout that each of these revealed exegesis and exegetical methods traceable to the direct influence of the first-century Palestinian Rabbis. In addition to the basic group of patterns of translation technique employed to identify the members of the καίγε group, Barthélemy isolated another set of patterns also characteristic of the group which revealed a kind of recensional and translational activity eventually culminating in the work of Aquila. It was because of these characteristics that Barthélemy entitled his book, Les Devanciers d’Aquila. The basic group of

patterns employed by Barthélemy to identify the members of the group I have called Core Patterns, while the additional set of traits adumbrating the approach to revision and translation technique perfected by Aquila I have called Precursor Patterns.

Significant for analysis of Theod is that Barthélemy placed the asterisked additions of Joban squarely within his καίγε group. Later, in 1976, Homer Heater Jr. classified this Joban text as the “Καίγε Recension.”12 The claims of both Barthélemy and Heater were reassessed by careful examination of the materials. Factors such as research based on a critical text, careful delimitation of the corpus of materials, exhaustive examination of the materials, and attention to both contrastive as well as comparative analysis led to conclusions differing somewhat from those of Barthélemy and Heater.

2.1. Theod and the Core Patterns

Barthélemy posited nine Core Patterns. Three do not occur in the Hebrew for which we have Greek renderings in Theod. Of the six remaining patterns, four are found in Theod while two are not. The chart below conveniently lists the patterns and presents these results. Patterns of translation technique characteristic of the καίγε group found in Theod are indicated by a plus sign (+), patterns not found are marked by a minus sign (−), and NA signifies that analysis in Theod is Not Applicable, i.e. the presumed parent text corresponding to our extant renderings in Theod does not have the expression(s) or term(s) of the pattern in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. מָרַע/מָרג = καίγε</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. שִׁיר = ἀνήρ</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. לְעַל = ἐπάνωθεν / ἄπανωθεν+ Genitive</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. לָבַע = στηλῶ</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. לְמַס = σάλπηγξ / κάτω = κερατίνη</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Elimination of Historical Presents</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. מַי = οὐκ ἔστιν</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. אָב = ἐγὼ ἐίμι</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. נָא = ἐως συνάντησιν</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before giving a brief evaluation of these results, details are provided for two or three of the patterns.13

12H. Heater, Jr., *A Septuagint Translation Technique*, 17-53, esp. p. 11.
2.1.1. שָׁם/שָׁם = קָאִיֶּה

Four instances of שָׁם and one instance of שָׁם occur in the portion of MT for which we have renderings by Theod. He employs קָאִיֶּה for all four occurrences שָׁם (15:10a, 15:10a, j19:18a 30:2a), but only קָאִי for the one occurrence of שָׁם (j28:27b). Thus Theod seems to treat שָׁם and שָׁם differently. Barthélemy argues that earlier Aquila (i.e. LXX-Ecclesiastes) does not distinguish between שָׁם and שָׁם while later Aquila does, employing קָאִי קָאִי for the latter. Perhaps not too much should be made of the datum of only one instance of שָׁם = קָאִי instead of an expected שָׁם = קָאִיֶּה, but it is interesting to observe that Theod also distinguishes [א and [א by employing קָאִי in four instances (36:29a, 36:33b, 37:1a, 37:11a) and γάρ in one (j15:4a) for ην and קָאִי προσέτι in one (36:16a) for ην. It should also be noted that some members of the קָאִיֶּה group offer קָאִי γάρ for שָׁם/שָׁם rather than קָאִי. The pattern in Theod, then, shows both connection with and independence from the קָאִיֶּה group as characterized by Barthélemy, for this feature.

2.1.2. בָּלָה/בָּלָה = στηλώ

Theod renders forms of בָּלָה only once and his equivalent is παραστήμα (2:1d). Semantically, unless one is willing to employ bad idiom, στηλώ cannot properly be used in this context and Theod is characterised by attention to the context.

---

14Heater noted only three of the five instances (15:10a, 15:10a, 30:2a) as he did not include in his corpus materials relegated in the Göttingen Edition to the second apparatus which were available to him only in Field (Heater, A Septuagint Translation Technique, 22-23).

15Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, 32-33.

16There are just four other instances of προσέτι in any of the Greek versions according to Hatch-Redpath: καὶ προσέτῳ for τὸ τὴν in 2 Kgs (Sm) 16:11 (= καὶ קי group), προσέτῳ δὲ for שָׁם in Ps 48(49):3 (= ס'), and 2 Macc 12:14 and 4 Macc 14:1 which are not relevant. From the point of view of the Hebrew, elsewhere in the βγ and γδ portions of Samuel-Kings three occurrences of προσέτι and προσέτῳ are rendered: נוֹסַד προσέτι (οπίω b c e; δ' 2 Kgds [2 Sam] 20:14), נוֹסַד προσέτ (2 Kgds [2 Kgs] 2:14), and τὸ τὴν καὶ προσέτ (sic Bij; καὶ προσέτ δ' c e; δ' om kai A N reli Eth Syh; 4 Kgds [2 Kgs] 5:13). This evidence is scant, but does not negate the conclusion that προσέτι and προσέτῳ are handled differently in the βγ and γδ portions respectively, as in Theod.

17Barthélemy, 41-43, 47.

18Barthélemy, 59-60.

19Heater correctly points out that OG already employed παραστήμα for MT בָּלָה in 1:6b and 2:1b, but he concludes falsely that 2:1d gives good evidence of the recensional nature of Theod (Heater, A Septuagint Translation Technique, 24). In point of fact, the equivalence בָּלָה/בָּלָה = παραστήμα is established already in the Pentateuch (see Hatch-Redpath, s.v.) and does not necessarily prove that Theod is revising OG.
2.1.3. ἔστω = οὐκ ἔστιν

According to Barthélemy, the Rabbis believed ἔστω was non-temporal; hence cases where a Future or Past of εἰμί is used are corrected to a Present by members of the καίγε group.\(^{20}\) Barthélemy claimed that this typical translation of ἔστω by οὐκ ἔστιν reappears in Job 32:5, thus linking Theodotion Job to the καίγε group.\(^{21}\) Theod rendered ἔστω in 10 instances, employing οὐκ ἔστιν in five of them (20:21a, 26:6b, 28:14b, 32:5a, 35:15a), οὐκ ἔστη once (32:12b), μή once (33:33a), alpha privative once (21:33c), and finally οὐκέτι εἰμί (7:8b) and οὐκ ἔστιν (27:19b) once each where ἔστω had pronominal suffixes. The instance mentioned by Barthélemy (32:5a) is the only case of οὐκ ἔστιν where a Present Tense would seem to be contextually out of place, but the instances rendered by οὐκ ἔστη, μή, and alpha privative show contextually sensitive renderings and especially the case of οὐκ ἔστη would be a good counter-example to that of 32:5a. In point of fact, however, the case of οὐκ ἔστιν in 32:5a does not itself support Barthélemy’s claim. Within a nominal ὅτι-Clause — as οὐκ ἔστιν is found in 32:5a — whether in primary or secondary sequence, the Present is normal usage.\(^{22}\) Therefore no example in Theod conforms to the pattern in the καίγε group.\(^{23}\)

2.1.4. Summary

The detailed discussion illustrates the character of the results. Four patterns out of six where analysis is possible are found in Theod. But evidence is quite scant for two of them (6, 8) and there is a variation on the pattern in one (1). Abundant and clear evidence exists for only one or two patterns (2). Certainly Barthélemy did have some reason to connect Theod with members of his καίγε group, but the connection is problematic as to the nature of the relationship.

---


\(^{21}\)Barthélemy, 67.

\(^{22}\)BDR, § 324. A perfect parallel to 32:5a is John 6:24: ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ἄγγελος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἔκει οὐδὲ ὁ μάθηται αὐτόν, ἐνέβησαν αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοῖα καὶ ἤλθον εἰς Καισαρείαν ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν Ἰησοῦν.

\(^{23}\)Heater does not distinguish the differing contextual and grammatical settings and concludes that “The KR [καίγε] trend is obvious in the translation of this particle, but the fact that old Greek does not hesitate to use a present should warn against too much weight being placed on this characteristic” (Heater, A Septuagint Translation Technique, 26). The evidence, however, fails to demonstrate any such trend.
2.2. Theod and the Precursor Patterns.

Twelve Precursor Patterns are presented by Barthélemy. Four do not occur in the Hebrew for which we have Greek renderings in Theod.24 Of the eight patterns which remain, three are found in Theod, four are not and the evidence for one is ambiguous. Again a chart conveniently lists the patterns and presents these results employing the same sigla. Parentheses are used to show how Aquila’s preferred pattern differs from the Precursor Pattern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ἀριστος = μονόζιονος (α’ εὐζιονος)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ταχυς = κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων (α’ κύριος τῶν στρατων)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ίσχυς = ἴσχυρος (α’ ἴσχυρος employed exclusively for ίσχυς)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. εντι = various derivatives of εντι (α’ κατέντι)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. μνήμη = διά τούτο (α’ separate equivalents)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. αἰώνα = εἰς τῶν αἰῶνα (α’ εἰς αἰῶνα)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. οὐσία = οὐσία (α’ Ω)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. συνάγω = συνάγω (α’ συνάγω)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. χωμάρειμ = χωμάρειμ (α’ τεμενίτης)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. σκοτία = σκοτία (α’ σκοτοσιμός)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ἤχος = ἤχος (α’ ἤχοςτατον)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. εὐπρεπεία = εὐπρεπεία (α’ διαπρεπεία)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details are provided for only two of the patterns.25

2.2.1. ίσχυς = ἴσχυρος (α’ ἴσχυρος employed exclusively for ίσχυς)26

Theod employs ὅθες for ίσχυς and οὐσία and ὅ ἴσχυρος for ίσχυς.27 But Theod also uses ἴσχυρος once in 37:18b as an adjective to render ποιήσα and once in 15:20b as a divine epithet for ἱεράς. Similarly, according to the evidence from Reider-Turner,28 ἴσχυρος is employed by α’ mainly for ίσχυς, but also sporadically for ἤχος, εὐπρεπεία, αἴωνα, οὐσία, οὐσία, βορρᾶ, ἡμέρα, βορρᾶ, αἴωνα, οὐσία, οὐσία,

24When commenting on MP, Barthélemy notes that like the καθεμ recension of Kingdoms and the Greek Translator of Psalms, MP prefers ταχυς and ταχέως for ταχυς. Aquila further systematizes using ταχυς = ταχυνέων, σημα = σημανει, τοῖς = ταχυνειν, τετῆ = ταξισκομάζειν (Barthélemy, 184). This may be counted as an additional (i.e., thirteenth) Precursor Pattern, but again, it does not occur in the Hebrew for which we have Greek renderings in Theod.

25Taken from Gentry, The Asterisked Materials, 395-402.

26Barthélemy, 83.

27For complete evidence and analysis, see Gentry, op. cit, 89, 118-120.

28J. Reider, An Index To Aquila (Completed and Revised by N. Turner; VTSup. 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966) s.v.
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2.2.2. רדך/א = א asmā' (א’ נודד)

According to Barthélemy, the נודד group frequently employs א asmā’ for רדך, but Aquila used א asmā’ for כ for כ because he reserved א asmā’ for כ.31 Thus he created נודד as the equivalent for רדך.

Theod renders רדך once (40:10b) and uses פסוס (6פסוס). It should be noted that in this text Theod has א asmā’ in פסוס for כ in MT. Possibly פסוס is employed for stylistic variation since א asmā’ is already used for רדך.32 Elsewhere Theod uses א asmā’ once for הוה (18:15b) and א asmā’ once for הוה in (8:6b)—in both instances as if from הוה — and once for כ in (36:11c). Aquila not only uses א asmā’ for כ, but also for הוה.33 Interestingly, however, at 18:15b א’ has כ for עניון.34 Thus

31Reider-Turner only 1:29 and 61:3 (א’ כ) and possibly as la, but note Jb 41:17a.

32Since most occurrences are in Jer and Ezek, Barthélemy claims these were early revisions of Aquila (Barthélemy, 83).


34Available to Barthélemy in Field. Also noted in Heater, 41. The plural shows Aquila did not read מס as כ.

35Barthélemy, 87-88. This characteristic is not considered by Heater.

36Although פסוס is employed for רדך in 37:22b, the equivalence belongs to OG rather than to א’ (see Gentry, 261-262).

37Reider-Turner, 101.

38App II 15b] א’ (leg א’) λαμμαθήσεται ἐπὶ ἑαυτῆς ἑαυτοῦ (+ to 137) θείον C’ (Olymp). As 18:15b is sub א, Ziegler is surely right in assigning this reading to Aquila. The evidence from Hagedorn now proves it beyond question:
Theod does not have the characteristic of the καίγε group for ἡδραίον, but neither does he show the specialization of Aquila.

2.2.3. Summary

Out of eight patterns, then, where analysis is possible only three are clearly found in Theod and evidence is slim for one of them (8). In one case, the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate either connection to or independence from the καίγε group (10).

Putting Core and Precursor Patterns together, where evaluation is possible only half are clearly found in Theod. Either we need to redefine the relationship of Theod to the καίγε group or redefine what is meant by the group itself, or both! If by the καίγε group we refer to a diverse group of recensions or first translations which share a common approach or attitude to translation — an approach that is developing or has developed into a tradition, then Theod belongs to it. But the diversity that exists within the καίγε group, as well as the precise line of demarcation between καίγε and LXX, has yet to be taken seriously by modern scholarship.

3. Post-Barthélemy Studies

Numerous articles, dissertations, and other studies were spawned by the original and stimulating work of Barthélemy. For a period of some twenty years, (1963 to 1983), the focus of research was to discover other equivalences or patterns characteristic of the ‘καίγε group’, some in texts already identified as belonging to the group and some in texts newly identified as belonging to the group. The culmination of this period was perhaps the dissertation of Leonard Greenspoon, Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua, published in 1983. On the basis of a compilation largely made by Greenspoon, we have a list of some 97 patterns claimed by different scholars during the period 1963-1983 to be characteristics of the ‘καίγε group’.38

While one may well question the relative value of many of the patterns proposed post-Barthélemy as characteristics or markers of the καίγε group, this is not the focus here. Where comparison is possible with Theod analysis revealed that twelve of these patterns are found in Theod, eight are not and in three the evidence is inconclusive.39 Therefore the data are similar to cases already considered.

18:15b α’ (Θ’ Γ N; apoc 250 612) λικνηθὴσεται (-θήσονται 3006) ἐκι (ἐν τῷ 3005) ἁρματησιν αὐτοῦ θείον (ὑ ὁ θείον 137) Γ’ (= 250 3005 Γ’[8]) N (U. and D. Hagedorn, Nachlese zu den Fragmenten, 23).

38See the paper by Tim McLaugh in the present volume.
39For details, see Gentry, 402-417.
There is obviously some connection between the so-called καιγε group and the asterisked materials, but the correlation between the two is only partial. Certainly Theod is not part of one monolithic recension as Heater concluded.\textsuperscript{40} Consideration of the history of καιγε studies together with the present results suggests several things: (1) post-Barthélemy studies and even the research of Barthélemy himself focussed exclusively on agreements in an effort to establish existence of the καιγε group that the differences between group members were not considered or examined sufficiently, (2) the καιγε texts were wrongly conceived of as one recension by pushing evidence in a direction Barthélemy himself was careful to avoid, (3) analysis must go beyond consideration of a few certain equivalences selected as key traits of a revisor’s or translator’s work. A broader analysis is necessary which compares Theod with the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll and Aquila on the basis of an exhaustive investigation and thorough understanding of the translation technique of all three. The analysis must be contrastive as well as comparative. All possible interconnections and relations must be explored. The issues and politics of the diverse groups of Second Temple Judaism must be the larger framework for interpreting the results.


Olivier Munnich’s analysis of the vocabulary of the Greek Psalter has given new directions and orientation to thinking about the καιγε group. First, he has turned attention away from suggesting a close link between exegetical and hermeneutical methods of the Palestinian rabbis and characteristic patterns of translation technique exhibited by the καιγε group. Secondly he has turned attention toward considering the key patterns as generalisations and stereotypes developed from earlier sources, instead of focusing solely on these texts as precursors to Aquila, the one who perfected these traits. The first direction is negative. Munnich demonstrated that a number of patterns were not necessarily motivated by peculiarities of Rabbinic exegesis as Barthélemy had claimed. In fact, many patterns discovered post-Barthélemy had no obvious link whatever. The second direction is positive. Munnich sought to establish the sources which influenced the καιγε group rather than focus on Aquila as the one influenced by the καιγε group.

Munnich began his research by analysing the vocabulary of the Greek Psalter. His analysis isolated lexemes which he demonstrated were coined and employed for the first time by the translator of the Hebrew Psalms. Next he traced the use of these

\textsuperscript{40} Heater, 20-46, esp. 45-46.
lexemes by revisors and translators of biblical books which were clearly later than the date of origin of the Greek Psalter. A fair number of these terms had been taken up by members of the καισε group and turned into stereotypes. Around the same time, A. Pietersma, working independently of Munnich, made much the same point.41

Munnich’s contribution suggested that a pilot study ought to be undertaken in which equivalences constituting patterns in Theod were compared and contrasted not only with MP as possibly coming from the same or a similar source, or Aquila as the perfecter of these traits, but also with the Greek Psalter as the possible origin or source of them. Unfortunately, such a comparison would have to be limited largely to lexical equivalences since exhaustive studies of patterns of translation technique are unavailable for the Greek Psalter and Aquila and only partially available for MP. Nonetheless, such a study would lay the groundwork for developing a typology in which we could place and position Theod.

To analyse the possible relationships between Theod, the Greek Psalter (designated herein by the siglum P), MP and Aquila in a preliminary way, all lexical equivalences employed by Theod for both nouns and verbs occurring three or more times were carefully compared and contrasted with equivalences employed by P, MP and Aquila for the same words.42

4.1. Theod and the Minor Prophets Scroll

Comparison of Theod and the Minor Prophets Scroll is not entirely straightforward. The fragmentary state of the Scroll, the relative shortage of common vocabulary, and the problem of comparing a recension with a translation (largely unaffected by a previous translation) preclude bold statements about the connection between Theod and the Scroll. There is no unique agreement between the two which could point to an incontrovertible inter-relationship, whereas some six or so disagreements (Nouns and Verbs) point to a considerable degree of independence. If one also looks at equivalences in Theod where the frequency is less than three, additional disagreements exist between patterns claimed by Barthélemy to be certain characteristics of the καισε group based upon the Scroll and what we find in Theod.43 The most that can


42 No space can be given here to the analysis and detailed discussion as the material was presented at the 1994 Oxford Hexapla Seminar. What follows is only a brief review of the results. See P. J. Gentry, “The Place of Theodotion-Job in the Textual History of the Septuagint,” Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments (ed. Alison Salvesen; Tübingen: Mohr, 1997) 199-230.

43 See Gentry, 439-440.
can be said in view of the nature of the evidence is that both Theod and the Minor Prophets Scroll had similar attitudes and approaches towards translation and appreciated some of the same type of techniques.

4.2. Theod and the Psalter

Approximately 8 out of 29 agreements between Theod and the Psalter constitute possible evidence for borrowing from the Psalter plus only two or three further instances arising when instances of disagreement were fully investigated. On the other hand, some 43 out of 55 disagreements show Theod clearly independent from the Psalter.

Certainly Theod was influenced by the Psalter, but the Psalter is hardly the lode from which the Theod mined his peculiar traits. Thus Munnich’s proposal that the Greek Psalter formed a sort of glossary from which members of the καιγε group galvanized certain equivalences into stereotypes requires further evaluation and revision. Indeed, Pietersma, in his “Plea For A Return To Basic Issues” was more cautious in describing influence from the Greek Psalter upon the καιγε group.45

Two features of Munnich’s research impeded his arriving at better results. First, he failed to employ contrastive as well as comparative analysis. For the Book of Job, he deals only with the rendering of יְעָשָׂ by διάβημα in 14:16a and 31:4b and claims on the basis of this a dependence of Theod upon the Psalter.46 Not only is the basis for such an assertion slim, there are, moreover, a number of neologisms in the Greek Psalter not borrowed by Theod.47

---

44A disagreement at the formal level may in fact be evidence for borrowing from the Greek Psalter by Theod, since, for example, an equivalence for a noun in Theod may be inspired by an equivalence for a verb in the Psalter.

45A. Pietersma, 309.

46Munnich asserts, “ce constat fournit un premier indice de la dépendence lexicale de Théodotion par rapport au Psautier des Septante” (O. Munnich, Étude Lexicographique, 476). Free renderings make MT יְעָשָׂ unrecognizable in OG at 18:7a, 31:37a, 34:21b. OG employs τα ἐπιστηνέματα in 14:16a for which the C Group attests τα διάβηματα μου attributed to 6°. 31:4b is clearly from Theod. Munnich says that in 14:6a, “Théodotion remplace ἐπιστηνίματα par διάβημα” (ibid.). He does not make his reader aware that, according to the evidence available to him (which is now confirmed by the critical edition), the attribution is somewhat vague.

47Some six or so are discussed, see Gentry, 467-469. One such example is the rendering of נַח (Qal Active Participle) by λατρεία in the Psalter; ἐγχριστεύω is used in Theod. This former lexeme was coined by the Psalter, as Munnich demonstrates (Munnich, Thesis, 106, 169-170). The latter was well established in the Greek Pentateuch (12 occurrences).
Secondly, serious methodological problems arise when one attempts to prove influence or relationship on the basis of certain key peculiar traits. Munnich’s analysis of βάρις is penetrating and sophisticated, but one cannot hang the identity of the καὶ γε group on such a slender thread. The present study points the way to further research on the relation of P to the καὶ γε group by demonstrating the value of assessing a large block of data and basing conclusions on comparative and contrastive analysis of the whole, not just on certain outstanding or peculiar traits.

On the positive side, Munnich’s work was helpful in focussing attention on possible sources of the καὶ γε group. But the Greek Psalter is not necessarily the only or even the main source. It is indeed plausible that the influence of portions of the LXX employed liturgically was greater upon later translators than parts not used this way. But it is equally clear that a number of equivalences were drawn by Theod from the Greek Pentateuch, OG Job and LXX Isaiah.

A more comprehensive explanation for the relations of Theod to other recensions and translations is necessary — one much broader than that proposed by Munnich who has already broadened Barthélemy’s thesis. Such an explanation would correlate a history of the development of approaches and attitudes to the translation of the Jewish Scriptures from III B.C. to II A.D as seen in the constant interchange between Diasporan and Palestinian Judaism with the evidence from the texts themselves.

4.3. Theod and Aquila

The few agreements and the large number of disagreements as well as the nature of the evidence supports the thesis of Barthélemy. Aquila represents a big step further down the road from the stance of Theod. The concern for quantitative alignment between Greek translation and Hebrew original in Aquila is highly refined. In Aquila there is a more specialized system of equivalents so that distinct equivalents for each Hebrew lexeme may be used. There is more stereotyping in these equivalents and less sensitivity to contextual factors. Aquila even attempts to represent the root system of Hebrew by forming a set of equivalents from a single Greek stem to be used for Nouns and Verbs derived from a single root. The approach of Aquila leads him to produce many absurdities and deviations from normal Hellenistic Greek usage in his translation.


41 Stereotyping here means a given Hebrew lexeme always rendered by a single Greek lexeme or more than one Hebrew lexeme rendered by a single Greek lexeme; see Gentry, The Asterisked Materials, 132.
5. Recent Studies

Research continues unabated on the \textit{kai}ye group. Three studies deserve to be mentioned, although little space can be given here to assess them.\textsuperscript{50} Tim McLay concluded his doctoral dissertation on “Translation Technique and Textual Studies in the Old Greek and Theodotion Versions of Daniel” in 1994 just after I finished my work.\textsuperscript{51} His research, done independently of mine on Job, emphasises the importance of studying translation technique and offers results remarkably similar. Nonetheless, his study is incomplete.\textsuperscript{52}

In 1995, at the IX\textsuperscript{th} Congress of the IOSCS in Cambridge, shorter studies by Staffan Olofsson on “The Ka\textit{i}ye-recension in the Septuagint Book of Psalms” and by Timothy Janz on “The Second Book of Ezra and the ‘Ka\textit{i}ye Recension’” were presented. Olofsson seeks a broader framework for examining questions pertinent to the \textit{kai}ye group by adopting the general picture painted by S. P. Brock of the translator as \textit{expositor} or \textit{interpretes} operating in the context of the tensions between Diasporan Judaism and Palestinian Judaism over the translation of Scripture.\textsuperscript{52} He never attempts, however, to clearly describe what he means by the \textit{kai}ye group and waffles as to whether the present Greek text of Psalms is Old Greek or recension. In interpreting the data, he appears too eager to claim evidence to identification as a \textit{kai}ye pattern.

\textsuperscript{50}Also to be noted is M. Harl, “La version LXX du cantique des Cantiques et le Groupe Kaige-Theodotion: Quelques remarques lexicales,” \textit{Textus} 18 (1995):101-120. As she admits in her conclusions, her study is based on limited lexical soundings and cannot yield certain results.


\textsuperscript{52}Dr. McLay chose five representative segments of text from Daniel containing ten verses each as the basis of analysis of translation technique. This corpus constitutes approximately 15% of the total text and must be expanded to permit firm results.

The ambivalence of the connection between the Psalms and the καίγε group noted by Olofson emphasizes again that the group is not homogeneous and certainly not a monolithic recension. The differences must be more carefully explored. It is a tradition of approach to translation which cries out for a clear typology of development in relation both to original texts and recensions of the Septuagint.

Janz's analysis of Second Ezra is a brief study, like that of Olofson, but one more attuned, in our view, to the problems of definition and methodology and less prone to establish relationship to the καίγε group when confronted with ambivalent evidence.

6. Conclusions

Recent reassessment of the Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job point the way to future research and study of so-called καίγε materials.

(1) Analysis must be based on the treatment of the translation technique of complete texts, wherever possible. We must not just look for select lexical equivalences as markers of inter-relationship between texts which are recensional.

(2) It is important to do contrastive as well as comparative study to establish the patterns and traits of translation technique.

(3) In discussing possible inter-relationships, we need explore the differences as well as the common ground.

(4) It is necessary to correlate the καίγε tradition with tensions between Diasporan and Palestinian Judaism in the Second Temple Period.

(5) To properly establish the early history of the Septuagint and the rôle of the καίγε tradition, we need to delineate the relation of καίγε tradition to both original texts as well as recensions.