

PREFACE

This work is a revised and improved version of my doctoral dissertation submitted to the Biblical Faculty of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 2016. This published version maintains the original structure of the thesis and has kept text-critical study and narrative analysis in separate sections within the book chapters. The same applies to the discussion of the narrative in the Greek textual traditions, which was divided into subsections. Although this decision implies a certain degree of repetition it allows those readers more interested in only one of the textual traditions discussed or only one step of my research to readily find what they are looking for.

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Stephen Pisano, my patient supervisor, for his guidance and encouragement. Acknowledgement is also due to Professor Craig Morrison for his several helpful suggestions. I also had valuable feedback from Professor Agustinus Gianto. Kevin Zilverberg has revised the English of this monograph.

Grants to enable my studies were generously given by the Simon Biblical Scholarship Fund and the Gregorian University Foundation. Financial aid was also provided by the CEI (*Conferenza Episcopale Italiana*) and the Archdiocese of Belo Horizonte, Brazil.

I am also grateful to my family, friends and colleagues from Brazil and from Rome for their practical and moral support.

Leonardo Pessoa da Silva Pinto
Rome, April 2019

INTRODUCTION

The text of the books of Samuel has been a challenge for OT scholars for a long time. The quality of the MT of 1-2 Sam, its relationship with the text of Chronicles, and the place and importance of the versions are just some of the questions that have been asked and debated in biblical scholarship.

The Septuagint of 1-2 Sam plays an important role in this debate, partly because it displays many differences when compared to MT. In the past the Greek version was often used as a source for emendation of the Hebrew text, the retroversions from the Greek being at times considered preferable to MT. At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century much of the scholarship was engaged in a MT versus LXX debate, MT being “the” Hebrew text, and no distinction between various forms of “the” Greek text being made.¹ It will be seen that the treatment of this problem has changed a lot, and gained complexity especially after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Furthermore, a different interest emerged in biblical scholarship in recent decades, and the versions are being studied not only as sources for correction of MT, but for their own value. Each version is a document worth studying in itself. Another point of interest is the fact that the versions sometimes display differences that are not reducible to punctual variants due to scribal mistakes or to occasional voluntary modifications. They often show a picture of a biblical narrative that departs from MT’s.

This study will be dedicated to the comparison of the Septuagint and MT of 2 Sam 10-12, the chapters on the war against the Ammonites. LXX will be studied in its double value: as an important document in itself, but also for its relevance in

¹ See M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The Book of Samuel – Hebrew and Greek: Hindsight of a Century”, *Textus* 14 (1988) 148, 154.

textual criticism. This goal will be achieved by using both the methods of narrative analysis and the traditional methods of textual criticism.

However, the chapters on the war against the Ammonites belong to what is nowadays called “the *καίγε* section” of the books of Samuel, where the study of LXX becomes even more complex. Therefore, before explaining the methodological path that will be followed in this study, it will be important to survey the history of the research on the Septuagint of the books of Samuel.

1. THE HISTORY OF THE RESEARCH ON THE SEPTUAGINT OF SAMUEL

“The Septuagint” of Samuel is not something as well-defined as the expression may suggest. On the contrary, the word hides a plurality of textual witnesses and traditions that must be confronted before the original Greek translation, the Old Greek (OG), can be reached. The history of the research on the Septuagint of Samuel has been explained in detail elsewhere,² and it will be enough for the purposes of this study to sum up the most important discoveries regarding the Lucianic text and *καίγε*, the two most relevant Greek textual traditions for 2 Sam 10-12. This survey starts then with the discovery of the Lucianic manuscripts and the pre-Lucianic readings.

1.1. *The discovery of the Lucianic manuscripts and the pre-Lucianic readings*

The 19th century was the period of the discovery of the Lucianic manuscripts for Sam-Kgs. Ceriani and Field were the first to recognize the link between Mss. 19, 82, 93 and 108 (respectively *b'*, *o*, *e*₂, *b* in the Brooke-McLean sigla), and their relationship with the Antiochene Church Fathers, Chrysostom and Theodoret.³

² See N. Fernández Marcos, “The Antiochene Edition in the Text History of the Greek Bible”, in S. Kreuzer–M. Sigismund (ed.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013, 57-73; J.-H. Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehende von 2Sam 15,1-19,9*, Berlin–New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2009, 4-32; P. Hugo, “Le grec ancien des livres des Règles: Une histoire et un bilan de la recherche”, in Y. A. P. Goldman *et al.* (ed.), *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honor of Adrian Schenker offered by the editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2006, 113-141; *Les deux visages d'Élie: Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18*, Fribourg–Göttingen, Academic Press–Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006, 5-54.

³ See A. M. Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*, vol. II/2, Mediolani, typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1864, 76, 98, 102; F. Field (ed.), *Origenes Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta*, vol. I-II, Oxford, Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1867-1875, lxxxvii.

These Mss. constitute a unique textual tradition of the beginning of the 4th century CE related to the recension of Lucian, martyr in 312 CE.⁴ Wellhausen hoped that the Lucianic manuscripts would be edited,⁵ which happened a few years later with Lagarde's faulty attempt (1883).⁶

Paul de Lagarde spoke of three recensional texts of the Septuagint: Hesychian, Hexaplaric, and Lucianic (Jerome's *trifaria varietas*).⁷ According to him, the OG should be achieved by reconstructing and comparing these texts. Lagarde's reconstruction of LXX^L in 1883 was not a critical edition, and his work was severely criticized by Rahlfs, even if he recognized that Lagarde's collation was better than the one produced by Holmes and Parsons. At that time Ms. 127 (c₂ in the Brooke-McLean sigla) was not yet included among the Lucianic manuscripts.

An interesting discovery of that time was that some readings typical of the Lucianic text were found in witnesses preceding the time of Lucian. In 1860-1864 Vercellone detected some pre-Lucianic readings in the *Vetus Latina*, and Wellhausen suggested in 1871 that some Lucianic readings existed before the 4th century CE, the time of Lucian.⁸ In 1895 Mez discovered pre-Lucianic readings in biblical references of Josephus.⁹

⁴ It is important to note that the Lucianic text was not detected for all OT books; for example, no Lucianic text was found for the Pentateuch. Furthermore, the manuscripts that are Lucianic in Sam-Kgs can change textual affiliation in other parts of the Bible. Conversely, *Codex Alexandrinus*, a witness to the Origenian recension in 1-2 Sam, becomes witness to the Lucianic text in Job; see N. Fernández Marcos, "Some Reflections on the Antiochian Text of the Septuagint", in D. Fraenkel *et al.* (ed.), *Studien zur Septuaginta, Robert Hanhart zu Ehren aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990, 220-223. Pietersma warns us against extending the problematic of the Lucianic (and proto-Lucianic) text in Sam-Kgs to other books of the Bible; see A. Pietersma, "Proto-Lucian and the Greek Psalter", *VT* 28/1 (1978) 66. Therefore, what is affirmed in this study about LXX^L is valid for 1-4 Kingdoms only. The Lucianic text of Chronicles will be quoted at times, but with the appropriate caution.

⁵ See J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871, 223-224.

⁶ P. de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canicorum pars prior Graece*, Göttingen, prostat in aedibus Dieterichianis Arnoldi Hoyer, 1883. Lagarde often followed in his edition the worst Mss.; restored some readings against all Mss.; did not prepare a critical apparatus; followed no clear principle in choosing among the variants; has mistakenly presupposed that the Mss. had the same affiliation through the whole Octateuch; see J. R. Busto Saiz, "El Texto Lucianico en el marco del pluralismo textual. Estado de la cuestión y perspectivas", *EE* 65 (1990) 6-7.

⁷ See Lagarde, *Librorum*, xv-xvi.

⁸ See C. Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum*, vol. II. *Complectens Libros Iosue, Iudicum, Ruth et Quatuor Regum*, Romae, Spithoever, 1864, 436; Wellhausen, *Der Text*, 221-223.

⁹ See A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus: Untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie*, Basel, in Kommission bei Jaeger & Kober, 1895, 80-84.

Rahlfs investigated the Lucianic text (1904-1911), and recognized as Lucianic also Ms. 127.¹⁰ According to Rahlfs there are no valid criteria to distinguish recensional readings of LXX^L from the base text, which was pre-Hexaplaric. The nature of the Lucianic text is difficult to describe, but it shows some tendencies: changes to make it a better Greek, and stylistic improvements; grammatical and syntactical corrections, word substitution by synonyms; harmonization of details according to the context; changes for easier comprehension; shortenings, mistakes; sporadic correction towards a Hebrew tradition.¹¹ There are irregularities in all these phenomena. Rahlfs also pointed out the lack of a clear principle in the recension.¹² He used early Church Fathers as pre-Lucianic witnesses, but he undervalued the importance of pre-Lucianic readings, among which the agreements between Josephus and LXX^L discussed in Mez's work.¹³ According to Rahlfs, Lucian corrected the Greek Mss. available to him (pre-Hexaplaric, close to *Codex Vaticanus*) according to MT. Although Rahlfs recognized the ancient variants present in Lucian's text, his reservations against the pre-Lucianic material strongly influenced the future research.

The next important step in the research of LXX^L in the books of Kingdoms (Sam-Kgs) was Brock's dissertation on 1 Sam (1966).¹⁴ While Rahlfs had emphasized double readings and corrections towards the Hebrew, Brock focused his study on linguistic and lexicographical characteristics of the Lucianic text.¹⁵ He affirms that the textual line on which LXX^L is based diverged from the rest of the tradition very early, probably during the 1st century CE. Therefore, distinctive characteristics of LXX^L are not necessarily linked to Lucian, but may derive from an independent textual tradition now lost. Despite the fact that there are early secondary variants in LXX^L, there is not enough evidence of a proto-Lucianic recension in 1 Sam, against Cross' theory (see below). There are at least three strata in LXX^L. The 1st stratum is probably early; the 2nd stratum includes readings from the fifth column of the Hexapla; the 3rd stratum includes readings excerpted from the other columns (notably the fourth, Symmachus). LXX^L contains a number of original readings lost in the rest of the tradition. Apart from stylistic and grammatical improvements, LXX^L was a text designed for public reading. In Brock's analysis, the Hexapla has a very central role and

¹⁰ See A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, vol. III. *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911, 15.

¹¹ See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* III, 176-186, 259-283.

¹² See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* III, 293.

¹³ See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* III, 83-92.

¹⁴ This thesis was published much later: S. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of I Samuel*, Torino, Silvio Zamorani, 1996.

¹⁵ See Brock, *The Recensions*, 224-299.

LXX^L is subordinated to it in his stemmatological analysis. Brock thinks that Barthélemy's high opinion of LXX^L goes too far (see below): LXX^L cannot be considered the original LXX in 1 Sam. Furthermore, Brock, in agreement with Rahlfs, thinks that Mez exaggerated the claims that Josephus' text is proto-Lucianic in character. OL agreements with LXX^L can be due to the use of the Lucianic Mss. by late correctors.¹⁶ Against Dörrie,¹⁷ LXX^L cannot be the result of the historical evolution of the text only, but constitutes a large scale recension.¹⁸ The grammatical and stylistic changes have to be contemporary or later than the Hexapla, for they include Hexaplaric material as well. This layer does not have to be separated from the modifications of the text for public reading. A final remark is that Brock did not use the Qumran material because of the lack of official publications at the time.

1.2. *Thackeray and the two translators of 1-4 Kingdoms*

We must now go back in time to follow the path of the discovery of καίγε. In 1907 Thackeray proposed to divide 1-4 Kingdoms in five parts: α = 1 Sam; ββ = 2 Sam 1,1-11,1; βγ = 2 Sam 11,2 – 1 Kgs 2,11; γγ = 1 Kgs 2,12-21,43; γδ = 1 Kgs 22 – 2 Kgs.¹⁹ According to Thackeray, the sections βγ and γδ present differences in the translation technique found in the other sections, and must be the product of a different translator, who produced a text more literal than the other parts. This translator was Palestinian, and displays an earlier stage of development of the tendency to literalism, further intensified in Aquila. The sections βγ and γδ are not earlier than 1st century BCE. Thackeray identified these sections with the so-called proto-Theodotion. Among the characteristics of these sections is the absence of the historical present, the use of καί γε for ׀א׀, ἐγώ εἰμι for ׀אני׀, and other lexical preferences. This multi-translator theory for 1-4 Kingdoms will be later abandoned by most scholars, but will also return in varied forms as will be seen.

¹⁶ See Brock, *The Recensions*, 204-219.

¹⁷ See H. Dörrie, "Zur Geschichte der Septuagint im Jahrhundert Konstantins", *ZNW* 39 (1940) 104-105.

¹⁸ Allen studied and described the features of LXX^L of Chronicles, and arrived at the same conclusion that LXX^L is a revision of an earlier textual form; see L. C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text*, vol. I. *The Translator's Craft*, Leiden, Brill, 1974, 65-75.

¹⁹ See H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings", *JThS* 8 (1907) 263-279.

1.3. *Dead Sea Scrolls and the discovery of kaiῃe*

New Hebrew textual witnesses to the books of Samuel have been found in Qumran (4QSam^{a/b/c}).²⁰ Cross in 1953 recognized the relationship between the recently found 4QSam^a and LXX and its *Vorlage*.²¹ Not only the new Hebrew witnesses broke with the former view that MT was “the” Hebrew text, but agreements between LXX and 4QSam^a have shown that many variants were not due to the Greek translator’s freedom in translating MT, but to a different Hebrew base text.²² The polemical procedure of retroversion from the Greek, often applied by 19th century scholars, was suddenly confirmed by the Qumran scrolls.²³

Another great impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Septuagint research relates to Barthélemy’s identification of a Greek recension in the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets Scroll (discovered in 1952). Barthélemy noticed in this scroll recensional traits similar to the features of the βγ and γδ sections of 1-4 Kingdoms.²⁴ Therefore, those sections are not the work of a different translator as proposed by Thackeray, but the result of a different stage in the recensional development of the text. It consists of a revision of the Greek towards a Hebrew text very close to MT, and whose

²⁰ I note in passing Rofé’s suggestion that 4Q51 (4QSam^a) is not a biblical scroll of the books of Samuel, but a new composition of midrashic nature, a proposal that has not been accepted by most scholars thus far; see A. Rofé, “Midrashic Traits in 4Q51 (so-called 4QSam^a)”, in P. Hugo–A. Schenker (ed.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*, Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2010, 75–88.

²¹ See F. M. Cross, “A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint”, *BASOR* 132 (1953) 15–26.

²² Likewise, 4QSam^b and 4QSam^c support many Septuagintal readings against MT, but also a few Lucianic readings against LXX *rell*; see F. M. Cross, “The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran”, *JBL* 74 (1955) 165, 171–172; F. M. Cross–D. W. Parry, “A Preliminary Edition of a Fragment of 4QSam^b (4Q52)”, *BASOR* 306 (1997) 63–74; E. C. Ulrich, “4QSam^c: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hay-yahad* (1 QS)”, *BASOR* 235 (1979) 1–25. However, since only 4QSam^a preserved fragments of the text of 2 Sam 10–12, object of this study, this is the textual witness that will receive more attention.

²³ See E. Tov, “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX”, in G. S. Brooke–B. Lindars (ed.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Studies: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Manchester 1990*, Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1992, 19.

²⁴ See D. Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante”, *RB* 60 (1953) 18–29; *Les devanciers d’Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète: trouvés dans le Désert de Juda, précédée d’une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l’influence du rabinat palestinien*, Leiden, Brill, 1963. According to Kraft, Barthélemy’s study had a great impact in four areas of research: the history of development of the Greek translations and recensions; the study of the Greek versions of the Minor Prophets; the study of translation technique; the study of the Greek texts of Sam-Kgs, comprising LXX^L and the Hexapla; see R. A. Kraft, “Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy’s *Devanciers*, Forty Years Later”, *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 4.

translation techniques are related to principles of rabbinic exegesis.²⁵ This textual tradition received the name of *καίγε*, according to one of its most characteristic features, and dates back to the 1st century CE. *Καίγε* can be found for Lamentations, Canticles, Ruth, Sam-Kgs, Judges, Daniel, Job, Jeremiah, Psalms, and the minor Prophets.²⁶ Barthélemy proposed initially that in the *καίγε* sections of Sam-Kgs the OG is actually preserved by the Lucianic text, the most faithful witness to the OG, even if not completely identified with it, just as Mss. Bha₂ are the best representatives of *καίγε*, but cannot be identified with it.²⁷ LXX^L may be closer to the OG in other sections as well, and its secondary features are due to Hexaplaric influence. Therefore, LXX^L is not a recensional text at all.²⁸ Barthélemy argued that there was no recension done by Lucian, the martyr; that is a myth. The sign *θ'* in the marginal notes in the *βγ* section of Ms. j and others does not refer to Theodotion, but to Theodoret. The explanation is that Origen's Hexapla had in the *βγ* section LXX^L in the sixth column (to Barthélemy, "la Septante ancienne") where it usually had Theodotion, and *καίγε* in the fifth. In speaking of the *Utlucian* Mez had already first noticed that the text of the sixth column was related both to Josephus and the Lucianic text.²⁹ Therefore, in Barthélemy's view, *θ'* in *βγ* is also witness to the OG.³⁰ OL was based on this Old Septuagint not yet touched by the Palestinian recension (*καίγε*). The same is valid for Josephus.

One of the problems in Barthélemy's analysis of LXX^L is that his focus is limited to the *βγ* section, missing other aspects of this textual tradition found in other books, as he will admit later.

Barthélemy's list of *καίγε* features partly repeats, and further expands Thackeray's description of the *βγ* and *γδ* sections of Sam-Kgs. After Barthélemy's pioneering work, other authors found additional characteristics of *καίγε*, increasing the list of its features; researchers have also identified and studied *καίγε* in other books.³¹

²⁵ See Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 31.

²⁶ See Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 47.

²⁷ See Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 125-126.

²⁸ See Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 127.

²⁹ See Mez, *Die Bibel*, 80-84.

³⁰ See Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, 131, 135-136.

³¹ S. M. Michael Smith, "Another Criterion for the *καίγε* Recension", *Bib* 48 (1967) 443-445; J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1968; J. A. Grindel, "Another Characteristic of the *Kaige* Recension: *בצח/νίκος*", *CBQ* 31 (1969) 499-513; K. G. O'Connell, *The Theodotianic 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; E. Tov, "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament: A Further Characteristic of the *Kaige*-Th. Revision?", *Textus* 8 (1973) 78-92; W. R. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments*, Chico, Scholars Press, 1980; H. Avalos, "ΔΕΥΠΟ/ΔΕΥΤΕ and the Imperatives of *חלף*: New Criteria for the 'Kaige' Recension of Reigns", *EstB* 47 (1989) 165-176. An extensive list of proposed *καίγε* features can be

Καίγε is not the work of a single reviser. This textual tradition is not identical in every OT book or section, nor is it monolithic or homogeneous. As a consequence, it is possible to find traits of καίγε which are peculiar to Sam-Kgs. On the other hand, it is also possible that features which are common to most of the καίγε texts throughout the OT do not apply to Sam-Kgs.

It has also been observed that some features of this textual tradition do not belong exclusively to καίγε but can be found in the original Greek translation of the Psalms. Καίγε has generalized the same translation technique to other OT books.³² Furthermore, for some books (Canticles, Lamentations, Ruth), καίγε is not a revision of a previous translation, but the OG itself, whereas in Job it may be an independent translation.³³ Therefore, καίγε is better described as a trend,³⁴ or a group of revisions/recensions or translations which share a few common features or translation techniques, and that touched not homogeneously a number of OT texts.

Despite Barthélemy's efforts to relate καίγε features to rabbinic exegesis, this association cannot always be sustained,³⁵ nor can the connection between Theodotion and καίγε (once called "proto-Theodotion")³⁶ be always maintained.

found in L. J. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*, Chico, Scholars Press, 1983, 269-273. There has been some criticism on the acceptance of some of these translation techniques as proper to καίγε; see D. G. Deboys, "Recensional Criteria in the Greek Text of II Kings", *JSS* 31/2 (1986) 135-139.

³² 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.

³³ See R. T. McLay, "Kaige and Septuagint Research", *Textus* 19 (1998) 128. This state of affairs has also to do with the fact underscored by Gentry that the OT books were translated through a long span of time; therefore, before all books have been translated, revisions of the existing translations were already being made; see P. J. Gentry, "Old Greek and Later Revisors: Can We Always Distinguish Them?", in A. Voita-J. Jokiranta (ed.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays in Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2008, 302.

³⁴ See J. W. Wevers, "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version", in M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, vol. I. *From the beginnings to the Middle Ages (until 1300)*. Part 1. Antiquity, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, 90.

³⁵ 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. In fact, as noted above, καίγε has not much to do with the application of principles of rabbinic exegesis, but with the more consistent use of a translation technique already present in the original LXX of some books.

³⁶ See, for example, how καίγε is synonym of Ur-Theodotion for Jellicoe; see S. Jellicoe, "Some Reflections on the KAIGE Recension", *VT* 23/1 (1973) 24.