

## PAUL KAHLE AS A SEPTUAGINT SCHOLAR\*

ANDREA RAVASCO, *Istituto Superiore di Scienze Religiose, Genoa /  
Facoltà Teologica di Sicilia, Palermo*

Paul Kahle, out of his prolific writings, dedicated a good number of works to the study of the Septuagint, linking his name to the theories about the origin of the Greek version of the Bible.<sup>1</sup>

Kahle has been the major exponent of the theory on the plural and targumic origin of the text.<sup>2</sup> Although it was disputed, this theory played a primary role in the study of the origin of the Septuagint. Furthermore, Kahle's name is linked to the theories on the second and fifth columns of Origen's Hexapla.

This article aims to present an overview of Paul Kahle as a Septuagint scholar.

---

\* I am grateful to Drew Longacre who corrected the English style of the article.

<sup>1</sup> 1) P. Kahle, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 88 (1915), pp. 399-439 [= *Opera Minora* (Leiden: Brill, 1956), pp. 3-37].

2) Id., "Die Septuaginta: Prinzipielle Erwägungen," in J. Fück (ed.), *Festschrift Otto Eissfeldt zum 60. Geburtstag* (Halle an der Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1947), pp. 161-180.

3) Id., "A leather scroll of the Greek Minor Prophets and the problem of the Septuagint," in *Opera Minora*, pp. 113-127 [= "Die August 1953 entdeckte Lederrolle mit dem griechischen Text der Kleinen Propheten und das Problem der Septuaginta," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 79 (1954), pp. 81-94].

4) Id., "Problems of the Septuagint," in K. Aland (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), pp. 328-342; reprinted in: S. Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York: Ktav, 1974), pp. 67-77.

5) Id., "The Greek Bible and the Gospels. Fragments from the Judaeen Desert," in Aland K. (ed.), *Studia Evangelica*. vol. 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959), pp. 613-621.

6) Id., "The Greek Bible Manuscripts used by Origen," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960), pp. 111-118.

7) Id., "Die von Origenes verwendeten griechischen Bibelhandschriften," in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, vol. IV (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1961), pp. 107-117.

8) Id., *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1947; 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1959); German edition: *Die Kairoer Geniza. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hebräischen Bibeltextes und seiner Übersetzungen* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962). If not expressly indicated, I quote this book from the first edition.

<sup>2</sup> For a summary of Kahle's theories see: N. Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta. Introduzione alle versioni greche della Bibbia* (Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia Supplementi 6; Brescia: Paideia, 2000), pp. 66-69; M. Harl - G. Dorival - O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des septante; du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: du Cerf, 1994), pp. 183-184; E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis - Assen: Fortress Press - Royal Van Gorcum, 2001)<sup>2</sup>, pp. 184 ff.; P.D. Wegner, *A Student's Guide to the Textual Criticism of the Bible* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2006), pp. 66-68; see also J.W. Wevers, "Proto-Septuagint Studies," in W.S. McCullough (ed.), *The Seed of Wisdom. Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek* (Toronto: Toronto Press, 1964), pp. 58-77.

## 1. Plural and Targumic Origin of the Septuagint

Paul Kahle published in 1915 the article *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes*, that deals successively with the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, and the Hebrew text. About the Septuagint he exposed for the first time his idea on the plural and targumic origin of the Greek text of the Bible.

He analyzed the quotations of the Old Testament in the New Testament, in particular in the speech of Stephan (Acts 7) and in the chapter 9 of the Letter to the Hebrews; he also pointed out the strong connections of these quotations with the Samaritan Pentateuch.

First of all, he considered the *Letter of Aristeas*. He believed that the Letter was written around 100 BCE, but it was a piece of propaganda written to support an “approved” version among many others rather than written for the original translation.<sup>3</sup> These “other versions” were born in the synagogues for liturgical reasons, as the Aramaic Targumim. Kahle suggested that in Egypt the various Jewish communities tried to present the biblical text in the Greek language. The resulting translations of parts of the Bible must have been different, perhaps also in terms of the Hebrew text on which these translations were based. The presence of such diverse translations must have been bothersome, as was the case of the Targums in Palestine. Thus a revision of this translation was made, and the result was essentially our Septuagint.<sup>4</sup>

He affirms in *The Cairo Geniza* that “the problems connected with the origin of the Septuagint can really be solved in the light of the facts concerning the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch.”<sup>5</sup> Thus the Septuagint would be an official, approved and unified revision born around the first century BCE. In Kahle’s opinion the *textus receptus* is the result of a critical reduction of “Vulgar texts” (see below) that has been made around 100 CE by the representatives of official Judaism in order to produce an old and reliable text form. The oldest translation of the Greek Pentateuch would preserve the old “vulgar text” – essentially preserved in the Samaritan Pentateuch – rather

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, pp. 136-137; Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 67; see also Wevers, *Proto-Septuagint Studies*, pp. 63 ff.; Wevers analyzes Kahle’s translation of Demetrius’ report to the king, and criticizes two clauses in which Kahle does not correctly renders the Greek terms *σεσήμανται* and *ἀμελέστερον*.

<sup>4</sup> Kahle, “Untersuchungen,” p. 12: “In den verschiedenen jüdischen Gemeinden Ägyptens wird man sich bemüht haben, den griechisch sprechenden Gemeindegliedern den Bibeltext in griechischer Sprache darzubieten. Die so entstehenden Übersetzungen von Teilen der Bibel werden verschieden gewesen sein im Wortlaut der Übersetzung, vielleicht auch hinsichtlich des hebräischen Textes, der diesen Übersetzungen zugrunde lag. Das Vorhandensein so verschiedenartiger Übersetzungen wird man als störend empfunden haben, um so mehr, als z. B. in Ägypten die griechische Bibelübersetzung in viel größerem Umfange noch dem Volke das Original ersetzen musste, als das bei den Targumen in Palästina der Fall war. So wurde eine Revision dieser Übersetzung vorgenommen, und das Ergebnis war - so müssen wir schließen - im wesentlichen unsere Septuaginta. Ich glaube sogar, dass der Aristeasbrief noch eine Bestätigung dafür bietet.”

<sup>5</sup> Id., *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 137.

than the *Vorlage* of our Septuagint. And the *Vorlage* of our Septuagint would be essentially identical with that “model codex” that the Egyptian Jews received around 100 BCE from Jerusalem.<sup>6</sup>

Parts of these previous translations, according to Kahle, survived: The divergent forms of earlier texts have not completely disappeared. One can find traces of them in the so-called “recensions” of the Christian “Septuagint”; in quotations from the Greek Old Testament which we find in the New Testament and in other writings of the first centuries; in older translations made from the Greek Bible, such as Isidore’s treatise *De fide catholica contra Judaeos*; in the remains of Hexapla; in Philo and Josephus.<sup>7</sup>

As mentioned above, the Samaritan Pentateuch should witness to an older text of the Pentateuch,<sup>8</sup> and the different texts of Judges or Daniel the “Ur-text” of two different translations.<sup>9</sup>

Finally he wrote that, despite all the warnings of the *Letter of Aristeas*, the translation has been continuously corrected. The historical realities of the period between the origin of this translation and the oldest extant manuscripts had considerable influence on the text. Although the Jews originally considered the translators almost inspired (an idea which continued even after the *Letter of Aristeas*), they eventually completely abandoned this idea. They did not agree with the new text and created new translations. Thus everything that we have received from the Septuagint was derived from Christian circles.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Id., “Untersuchungen,” p. 35: “Mir erscheint für das Verständnis der alttestamentlichen Textgeschichte grundlegend zu sein die Erkenntnis, dass unser *textus receptus* überhaupt erst das Ergebnis einer kritischen Reduktion des Vulgärtextes darstellt, die um 100 n. Chr. von den Vertretern des offiziellen Judentums vorgenommen worden ist. Man hat sich bei dieser Bearbeitung bemüht, eine alte und zuverlässige Textgestalt herzustellen. Für diese Bearbeitung hat man alte Handschriften benutzt. Mit Hilfe dieser Handschriften hat man alte Lesarten und Formen, die in den sonst kursierenden Texten längst beseitigt waren, wieder hergestellt, Zusätze im Texte ausgeschieden, Aramaismen getilgt. Manches in den alten Handschriften wird unendlich gewesen sein;” p. 19: “Für die älteste griechische Pentateuchübersetzung ergäbe sich dann als Resultat, dass sie dem alten Vulgärtext, wie er sich im wesentlichen im Pentateuch der Samaritaner noch erhalten hat, näher gestanden hat, als die Vorlage unserer Septuaginta. Und die Vorlage unserer Septuaginta wäre identisch im wesentlichen mit jenem Musterkodex, den die ägyptischen Juden um 100 v. Chr. aus Jerusalem bezogen haben.” Cf. the summary of Tov, *Textual Criticism*, p. 184: “various translations were originally attempted, which only at a later stage were revised into the form now known to us through the uncial manuscripts of his translation.”

<sup>7</sup> Kahle, “Untersuchungen,” p. 36; Id., *The Cairo Geniza*, pp. 176 ff.; cf. Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 95.

<sup>8</sup> Kahle, “Untersuchungen,” p. 37.

<sup>9</sup> Id., *The Cairo Geniza*, pp. 156 ff.; for the critic to this view see Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 96.

<sup>10</sup> “Die Ansichten über Vollkommenheit einer Übersetzung und des ihr zugrunde liegenden Urtextes sind in den verschiedenen Zeiten verschieden. Trotz aller Warnungen des Aristeasbriefes ist an dieser Übersetzung fortdauernd korrigiert worden. Insbesondere sind die geschichtlichen Tatsachen, die zwischen der Entstehung dieser Übersetzung und den ältesten Handschriften, die wir von ihr haben, liegen, nicht ohne erheblichen Einfluss auf sie gewesen. Die Juden, in deren Kreisen sie entstanden ist, die zuerst – über den Aristeasbrief hinausgehend – die Übersetzer geradezu für inspiriert gehalten haben, hatten sie längst vollkommen

Again in *The Cairo Geniza* he writes:

“We may try to edit the Jewish standard text of the Greek Tora. But can we possibly regard such a text as an ‘Urtext’ – a text from which all existing texts have to be derived? A standard text of a translation is always found at the *end* of the development, never at the *beginning*. [...] [T]here can no be doubt that the standard text of the Greek Tora was preceded by divergent forms of earlier translations.”<sup>11</sup>

## 2. The “Vulgärtexte”

In the *Untersuchungen* again Kahle identified the *Vulgärtexte*, a theory with reference to the Hebrew text of the Bible that he developed in other articles. A short explanation is in order. A vulgar text, or “popular text,” is a text that facilitated reading; as E. Tov explains, is a text “whose writers approached the biblical text in a free manner inserting changes of various kinds, including orthography.”<sup>12</sup>

For example, according to Kahle:

“The Samaritan text is in the main a popular revision of an older text, in which antiquated forms and constructions, not familiar to people of later times, were replaced by forms and constructions easier to be understood, difficulties were removed, parallel passages were inserted.”<sup>13</sup>

He was convinced, since 1915, that the Samaritan Pentateuch witnesses a text very close to the *Vulgärtexte*.<sup>14</sup>

For the Hebrew Bible, according to him the *Textus Receptus* firstly represents the result of a critical reduction of the *Vulgärtexte* that was made around 100 CE by the representatives of official Judaism.<sup>15</sup> Strictly speaking, Kahle never used the term *Vulgärtexte* about the history of the Septuagint; but he explains a similar process for the Septuagint. As told above, in Kahle’s view the Septuagint was unified around the beginning of the first century BCE:

---

aufgegeben. Sie stimmte nicht zu dem neuen Texte, der um 100 n. Chr. für das orthodoxe Judentum massgebend geworden ist. Auf Grund dieses Textes haben sie sich neue Übersetzungen geschaffen. So stammt alles, was wir von der LXX erhalten haben, aus christlichen Kreisen”: Kahle, “Untersuchungen,” p. 17.

<sup>11</sup> Id., *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 175.

<sup>12</sup> Tov, *Textual Criticism*, p. 185.

<sup>13</sup> Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 148.

<sup>14</sup> “Es ergibt sich somit, dass der Grundtext, der für griechische Pentateuchhandschriften vorauszusetzen ist, die von Philo und neutestamentlichen Schriftstellern gebraucht worden sind, dem alten uns im wesentlichen im Pentateuch der Samaritaner erhaltenen Vulgärtext näher gestanden hat, als die Vorlage der LXX, auf die wir aus den uns erhaltenen Handschriften schließen können”: Kahle, “Untersuchungen,” pp. 18-19; cf. *Ibi*, p. 19.

<sup>15</sup> Kahle, “Untersuchungen,” p. 35.

“For the Greek Tora the Jews in Alexandria had created a standard text in the so-called ‘Septuagint’. In spite of this standard text many other forms of the Greek Tora were used by the Jews and early Christians [...]”<sup>16</sup>

### 3. *The Lucianic Text*

Kahle dealt with the Septuagint again in 1941, during the *Schweich Lectures of the British Academy* that were published in his famous book *The Cairo Geniza* in 1947.<sup>17</sup> He confirmed his ideas on the targumic origin of the Septuagint and on the *Letter of Aristeas* as a script of propaganda. He pointed out other aspects of the Septuagint, such as the Chester Beatty Papyrus, Josephus’ quotations from the Bible or the Lucianic recension. This last point in my opinion is worthy further consideration. Kahle quotes H.St J. Thackeray, A. Mez and S.R. Driver and, briefly summarizing, one can say that he defends their suggestions: The historical books, Josephus, *Vetus Latina*, and Peshitta can be regarded as sources for a primitive text of Lucian in the first and second Christian centuries; Kahle specifies that this view is in contrast with that of A. Rahlfs according to which a few scattered readings of Lucian might be of greater antiquity, not the text of Lucian in general, and some of these older Lucianic readings may have been influenced by Josephus. Kahle asserted that “there can be no doubt that the quotations of Josephus from these historical books are in agreement with the text of Lucian,”<sup>18</sup> and that “Lucian based the text created by him on a form of the Greek Bible which was in existence some centuries before him.”<sup>19</sup>

### 4. *Theodotion*

Only a mention about this topic is due. As told above, Kahle in *The Cairo Geniza* mentioned the Theodotionic text in Daniel in order to support his idea on the targumic origin of the Septuagint. He suggests that the text revised by Theodotion was an “earlier translation,” different from the text which became later known as “Septuagint” the standard text of the Christian Church. Theodotion did not alter materially the text of the earlier translation when he adapted it to the authoritative Hebrew text.<sup>20</sup> This fact is another witness, according to Kahle, of the targumic origin of the Greek text of the Bible, because Theodotion did not replace transliterated Hebrew

<sup>16</sup> Id., *The Cairo Geniza*, pp. 149-150.

<sup>17</sup> Kahle published part of these lectures also in the *Festschrift Otto Eissfeldt*, 1947 (see n. 1).

<sup>18</sup> Id., *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 154.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibi.*, p. 155.

<sup>20</sup> Id., *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 169.

words by Greek translations, and did not need to fear that the Jews might not understand them.<sup>21</sup>

### 5. *The Twelve Minor Prophets fragments*

In 1953 D. Barthélemy published the fragments of the Minor Prophets from Naḥal Ḥever.<sup>22</sup> In 1954 Kahle supported his ideas with the same scrolls identified by D. Barthélemy.<sup>23</sup> He published both in German and English an article in which he criticizes the paleographical dating given by Barthélemy on the basis of private communications with Mr. C.H. Roberts of Oxford,<sup>24</sup> and consequently suggests that the scroll testifies to a Greek text of the Bible written by Jews and for Jews, not by Christians such as the Chester Beatty Papyrus.<sup>25</sup> By comparison of the scroll with other fragments (the Aquila fragment from the Cairo Geniza, the John Rylands Papyrus Greek 458, and the Cairo Papyrus Fouad 266), Kahle interprets the variants as witness of the plural origin.

In the articles *Problems of the Septuagint* in 1957 and *The Greek Bible and the Gospels* in 1959<sup>26</sup> he revisits this data and confirms this idea.

In the first one Kahle points out that the text of the scroll is in the main identical with the text given in the quotations from the Old Testament by Justin the Martyr, in particular Micah 4:1-17. Since the Septuagint text quoted by Justin has a Lucianic character and deviates from the Codex Vaticanus, and we find the same text of the Greek Bible together with readings known from the later Greek translations – which had been used by Origen in his Hexapla – in a Codex written by a Jew about 300 years before Origen, the Greek Bible used by the Jews at the time of the beginning of Christianity was not at all a uniform text as supposed by Lagarde.<sup>27</sup> So, “the ancient Christians used texts of the Greek Bible which had already been adapted to the Hebrew original by the Jews in pre-Christian times.”<sup>28</sup> Thus Lucian, and Theodotion as well, should have revised not the Septuagint, but other old translations.<sup>29</sup>

In the second article Kahle deals with three Greek fragments from Qumran, cave 4. After the analysis of the variants, he affirms that the Septuagint

<sup>21</sup> *Ibi.*, p. 170.

<sup>22</sup> D. Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante,” *Revue Biblique* 60 (1953), pp. 18-29.

<sup>23</sup> P. Kahle, “Die im August 1952 entdeckte Lederrolle,” reprinted in English in 1956; I refer to the English edition.

<sup>24</sup> “We must therefore suppose that the scroll is about 50-100 years older than Barthélemy has suggested,” *i.e.* to the century 50 B.C. to 50 A.D., p. 113.

<sup>25</sup> Kahle supports the Jewish origin of the scroll also by the fact that the tetragrammaton was written not only in Hebrew letters, but in ancient Hebrew letters.

<sup>26</sup> This paper corresponds to the paper given in 1957 (see n. 1).

<sup>27</sup> Kahle, “Problems of the Septuagint,” pp. 332 ff.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibi.*, pp. 333.

<sup>29</sup> Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 67.

is the result of a “Bible Commission which fulfilled its task like a modern Bible Commission”<sup>30</sup> reaching a uniform text. Thus, the old fragments we have, must not to be regarded as corrections of the text of the Septuagint, but as “specimens of previous translations on which the work of the Bible Commission set up in Alexandria was based.”<sup>31</sup>

## 6. Origen and the Hexapla

As told above, Kahle dealt with Origen’s Hexapla. In accordance with his targumic hypothesis on the origin of the Septuagint, in his opinion the fifth column was taken from preexisting Jewish texts. An explanation is in order. Giovanni Mercati, in an article published in 1947,<sup>32</sup> suggested that the transcribed text of the *Secunda* (i.e. the Bible text written in Greek letters) was made either by Origen himself or at his behest.<sup>33</sup> Also, according to Mercati, Origen inserted in the *Quinta* the Septuagint “of common use” (or a quite official text) without asterisks or obeli, because in the palimpsest that he discovered in Milan in 1894 he did not find signs.<sup>34</sup>

Kahle agreed with Mercati’s view. According to him, Origen did not use diacritical signs and affirmed: “We can, I believe, be quite certain that neither in the Hexapla nor in the Tetrapla did the LXX column have any diacritical signs.”<sup>35</sup> Additionally, according to Kahle, since Origen in the Septuagint column of his Hexapla wrote the name of God in Hebrew square script, he must have copied a Jewish manuscript also in the *Quinta* just as in the other columns (*Secunda*, Aquila and Symmachus). Kahle points out: “That there were Christian Septuagint manuscripts in Origen’s time in which the name of God was written in Hebrew square letters is directly contrary to all that we otherwise know.”<sup>36</sup>

About the *Secunda*, Kahle quotes Melito of Sardis’ homily “Passover and Passion,” written in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century.<sup>37</sup> Melito writes: “The book of the Hebrew Exodus has been read and the words of the Mystery have been explained, how the Lamb was slain and the people saved.” According to Kahle Melito witnesses the necessity for many of the Jews to use a Greek transcription for the public reading of the Old Testament. Thus this would be the evidence for Hebrew texts transliterated before Origen.

<sup>30</sup> Kahle, “The Greek Bible,” p. 619.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibi*, p. 619.

<sup>32</sup> G. Mercati, “Il problema della colonna II dell’Esaplo,” *Biblica* 28 (1947), pp. 1-30, 173-215; reprinted in *Opere Minori* VI (Studi e Testi 296; Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1984), pp. 223-293.

<sup>33</sup> Quote by Kahle, “The Greek Bible Manuscripts,” pp. 113 ff.

<sup>34</sup> Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 213.

<sup>35</sup> Kahle, “The Greek Bible Manuscripts,” p. 116.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibi*, pp. 116-117.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibi*, p. 114.

## 7. Conclusion

We can summarize as follows the results of Kahle's theories, quoting his *The Cairo Geniza*. First of all he obviously did not agree with Paul de Lagarde:

“There can be no doubt that the principles laid down by Paul de Lagarde for the study of the ‘Septuagint’ mark an important step in the progress of Septuagint textual criticism. Lagarde was right in demanding that methods approved in other branches of philology should be applied to work on the Greek Bible. But he did not realize the necessary difference between editing an original text and editing a translation.”<sup>38</sup>

Building on the above, he wrote again: “He (*i.e.* de Lagarde) (...) tried to arrive at an “Urtext” even when he knew and acknowledged that we have different translations in the manuscripts. Can we ever arrive at such an ‘Urtext’?”.<sup>39</sup> According to Kahle this was impossible. What, then, is the goal of the Septuagint scholar? In the second edition of *The Cairo Geniza* he wrote:

“The task which the Septuagint presents to scholars is not the ‘reconstruction’ of an imaginary ‘Urtext’ nor the discovery of it, but a careful collection and investigation of all the remains and traces of earlier versions of the Greek Bible which differed from the Christian standard text.”<sup>40</sup>

Third, as told above, the Septuagint should be the revised and adapted text for the use of Christian readers, and by copying this text again and again the Church came into possession of a standard text: “The Jews had a standard text for no other part of the Greek Bible. It was the Christian Church which needed a ‘canonical’ text of the whole Bible.”<sup>41</sup>

One century after the publication of the *Untersuchungen* what can one say about Kahle's theory on the Septuagint?

Among his pupils, Alexander Sperber followed his teacher's way, whereas Peter Katz abandoned his theories. The positions and methodology of the Lagardian school of Septuagint criticism have been followed and defended – although not to the extreme – and modified in some aspects, by Septuagint scholars. In particular, the Lagardian system is the basis of the Göttingen critical editions. Kahle's theories have been criticized by scholars, briefly summarized here.

About the plural and targumic origin of the Septuagint, E. Tov and N. Fernández Marcos point out that we do not have sufficient elements to sup-

<sup>38</sup> Id., *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 174.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibi*, p. 175.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibi*, p. 264, quoted by Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 68, n. 5.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibi*, p. 175.



port either the targumic or the plural origin of the Septuagint.<sup>42</sup> In particular about the plural origin, quoting Fernández Marcos, the Septuagint became the Bible of the Christians only after the II century CE; furthermore, although the fluidity of the biblical text is undoubted, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament quotations show that this fluidity existed before the fixation of the consonantal text, i.e. before 100 CE.

About the targumic origin, although the Jewish hermeneutic influences the Septuagint, the targumic elements are only hinted at in the Greek version of the Bible, especially in comparison with the Aramaic Targums.<sup>43</sup>

As far as the Lucianic text is concerned, we can summarize as follows. Whereas according to Rahlfs the Lucianic text depends on the text of the Septuagint, i.e. the Codex Vaticanus and those manuscripts that follow the same textual tradition,<sup>44</sup> we know today, after the study of D. Barthélemy,<sup>45</sup> that in the historical books the Lucianic or Antiochene text witnesses the Old Greek text.<sup>46</sup> Thus Kahle correctly understood the relationship between the Lucianic text and Josephus,<sup>47</sup> but, according to Fernández Marcos,<sup>48</sup> the proto-Lucianic text was made around the first century C.E. by the Jews in Antioch. Thus, the Lucianic text is far from testifying to the plural origin of the Septuagint as supported by Kahle.

Furthermore Septuagint scholars followed not only the Lagardian system, but also the interpretation of D. Barthélemy on the Twelve Minor Prophets fragments. These fragments would witness a revision that attempts to correct the Greek text with a text similar to the "Proto-Masoretic" Hebrew text,<sup>49</sup> and contains an early revision of the Septuagint (named *kaige* by Barthélemy and ascribed to Theodotion).<sup>50</sup> This fragments, according to Fernández Marcos,<sup>51</sup> testify to a recensional activity before Origen, within the Jewish communities, older than the Jewish-Christians dispute; then this is in contrast with Kahle's theory.

However Kahle, with his debate with de Lagarde, had the great role to introduce in the Septuagint scholarship the interest for the Proto-Septuagint.

---

<sup>42</sup> Tov, *Textual Criticism*, pp. 184-185; Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, pp. 68 ff., 76 ff., 110.

<sup>43</sup> Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 110.

<sup>44</sup> A. Rahlfs, *Lucian Rezension der Königbücher* (Septuaginta Studien 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), p. 190 quoted by P.A. Torijano, "The Two Parallel Texts of the List of Solomon's Officials: 3 Reigns 4:2-6 and 2:46<sup>b</sup>," *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 46 (2013), pp. 58-71, p. 58.

<sup>45</sup> D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

<sup>46</sup> Torijano, "The Two Parallel Texts," p. 59, n. 5 for further bibliography.

<sup>47</sup> See e.g. E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 19; Missoula: Scholar Press, 1978).

<sup>48</sup> Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 233.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibi*, pp. 83 ff.; see lastly C. Martone (ed.), *Lettere di Bar Kokhba* (Brescia: Paidea, 2012), pp. 83 ff., who summarizes and offers the bibliography on the argument.

<sup>50</sup> Tov, *Textual Criticism*, p. 145.

<sup>51</sup> Fernández Marcos, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, p. 83.

Not only this, but he also stimulated the scholarship on the “double texts” of Joshua and Daniel, which he mentioned but did not study in detail. One can say that the problem of the Proto-Theodotion born with A. Schmitt and continued by J.A. Montgomery, or the studies of A. Díez Macho on the Targums, found the impulse in the theories of Kahle. Scholars such as Montgomery, Margolis, Rahlfs, Ziegler, Wevers and others, confirmed and corrected de Lagarde’s theories, but we can say that Paul Kahle, although contradicted by scholars, was a milestone for scholarship on the origin of the Septuagint, stimulating a lot of aspects on this regard.