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In 1952 Bedouin discovered the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr), a manuscript dating near the end of the first century BCE.¹ Soon thereafter Dominique Barthélemy designated the text as kaige, given its tendency (e.g., in Zech 9:2) to translate וַגָם (also) as καίγε (even; at least).² Kaige clearly intended to revise the Old Greek (hereafter OG) into closer conformity with a proto-Masoretic Vorlage.³ Barthélemy also postulated the equivalence of kaige and Quinta, the “fifth” translation—besides the LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion—occasionally preserved in the Hexapla.⁴ This position

This essay furthers my argument in “The Reconstruction of Kaige/Quinta Zechariah 9,9,” ZAW 126 (2014): 584–88. That was my first peer-reviewed publication, and Leonard Greenspoon graciously provided such helpful feedback on it; I am honored to dedicate this essay to him. I thank Emanuel Tov, Kristin De Troyer, and Michaël N. van der Meer, as well as David Leonhardt for offering helpful comments and corrections for this essay.

³ Robert A. Kraft (review of Dominique Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d’Aquila, Gnomon 37 [1965]: 474–83, here 477) initially questioned whether the kaige scroll would show systematic dependence on the OG. This question has been answered affirmatively; see Tov, Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 102–6, 145–53. On the term “proto-Masoretic,” see Tov’s essay in this volume.
gained initial acceptance, but subsequent scholars have questioned it. This essay vindicates Barthélemy’s conclusion.

The essay divides into four parts. First, I give examples of lesser and greater extents of kaige’s revision of the OG. Second, I discuss Justin Martyr’s use of kaige for the Minor Prophets. Sometimes Justin quoted kaige verbatim, but at other times he conflated it with the OG. Third, I reexamine the relationship between kaige and Quinta. Based on the extant evidence from Justin, Origen, and Jerome, one can reasonably conclude that kaige and Quinta were the same in the Dodekapropheton. The prevailing counterargument contends that kaige influenced Quinta no more than kaige also influenced Justin, the Coptic versions, Codex W, and Aquila.

The concluding section shows this argument to be specious by weighing internal and external evidence.

**Kaige’s Revision of the Old Greek**

This section presents three examples of kaige’s revision of the OG. Sometimes kaige bears relatively little resemblance to the OG, but at other times kaige follows the OG closely. Kaige Hab 2:18 remains very close to the OG, which reads, “What is the use of a carving, for he

---

5 Kraft, review of Barthélemy, 477.


8 The OG text is from Ziegler, Duodecim prophetae (see n. 4 above).
carved it? He shaped it, an image, a false fantasy. For the shaper trusts in his shape when making dumb idols.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OG Hab 2:18</th>
<th>8HevXIIgr Hab 2:18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τί ὕφελεξι γλυπτόν, ὅτι ἐγινευν αὐτό; ἐπλασεν αὐτό χῶνεμα, φαντασιαν ψευδῆ, ὅτι πέποιθεν ὁ πλάσας ἐπὶ τὸ πλάσμα αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποιησαι εἴδωλα κωφά.</td>
<td>τί ὕφελεξι γλυπτόν, ὅτι [ἐγινευν] αὐτό; ὁ πλάσας αὐτό χῶνεμα [καὶ φαντασιαν ψευδῆ, ὅτι πέποιθεν ὁ πλάσας ἐπὶ τὸ πλάσμα αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ [π]οιησαι εἴδωλα κωφά.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kaiige* changes the tense of ὕφελέω (benefit) from the present or imperfect to the aorist to match the perfect aspect of the Hebrew. *Kaiige* changes the finite verb ἐπλασεν (he shaped) to the participle ὁ πλάσας (the shaper); these represent different vocalizations of ר طويلة, but *kaiige* reads incoherently, “the shaper it an image.” Before the infinitive ποιησαι (to make), *kaiige* changes the definite article (τοῦ) to ἐπ’ αὐτό (in it) based on ἔρχόμε (unto it or unto himself). The OG and *kaiige* have in common φαντασίαν, which would reflect ἀρνήμα (appearance) rather than the MT’s פמיד (teacher), and *kaiige* adds καί. The Coptic versions and Codex W are nearly identical to the OG in this instance, and they show no influence from *kaiige.*

Vis-à-vis the OG, Hab 2:7 shows slightly more variation than the preceding example. *Kaiige* Hab 2:7 reads, “Will not the ones who bite you suddenly arise, and will not the ones who shake you sober up, and you will be booty to them?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OG Hab 2:7</th>
<th>8HevXIIgr Hab 2:7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὅτι ἐξαίφνης ἀναστήσονται δάκνοντες αὐτόν, καὶ ἐκνήψουσιν οἱ ἐπίβουλοι σου, καὶ ἐσῃ εἰς διαρπαγήν αὐτοῖς.</td>
<td>οὐχὶ ἐξαίφνης ἀναστήσονται δάκνοντες σε, καὶ ἐγνήσουσιν οἱ σαλεύοντες σε, καὶ ἐσῃ εἰς διαρπαγάς αὐτοῖς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the OG the verse is a statement, which *kaiige* turns into a question, as in the Hebrew. That is, *kaiige* changes δι (for) to οὐχι (not), which more closely matches ק닐 (is it not?). *Kaiige* also changes αὐτόν (him) to σε (you), which matches the Hebrew suffix. *Kaiige* changes οἱ ἐπίβουλοι σου (your schemers) to οἱ σαλεύοντες σε (the ones who shake you), which matches תועש. *Kaiige* changes the singular διαρπαγήν (booty) to plural, as in the Hebrew. Both the OG

---

9 In Hab 2:18 Codex W is identical to the OG except for plural verbs ἐγινευν and ἐπλασεν; the Achmimic and Bohairic versions also have the plural ἐπλασεν, and there is no comparative data for Aquila.
and kaige understand נָעַשׁ as plural (see GKC §103.2.a). Once again, the Coptic versions and Codex W are nearly identical to the OG, despite kaige’s more substantial revisions.\(^\text{10}\)

Compared to the OG, nearly every word of kaige Hab 3:14 is changed. In this instance, kaige looks like an independent translation: “You cut in two with his staffs a head of his unfortified areas; they will be shaken to scatter us—their exultation just like a poor man eating in secret.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OG Hab 3:14</th>
<th>8HevXIIgr Hab 3:14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>διέκοψεις ἐν ἐκστάσει κεφαλάς δυναστῶν, σεισθήσονται ἐν αὐτή· διανοίξουσι χαλινοὺς αὐτῶν ὡς ἔσθων πτωχὸς λάθρα.</td>
<td>διέτρησας ἐν ῥάβδος αὐτ对其真实 κεφαλὴν ἄτειχος· διακόπτοις καθως ἔσθων πτωχὸν κρυφῇ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opening word of kaige, διέτρησας, means to pierce, which accords with the Hebrew פסח, as compared with the synonymous διακόπτω (cut through) in the OG. Kaige not only corrects the odd word ἐκστάσει (ecstasy) to ῥάβδος for פסח (staff) but also adds the possessive αὐτῶν, which is present in the Hebrew. Kaige makes head singular, and the meaning is a chief of the unfortified areas (ἀτείχοςτοι), which reflects the Hebrew פֶּרֶשׁ (open country); the MT’s פֶּרֶשׁ is dubious, and the BDB renderings warriors or leaders are simply based on the OG’s δύνασται (masters, from δύναμα). Kaige’s “to scatter us—their exultation” (σκορπίσαι ἡμᾶς τὸ γαύριαμα αὐτῶν) matches the OG’s “they will open their bridles” (διανοίξουσι χαλινοὺς αὐτῶν) is peculiar. Kaige here prefers καθός (just like) to ὡς (like), and it spells eating ἔσθων rather than ἔσθων. Kaige prefers κρυφῇ to λάθρᾳ, both of which mean secretly, and it reflects the poor man in the accusative (πτωχὸς/πτωχὸν).\(^\text{11}\) In Hab 3:14 Codex W matches the OG verbatim, and the Coptic here shows no influence from kaige. Aquila’s purported rendering (τοῦ

---

\(^\text{10}\) In Hab 2:7, instead of ἐκνηψονοῦσιν, Codex W has a solecism ἐκνήψοντα, which is simply influenced by the ending of ἀναστήσοντα on the line directly above; there is no comparative data for Aquila or the Coptic.

\(^\text{11}\) Literally someone is secretly eating the poor man, as Harper (Responding to a Puzzled Scribe, 253) points out. However, I assume that 8HevXIIgr intends καθός ἔσθων πτωχὸν κρυφῇ. It is not unusual to inflect similes in the accusative, and at least once 8HevXIIgr writes omicron for omega, namely Hab 1:8 (see Tov, Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 144); moreover, there is no direct object marker (ἢ) before ἔστω.
διασκορπίσαι [με]· γαυριάματα αὖτῶν τοῦ φαγεῖν πένητας ἀποκρύφως) nowhere matches kaige.12

These three verses exemplify greater and lesser extents of kaige’s revision of the OG. In the OG, these verses contain fifty-three words (including articles), and kaige made twelve changes, none of which influenced Aquila, Codex W, or the Coptic versions. To be sure, kaige influenced these texts elsewhere, yet here these witnesses do not match kaige’s thoroughgoing revision of the OG. More particularly, Codex W and the Coptic versions clearly remain in the OG’s textual tradition, whereas kaige is readily identifiable as a distinct—albeit dependent—tradition.13

Justin Martyr’s Use of Kaige

This section explains Justin Martyr’s use of kaige. Scholars had long known that Justin Martyr’s Old Testament quotations do not always match the OG.14 One of Justin’s longest quotations in Dialogue with Trypho is of Micah 4:1–7, which mentions beating swords into ploughshares. Upon discovery of 8ḤevXIIgr, Barthélemy identified kaige as the source of Justin’s quotation. Given its significance, I will explain it in detail.

There are several inconsequential differences between the OG and Codex W,15 and there are a few inconsequential differences between 8ḤevXIIgr and Justin.16 The more substantial

12 Field, Origen Hexapla, 2:1010, there citing Bernard de Montfaucon’s reference to Codex Coislinianus.
14 The Greek text of Justin’s works is from Edgar J. Goodspeed, Die ältesten Apologeten: Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914).
15 In Mic 4:1 Codex W has αὐτὸν rather than αὐτό. In v. 2 W adds ἐπ’ αὐτό after πορεύονται, has dittography of τὴν before δῦον, and says the law and word of God (θεοῦ) rather than Lord (κυρίου). In v. 3 W has ὡς (as) rather than ἦς (until); adds land (γῆν) to clarify faraway (μακράν); and has ἐπὶ (at) rather than εἰς (into) before plows (ἄρωτα). In v. 7 W uses ἀπερήμωσαν (thrown away) rather than ἀπωσιμένην (driven away), and W describes the nation as capable (δυνατόν) rather than strong (ἰσχυρόν).
16 8ḤevXIIgr uses an initial sigma for ζηβύνας and [ἐ]φ’ rather than ἐπ’ before ἔθνος in v. 3; the scroll elsewhere shows this tendency to aspirate. 8ḤevXIIgr also uses plural [καθίσ]ονται rather than singular in v. 4.
differences between 8HevXIIgr and Justin are as follows. In Micah 4:3 Justin’s shortened ἀρη (raise up) is idiosyncratic; ἀντάρη/ἀνθάρη (raise up against) would be the original reading.

Similarly, the OG and 8HevXIIgr align against Justin’s anarthrous στόμα (mouth) in v. 4, and there Justin’s infinitive ἔσται (to be) is likely influenced by the OG, since 8HevXIIgr uses the finite ἔστιν. In v. 5 Justin’s plural gods is as likely as 8HevXIIgr’s singular—“in the name of their god(s);” Justin and kaige use the plural “their” (αὐτῶν), whereas the Hebrew uses the singular possessive “his god(s)” (יְהוָה). Justin likely omitted “says the Lord” in v. 6; λέγει πᾶς is included in Tov’s reconstruction of 8HevXIIgr.

| OG Micah 4:1–7 | 1 καὶ ἦσται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τὸν ἡμερὸν ἐμφανές τὸ ὅρος τοῦ κυρίου, ἔτομον ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὄρων, καὶ μετεωριθήσεται ὑπέρανον τῶν βουνῶν· καὶ σπεύσοισι πρὸς αὐτὸ λαοί, 2 καὶ πορεύσονται ἐδήν πολλὰ καὶ ἐρούσι Δεὺτε ἀναβώμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακωβ, καὶ διεξούσιν ἡμῖν τὴν ὅδον αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορευόμεθα ἐν ταῖς τριβίσις αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἐκ Σιων ἐξελέγωσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ. 3 καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνά μέσον λαὸν πολλὸν καὶ ἐλέγξει ἑδήν ἱσχυρά ἐως εἰς μακρὰν, καὶ κατακόψωσι τὰς βομβαίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄρτρα καὶ τὰ δόρατα [cf. W: τὰς ζύβνας] αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ ἄνταρη [cf. W: ἀνήθηρ'] ἠδος ἐπ’ ἑδὸν ῥυμαίαν, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ ἀθάνωσι πολμέν. 4 καὶ ἀναφάσεται ἐκάστος ὑπόκατο ἀμέλεου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκάστος ὑπόκατο σκῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἦσται ὁ ἐκφόβος, διότι τὸ στόμα κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐλάλησε ταῦτα. 5 ὅτι πάντες οἱ λαοί πορεύσονται ἐκάστος τὴν ὅδον αὐτοῦ, ἡμὲς δὲ πορευόμεθα ἐν ὄνοματι κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα, 6 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνῃ, λέγει κύριος, συνάγω τὴν συντετριμμένην καὶ τὴν ἐξωσμένην εἰσόδεμαι καὶ οὐς ἀποσάμην· 7 καὶ θήσομαι τὴν συντετριμμένην εἰς ὑπόλειμα καὶ τὴν ἀποσμένην εἰς ἑδὸν ἱσχυρόν, καὶ βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἐν ὅρει Σιων ἀπὸ τοῦ νόου καὶ ἔως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. |
| Justin Martyr Dial. 109.2–3 | 1 καὶ ἦσται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τὸν ἡμερὸν ἐμφανές τὸ ὅρος κυρίου, ἔτομον ἐπ’ ἄκρο τῶν ὄρων, καὶ ἐπηρεμένον αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ τοὺς βουνοὺς· καὶ ποταμὸν θῆσονται ἐπ’ αὐτῷ λαοὶ, 2 καὶ πορεύσονται ἑδήν πολλὰ, καὶ ἐρούσι· Δεύτε, ἀναβώμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακωβ, καὶ φωτισθῶσιν ἡμᾶς τὴν ὅδον αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορευόμεθα ἐν ταῖς τριβίσις αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἐκ Σιων ἐξελέγωσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ. 3 καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνά μέσον λαὸν πολλὸν καὶ ἐλέγξει ἑδήν ἱσχυρὰ ἐως μακρὰν· καὶ συγκόψωσι τὰς μαχαίρας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄρτρα καὶ τὰς ζύβνας αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἄρῃ [cf. 8HevXIIgr: ἀνθαρά] ἠδος ἐπ’ ἑδὸν μαχαίραν, καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν ἐπὶ πολμέν. 4 καὶ καθίσεται ἀνήρ ὑπόκατο ἀμέλεου αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑπόκατο σκῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἦσται [cf. 8HevXIIgr: ἐστιν] ὁ ἐκφόβος, ὅτι στόμα [cf. 8HevXIIgr: τὸ στόμα] κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων ἔλαλησεν. 5 ὅτι πάντες οἱ λαοὶ πορεύσονται ἐν ὄνοματι θεοῦ [cf. 8HevXIIgr: [δεσπό] αὐτῶν, ἡμεῖς δὲ πορευόμεθα ἐν ὄνοματι κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ ἦσται 6 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνῃ λέγει πᾶς ὁ μετὰ τοῦ ἐν 8HevXIIgr] συνάζω τὴν ἐκτεθλιμμένην καὶ τὴν ἐξοσμένην ἅθροίσω καὶ ἥν ἐκάκοσα, 7 καὶ θησω τὴν ἐκτεθλιμμένην εἰς ὑπόλειμα καὶ τὴν ἐκτεθλιμμένην εἰς ἑδὸν ἱσχυρον· καὶ βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ὅρει Σιων ἀπὸ τοῦ νόου καὶ ἔως τοῦ αἰῶνος. |
There are numerous differences between the OG and kaige. Kaige Micah 4:1 has singular ἐσχάτον (end) rather than plural ἐσχάτων, omits the definite article before the Lord, and has ἅκρον (farthest point) rather than κορυφάς (highest points). Kaige’s “having lifted it above the hills” (ἐπηρμένον αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ τοὺς βουνοῖς) is synonymous with the OG’s “it will be raised high above the hills” (μετεωρίσθησεται ὑπεράνω τῶν βουνῶν), but kaige’s “and peoples will put a river at it” (καὶ ποταμὸν θήσονται ἐπ’ αὐτῷ λαοί) does not make as much sense as the OG’s “and peoples will speed to it” (καὶ σκέυοισουσι πρὸς αὐτὸ λαοί); the Hebrew uses the verb רֵדָה (flow). In v. 2 kaige’s “and they will enlighten us” (καὶ φωτισθήσεται ἡμᾶς) and the OG’s “and they will show us” (καὶ δείξουσιν ἡμᾶς) both differ from the Hebrew “and he will teach us” (וָאֵין). In v. 3—as in the parallel saying in OG Isa 2:4—kaige not only uses the complex element συν- (with) rather than κατα- (against) with the verb κόπτω (cut) but also prefers μάχα (short sword) and ζυβώνη (spear) to the OG’s ῥομφαία (long sword) and δόρυ (spear) for μάχα (sword) and ἔλευσιν (spear) respectively;\(^\text{17}\) to say, “not at all again,” kaige divides οὐ μή… ἐτι rather than combining οὐκέτι μή.

Furthermore, in v. 4 kaige omits the definite article before στόμα (mouth) and ταῦτα (these things), and kaige changes ἀναπαύσεται (rest) to καθίσεται (sit), ἐκαστος (each one) to ἀνήρ (man), διότι (therefore) to ὅτι (for), and παντοκράτωρ (almighty) to τῶν δυνάμεων (of the hosts/armies); ἀνήρ, ὅτι, and τῶν δυνάμεων are characteristic kaige revisions. In v. 5 kaige omits ἐκαστος and changes τὴν ὀδὸν αὐτοῦ (his road/way) to ἐν ὀνόματι θεοῦ/θεών αὐτῶν (in the name of their god/gods), which matches the Hebrew וַיָּרָבָם; kaige also omits καὶ ἐπέκεινα (and beyond) after “forever,” and it adds ἔσται (it shall be) to begin the ensuing sentence. In v. 6 the OG’s συντετριμμένη (ground up), εἰσδέξομαι (receive in), and ἀπωσάμην (push away) are respectively changed in kaige to ἐκτεθλιμμένη (squeezed out), ἀθροίσω (gather together), and ἐκάκοσσα (afflict); kaige also uses a singular rather than a plural relative pronoun. In v. 7 kaige changes the active (θήσομαι) to the middle voice (θήσομαι) for “I will put,” συντετριμμένη (ground up) to ἐκτεθλιμμένη (squeezed out) as in v. 6, and ἀπωσάμην (pushed away) to ἐκπεπεσμένη (squeezed out); kaige also prefers the genitive to the accusative with ἐπὶ—both being grammatically correct. Finally, kaige adds a definite article before “Mount Zion” and omits the preposition εἰς with “forever.”

\(^{17}\) Cf. OG Isa 2:4b: καὶ συγκόνυσιν τὰς μαχαίρας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰς θυσίνας αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐ λήμψεται ἐτι θνος ἐπ’ θνος μάχαιραν, καὶ οὐ μή μάθωσιν ἐτι πολεμεῖν.

---

By my count, the OG contains 196 words, and *kaige* makes forty-four changes, only one of which influences Codex W. Additionally, W adds land (γῆν) to clarify faraway (μακράν); this clarification also appears in the Achmimic. As in *kaige*, the Bohairic reflects singular ἐσχάτον in v. 1, and the Achmimic is closer to *kaige*’s ἐκάκωσα (afflict) than the OG’s ἀπωσάμην (push away). The Coptic versions here show no further influence from *kaige*. Without specifying a source, the Syrohexapla notes ἐν ὀνόματι θεοῦ—as opposed to τὴν ὀδὸν αὐτοῦ—in the margin at v. 5, so the presumption is that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all shared this reading with Justin and *kaige*. There are no other known agreements between Aquila and *kaige* in Mic 4:1–7. Accordingly, there is no basis for assuming that our extant MSS of Justin’s works have been contaminated by Aquila’s text.

It is a vast understatement to describe *kaige* as merely “influencing” Justin. As Barthélemy pointed out, Justin’s quotation of Mic 4:1–7 is “substantially identical” to the text of 8ḤevXIIgr. Justin’s quotation totals 192 words, and there is only one instance of contamination from the OG, namely ἔσται rather than ἔστιν. It would be superfluous to posit Justin’s knowledge of Aquila here, since Justin shares none of Aquila’s other attested variants. The single most important variant in Codex W is the change from τὰ δόρατα to τὰς ζιβύνας in Micah 4:3, which agrees with Justin and 8ḤevXIIgr; there is a slight chance that OG Isaiah influenced W here, but in any event W shows no more than one word of influence from *kaige*. The significance of Justin’s Micah quotation cannot be overstated, for it recovered *kaige* as the long lost source of Justin’s non-LXX quotations of the Minor Prophets in the *Dialogue with Trypho*.

---

20 Howard, “Quinta of the Minor Prophets,” 22.
21 Barthélemy, *Devanciers d’Aquila*, 205.
22 The Syrohexapla notes that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion differed from the MT by saying God (θεοῦ) rather than Lord (κυρίου) in v. 1; this influenced W. Also, Aquila and Symmachus preferred μεταξύ to ἀνὰ μέσον in v. 3, and Aquila and Theodotion had ὑπὸ instead of ὑποκάτω in v. 4.
Another non-LXX text appears in Dial. 107.4. There Justin quotes Jonah 4:10–11, the conclusion to the book wherein God chastises Jonah for worrying more about a gourd that he did not plant than about the thousands of human and animal inhabitants of Nineveh. These verses do not appear in Column 4 of 8HevXIIgr, but in all likelihood Justin purely preserves kaige.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OG Jonah 4:10–11</th>
<th>Justin Martyr Dial. 107.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σὺ ἐφείσω ὑπὲρ τῆς κολοκύνθης, ὑπὲρ ἦς οὐκ ἐκακοπάθησας ἐπ’ αὐτῆς καὶ οὐκ ἐξέβρεσας αὐτὴν, ἢ ὑπὸ νύκτα ἐγενήθη καὶ ὑπὸ νύκτα ἀπόλετο. ἔγω δὲ σὺ φείσομαι ὑπὲρ Νινευ̣ τῆς πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης, ἐν ἡ κατοικοῦσι πλείους ἡ δώδεκα μυρίας ἄνθρώπων, οὔτε οὐκ ἐγνωσαν δεξιῶν αὐτῶν ἢ ἀριστερῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ κτήνη πολλά;</td>
<td>σὺ ἐφείσομαι περὶ τοῦ σικουώνος, οὐ δὲ ἐκοπίσας ἐν αὐτῷ, οὔτε ἐξέβρεψας αὐτόν, δὲ ὑπὸ νύκτα αὐτοῦ ἤλθε καὶ ὑπὸ νύκτα αὐτοῦ ἀπόλετο. κἀγώ σὺ φείσομαι ὑπὲρ Νινευ̣ τῆς πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης, ἐν ἡ κατοικοῦσι πλείους ἡ δώδεκα μυρίας ἄνθρώπων, οὐ δὲ ἐγνωσαν ἃνα μέσον δεξιῶν αὐτῶν ἢ ἃνα μέσον ἀριστερῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ κτήνη πολλά;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justin’s text uses the preposition περὶ rather than ὑπέρ, both of which mean concerning, and Justin omits the second instance of ὑπέρ. Justin’s text also uses ἐν (in) rather than ἐπί (at) for σὺ, σικουώνη (cucumber) rather than κολοκύνθης (cocochnth, a gourd) for γεννηθη (castor-oil plant), κοπιάω (toil) rather than κακοπάθēω (suffer ill) for ἐμφυσ (toil), and οὔτε (neither) rather than καὶ οὐκ (and not) for ἄνηρ (and not). Justin’s text adds αὐτοῦ (its) modifying night in both instances, and he uses ἑρχομαι (come) rather than γίνομαι (be, become) as well as καγό (and I) rather than ἔγω δὲ (but I). Justin inflects Nineveh with a iota, and he uses the article οἱ rather than the pronoun οἵτινες for ἄνηρ. Most significantly, Justin uses ἀνήρ (man) rather than ἄνθρωπος (person) for ἄνθρωπος (man), a characteristic kaige revision; finally he adds ἀνὰ μέσον (in the middle of) to reflect γεννηθη (in between) with the right and left hands. Compared with the OG, Justin’s quotation deletes two words, adds six words, and alters seventeen other words; this amounts to twenty-five changes to a string of fifty-two words. Codex W contains none of these alterations,23 and the Achmimic has only one, namely οὔτε like Justin’s οὔτε; there is no comparative data for Aquila. As was the case with Justin’s Micah quotation, kaige appears to be Justin’s sole source for this text.

---

23 Codex W has one instance of haplography, omitting καὶ ὑπὸ νύκτα, and W reverses the right and left hands.
The aforementioned Jonah and Micah quotes establish that Justin sometimes quoted \textit{kaige} very precisely. Surprisingly Justin nowhere quotes the OG of the Dodekapropheton verbatim.\textsuperscript{24} However, Justin occasionally presents mixed quotations, partly OG and partly \textit{kaige}. Mixed quotations are identifiable based on conflations of the OG and variant readings. As the earliest known revision of the OG, \textit{kaige} offered corrective variants, but \textit{kaige} did not make any conflations. For example, \textit{kaige} uses \textit{μάχαμα} (short sword) and \textit{ζηβύνη} (spear) rather than \textit{ῥομφαία} (long sword) and \textit{δόρυ} (spear) in Micah 4:3. In other words, the OG’s terms were replaced altogether, not juxtaposed with \textit{kaige}’s variants; such would-be conflations occur nowhere in 8Hev XIIgr. In \textit{Dial.} 22.2–5, Justin gives a mixed quotation from the book of Amos.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
OG Amos 5:18–6:7 & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{24} Justin’s use of Mic 5:2 in \textit{I Apol.} 34.1 and \textit{Dial.} 78.1 quote Matt 2:6 verbatim—not the OG or \textit{kaige}. 
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Codex W shows a tendency to omit the definite article and add καί,\(^{25}\) whereas Justin tends to add the definite article and omit καί.\(^{26}\) Each witness has one or two minor differences in spelling,\(^{27}\) and there are several inconsequential variants in Codex W.\(^{28}\) Undoubtedly reflecting \textit{kaige}, Justin’s quotation in \textit{Dial.} 22.2–5 shows numerous differences vis-à-vis the OG. In Amos 5:19 Justin has ὀταν (whenever) rather than ἐὰν (if); Codices W and Alexandrinus also have this variant. Justin also has the synonymous ἐκφύη (escape) rather than φύη as well as συναντήση (meet with) rather than ἐμπέση (fall upon) in v. 19. In v. 23 Justin has ἀπόστησον (be away) rather than μετάστησον (take away) as well as πλῆθος (abundance) rather than ἤχον (sound); for the latter, the Hebrew word γῆ can mean both \textit{sound} and \textit{abundance}. In v. 25 the Hebrew says, “in the desert forty years,” and the quotation in Acts 7:42 says, “forty years in the desert;” Justin simply has ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (in the desert), whereas the OG, W, and the Bohairic simply have τεσσαράκοντα ἐτη (forty years). At the end of v. 25, Justin and the Bohairic add λέγει κύριος, which also appears in Alexandrinus but is not in the Hebrew. In v. 26 Justin, Acts 7:43, and the Bohairic omit αὐτῶν (their), which should be ὑμῶν (your) according to the Hebrew. In v. 27 Justin has παντοκράτωρ (almighty) as in the OG; surely \textit{kaige} would have made the characteristic change to τῶν δυνάμεων (of the armies).

\(^{25}\) Codex W omits the definite article in 5:18 before κυρίου (Lord), in 5:19 before ὄφις (snake), and—according to Sanders’s reconstruction—in 5:22 before ὀλοκαυτώματα (whole burnt offerings); Justin omits the definite article in 6:1 before Ισραήλ, and the article is not present in the Hebrew. W adds καί in 5:18 between κυρίου and ἕνα, in 5:22 between δότι and ἔνα, and in 5:26 after Ραφαήν.

\(^{26}\) Justin adds the definite article in 5:20 before ἐφορτάς (feasts; the article is present in Hebrew), in 5:22 before θυσίας (sacrifices; absent in Hebrew), in 5:24 before δικαιοσύνη (righteousness; absent in Hebrew), in 6:2 before ἄλλοφύλων (foreign tribes; the Hebrew is anarthrous Philistines), and in 6:4 before ἔσθιοντες (the ones who are eating); Justin omits καί in 6:1 between ἔθνων (nations) and ἐισῆλθον (entered; \textit{waw} is present in Hebrew) and in 6:4 before ἔσθιοντες (present in Hebrew).

\(^{27}\) Codex W spells ὁβάτως with two \textit{bētas} in 5:24, and Justin omits the \textit{iōta} in Ραφαήν (5:26) but adds a \textit{iōta} to ἔσθιοντες (6:4).

\(^{28}\) Codex W has the future ἀπόσομαι rather than the perfect ἀπόδομαι in 5:21, and W omits αὐτά after προσδέξομαι in 5:22; according to Sanders’s reconstruction, W also changed σωτηρίου to σωτηρίους in 5:22. W has αὐτοί rather than ἑαυτοῖς in 6:1, and after κατάβητε in 6:2 W has dittography of διέλθητε, which is on the line directly above.
In Amos 6:1 Justin has οἱ κατασπαταλόντες (those living excessively or self-indulgently) rather than τοῖς ἐξουθενοῦσι (those considered useless). After Σαμαρεῖας in 6:1 Justin adds “those named among the leaders” (οἱ ὄνομασμένοι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀρχηγοῖς), which must have been kaige’s alternative to “they harvested the authorities” (ἀπετρύγησαν ἄρχας); the OG considers Hebrew הבנים in the in the active voice (pluck), but kaige—as in the MT—considers it passive (distinguished or designated).²⁹ In v. 2 W and Justin add εἰς Χαλάνην (into Chalanēh) after πάντες (all); the MT has a proper name (vocalized כַּלְנֵה, Kalnēh), but πάντες in the OG probably reflects כל (vocalized כל, meaning ‘all of it’),³⁰ so this would be a conflation. In v. 2 Justin has πορεύθητε (be brought) rather than διέλθατε (pass through), and he has the translation τῆς μεγάλης (great) rather than the transliteration Ραββία for בָּבֶל; also in v. 2 Justin has the synonymous ὑμῶν (your) for ὑμετέρων as well as a different word order than the OG.³¹ In v. 3 Justin has ἔρχομενοι (coming) rather than ἐνχόμενοι (praying) as well as πονηρόν (evil) rather than κακήν (bad). In v. 4 Justin has κομίμομενοι (falling asleep) rather than καθεδόντες (sleeping) as well as ἁρνας (lambs), which matches ירמיה, as opposed to ἐρίφους (young goats). In v. 6, as compared with the OG’s “those drinking filtered wine” (οἱ πίνοντες τῶν διυλισμένον οἶνον), Justin has, “those drinking wine in bowls” (ἐν φιάλαις), which matches the Hebrew; Coptic versions conflate “those drinking filtered wine in bowls.”

Although ἀπ’ ἀρχὴς is always temporal in the New Testament, “from the beginning,” the sense of the Hebrew is “at the head [i.e., front] of the line of exiles” (בראש גלים) in v. 7.³² The OG and Justin use δυναστῶν (captives), but Justin adds ἀποκιζομένων (exiles), which must have stood in kaige. The OG and Justin also say “and neighing of horses will be removed from Σαμαρεῖα (horses)—or perhaps a more graphically similar, albeit morphologically unattested, form סוסות.

---

²⁹ Cf. the phrase נִכְבּוּ בּשְׂמֵיהֶם (designated by the names) in Num 1:17; 1 Chr 12:32; 16:41; 2 Chr 28:15; 31:19; Ezra 8:20.
³¹ Justin has εἰ πλείουνά ἔστι τὰ ὄρια αὕτων τῶν ὄριων ὑμῶν rather than εἰ πλέονα τὰ ὄρια αὕτων ἔστι τῶν ὑμετέρων ὄριων.
³² Cf. “at the end of the street” (בראשית דוד/וינת) in Ezek 16:31; 21:24 (Eng. v. 9); 42:12; Nah 3:10.
(mares)—for סרח, which refers to lazy people sprawling on a couch; the same Hebrew word appears in v. 4, where the OG rendered these people κατασπαταλώντες (living excessively or self-indulgently). The Hebrew word מרגח only occurs here and in Jer 16:5, where it is a cry of mourning; once horses entered the Greek verse, however, their cry was translated specifically as neighing (χρεμετισμός). Here Justin would conflate kaige, which most likely read instead, “a house of wickedness (οἶκημα κακούργων); house is inexplicable, but wickedness would be synonymous with the self-indulgent rendering of סרח in the OG of v. 4. Kaige also would have had μεταστραφήσεται (turn around; change) rather than ἐξαρθήσεται (go out), either of which work for סור (BDB: turn or depart [qal]). The Hebrew does not mention Ephraim, but Justin and the OG do.\(^\text{35}\)

| MT Amos 6:7 | Therefore now they will be exiled at the head of exiles, and the cry of the licentious will go out. |
| OG Amos 6:7 | Therefore now they will be captives at the first of the powerful, and neighing of horses will be removed from Ephraim. |
| Dial. 22.5b | Therefore now they will be captives at the first of the powerful of exiles, and a house of wickedness will turn, and neighing of horses will be removed from Ephraim. |

Including definite articles, the OG contains 292 words, thirty-three of which are changed somehow in Justin’s quotation (fifteen alternate words, seventeen added words, and one subtracted word). Justin shares three word changes with W and five word changes with the Coptic; the only kaige readings in W are ὅταν in Amos 5:19 and εἰς Χαλάνην in 6:2. The

\(^{33}\) Cf. סרח as the part of a curtain that hangs or folds over in Exod 26:12; perhaps also contributing to horses in OG Amos 6:7 is the reference to horses in v. 12.

\(^{34}\) Kaige likely also translated as κακούργοι in vv. 4 and 7; kaige likely reserved κατασπαταλώντες for שאננים (people who are secure, at ease, or arrogant) in v. 1.

\(^{35}\) For comparison, Ephraim and a horse are juxtaposed in Zech 9:10 (…تضرير وتت …).
Bohairic aligns with Justin in adding λέγει κύριος in Amos 5:25 and (along with Acts 7:43) omitting αὐτῶν in 5:26; in a conflation, Coptic versions include “in bowls” in 6:6. Justin shares none of Aquila’s attested revisions, thereby nullifying Barthélemy’s suspicion that Aquila’s version contaminated the fourteenth-century MS of Justin’s works. Such seeming contamination results instead from Justin’s conflating kaiige with the OG. Justin’s conflation of these two known sources eliminates the need for a hypothetical testimonium as one of Justin’s sources.

In summary, sporadic variants show that kaiige definitely influenced Codex W and the Coptic versions. The Coptic and W nonetheless remain faithful to the OG line by line. On the contrary, Justin’s Jonah and Micah quotations are taken practically word for word from kaiige with minimal contamination from the OG. Justin’s Amos quotation is a more difficult case, for without comparative data from 8HevXIIgr, one cannot reasonably assume that kaiige left the OG

36 Vis-à-vis the OG, Aquila transliterates ναβλων rather than translating ὀργάνον in Amos 5:23 according to MS 86; according to Jerome, Aquila prefers the synonymous συσκιάσμους rather than σκηνήν for shade in v. 26 and (including 2pl. suffix) transliterates ἡμέρας as Μολχωμ rather than Μολοχ and ἔτη (Saturn) for Ραίφαν in v. 26; finally Aquila translates πολλήν rather than transliterating Ραββα in 6:2 according to the Syrohexapla, and Aquila gives the more accurate οἱ ἀποκεχωρισμένοι (separating) instead of οἱ ἐρχόμενοι (coming) for διαβίων (putting away) in v. 3 according to MS 86.

37 Barthélemy, Devanciers d’Aquila, 208–9.

unchanged in all the places where Justin’s quotation agrees with the OG.⁴⁹ One can, however, reasonably conclude that Justin quotes kaige variants wherever his Amos quotation diverges from the OG. Kaige and the OG sufficiently account for Justin’s sources for the Dodekapropheton in the Dialogue with Trypho, so there is no need to posit hypothetical testimonia as additional sources.

**The Relationship between Kaige and Quinta**

This section argues for the equivalence of kaige and the Quinta in the Dodekapropheton. The case studies are Origen’s quotation of Quinta Zech 9:9 and Jerome’s quotations of Quinta Hab 2:15, 3:13, and Mic 5:6, as well as Hos 8:6. I offer a few correctives to Barthélemy’s work, but overall I show that his main conclusion withstands George Howard’s counterarguments regarding the relationship between kaige and the Quinta.

As shown in the preceding section, Justin’s Jonah and Micah quotations come solely from kaige. On that basis, some scholars have mistakenly assumed that Justin exactly reproduced kaige when quoting Zech 9:9 in Dial. 53.3.⁴⁰ However, this is a mixed quotation, as was the case with Justin’s Amos quotation in Dial. 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OG Zech 9:9</th>
<th>Justin Martyr Dial. 53.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χαίρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σιων· κήρυσσε, χαίρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σιων, ἀλάλαξον,</td>
<td>χαίρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σιων· κήρυσσε, ϊδου ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἢξει σοι δίκαιος καὶ σώζων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρχέται σοι, δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς, πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ υποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον.</td>
<td>αὐτὸς καὶ πραῦς καὶ πτωχὸς ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ υποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον ὄνου.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I have demonstrated elsewhere,⁴¹ Justin changed ἔρχεται (comes) to ἢξει (will have come); the “prophetic future perfect” is a redactional Tendenz that Justin shows elsewhere.⁴²

---

⁴⁹ E.g., Jerome does not cite any Hexaplaric data for Hab 3:14, where kaige changed nearly every word of the OG; Codex Montefiore attests thoroughgoing revision of Hab 3:14 by Aquila and Symmachus as well.

⁴⁰ E.g., Prigent, Justin et l’Ancien Testament, 284; Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 76.

Justin then conflated *kaige*’s ἀλάλαξον (shout) with the OG’s κήρυσσε (proclaim) as well as *kaige*’s πτωχός (poor) with the OG’s πράς (humble); to reiterate, as the earliest known revision of the OG, *kaige* would have contained no such conflations. Last, Justin’s phrase πῶλον ὄνου (a colt of an ass) was influenced by John 12:15, not by any extant Greek version of Zechariah.43

For Zech 9:9b, Origen lists full Hexaplaric data including the Quinta.44

| OG Zech 9:9b | πρας καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον |
| Aquila | πρας καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνου καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑμῶν |
| Symmachus | πτωχός καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑμῶν ὀνάδος |
| Theodotion | ἐπακούων καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑμῶν |
| Quinta | πτωχός καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑμῶν |

Howard accepted that Justin used *kaige*, but since Justin’s quotation does not exactly match Origen’s *Quinta*, Howard rejected Barthélemy’s equating *kaige* and the *Quinta*.45 However, neither Barthélemy nor Howard recognized that Justin conflated the OG with *kaige*. By

---

42 In *Dial. 49.3* Justin described John the Baptist as a prophet who cried out that one stronger than he “will have come” (ἡξεί). Justin’s Vorlage(n) would have said that someone either “comes” (ἔρχεται; Mark 1:7b; Luke 3:16c) or “is coming” (ἔρχόμενος; Matt 3:11a; John 1:27).
43 Justin also quotes Zech 9:9 in *I Apol. 35.11*; there his sources were the OG and the quotations of Zechariah in the Gospels of Matthew (21:5) and John (12:15): χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιων· κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ιερουσαλημ· ἵδοι ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἐρχεται σοι· πρᾶς ἐπιβεβηκώς ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνον ὑμῶν ὑποζύγιον; the missing καί between πρᾶς/πρας and ἐπιβεβηκώς is also attested in Codex Bezae at Matt 21:5. In *I Apology* Justin misattributed the verse to Zephaniah, for OG Zeph. 3:14a and OG Zech. 9:9aa begin verbatim, “Rejoice greatly, daughter Zion; proclaim, daughter Jerusalem.” As I have pointed out elsewhere (James W. Barker, *John’s Use of Matthew*, Emerging Scholars [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015], 79), it is possible that Justin read from the Book of the Twelve and arrived at Zephaniah 3 prior to Zechariah 9. After copying as far as “daughter Jerusalem,” Justin could have relied on Matt 21:5 and John 12:15 for the remainder of his quotation without further recourse to any OT text. Justin’s *I Apology* nowhere reflects knowledge of *kaige*.
removing Justin’s redactions, I reconstruct kaige Zech 9:9 as follows: χαῖρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σιων· ἀλάλαξον, θύγατερ Ἰερουσαλήμ· ἵδοι ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι, δίκαιος καὶ σάφζων αὐτός, πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκός ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νιών ὅνων.

Justin shows that—as in the Quinta—kaige preferred πραῦς (humble) to πτωχὸς (poor) for יֵשׁ, which can mean either humble or poor; the translation πτωχὸς for יֵשׁ also appears in 8ヘbXIIgr Hab 3:14. Symmachus also had πτωχὸς in Zech 9:9, but he did not work until a few decades after the death of Justin. It is also important that Aquila kept πραῦς, for there is no reason to suppose that later scribes conformed Justin’s text to Aquila’s recension.46 Another key agreement between kaige and Quinta is leaving the OG’s ὑποζύγιον unchanged; Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion unanimously preferred νός. In Zech 9:9 Codex W is identical to the OG, and Coptic versions show no Hexaplaric influence.47

Regarding Zech 9:9, then, Justin alone gives evidence that kaige preferred ἀλάλαξον to the OG’s κήρυσσε. Justin also shows that kaige changed πραῦς to πτωχὸς but left ὑποζύγιον unchanged. Origen’s Quinta likewise read πτωχὸς and ὑποζύγιον. Justin’s πῶλον νιών—as opposed to the OG’s πῶλον νέον or the Quinta’s πῶλον νιών ὅνων—comes from the quotation of Zech 9:9 in the Gospel of John. Accordingly, as compared with Origen’s Quinta, Justin’s main disagreement did not derive from kaige. Moreover, the shared agreements between Justin’s kaige and Origen’s Quinta line up against the OG, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. One can thus reasonably infer the equivalence of kaige and Quinta in Zech 9:9.

Zechariah 9:9 is Origen’s lone extant quotation of the Quinta, but Jerome cites the Quinta twenty-six times in the Minor Prophets.48 Only three references can be checked against

---


47 E.g., “a yoke animal and a young colt” (Ὅψαλμαρβῆ ὁγ ν γκο ν ηπρε) in the Achmimic matches the OG exactly; the Achmimic is taken from Carl Wessely, “Duodecim porphetarum minorum versionis Achmimicae: Codex Rainerianus,” Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 16 (1915): 257.

8ḤevXIIgr, yet in all three cases *kaige* is identical to Jerome’s *Quinta*. For Hab 2:15, Jerome cites Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the *Quinta*, and two others. The OG proclaims woe on someone who gives a neighbor ἀνατροπῇ ἑλερῷ to drink; LSJ here understands ἀνατροπῇ as *poured out*, but it can also mean something *upsetting*, and ἑλερῷ means muddy or cloudy. According to Jerome, the *Quinta* changed ἑλερῷ to ὑμός (wrath) but the *Quinta* retained ἀνατροπῇ, albeit in the genitive rather than the dative. In 8ḤevXIIgr a fragment of Column 18 preserves ἀνατρῷ in Hab 2:15, so *kaige* and *Quinta* here line up against every other attested revision of the OG.

The Hebrew word סלה appears in Hab 3:3, 9, 13. The OG translated διάψαλμα, but Jerome relates the translations ἀεί (always) by Aquila, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (until the aeon) by Symmachus, and εἰς τέλος (until the end) by Theodotion as well as the transliteration σελα by the *Quinta*. Although Habakkuk 3 is very fragmentary in 8ḤevXIIgr, this transliteration—albeit spelled σελε—stands in *kaige* Hab 3:13; by contrast, Codex W and the Coptic maintain the OG’s διάψαλμα. In this instance, *kaige* and *Quinta* align the OG to the Hebrew in exactly the same way *and* in contrast to Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.49

The prophet Micah imagines a remnant of Israelites ruling the Assyrians: “And they will shepherd the land of Asshur with a sword and the land of Nimrod with a פתחיה” (MT Mic 5:5a; OG v. 6). The Assyrian cities Nimrod and Asshur clearly stand in parallelism, and so would חרב and פתחיה. Nonetheless OG Mic 5:6a reads: “And they will shepherd Assour with a alike has translated, ‘will live by *his* [ἀὐτῷ] faith.’ Only Symmachus says, interpreting distinctively, ‘the righteous will live by *his own* [ἐαυτῷ] faith.’” Similarly, the Syrohexapla (Ceriani 107r) notes that “these” (אלו)—i.e., Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion—say that the righteous one “lives from his faith” (אלו). Column 17 of 8ḤevXIIgr preserves κατος εν πιστει αυτου ζησετ, which agrees verbatim with Eusebius’s attribution to Aquila in *Dem. evang.* 6.14 (*PG* 22:439, 441). Migne’s Hexapla (*PG* 16:2985, 2987) mistakenly extends Symmachus’s reading to Theodotion, *Quinta*, *Sexta*, and *Septima*.

---

49 Barthélemy (*Devanciers d’Aquila*, 176) and Howard (“Quinta of the Minor Prophets,” 20) reconstructed the rest of Hab 3:13 differently, and Howard concluded that “there is no certainty whatever that Quinta and R are the same in this passage”; yet Howard neglected the key agreement of σελα/σελε, which does not require reconstruction.
sword and the land of Nebrod with her ditch.” The Greek phrase ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς (with her ditch) would reflect Hebrew הבמה, the segolate פֶּתַח (opening, doorway) with the preposition bet and 3fs suffix he. Symmachus’s ἐντὸς πυλῶν αὐτῶν and Theodotion’s ἐν πύλαις αὐτῶν show the same understanding of the Hebrew noun. Aquila’s in lanceis eius (with her spears) and the Quinta’s ἐν παραξίφεσιν αὐτῶν (with their daggers) understand the Hebrew word in 5:5aβ as פֶּתַח for drawn sword or dagger, which restores the parallelism with sword (חרב) in 5:5aα. Most importantly, ἐν παρα in Column 9 of 8ḤevXIIgr shows that kaige here aligns with Jerome’s Quinta reading.

Especially in Hosea 4–9, Barberini MS 86 designates a number of marginal variants with the siglum ε’. The question is whether these come from the Quinta. Hosea 8:6 is most important because Jerome gives a different Quinta reading than the ε’ note in MS 86. Here Hosea decries Israel’s idolatry, specifically “the calf of Samaria” (cf. 1 Kings 12).

| MT Hos 8:6 | ווהא חרש שעשה לא אלוהים והו כ-שׁבבים יהוה על שׁמרות |
| OG Hos 8:6 | καὶ αὐτὸ τέκτων ἔποιησε, καὶ οὐ θεός ἐστιν ἡ πλανῶν ἢν ὁ μόσχος σου, Σαμαρεια |
| MS 86 ε’ Hos 8:6 | τὸ ὑπὸ τέκτωνος γενόμενον οὐκ ἢν ἡ θεός· παραπλησίως τῷ τῆς ἄραχνης ἱστῶ. |

| MT Hos 8:6 | And it, a carpenter made it, and it is not a god, for the calf of Samaria will become splinters. |
| OG Hos 8:6 | And a carpenter made it, and it is not a god; therefore your calf, Samaria, was misleading. |
| MS 86 ε’ Hos 8:6 | What came into being by a carpenter should not be a god, resembling a spider’s web . . . |

The Hebrew word שׁבבים is hapax legomenon. The rendering splinters (see BDB and HALOT) is supported by Targum Jonathan’s phrase, “for the calf of Samaria will become sawed boards” ( errorHandler; cf. qere שׁבבים for ketiv שׁבבים in Jer 50:6a), which denotes turn or turn back but can connote turning away or apostasy. Jerome gives full Hexaplaric data for this word. Aquila said errantibus (wandering) or conuersis (turn around or turn back), whereas the Quinta said

---

50 The Peshitta reflects the OG’s πλανῶν in the sense of error (ךתא); Grossouw lists no variants for the Coptic.
ῥεμβεύων (roaming). Symmachus put ἀκαταστατῶν (unstable), and Theodotion kept the OG’s πλανῶν (wandering, misleading). The Quinta’s ῥεμβεύων does not match παραπλησίως, the ε’ note in MS 86; for comparison, MS 86 attributes to Symmachus ἀκατάστατος, which does correspond to Jerome’s evidence.

Jerome’s translation of Hos 8:6b in the Vulgate reads, “since the bull of Samaria will turn into a spider web” (quoniam in aranearum telas erit vitulus Samariae). According to Jerome’s commentary, Hosea was saying that a thin web disappears into thin air, just as Samaria’s greatness will diminish. Moreover aranearum fila (spider web) is Jerome’s understanding of Hebrew שבבים, which he transliterates sababim. Barthélemy speculated that Jerome was influenced by Syriac نوو، which can mean “to descend by means of a rope.”

A clearer explanation has gone unrecognized until now: Jerome actually misreads שׁבבים as שׂבכים, which signifies interwoven things such as a net (Job 18:8) or lattice-work (1 Kgs 7:17); cf. Aramaic סבכא for a lyre, which is strung or threaded. Jerome thus mistakes a graphically similar kaph for bet; sin and shin are indistinguishable in unpointed MSS.

I accept Barthélemy’s hypothesis that MS 86 ε’ is dependent on Jerome’s Vulgate and his commentary on the Minor Prophets. At the same time, it is difficult to determine the origin of that Greek text, because it is not a direct translation of the Vulgate. There are two unparalleled features, namely omitting “and” as well as the shift to the subjunctive; “should not be a god” (οὐκ ἄν ἦ θεός) differs from the Vulgate’s et non est Deus, which matches the OG and the MT.


52 Barthélemy, “Quinta ou Version selon les Hébreux,” 344. Howard (“Quinta of the Minor Prophets,” 17–18) further suggested that Jerome could have mistakenly copied the Quinta and that MS 86 could have copied a contaminated Quinta. However, there is no basis for doubting that Jerome took ῥεμβεύων from the Quinta, and contamination (e.g., kaige’s influence on Codex W and Coptic versions) typically consists of a word here or there, not an unparalleled string of thirteen words.

53 The shift to the subjunctive in MS 86 ε’ further distances this text from kaige, for the subjunctive is relatively infrequent in OG, and only once does 8ḤevXIIgr change an indicative to a subjunctive: OG’s ἐξουσι becomes ἔλθωσιν for ἴπτει in Zech 8:20 (Tov, Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 124).
The main problem in v. 6b is παραπλησίως, which seems to be related to, or a revision of, πλανῶν. That is, παραπλῆσιος is a Greek word with a dual meaning: one pertains to movement (coming alongside), and the other is used for comparison (resembling). The OG’s πλανῶν connotes movement, but Jerome apparently introduced the notion of comparison in this verse. In the OG the calf image instrumentally caused Israel to sin, whereas the MT says that Samaria’s calf will be materially chopped to pieces. In other words, the Hebrew does not say that the calf will become like splinters but that it literally will be turned into splinters. Jerome’s “spider web” mistranslation necessitates a figurative interpretation, and the discussion in Jerome’s commentary—not the Vulgate itself—presumes Hosea to have compared Samaria’s bull to a spider web. Therefore the comparative aspect of παραπλῆσιος makes the most sense in view of Jerome’s interpretation.

Jerome did not find the “spider web” reading anywhere in the Hexapla or even in the Old Latin, which closely follows the Old Greek—particularly the participle seductor (one who misleads) for πλανῶν.\(^\text{54}\) There is no evidence for a Hebrew Vorlage reading “spider web,” a misunderstanding arising from Jerome’s own exegesis in the late-fourth century. Had he known of a Greek version like the MS 86 ε’ reading, Jerome could have quoted it as “others say,” as he does for the Sexta and the Septima. I consider it too much of a stretch to see the Greek MS 86 ε’ as independent of, or prior to, Jerome. In any event, Jerome’s Quinta reading of ῥεμβεύων does not match παραπλησίως in MS 86 ε’, and I confidently concur with Barthélemy’s dissociation of MS 86 ε’ from the Hexapla’s Quinta; although they share the same siglum, they are not the same text. Since Jerome’s Quinta does match not match kaige here but does match it elsewhere, the marginal notes in MS 86 do not challenge the equivalence of kaige and Quinta in the Dodekapropheton.

In summary, there are admittedly few examples, but in every verifiable instance kaige and Quinta turn out to be equivalent with no contrary evidence. In previous research, the greatest

---

difficulty came from dissimilar quotations of Zech 9:9 in Justin Martyr’s *kaige* and Origen’s *Quinta*. Upon closer inspection, however, Justin was conflating the OG with *kaige*. By subtracting the OG conflations, *kaige* is shown to agree with the *Quinta* there. Moreover, Jerome’s quotations of *Quinta* Hab 2:15, 3:13, and Micah 5:6 match *kaige*, as evidenced by 8Ḥev XII gr. Jerome’s witness to *Quinta* Hos 8:6 further establishes that the ε’ notations in MS 86 do not refer to the *Quinta*, and so Barthélemy rightly excluded MS 86 ε’ readings from consideration. I have offered occasional refinements to Barthélemy’s discussions, but overall I hope to have vindicated his carefully weighed conclusion based on internal evidence that *kaige* and *Quinta* are equivalent in the Dodekapropheton.

**Conclusion: Weighing Internal and External Evidence**

Howard paid insufficient attention to external evidence, and so he inaccurately asserted that *kaige* and *Quinta* were no more closely related than *kaige* was to Justin, the Coptic versions, Codex W, or Aquila.55 The OG is by definition the earliest known Greek translation. As the earliest known revision of the OG, *kaige* dates no later than the first century BCE, since the physical artifact of 8Ḥev XII gr dates near the turn of the era. The scroll’s discovery in the Cave of Horror shows that this artifact remained in use in Palestine until the bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135 CE). Soon thereafter, Justin Martyr used *kaige* for his *Dialogue with Trypho*, which dates between 155 and 167.56 To reiterate, *kaige* did not simply influence Justin—*kaige* was the discernible, independent source that Justin used alongside the OG for the Minor Prophets.57

Aquila’s revision dates to ca. 125 CE, so it was a potential source for Justin; it appears not to have been an actual source, however, since Justin’s work nowhere reveals traces of

---

55 Howard, “Quinta of the Minor Prophets,” 22.
57 I agree with Tessa Rajak’s (“Theological Polemic and Textual Revision in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*,” in *Greek Scriptures and the Rabbis*, ed. Timothy Michael Law and Alison Salvesen, CBET 66 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 127–40, here 140) caution regarding Justin’s polemics, yet I would qualify that he still plays an important part in textual reconstruction.
Aquila’s revision. As Barthélemy demonstrated, Aquila was himself dependent on *kaige*. As a revision of *kaige*, Aquila’s would not have been identical—as were Justin’s verbatim quotations. Nevertheless, Aquila would show much closer affinity to *kaige* than does Codex W or the Coptic versions, all of which only reveal *kaige* variants sporadically.

The recensions by Symmachus and Theodotion traditionally date to ca. 200 CE. Third-century biblical translations reflect scholarly interests that culminated in Origen’s Hexapla. Codex W dates to the mid- to late-third century, and W incorporates variants from Aquila, Symmachus, and the *Quinta*. Henry Sanders inferred that W’s parent text included marginal Hexaplaric glosses similar to those of MS 86, except that the sources might not have been identified. The same type of Hexaplaric influence appears in Coptic translations, which did not emerge until the mid- to late-third century. In particular, Coptic versions of the Minor Prophets incorporate variants from Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the *Quinta*.

Since Codex W and the Coptic versions date to the third century, they can and do occasionally attest Hexaplaric readings that did not exist in Justin’s era. Yet it is essential to recognize that W and the Coptic firmly stand in the OG tradition. For example, in Mic 4:1–7 W and the Coptic each show >99% agreement with the OG, whereas Justin’s *kaige* shows <78% agreement with the OG. Howard relativizes these textual traditions as though *kaige* exerted

59 Peter J. Gentry (“Pre-Hexaplaric Translations, Hexapla, post-Hexaplaric translations,” in *Textual History of the Bible*, vol. IA (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 211–34, here §1.3.1.2.4) has recently re-dated Theodotion to 25 BCE–25 CE, working contemporaneously within the *kaige* tradition. The relation between *kaige/Quinta* and Theodotion in the Dodekapropheton needs further study; presently, though, two points are clear: Theodotion readings in the Minor Prophets are distinguishable from *kaige/Quinta*, and Theodotion did not influence Justin’s quotations.
similar influence across the board. Quantifiably, out of all the examples included herein, *kaige* changed approximately one out of every five words of the OG, yet very few of those variants (<6%) went on to contaminate Codex W or the Coptic versions; Aquila would assume more of those variants because it stands in the new tradition forged by *kaige*.

In conclusion, Howard justifiably questioned the equivalence of *kaige* and *Quinta* given such limited data.\(^{63}\) But if, in the Minor Prophets, *kaige* is not the *Quinta*, then what is it? Jerome cites the *Sexta* (ϛ') and *Septima* (ζ') for Hab 1:5 and 2:11. He gives an additional *Sexta* reference for Hab 3:13, which reads “through Jesus, your Christ.” None of the *Sexta* or *Septima* quotes can be checked against 8ḤevXIIgr, but the *Quinta* definitely differed from these two, and the *Sexta* was clearly a Christian revision. As a pre-Christian revision of the OG, *kaige* thus cannot be the same as the *Sexta*. And if the positive evidence connecting *kaige* and *Quinta* is insufficient or indeterminate for some scholars, then neither could *kaige* be identified with the *Septima*, for which there is no overlap at all. I do not draw conclusions for *kaige* or *Quinta* beyond the Dodekapropheton, but in terms of parsimony I validate Barthélemy’s argument for their equivalence in the Minor Prophets as the surest hypothesis moving forward. Otherwise *kaige* must be posited as an *eighth* Greek version of the Minor Prophets, one that Justin Martyr knew but Origen did not—even though Origen was “more textually aware than almost anyone else one could name in the history of ecclesiastical scholarship.”\(^{64}\)

---

\(^{63}\) Howard, “Quinta of the Minor Prophets,” 16.